best reference examples of a consonantal writing system. Clearly, the volume being based on the conference papers, researchers of these languages were not present in the conference, and hence this apparent oversight could be remedied in the future with more volumes on future conference outcomes.

However, the true richness of the volume does not lie in the collection of languages and their writing systems discussed, but on the analysis concerning the different structures of writing systems and their fit with the (morpho-)phonological structures of other languages, when borrowed ("the perfect fit"). Of special interest regarding this concept are Bauer's chapter on the development of the orthophonic spelling of Icelandic, which was very similar to the creation of the Coptic alphabet from the Greek one, and Consani's discussion on Linear B. In addition, the volume takes steps in discussing connections between historical writing systems and modern language studies. One example of this is a nice article on child writing samples, which, when compared with e.g. runic writing, display similar tendencies of omitting pre-consonantal nasals, apparently connected to a bottom-up spelling universal.

There are other volumes that discuss the same type of connections between phonology and orthography, for example *Scripts and Literacy: Reading and Learning to Read Alphabets, Syllabaries and Characters*, eds. I. Taylor – D. R. Olson, Dordrecht 1995, and *Second Language Writing Systems*, eds. V. Cook – B. Bassetti, Clevedon 2005. However, as the editors Cotticelli-Kurras and Rizza point out in the introduction, the aim of this volume is research of writing systems in a multifunctional context, i.e. not limited to the differing writing systems (e.g. consonantal vs. alphabetic, grapheme-based vs. logographic, etc.). Indeed, the volume also includes studies on the chronology of the development of writing systems, studies on writing support, and cultural context, to mention a few. In this way, the volume certainly brings in something novel to the field, and is a welcome addition to the more traditional approach to research on writing systems.

Sonja Dahlgren
University of Helsinki

Juan Signes Codoñer – José Domingo Rodríguez Martín – Francisco Javier Andrés Santos: *Diccionario jurídico bizantino: griego-español. Sobre la base de la* Introducción al derecho *del patriarca Focio y de las* Novelas *de León VI El Sabio*. Colección Derecho Romano y Ciencia Jurídica Europea, Sección Nexum, 12. Editorial Comares, Granada 2019. ISBN 978-84-9045-789-4. LXXXI, 544 pp. EUR 48.

This work is a Greek-Spanish dictionary of Byzantine-era legal vocabulary. It is the first of its kind in any modern language. Thus, it is of obvious interest to all those who work with Byzantine legal sources, whether their main interest lies in legal history or in language history, and whether they themselves are writing in Spanish or not.

Legal sources and legal language, in general, are often regarded as hard to approach for the non-initiated. Byzantine law – which, in essence, can be described as Roman law expressed in Greek – is by no means an exception; rather, to the contrary. So far, the absence of a dedicated dictionary has certainly been one of the most obvious challenges facing anyone consulting these sources. Thus, the publication of this new dictionary is very much to be welcomed.

The book includes, in addition to the alphabetical dictionary entries themselves (p. 1–544), an introduction that presents the work, its sources, and the methodology used by the authors (p. xi–xxiv), a list of abbreviations together with an explanation of the graphic conventions used (p. xxv–xxvi), and, as an extra feature, a so-called *Parte analógica con campos semánticos* (p. xxvii–lxxxi). This is a list of the words included in the dictionary grouped by semantic field, on which more below. The book comes unassumingly in the form of a paperback but still makes an elegant and polished overall impression. Among other things, proofreading appears to have been carried out very carefully, with almost no typos catching my eye (however, in the entry on βοήθεια, in line 7, βηείας should be corrected to βοηθείας).

As is already apparent from the subtitle, the dictionary is based on (only) two primary sources of the late 9th to early 10th century and thus on a relatively small sample of the whole textual mass that is preserved. One of these sources is the *Eisagoge*, that is, the Introduction to Law of the patriarch Photius, a work that is also known as the *Epanagoge*. The other source is the Novels of Emperor Leo VI 'The Wise.' The authors have gone through these two sources in full. Further sources that have been used as comparative material and that sometimes appear in the dictionary are the *Prochiron* (probably the precursor to the *Eisagoge*, although the textual history is disputed), and, more sporadically, the *Ecloga*, Justinian's *Corpus Iuris Civilis* and Theophilus' Greek paraphrase of Justinian's Institutes. The most notable absence is that of the *Basilica*, the Greek equivalent to the *Corpus Iuris Civilis* and by far the largest source of Byzantine law. The authors themselves readily acknowledge (p. xiii) that the dictionary can thus only be regarded as a 'primera aproximación' to Byzantine legal vocabulary and by no means exhaustive. However, one can perfectly understand their choice: even with this more manageable source base, the finalization of the dictionary has been a tremendous effort.

The main question for the user, perhaps, is whether the restriction to two sources detracts from the dictionary's practical value in any significant way. Needless to say, someone reading, for instance, the *Basilica* or the *Scholia Basilicorum* will, sooner or later, come across words or meanings

of words that are not covered by the lexicon (for instance, the words ἄνομος and χαμαιδικαστής are absent). But even so, the dictionary covers so much ground that I believe users are much more likely to find the word they are looking for than not. Probably the main exception to this is Latin loanwords – I counted 'only' 61 lexical loans from Latin in the *Parte analógica*, which is far from the ca. 1000 individual Latin words that appear in Theophilus' Paraphrase alone, as counted by L. Burgmann ('Λέξεις ῥωμαϊκαί. Lateinische Wörter in byzantinischen Rechtstexten,' in *Lexicographica Byzantina*, eds. W. Hörandner – E. Trapp, Wien 1991, 62). This quite simply reflects the differences in style that can be found between various works. (I am here leaving aside the question of how many of the mentioned ca. 1000 words are actual, integrated loanwords 'worthy' of being incorporated in a Greek dictionary in the first place, and how many remain unintegrated loans or represent outright code-switching.) In any case, users confronted with Latin loanwords not included in the dictionary should, in most cases, find the answer they need in Latin dictionaries.

It should also be noted that the authors' choice of their sources is wise in that the two works are of quite different natures, also as regards their language, so that they complement each other well. While the *Eisagoge* represents technical legal writing with a relatively 'down-to-earth' style, Leo's Novels, as is typical of that genre, have much higher rhetorical aspirations, something that is usually also reflected in the vocabulary used (for instance, a preference for avoiding lexical loans from Latin). Therefore, these two sources, combined, give an insight into two different registers of legal language, and thus, a good 'approximation' of the Greek legal language of the time as a whole. A further register that, unfortunately, is not accounted for is the language of the documents from the legal practice, such as court proceedings or private contracts. But for the Middle Byzantine period, on which the dictionary focuses, the source base regarding legal practice is much shallower than for the Early Byzantine period, for which numerous documentary papyri survive, so that the authors cannot really be faulted for not incorporating that register as well.

Obviously, as this is a juristic dictionary, it does not include every single word that appears in the two sources. In addition to basic words such as καί, some other groups of words are also omitted, even if they appear in the sources used, including administrative words such as ἔπαρχος or ὕπατος. Reasons for leaving out this or that group of words are explained in the introduction (p. xviii–xix). That being said, the authors' scope is quite broad, which I find good. In addition to words that any reader will immediately recognize as being 'legal,' such as δικαστήριον or νομοθετέω, the dictionary includes many words that are not specialized in themselves, but which have, among other meanings, juristic meanings as well that apply in certain contexts, or words that form part of specialized collocations or locutions. Examples of such words are ἄγω, ἔχω and οἰκία – all words that, at first thought, one would not necessarily expect to find. In addition to the technical uses of such words, common ones are also included in the dictionary. While this somewhat inflates the

dictionary's size, I agree with the authors (p. xv) that it is important in that it makes it possible to understand the special uses better.

The individual entries are clearly structured. When a word has several meanings, these are divided into numbered sections. In each section, a Spanish translation of the relevant meaning is given first. It is followed not just by references to, but by quotations of the relevant passages from the sources, and these quotations are always accompanied by Spanish translations, something that I think any user will appreciate. Every relevant passage is included, except in cases where an 'etc.' indicates that only a selection of passages is presented (this mainly happens with very widely used words). Sometimes the sections are further structured by subheadings, which renders longer sections in particular more accessible (see, for instance, the entry on γάμος, consisting of a single section that is more than two pages long, but which remains manageable thanks to the subheadings). At the end of each entry or section, there is a reference to the semantic field to which the authors have assigned the word or the meaning and that can be looked up in the *Parte analógica*.

In fact, this *Parte analógica con campos semánticos* is one of the most interesting features of the dictionary. It is a 54-page-long list of the words included in the dictionary, grouped by the semantic fields to which the authors have assigned them. Modeled on a comparable list that is included in the *Diccionario ideológico de la lengua española* by Julio Casares (Barcelona 1959), this is not a standard part of dictionaries. As mentioned, each dictionary entry (or section thereof) refers, at its end, to a semantic field (expressed in Spanish). For instance, the word νεαρά is assigned to the semantic field 'texto jurídico.' By looking up that heading in the *Parte analógica*, one can find related substantives such as βιβλίον, κῶδιξ, or ῥητός, followed by related verbs such as συντίθημι. There are also cross-references between the semantic fields. For instance, 'texto jurídico' refers to the related fields 'documento' (including words such as ἀπόδειξις or συμβόλαιον) and 'ley' (including words such as διάταξις and κανών). While the definitions of the semantic fields and the assignments of the words to them are obviously, to some extent, subjective – for example, couldn't νεαρά also be classified under 'ley'? –, this list certainly provides a helpful and interesting way of exploring the composition of the vocabulary. Thus, it renders the dictionary more than just a tool for answering the question of what a particular word means; it encourages and facilitates more in-depth study.

Some words in the *Parte analógica* are specially marked. For instance, loan words from Latin are marked by bold format, making it easy to find them quickly and, for instance, to assess their share in the total vocabulary. A small sidenote on this: As is often the case in works relating to Byzantine legal language, the attention to Latin influence is here limited to lexical borrowings (such as δεκρέτον < *decretum*), while semantic borrowings from Latin are not marked as such. An example would be the word πρόκριμα (listed under the heading 'perjuicio' on p. lxiv), which is a loan translation of

the Latin *praeiudicium* (cf. my analysis in *Römisches Recht auf Griechisch*, Helsinki 2018, 79–88). In this list, however, the word is not marked as representing Latin influence, as the authors have only marked lexical borrowings. While this is totally acceptable as such, and the analysis of the origins of the words goes beyond the scope of this dictionary, I suggest that if a more exhaustive dictionary of Byzantine legal Greek is to be produced in the future, it should also pay attention to the identification of semantic loans from Latin.

To sum up, despite its limitation to two sources, this dictionary is a well-produced and most helpful tool that anyone working on Byzantine legal history or Byzantine legal language is sure to appreciate.

Matias Buchholz
University of Helsinki

Wolfgang Günther: *Inschriften von Milet. Teil 4. Eine Prosopographie*. De Gruyter, Berlin – Boston 2017. ISBN 978-3-11-045484-0. XVII, 676 S. EUR 149.95.

Im Jahr 2013 erschien der Band V.B des *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* (*LGPN*), wo das Namenmaterial von Milet bearbeitet wurde. Der Verfasser des vorliegenden Werks, der an der Arbeit um Milet maßgeblich teilnahm, legt jetzt sein eigenes, XVII + 676 großformatige Seiten umfassendes Opus Magnum vor. Es handelt sich um ein hervorragendes Werk, das für lange Zeit ein unentbehrliches Mittel in der griechischen namenkundlichen Forschung bleiben dürfte. Wenn auch *LGPN* weiterhin seinen Wert behalten wird, bietet Günthers Buch doch schon mit seinen prosopographischen Beiträgen einiges mehr.

Den Hauptteil nimmt das alphabetische Namensverzeichnis ein. Es folgen drei Anhänge: Verzeichnis des Stephahephoren; Auswärtige Didymeensieger, deren Namen nicht mehr erhalten sind; Inschriftenkonkordanzen. Den Kern des Werks bildetder prosopographisch angelegte und alphabetisch geordnete Namensindex. Die römischen Bürger werden nach dem Gentilnamen geordnet (anders als in *LGPN*) und unter dem betreffenden Cognomen steht ein Verweis auf den Gentilnamen. Für ein Werk wie das vorliegende ist dies zweifellos eine gute Entscheidung (wenn in *LGPN* anders verfahren wird, liegt das an der unterschiedlichen Anlage der beiden Werke); aber warum wird Ἰούλιος Καῖσαρ unter Καῖσαρ angeführt? Dagegen ist die Ordnung innerhalb eines Gentilnamens überraschend, da die alphabetische Ordnung nach dem Vornamen und nicht nach dem Cognomen vorgenommen wird; dies entspricht nicht der normalen Praxis in Indizes epigraphischer Editionen.