

(fifty-four examples) rather than the bare ablative *Roma* (which never occurs) with verbs of motion (xvi and 260).

With the demolition of the view that everything in Romance comes from the lower registers, other notions must also be abandoned, such as the idea that the comedies of Plautus preserve a spoken register which goes ‘underground’ to emerge in Romance centuries later. A. does, however, make a strong case for a ‘submerged’ Latin, that is words or expressions which are usually avoided in written texts of all registers in the ancient world, but which must have been widespread in speech in order to explain their ubiquity in Romance and their occasional appearance in sub-literary or other documents. These words include Germanic loanwords such as *hanca* ‘hip’ (788) or *baro* ‘man’ (not mentioned in this work but discussed at *Regional Diversification*, 599–600). None of these submerged Latin words can be convincingly linked to Plautine usages, and many are demonstrably later imports into Latin (as is the case with the Germanic loanwords *hanca* and *baro*). Some of this vocabulary does appear to be connected with lower-class usages, but since constructions such as the infinitive with *habeo* future are also largely absent from our texts, it is important to keep in mind the warning of A. (858): “Submerged” does not necessarily mean “vulgar”.

Taken together, the chapters in this book therefore present a new picture of the history of Latin. The notion that all change in Latin is ‘from below’ is successfully exploded, as is the lazy use of the term ‘vulgar’ to refer to a social dialect of Latin, the ancestor of the Romance languages and forms which are stigmatized or avoided in literary texts. A. is keen to keep the term Vulgar Latin in play (8–11) but outside of the first chapter it hardly recurs in the main text of the book, and there is a case for saying that the term is now so confused and weighed down with baggage that it would have been better to leave it out altogether.

There will be a temptation for Latin scholars to buy this book and use it as a work of reference. The organization of the chapters, the level of detail and the excellent indices mean that it could profitably service as such. Indeed, reading through the whole thing from cover to cover is a lengthy and demanding task. But the sum is greater than its parts, and those who read through the 900 or so pages will undoubtedly be richly rewarded.

Jesus College, Cambridge

jptc1@cam.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S0075435814000604

JAMES CLACKSON

E. DUPRAZ, *SABELLIAN DEMONSTRATIVES: FORMS AND FUNCTIONS*. Leiden: Brill, 2012. Pp. 370. ISBN 9789004215405. €128.00.

This book analyses the pragmatics, semantics and syntax of demonstratives in the Sabellian languages of ancient Italy (Oscan, Umbrian, South Picene and ‘Pre-Samnite’), and it is the most ambitious and thorough work on this subject to date. Dupraz discusses all 338 examples of demonstratives attested in the epigraphic evidence, grouping the examples by stem. The book argues for a system of four main demonstrative stems (*esto-/esmo-, *eko-/ekso-, *ollo- and *i-/eyo-/eyso-) across all of the Sabellian languages; it suggests that this system is broadly comparable to that of Latin, because of both inheritance from Common Italic and the stylistic *koine* that existed across the languages of Italy in official and legal writing.

As D. explains in his introduction, the available evidence is patchy and limited to certain text types, but is sufficient for a synchronic analysis if supported by theoretical models derived from modern linguistics (outlined in ch. 1). The main sources of evidence used are the Iguvine Tables, South Picene funerary epigraphy and the longer Oscan texts: official texts, curse tablets, the Cippus Abellanus treaty and the Lex Osca Tabula Bantina. Some evidence is also included from ‘Pre-Samnite’; Venetic and Sicel are not included, because they provide little relevant evidence. The lack of casual texts that might more closely reflect spoken style is acknowledged, and D. keeps stylistic and pragmatic considerations in mind throughout his analysis.

In chs 2 and 3, D. discusses two controversial demonstrative stems. D. argues (a) the traditional view that *esto-/esmo- and *eko-/ekso- are suppletive paradigms of two separate proximal demonstratives, both employed for exophoric, text deictic and discourse deictic uses; (b) that both of these demonstrative paradigms were present in all the Sabellian languages, but that the lack of documentation of more complex sentences in South Picene and Oscan means that only Umbrian has both attested; and (c) that there was some kind of pragmatic and syntactic distinction between

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,