La description détaillée et énumérative de Frédérique Biville est animée par quelques tableaux clairs, qui pourraient être même plus nombreux, et par les résumés à la fin de chaque chapitre. Les index excellents et la présentation très claire font de ce livre un bon ouvrage de référence. Il sera lu avec profit par quiconque s'intéresse à l'évolution de la langue latine et aux rapports linguistiques gréco-latins.

Henna Paunonen


This book is a well-educated philologist's contribution to one challenging issue in Latin grammar, viz. that of differentiating between (free) relative clauses and indirect questions. In written German, this difference is not formally encoded at all; witness Markus fragte, was sie bekamen and Sie assen, was sie bekamen; whereas in Latin, the categorial difference is encoded both pronominally (quid vs. quod) and modally (indicative vs. subjunctive). However, there are quite a few cases of syntactic ambiguity due to various factors: first, the paradigms of quid and quod largely overlap; second, the subjunctive mode serves many functions. It turns out that the Latin system of pronominal and modal encoding fails to carry out the disambiguating function: it is only the indicative modus that signals a relative clause (at least in classical Latin). As the title of the book indicates, Eckert proposes to tackle the issue in terms of linguistic pragmatics. In this, he is eminently successful.

Eckert's book is a very impressive specimen of philological diligence. The book has many potential uses. First, it is a solid contribution to Latin grammar: the wealth of data and its discussion is apt to increase our non-native competence / Sprachgefühl of the Latin language. Second, the book can be construed as a contrastive study of Latin and German; moreover, it is a contribution to translation theory. Third, the book provides invaluable data for a computational linguist engaged in devising a syntactic parser of Latin. Fourth, the book provides food for thought for a textual critic.

The predominantly positive impression created by the book is marred by a few infelicities. There is no index locorum, no index nominum, no index rerum. The author has chosen to compartmentalize the bibliography into thematic chunks; at first glance, this may look like a good idea; in practice, however, this solution does not work at all. The present book also mixes relevant with irrelevant: in principle, it is recommended to give a full Forschungsgeschichte, but one might question the relevance of school
grammars in this context (cf. pp. 26-52). This kind of meticulousness is obviously due to the fact that the book is an elaboration of a European-style doctoral thesis. In spite of these critical comments, I wish to congratulate Dr. Günter Eckert for his achievement.

Martti Nyman


The publication of a new Latin dictionary of international interest is always a welcome event, in view of the fact that there is still much to be desired concerning Latin lexicography. As for the present book, it is, however, not a question of a Neo-Latin lexicon, as one could expect on the basis of the title, but of an Italian-Latin dictionary. In this regard, the new publication competes with Angelo Perugini's excellent 'Dizionario italiano-latino' (X, 2322 p.) which was published in the Vatican in 1976. Egger does not mention this lexicon in his short preface, but he notes (p. 7) that his book will replace A. Bacci's out-of-print 'Lexicon vocabulorum quae difficilius Latine redduntur'. On the other hand, Egger and his collaborators have made use of Christian Heifer's 'Lexicon auxiliare, Ein deutsch-lateinisches Wörterbuch' (Saarbrücken, 1991), a modern German counterpart to the Italian-Latin dictionaries. These kinds of vocabularies are very important and necessary, when one takes into consideration the increasing use of Latin as a living language in our time. For that reason, too, Egger's (et aliorum) lexicon has been long awaited.

The 'Lexicon recentis Latinitatis' consists of about 15 000 Italian headwords with their Latin equivalents and synonymous expressions. The explanations are given always in Latin. Many words of Greek origin have been etymologically explained. Often, there are also references to ancient authors in order to illustrate that the word in question has been used in the given meaning in antiquity. The main source of the lexicographers has been the 'Thesaurus linguae Latinae' (cf. p. 7), which covers the Latinity up to about A.D. 600. In addition to this, the authors have collected some material from Medieval and Ecclesiastical Latin texts. On the other hand, there is no mention of Neo-Latin literature in this connection. Considering the title of the present dictionary, this is quite surprising. As a matter of fact, many of the scientific terms and other modern expressions, which occur in Egger's glossary without any reference, can be found in Latin texts composed in the seventeenth and/or eighteenth century. It is regrettable, too, that geographical names and other proper nouns have been excluded from the present lexicon.

A Latin equivalent for one and the same modern word often varies somewhat in