

JAMES CLACKSON – GEOFFREY HORROCKS: *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language*. Blackwell, Malden – Oxford – Carlton 2007. ISBN 978-1-4051-6209-8. VIII, 324 pp. GBP 50.

This book certainly was desperately needed and there are several reasons why one cannot but have unusually high expectations of it. The predecessor, L. R. Palmer's *The Latin Language* was published in 1954, more than 50 years ago. The topic belongs to a field or, in fact, fields where considerable progress has been made meanwhile: Latin linguistics, historical linguistics, and sociolinguistics. The authors of this book are both prominent Cambridge classicists with strong linguistic profiles. As a model, they refer to Geoffrey Horrocks' *Greek. A History of the Language and its Speakers* (London: Longman 1997) that undoubtedly is one of the most important studies on the Greek language in recent years.

The book consists of eight chapters (Chapter 1: Latin and Indo-European, Chapter 2: The Languages of Italy, Chapter 3: The Background to Standardization, Chapter 4: "Old" Latin and its Varieties in the Period c. 400–150 BC, Chapter 5: The Road to Standardization: Roman Latin of the Third and Second Centuries BC, Chapter 6: Elite Latin in the Late Republic and Early Empire, Chapter 7: Sub-Elite Latin in the Empire, Chapter 8: Latin in Late Antiquity and Beyond). The first and last two were written by James Clackson, and the four medial ones by Geoffrey Horrocks.

As the authors note in the Preface and as becomes evident by looking at the Table of Contents, language standardization is a major theme of the book, and deservedly so. After all, almost all major questions of language variation and change in Latin eventually come down to the processes of standardization, regardless of whether they concern early or late phenomena. The developments that led to the standardization in the early stage, as well as the processes that later petrified literary (and more generally, written) Latin as a fortress against linguistic change on a perhaps unusually high scale, continue to raise interest and are crucial for a proper understanding in any history of the Latin language. Thus, the ample space and attention devoted to standardization are especially welcome. Another shift in emphasis that likewise can only be praised is from lexical matters to syntactic change, made possible by advances in the publication of the major dictionaries (as explained by the authors on p. vii).

The book starts with a relatively long account of the IE roots of Latin, and the languages of Italy, so that discussion on Latin "proper" starts on p. 77 (of 304 pp. of text in the whole book). For the average classicist, the IE part is very useful, even if, due to the compactness of style, it does require some concentration from the reader. Particularly useful are, naturally, those instances where the inherited material helps to explain irregularities and oddities in the Latin system.

The chapters on the languages of Italy and the earliest Latin evidence contain careful evaluations of different tendencies in the spelling and phonology of the early and difficult texts as well as well-balanced views on much debated topics such as the Italo-Celtic and Latin-Sabellian questions. The authors regularly differentiate between Roman and regional evidence, e.g., in the treatment of final /s/ and /m/ (pp. 96–7), as well as between elite and sub-elite tendencies.

Concerning the question of how long the vernacular languages of Italy remained alive after the arrival of Latin, attention is drawn to the fact that there must have been a long period of extreme bilingualism with the vernacular languages remaining in use long after Latin was introduced as the language of official communication by the conquerors (pp. 83, 91, 231–2,

234). Regarding Latin inscriptions from outside Rome, it is, as the authors explain, often difficult, or impossible, to make a distinction between what is an established substrate feature, and what represents the outcome of an occasional case of imperfect learning of L2 (p. 111).

The chapter on early Latin includes an excellent description and analysis of the official style and composition in the *Senatus consulta*, with possible influence from Greek models (pp. 150–3). The authors argue against the putative "clumsiness" of the early official records, stressing the fact that these texts in fact show stylistic and syntactic rules already in full operation (pp. 150–4). They further illuminate the importance of native sources for the official and literary styles of Latin (p. 160). The traditional *carmina*, with rhythmical features reflecting the earlier memory-based culture, provided the early writers with a model of elevated language, together with structures in di- or tricola, anaphora, alliteration, assonance and figura etymologica, all of which served to distance written language from ordinary speech (p. 161).

One of the most important contributions, if not indeed the most important, of this book, is tracing the standardization process of Latin prior to the achievements of the classical period and Cicero. The growing need for, and rapid evolution of, a complex official form of the language is placed in the context of imperial expansion and the new responsibilities of the state resulting from this, with a tension between striving for standard and ever-changing spoken varieties (pp. 91, 152–3). This is all the more interesting as careful distinction is made between different genres in the early period, and in all language levels, from orthography to syntax. One might mention in this connection, e.g., the treatment of the Scipio epitaphs stressing their literary nature (p. 140). This is especially interesting concerning word order, and the verb-final style of official texts, as opposed to private and/or literary texts like the Scipio epitaphs. Moreover, spelling reforms may have been introduced at different times in different text types (p. 141). The conception that the language already exhibits stylistic elaboration at this early stage is very important. All too often one runs into the idea that at early stages of the written record, the language would be a reflection of contemporary speech, a view clearly rejected by the authors of this volume.

The sensitivity to genre-specific features is appropriately continued in the exposition of Cicero's style, especially regarding comparison of him and other writers of the classical age. The authors point out the self-evident fact that Cicero never wrote history, and thus the differences between him and the historians derive from this difference in genre and function (pp. 216 and 219). Despite genre-dependent stylistic variation, a certain consensus of the grammatical norm and correctness was retained in imperial prose. Deliberate deviations from this norm (Apuleius, even more so Petronius) occasionally give us glimpses, although not much more than that, of variation of another kind, variation that reflects changes happening in spoken registers (p. 217). Poetry is seen to differ from prose mainly in morphology and syntax (including "routine disruption of normal word order"), although canonized lexical archaisms and Greek influence are conspicuous elements as well (pp. 223–7).

The case studies of sub-elite Latin in the empire (all are based on the work by J. N. Adams) contain an insightful analysis of the famous letter of Chrauttius from Vindolanda (pp. 244–9) together with a highly interesting account of the poem of the *centurio* Iasucthan from Bu Njem (pp. 259–61). Regarding the latter text, the authors analyze the elements that Iasucthan felt poetical language consisted of, as well as his efforts in trying to produce those ele-

ments himself. In the words of the authors, "Iasucthan's inscription therefore tells us perhaps more about what spoken Latin was not than what it was" (p. 262).¹

The space given to syntax is obvious from the start. There is a very good exposition of syntax and style of old Latin (pp. 104–7). Attention is drawn to topic-comment-afterthought structures with much "loose" syntax between the component parts of sentences (p. 105). The authors identify the same markers and resources that appear in the *carmina* and the *Senatus consulta* as producing elevated language in early Latin literary texts (p. 166). The discussion of early literary Latin also contains a balanced account of the language of Plautus and Terence, a prime example of the concise style and precision of the work in general (pp. 176–7). Newer trends and advances in syntactic inquiry are seen, e.g., in the fact that pragmatics and information structure are given due emphasis in the account of syntactic developments, for example, in the treatment of the passive voice and its changing functions in literary language (p. 214).

The relative unity of spoken Latin, a largely undeniable but not easily explainable fact, is explained as resulting, first and foremost, from both geographical and social mobility that was not confined to the elite classes. This mobility was brought about by such institutions as the army, empire-wide trade, slavery and Roman colonies founded in different parts of the empire (p. 235). One of the principal questions that any book on the history of Latin will need to take a stand on is the status of the written standard with respect to the spoken registers. It was exciting to see how the authors position themselves concerning this topic. Their approach stresses the codification of the classic literary canon, and the classic form of the language that resists changes. The norms of written Latin remained close to unchanged for centuries after the Classical period, and the majority of the population lived their lives unaffected by this written norm (pp. 79–80, 227).

In the same vein, the seemingly sub-elite Latin of the *Peregrinatio Egeriae* (end of the 4th century) is, quite logically, characterized as written in the colloquial style of the educated (and not the uneducated), with pleonasm, repetition and no attempt to build up periodic sentences in the classical manner (p. 286). The reason for this was the author's Christian faith: she felt she did not need the classical models. Centuries later, the literary works of Gregory of Tours were intended for a small elite, and probably were not intelligible to the rest (p. 295). This is, in my view, a realistic conception about the status of written standard Latin in the later period.

I especially enjoyed the account of Latin word order, a theme that has received much attention in recent decades, and continues to be one of the major topics in Latin language research. The authors follow word order matters throughout the book, starting from the inherited patterns of PIE (pp. 26–31), and following the trends and changes in word order through the course of history, up to the Romance developments. In archaic Latin, default (unmarked) is

¹ One should, however, note that the text of *P. Mich.* VIII 469 given on pp. 250–1 is rather optimistic, and there is one strange form, the verb *circumcupiscere* that is not found in any of the editions, in place of *cumcupiſç[e]r[e]* (l. 11). The dubious text guides the interpretation of, e.g., Terentianus' use of the accusative and infinitive construction in *se eni sitlas et fur[ca] [hab]ere se* (ll. 12-13) where *fur[ca]* and *[hab]ere se* follow P. Cugusi's conjectures (in *Corpus epistularum latinarum*, Firenze: Gonnelli 1992, no. 144). This interpretation results in a perhaps too bold statement on uncertain text (p. 256): "Terentianus has repeated the pronoun [scil. *se*] which functions as the subject of the infinitive in order to have it next to its verb. If the accusative and the infinitive were entirely learned, such a repetition would have been unlikely."

SOV, but VO and OVS may also be present for reasons of emphasis or contrast. It is, according to the authors, "... possible that the later rigid SOV system is not a preservation of an archaic state, but rather an artificial "official" order created for the specialized discourse of bureaucratic prose, an artificial order that may never have been a feature of spoken Latin" (p. 30, 281). Attention is drawn to other factors that influence the word order in literary texts: rhythm and meter, antithesis and saliency (p. 281). Word order in the *Peregrinatio Egeriae* is compared with the emerging Romance patterns (p. 291).

Finally, it may be noted that the book in its entirety is written in a concise and compact style. It is intended, in addition to Latinists, for linguists working on other languages. For a Latinist, it is difficult to rate the book's approachability for non-classicists. The practice of introducing sample texts with glosses and translations (according to the way set out in Horrocks' book on Greek, cf. the reference above) is highly useful: they link the discussion to the material, and keep it on a concrete level, in addition to exemplifying the actual features, and giving them a proper context. The work is written with a truly linguistic (as opposed to stylistic) approach, the presence of which in what will undoubtedly become the standard work on the history of Latin will help to promote a more linguistic approach in Latin studies generally. The chapters have separate bibliographies, and there is no general bibliography (apart from a short list of the most important reference works).

Hilla Halla-aho

Inscriptiones Graecae. Vol. II et III editio altera, Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno posteriores: pars V: Inscriptiones Atticae aetatis quae est inter Herulorum incursionem et imp. Mauricii tempora. Consilio et auctoritate Academiae litterarum Borussicae editae. Edidit ERICUS SIRONEN. Gualterus de Gruyter et socii, Berolini 2008. ISBN 978-3-11-020621-0. VIII, 218 S. 50 Taf. EUR 278.

Eine hochwillkommene Ausgabe. Johannes Kirchner hatte in seiner Edition von *IG* II/III² die Inschriften des ausgehenden Altertums nur recht unvollständig berücksichtigt. So füllt das vorliegende Werk eine fühlbare Lücke. Sironen hat in jahrelanger mühevoller Arbeit an Ort und Stelle und in Archiven, Bibliotheken und Museen alle epigraphischen Urkunden aus der Zeit zwischen dem Einfall der Heruli 267/8 n. Chr. und dem Ende des 6. Jh. aufgenommen und präsentiert sie jetzt auf vorzügliche Weise als Fortsetzung zu Kirchners monumentaler Ausgabe.

Die äußere Anlage der Edition ist die bewährte, die sich in den letzten Bänden der *IG* durchgesetzt hat. Die Ausgabe enthält alle antiken Inschriften (auch die lateinischen), die mit guten Gründen in die Zeit nach dem Herulereinfall datiert werden können, auch diejenigen, die schon bei Kirchner stehen. Man fragt sich aber, ob es nötig war, alle von Kirchner publizierten Texte neu auszulegen. Zum Beispiel hat die erste Inschrift, ein Fragment von Diokletians Preisedik, eigentlich nichts mit Athen zu tun; außerdem findet sie sich nicht nur bei Kirchner, sondern auch in allen Gesamteditionen des Preisediktes (auch z. B. 13262–64 gehören ins 3. Jh. und sind schon von Kirchner vorzüglich erschlossen). Die Lemmata sind vorzüglich aufgebaut; der kritische Apparat bei einzelnen Texten scheint vollständig zu sein. Dagegen sind die Kommentare nicht immer erschöpfend, besonders bei längeren Texten (z. B. ist die Erklärung von 13249 etwas dürftig).