ERICH SEGAL: *The Death of Comedy*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge Mass. 2001. ISBN 0-674-00643-7. XI, 589 pp. USD 23.95.

It is not easy to give a balanced judgement of a work written by a celebrity like Erich Segal. The task would be less difficult if the first name of the author were Charles. But to be brief, the bulk is disappointing: the 589 pages do not correspond to the substance. The book is divided between ancient Graeco-Roman and later Western comedy. There are few new insights, as least as concerns the Old Comedy, and in general, this part is a bit disappointing. The chapters on Roman comedy reveal a somewhat surer footing. The second half of the book, on post-classical comedy, is mixed in its quality. The chapters on Shakespeare and Molière offer little beyond plot summary. But there are better chapters, e. g., on Machiavelli, Ben Johnson, and others. The volume has an erudite appearance with its 118 footnotes, but it does not provide many new insights into its subject, at least as far as the ancient times are concerned.

Heikki Solin

JOSEPH FARRELL: Latin Language and Latin culture from ancient to modern times. Roman Literature and its contexts. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2001. ISBN 0-521-77663-5. XIV, 148 pp. GBP 12.95.

The argument in Farrell's exciting and stimulating essay has two main components: first, that Latin culture should include all written (and spoken) Latinity, in other words, that we should override the divide between ancient and medieval Latin and read all Latin as part of Latin culture; second, that languages, and the Latin language in particular, are not only there to be studied and taught; they are the subjects of representation of certain literary cultures. Farrell brings together texts from a wide variety of periods, from Sappho to Stravinsky.

Chapter one, which begins with Virgil, is fundamentally concerned with the idea of Latin as a civilizing force, the Roman linguistic imperialism (not a completely felicitous expression) which conquers and civilizes the conquered by teaching them Latin. Chapter two examines the *patrii sermonis egestas* through Valerius Flaccus and Lucretius, and how this is connected with modern traditions worshipping Greek and despising Latin, represented by Virginia Woolf and W.B. Yeats. Chapter three is dedicated to women writers; F. considers Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi, Sulpicia, Hortensia, Perpetua, and others; Chapter four discusses the metaphors used to speak about Latin. Discussion on metaphors continue in Chapter five. All in all, a thought-provoking little book, well written, more essayistic than academic.

Heikki Solin

A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names. Volume IV: Macedonia, Thrace, Northern Regions of the Black Sea. Editors P.M. Fraser and E. Matthews. Assistant Editor R.W.V. Catling. Clarendon Press, Oxford 2005. ISBN 0-19-927333-2. XXIX, 387 pp. GBP 115.

The fourth volume of LGPN more than ever has to deal with problems of inclusion and exclusion. The editors have had to make several decisions regarding both onomastic and regional items. Since the name of the Lexicon is Greek Personal Names, they have had to face the complex questions of contact and areal linguistics which culminate in two problems: what is a Greek personal name and where do we find such names? The second question has been solved in the traditional way. Those areas which were strongly Hellenised, even in the Roman Empire, have been included in the volume. Macedonia has been defined as an area from the Vale of Tempe in the south to the Scardus (Stara Planina) range in the North, and to the river Nestos (Mesta) running from Bulgaria to Greece in the east. Dacia, Moesia Superior, Pannonia and Dalmatia are excluded. The editors note that the inhabitants of that continental area were predominantly Scythian, Thracian/Getic, Illyrian, Dardanian and Celtic, but later they ended up in shifting their languages into Latin. Thus the exclusion is, mainly, plausible, as personal names were usually in a Latin format.

The second question is more difficult. The editors draw the line between Greek and non-Greek names rather randomly, and they do not seem to make a difference between a Greek personal name and a personal name written in Greek. It also seems that they have not tried to solve the problem of borrowing: when does an L2 name become an L1 name? As the editors state, they are not the first to face this problem (p. ix). Unfortunately, they do not suggest better solutions than those who have faced it earlier. A foreign name definitely does not become a Greek name merely by being written in Greek letters. To see the difference more clearly, we can take some modern examples. Every European state has a population of different ethnic groups. In Finland, there are many different ethnicities with different onomastic traditions. If we have to include all the Finnish names in a lexicon of Finnish Personal Names, we would probably face similar problems to those in LGPN. Therefore, we could try to solve those in a linguistic, not cultural or regional or emotional way. Linguistically, a Finnish name is a name that has been familiarised, i.e., it is phonologically and morphologically made Finnish. This can be clarified as follows. A Finnish athlete of Vietnamese origin is called Vinh Nghi Tran. His personal name is the second one, which is phonetically impossible in Finnish and does not fit in Finnish morphology either. All the same, the name is written in the Latin alphabet, the individual is Finnish by nationality and he is attested in Finnish newspapers. These seem to be the basic criteria of the editors of LGPN for a Greek personal name. However, the athlete's name is not Finnish, and should not be included in a Lexicon of Finnish Personal Names. Only after he is known as Nipa Tran, as he generally is, does he have a Finnish name. His Vietnamese name Nghi has thus been familiarised to Nipa.

Another kind of problem is the inclusion of Latin names as Greek personal names. Here we come close to another Finnish parallel, viz. the difference between Finnish and Swedish names. This problem is more emotional and cultural than linguistic. On many occasions, both the Swedish form of a name and its Finnish variant can be used as a Finnish personal name, e.g., Einar and Einari, or Petter and Petteri, to give simple examples. The names have been borrowed and they are easy to be included in the Finnish declension system. Thus, we have a parallel in cases of, e.g.,  $Ai\mu\lambda\iota\alpha\nu\delta\zeta$  and the like, though probably Aemilianus would not work as a Greek name in the same way as Einari would not work as a Swedish name since the direction of borrowing is from Latin and Swedish to Greek and Finnish, respectively. Here the reasons, however, are not so much linguistic than cultural, and

the inclusion of names of Latin origin in the Lexicon of Greek Personal Names is a cultural not linguistic choice.

To conclude this reasoning: a name is Greek only if it is familiarised and included in the Greek grammar by making required phonological and morphological changes, if needed, so that it can be inflected in a Greek grammatical system. A typical system of Hellenising names from a language that is not suitable as such for Greek inflection can be found in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt. This familiarising has other consequences as well. When a name is Hellenised, it can be accentuated using general accentuation rules, but otherwise it should be left without diacritical marks, regardless of its whereabouts.

The method is not simple, but it is linguistically solid. The Lexicon has entries that are very problematic. A few examples should be sufficient: there are three successive entries  $\Sigma$ ανόκας,  $\Sigma$ ανόκας, απd  $\Sigma$ άνχος – all from Cimmerian Bosporos. How do we know that they are different names? It is clear that they are not Greek personal names, and it is equally unclear whether they are totally Hellenised even if they exist in inscriptions. Naturally, they do not have foreign elements as regards Greek phonotaxis, but what should we think about  $\Sigma$ αοναίνων from the same region? It is difficult to see a Greek personal name in that format.

The chronological limit of this volume has been altered in comparison with the previous volumes. The onomastic material from Constantinople, i.e., from 330 onwards, has been excluded with the exception of names of individuals whose time of birth is unknown but who probably have lived through the turn of the third century, from the reign of Aurelian to that of Constantine. Outside Byzantion/Konstantinoupolis, however, names up to the 6th century are included. This decision has its good points since the onomastic material from early Konstantinoupolis is extensive and belongs, in many respects, to a totally different age than before. However, it also has several weaknesses as there never was an abrupt change in reality. The inclusion, therefore, could cover the period to the reign of Justinian in every part of the included area since, after his reign, the change was much more extensive than before.

In spite of my methodological critique, I am first to admit that this volume is a great achievement and will become a main reference book for many important studies in the future.

Martti Leiwo

MASSIMO MORANDI TARABELLA: *Prosopographia Etrusca. I Corpus. 1. Etruria Meridionale.* Studia Archaeologica 135. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Roma 2004. ISBN 88-8265-304-8. 804 pp. EUR 450.

This is the first volume in an ambitious project, planned to comprise a *Corpus* in three volumes followed by *Studia* in six volumes. Of course, one has to welcome such a scholarly investment towards our better knowledge of Etruscan *gentes*, and to wish all luck and persistency to its young and remarkably efficient author. But simultaneously, one has, just because of the immensity of the project, to ask certain questions.

Everyone understands that an Etruscan prosopography looks quite different when compared with its Roman or Greek counterparts. There are extremely few historical facts or, in general, persons who play any role in "history", and practically no accurate dates. From whence comes a prosopography? The author has decided to include *all* Etruscan people