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persuade everyone, but they are clearly based on an intimate familiarity with the
text and a strong feeling for the poetry.
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The Latin of the ancient lexicographers and their successors is a fascinating, but
to some extent neglected, field of study. Their work offers rich material for vari-
ous lines of research. In this beautifully produced volume F. has brought together
diverse set of studies exploring aspects of the Roman lexicographical tradition
ranging over more than fifteen centuries. There is much to admire here. The book
presents papers delivered at the ‘Latin of Roman Lexicography from Verrius to the
Corpus glossariorum’ conference at Pisa (5–6 December 2008). The title suggests
a linguistic focus, and F. indicates (p. 9) that the original purpose motivating the
conference was to investigate awareness of lexical register in the works of the
Roman lexicographers. In the event, however, a much broader range of approaches
to the material was assembled. This is reflected in the published collection, which
comprises a brief introduction (in English) and nine chapters from a distinguished
group of contributors. Four of these chapters are written in English (by F., D.U.
Hansen, R. Maltby and J. Powell), three in French (by F. Biville, M.-N. Furno
and M.-K. Lhomé) and one each in German (by P. Pieroni) and Italian (by P.
Gatti). There are useful indexes of passages discussed and of subjects. F. alone
illustrates his chapter, including a series of seven images (a very welcome feature
for communicating the nature of the material).

The chapters are arranged in roughly chronological order. Hansen explores the
narratological function of the learned word-lists in Athenaeus’ Deipnosophistae.
Lhomé treats entries in Festus' second-century epitome of Verrius Flaccus’
Augustan-era De verborum significatione and their transformation in Paul the Deacon’s
eighth-century abridgement. Gatti investigates the compositional methods of Nonius.
Maltby focusses on definitions of stylistic register in Servius’ commentary on Virgil.
The next three chapters analyse the nature, origins and register of late antique glos-
saries and word-lists; Powell explores the Appendix Probi (perhaps fifth century),
Biville Martyrius’ De B mata et V vocatı (fifth century), F. the Hermeneumata Celtis
(extant in a humanistic copy, but dating back to late antique sources). Pierone’s
study explores the etymological analysis of language in Cassiodorus. Furno rounds
off the volume with a chapter surveying the methods and readership of medieval
and humanistic lexicography up to Estienne’s Thesaurus and investigating the speci-
cific case of Paolo Manuzio’s Additamenta (in fixed form from 1558) to Ambrogio
Calepino’s Latin dictionary (first published 1502).

The approaches of the contributors are various. Some focus on the valuable lin-
guistic evidence to be gleaned from these works through careful analysis, others on
compositional method and purpose, while Hansen’s opening study has an essentially
literary bent. All are illuminating and full of interesting and entertaining detail;
to pluck a single example, see F. (pp. 142–3) on Celtis’ assertion that the MS underlying part of his *Hermeneumata* preserves Cicero’s autograph, an idea fitting with typical scholarly notions of the period. The present writer has learnt much from each of the chapters. A short review such as this does not allow scope for detailed interaction with the arguments of the individual studies. Instead I offer some general comments on the cohesion and effectiveness of the collection.

The book is aimed at a specialist audience. F. expresses the hope that it will prove ‘useful to readers coming from different departments of knowledge’ (p. 9). They would certainly benefit from the experience, but it seems doubtful that the collection will attract a clientele among generalists. Some chapters are more accessible than others. Powell’s masterly study of the *Appendix Probi*, for instance, is a model in clear presentation of complex material. Furno’s chapter, somewhat discrete from most of the other studies in its focus on sixteenth-century erudition, is also excellent in this regard. Overall, however, the collection appears unlikely in itself to open this sphere of research to a broader readership.

The subject matter is by its very nature dense and challenging; it is also heterogeneous. The *Deipnosophistae* is a literary exercise, a sort of monster-dialogue in the Platonic style. We also have an encyclopaedia showing signs of reduction to the form of a glossary, a learned commentary, a series of both monolingual (Latin–Latin) and bilingual (Greek–Latin or the reverse) glossaries and word-lists, and an early-modern lexicon. In addition, most of these works have complex histories, their extant forms having been built on earlier works. In some cases, such as that of the *De uerborum significatione* or the Servius commentary, we can link authorship and historical development to names and at least rough dates with a degree of accuracy (see Lhommé p. 29; Maltby p. 63). In others the surviving works are anonymous and the reconstruction of their histories must remain speculative. F. sums up the kinds of issues interpreters face in his suggestion that the *Hermeneumata Celtis* contains ‘an ancient nucleus, no later than the [fifth] century and perhaps much older’, which ‘appears certain, although it is often impossible to draw a line between the medieval additions (both to the Latin and the Greek halves) and the earlier entries’ (p. 169).

Added to the testing nature of the material, the mixture of approaches brought to bear in its analysis, combined with chronological rather than thematic arrangement of chapters, results in a certain lack of clarity. Thus, for instance, the literary cast of the first chapter contrasts awkwardly with what follows. Small collections are vulnerable in this respect, and this particular volume lacks a sharply defined focus. Its thematic heterogeneity probably worked better in the original conference than it does in a book (anyone who has edited such a collection will sympathise with F. on the inherent challenge for organisation).

An extended introduction outlining the characteristics of this tradition of Latin lexicography and contextualising the detailed studies of Chapters 1–9 could have rectified this weakness. The effectiveness of the volume would have been greatly enhanced by an opening treatment of the ways in which ancient glossaries and word-lists first developed, the layers of ancient scholarship which underlay them, the processes of abridgement and accretion which shape them in the late antique and medieval periods, their varying purposes, and such key factors as etymological analysis, discussed at length in relation to Cassiodorus by Pieroni and briefly mentioned in general terms by F. (p. 10; it would have been helpful to expand on his comment, since etymology has a problematic legacy in modern lexicography). One can draw a sense of these issues gradually from the chapters themselves (e.g.
Powell p. 77 is valuable on the arrangement of late antique and early medieval word-lists. Without such introductory scaffolding, however, the volume will be much harder work for the non-specialist than it might have been.

These observations are not meant to obscure the high quality of the individual studies presented here by F. and his colleagues or to downplay the significance of the field. The formidable research on display highlights the potential of the Roman lexicographical tradition to repay further investigation in the spheres of Latin language and literature and the history of western scholarship, and the volume indicates promising lines of inquiry for future research.
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This volume is the result of a carefully matured, thoroughly thought out and skillfully developed process. Its appearance is excellent news in the field of medieval Latin literature.

Like all the volumes of the ALMA collection, this one has an introduction, the Latin text accompanied by a translation into French, and a commentary in the form of abundant footnotes. In the notes, S. indicates the textual sources, examines the most problematic passages from the textual point of view and comments on passages that merit explanation. There are six useful indexes, an extremely interesting annex listing divergences from the text of W.M. Lindsay (1911), and an illustrative map of the world as described by Isidore.

The Introduction moves from the general to the particular. S. begins by explaining how Roman writers perceived the divisions of the world, and contrasts this with the Christian view of Orosius and Augustine. This is necessary background for the views developed in Book 14 of the Étymologies, which S. summarises in great detail, highlighting the importance of the work of Orosius in Isidore’s conception of terrestrial geography. It is an admirably well written chapter. S. next points out that the territorial and administrative organisation presented by Isidore does not correspond to the reality of the times; its aim was to provide an understanding of ancient culture for school pupils. There follow a brief treatment of etymology, of terms for the various regions and countries, and of Isidore’s lexicon.

S. next discusses her edition and its principles: the division of the work into chapters in the manuscripts, the maps, the sources, Isidore’s language, his method of compilation and his errors, and the criteria used for establishing the text. I have a single correction to make: S. refers to the edition of A.D 659 ‘réorganisée par Braulio après la mort d’Isidore’; but Braulio de Zaragoza († c. 651) was already dead. The error stems from a misinterpretation of a comment made by M.C. Diaz.