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This beautiful and exquisitely printed book, henceforward *LIA*, contains several sections. In the short Introduction (pp. 1-12) the authors deal with the history of the project which resulted in this publication, provide concise information on the history of epigraphic research in Albania and briefly survey the political geography of the area in Roman times as well as the usage of the Latin language in the region. The three following pages outline the lay-out of the presentation of the data. The bulk of the book (pp. 19-700) is the corpus itself, followed by useful indices and helpful concordances (pp. 701-724). The presentation of the inscriptions, grouped according to find location throughout the corpus, is standard. Information on the place where the inscription is found is offered first, and references to the corresponding Roman provinces are provided (if the place was part of more than one province, and if the date of inscription cannot be established, both provinces are named as on pp. 580, 629, etc.). This is followed by information about the present location of the monument, mostly in various museums in Albania, but sometimes further afield; inventory numbers are regrettably provided only in exceptional cases (as for *LIA* 95, p. 250 or *LIA* 130, p. 330). The genre and the material on which the inscription occurs are noted, and its measurements are provided when known. As is to be expected, for lost inscriptions this information may not be supplied (as, *e.g.*, for *LIA* 31, 32 and 33 from Dyrrachium); surprisingly, it is not offered for some of them (*e.g.*, *LIA* 53, p. 146 or *LIA* 82, p. 220) which are still accessible. Interestingly, when the measurements are presented differently in the earlier publications, the editors reproduce them with references to these works.

Next comes the list of known editions of a given inscriptions. Titles of articles are not provided: the references contain only the author’s name, journal title, its number and date, and a reference to page/figure; there is no general bibliography to the volume. Then, the editors reproduce photographs of inscriptions known from other works, *cf.* a very useful set of five pictures illustrating *LIA* 53 from Dyrrachium on pp. 146-147. Sometimes, however, as in the case of *LIA* 132 (p. 335), the two pictures provided are not of a sufficiently
high quality to allow reading of the text, and in quite a few cases (e.g., LIA 50, 72, or 84) one photograph would have been sufficient. Then, the authors offer their reading of a given inscription, and reproduce all other known complete readings of it even if they have slight and tiny variations. These lists are incomplete. Thus, for example, for LIA 95 (p. 251), as well as elsewhere, a reference is provided to the French book by F. Tartari on Dyrrachium which contains a number of misprints, while the Albanian version of the work published the same year and by the same publisher is totally neglected. It is notable, too, that the Albanian book by Tartari, which, although it bears the same title in Albanian, only partially corresponds to the French one and contains publications of more inscriptions and also offers readings different from those of \textit{LIA}. Although the treatment of these inscriptions by U. Ehmig and R. Haensch supersedes that of Professor Tartari, the completeness of the corpus requires their inclusion. The readings of a number of inscriptions suggested by D. Dana are sometimes ignored, although the authors do refer to this valuable work on several occasions, cf. LIA 55, p. 152 or LIA 191, p. 471. It is remarkable that mostly the readings offered by Dana are also found in this book, as in LIA 49, but sometimes interpretations are different, as in the case of LIA 54. This part of the entry is followed by a commentary and the date of the inscription is provided at the end.

The publication of \textit{Corpus des inscriptions latines d’Albanie} just two years earlier immediately prompts the necessity of the comparison of both corpora. The first striking difference is visual: 724 pages in A-4 format of \textit{LIA} which is hardbound against the smaller sized paperback \textit{CIA} with 230 odd pages. The latter, however, uses shorter intervals between lines and does not allow empty spaces with which \textit{LIA} abounds – even if the discussion of a given inscription ends at the very beginning of the page (as on p. 486 for \textit{LIA} 199, which contains just three lines of text), the next inscription is printed on the next page. It should be pointed out in this respect that \textit{LIA} is more complete and contains certain inscriptions which are missing from \textit{CIA}. Some of these are published in this volume for the first time, such as \textit{LIA} 26, and some were first published

\begin{itemize}
\item[1] Cf. Tartari 2004a, 46 where both \textit{STVS (est?)} / \textit{A V ann XVII} and \textit{STVS EST / Q V ann XVII} are provided, while Tartari 2004, 54 lists – like \textit{LIA} – only the latter. Cf. also \textit{LIA} 327 for which the reading published (apparently with misprints, cf. Tartari 2004a, 45 and Tartari 2004, 52) in Tartari 2004a, 46 is not acknowledged. Cf. also in this respect Tartari 2004, 47 and 48 for \textit{LIA} 72 and 88.
\item[3] Dana 2011, 440.
\item[4] Anamali, Ceka, Deniaux 2009, henceforward \textit{CIA}.
\end{itemize}
elsewhere after the appearance of CIA, such as LIA 53. A number of inscriptions, such as LIA 82 and LIA 147, have been known to scholars for years, a certain amount of them (e.g., LIA 146 or LIA 234) literally for ages. Apart from the completeness of the corpus, it is also important that U. Ehming and R. Haensch offer better readings in quite a few cases, such as e.g., LIA 17 (Rufilia, contrast CIA 13 Rufilia), LIA 73 (Etereius, contrast CIA 123 Eter/ius), LIA 87 (Celer[i]n[es], CIA 47 Celer[i]n[ae]), cf. also LIA 161 for a completely different reading from the corresponding one at CIA 151. LIA 278 certainly contains Pompo[-] / vix(it) […] / Pompo[…] / vix(it) […] / tit[…] and the reading of LIA 270 is no doubt correct.⁵ LIA 208 surely contain Saufeius, and the reading Nice ma[t(er)] in LIA 273 supersedes Nicema of the Corpus des inscriptions latines d’Albanie.⁶ In an exceptional case (LIA 162) the authors admit that no reading of the inscription is possible, contrast CIA 152 for […] et Caius / […] / filio Cai / e(ius) i(ndex) n(atalibus) d[…]s Vitalis. Therefore, the importance of this book for epigraphic studies is hard to overestimate.

In some cases the readings offered by the authors may be questioned. Thus, for LIA 103 they print Flabiana but judging by the drawing the reading of CIA 56 (IL ABI NA) seems to be at least closer. On the basis of the photograph reproduced from CIA it is not clear at all if the reading of LIA 168 should indeed be Successus and not [S]uccessus as accepted in the earlier publications of this inscription. The reading Aburia in LIA 171 (CIA 163 prints Apudia) may in theory also be questioned: the form of the surviving part of the second letter in the name judging from the drawing⁷ is different from the B in SIBEI which occurs in the same line. For LIA 100 cf. my own discussion on the result of autopsy (September, 2011): the inscription preserved at the Archaeological Museum in Durres (Inv. No. 814) indeed, as the authors suggest, contains perpetio, and not perpetuo as in CIA 78. The last lines of the inscription are badly preserved, but there are no doubts that they contain dato sin (dato si[. . .] LIA, dato si [ne . . ./ . . .], CIA).⁸ It seems that the reading of LIA 241 (as well as CIA 228) based on the drawing by D. Komata requires an autopsy; see also below.

Commentaries on the inscriptions vary from several lines, such as for LIA 254 (not really commented upon in CIA, p. 194), to several pages. These provide epigraphic, onomastic and historical information, and are sometimes supplied with further bibliography; for personal names the authors prefer to refer to the

---

⁵ Contrast CIA 260 and 266; cf. Falileyev 2012, 209.
⁶ Contrast CIA 203 and 277; cf. Dana 2011, 440 for this latter interpretation which is not acknowledged by the editors.
⁷ Reproduced from Praschniker, Schober 1919, 58; the same drawing in CIA, p. 130.
⁸ Falileyev 2012, 208-209. The reading perpetio is accepted in Praschniker, Schober 1919, 41.
editions of the text rather to OPEL. The book contains valuable and informative insights on various aspects, and the new readings offered in it are particularly important to students of onomastics. Thus, for example, contrary to the earlier publications,9 which have Strabia, LIA 118 suggests reading the name as Stablbia, which cannot but remind us of St(atia) Labia as it was read by V. Toçi more than a decade ago. OPEL III does not register Labia, while Ehmi and Haensch note the attestation of Stlabia in Africa to which further examples may be added,10 and its masculine counterpart recorded in Misenum (for obvious reasons not considered in OPEL which does not register the name). The name has been traditionally compared with the Oscan proper name Slabiis.11 The new reading of the inscription LIA 265 offers Gall(—) while CIA 269 reads it as Gali. Judging by the photograph, this reading is correct and probably adds one more example to the corpus of its attestations in the Balkans.12 Ehmi and Haensch agree with CIA 107 that LIA 107 contains Provincia Nutri f(ilia), while the earlier reading was Provincia utri f(ilia). This attestation thus adds important data for the discussion of the origins and distribution of the nomen Nutrius in the Balkans.13 The authors also are of the same opinion as CIA 12 that the inscription LIA 11 contains Aur(elia) Notalie, but unlike the editors of CIA offer their interpretation of this apparent hapax. Ehmi and Haensch consider it to be connected with Anatole (cil VI, 38409), but this attestation has been claimed to be a misspelling, with the correct Anatole inscribed on the reverse of the stone.14 They also quote Danotalis, Dubnotalis and Dumnotalis, but these examples are certainly irrelevant for the discussion as these Gaulish compounded names contain the component *talo-, and the sequence -no-belong to their first components, dan(n)o- and dubno- / dumno-.15 Therefore the hapax Notalie remains in fact unexplained. The reading of another hapax, Laticira,16 accepted in the earlier publications, is questioned in LIA 216, and henceforward should be treated with caution in onomastic research.

9 To which Tartari 2004, 54 should be added.
10 Cf. e.g., Engelmann 1999, 142.
11 See e.g., Phelps 1937, 280 where it is also compared with Lat. Labius. Cf. the cognomen Labio, OPEL III, 15.
12 See Falileyev 2013, 70-71 and cf. attempts to interpret this inscription from Butrint in LIA, p. 469.
13 For which see Salomies 1996, 123.
14 Wilson 1911, 184; OPEL I, 51 lists three attestations of Anatole and none of Anatole; Notalie is not found in OPEL III.
15 Gaulish personal names with talo- are discussed in detail in Evans 1967, 259-61; for dan(n)o- see Evans 1967, 189-190, and for dubno- / dumno- – Evans 1967, 196-197.
16 For various explanations see Falileyev 2013, 81-82.
There is no doubt that this volume will find its place in epigraphic libraries worldwide and the results of the research presented in LIA will be gratefully used by students of various disciplines.
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