

Kristina Milnor, *Graffiti and the Literary Landscape in Roman Pompeii*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014. Xviii + 312 pp.; 8 coloured plates and numerous illustrations in text. ISBN 978-0-19-968461-8.

Milnor's (hereafter M.) title had enticed me since OUP's first pre-publication publicity; since a conference paper of 1981/4, down to my little book on the *Culture of the Roman Plebs* (2003), I have written a good deal on Pompeian literacy and writing, as also, if not so much about graffiti proper, then about the Latin of epitaphs. I was curious, even nervous, to see what a modern American feminist historian of ancient Italy might make of the material. Unfortunately, the flaws of detail in M.'s exposition discourage the reader from close attention to her tortuous exposition. Indeed the riotous good-humour of much of the Pompeian material clashed unhappily with the ponderous rigour of M.'s logic, a rigour which is itself no happy partner of the many defects in her detail.

M.'s attention to some of the earlier graffiti-bibliography is commendable, but she has chosen to use *CIL* almost in isolation as text (and commentary). No reference to E. Diehl, *Pompeianische Wandinschriften* (Bonn 1911), nor to S. Ferraro, *La presenza di Virgilio nei graffiti pompeiani* (Napoli 1982): there must be other local schoolteachers who have tackled the subject, but whose work I do not know. More gravely, M. refers in passing to *CLE*, but has apparently elected not to consult the often detailed commentary of Bücheler-Lommatzsch. Given the fragmentary state of the texts and the unorthodox character of their Latinity, it was gravely imprudent not to take advantage of so valuable an instrument. Equally, T. Kleberg's admirable *Hôtels, restaurants et cabarets* (Uppsala 1951) should not have been ignored.

Some attention to detail is called for. See 177: in *CLE* 1863, Lommatzsch explains that *dei* is not (*pace* M.) an (unusual) instance of *dir.obj.* in *gen.*, but is rather a *gen.* depending on the *dir.obj.* missing in the next line. At 192, against M.'s [*ad*] *peream*, see *CLE* 937. It is hardly too much to ask an apparent expert in *Pompeianis* such as M., that she should make regular use of a standard tool in the field. At 164, 'Cresces' is a standard local spelling for conventional 'Crescens', Reisch, *TLL* Onom. 2.699.44f. Unfortunately, for Eur. fragments, M. employs not the majestic volumes of *TGF* but Nauck or Collard and his colleagues. At 233, see Kannicht, *TGF* 5.2.200.2f. At 61, 'epitaph' is no word to apply to Varro's verses about Homer's tomb; his *Imagines* were clearly not a collection of epitaphs. M. seems to write 'authors' for 'actors' (203), and at 236, 'orthography' for 'calligraphy'. But beyond a certain point, the time for tolerant smiles is past. The names of G.P. Goold and W.V. Clausen are both mis-spelled in a single line, 287. At 290 Champaign becomes, engagingly enough, 'Champagne'. Mau's first name, August, was Latinised for *CIL* (137). Ramsay MacMullen should be written thus, and not as in 45, n.5, etc. Unsurprisingly, ancient orthographies, etc. are violated: note (242) *qarm*; *notitia* omitted in the Tacitus citation on 239. 'Cerimicus' apparently conceals Kerameikos (202); 'peri-canonical' should probably be 'para-...' (213); the author of *Andria* and *Adelphiis* not Terrence (47, n.9); note Vettii for Vettii (92), 'boarder' for 'border' (128, 219), *quails* for *qualis* (162), 'libs' for Lat. *artus*. Remember, this is the OUP and 2014. *Ainigma* and *zetema* should not have been confused (179). It would have been a kindness to say two words about the (common) ancient palindrome (25): see H-A. Gärtner in the *New Pauly* and even since, M.A. Squire, *Iliad in a nutshell* (2011), 223f.

It is not clear to me why M. prints all pentameters precisely aligned with their preceding hexameters, and not, as everywhere else, two or three mm. inset to the right. Her discussions of metrical points are notably awkward and cumbrous (see e.g. 207). Note (244) that *singulus ad lunam* (*CIL* 4.3884) is the first half of a dactylic verse, though you cannot prove that the author was aware of it. The first word of *otiosis locus hic non est* is rendered as though *otio* (*CIL* 4.813, p.58). *Res publica* is rendered variously (107, 108, 124). I pass sadly to *CIL* 4.3905: at 163, M. suggests that *conductor* means 'conductor' and *monotori* 'assistant'. For *conductor* = *dux plausorum*, see Deicke, *TLL* 8.337.75 and for *monitor* as 'prompter of applause', see Buchwald,

*ib.*, 1420.68 (a remarkably interesting and suggestive pairing of activities). For such use of glosses, vd. W. Heraeus, *Kl. Schr.*, 52-150. This information was not concealed, but lay ready to hand. I add a very few more instances of M.'s flawed Latinity: at 124f., the *mutunio* of *CIL* 4.1939.2 = simply *membrum virile*. See the ample discussion, *Adams, Lat. sex.vocab.*, 63 and *OLD* s.v.; the apparent silence of *TLL* I do not understand. At 240, *CIL* 4.2361 *carmina communemque* is rendered as though implying something about 'vulgar song'. At 179, the *vellit* of *CIL* 4.1830 is rendered as though from *velle* (no explanation of the mood. I have thought of *vellere*, in the sense of 'grip, tug at', though Adams' silence is a little disquieting. At 251, M. renders the *conticuere* of *Aen.* 2.1 as 'were silent', wrongly. Rather, 'fell silent' as I explain in my detailed comm. of 2008. At 86, n.117, the orthodox, correct *Setinum*, wine of (mod.) *Sezze* is rendered 'wine of Saentinum'. the *otiosis* of *CIL* 4.813 is rendered as though *otio*. *Res publica* is rendered inconsistently (107, 108, 124).

Unsurprisingly, M.'s English is brutally modern and uncaring of the decencies of learned academic diction: cf. 231, (noun) 'disconnect', 86, 'foregrounds' (vb.), adj. 'inscriptive' (72). The shock is not so much that M. is ready to use such language as that OUP, ca. 2012, let it pass.

The last two pages (261f.) of ch.5 arouse particular disquiet: M. cites an old discussion of mine at 262; she had already done so and to just the same effect at 239. At 261, she denies that there is 'really strong evidence' for Virgilian influence in the theatre before late antiquity. That will not do: M. dismisses the material I collected at *Companion*, 250 without a word of explanation, and, secondly, it is precisely the polemic requirement to collect instances of c.4-5 theatrical usage that leads the Latin fathers to dwell on theatrical practice of the age (so, admirably, G.Wille, *Musica Romana*). Rather more serious is the material surveyed in the last fifteen lines of p.261. It derives evidently from my *Companion*, 249, to which M. offers not a word of reference. Clearly, she was eager to finish her book, but her grave omission (harsher language I eschew, though it would not be misplaced) makes it even harder for me to view with benevolence or goodwill this book. M.'s sloppy annotation and scant attention to detail dispense me from the toil of expounding and criticising her arguments. She touches occasionally (96, 176) on the singular character of composition by poets whose literary antecedents were rooted in their memories, not their libraries. Such (sometimes/partly/largely/wholly) non-written sources, coexists with often scant training in the gentle art of writing hexameters, senarii, elegiacs or whatever the chosen metre may be: the results are often colourful and unorthodox. M. consistently believes that the results are the outcome of authorial intention. Certainly, my own experience, at various periods, of writing hexameters, sometimes for simple fun and often in haste, suggests a quite different state of affairs. I should never for a moment encourage such minute and solemn analysis of my own *scribendi cacoethes*.

Nicholas Horsfall

Dalnacroich, Wester Ross

Eyal Regev, *The Hasmoneans: Ideology, Archaeology, Identity. Journal of Ancient Judaism. Supplements, 10*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013. 340 pp. ISBN: 9783525550434.

Les Maccabées et les Hasmonéens éveillent l'intérêt général des spécialistes comme des dilettantes ; tout ce qui se rapporte à leur histoire et à son étude suscite l'attention du grand public. Cela est vrai notamment dans le monde juif au sens large et dans la société israélienne et son système éducatif en particulier. De fait, la période hasmonéenne a été (ré)formatrice pour le judaïsme de son temps et a représenté une source d'inspiration pour les fondateurs des premiers kibboutz d'avant la création de l'État d'Israël.

Eyal Regev (R.) a réussi à offrir un ouvrage qui s'adresse aussi bien à des chercheurs avisés qu'à des amateurs sans formation adéquate. En effet, l'auteur définit les termes qu'il utilise,