

that the oratorical composition of speeches in the 5th century B.C.E. is not commonly governed by ideas concerning the division of speeches into separate parts – ideas that later became commonplace.

As already stated, the book is clearly written and the argumentation, in general, transparent. It does, however, contain some unnecessary repetitions, obviously due to having been partly compiled from originally separate publications. This reader also finds the recurrent direct quotations from the authors' previous works somewhat disturbing. Some references to secondary bibliography could have been moved into footnotes (surprisingly seldom used by the authors), and fellow classicists surely would not have minded quotations in original Greek. The authors' concept-driven approach, with the analytical focus on the development of specific terms of art, is apt to produce illuminating interventions in and corrections to the given historical accounts; but it meets its limitations when it comes to sketching historical narratives of a more synthetic kind. This is why the book is best viewed, as stated at the beginning of this review, as an illuminating independent *addendum* to a greater revised research program on the early history of rhetoric. I hope that the academic audience will, sooner or later, see a publication of a more synthetic kind, dealing with the fascinating interrelations between sophists, orators and philosophers in the heyday of 4th century Athens. Meanwhile, additional scholarly interventions of the kind contained in this book are also highly welcome. All in all, this is a thought-provoking and innovative piece of scholarship, highly recommended for anybody interested in the intellectual history of 5th and 4th century Greece.

Lassi Jakola

ALESSIA PRIOLETTA: *Inscriptions from the Southern Highlands of Yemen: The Epigraphic Collections of the Museums of Baynūn and Dhamār*. Arabia Antica 8. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Rome 2013. ISBN 978-88-913-0001-0. 408 pp, 235 ill. EUR 145.

There has been, in recent years, a revived interest in Arabian archaeology and epigraphy. Scholars have taken up the task of finding and studying new Arabian antiquities, pre-Islamic and Islamic-era languages and inscriptions, and so on. (It must be noted at the outset that most written evidence from pre-Islamic Arabia consists of inscriptions; we have no or at the most very few literary remains written on more perishable materials.) When, in 2000, Michael Macdonald published his trailblazing essay "Reflections on the Linguistic Map of Pre-Islamic Arabia" (*Arabian Archaeology and Epigraphy* 11: 28–79), many of the questions concerning pre-Islamic Arabian languages remained murky. Since then, painstaking scholarly work by such epigraphists and linguists as Peter Stein, Ahmad Al-Jallad, Laïla Nehmé, and Michael Macdonald himself, has provided an answer to many questions concerning Ancient South Arabian (ASA) and Ancient North Arabian (ANA) languages as well as Old Arabic and Nabataean Aramaic. The number of finds has increased extensively as well: some 80,000 ANA and some 10,000 ASA inscriptions are known today.

While it was often suggested in the past that ASA and ANA languages formed linguistically genealogical groups or even that ANA and ASA were single languages in which there was only dialectal variation, nowadays most scholars think of these categories first and foremost as geographical ones that belie the linguistic plurality within them. It has also been noted that the categorization is

often based on script, which does not necessarily mean anything for the language of the inscriptions.

Alessia Prioletta has joined the group of important ASA epigraphists with an edition and commentary of an important collection of ASA (mostly Sabaic) inscriptions. It must be conceded that I myself am an Islamicist working mostly with Islamic origins and Arabic epigraphy. Although I take a keen interest in pre-Islamic Arabia and its inscriptions and languages, I am not a specialist in ASA and cannot comment on the issues specifically related to the ASA languages or the exact readings and interpretations of the inscriptions published by Prioletta in her book.

Alessia Prioletta was taught by Prof. Alessandra Avanzini – one of the foremost scholars of ASA inscriptions – at the University of Pisa from which she graduated in 2000. She then moved to the University of Florence where she wrote her doctoral dissertation, receiving her PhD in 2004. She has written a large number of articles, but *Inscriptions from the Southern Highlands of Yemen: The Epigraphic Collections of the Museums of Baynūn and Dhamār* is her first monograph. Since 2015, she has been part of the famous French National Centre for Scientific Research, UMR 8167 "Orient et Méditerranée", a real haven for anyone working on pre-Islamic Arabia.

The book under review is a careful edition and analysis of 235 ASA inscriptions housed at the Museum of Baynūn, the Regional Museum of Dhamār, and the Museum of the University of Dhamār. Many of the inscriptions of these museums spring from nearby locales but some have ended up there from more distant regions. If I understand Prioletta correctly (p. 12), (some of?) the inscriptions had already been published online in the database of ASA inscriptions, the Digital Archive for the Study of pre-Islamic Arabian Inscriptions (<http://dasi.humnet.unipi.it>), so these are not necessarily new inscriptions, but they merit their publication in book form very well, since the introduction (pp. 15–74) and the analysis of the inscriptions written by Prioletta are excellent.

The introductory chapter describes the language of the inscriptions treated in the book as well as the historical, societal, religious and tribal information they give us about the Dhamār region in antiquity and late antiquity in a lucid fashion. Pages 45–51 discuss in what aspects the inscriptions published by Prioletta agree (or disagree) with Peter Stein's studies¹ on the chronology, phonology, and morphology of Sabaic.

The main significance for an Islamicist like me is certainly Prioletta's contribution on the tribal map of Dhamār in pre-Islamic times (pp. 29–39), religious developments (pp. 40–44), and the political history of the region (pp. 51–70). I read all this with much fascination. In a very clear way, Prioletta depicts the rise of the Ḥimyarite Confederation at the end of the first millennium BCE (p. 56) as well as its fighting with, and eventual victory over, the Sabaeans. Also very significant is her contribution on the religious developments in the region. She shows how the inscriptions evince the change from different varieties of polytheism to, in the fourth century CE, the monotheistic cult of Raḥmānān (p. 44), identified sometimes in the inscriptions and usually in the modern studies with the Jewish God. Traditional polytheism was a living and dynamic phenomenon in before that. The main deity was 'Athtar, who received different attributes among different tribes. The Sabaean chief god Almaqah is also attested in the Dhamār inscriptions (p. 41). Notably for Islamicists, the goddess known in pre-Islamic inscriptions, in the Qur' ān, and later Arabic tradition as al-'Uzzā seems to appear in one inscription of this corpus as ʿzyn (BynM 202, pp. 44, 112–115).

¹ See especially his *Untersuchungen zur Phonologie und Morphologie des Sabäischen*, Rahden 2003.

Epigraphists divide the material they work with in a variety of ways. One can divide inscriptions on the basis of their provenance, language, contents, intended functions, the materials and objects that they are written on, the methods of writing (engraving, painting, scratching), or their formal vs. informal nature, for instance.

The inscriptions in Prioletta's book are classified on the basis of which museum they come from, language (Sabaic or other ASA language), and type: construction inscriptions, dedicatory inscriptions, commemorative inscriptions, onomastics, minor fragments of uncertain typology as well as inscriptions on bronze objects, pottery vessels, and figurines (see the contents on pp. 5–6 and the criteria given on pp. 12–14). The possible problem with this categorization is that it conflates contents, function, and the materials that the inscriptions are written on. Dividing the inscriptions into construction, dedicatory, and commemorative inscriptions is based on the analysis of their contents, while the division "inscriptions on bronze objects, pottery vessels, and figurines" is based on what material or object the inscriptions are written on.

Perhaps the most problematic type is the inscriptions classified as "onomastics" (pp. 131–154, 245–266, 337–352). As can be seen from the figures, these are often inscriptions on statues and portable items that contain only or mostly names. But these are often very similar to what is published as inscriptions on bronze objects, pottery vessels, and figurines (pp. 293–318), so one would want to know on what basis the division has been made. Some of the inscriptions classified as "onomastics" are also damaged (e.g. BynM 418); we cannot be certain whether the original inscription actually included something more than a name. Furthermore, BynM 5, also published in the "onomastics" category, is a funerary stone with a longer inscription, so it would be better classified as something else. On p. 12, Prioletta notes: "Inscriptions that contain only names, including funerary stelae with the name of the object and author, are categorized as 'Onomastics' in each museum collection." But BynM 5 is a longer inscription which not only contains names but additional information as well (p. 134): "Funerary stela of *Ḍrhm* of *Rmln*. And may 'Amm shame the one who will violate this memorial." This is also the case with some other funerary stelae in the collection (e.g., BynM 422, pp. 137–138).

In any case, these are minor complaints, but I would like to have seen a longer discussion of why the typology was established in this way. As it now stands, it confuses different criteria. To be fair, Prioletta is aware of this. On p. 13, she comments: "Some special groups of artefacts, such as the Regional Museum of Dhamār's 'Inscribed bronze objects' and 'Inscribed pottery vessels and figurines,' are collected together regardless of their textual typology." Incidentally, some of the inscriptions look and read like graffiti to me (e.g., BynM 400, pp. 131–132, and ThUM 34, pp. 322–323), but the possible division graffiti vs. monumental inscriptions is not discussed by Prioletta.

Many of the inscriptions are beautiful specimens of ASA epigraphy and of the utmost importance for scholarship. One can mention, for example, a complete building inscription (BynM 200, pp. 87–89), a dedicatory inscription on an incense burner (BynM 22, p. 109), a sixteen-line well-preserved inscription on a statue base (BynM1, pp. 116–118), and a dedication to the deity Almaqah (DhM 383, pp. 206–210).

The book is well written and Prioletta's interpretations and arguments are easy to follow. It can be recommended not only for ASA specialists but for anyone interested in pre-Islamic Yemen as well as Arabian epigraphy and religion. It could be noted, however, that the book would have

profited from one more proofreading by a native English speaker. One could also comment that the price (EUR 145) is extremely steep for a book that is only paperback.

Ilkka Lindstedt

Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum. Consilio et auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Berolinensis et Brandenburgensis editum. Vol. I²: Inscriptiones Latinae antiquissimae ad C. Caesaris mortem. Pars II, fasc. V: Indices fasciculorum I-IV. Ediderunt ERNESTUS LOMMATZSCH – IOANNES KRUMMREY. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin 2015. ISBN 978-3-11-041589-6. VIII, 1205–1439 pp. EUR 149.95.

Wie bekannt, enthält das letzte 1986 erschienene Supplement des ersten den republikanischen Inschriften gewidmeten Bandes des Berliner Inschriftenwerkes keine Indices. Dieses Manko hat jetzt Hans Krummrey mit dem vorliegenden Indexband aufgehoben, und zwar auf eine ausgezeichnete Weise; er ist ein erstklassiges Arbeitsinstrument geworden. Krummrey hat nicht nur die im letzten Supplement enthaltenen Texte berücksichtigt, sondern auch die in früheren Faszikeln publizierten. So hat er einen kritisch gesichteten Gesamtindex zu CIL I² (verständlichweise ohne die Fasti et Elogia) hervorgebracht, der ihm Ehre macht und für die Forschung große Dienste leisten wird. Die Struktur des Index ist dieselbe bewährte der zwei von Lommatzsch im zweiten und dritten Faszikel gefertigten Indices. Neu hinzugekommen ist ein topographischer Index, gesondert nach den Fundorten (A) und Aufstellungsorten (B) geordnet; mit einem dritten Teil (C), betitelt "Qui homines in parte B memorati titulos legerint et quorum in aedibus hortis collectionibus tituli asserventur vel asservati sint", endet der Band. Von ihnen sind besonders A und B ein hochwillkommener Beitrag zur Einbettung der Inschriften zur historisch-geographischen Umgebung, aus der sie stammen.

Heute, da der Forschung ausgedehnte Datenbanken zur Verfügung stehen, ist es wichtig, dass Indices traditioneller Art weiter gepflegt werden. Die Datenbanken können die Indices alten Stils nicht ersetzen; die zwei Gattungen ergänzen einander. Die Mitforscher begrüßen mit Freude diese Initiative. Ihr großer Nutzen wird auch dadurch augenscheinlich, dass die gebotene Information stellenweise vollständiger ist als in Lommatzsch' Indices. Hinzugekommen ist der Abschnitt "Litterarum formae notabiliores" (S. 1336-1359), ein äußerst nützliches Pendant zu Hübners Exempla.

Ein paar Randbemerkungen eines dankbaren Lesers. Krummrey hat sich nicht veranlasst gesehen, der neueren nach dem Erscheinen des letzten Supplements 1986 betriebenen Forschung ausführlicher Rechnung zu tragen. Er hat z. B. dem Abkürzungsverzeichnis meine *Analecta epigraphica* (1998) einverleibt, sie aber nicht systematisch ausgebeutet, wie drei Beispiele zeigen: im Wortverzeichnis zitiert er unter *mancipo* 1620, es liegt aber wohl das Wort *macellum* vor (*Analecta* 354); in 3108a hat Krummrey die alte Deutung *Curveili Pedonis* beibehalten statt *C. Urveili Pedonis* in *Analecta* 356; und unter den Cognomina gibt er zu 3405a *L. Acceptus*, ohne bemerkt zu haben, dass ebenda [---] *l. Acceptus* mit Datierung in die Kaiserzeit gegeben wird. Auch sind seine Lokalisierungen von einzelnen Inschriften nicht immer auf dem Laufenden (dies ist nicht als Tadel gemeint). So steht 1542 unter Aquinum, weil Degrassi die Stelle, an der die Inschrift im 16. Jh. gesehen wurde – nämlich die Kirche *S. Maria a S. Germano* in Cassino – falsch als Piedimonte S. Germano im Gebiet des römischen Aquinum gedeutet hat; die Geschichte der Inschrift beginnt also in Cassino (aber der Stein selbst stammt aus Interamna Lirenas: Solin, in *L'epigrafi del villaggio*