TERTULLIAN'S NEW WORDS

M. WELLSTEIN: *Nova Verba in Tertullians Schriften gegen die Häretiker aus montanistischer Zeit.* Pp. 351. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1999.Cased. ISBN: 3-519-07676-4.

This book, which is a Göttingen *Doktorarbeit*, opens with the observation that scholarship has been concerned with the issue of Tertullian's heavy use of neologisms for over a century; however, the attempt has rarely been made to examine 'die neuen Wörter in einer grösseren Gruppe von Schriften in ihrem jeweiligen Kontext nach formalen und inhaltlichen Kriterien zugleich' (p. 13). The present work is intended as a 'first step' towards such a study: the 'grössere Gruppe' in question comprises *De Carne Christi*, *De Anima*, *Adversus Marcionem*, *Adversus Valentinianos*, *De Resurrectione Mortuorum*, and *Adversus Praxeam*, which form the anti-heretical corpus of Tertullian's Montanist period.

W. then proceeds to a *Forschungsüberblick* which dismisses the 'Nijmegen school' and identifies the author's own contribution as a focus on 'Kontext' and 'Herkunft'. The reluctance of pagan Latin authors to coin new terminology in philosophy and rhetoric is considered next. The third chapter then deals with neologisms in the translations of the Bible. Tertullian is held to have availed himself of pre-existent Latin versions, while also feeling free to modify them in accordance with the LXX; here his purpose is often to ensure maximum accuracy. Chapter IV discusses new words employed to translate non-biblical expressions from philosophic, Gnostic, and Marcionite texts; once again a frequent concern for exact equivalence is identified. Finally W. turns his attention to neologisms which occur in connection with Tertullian's treatment of heretics. After well over 300 pages of such investigation a chapter only four pages long entitled 'Zusammenfassung und Wertung' then rounds off with synoptic comment on the following wide range of topics: 'Tertullian als erster Zeuge und als Schöpfer neuer Wörter', 'Gründe für die Bildung neuer Wörter', 'Entlehnung bekannter Wörter', 'Die Bedeutung der neuen Wörter für den Stil Tertullians', and 'Tertullians Nachwirkung als Sprachschöpfer'.

W.'s book is not without merit. In particular he has made careful use of the material provided by *TLL* and its *Zettelarchiv* in order to draw some significant conclusions about Tertullian's linguistic practice. No attempt has been made, however, to supplement the lacunae in this evidence by use of the new databases. A more serious shortcoming is the superabundance of errors in the work itself. Some are due simply to carelessness. A case in point is the list of passages W. adduces to show that *visibilitas* is employed by Christian authors to designate an attribute of the Son (pp. 203f. with n. 608). Here 'Ir. 5.8.1' contains no instance of the word at all, while the commentary on Romans to which he then refers is ascribed to Ambrose instead of Ambrosiaster. The ensuing mention of Rufinus fails to distinguish between the *Apol. ad Anast*. and the *Apol. adv. Hier.*; moreover *visibilitas* does not occur at '1.27', but at '1.17', where in any case the text at issue is merely a citation from Origen's *De Principiis*. The reference to Fulgentius' 'myth. Virg. contr.' jumbles two separate works, the *Mythologiae* and the *Expositio Virgilianae Continentiae*; here the 'r' of W.'s 'contr.' is a superadditional goof. The last of the passages cited in this treatment of *visibilitas* is wrongly said to have come from Priscillian's eleventh treatise; it belongs in fact to the ninth. It may also be observed that *visibilitas* has been omitted from the book's index despite the author's claim (p. 345) to have included all words discussed.

Other errors are more serious, since they leave the reader in some doubt about W.'s

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.55 Published online by Cambridge University Press

own linguistic competence. A number of examples may be adduced. When discussing *Resurr*. 4.6 the author affirms that 'für das Wortspiel mit *cupere* [wird] das Verb *recuperare* neugeprägt . . . *Recuperare* bleibt Hapaxlegomenon; es ist . . . eine Augenblicksbildung' (p. 255). Here W. has failed to realize that *recuperare* is just the alternative spelling of *reciperare*, for which the entry in *OLD* fills half a column. The final text to be examined in Chapter V is taken from *Anim*. 38.3 (' "ex omni ligno", inquit, "edetis", et secundae post diluvium geniturae supermensus est: "ecce dedi vobis omnia in escam tamquam olera faeni" '). W. sees in this use of *supermetiri* an 'Anspielung auf die Herrschaft der Menschen über die Meerestiere' in Gen. 9.2, which is quoted in the following nonsensical form: *καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἰχθύας τῆς θαλάσσης ὑπὸ χεῖρας ὑμῖν δέδωκα* (p. 170). This passage of the LXX should in fact read: *ὁ τρόμος ὑμῶν . . . ἔσται . . . ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἰχθύας τῆς θαλάσσης· ὑπὸ χεῖρας ὑμῖν δέδωκα*. Of greater concern, however, is the misinterpretation of *supermensus est*, which cannot refer to the 'Herrschaft' of Gen. 9.2; the meaning is simply 'maiore liberalitate mensus est alimenta hominibus' (Forcellini s.v.). In an attempt to explain *properabilis* at *Anim*. 43.3 W. asserts that *properare* can mean 'schnell entschwinden' (p. 310). Two passages are adduced in corroboration: Cic. *Manil*. 36 and Ov. *Am*. 1.13.3. In the first the term *properare* does not occur at all, while in the second, where W. misquotes 'quo properas, Aurora?' as 'quid properas? Aurora.' (*sic*), the meaning is shown to be the very opposite of 'entschwinden' by the immediately antecedent *vĕnit*. Similarly on p. 305 *inviscare* (*Anim*. 1.3) is taken to signify 'poison'. The Latin itself is often gibberish. Sometimes two separate passages are garbled on a single page (e.g. 'ceteris praemissis horum filiorum nuncupavit' for 'praetermissis . . . filium' and 'corrobat' for 'corroborat'; p. 129); the same thing happens only half a dozen pages later ('cenae paratura vitae aeternae et saturitatem figurat' for 'vitae aeternae saturitatem' and 'quid plurius' for 'pluribus'; p. 136). The Greek is no better: though the first non-biblical passage to be cited consists of less than one line, it contains no fewer than three bloomers (*ἐπειδὴ δὴ* [*sic*] *δὲ ἀγένητόν ἐστιν, καὶ ἀδιάφθορον* [*sic*] *αὐτὸ ἀνάγκη ἐστίν* [*sic*; read *εἶναι*]; p. 97 with n. 285).

University of Nebraska—Lincoln NEIL ADKIN

AMMIANUS

G. Sabbah (ed., trans.): *Ammien Marcellin* Histoire. *Tome VI*. Livres xxix–xxxi (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. lxvi + 367, maps. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1999. Cased. ISBN: 2-251-01408-X.

This volume brings to its conclusion the Budé edition of Ammianus. A stimulating introduction deals with the structure, collective and individual, of the final books, the subject matter, and the date of composition. Unfortunately constraints of space preclude detailed discussion, which must give pride of place to S.'s text.

Its most striking feature is the desire to preserve the readings of V as often as possible. In a number of cases this commendable ambition achieves a successful result. In the instances that follow V's reading may surely be allowed to stand against the consensus of all or most recent editors. 29.1.5: *praesidalem* (cf. n. 13); 29.1.9: *idem*; 29.1.18: *et*; 29.1.31: *consonans*; 29.1.32: *postrema* (cf. n. 49); 29.1.33: *ipsis*; 29.1.34: *pacem* (cf. n. 54); 29.2.5: *procero generatus*; 29.2.16: *aduliscentiae*; 29.2.27: *lacer*

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.55 Published online by Cambridge University Press