うか。
13章「クレオポンと『蛙』の再演」を読むと、アリストパネスも時代に呑み込まれていたか、と悲哀を覚える。Ran.はパラバシス(674以下)の主題の故にポリスから顕彰され再演を許されたが、その再演は前404年のレナイア祭であったろうと考証される。ところがこの年は、反民主政・寡頭派の策謀が最も盛んに行われた時期で、彼らはデマゴーグのクレオポンに狙いをつけていた。ところで、Ran.も講和反対論者クレオポンを3度にわたって(678, 1504, 1532)名指しで攻撃する。これは、クレオポンに対する市民の反感を煽ろうとする寡頭派にとっては好都合なことで、アリストパネスは進んで寡頭派の手先になったのか、心ならずも利用されただけなのかが問題になるのである。

「他人を犠牲にして自分だけ楽しむ。自分の楽しみを禁じる代わりに他人からも楽しみを奪う。このような態度は喜劇の敵であり、自分も他人もできるだけ大勢を巻きこんで楽しむことを目指すのがディオニュソスの精神である」という文章が本書には二度現れる。アリストパネスは喜劇をこのようなものと考えていた、というのがS.の結論であろう。『アリストパネス全注釈』の簡潔なコメントの背後にはこのような考察、このような語彙の分析があるのかと感じつつ読んだ一冊であった。

中務哲郎


How much can our text of Plautus tell us about the language actually spoken in the late 3rd/early 2nd century? After all we are still nowhere near settling all the metrical, textual, even methodological problems that stand in the way of a researcher who embarks on such an ambitious journey. Yet Fortson is to be congratulated on grappling with the immensity of the subject from a truly exciting angle. He combines the best of classical philology with modern linguistics modelling his approach on the work done by Devine and Stephens.

After the preliminaries there is a brief introduction to the scansion of Plautine iamb-trochaics intended for general linguists (but then they are often
left hanging in midair and summarily referred to general handbooks; I suspect that the book will find its most attentive readers among metricians). There follow chapters on violations of (Bentley-) Luchs', Meyer's and Jacobsohn's Laws, enjambement, aphaeresis of est and breuis breuians/iambic shortening. F.'s arguments and findings are summed up passim as well as in the final chapter 'Towards a Reconstruction of the Prosody of Plautine Latin Speech'. Sadly there is no general index (only an index locorum).

This well-argued and nuanced book is based on F.'s Harvard dissertation. He is honest about his aporia concerning many particular points as well as about his inability to follow through many of the interesting questions he poses. Misprints are insignificant and easy to spot. Sensibly he uses Gratwick's alphabetic notation though not always to its full potential: why annotate verse-end insāniam as A B c D (p. 27) instead of A B c d + ? Why write of "a short C" (p. 76, note 64)?

When showing vowel length (pp. 25 and 27), he does not write -bāt in: perturbat paenissūmē (end of a senarius) — is that a tacit admission of aporia about the exact time of the change in the length of 3rd person singular verb endings or rather an explicit agreement with Ceccarelli who claims that this occurred already during Plautus' lifetime? The syllable, as often in these cases, scans long anyway but one would like to see a note addressing this point (or, again, a subject index entry pointing to a related discussion hundred or so pages later). But these are all trivial points perhaps not even worth mentioning. Now to the positively more interesting points:

On pp. 74f. he sums up his nuanced description of Meyer's law that improves on all previous descriptions. He shows that the 'law' needs to be considered as two sets of principles: 'First measures ending... C D/required that the material in the following A be phonologically left-leaning so as to form a close prosodic unit (C D A) before the caesura. By contrast, ... C D/at the end of the second measure required (though not as strongly) that the following measure be self-contained.' This was not a hard-and-fast rule and he admits that by itself it is not the best guide to Latin prosody. I found highly plausible his hypothesis that Meyer's law reflects the avoidance of filling a C position with a heavy stressed syllable (pp. 60f.) as well as his suggestion
that 'a left-leaning monosyllabic clitic resulted in some phonological reduction of the word to which it leaned' that \textit{ul-} in \textit{ultro} is heavier than in \textit{ultro + fit} (and it does not matter if reaccentuation \textit{ultró-fit} took place or not). As he says, 'shortening of stressed syllables also happens inside domains larger than the word' (p. 62).

Exceptions from the much more strictly observed Luchs' law (DAB/not DaB/: i.e., words may end on the last \textit{longum} only if the preceding \textit{an cep s} is long or bisyllabic) tell us a lot about prosodic properties of spoken Latin: \textit{malam crucem} is a perfectly good verse ending because it underwent univerbation. So why not, he asks, \textit{patrem meum}? Because \textit{meus}, when iambic, is not clitic! (Only Wallstedt and Bettini noticed this.) Exceptions to Luchs' law such as \textit{malam crucem} are 'good evidence that (at least some) idiomatic compounded Adj.-Noun phrases became accented as single words' (p. 45). Here and elsewhere he adduces interesting cross-linguistic parallels.

Even if monosyllabic verbs may have behaved as clitics, the fact that we do not find \textit{pater petit} at line end is 'excellent evidence that however prosodically deficient disyllabic verbs could be, they did not univerbate with preceding words' (p. 53).

'Luchs' Law is the only one that appears to be sensitive to the domain of the phonological word' (p. 262) but it is worth quoting this summary of his findings further:

'Plautus' poetry is sensitive to the next-larger prosodic domain, namely the clitic group. Violations of Meyer's Law are obviated by a clitic group straddling the end of the first and the beginning of the second measure. The prosodic break associated with line-end was too great to allow clitic groups to straddle it in nearly all cases, but not too great to block separation of a modifier from its head noun (i.e., a minor phrase). Resolutions are not considered "split" if the word-boundary is within a clitic group. The fourth-paean sequences that obviated a violation of Luchs (dd a B) are either single words or clitic groups. Iambic shortening applied within words and within an iambic sequence forming the left edge of a clitic group. Still other phenomena are sensitive to the next-higher level, the minor phrase: violations of Meyer's Law in the second measure are followed by either measure-filling words,
clitic-groups filling the last measure, or minor phrases (short NPs, for example).

This book on the phonology-syntax interface of the spoken Latin of Plautus' time is not for the faint of heart but its close reading promises many exciting revelations and, one would wish, at least some revival in the study of Plautine meter.

Martin Ciesko (Kyoto University)


V (ergilius) and H (oratius) の作品の重要な特徴に関する，気鋭の Latinist による研究書である，generic enrichment (以下 GE と略記) とは，Harr (ison) の定義によれば「特定の genre (以下 g と略記) の text が異なる文学 g に属する text と対峙しそこからの要素を取り込むことで文学的な深みと特質を獲得する方法」である (p. 1). Harr. は序において，GE は V. と H. の詩の豊かさを説明する方法の一つだとして，本書はそれを具体的な text に即した詳細な事例研究を通じて明らかにすることを目指すと述べる。全体は 7 章から成り，第 1 章の序論で GE の理論的説明が，残りの 6 章で個々の作品解釈がなされている。

第 1 章で著者はまず古代ギリシアに遡る文学 g の理論を概観し，ローマでは H. AP 73–98 に，g ごとの形式と内容の適合性という Ar (istoteles) 的概念に加えて，他方では g の枠を超えた要素の取り込みという Hell (enism) 的な概念が見出されることを指摘する。W. Kroll (1924) によって「g の交差」として指摘されたこの特徴こそ，Hell. 詩以来の創造的特色としてラテン詩にも受け継がれたものだと言う。また，g の階層性 (hierarchy) ということも Ar. に由来する概念として重要であり，V. と H. の詩的経歴も g の上昇と捉えうる；GE のプロセスの解明に際しては，作者の意図よりも当時の理想的な読者の期待と反応を再現することを主眼とする；GE のメカニズムは当該作品の属する g が他 g の要素を 'mode' として取り込むことであり，それは 'host' g による 'guest' g のを迎え入れという比喩で語りうる，とも言う。序論の最後では g 同定の基礎となる「g 特徴の範囲 (generic repertoire)」として，A. 形式，B. 題材，C. g 論的指標 (metageneric signals) を挙げる。A. には題名，韻律，言