II. LATIN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

J. N. ADAMS, *THE REGIONAL DIVERSIFICATION OF LATIN, 200 BC–AD 600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. Pp. xix + 828, maps. ISBN 0-521-88149-8; 978-0-52-188149-4. £110.00/US$220.00.

Adams has established a pre-eminent position as an authority on Latin and his publications treat a remarkable range of texts from the Latin-speaking world. This book, together with his recent *tour de force*, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (2003), will undoubtedly be among his most significant and influential works. Regional Latin is a tortuous subject to which numerous scholars have added a mixed bag of often temporally or geographically restricted studies. A. has assembled and assessed more evidence than ever before (4) and his critical eye and rigorous attention to detail have created a piece of seminal scholarship which will guide future generations.

The volume opens with a chapter setting out the main issues, the evidence, the terminology, and methodological considerations. A. does not deal with the Eastern Empire, for a series of cogent reasons (3, 35–6). Neither does he examine syntax, due to the lack of discussion in the *testimonia* and the paucity of examples in the literary and inscriptional evidence (3, 10, 186, 510, 726–31); however, I do not share A.'s pessimism about future syntactic studies, particularly if they follow his methodology and include our growing corpus of 'non-literary' texts. A. explains that the 'thèse unitaire' (the notion that Latin was homogeneous until the Medieval or Proto-Romance period) is untenable, and that regional varieties of Latin were the norm, even in the Republican period. His aim is not simply to illustrate the stages in the diversification of Latin, but to attempt to explain the changes through multiple causation.

The following two chapters concern the inscriptional evidence (ch. II) and the *testimonia* (ch. III) from the Republican period and supersede the previous scholarship. We begin to feel the relentless force of A.'s argument as he states that regional varieties clearly existed, but demonstrates that we are unable to describe them in any detail due to the poor evidence. The negative arguments are thoroughly justified, and the path quickly becomes littered with fallen eminent scholars (e.g. Coleman on the Republican evidence, Tovar on Spain, Jackson on Britain, Herman on Imperial inscriptions). A.'s clarity and effortless ability to deal with complex material impress, as does his resolute refusal to offer a simplified version. Chs IV–X present the vast array of Imperial evidence. Ch. IV considers the *testimonia*, and V–IX use the literary and non-literary textual evidence. A. again attempts to identify and account for regional features, though a major question is that of assigning a place of composition to texts based on linguistic evidence. Ch. X considers regional variety in the inscriptional evidence, and notes that the inclusion of 'non-literary', 'informal writing' (*defixiones*, writing-tablets, ostraca, papyri) marks a difference from previous discussions. We are firmly reminded of the discrepancy between speech and writing and the potential importance of cultural (e.g. level of education) rather than linguistic reasons in the interpretation of statistics on misspellings. Though A. specifically focuses on B/V and E/I misspellings, his clearly worked examples demonstrate how previous studies have erred and he sets out a methodology for the future. Misspellings must be set against the incidences of the correct forms (taking into account the size and coherence of the corpus) and compared against other errors in the same corpus to be of any value. A. remarks that this area, in particular, offers opportunities for further research (677–8).

Without doubt, this book will have a wide-ranging relevance and impact. It will be a standard text on Latin philologists' shelves, and should not be neglected by Romance philologists who will find it an authoritative source for the Latin material. However, this book should enjoy an audience far beyond linguists. Those studying the history of the provinces discussed should consider the significance of language contact for their treatment of cultural processes using both the 2003 and 2007 volumes. Furthermore, A. has produced a work which Latinists would be unwise to overlook. The book is replete with references to literature of varying obscurity, but several standard authors also receive special attention, e.g. Plautus (III.3), Cicero (III.4), Livy (III.5), Varro (III.6, VII.2), Virgil (VII.3), Petronius (VII.4).

Perhaps some of the terminology might have been glossed or given fuller explanations; the reader will search in vain for a discussion of the exact relationship between 'regional varieties' and 'Vulgar Latin' (67, 510, 517–18, 587, 588). I would prefer 'contact language' rather than 'mixed language' (e.g. at 75) and the references to 'Ligurian' (217) and 'Iberian' (221) might cause confusion for those not *au fait* with the complex linguistic history of the Western Empire. A. deals

with the origins of the authors of literary texts with great care, but the problem of origins also arises for non-literary texts. The difficulties involved can be illustrated through the Vindolanda tablets, which, he rightly reminds us, were found in Britain, but the majority of their authors were likely to have been Celtic- and Germanic-speaking Batavians and Tungrians from the Continent. The main treatment of these texts is placed in the chapter on Britain (ch. IX), but the tension between the origin of the texts versus the origins of the authors cannot be resolved in this way. Indeed, the well supported argument that regional diversity was not restricted to regional boundaries might be somewhat undermined by the organization of the book itself (32), though it is hard to imagine a feasible alternative. A related comment concerns the excellent exposition of the problematic nature of statistical analysis and the importance of considering explanations other than regional variation, e.g. archaism. The concept of horizontal (geographical) *and* vertical (social) variation might perhaps have been emphasized more strongly, and the explanation for the confused evidence from the Republic might have focused more on the multicultural nature of Rome (118, 160, 181, 274).

The standard of production continues that set by the 2003 volume. The one inconvenient feature of Adams 2003, the lack of an *index locorum*, is thankfully rectified, though the exclusion of indices of the numerous Romance cognates may be regretted. Furthermore, even though the material is neatly marshalled into aptly entitled chapters and sections, it takes time to learn to navigate. For cross-references, page numbers are sometimes given, but it would perhaps have been convenient to have them as standard, as the references to sections could be confused by the use of bare numbers for *CIL*, and might pose difficulties for those using the book for reference.

A. modestly tries to play down his effort, by referring to himself 'groping around trying to unearth mere snippets' (xvi), but no reader will be fooled. A. has produced a rare book of outstanding scope and insight, combining all the best aspects of modern criticism with unrivalled traditional scholarship.

Jesus College, Cambridge ALEX MULLEN

R. HUNTER, *THE SHADOW OF CALLIMACHUS: STUDIES IN THE RECEPTION OF HELLENISTIC POETRY AT ROME*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. Pp. xi +162. ISBN 978-0-521-69179-6. £15.99.

A demanding but very rewarding book, if you do your homework. Hunter announces four interrelated chapters on the Roman reception of Greek poetry, particularly Callimachus, and points to some received opinions (1–6): the Callimachean qualities claimed by Catullus, Horace, Virgil, Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid, or asserted for them by modern critics, are based on only a few declarations in the *maestro* against big books and turgidity (*Ep*. 28; *Ap*. 105–13; *Aet*. fr. 1 Pf.), and reductively misrepresent Callimachus' actual variety. Other notions are (as he says) just wrong, e.g., that Callimachus repeatedly preached against hexameter epic, and that there is a watershed between the socially engaged poetry of Classical times and a frivolous and pedantic Hellenistic poetry bred in Alexandria, marked by 'crossing of the genres' (as Kroll put it his *Studien zur Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (1924)). Nor, says H., was the foundation of Alexandria such a big deal in the continuity of Greek poetry; Callimachus' only innovation was his promotion of cultural panhellenism.

Ch. 1, 'In the Grove'

1.1. 'The priest of the Muses' (7–15): H. starts with Propertius posing as a priest of Callimachus, entering his grove (Prop. 3.1.1–6). This is not just a metaphor, but alludes to then still observed cults of early poets (Homer, Hesiod, Archilochus, Mimnermus). The worshipper, if worthy, becomes at last the worshipped (Callimachus and Hesiod, Ennius and Homer). The acolyte becomes priest by practice, technique, and competition, and hopes in turn to be remembered by merit after his death as a worthy exponent of the craft he has practised.

1.2. '*De monte sororum*' (16–28): such cults were tied to places. H. conjectures that Philitas' *Demeter* had a description of a *locus amoenus* in Cos imitated by Callimachus, Theocritus, and Propertius; Propertius' allusion to the 'mountain of the sisters' (3.1.17) takes us back through Callimachus' encounter with the Muses on Helicon (*Aet*. 1–2) to Hesiod's vision (*Theogony* 1–25); the surviving cult of the Muses near Ascra and Thespiae is described by Pausanias 9.31. H. refers to Velleius Paterculus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus to illustrate Hesiod's reputation in