arguments pro and contra assuming Latin influence on the Gothic Bible version as preserved in the Codex Argenteus and is 'prepared to entertain' such a 'possibility' (p. 417). Pierre Flobert, 'Latin–Frankish Bilingualism in Sixth-Century Gaul: The Latin of Clovis', finally, is a convincing demonstration of the asymmetric contacts between Latin and Frankish, with the Frankish rulers quickly adopting Latin, though leaving a considerable number of loanwords in the French language. A typical French learned and compact essay in English disguise.

The introduction to the volume is highly recommended. The authors succeed wonderfully in drawing general conclusions from the diversity I have tried to sketch above. The book is well produced, and the errors I found are too unimportant and few to report here.

University of Amsterdam

HARM PINKSTER

## HOW TO ADDRESS A ROMAN

E. DICKEY: *Latin Forms of Address: From Plautus to Apuleius*. Pp. x + 414. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-19-924287-9.

In 1996 Dickey (D.) published *Greek Forms of Address: From Herodotus to Lucian* (Oxford), and now follows *Latin Forms of Address: From Plautus to Apuleius*. In many respects the Latin volume is similar to the Greek: an Introduction first describes some of the results and approaches of the sociolinguistic study of address forms, and then specifies the scope of G.'s study. She confines herself to free forms of address, those not integrated into the syntax of the sentence, which in Latin basically means vocative addresses. The chronological terminus is the end of the second century A.D., and the study is not corpus-based (unlike the earlier Greek book), but aims to include most of the literature of the period, although D. modestly acknowledges that her collection of addresses is not absolutely complete.

Part I deals with 'Addresses'. Chapter 1, 'Names', naturally builds on earlier work on the Roman naming system, surveying the ways that Roman males and females are addressed. Chapter 2, 'Titles', begins with an important discussion of the development of the vocatives domine and domina. D. argues that these vocatives were not part of the language of slaves (who used ere and era in address to their owners), but the earliest use was in private amatory contexts, from where the love poets derived their use of domina. Later the use of these addresses was gradually extended to family members, acquaintances, and emperors. Other imperial titles are also discussed in this chapter, along with patrone, rex, regina, and other political and military titles. Chapter 3, 'Kinship Terms', is mainly concerned with the extension of kinship terms beyond their literal usage. Chapter 4, 'Terms of Endearment, Affection, and Esteem', analyses the use of affectionate adjectives such as carissime and optime, nouns such as amice and hospes, and the figurative use of nouns such as anima, uita. D. shows how with a number of the adjectives the superlative is the most common, and the positive predominantly used in poetry, where, she suggests, it had an archaic and poetic flavour. Chapter 5, 'Insults', starts with a review of earlier treatments of the subject, some of which have been neglected. D. begins by admitting that a 'study of forms of address is not a good context in which to undertake an examination of Latin insults' (p. 166), because often there is no apparent distinction between vocative and non-vocative

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

usage of the terms. D. rightly characterizes the majority of high-register insults as adjectival rather than nominal, precise and literal rather than vague or metaphorical, and as using words in a similar fashion to their lexical, non-address usage (pp. 179–81). But one might go further and suspect that such vocative insults are not really part of any 'address sytem' at all: so, for example, addresses like Sen. *Oed.* 626–7 *O Cadmi effera, I cruore semper laeta cognato domus* (cited p. 178) or *Phaed.* 687–9 *o scelere vincens omne femineum genus, I o maius ausa matre monstrifera malum I genetrice peior* (cited p. 184) are not significantly different from a relative clause with vocative as antecedent, one of the constructions that D. rightly acknowledges as allowing any word to be used in an address (p. 213). Chapter 6, 'Other Addresses', considers addresses that convey pity, that denote age or gender, occupation, social group, ethnicity, and patronymics. Chapter 7 examines 'The Use of *mi* and *o*'. D. argues that *mi* is informal, and especially associated with the epistolary genre; but she misrepresents the evidence of Seneca by overlooking the *De Beneficiis*, where eight out of the sixteen addresses to the dedicatee Aebutius Liberalis are accompanied by *mi*.

Part II, 'Interactions', approaches the material differently, looking at the ways in which people in different relationships address each other (chapter headings are 8, 'Addresses between Known People without any Special Attachment to One Another'; 9, 'Addresses to Strangers and Nameless Characters'; 10, 'Addresses between Relatives'; 11, 'Addresses between Spouses and Others with a Romantic Interest'; 12, 'Addresses to Groups'; and 13, 'Addresses to and from Non-Humans').

There follows the glossary (pp. 305–65), which lists alphabetically the words that D. judges to have formed part of the Latin address system, literary and non-literary. The information given on each word includes translation, number of occurrences in D.'s data, list of authors in whom the word occurs, an indication of whether it belongs to literary language or is used more widely, and a judgement on its register (high, middle or low, or a combination); references are given to a few passages to illustrate the usage. The glossary contains no cross-references to the main text, so the *index verborum* must also be consulted on individual words (e.g. on *commilito* one needs to read not just the glossary entry but also D.'s important discussion on pp. 288–92). On pp. 366–9 are 'Usage Tables', briefly tabulating the standard forms of address to different categories of addressee and standard ways of expressing emotion. Both the glossary and the usage tables are intended, in part, to help people with writing or speaking their own Latin. There follow bibliographies, and indices of words discussed, passages, and topics.

There is a wealth of detail in this book that cannot be summarized in a review. However, as D. not infrequently acknowledges, her book is not the last word on the subject, and work remains to be done on various topics. Also, it seems to me, some of the basic concepts that D. uses need further exploration. She admits to preferring to err on the side of inclusivity rather than exclusivity in identifying words that form part of the address system (p. 305), but I wonder whether the numerous adjectives she lists that occur in addresses only in poetry really belong to an 'address system', or is it not the case that in poetry any adjective that can be used at all can also be used in a vocative address? Sometimes, too, attribution to particular registers is based on very few examples. But, in conclusion, this book is immensely learned, drawing together earlier findings in the field but also making significant advances, and it will be a most useful reference work.

University of St Andrews

HARRY M. HINE