

A final glaring weakness in C.'s book is the number of typos and errors, which are too many for me to list in this brief review. In sum, C. fills a hole in classical scholarship, but the flaws in her work vitiate her effort.

Rice University

SCOTT MCGILL

LANGUAGES IN CONTACT

J. N. ADAMS, M. JANSE, S. SWAIN (edd.): *Bilingualism in Ancient Society. Language Contact and the Written Word*. Pp. x + 483. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. Cased, £65. ISBN: 0-19-924506-1.

This volume, with fifteen articles based on papers of a conference in Reading in 1998, is a welcome and excellent contribution to the study of the linguistic situation in antiquity. In contrast to many conference volumes, the contributors were given ample space to develop their arguments, and the result is a book of almost 500 pages, including an introduction by the editors J. N. Adams and Simon Swain, an integrated bibliography (for which we may be grateful), and a very useful index. All articles are in English, with every now and then, as far as this non-English reviewer can judge, a gallicism.

In their introduction Adams and Swain use the words 'miscellaneous group of papers' and 'interesting diversity of material', and this is a good characterization of the book, with respect to both its form and its content. To start with 'form', it is obvious that some authors have tried to write a state-of-the-art report on their field for a wider audience than their fellow specialists (I find Rutherford's article a very successful example), while others have opted for an in-depth study (one such is Adams's contribution, which is very good and well focused). Whereas some authors give translations throughout, even for common Latin or Greek texts, others do not. In some articles more or less elaborate glosses are used, if only for languages like Finnish or Turkish, but this is exceptional. These differences of approach mean the book as a whole is not an evident must for one's private library.

The diversity of the book's content is indeed astonishing. The wealth of data, their linguistic complexity, and the methodological problems involved in assessing their meaning as products of multilingual societies are manifest throughout the volume. Some authors pay more attention to theoretical and methodological issues than others, but it is evident from all contributions that recent studies on bilingualism provide better tools for analysing the data than we had, say, thirty years ago. Whereas older studies of bilingual texts, or texts showing traces of bilingualism, concentrated on the negative side (defects, insufficient knowledge of a second language, etc.) several articles in this volume show that living in a bilingual community creates room for manipulating one's message in order to obtain better communicative results.

The volume starts with two introductory articles of a mainly theoretical orientation. D. R. Langslow, 'Approaching Bilingualism in Corpus Languages', illustrates the usefulness of a number of recent concepts ('code-switching', 'interference', etc.) by applying them to texts in a variety of languages in the ancient world. Kees Versteegh, 'Dead or Alive? The Status of the Standard Language', has a lengthy section on the evidence of written records as a reflection of the real linguistic situation in which they

arose, concluding that it is shaky evidence. According to V., Romance scholars have too much confidence in the written evidence and are wrong in assuming on the basis of that evidence a gradual development of the Latin language. It is good to have the other articles in this volume to see that, of course, we cannot reconstruct linguistic interaction in the ancient world, but we can do something.

The second part of the volume is about Greek–Latin bilingualism, with four articles. Frédérique Biville, ‘The Graeco-Romans and Graeco-Latin: A Terminological Framework for Cases of Bilingualism’, states that ‘fewer were fully bilingual than has previously been claimed’ (p. 82) and points out that ‘bilingualism gave rise to quite a range of discursive strategies’ (p. 81). J. N. Adams, ‘Bilingualism at Delos’, convincingly shows which factors underlie the choice between Latin and Greek in official inscriptions, and in what way Roman *negotiatores* on the island used bilingualism. Simon Swain, ‘Bilingualism in Cicero? The Evidence of Code-Switching’, discusses Cicero’s code-switching in his letters, which is ‘not testimony of his bilingualism’, but ‘first and foremost a discourse strategy within his Latin’ (p. 164). There is also a longish section on terminology and methodology, which is not very well tied up with the central argument. Martti Leiwo, ‘From Contact to Mixture: Bilingual Inscriptions from Italy’, is less focused than most other papers, but ends with an interesting discussion of ‘The Jews of Venusia’ which deserved more space.

The third part of the volume is about Greek and other languages, namely Lycian, Egyptian, Phrygian, Iranian, Aramaic, Syriac, Hebrew, and Turkish. Ian Rutherford, ‘Interference or Translationese? Some Patterns in Lycian–Greek Bilingualism’, after dealing with possible forms of interference between the two languages, addresses the remarkable symmetry in word order in bilingual inscriptions to conclude that ‘the order of the main constituents in the sentence is a higher priority than exact imitation of the syntax’ (p. 218). Penelope Fewster, ‘Bilingualism in Roman Egypt’, concludes that ‘for most Egyptians Greek remained a very foreign language’. She draws attention to the fact that sometimes texts are regarded as ‘bad Greek’ because the nature of the text and the requirements for that type of text are insufficiently taken into account. Claude Brixhe, ‘Interactions between Greek and Phrygian under the Roman Empire’, starts with a dense introduction to the context—a map would have been helpful here—and then briefly describes the mutual influence of the two languages, to end with an interesting section on ‘areas in which the two languages converged’ (p. 263). Zeev Rubin, ‘*Res Gestae Divi Saporis*: Greek and Middle Iranian in a Document of Sasanian Anti-Roman Propaganda’, has a very interesting section on ‘Iranian Concepts in Greek Garb—A Few Rendering Problems’ (pp. 277–89), as well as an appendix on ‘The Problem of the Genesis of the Greek Text’ (pp. 291–7), in reaction to Huysse’s recent edition of this document. David G. K. Taylor, ‘Bilingualism and Diglossia in Late Antique Syria and Mesopotamia’, describes the strong position of Aramaic and Syriac: ‘it is clear that Aramaic was a flourishing and high-status language and that this gave its speakers the self-confidence to employ Greek for practical reasons in certain limited and specialized functions’ (p. 331). Mark Janse, ‘Aspects of Bilingualism in the History of the Greek Language’, the longest article in the volume, compares the Greek of the Septuagint and its close adherence to Hebrew (a lot of ‘translationese’) with the development of Cappadocian Greek through its contacts with Turkish. The exposé is clear enough, but the conclusion too predictable for so many pages.

The fourth part is about Latin and other languages (Gothic and Frankish). Philip Burton, ‘Assessing Latin–Gothic Interaction’, presents an accurate account of the

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