

in the pragmatic values of their constituents' (2006, 150, with examples). In her discussion of noun phrases that are combined with a head noun and an adjective as a modifier, S. states (225) that she will base herself on observations made by de Jong in the 1983 volume *Latin Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*. This is rather curious, given that de Jong's study is not about adjectives, but about other types of modifier.

Finally, while I read this study I kept asking myself about its replicability, which is vital for investigations of this type: will other students of Latin word order be able to base themselves safely on S.'s investigation, using her definitions to identify Topic, Focus, contrast, and emphasis, using the exact same data, and reach virtually the same conclusions? I have my doubts here, because, as with most (qualitative) functional work, S.'s definitions of the pragmatic values are vague to the point of being operationally unstable. '[Contrast]', it is asserted, 'is a type of confrontation between two elements that are brought into contact with each other. These elements either share some property or differ in some property' (45). But what exactly does S. mean here? How can one safely go through a text and pick out contrastive constituents *objectively* based on this definition? S.'s definitions unfortunately foster subjectivity, and not the objectivity required for a rigorous, replicable investigation.

Despite these criticisms, this book is an enjoyable read. It contains important information and insights, and there is a useful appendix containing pragmatic commentaries on three passages. Serious students of Latin syntax must not neglect to consult this rich contribution to the field.

University of Manchester  
james.brookes@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk  
doi:10.1017/S0075435812000846

JAMES W. R. BROOKES

C. STRAY (ED.), *CLASSICAL DICTIONARIES: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE*. London: Duckworth, 2010. Pp. viii + 229. ISBN 9780715639160. £50.00.

Conferences and the books that derive from them are, like dictionaries, the product of hard work, organization, selectivity and compromise. The convener/editor must locate his/her enterprise somewhere along the spectrum from *tour d'horizon* to (unachievable) totality. The present volume had its origin in a one-day meeting in Oxford in June 2009: seven chapters originated as papers delivered on the day; a further two were subsequently added. The result is a pleasing and timely contribution to the study of classical lexicography and the developing use of Greek lexica and Latin dictionaries (yes; those interested in Lemprière and his epigoni should look elsewhere), almost exclusively from an Anglophone and British viewpoint.

Stray in his Introduction maps out the territory — case studies of the treatment of individual words, the nature of lexica as cultural enterprises, the human stories of their makers, tensions between scholarly accuracy and the practicalities of publishing, and the way such books are used by their readers. There follow four chapters on different types of dictionary, three on the stories (past and possibly future) of two central and much-used works, LSJ and *OLD*, and two on dictionaries currently being compiled.

Eleanor Dickey begins, with a very well-organized and clearly expressed chapter on 'Greek Dictionaries Ancient and Modern'. Having reviewed the basic characteristics and various types (monolingual/bilingual, author-specific/topic-specific, etymological, etc.), she concludes that we might do well to emulate the ancients in producing dictionaries which are less bulky and expensive by omitting common or unproblematical words. Joshua Katz (ch. 2) then makes an entertainingly provocative argument for more (and more) etymological dictionaries. His substantial endnotes at times reveal a vista of turf wars (an article by X is 'typically under-argued, under-referenced, and difficult to understand', 39), but the touch in the main text is lighter; as an illustration of semantic change we are reminded of Dean Farrer's description of St Paul as 'this audacious pervert' (31). Then Graham Whitaker, reviewing the modern history of the single-author lexicon (ch. 3), considers who compiled them, how they went about their work, and how their works were published and used. He points up the 'chasm' (52) between the English and German traditions and in passing observes soberly that 'in general, it is inadvisable to undertake a new lexicographical work late in life' (54). In ch. 4, David Butterfield provides a scholarly review of the publication history of the *Gradus* in its various forms. As he himself acknowledges, there is more that could be said about the cultural choices of editors and about the tastes and aims of educated society within Europe between the mid-seventeenth and late nineteenth centuries, but he

does point, for example, to the reservations felt in England towards the over-easy use of the *Gradus*, not only by dull or lazy schoolboys, but by poets, for whom it became ‘synonymous with a convenient epithetary’ (84).

S.’s own contribution, ‘Liddell and Scott: Myths and Markets’ (ch. 5), is a typically thorough and engaging piece of cultural history from one who has already done so much to record the place of Classics in British education and society over the past two centuries. He notes that lexicographical collaboration was unusual when Liddell and Scott were at work and speculates that they may have embarked on their project partially as an escape from the ‘currently controversial realm of theology’ (101). It is remarkable that their lexicon went through eight editions in Liddell’s lifetime, selling some 80,000 copies, and that their friendship ‘survived even the acid test of division of profits’ (100). S. carries the story through to the ninth edition; John A. L. Lee then (ch. 6) considers how to ‘releas[e] Liddell-Scott-Jones from its past’. For him it is a no-brainer that what is needed is an electronic data base, from which printed books might be created to meet the requirements of different types of user. He details the various categories for such a database (from ‘main entry’ via ‘syntagmatics’ to ‘secondary literature’); the tone throughout is upbeat. No whisper here of the problems which have beset the production of vast and complex databases in other spheres.

We then come to ‘AI-ZYTHUM: DOMIMINA NUSTIO ILLUMEA, or out with the *OLD* (1931–82)’ (ch. 7), John Henderson’s ample, subtle, quirky history (and prehistory) of the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. He fulfils his aim, ‘to outline the chief lines of transition, torsion and tension between initial determination and final realisation’ (139), and spotlights personalities (e.g. Burn, ‘the indefatigably incompetent Scottish mountaineer’, 171) and sharpened pens (of a report on one specimen entry, ‘The speech of the Second Murderer is even bloodier than its predecessor’, 160). By comparison, the fare provided in the last two chapters by Patrick James on the *Cambridge Greek Lexicon* and Richard Ashdowne on *The Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* is plainer; there is more methodology in the former, more history in the latter, but each author has much to say that will be of interest to lexicologists.

The book is generally well produced; Crowley 1989 and Dowling 1986 (both on 101) are missing from the bibliography to ch. 5, as is Coats 1906 from that to ch. 7; ‘Henderson 1998, n. 173’ (170 n. 22) should be ‘Henderson 1998, 113 n. 36’, and there are minor typos (e.g. ‘othe’ for ‘other’, 159, ‘th’ for ‘the’, 185; ‘somnum’ and ‘1882’ for ‘somnus’ and ‘1982’, 183). And I doubt whether John Henderson wrote ‘... the terms is gives its slippery terms’ (143).

Southampton  
ian.mcauslan@btinternet.com  
doi:10.1017/S0075435812000858

IAN MCAUSLAN

A. T. REYES (ED.), C. S. LEWIS’S LOST AENEID. *ARMS AND THE EXILE*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2011. Pp. xxiii + 208. ISBN 9780300167177. £18.99.

The publication of C. S. Lewis’ fragmentary translation of Virgil’s *Aeneid* is an event of significant interest to students of classical poetry and English literature alike. It is not every day that sees the release of a hitherto unknown translation of one of the most canonical works — for centuries arguably *the* canonical work — of antiquity by one of the leading literary critics of his age. In his introduction to the volume, A. T. Reyes relates the story of the rescue of Lewis’ notebooks containing his versions of the *Aeneid* from the posthumous bonfire (a curious parallel to the close escape of the poem itself from a similar fate, if the ancient tradition is to be believed) by Lewis’ secretary, Walter Hooper, who contributes a foreword to this edition. R. further provides a survey of Lewis’ engagement with and attitudes towards Virgil in his letters, autobiographical writings and academic works, and of his views on translation (including his well-known partiality for the sixteenth-century Scots *Eneados* of Gavin Douglas). There is also an enthusiastic endorsement from the Virgilian scholar D. O. Ross, comparing Lewis’ handling of Virgil’s description of the Libyan harbour at *Aeneid* 1.159–68 favourably with other twentieth-century translations.

The main body of the volume presents the text of Lewis’ translation, which includes the whole of the first book, the first five hundred lines of Book 2, and a little over 250 lines of Book 6; these passages are interspersed with synopses of the rest of the poem, and with smaller excerpts from the *Aeneid* culled from the translations that appear in Lewis’ critical writings and elsewhere. An appendix collects further discussions of and translations from the *Aeneid* in Lewis’ published