

than the Swedish one. Widekindi himself commented on this disparity, stating that “the Swedish tongue will lose all the grace of simple and ingenuous sincerity if too much attention is given to its decoration” (Widekindi’s letter to Magnus Gabriel De la Gardie, translated by Vetushko-Kalevich). More formalistic and more pedagogical, the Swedish version served a purpose that was slightly different from that of the Latin version.

Vetushko-Kalevich has chosen an interesting topic for his research. By examining Widekindi’s Latin and Swedish versions, his work illuminates the coexistence and interaction of Latin and the vernacular in seventeenth-century Sweden. Moreover, his work contributes to the discussion of the relationship between Neo-Latin and vernaculars in the early modern period, an area that has recently gained much attention within Neo-Latin studies. Vetushko-Kalevich’s meticulous analysis of Widekindi’s working process illustrates how translating worked in practice, that is, how knowledge and ideas were transmitted and exchanged between early modern reading communities.

Raija Sarasti-Wilenius
University of Helsinki

Word, phrase, and sentence in relation: Ancient grammars and contexts. Edited by PAOLA COTTICELLI-KURRAS. Trends in Classics – Supplementary Volumes 99. De Gruyter, Berlin – Boston 2020. ISBN 978-3-11-068796-5; ISBN (e-book) 978-3-11-068804-7. XI, 217 pp. EUR 99.95.

The volume consists of six substantial studies based on the papers given in a workshop at the University of Verona in 2016. It opens with two contributions focusing especially but not solely on Aristotle. The comprehensive article by Paola Cotticelli-Kurras scrutinizes two Aristotelian expressions, *leksis eiromene* and *leksis katestrammene*, occurring in Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, 3.9, and used by Aristotle to define two different rhetorical styles. It is her intention to explore to what extent this discussion involves understanding of such syntactic phenomena known to us as coordination and subordination. For this purpose, Cotticelli-Kurras analyses the development of syntactic relations in ancient rhetoric and grammar, tracing the metalanguage arising in these contexts until the times of the Latin rhetoricians Cicero, Quintilian and Aquila. She found no conceptual correspondence between the modern notion of subordination and the ancient use of *hypotaxis*, concluding that “the history of the development of the grammatical and of the rhetorical sphere have gone separate ways with respect to the question of the syntactic structures, even if the former could have had a possible start in the Aristotelian theory of the composition” (p. vi).

Giorgio Graffi discusses the use of the term *rhema* in two early texts of Aristotle, the *De Interpretatione* and the *Poetics*. It turns out that the meaning of this term as used in the latter treatise comes close to the contemporary concept of ‘verb’, and the discussion focuses on the morphological and phonological aspects of words. In the former treatise, which deals with the structure of the logical proposition, syntactic and semantic functions are at issue, and the term is best translated as ‘predicate’ since it can refer not only to verbs but even to nouns and adjectives in the predicate position, as connected with the copula ‘to be’. Regarding the term *logos*, in a narrow sense, it points to a unit of speech capable of expressing truth and falsehood, for which the presence of *rhema* is crucial. In this sense, the *logos* is usually translated as a statement or a proposition. In a broader interpretation, however, it can mean “any form of unitary speech”, including the grammarians’ ‘sentences’, as Graffi concludes (pp. 90–91).

The essay by Roberta Meneghel is an important contribution to the concept of “transitivity”, which served to account for the syntactic relations of valence and argument structure in the works of ancient grammarians from Apollonius Dyscolus (2nd cent. AD) to Priscian (c. AD 500). Meneghel explores the many aspects and levels of description involved in this multifaceted concept, namely morphology (nominative – oblique cases), semantics (agent – patient), and pragmatics (one or two persons involved in a state of affairs), being also crucial for the active – passive transformation. One of her main focuses is the metalanguage relating to this phenomenon, and above all the Greek *diabasis* and *metabasis* together with their derivatives, and the corresponding Latin terms *transire*, *transitivus* and *intransitivus*; the noun *intransitio* was coined in the Middle Ages. The essay by Stella Merlin Defanti contains a detailed analysis of Priscian’s classification of interrogative and indefinite nouns comparing it with Donatus’s popular manuals, in which interrogative and indefinite words are included among the pronouns.

Matthaios offers an excellent survey of the famous quarrel supposedly having taken place between the ‘anomalists’ and ‘analogists’ in Hellenistic times. Our principal source for this conflict is Varro’s *De lingua latina*. In Book 9.1 Varro sets the scene for the story, in which the Pergamonian grammarian Crates is an anomalist who had borrowed his tools from Chrysippus, the founder of Stoic logic, and the analogists are the two Alexandrian grammarians, Aristophanes and Aristarchus. We know that Chrysippus had composed a treatise on anomaly, which, according to Diogenes Laertius (7.189), dealt with the lack of correspondence between the word-form and the word-meaning. By contrast, the analogy – one of the main criteria of the linguistic norm known as *Hellenismos* – was concerned with the regularity of morphological patterns of inflection.

As a result of *Quellenforschung* as pursued in the twentieth century, the focus in dealing with this controversy shifted from analogy and anomaly to the opposition between *empeiria* and *tekhne*,

that is, to the epistemological status of grammatical doctrine. Matthaïos argues against this line of argument, criticizing the views of David Blank in particular.

In the early interpretations of the analogy – anomaly quarrel, it was assumed that a fully developed grammar had already been developed at the time of Aristophanes and Aristarchus, and that their work culminated in the *Tekhne* attributed to Dionysius Thrax. In the late 1950s, however, severe criticisms against the authenticity of the *Tekhne* were raised by an Italian scholar, Vincenzo di Benedetto. The outcome of di Benedetto's scrupulous analysis in two articles was that only the introductory section of the textbook attributed to Dionysius was original whereas the technical part of this manual reflected later stages in the development of grammar.

To conclude his valuable survey, Matthaïos turns his attention to the obscure position of Crates in this story, whereby he presents his own contribution to this debate. According to Varro, Crates and his followers maintained that anomalies are omnipresent in language and especially in the inflection system. Matthaïos scrutinizes the few testimonies from Aristarchus's and Crates's Homeric studies concerning the number of the ambassadors sent by Agamemnon to Achilles. Aristarchus thought that the members were two, Odysseus and Ajax, basing his argument on the dual number used in the passage. Thus, the meaning was consistent with the state of affairs depicted in the Homeric text. By contrast, Crates thought that Phoenix was also a member of this embassy, and for him the passage was an instance of *anomalía*. For Crates, it provided evidence for the limitations of the analogical procedure. The use of the dual ending was in Crates's view a matter of linguistic usage, another important criterion of *Hellenismos* (p. 108–111).

Antonella Duso and Renato Oniga explore the early stages of linguistic thought in Rome as it is presented in Svetonius's (75–160) work on the Roman grammarians and rhetoricians (*De grammaticis et rhetoribus*). The emergence of linguistic consciousness in Rome seems to coincide with the birth of Latin literature, that is, with Livius Andronicus's translation of the *Odyssey* into Latin. "Livius Andronicus was therefore, as his contemporary Alexandrian philologists, a poet, a grammarian, and an exegete at the same time" (p. 54). This tradition of poet-scholars continues in the works of Ennius, Naevius, Accius and Lucilius, and the linguistic themes treated by them include, for example, etymologies, orthography, and analogy, alongside issues arising from Homeric exegesis. This kind of work "presupposes the knowledge of the linguistic theories elaborated by the Alexandrian grammarians for the edition of the Homeric texts", as the authors state (p. 54).

The article highlights the early developments of Latin grammar, which is an under-researched area. However, it would have been a good idea to spell out more clearly what kind of linguistic knowledge deserves to be called a 'linguistic theory' and to what extent a distinction was drawn between philology and grammar (in a more technical sense) in Svetonius's treatise. Svetonius uses the term *studium grammaticae* indistinctly, but he was writing in the second century AD, when

the term (*ars grammatica*) was established, as is attested by Quintilian (AD 35–95). Cicero, however, tended to use such expressions as *studium litterarum* (*de part. or.* 22.80) and (*litterarum cognitionem et poetarum, de orat.* 3.32.127) instead of (*ars grammatica*) in talking about the study of the Liberal Arts.

Anneli Luhtala
University of Helsinki

GIUSEPPE CAMODECA: *Puteoli Romana: Istituzioni e società. Saggi.* Università degli Studi di Napoli “L’Orientale” – Dipartimento Asia, Africa e Mediterraneo / UniorPress, Napoli 2018. ISBN 978-88-6719-135-2. 606 pp. EUR 0.

Giuseppe Camodeca is an eminent authority on Roman epigraphy and history in general, but he is perhaps best known for his work not only on documents written on wax tablets found in Pompeii and Herculaneum, but also on the epigraphy of Roman Campania in general. He has published widely especially on the great commercial port city of Puteoli (modern Pozzuoli), and to call these studies seminal and ground-breaking is certainly no exaggeration. Moreover, as Camodeca himself observes on p. 233, studies on Puteoli are often of more than local interest. It is therefore very good to have “some” contributions (“alcuni contributi”, p. 9) published by Camodeca (in what follows “C.”) between the years 1977 and 2104 republished as chapters in this volume with the necessary addenda (cf. below). Two unpublished contributions have been added, and the whole has been furnished with detailed indexes. The result is one of the most useful and important epigraphical publications of the last few years – but there is even one more attractive side to it, as the whole book can be downloaded as a PDF for free. As for the addenda, C. observes on p. 9 that they are included within square brackets. This, however, seems to mean only major additions, for example those on p. 50 and 60, with a reference to a find of 2005, and at the end of ch. 8, there is a separate section labelled Addendum. In fact, the contributions published here in general leave the impression of being thoroughly modified, with numerous references to work published *after* the original publication of a particular contribution. For example, the Introduction (p. 13–39), on the economic and social history of Puteoli between Augustus and the Severans, taken from a 1992 publication, contains no square brackets but is “ampiamente modificato e aggiornato” (p. 13 note *) and contains many references to work published after 1992. The fact that the Introduction deals with the earlier imperial period until the Severans is not to be taken to mean that only this period would be in the focus of the volume as a whole. In fact, although no contribution is devoted exclusively to Republican Puteoli (but the late