into subsubsections containing names derived from names of Greek rivers, Thracian rivers, etc.).

Neither the alphabetic section nor the classified one has become any easier to use than it was originally; to give only two examples of the difficulties, the alphabetic one puts names written in Latin characters into Greek alphabetical order, so that *Timotheus* precedes *Timocrates*, and the classified one has some sections where names are divided not semantically but by formation (e.g. present participles, verbal adjectives in -τος, etc.). No name is listed more than once, however well it may fit into multiple categories, and there are no cross-references. A full explanation of the classification system, which though related to that of Bechtel differs from it in important respects, is to be given in the forthcoming second part of the *Beiträge*. Meanwhile the author rather charmingly acknowledges the contradictions and subjectivity involved, makes it clear exactly what principles have guided his decisions in grey areas, and defends his system on the grounds that it is as much interpretation as listing. Certainly the groupings are revealing in the way they highlight extensive use of some semantic categories and the relatively rare appearance of others. And fortunately for readers who want to find specific names, there is a comprehensive index (as well as a helpful listing in reverse alphabetical order and one in order of frequency).

Other changes in this edition include the incorporation and consequent disappearance of the errata sheets and of the addendum at the end of the third volume. In addition, the numerical totals originally given at the end of the entry on each name, which offered potential confusion and certain redundancy in entries consisting of only one attestation, have been rationalized so that they are given only for names occurring at least three times.

In general this new edition is a thorough revision that offers many significant improvements over the first version of this reference work.

The reviewer would like to acknowledge her gratitude for the help of Ina Hartmann Doettinger.

Columbia University ELEANOR DICKEY
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni060

THE PERFECT SYSTEM IN LATIN

G. MEISER: *Veni Vidi Vici. Die Vorgeschichte des lateinischen Perfektsystems*. (Zetemata 113.) Pp. xxii + 278. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 2003. Paper, €59.90. ISBN: 3-406-49628-8.

Gerhard Meiser's *Habilitationsschrift*, written in 1991, appeared for a while set to become one of the great lost works of comparative philology, frequently referred to by a small group of scholars, but inaccessible to the wider public. The publication of an extensively updated and rewritten version of the habilitation is as welcome (and unexpected) as the publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls, and it is likely to have a significant impact on research into the history of Latin. This book is not just concerned with the formation of the Latin perfect, although it does provide the fullest contemporary attempt to answer questions such as why the structurally similar verbs *mordeo*, *moneo*, and *maneo* have radically different perfect stems (*momordi*, *monui*, and *mansi*, respectively). It also provides a thoroughgoing revision of the pre-history of the entire Latin verbal system and the strongest case yet put forward

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni061 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for the 'Italic' hypothesis, the theory that Latin developed from the same branch of Indo-European as Oscan and Umbrian.

M. was a pupil of the great specialist on all the languages of Ancient Italy, Helmut Rix, who died in December 2004, and the two scholars continued to work closely together; many of the ideas in this book stem either from discussions between M. and Rix or arise from observations made by Rix himself. The most important influence of Rix is the underlying principle that in order to explain phenomena in Latin, one must have a secure grasp of the other Indo-European languages of Central Italy: Oscan, Umbrian, the recently deciphered South Picene, and the minor dialects (M. terms all of these languages *Sabellisch*, a label which is fast gaining general acceptance). M. is certain that these languages are Latin's closest relatives, and he attempts to gain an insight into the early history of the Latin verb by detailed analysis and comparison of Latin verb forms with their Sabellian counterparts. This is less straightforward than it may sound, since although there are a number of similarities between Latin and Sabellian, such as the creation of new vocabulary items (Latin *probe*, Umbrian *prufe* 'correctly'), the greatest divergences between the languages is seen in their verbal formations, particularly in the perfect (compare Latin *probauit* with its Oscan counterpart **prúfatted**). Indeed, according to M.'s calculation (p. 73), of seventeen comparable perfect formations in Latin and Sabellian, there are only four matches (and one of these depends on a far from certain assessment of Sabellian data). It is Meiser's basic contention that, while the perfect as we have it in Latin is a formation which dates from a period following the break-up of 'Italic', the germs of its creation were already present during the Italic period. This is the way in which he accounts for structural similarities in the formation of the perfect, such as the creation of perfects from original periphrastic constructions of participles and auxiliaries, a scenario which M. believes explains both the Latin *u*-perfect, as *probauit*, taken from a perfect participle in *-wos-* (otherwise largely lost in Latin), and the Oscan *t*-perfect, as **prúfatted**, taken from a past participle in *-to-* (pp. 162–6).

The argumentation is detailed and complex in many cases, and M. makes the best possible case for his premise, incidentally shedding light on a number of different word-forms in both Latin and Sabellian. But the fact remains that M. is very unwilling to see any means of transmission of linguistic data other than through genetic relationships between languages. Cases of parallel innovation of similar forms through language contact, including bilingualism, or the idea that a morphological innovation may be borrowed across closely related languages, are nowhere considered. The example of the creation of periphrastic perfects is a case in point; M. may well be right to explain perfects such as Latin *probauit* and Oscan **prúfatted** through the univerbation of an original periphrasis of participle and auxiliary verb, but it is indicative that he has to date the existence of these periphrastic constructions back into a period of 'Italic Unity'. An alternative explanation would be to suppose that similar, but not identical, formations may have arisen side by side in languages spoken in the vicinity of each other, much as the perfects formed with auxiliaries 'have' and 'be' have developed alongside each other in French and German in the first millennium A.D., although there is no suggestion here that there was any relationship other than contact.

Ultimately, M.'s picture of the Italic verb will not depend on how well it explains the forms available in Latin and Sabellian (there is no question that it is able to do this, even though sometimes one might feel that the evidence is a little tailored to suit the cut of the cloth). It is rather worth considering whether the picture M. (re)constructs of the Italic verb is a plausible one. According to M., the verb in Italic is already on the

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni061 Published online by Cambridge University Press

way to becoming a purely tense-focused affair, but we have two aspectually distinctive futures. Surely there is some contradiction here? Furthermore, in M.'s Italic there is still a distinct subjunctive and optative, and a new mood, the prohibitative (reconstructed on very questionable grounds from the form **hvidas** attested in a single fragmentary and obscure Oscan inscription). This proliferation of moods can only be explained as an attempt to keep all the pieces in the puzzle; is it not more likely that the number of moods was on the decrease from Proto-Indo-European to Latin, rather than vice versa? Ultimately, one might think that 'Italic' has become a rather unwieldy rag-bag, used to explain too many different things at once.

Jesus College, Cambridge JAMES CLACKSON
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni061

LATIN COMPOUNDS

T. LINDNER: *Lateinische Komposita. Morphologische, historische und lexikalische Studien.* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 105.) Pp. 378. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck, 2002. Cased, €64. ISBN: 3-85124-686-1.

Monstrous hermaphroditic portents exist—so says Livy 27.11.4–5 of a child born at Sinuessa around 209 B.C.—*quos androgynos uolgus, ut pleraque faciliore ad duplicanda uerba Graeco sermone, appellat*. By *duplicanda uerba*, Livy means compounds (e.g. *ἀνδρό-γυνος* and *ἑρμ-αφρόδιτος*), a formation in which Latin was in its heyday, and in scholarship is still now, usually said to be wanting. The very first *non*-compound in Latin literature is instructive: Livius Andronicus' *uersutum* (~ *πολύ-τροπον*; cf. Gell. 11.16, esp. 5 on *πολυτροπία*), which Stephen Hinds's observation that *uertere* is the technical term for 'translate' makes all the more pointed.

The fact is, though, that Latin has no lack of compounds, and L. has made it his business in two books (the present one is best read with the earlier dictionary in hand: *Lateinische Komposita: Ein Glossar vornehmlich zum Wortschatz der Dichtersprache* [Innsbruck, 1996]) and some recent articles to give a nuanced overview of the sorts of formations favored and disfavored by writers of all genres from archaic to medieval times. If it would be exaggerated to suggest that Latin is 'ein äußerst kompositionsfreudiges, den übrigen indogermanischen Sprachen wie Altgriechisch oder Vedisch kaum nachstehendes Idiom' (p. 161)—L. tries this revisionist formulation on for size and rightly rejects it—it would not be wrong to say that the history of Latin compounds is considerably more interesting than is typically supposed. L.'s new study is something of a grab bag and is definitely not for popular consumption. But it does give us a good window (in the sense of Petrus Helias' would-be compound *fenestra*, *quasi 'ferens nos extra'*) onto a language whose *patrii sermonis egestas* even native speakers generally felt it right to exaggerate.

An advantage of the book and at the same time a disadvantage is L.'s desire to please everyone. The material on any given page is laid out with care, but there is considerable repetition across the three sections, which cater to very different audiences: a technical linguistic survey of the kinds and makeup of Latin nominal compounds, culminating in a 100-page 'Alphabetische Liste der Hinterglieder' (the 1996 *Glossar* is a 200-page list of 'Vorderglieder'); a sparely annotated gathering of the ancient testimonies on compounding (which L. gives in Latin, with German

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni061 Published online by Cambridge University Press