

the two demonstratives. These chapters therefore constitute a response to Penney's 2002 article ('Notes on some Sabellian demonstratives', *Oxford University Working Papers in Linguistics, Philology and Phonetics* 7, 131–42), which argued that the Umbrian, South Picene and Pre-Samnite forms deriving from *esto-, *esmo and *ekso- all belong to one demonstrative paradigm, and that Oscan *eko-/*ekso- represents a non-cognate form. The pragmatic distinctions suggested between the two demonstratives and the proposed stylistic reasons for the lack of *esto-/ *esmo- in Oscan (cf. the near total lack of *iste* in Latin Republican inscriptions) are generally convincing. However, this is a situation in which a lack of evidence prevents any definitive conclusion.

Ch. 5 deals with the stem *i-/*eyo-/*eyso-, of which there are many examples in both Umbrian and Oscan. Ch. 6 covers some of the more obscure and grammaticalized forms, including Umbrian and Oscan *essuf/esuf* (equivalent to Latin *ipse*). It is only in chs 7 and 8 that D. turns to the relationship between Sabellian and Latin, with a synchronic comparison and a diachronic reconstruction of the Italic demonstratives, respectively. This is commendable — while it is clearly important to compare Sabellian and Latin/Faliscan, in the past too many works have relied too heavily on Latin comparanda in explaining the Sabellian data. D., on the other hand, is in a position to point out the overall similarity between the Sabellian and Latin demonstrative systems, but also the distinction between them, based on the detailed analysis of the earlier part of the book. So, while he argues in ch. 7 that Latin *hic, iste, ille* and *is* broadly correspond to Sabellian *eko-/*ekso-, *esto-/*esmo-, *ollo- and *i-/*eyo-/*eyso- respectively, there are also clear differences in usage. However, this chapter is very short and deals with only a few examples of Latin prescriptions, poetic epigraphs, curses and prayers — there is more to say here, as D. himself admits. The diachronic reconstruction in ch. 8 then cautiously lays out the possible forms and usage of the demonstratives of Common Sabellian, Common Latin-Faliscan and Common Italic.

There are very few complaints to be made about how this book is laid out and produced. All quotations from ancient languages are translated clearly, not always an easy task with the more fragmentary inscriptions — though the use of 'thou/thee' for the second-person singular is a little unusual, and not used consistently (see the use of singular 'you' on pp. 71, 75). In a book which defines its terminology so carefully, it seems strange that D. does not deal with the problematic position of 'Pre-Samnite' (which may represent several different languages rather than one) until a footnote on p. 60, after having discussed several Pre-Samnite inscriptions at length. The book includes an *index locorum* and an *index verborum*, which will be particularly helpful for those interested in specific texts or languages, since comments on any one inscription are understandably scattered across a number of different chapters. Overall, this book is likely to be a lasting point of reference for anyone studying the Sabellian languages, not just for its detailed analysis of the demonstratives, but for its contribution to the scholarship on the stylistics and pragmatics of a range of Sabellian inscriptions.

Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge
 km440@cam.ac.uk

KATHERINE McDONALD

doi:10.1017/S0075435814000616

R. M. KERR, *LATINO-PUNIC EPIGRAPHY: A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE INSCRIPTIONS* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2 Reihe 42). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010. Pp. xvi + 253. ISBN 9783161502712. €64.00.

It is well known that Punic survived for a very long time in North Africa; Augustine makes frequent reference to the language and its speakers in northern Algeria. What is a lot less clear is how extensive this phenomenon was, both geographically and in terms of the language's functions, not least because inscriptions written in Punic script are not found in Africa after the early second century C.E. Fascinating clues, however, come from the Punic-language texts written in Latin script in Tripolitania, dating from the first to (at least) the fourth century C.E. These were first catalogued by Francesco Vattioni in 1976, but new finds and advances in Phoenician linguistics mean that Robert Kerr's catalogue, which includes all currently known documents (published and unpublished, decipherable and not), is hugely welcome. Based to a much larger degree than its predecessor on autopsy, K.'s catalogue now provides reliable new translations and commentary,

though not illustrations (of which seventeen can be conveniently accessed online in the reissue of *Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania* (<http://irt.kcl.ac.uk/irt2009/>), an excellent resource which could itself be updated on the basis of this work). K. takes a sensibly conservative approach to the transcription and interpretation of the texts, and has little patience for the more creative suggestions of those who do not.

K. publishes sixty-nine ‘Latino-Punic’ texts from Tripolitania in all, as well as two ‘Graeco-Punic’ ones from Algeria, and one (probably) Greco-Phoenician example from Syria. Most are epitaphs, three are building inscriptions, one is a brickstamp. This relatively small group of texts emanating from élite contexts nonetheless provides a fascinating glimpse into everyday life in a region where for instance women erected not only mausolea but apparently in one case a *castrum* or fortified farm. It should be noted that K. provides first and foremost a linguistic commentary on the texts themselves and the development of the language that they reveal; there is still much scope for historical and cultural interpretation, for which this catalogue finally provides a solid foundation.

The catalogue is, however, only an appendix to the book under review. K. first provides an introduction to the inscriptions in their historical contexts, usefully summarizing earlier work on local cultural persistence in the region under Rome and discussing the identity of the authors of the inscriptions — Roman colonists (unlikely because the names are Libyan, and what little Latin there is in inland Tripolitania is poor quality), ‘Libyan tribesmen’ (as has been suggested in the past), or (as K. prefers) ‘Libyphoenician’ migrants from the coast? The bulk of the text is then devoted to the phonology and grammar of Late Punic as elucidated by the Latino-Punic texts (which crucially contain the vowels that Phoenician and Punic scripts traditionally omit), contemporary inscriptions in ‘Neo’-Punic script and, with due caution, the passages of transcribed Punic in Plautus’ *Poenulus*. K.’s stated goal is to demonstrate the extent to which Late Punic is a coherent system, not the vulgar and debased dialect of much scholarship on the subject, already half-drowned in Latin. This aim he accomplishes with some style: not only was there ‘a standard system for rendering Punic in Latin letters’ (7), but the Neo-Punic inscriptions too use systematic and explicable spellings which reflect not confusion, but a development in the language in which gutturals were lost in pronunciation, and their lexemes often recycled as vowel-letters in the written language. Speculation is clearly marked as such, as in discussions of possible Libyan substrate influence on the disappearance of gutturals in Late Punic (26–38: bilingual inscriptions suggest that unlike Tuareg, Libyan had no guttural phonemes) and the vowel shortening that occurs in both Punic and African Latin (103–4).

K. brings an enormous variety of ancient and modern languages to bear on his already polyglot topic (mostly rendered in their original scripts as well as in transcription; there is no strict policy with regard to translation into English). In this sense and others, the book is a treat: highly technical but also very readable, and often funny — not the least of the reasons to wholeheartedly recommend it to all those interested in Roman North Africa as well as, of course, Semitic linguistics.

Worcester College, Oxford
josephine.quinn@classics.ox.ac.uk
 doi:10.1017/S0075435814000628

JO QUINN

PRISCIEN, GRAMMAIRE. *LIVRES XIV, XV, XVI – LES INVARIABLES* (Ed., trans. and comm. *Ars Grammatica*). Paris: J. Vrin, 2013. Pp. 330. ISBN 9782711625000. €19.00.

The French research group *Ars grammatica* (CNRS, UMR 8163 STL) owes its existence to a lamentable lacuna. While the main Greek grammatical texts have been translated into several modern languages, many of the Latin ones have never been translated at all. Priscian who lived in Constantinople towards the end of fifth century A.D., and whose grammar was one of the most important textbooks of the Middle Ages, thus lingered untranslated until Schönberger’s recent five-volume German edition (2008–2010). Thus, at the initiative of Marc Baratin, a group of French specialists in Latin grammar, history of linguistics and philology ventured forth to translate the *Ars Prisciani*, one of the richest but also most difficult Latin grammatical texts. In 2010, the *Ars grammatica* group released the first volume, a translation of Book 17, that constitutes part of the so-called ‘Priscian syntax’. A second volume has now appeared that offers translations of Books 14, 15 and 16, which feature Priscian’s examination of the invariable parts of speech