

GNOMON

KRITISCHE ZEITSCHRIFT
FÜR DIE GESAMTE
KLASSISCHE ALTERTUMSWISSENSCHAFT

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON

HANS-JOACHIM GEHRKE · HENNER VON HESBERG
CHRISTOPH HORN · MARTIN HOSE
JOSEPH MARAN · ERNST VOGT
KATHARINA VOLK · PAUL ZANKER

SCHRIFTFÜHRUNG

MARTIN HOSE (VERANTWORTLICH) UND
MAXIMILIAN BRAUN †

Sonderdruck aus Band 87, 2015



87. BAND

2015

HEFT 8

VERLAG C.H.BECK MÜNCHEN

Gli stessi autori esaminano, di tre commenti di cui studiano la tradizione, quello di 'A bd al-Latif (fornendone in appendice l'edizione – basata su sei manoscritti – e la traduzione del prologo) trovando importanti spunti originali (Latif è l'autore a cui si assegna la scoperta della piccola circolazione e della negazione dei passaggi interventricolari immaginati da Galeno). Latif confronta traduzioni del *Prognostico* oltre quella di Hunain (p. 265).

p. 262 l'*accessus ad auctores*, oltre a quello di Stefano per il *Prognostico*, è canonico nei commenti greci tardo antichi, e in arabo nei commenti di Tayyib (vedi ad esempio Il commento di Abu-l-Abu-l-Faraj ibn at-Tayyib all'*Ars medica* di Galeno, in N. Palmieri, *L'Ars medica* (Tegni) *de Galien: Lectures antiques et médiévales*, Saint-Etienne 2008, 67–125).

p. 262 analysis through opposition = semplicemente analysis.

Leigh Chipman, 'Recipes by Hippocrates, Galen and Hunayn in the *Epidemics* and in Medieval Arabic Pharmacopoeias'.

Come era prevedibile, l'autrice fa scarso uso delle poche ricette contenute nelle *Epidemie*, mentre utilizza largamente Galeno e Hunain.

Errori di stampa

Per un errore tipografico, a p. 40 testo arabo e traduzione inglese non corrispondono.

p. 74: χρηστὸν lege χρηστόν

p. 77: γυνή lege γυνή

p. 77: σκύτεως lege σκυτέως

p. 79 in fine: Cranon lege Crannon

Barge

Ivan Garofalo

✱

Angelo Mercado: *Italic Verse. A Study of the Poetic Remains of Old Latin, Faliscan, and Sabellic*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck. Bereich Sprachwissenschaft 2012. XXVII, 437 S. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft. 145.) 80 €.

This study, a thorough revision of the author's 2006 UCLA dissertation, is a paragon of early twenty-first century philology.¹ Angelo Mercado has set him-

¹ Literature:

Agresti, A. (2013). *Categorical Data Analysis*. 3rd ed. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
 Allen, W. S. (1973). *Accent and Rhythm. Prosodic Features of Greek and Latin: A Study in Theory and Reconstruction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 Anderson, S. R. (2005). *Aspects of the Theory of Clitics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (2012). 'Clitics'. In: *The Blackwell Companion to Phonology*. Ed. by M. van Oostendorp et al. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
 Baayen, H. (2008). *Analyzing Linguistic Data: A Practical Introduction to Statistics Using R*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 Baker, R. (2010). 'The Accentuation of Ancient Greek Enclitics: A Didactic Simplification'. In: *Classical World* 103, 529–530.
 Bürging, D. (1997). *The Meaning of Topic and Focus – The 59th Street Bridge Accent*. London: Routledge.
 — (1999). 'Topics'. In: *Focus – Linguistic, Cognitive, and Computational Perspectives*. Ed. by P. Bosch und R. van der Sandt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 142–165.

self a daunting task, namely to formulate the principles of the Saturnian verse, that *horridus...numerus* (Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.157–158) that has resisted analysis for generations. He distinguishes himself from his predecessors in the analytic panoply that he brings to the job: linguistic typology, inferential statistics, metrical and phonological theory, literary history, textual criticism, epigraphy, and the broader context of archaic Indo-European are all within his ken. The presentation as a whole is remarkable for its organization and clarity, the latter of which is due in no small part to the graceful prose. This is a book that goes to the heart of the matter, and yet remains accessible to those untutored in the many sub-disciplines that the investigation ranges over (that said, readers who would like more background on the statistics can consult Baayen 2008, Johnson 2008, Gries 2013, or Agresti 2013; the initial three are specifically geared to the application of statistical methods to linguistic research).

The first chapter introduces the main claim of the work, its theoretical underpinnings, the statistical tests that will be used, and the metrical terminology. From here, the book is concentrically organized into three parts, with the first devoted to Latin, the second to the rest of Italic (Faliscan and Sabellic), and the third to the wider Indo-European context (Celtic, Indo-Iranian, Greek, Slavic, Germanic). Chapter two begins with an overview of the literary and epigraphic Saturnian corpora, and then briskly guides the reader through the main threads of previous scholarship. Analyses are categorized into one of three categories: quantitative (advocated by Leo, Pasquali, Campanile, Cole, Parsons), accentualist

-
- Clackson, J. (2014). 'Review of A. Mercado, *Italic verse: A study of the poetic remains of Old Latin, Faliscan, and Sabellic* (Innsbruck 2012)'. In: *The Classical Review*, 1–2.
- Danckaert, L. (2012). *Latin Embedded Clauses*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fabb, N. und M. Halle (2008). *Meter in Poetry: A New Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fortson, B. W. I. (2011). 'Latin Prosody and Metrics'. In: *A Companion to the Latin Language*. Ed. by J. Clackson. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 92–104.
- Goldstein, D. M. (in print). *Classical Greek Syntax: Wackernagel's Law in Herodotus*. Leiden: Brill.
- Gries, S. T. (2013). *Statistics for Linguistics with R: A Practical Introduction*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Halliday, M. A. und R. Hasan (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hettrich, H. (1988). *Untersuchungen zur Hypotaxe im Vedischen*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Johnson, K. (2008). *Quantitative Methods In Linguistics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Lindsay, W. M. (1922). *Early Latin Verse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Melchert, H. C. (1994). *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Peperkamp, S. (1997). *Prosodic Words*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.
- Probert, P. (2002). 'On the Prosody of Latin Enclitics'. In: *Oxford University Working Papers in Linguistics, Philology and Phonetics*. Ed. by I. J. Hartmann und A. Willi. Bd. 7. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 181–206.
- (2003). *A New Short Guide to the Accentuation of Ancient Greek*. London: Bristol Classical Press.
- Questa, C. (2007). *La metrica di Plauto e di Terenzio*. Urbino: QuattroVenti.
- Selkirk, E. (2011). 'The Syntax-Phonology Interface'. In: *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*. Ed. by J. A. Goldsmith, J. Riggle und A. C. L. Yu. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 435–484.
- Trotzke, A. (2012). 'Review of Lieven Danckaert, *Latin Embedded Clauses: The Left Periphery*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins'. In: *The LINGUIST List* 23.4367.

(Thurneysen and Lindsay), and miscellaneous. The distinction between the first two comes down to the question of whether the metrical template of the Saturnian is organized according to syllable weight (such as the quantitative meters of Greek and Indo-Iranian) or syllable prominence (as with various meters in the Germanic languages). Mercado comes down on the side of the latter and argues for an underlying trochaic-amphibrachic tetrameter (p. 2): / () ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ || () ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪/. || and | mark the major and minor caesurae, respectively, while possible sites of acephaly are in parentheses. Anacalasis can operate on metra to produce initial 3 | 4 cola ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ and on feet to yield initial 5 | 2 cola ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ (pp. 76, 89–90). In the mapping between syllables and metrical positions, the familiar rules of resolution, synizesis, (prod-)elision, and hiatus apply, as well as less familiar processes such as mismatch (p. 106–109, 133), by which e.g. ∪ ∪ maps onto ∪ ∪.

The challenge for accentualist accounts of the Saturnian is our limited understanding of early Latin stress. Scanning the lines according to the penultimate stress rule of Classical Latin does not yield consistent patterns (Fortson 2011: 93). The danger of circularity is also high, as the meter is both based on and informs our understanding of stress assignment. Mercado (p. 55) assumes that stress assignment in the Saturnians resembles that of Plautine Latin, i.e. the penultimate law in conjunction with initially-stressed proceleusmatics, so *facilius* instead of Classical *facilius*. (I take up the question of stress below.) One of the appealing properties of Mercado's analysis is that it is able to account for the long-standing difficulty in explaining the Saturnian. It is typologically unusual (or as unusual as Classical Arabic meter, p. 343; for a cross-linguistic view of metrical systems, see Fabb und Halle 2008) in that it cannot be described via columnar correspondence alone (p. 53): «We expect that the realization of one position in one line should be the same as or equivalent to the realization of the same position in another, and this unmarked expectation may be standing in the way of discovering a system of versification that may have allowed more complex variation and responsion.»

The ensuing three chapters flesh out the prosodic and stylistic properties of the verse. Chapter four explores not only the scansion of the Saturnian, but also the relationship between the verse and Latin phonology, namely syllable structure and stress. This latter facet of the discussion is particularly interesting, because unlike other accounts, Mercado's makes clear predictions about what sort of scansion would conflict with Latin phonology (e.g. p. 95). His model is put to the test in the next three chapters, which take up problematic (chapter six), putative (chapter seven), and monocolic Saturnians (chapter eight) in turn. Chapter six in particular showcases the fruits of the analysis, as Mercado provides new dispositions for some fragments and arguments for the emendation – and de-emendation – of others. Closing out the Latin portion of the investigation, chapter nine investigates a handful of subliterate texts from the Classical period that in Mercado's view have been miscategorized as «rhythmic prose.» He argues that these outliers in fact instantiate regular trochaic and dactylic tetrapodies, which means that there were other syllabo-tonic meters besides the Saturnian in circulation.

Part II begins with an introduction to the non-Latin Italic languages and corpora, and then treats Faliscan, Umbrian, and South Picene verse in greater detail. Mercado argues that these Italic systems of versification are, like the Saturnian, based on prominence contrast. Part III continues the outward trajectory of the exposition by first offering a typological comparison with Classical Arabic meter and English textsetting, and then returning to archaic Indo-European with a discussion of the Proto-Italic and Italo-Celtic metrical systems. This is a difficult question, not least because it is not clear that the comparative method, which has been used to such dazzling success in phonology and morphology, can even be applied to systems of versification, given that metrical traditions do not propagate the way words do. The question is one that should be pursued and Mercado takes a responsibly circumspect approach. Two Appendices close out the book, one presenting the corpus of Latin Saturnians, the other taking up the question of metrical rhythm in Latin prose. The first of these is especially helpful, as Mercado presents his corpus of Saturnians with accompanying scansion, so one can readily check his analysis of any given line.

It would be impossible to do justice to the richness of this book within the confines of a review, so I limit comments to just three topics: the restrictiveness of the meter, clitic incorporation, and a few points of syntax. I close by considering the role of the book in the field. (Given the focus of the journal and the typical interests of its readership, only the Latin data will be discussed.)

In a recent handbook article on Latin prosody and metrics, Fortson (2011: 94) writes: «the ability of any theory of the Saturnian to convince will depend on how cleanly it does this and on the degree to which it avoids (or appears to avoid) arbitrary application of licenses and multiplication of verse-types.» Previous analyses of the Saturnian have been criticized for being too permissive or too complex. To circumvent these pitfalls, Mercado relies on quantitative measures to evaluate his analysis of the Saturnian in relation to previous proposals (esp. pp. 35–53, 133–134). The advantage of using a quantitative measure is that it avoids intuitive judgments about complexity and permissiveness. To quantify restrictiveness, Mercado uses a value called surprisal. Surprisal is a term from information theory that refers to the amount of information linked to a variable. A coin toss has a surprisal lower than that of a roll of a die, because there are two possible outcomes in comparison to six. Applying this concept to the metrical line, we can think of each metrical position as a roll of the die, and the surprisal as the average number of possibilities per position. Mercado calculates the surprisal of five meters, which from most to least restrictive are ranked as follows: dactylic hexameter » iambic trimeter » iambic septenarius » iambic senarius » trochaic septenarius. He reasons (p. 39) that any quantitativist analysis of the Saturnian should be as restrictive as the dactylic hexameter, or at the least no looser than the trochaic septenarius. The only accentualist model that achieves this is that of Pasquali-Campanile, whose surprisal matches that of the trochaic septenarius; those of Parson and Cole exceed it. Among the accentualists, Mercado's model is more restrictive than Lindsay's but less restrictive than Thurneysen's (implausible stress assignments mar the latter's model, according to Mercado). Mercado's Saturnian falls between the iambic trimeter and the iambic septenarius (p. 133). One might question his assumption that the restrictiveness of the Saturnian

should fall between the dactylic hexameter and the trochaic septenarius, but we do come away with a Saturnian that is neither too free nor implausibly complicated.

At a more concrete level, he argues that both the combinations of cola (pp. 86–89) as well as their substructures (pp. 77–80) are regulated by the following constraints:

(1) Constraints on Colon Substructure

a. CRESCENDO

Within a colon, each foot must be longer than the last.

b. FAITHFULNESS(LINK)

Within a colon, the link between a foot and its metron must be the same in the derived form as the base form.

(2) Constraints on Colon Combination

a. DECRESCENDO

Within a line, the second colon must be shorter than the first.

b. †ACEPHALY

The colon-initial metrical position must be able to be filled.

Beginning with the substructure constraints, CRESCENDO penalizes 3 | 3 and 2 | 3 cola, while FAITHFULNESS(LINK) assigns a violation to e.g. the derivation of 4 | 2 cola (◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ | ◡ ◡) from 3 | 3 (◡ ◡ ◡ | ◡ ◡) via anacalasis, as the restructuring that yields the 4 | 2 colon requires taking a syllable from the second metron and appending it to the first. DECRESCENDO is the opposite of Crescendo, but applies at a higher level, namely the line. Finally, †ACEPHALY penalizes headless cola. Violations are cumulative so DECRESCENDO assigns 6||7 lines two penalties. By tallying up penalties, we can rank the well-formedness of the lines: the fewer the violations, the more well formed the line. Remarkably, Mercado's well-formedness hierarchy correlates with frequency of attestation (he demonstrates the statistical significance of the correlation on the basis of a Likelihood Ratio Test using a χ^2 distribution). So the least marked 7||6 line (it violates neither constraint 2a nor 2b) occurs 65 times, while the 5||7 and 5||6 lines (which each incur four violations) are not attested. The hierarchy from most to least well-formed is as follows (unattested lines are marked with an asterisk): 7||6 » 7||5 » 6||7, 6||6, 6||5 » *5||7, *5||6. At the level of the colon, however, there appears to be a problem, as 2 | 3 | 2 and 4 | 2 cola each incur four violations, but the former is only attested three times, while there are seventeen tokens of the latter. The 4 | 2 colon exhibits more violations of CRESCENDO, while the 2 | 3 | 2 more of FAITHFULNESS(LINK), which suggests that violations of the latter should be given more weight. This issue aside, no other analysis of the Saturnian (to my knowledge) is able to motivate the attested frequencies of the various instantiations of the line.

As noted above, our understanding of stress in archaic Latin is murky, in particular when it comes to enclitic incorporation (see e.g. Questa 2007: 90). Before turning to the details, I want to situate the discussion within the following typology from modern Italian (Peperkamp 1997: 177):

(3) Standard Italian (Free Clitic)

pórta

bring.IMPV

pórta=mi

bring.IMPV>me

pórtasme=lo
 bring.IMPV=me=it
 (4) Lucanian (Internal Clitic)
vinnə sell.IMPV
vənní=llə sell.IMPV=it
vinnə=mi=llə sell. IMPV =me=it
 (5) Neapolitan (Affixal Clitic)
cóntə
 tell. IMPV
cónta=lə
 tell. IMPV =it
cónta=tí=llə
 tell. IMPV =you.refl=it

In Standard Italian, the addition of the enclitic has no effect on the accentuation of the host, whereas in Lucanian and Neapolitan it does. In the former, the stress of the host shifts to the right. One often reads that Classical Latin was of this type, e.g. *virum* → *virúmque* (the situation is not always so straightforward however, see Probert 2002). Finally, in Neapolitan, clitic incorporation triggers secondary stress. This is the behavior that we find in Classical Greek (Probert 2003: 147–148, Baker 2010; it is of course not the case that every host+clitic combination yields a secondary stress). These systems have been analyzed formally within the Prosodic Hierarchy and Optimality Theory (e.g. Anderson 2005, 2012, Selkirk 2011), and the names above in parentheses (free, internal, affixal) stem from this field of research.

Mercado argues that the earliest Saturnian lines provide crucial evidence for a stage in which the host-enclitic relationship patterned like Standard Italian, before shifting to the Lucanian type after Plautus (pp. 120–121; also pp. 133, 197–198, 358). So we would have a change from *virumque* to *virúmque*. This view has been espoused before, but on Mercado's analysis of the Saturnian it receives renewed support (raised ° is elided):

- (6) a. *silvicolae | homines || belli- | qu° inertes*
 'forest-dwelling men and weak in war'

Naev. 10

- b. *inerant signa expressa, quo modo Titani*
bicorpores | Gigantes || magni- | qu° Atlantes
Runcus ac Purpureus filii Terras
 'There were carved images on it, how the Titans double-bodied Giants,
 huge Atlantases, Runcus and Purpureus, sons of mother earth'

Naev. 8.2

- c. *sesequ° ei | perire || mavolunt | ibidem*
quam cum stupro redire ad suos popularis.
 'and they prefer that they themselves die there, than return in disgrace
 to their countrymen'

Naev. 50.1

- d. *pleriqu° omnes | subiguntur || sub unum | iudicium*
 'Nearly all are brought under one judgement'

Naev. 52

Mercado takes the first two examples to be especially probative (p. 121), as the pre-caesural position must be non-ictic. So the hosts are accented on their first syllables, *bélli qu^e* and *mágnī qu^e*.

This in itself is an important observation, but there is still the matter of how one interprets these facts. One possibility would be to take the accent at face value and see these examples as direct evidence of the Standard Italian pattern. Alternatively, the Lucanian pattern may have already obtained in Naevius' time, in which case *mágnī qu^e* and *bélli qu^e* would be the products of a post-elision stress retraction (*magnī qu^e → mágnī qu^e*). Such an analysis has both been proposed (see the account of Allen 1973: 159) and rejected (e.g. Lindsay 1922: 34). Mercado seconds Lindsay's judgment on the grounds that typologically we expect elision to be ordered after accentuation. In favor of the Lindsay-Mercado view, one could add that the Standard Italian pattern appears to be found in Vedic Sanskrit, as well. (Hittite seems to be of the Lucanian type, but the evidence is meager; see Melchert 1994: 106–107.) This would then be a point of similarity between the earliest Latin and the earliest Sanskrit.

At the same time, the view that the Lucanian system already obtained by the time of Saturnian composition perhaps deserve more consideration. The post-elision accent recalculation that Lindsay and Mercado are skeptical of is in fact known from Greek:

(7) πολλὰ ἔπαθον → πόλλ' ἔπαθον

The accent of the elided vowel hops back one syllable to the left. While we have to allow for the possibility of reaccentuation after elision, the conditions of this process remain to be determined. Should we only expect it to occur when an accent-bearing vowel is deleted?

In fact the assumption of the Lucanian pattern in archaic Latin might also improve the parsing of certain Saturnians:

(8) *virum mihi, camena, insece versutum*
'Sing to me, Camena, the versatile man.'

Liv. Andr. Od. 1

On Mercado's analysis, the line opens with two trochees *virūm mīhī*. The problem is that the clitic *mīhī* is accented (see Clackson 2014 for the same concern), which is neither what the Greek model has nor what we expect from systems of the Standard Italian type. (Indeed, on Mercado's analysis, the accentuation is actually reminiscent of the secondary accentuation that one finds in Greek.) One way to remove this problem is to posit the Lucanian pattern, which would yield *vīrūm mīhī*, with an unaccented clitic.

The following example is perhaps amenable to a similar analysis:

(9) *tuque mihi narrato omnia disertim*
'And you tell me everything exactly'

Mercado scans (e.g. p. 378) the opening sequence $\sim \cup \sim \cup$, where again *mihi* is accented. The situation is more complicated here because it is not clear how the stress is assigned in the presence of two enclitics. If however it were the case that the syllable preceding the last clitic received an accent, then we could again entertain the possibility of a second paeon $\cup \sim \cup \cup$, i.e. *tū qué mīhī*. (If *mihi* is not in fact enclitic, then Mercado's scansion should remain unaltered.) Such a move does, however, require that the host+enclitic sequence count as one prosodic

word (such as the polysyllabic words given in example 40 on p. 74) as opposed to two disyllabic ones.

The Saturnian corpus is no less important for the study of early Latin syntax. The relationship between syntax and meter is discussed in detail in chapter five, 'Saturnian Stylistics and Metrical Structure.' Before considering some of its claims, a preliminary remark about the title of the chapter is in order. I understand style to refer to surface properties of an utterance (e.g. lexical choices, intonation, articulation) that at least canonically do not affect the core content of the message, but do affect other dimensions, in particular register (on which see e.g. Halliday und Hasan 1976). Some of the material discussed in this chapter may not belong to the realm of stylistics, but rather to semantics/pragmatics. Word-order variation is a case in point. Consider for instance the discussion of adverbial and relative clauses on pp. 146–149. It is well known that complementizers such as *sī* typically occur in clause-initial position (for a recent treatment of the left periphery in Latin, see Danckaert 2012 with the review of Trotzke 2012). But what are we to make of examples in which *sī* occurs after the first word of the clause? One possibility is to view the word or phrase preceding *sī* as left-dislocated to some position in the clause that precedes the complementizer. Left-dislocation could be due to one of the three following factors (which are not mutually exclusive). The construction could bring with it a distinction in meaning, such as that characteristic of contrastive topicalization (on which, see e.g. Büring 1997, 1999). The second is that left-dislocation does not yield a distinction in meaning or function per se, but rather is 'stylistic' or even metalinguistic: it says something about the utterance itself (or the utterance context), for instance that it is poetic or elevated. The final possibility is that the word order is determined by the exigencies of the meter, and the variation accordingly has no affect on what is communicated (i.e., no semantic/pragmatic effect, no register effect). In contrast to these various possibilities, the material preceding the complementizer may not be dislocated at all, but rather may correspond to some type of syntactic structure in which complementizers are not clause initial.

Mercado describes the clauses with material preceding a complementizer as left-dislocated, which may well be right, but it is not immediately clear that this is how they should be analyzed. One can for instance find a similar pattern in Vedic Sanskrit, where the relative pronoun does not occur at the beginning of the clause (see Hettrich 1988). And in Classical Greek there are cases of non-clause initial complementizers in adverbial clauses. Of crucial importance in the latter case is that such examples do not appear to have the semantics of contrastive topicalization, which is characteristic of other clauses with left-dislocation (see Goldstein *im Erscheinen*). Coming back to the Saturnian, are we dealing with real left-dislocation, and if so, what sort of meaning does the construction encode? Or are we dealing with metrically-conditioned word order?

Elsewhere I had reservations about some of the syntactic judgments. On p. 99, the absence of vowel elision in *tu* in Naev. 62 (*cum tu arquiteuens sagittis pollens dea*) is said to be «syntactically and semantically motivated, being emphatic and before a minor phrase boundary,» but I had trouble seeing the motivation for emphasis. On p. 145, in the discussion of Liv. Andr. 1, is *versutum* to be read as

intersective ('the versatile man') or appositional ('the man, the versatile (one)' or 'the man, who is versatile')? If the latter, is this still a case of hyperbaton?

While questions about the Saturnian remain, this book has realigned the field. Mercado's model now holds pride of place as the standard analysis of the Saturnian, against which competing analyses will be measured. Beyond the Saturnian, Mercado's work also illustrates the power of consilient analysis, and all that typology, diachrony, linguistic theory, and statistical methods have to offer our understanding of the ancient world.

Wien

David Goldstein

*

Il carme 67 di Catullo. Introduzione, edizione critica, traduzione e commento a cura di **Orazio Portuese**. Cesena: Stilgraf editrice 2013. 417 S. (Quaderni di 'Paideia'. 16.) 39 €.

Catullus c. 67, a dialogue between a house door and an unnamed interlocutor, has long been recognized as something of a mystery, as it is fraught with difficulties arising all at once from its form, its content, and its textual cruces. Portuese's edition (with text, translation, and commentary) does an excellent job of gathering together and presenting the complex scholarship on c. 67, in the process contributing a new interpretation for consideration. Portuese's work is sensitive to matters paleographical, text critical, literary, and socio-historical, and provides a good example of the benefits of an approach that blends together the fruits of all these pursuits.

Portuese is particularly well attuned to Catullus' love of blending genres and bending literary traditions. He points out the many comic elements of the door's tale of scurrilous gossip and household malfeasance, but also underscores the epic and tragic influences parodied by Catullus, often through a Plautine filter. While the generic complexity of c. 67 has long been acknowledged, some of Portuese's observations are quite novel, such as his argument for the presence of a tragic tradition in which women fear that the house might tell of their misdeeds (e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 36ff). All of his observations, novel or not, are well expressed with ample comparanda.

C. 67 opens with what appears to be a direct address to a new bride (1–2), but at the start of the second couplet the addressee is identified as a house door. Previous commentators on the disorientation engendered by this opening tend to fall into two camps: those who find it jarring and upsetting, and those who find it witty and delightful. Portuese falls into the first group, and whose most strident argument is in favour of relocating the first couplet of c. 67 to the end of c. 66. Much of his first chapter ('La Traduzione Manoscritta') and a good portion of the second ('Caratteri Generali del Carme') are dedicated to making a twofold case for this, one part textual and one part literary. Observing in Chapter One that the archetype *A* appears to have transmitted c. 66 and c. 67 without break, Portuese traces the division at 67.1 to Coluccio Salutati's annotation of *R* (*R'*). Portuese then points to the unknown annotators of two later manuscripts (*α'* and *D'*), who moved the incipit to 67.3, in addition to sharing a few other significant divisions and emendations. Portuese proposes on this evidence that *α'* and *D'* arose from the collation of the text with a lost manuscript of older pedigree,