

All in all, O'Hara's study is an intriguing discussion of multiple voices perceivable in the epic tradition. It draws attention to various ways in which the internal audience, as well as the external one, are sometimes deceived by the poet. Similarly, it seeks to liberate Roman epic poets from their canonical position as interpreters of their age, and allows them a right to hesitate, err, and have a change of heart. Rather than seeking to convince the reader, O'Hara's study encourages us to consider Roman epic from various viewpoints, and to continue discussion of its goals and ideals.

Elina Pyy

Colloquial and Literary Latin. Edited by ELEANOR DICKEY – ANNA CHAHOUD. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge – New York 2010. ISBN 978-0-521-51395-1. XVIII, 515 pp. GBP 65, USD 110.

What is colloquial Latin? This book, dedicated to the renowned Latinist J. N. Adams, discusses one of the most intricate questions of Latin linguistics and literary studies: how and to what extent did Roman authors exploit spoken language in constructing their literary works. The term 'colloquial' remains one of the concepts that seem to escape clear-cut definitions but that are vital to any student of Roman literature or of linguistic variation and change.

The book consists of 25 articles or chapters arranged in five parts, the first part outlining the theoretical framework. Here the primary task is, inevitably, to try to determine the notoriously ambiguous terms 'colloquial' and 'literary' as precisely as possible.

In chapter 1, Eleanor Dickey points out that the two concepts refer to registers and are dependent on the linguistic genre of the text, the distinction between them being connected to that between spoken and written language. According to Dickey, the latter holds true to some point but the dichotomy 'colloquial'/'literary' cannot be equated with the dichotomy speech/writing. The fact that Classical studies deal exclusively with written sources predestines the parameters of the examination, as all written texts, be they speeches or lines of a play, have a literary touch after all, whatever conversational features they may display. As Dickey notes, another serious problem is that the terms are used inconsistently among scholars. It is well known that 'colloquial', referring either to the conversational language of low-status people or to that of high-status people, may occur in both these senses even in a single study.

In chapter 2, James Clackson surveys how the term 'colloquial' has been used in the history of linguistics. He concludes that it has too wide a field of application to serve as a classificatory term. Therefore, most linguists tend to replace it with more specific terms that do not confuse diaphasic and diastratic variation. The concept of register appears a useful tool when assessing linguistic varieties determined by the context of their use. After all this, one would have expected some definition of 'colloquial', but the author, apparently being cautious, refrains from offering any.

The authors of chapter 3, Rolando Ferri and Philomen Probert, succeed well in their unrewarding task of analysing the inconsistent terminology used by Roman authors with formal and less formal varieties of Latin. Ferri and Probert try to reconstruct the attitudes to diverse varieties by examining the classifications and examples given, first, by the rhetorical theorists

and, secondly, by the grammarians and commentators. The analysis of the rhetoricians, heavily indebted to the 2001 book of Roman Müller as the authors admit, reveals that it may be possible to identify characteristics of 'ordinary language' on the basis of certain usages assigned to 'simple style'. It is, however, the grammarians who appear to be more aware of (or interested in) register variation in their discussions of the *vitia orationis*. The term *idiotismus* in particular often covers colloquial idioms. The appendix of the terms analysed in the article is useful to everyone who needs to check how Roman writers used a specific metalanguage term.

The core of the introductory part of the book is clearly chapter 4, in which Anna Chahoud tries to constitute a reasonable set of criteria to distinguish truly colloquial features from alleged ones, that is, from those that are explicable in other ways. Chahoud systematically scrutinises the possible opposites of 'colloquial' (dichotomies between colloquial vs. intellectual/stylised/poetic/vulgar/archaic) that are found in literary studies. Chahoud makes two important observations about the temporal dimension: first, as we deal with almost a millennium of Latin literature, what is colloquial at a specific date may not be such at another point of time; second, in many studies the unquestioned reference point for evaluating the colloquial is the Augustan age. Somewhat strangely, Chahoud herself, like many other authors of the book, contents herself with this Augustan point of reference. In conclusion, Chahoud presents a list of stylistic indicators of colloquialism based on the assessment of their context and distribution. Several questions remain, understandably, unanswered, for example, the one concerning the possibly colloquial nature of parataxis.

Chapter 5, written by Eleanor Dickey, is a much required but rather discouraging summary of the theoretical background illustrated in the previous chapters. In my opinion, the introductory chapters succeed very well in demonstrating the complexity of the problems around 'colloquial', even though the moral of the story seems to be, roughly put, that it is legitimate to look for colloquial Latin starting from any one of the premises described in the first four chapters on condition that these premises are not assumed to be automatically interconnected. As Dickey soundly sums up, if a text represents one characteristic symptom of colloquialism, it need not represent others.

The rest of the book consists of case studies divided chronologically into four parts: Early Latin, Classical Latin, Early Principate and Late Latin. Some articles are research reports answering specific research questions, while others seem to be more like commented lists of possibly colloquial features discovered in certain texts (e.g. chapter 12, Tobias Reinhardt on Syntactic colloquialism in Lucretius, or chapter 16, Stephen J. Harrison on conversational usages in the divine discourse of the *Aeneid*). I will deal here with the chapters that I find the most important.

In his thorough article on possessive pronouns in Plautus (chapter 6), Wolfgang David Cirilo de Melo draws attention to the fact that the 3rd person *suus* is used in post-modifier hyperbata more often than the other possessive pronouns. To my mind, this unexpected distribution could possibly be interpreted by applying the same semantic argument that de Melo uses when discussing the status of the phrase *suus sibi*: the difficult identificability of the 3rd person compared to the 1st and 2nd persons. De Melo, contrary to Stephen J. Harrison (chapter 16), does not consider structures of type *suus sibi* colloquial.

As regards Early Latin in general, it can be observed that, as Hilla Halla-aho and Peter Kruschwitz state in chapter 8, much allowed variation existed before the standardisation processes of Classical Latin and, therefore, several features that have been labelled colloquial

in earlier studies should not be considered as such. Jan Felix Gaertner (chapter 14) postpones the stabilisation of the standard of 'correct' literary Latin as late as in the early Principate. Halla-aho and Kruschwitz examine the language of early Roman tragedy and conclude that colloquial elements are part of the variation attested within the tragic register. After a meticulous discussion of a wide range of potential colloquialisms, the authors consider only *habet* (= *habitat*), *bene facis* and some frequentative verbs to be truly colloquial.

In chapter 10, J. G. F. Powell provides a detailed categorisation of discontinuous noun phrases in Cicero. Powell demonstrates that hyperbaton should not be treated as a rhetorical figure: it is a purely linguistic phenomenon used as a focusing device according to complex linguistic rules. Moreover, Powell is able to show that hyperbaton does not actually belong to either rhetorical or colloquial contexts, but may be rather a feature used in imitating oral discourse. This may seem surprising, but I do find Powell's reasoning convincing.

In her innovative article (chapter 21), Brigitte L. M. Bauer seeks the forerunners of the Romance type adverb 'adjective + *mente*'. A statistical analysis of selected prose writers, poets and playwrights indicates that the adverbial change may have originated in poetry where combinations of adjective + noun such as *pede*, *manu*, *pectore*, *lingua*, *corde* seem to have simultaneous instrumental and adverbial value from very early on. In prose, this development is properly attested only later. Albeit exceptional, this direction of change downwards from higher registers seems to be confirmed by Bauer's earlier studies on adjective + *mente*. I would, however, regard with reservation Bauer's suggestion that the origin of this shift was in the creative freedom of the poet. The motivation could be sought, instead, in the semantic potential of these noun phrases (perhaps cross-linguistically). In any case, further research on this interesting topic is required.

The final part of the book deals with Late Latin. The articles show that with the mainly unexplored Late Latin materials it is still possible to make remarkable discoveries.

In chapter 22, Giovanbattista Galdi examines the possible colloquialisms of Jordanes' epitomes *Getica* and *Romana*. The main outcome of the article is to show how cautious one must be when analysing the language of Late Latin compendia based on several sources. Galdi is able to prove, on the base of a comparison between the *Getica* and its sources, that many orthographic, phonetic and morphological errors are likely to be due to the transmission history, not to Jordanes himself. When combining material from several sources, Jordanes ended up with hypercorrections and mixed constructions that seem to reflect late colloquial trends. One remains, however, astonished by the claim that Jordanes' mother tongue had been Gothic instead of Latin.

In chapter 23, Danuta Shanzer revises the obscure case of an alleged correspondence between two Merovingian bishops, Frodebert and Importunus. The five letters are written in a seemingly simple style abounding with vulgar features but, in spite of this, employ various literary registers and many learned religious expressions. Opinions about the nature, purpose and even authenticity of these texts vary among scholars, and Shanzer rightly points out the difficulty of analysing linguistically text types elsewhere unattested (cf., e.g., *Hisperica famina* or Virgilius Maro Grammaticus). Through a profound philological analysis of the texts, Shanzer provides several plausible interpretations of complicated lexical issues of an ecclesiastical nature and is able to demonstrate quite convincingly that the letters are genuine. Her claim that this letter collection represents 'a parodic and consensual correspondence' between jolly clerics remains, however, a matter of opinion.

In chapter 24, Michael Lapidge sets out to examine the colloquial features of a minor Latin genre of scholastic *colloquia*, that is, model conversations for Latin students of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages. The genre seems potentially prolific, but Lapidge concentrates on finding out if the text known as *De aliquibus raris fabulis* was written in sub-Roman Britain or not. The manuscript dates to the 10th century. Lapidge concludes that because the text contains several common vulgar features and does not resemble Medieval Latin, it 'could arguably point' to it being composed in sub-Roman Britain. It is, however, difficult to understand why the text could not have been copied from a (possibly non-insular) Roman-era *colloquium* much later, for example, in the 10th century. In order to clarify this point, one could start by comparing the language of the text to other, dated texts of the same manuscript (if available).

Perhaps the most important result of this collection of articles is to have highlighted, through a systematic study, the intricacy of the often so vaguely utilised concepts 'colloquial' and 'literary'. It seems that colloquialism, whatever that may be, is best seen as a continuum – as so many phenomena nowadays. Now, once the field of study has been, so to say, charted, further research can be carried out with the focus on those points that the writers of this book found the most difficult.

As often happens in this kind of book consisting of several independent contributions, the quality of the articles varies. As a whole, the book is, however, a balanced ensemble of good scholarly work and in this respect an appropriate gift to its honorand.

Timo Korhakangas

Inscriptiones Graecae. Vol. IX: *Inscriptiones Graeciae septentrionalis voluminibus VII et VIII non comprehensae consilio et auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Berolinensis et Brandenburgensis editae*. Pars 1: *Inscriptiones Phocidis Locridis Aetoliae Acarnaniae insularum maris Ionii*. Fasc. 5: *Inscriptiones Locridis orientalis*. Schedis usa quas condidit GUENTHERUS KLAF-FENBACH edidit DANIELA SUMMA. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin 2012. ISBN 978-3-11-026200-1. X, 147 pp., 20 tab. EUR 229.

Mit dieser Ostlokris gewidmeten Ausgabe wird die Neuauflage des ersten Teils von *IG IX* fortgesetzt. Sie macht im Ganzen einen vorzüglichen Eindruck. Der Zuwachs an Inschriften ist ansehnlich. In der ersten Auflage von 1897 hatte Dittenberger deren 84 zusammengestellt, während die neue Ausgabe die Zahl 263 Nummern beträgt. Darunter finden sich freilich keine wirklich sensationellen Inschriften (aber etwa die Texte von Opus enthalten einige interessante öffentliche Urkunden), doch ist man der Editorin dankbar, dass sie alle epigraphischen Urkunden der kleinen Landschaft der Forschung in einem handlichen Band zur Verfügung gestellt hat.

Der Edition sind umfangreiche Fasti vorausgeschickt, die bis zum 8. Jahrhundert n. Chr. reichen. Dann folgt die Edition selbst, danach die Indices, eine Karte (die anschaulicher sein könnte), photographische Abbildungen. Die Edition umfasst alle zurzeit verfügbaren Texte, darunter einige von lokalen Archäologen in diesem Band mit ihren Sigeln publizierte Stücke. Es wäre aber schön gewesen, wenn auch der unter 1780 erwähnte archaische Text in extenso hätte mit einbezogen werden können. Die Kommentare sind kurz gehalten und betreffen meistens onomastische Gegebenheiten (dazu einiges unten unter den Einzelbemerkungen). –