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/bni062 Published online by Cambridge University Press

translations), by both standard Roman authors (e.g. Lucretius) and post-classical and Late Antique grammarians (e.g. Probus); and a chronological author-by-author account of attested compounds. Readers of *CR* are likely to skip over the first part and to find the third a particularly useful resource. I myself learned the most from the second, which functions surprisingly well as the glue that holds the whole project together: the metalinguistic attitudes of the Romans have been the subject of many recent studies (I think of work by such different scholars as J. N. Adams, Joseph Farrell, and Thorsten Fögen), but by limiting his ambition to just one important topic and presenting the full range of evidence, L. is able to give a true history of compounds, one that looks at what Latin starts with, what Latin does with that inheritance, and also how the twists and turns in the fortunes of compounding between Livius Andronicus and Apuleius affected those guardians of grammar who made it their business to reflect seriously on the nature of Latinity.

In brief, L.'s 'Hauptthese' (p. 213) is that pre-Latin at no point lost the ability it inherited from Proto-Indo-European to form compounds. This is hardly a surprising conclusion. As for what happened next, a quick history of Latin compounding in attested texts goes something as follows: in Old Latin times, there was an 'üppiges Wuchern der Übersetzungskomposita' (p. 236), a tendency that more or less continues up to the Augustan age, when the pervasive doctrine of Varro, Caesar, and their fellow analogists led to a striking decline in the number and kinds of compounds, especially newly created ones; only with Ovid, especially in the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, do new compounds begin to reassert themselves, in the first place in poetry but then also in prose; and compounding becomes a major business again in Silver Latin times and beyond. L. makes many notable observations along the way, giving for example an impassioned appreciation of both the linguistic importance and, indeed, the genius of Cicero's poetry: the early *Aratea* has a very high concentration of compounds, and L. cites with hopeful approval the observation of Eduard Norden that it is no surprise that when in his *De natura deorum* (45/44 B.C.) Cicero quotes an old poetic line that he himself composed forty years before, 'et magis horrisonis Aquilonis tangitur alis' (*Arat. fr.* 33.13 Soubiran), he replaces the Ennian-inspired *horrisonus* (which, however, he still used in 45 B.C. when translating Aeschylus: *Tusc.* 2.23) with the tame *horrifer* (*Nat. D.* 2.111 'et magis horriferis Aquilonis tangitur auris'); note that the *De natura deorum* was written just months before the *Topica*, in which Cicero famously rejects translating ἐτυμολογία as *ueriloquium* (p. 35).

Sometimes, to be sure, L. misses something. He might, for example, have cited David Sedley's idea that Lucr. 1.3 'quae mare nauigerum, quae terras frugiferentis', with its pair of original compound adjectives, is a translation of a lost Empedoclean line (see now further Gordon Campbell's 2003 Oxford commentary *ad* Lucr. 5.864–6); and as for the fact, which L. stresses, that there is not a single new compound in Tibullus, it is interesting to compare the similar, but in the details by no means identical, picture of classical Latin compounding that Robert Maltby paints in his 1999 paper 'Tibullus and the Language of Latin Elegy'. Words that L. might have mentioned include *anguilla* (literally 'snake-eel'; L. nowhere considers this type of 'determinative' compound) and *fastidium* (if really from **fasti-taedium*); his derivation of *usurpare* from **usu-rap-* (with the root of *rapere*) ignores Calvert Watkins's preferable **usu-rup-* (cf. *rumpere*); and L.'s book appeared before he could take account of Maurizio Bettini's view that a *mustela* is not a 'mouse-grabber' after all. On a different note, I have difficulty believing that L.'s (admittedly only weakly expressed) wish to read *animagens* in the manuscripts of Catull. 63.31 trumps Lachmann's *animam agens*, printed in every modern edition: 'furibunda simul anhelans uaga uadit animam agens'.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni062 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The difference in pronunciation between the two is minimal, of course, but surely a word break between *animam* and *agens*—especially following, as it does, on the heels of another participial form that begins with an *a*-, two words in *ua*-, and a general emphasis on the vowel *a*—stresses the verse's inherent out-of-breathness.

There is a burgeoning literature on classical compounds, and L. is the rare scholar who is at home with both linguistic and philological minutiae. Anyone whose eyes do not automatically glaze over at the sight of lists of Latin words preceded by such infelicitous symbols as '~ ~' (attested from Late Latin times) and '~ ~ ~' (attested first in Middle or Neo-Latin) will find in these pages an exemplary sesquipedalian account.

Princeton University JOSHUA T. KATZ
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni062

ACCIUS THE TRAGEDIAN

S. Faller, G. Manuwald (edd.): *Accius und seine Zeit.* (Identitäten und Alteritäten 13: Altertumswissenschaftliche Reihe 3.) Pp. 354. Wurzburg: Ergon Verlag, 2002. Paper, €41. ISBN: 3-89913-257-2.

Accius und seine Zeit is the immediate sequel to *Identität und Alterität in der Frührömischen Tragödie* (ed. Manuwald, 2000). Both are products of international conferences sponsored by the Freiburg Seminar für Klassische Philologie, and both have added substantially to the scholarship on early Roman drama. The earlier volume contained only one contribution on Accius, the masterly study of his praetexta(ta) *Aeneadae aut Decius* by the late lamented Henry Jocelyn (pp. 325–59). It is not only from *pietas* that I urge reading Jocelyn's paper as an introduction to this volume, and to the study of Roman dramatic *ludi* and the literary origins and political motivation of both adapted Greek tragedies and Roman historical plays. Jocelyn's paper combines study of the major questions with clarity in the main text and predictably erudite footnotes.

Baier (p. 51) reports the aim of this volume as exploring Leo's perception that in Accius' time playwright and public thought of themselves as Romans experiencing Greek culture while actually benefiting from the synthesis of both cultures. Yet these studies go further; besides reconstituting and appraising individual dramas as far as possible, they examine the relationships implied by these dramas between Rome and other communities of Italy (Greek, Italic, and barbarian), and their possible reflection of internal politics. Nine contributors also wrote for the previous volume; besides the papers focused on individual dramas, there are studies of this very self-conscious poet's self-image (Hartmann), his creation of calques from Greek (*Dichtung und Philologie:* Bagordo), Lucilius' criticisms of Accius (Faller), and aspects of religion in the dramas (Rüpke and Lehmann; the disappointing harvest is not the fault of these scholars.) Dangel, editor of the idiosyncratic *Accius: Oeuvres* (1995; see Pierini, *Boll. Stud.* [1996], 270–5 and Timpanaro's review article in *Paideia* 51 [1996], 194–218), offers a resumptive synthesis of her main conclusions, that Accius was constructing a comprehensive epic anthropogony from genealogically determined cycles (106–10) while adapting the crimes of Greek myth in light of Roman legislation and morality. Two of the dramaturgic studies (Manuwald's 'Der Streit um die Waffen Achills' and Schierl's 'Rezeption des Medea-mythos bei Pacuvius und Accius') helpfully relate

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni062 Published online by Cambridge University Press