

Emphasis on repetition in a discussion of the *Eclogues* is appropriate in itself, and does not require the 'ecology' analogy as a vehicle.

The implications of S.' study are further reaching than he suggests. What his argument shows is *not* that 'ecology' or 'ecosystems' can provide yet another metaphor for how texts interact with other texts, but rather that real ecosystems constitute the enabling medium of poetic discourse among Virgil's poetic predecessors, and especially in his *Eclogues*. E.O. Wilson's biophilia hypothesis (*Biophilia*, 1986), which posits that living things are by nature drawn to other living things, comes to mind as I close S.' book, as does the work of Thomas Berry (e.g. *The Dream of the Earth*, 2nd ed. 2006), who emphasizes how crucial to human intellectual and psychological flourishing is our relationship with the natural world. S.' work showcases the remarkable depth and variety of Virgil's, and his poetic predecessors', engagement with the natural world as a mysterious and bountiful fund of poetic meaning; he has laid the groundwork for further exploration of the importance of the natural world as a medium of thought in ancient literature and beyond.

MEGHAN REEDY
Dickinson College

Andrew L. Sihler, *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008. xii + 686. ISBN: 978-0-19-537336-3. \$45.00.

This is a paperback reissue of the 1995 hardback edition, which was an update to Buck's seminal but outdated *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (Chicago 1933); no changes have been made to the text of the reissue. The book begins with a brief survey of the subgroups and daughter languages of Indo-European. This is followed by a substantial (ca. 320 pp.) section on historical phonology. Historical morphology is then dealt with in four parts: declension, pronouns, numerals, conjugation. Issues of historical syntax, semantics, and pragmatics are only mentioned in passing. Buck's *Grammar* had a section on word formation, which Sihler (= S.) has excised on account of space.

Reviewers of the 1995 hardback expressed qualified praise and appreciation for the book (see e.g. M. Weiss, *AJPh* 117 (1996) 670–675; J. Clackson, *CR* 46 (1996) 297–301; G. A. Sheets, *CJ* 93 (1997) 88–92). On the one hand, it is a useful and necessary volume to consult because it offers an extremely rich collection of data. On the other hand, its utility is seriously undermined by the complete absence of bibliography, which extends even to citations of ancient testimonia. It is true that S. often (but not always) acknowledges others' opinions and marks the absence of a *communis opinio* with phrases like "some scholars believe," but still this book is not without its tacit idiosyncrasies—a situation that is far from ideal for the untutored reader. When S. airs his own analyses, the level of detail often exceeds what the typical classicist will need. The upshot is that while useful, the volume must be read with caution, and double checked against other sources.

One might question the decision of the Press to issue a paperback almost fifteen years after the original publication, and leave the text entirely unaltered. As a basic collection of data, the book retains its utility. The weakness of its reappearance now of course is that no account can be made of the developments and discoveries that have occurred since the mid-1990s. How have things changed? Space permits only the most restricted notice of developments (see further the review of the paperback reissue by Z. Simon, *BMCR* 2009.06.34). There have been sweeping proposals for the parent language, such as Jay Jasanoff's magnum opus, *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb* (Oxford 2003), which presents a new account of the PIE verbal system in trying to work out the knotty problem of the Anatolian *i*-conjugation and its relation to the perfect and middle verbal paradigms. Our understanding of the Anatolian languages has increased dramatically, in particular that of Carian; see I. J. Adiego, *The Carian Language* (Brill 2007). Investigation into the sub-grouping of Indo-European has also intensified in recent years; the issues in this domain have attracted not only philologists and linguists, but also evolutionary biologists. Their goal has been to provide a more articulated *Stammbaum* of Indo-European that reflects the historical break-up of the family, as opposed to the rake-like tree models that one often encounters.

But perhaps the most striking difference between 1995 and today is to be found in resources. Back then, there was very little in English to guide the classicist into the complexities of Indo-European linguistics, or even recent historical accounts of the classical languages. Since then, a handful of useful introductions to the field have been published, including those of O. Szemerényi, *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics* (Oxford 1996); M. Meier-Brügger, *Indo-European linguistics* (Berlin/New York 2003); R. S. P. Beekes, *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia 2005); B. Fortson, *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction* (Malden, MA/Oxford 2004, a second edition of which is due in September 2009), which is the best of the lot in my opinion; J. P. Mallory and D. Q. Adams, *The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European World* (Oxford 2006); E. Tichy, *A Survey of Proto-Indo-European* (Hempden 2006); and J. Clackson, *Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction* (Cambridge 2007). A number of works on the history of Latin have also appeared in recent years, such as P. Baldi, *The Foundations of Latin* (Berlin/New York 1999); J. Clackson and G. Horrocks, *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language* (Malden, MA/Oxford 2007); and soon we will have another from Michael Weiss, which is to be published by Beech Stave Press. In German, there is also the work of G. Meiser, *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache* (Darmstadt 1998). A new Latin etymological dictionary by M. de Vaan appeared recently as well, *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages* (Leiden/Boston 2008). The history of Greek has not received the same attention, but A. Barton's *Handbuch des mykenischen Griechisch* (Heidelberg 2003) appeared, and S. Colvin recently published his *A Historical Greek Reader: Mycenaean to the Koiné* (Oxford 2007). And Brill will soon publish a two-volume etymological dictionary by R.S. P. Beekes. What this amounts to is that there are now

far more places where one can (and in fact must) go for information on the historical development of Greek and Latin beside Sihler.

In a book of this type, there will inevitably be many points on which one can disagree. Minor criticisms I have placed at the end of this review. For now, I would like to call attention to two rather more serious faults. First, there is an issue of presentation and scope: the title promises more than it delivers. A handbook that bills itself as a “comparative grammar” should investigate more than historical phonology and morphology. It is true that this has been the bread and butter of Indo-European linguistics (as well as historical linguistics more broadly). It is also true that this fault is not unique to S., especially in this case where he assumed the title from Buck. It is also true that less work has been done on historical syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. But still, worthwhile claims about these issues can be made; for syntax in particular, I refer the reader to B. Fortson, “Proto-Indo-European Syntax,” in *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd ed. (Amsterdam/Boston 2006), vol. 10: 228–235.

A second problem concerns the description of verbal aspect and the PIE verbal system. If I understand his account, S. claims that verbs were classified into one of two categories, “stative” and “eventive.” The former included predicates like *know, remember, am afraid*. The latter by contrast marked “events,” and encompassed *learn, fly, throw*, etc. Morphologically, the PIE “stative” corresponds to the Greek and Sanskrit perfect tense; the other tenses (present, aorist, imperfect) fall within the “eventive” domain. What is confusing in this account is that he seems (with just a nod to exceptional situations at §410) to think that a predicate was either inflected as a “stative” or as an “eventive.” But this cannot be true, as it is possible for verbs to straddle the stative-eventive divide in different stems, e.g. perfect (= “stative”) $\mu\mu\mu$ ‘I remember’ vs. aorist (= “eventive”) $\mu\nu\sigma\theta\eta\nu$ ‘I remembered.’ Matters would have been clearer if S. had drawn a distinction between *Aktionsart* (otherwise known as lexical aspect, *modes d’action*, or situation aspect) and grammatical aspect (otherwise known as viewpoint aspect or simply aspect): the former refers to the inherent properties of a situation, while the latter is a property of a verb form.

A further problem is that the classification of situations into classes like “stative” and “eventive” can vary across cultures and languages. Such differences emerge for instance in progressive verb forms. In some languages, particular situations are classified as states and do not appear in the progressive, while in others they are not so perceived, and can assume a progressive form. Take the verb *see*, for instance. In English we do not say **I am seeing*, but the Portuguese equivalent of this sentence would be perfectly acceptable: see B. Comrie, *Aspect* (Cambridge 1976): 34–35. Thus we cannot always expect our intuitions about what is a state versus what is an event to correspond to those of Greek (or PIE) speakers; nor should we always expect the same classifications among the daughter languages.

Lastly, an issue of semantics: at various points (e.g. §407 fn. 1), S. asserts that stative predications “lack tense.” Exactly what this means is unclear throughout, and more space should have been devoted to such a complicat-

ed and important issue. S. tries (*ibid.*) to explain the tenselessness of stative predications with the following pair of sentences:

(1) *Jane's family owns most of downtown Altoona.*

(2) *Jane's family owned most of downtown Altoona.*

S. claims that semantically (1) "includes" the meaning of (2), but does not specify how: via implication? or presupposition? Furthermore, he claims that (2) is synonymous with the following:

(3) *Jane's family no longer owns most of downtown Altoona.*

One can challenge this claim with the following sentence:

(4) *Jane's family owned most of downtown Altoona in those days, just as they do now.*

If (2) and (3) were synonymous, one would expect the two clauses of (4) to contradict one another: for according to S. the first establishes that Jane's family no longer owns most of downtown Altoona. We can also question the synonymy of (2) and (3) by substituting (3) into the first part of (4):

(5) *?Jane's family no longer owns most of downtown Altoona in those days, just as they do now.*

The outcome in (5) is very odd (even if it can be defended as making some sense), and the clash suggests that (2) and (3) are not as synonymous as S. claims. Lastly, consider also the following two sentences:

(6) *I loved her deeply.*

(7) *I know the answer.*

The first of these need not implicate *I no longer love her*, nor need (7) implicate that one has always known the answer, or knew it at any point in the past; that information is simply not encoded or derivable from the sentence. S.'s account raises a further problem, which is that the tenselessness that he attributes to the perfect/stative is often held to be a feature of the aorist, specifically the gnomic aorist, which is found in Greek, Indo-Iranian, and Slavic. I dwell on this issue because S.'s description is seeping into scholars' conceptualization of the Greek perfect. For a useful description of the semantics of the perfect, see A. Deo with C. Condoravdi, "Aspect Shifts in Indo-Aryan," in *Proceedings of International Congress of Linguists 18* (Seoul 2008). (Though the data are from Indic, the semantic descriptions apply remarkably well to Greek.)

I offer now a selection of smaller criticisms of the work. §116 Regarding Hesychius' entry for 'foot,' π ς · π ς π Δωρι ων, S. comments: "since there is no such word as 'π ς' the true meaning of this entry is enigmatic." But π ς is elsewhere attested (PMG 977); it is clear from the context of that quotation that Herodian at least construed it as a form of π ο ς. §218 S. has reservations about the change of Lat. *-ny-* > *-nd-*, and describes it as "phonetically unexpected." But phonetically a stop could have arisen via gestural overlap if a closure were created in the glottis during the release of the tongue from *n* toward the palate. And after an apical nasal, *d* is exactly what one would expect. This type of change is known as glide fortition, and is not a rare phenomenon, e.g. PIE **y* > Lydian *d* in Anatolian, and Holtzmann's Law in Germanic. Farther afield, one can find parallels in Austronesian: see O. Dahl, *Proto-Austronesian* (Lund 1973): 46–48. §245 The discussion of the relationship between recessive verbal accentuation and its purported origin in enclisis is unclear. S. claims that ε μ and φημ are enclitic "in all circumstances," which is patently false; in sentence-initial position, they are not clitics, and when ε μ means 'it is possible,' it is likewise tonic. S. writes further: "...it is of crucial importance that, being so short, their (unaltered) forms fell within the limits possible for enclitics, such that the obligatory accent lies on the preceding word." He then cites cases like βασιλεύς στι. But he neglects to mention that when στι is hosted by a paroxytone, it will be accented, i.e. ργον σι . §376.b S. labels the anaphoric pronoun α a Sophoclean hapax (Fr. 471.1 Radt), but the form is also attested in the Greek grammarians, e.g. Dionysius Thrax, p. 65.1 Uhlig. S. claims that the form continues **sih₂*, although he also notes that we would expect α from **sih₂*. He implies that α is feminine (and the Sophoclean fragment accords with this analysis), but in Dionysius Thrax, the word is implicitly presented as masculine; see further Uhlig's note ad loc., as well as Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* 1.608 (Munich 1934-1939). Is α rather to be taken as a gender-unspecified indirect reflexive, and equated with Lat. and Gothic *is*? §408 fn. 1 The remark that "even the basic verb categories of Sumerian have resisted analysis to date" is overstated: see P. Michalowski, "Sumerian," in *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages* (Cambridge 2004): 19–59. §414 S. writes, "In PIE itself there was no true passive, that is, a type of morphosyntax with the direct (or indirect) object as the subject of the verb, with an agent in an oblique case." But what about **-tó-* formations? S. answers this question (p. 622), and in doing so appears to contradict the sentence just quoted: "Functionally the derivative made a verbal adjective which construed with nouns that would stand in object relation to a transitive finite verb. Nouns that would have been in subject relation are either absent or are marked with some case other than nom. or acc." See further the two classic articles of S. Jamison: "The case of the agent in Indo-European," *Sprache* 25 (1979) 129–43, and "Remarks on the expression of agency with the passive in Vedic and Indo-European," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 93 (1979) 196–219. §493 It leaves me with misgivings to see the augment **e-* projected back to PIE. This affix is attested only in Greek, Indo-Iranian, Armenian, and Phrygian; as such, it may well be a post-PIE development, as S. himself notes (p. 485). Moreover, even in Vedic

and Homeric, the development of the augment is not yet complete, as there we still find so-called injunctive forms. S. explains (*ibid.*) that the prestige of Greek and Indo-Iranian once fostered acceptance of the affix in the parent language. But if we know better now, why propagate ancestral errors? §564 S.'s insistence that Skt. *srutá-* and Grk. $\upsilon\tau\ \zeta$ are not to be compared is odd. The former does not occur in Vedic, but in the *Mahabharata* it attests the meaning 'flowing' (S. makes an explicit claim to the contrary), which would match that of the Greek exactly.

D. M. GOLDSTEIN
Thesaurus linguae Latinae

John W. Stamper, **The Architecture of Roman Temples: The Republic to the Middle Empire**. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Pp. 304, 162 b/w illus., 7 tables. ISBN: 978-0-521-72371-8. \$32.99

I should preface this review with the acknowledgment that I am not an architectural historian. I do however teach introductory and advanced courses in Roman material culture, and therefore am interested in affordable and accessible books on Roman temple architecture. Issued in paperback in 2008, Stamper's book on Roman temple architecture is very affordable (especially given the wealth of illustrations) and fairly accessible. Starting with the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in the sixth century B.C.E., Stamper traces the development of Roman temple architecture through to the second century C.E. His main argument is that the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus was a paradigmatic building in ancient Rome, and both contemporary and subsequent rulers drew power and authority from their association with this temple.

In Chapter One, Stamper gives background on the site of Rome during the period when the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus was built. He also describes the rituals associated with the foundation of the temple, and the importance of the Capitoline Triad in Rome. In the second chapter, Stamper argues against the traditional reconstruction of the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus. According to Stamper, the foundation walls, the size of the columns and contemporary comparative evidence all point to a smaller temple, about 1/3 smaller than conventional interpretation. This smaller size makes later emulation of the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus easier to trace. In Chapter Three, Stamper describes temples constructed in the early to mid-Republic in the Forum Romanum, Forum Boarium, Largo Argentina and the Roman colonies of Paestum and Cosa. The Etrusco-Roman tradition of temple architecture is predominant during this period, and the Capitoline temple remains the primary reference. In the fourth chapter, Stamper discusses the influence of Hellenistic architecture in Rome in the second century B.C.E., highlighting the popularity of the Ionic order, the use of stone, and the closer spacing of columns (but always combined with distinctly Roman characteristics). In Chapter Five, Stamper addresses the introduction of the Corinthian order in Rome, with the Round Temple by the Tiber and the temples in the Largo Ar-