

and can thus be more informative – but at the same time more in need of interpretation – than earlier inscriptions. This chapter also includes lists of known patrons of Puteoli and of representatives of the local elite (some of the also attested as patrons). In ch. 13 (p. 423–438, from *Arctos* 2014), C. publishes an inscription in honour of one Tannonius Chrysanthius, a young man described as *togae* (apparently a genitive defining *primus*, cf. p. 431 with n. 26) *primus fori Campaniae* and as the son of an *ex-consularis provinciae Byzacena* (note the list of all known governors of this province on p. 436–438), but goes on to deal with the Tannonii of Puteoli in general.

Finally, there is ch. 14 (the other contribution that was previously unpublished) which is essentially an almost 100-page inventory of all attested inhabitants of Puteoli with a nomen (p. 441–537, with the EDR number supplied for each entry). It is important to note that this inventory will be of great use not only to students of Puteoli, but also to students of Roman emigration to the East, as many Romans attested in the East in the Republican period are thought to have arrived there from Puteoli or from Campania in general. The inventory is followed by a list of all attested local magistrates (cf. above) and by another (p. 542–545) of inscriptions published in *CIL* in the chapter on Puteoli but are now known to have come from other places. The book, a splendid document of outstanding scholarship, finishes off with a substantial bibliography and, as already pointed out above, detailed indices of names, subjects and sources.

Olli Salomies
University of Helsinki

Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum. Consilio et auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Berolinensis et Brandenburgensis editum. Vol. IV suppl. 4,2: Inscriptiones parietariae Pompeianae. Ediderunt HEIKKI SOLIN – ANTONIO VARONE – PETER KRUSCHWITZ adiuvantibus STEFANO ROCCHI – ILENIA GRADANTE. De Gruyter, Berlin – Boston 2020. ISBN 978-3-11-072969-6; ISBN (e-book) 978-3-11-072920-7. XXI–XLVII, 1557–1912 pp. EUR 219.

The most recent *supplementum* to volume IV of *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, numbered 4.2, brings the publication of Pompeian wall inscriptions almost up to date. The 400-page-long volume contains mostly comments or corrections to the more than 10,000 texts that have previously been published, but some painted texts are published for the first time. In fact, only the texts from the recent excavations along the alley between city blocks V 2 and V 3 remain unpublished. The editors, Peter Kruschwitz, Heikki Solin and Antonio Varone, are renowned scholars in the field of epigraphy, including that of Pompeii. Their expertise is tangible in every line of text, and little can be added to

the entries on the new texts compiled by Varone. Reviewing such a volume is somewhat challenging, but browsing through it, I started to think about the format of publication and the effect it has when studying the texts.

For the past decade, *CIL IV* has been one of my most important tools in studying Pompeian wall inscriptions and their spatial relationships. The pros and cons of how these texts are published are familiar, especially when the research question does not focus specifically on language or content. The format of the new entries in the current volume maintains the conventions set in the previous *CIL IV* volumes. This tradition was established in the mid-19th century, and relatively little has changed since then. But is the information provided sufficient to answer the questions current scholars ask? And is the format – a traditional book (also available in electronic format) – the most efficient way to publish and update the massive data set?

Wall inscriptions have been a valued find from the beginning of the excavations: they are mentioned in the reports and were also part of the drawings and paintings made of Pompeii. More systematic study and publication of these texts started in the 1840s when regular reports of the excavations started to be published in scholarly journals. How the texts included in *CIL* were selected and documented is rarely discussed, but it should be noted that *CIL* is not the responsibility of the authorities maintaining the site (currently *Parco Archeologico di Pompeii*, PAP). Did the scholars working on the texts have access to all the excavated areas? Are all areas studied and published systematically? Is the data collected by the excavators available for the epigraphers working on the texts? In this volume Varone refers to the former director Massimo Osanna's social media accounts and the Pompeii in Pictures website for photographs and details of the locations (for example, on p. 1594), but not to the documentation made by PAP. Many texts have been published before their inclusion in *CIL*, which allows data to be corrected, and thus the *CIL* version is usually the most important reference. It would also be important to know how exactly the material published in the *CIL* was collected.

The data provided by the entries for each text is particularly important when *CIL* is the only publication. The emphasis in the description is on the transliteration of the text in addition to providing some basic data such as location, technique and size, as well as references to previous research. Notes also often include comments on the reading and meaning of the text. Graffiti and amphora texts are sometimes accompanied by drawings, but this is only rarely the case with painted wall inscriptions. The current volume includes photographs, which are a useful addition to the general information. The organization of the texts is based on location, using the familiar Pompeian address system. However, to collect all the texts related to one house, it is necessary to go through both volumes *CIL X* and *CIL IV*, and the many sections they contain based on material, technique of writing, chronology and content. The original publications and online

databases also often add important contextual information that is not included in the relatively sparse *CIL* entries.

The publication of photographs and drawings of texts from the PAP archives has made clear the importance that images have for the quality of data (A. Varone – G. Stefani, *Titulorum pictorum Pompeianorum qui in CIL vol. IV collecti sunt: Imagines*, Roma 2009 and A. Varone, *Titulorum graphio exaratorum qui in CIL vol. IV collecti sunt: Imagines*, Roma 2012). Photographs covering larger sections or entire walls can be used to check location data and content. The expressions used in the entries, such as “left of x”, are often vague and in the past could mean almost anything. Photographs also reveal the conventions applied when painting texts. Placing graffiti in a drawing or a photograph would give an immediate idea of their size and placement. Images also make it possible to analyse the scripts used and to draw conclusions on how, for example, electoral campaigns might have been organized. (For painters and painting, see E.-M. Viitanen 2020, “Painting Signs in Ancient Pompeii: Contextualizing *scriptores* and Their Work”, *Arctos* 54 (2020) 285–331.) Current graffiti scholars such as R. Benefiel, J. DiBiasie Sammons and P. Lohmann have also argued for systematic documentation of graffiti with drawings and publishing these drawings in addition to photographs. This would enable identifying individual scripts and discerning how many hands were responsible for creating graffiti found in one context, or possibly where in Pompeii someone wrote graffiti. Considering that a very large proportion of old finds have been destroyed since they were revealed, the publication of new texts should always contain good quality images of the text itself and of its general context, preferably with scales for size and colour.

However, locating texts is often difficult even with quite a lot of data. In the current volume, graffiti *CIL* IV 1593 is placed near door V 4,7. The description in *CIL* IV,1 is in *sexta pila ante pontem (viae Boscanae)* and the bridge mentioned is marked on the map at the end of that volume near the eastern edge of city block V 3. Other maps from the 1840s confirm the route of the Via Boscana. The location given for it is based on the current bridge, a later structure located over the southwestern corner of city block IV 1, although the correct location for the graffiti is the eastern part of V 2. (My thanks to Joonas Vanhala for pointing out the correct location.) Even photographs can be difficult to interpret. The photo on p. 245 in Varone – Stefani 2009 is placed at III 3,4 and the electoral notice is identified as *CIL* IV 7647. However, the kind of stucco relief decoration seen in the photograph has not been found on the façade of III 3. The text is actually *CIL* IV 7148 (almost identical to 7647) and is found on the façade of I 6,3, where the remains of the decoration still exist. In the current volume, the electoral notice *CIL* IV 11032 in a photograph cannot be located. It was covered with glass, but even this fact has not helped to place it. The original archival record refers to VI 14,20, but the structures and decoration do not match with that façade. Exploration based on where such a doorway could be found led to city block I 19, possibly doorway 10 or 13.

Unfortunately, the current photographs of that area show that the walls are in such bad shape that it is difficult to be sure.

CIL is based on paper book format, which makes the use of volumes cumbersome even with the help of indexes. The electronic version of the current volume enables searches for some elements, but it is not possible to search, for example, for emended sections in the same way as in a full-text database. Two online databases include Pompeian texts, but in their current stage they are auxiliary tools rather than replacements of the *CIL* publications. *Epigraphik Datenbank Clauss-Slaby* (<http://www.manfredclauss.de/gb/index.html>) contains almost all the published texts from Pompeii. However, as it provides only the text, it is primarily a tool for data mining and exploration, and the collected data should be checked against other publications. The second is *Epigraphic Database Roma* (<http://www.edr-edr.it/default/index.php>), which currently includes only some of the texts from Pompeii, although each entry provides plenty of additional data, including images. In both databases, search functions are still limited mostly to the content of the texts. In Pompeii, the locational data is an important aspect and finding an easy way to use it would be a helpful addition when studying them.

The way the materials are published informs and guides how they are studied. *CIL*'s emphasis on content and language directs one towards work on those themes. Small data sets can be collected relatively easily, but it is difficult to know what they represent when considering the whole material. Many other aspects of the culture of writing and reading in Pompeii remain unexplored or have only been analysed superficially. Recent work on the locations of Pompeian graffiti has demonstrated great regularity in them, and the usual places are some of the most public and visible spaces in Pompeian houses – graffiti writing was not a forbidden or hidden activity in ancient times (see for example, P. Lohmann, *Graffiti als Interaktionsform*, Berlin – Boston 2017). The graffiti habit is also often described as being ubiquitous and practised by most Pompeians. However, the 6,000 graffiti that have been recorded and published were written in a time span of some 150 years – the earliest dated text from the Basilica (*CIL* IV 1842) is from 78 BCE. It is likely that most graffiti are from the 1st century CE, but even for that period of time, the number of known texts means only about 75 texts per year – not a large amount in a city which might have had 10,000 inhabitants. It is also quite rare to be able to identify more than one text by one person – Roman naming conventions and common names make identification hard, but lack of data on scripts and styles makes them almost impossible to study efficiently.

Many of the assumptions concerning graffiti, painted texts and the culture of writing in Pompeii should be explored more rigorously. The list of different topics to be studied ranges from the formation process of the text editions to onomastics and beyond. Our current understanding is still as fragmentary as the texts themselves often are. Much work needs to be done and having

proper tools to do it would be essential – the *CIL* as it is now is not perhaps the best possible tool for approaching the written material of Pompeii.

Eeva-Maria Viitanen

Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum. Consilio et auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Berolinensis et Brandenburgensis editum. Vol. IX suppl. 1: Regio Italiae quarta. Fasc. 2: Marrucini – Paeligni – Vestini. Edidit MARCO BUONOCORE. Berlin – Boston, De Gruyter 2019. ISBN 978-3-11-067164-3; ISBN (e-book) 978-3-11-071762-4. CXXV–CLXXX, 1267–1712 pp. EUR 239.

In huius ephemeridis volumine anni 2020 (*Arctos* 54 [2020] 403–409) scripsi de fasciculo primo (edito a. 2018) continente titulos Samnii Frentanorumque. Quae in universum ibidem scripsi de supplemento scripto a Marco Buonocore (“B.”) ad *Corporis* voluminis IX partem eam, quae dedicata est titulis regionis IV, cum non putem hic esse repetenda praeter hoc unum, agi de opere magnifico summis laudibus digno, possum iam transire ad ipsum opus. Hic fasciculus dedicatus est titulis Marrucinatorum Paelignorum Vestinorum ita, ut contineat addenda ad titulos editos in corpore Mommseniano anni 1883 nn. 3012–3648 et 6316–6346 et 6408a–6412a (item ad titulos quosdam alios a B. primum attributos gentibus supra dictis) et titulos novos, scilicet qui post a. 1883 innotuerunt, nn. 6974–7638, id est titulos plus quam 650; hi tituli novi quomodo sint distributi inter tres populos supra dictos, hic apparet:

	paginae huius voluminis	numeri
Marrucini	1267–1305	6974–7039 66
Paeligni	1306–1545	7040–7446 407
Vestini	1546–1693	7447–7638 192

Notabilis mihi videtur numerus satis magnus titulorum Paelignorum. Quomodo tituli tam “veteres” quam novi distributi sint in capitula hac tabula illustratur (in qua ratio titulorum falsorum et alienorum non est habita):

Marrucini	<i>CIL</i> IX (1883)	<i>Ibid.</i> add.	<i>CIL</i> IX S. 1:2
(2019)LXVI. Teate	3012–42	6316–8	6974–7039
Paeligni			
LXVII. Pagus Interpromium	3043–73		7040–7099