

**Recenzie – Censurae librorum – Book Reviews –
Rezensionen – Revue de livres**

Irena RADOVÁ: *Altgriechische Scholien. Ein typologischer Versuch*. Praha: Koniasch Latin Press 2011. 215 S. ISBN 978-80-86971-58-6

Unter den modernen, so technischen, wie humanistischen Fächern gibt es nicht viele, die heute zu systematischen und faktographisch genauen Angaben über das Wissens- und Methodenpotenzial der Anfangsphasen ihrer Entwicklung Zugang hätten oder sogar es sich zu Nutze machen könnten. Die philologische Wissenschaft verfügt dagegen schon lange über die Scholien, die in der Form der oft aus weit älteren Arbeiten schöpfenden, während der Spätantike redigierten Randnotizen bzw. der zwischen den Zeilen aufgeschriebenen Bemerkungen entstanden. Diese blieben gewöhnlich anonym und unterschieden sich also von den systematischen Kommentaren (*ὑπόμνημα*). Irena Radová, Dozentin an der Masaryk-Universität Brünn (Brno), tritt zu den Scholien diesmal nicht traditionsgemäß, d. h. als zu einem wichtigen Zeuge der indirekten Textüberlieferung heran, sondern sie versucht die Scholien als eine Literaturgattung zu etablieren. In ihrer genealogischen Beschreibung beschloss sie die Methode der Opposition der Merkmale, die B. Sandig entwarf, mit den sechs Dimensionen, die W. Raible festsetzte, zu kombinieren. Die Dimensionen sind: Kommunikationssituation zwischen Sender und Empfänger; Objektbereich; übergeordnete Ordnungsstruktur eines komplexen sprachlichen Zeichens; Beziehung zwischen dem Text und der Wirklichkeit; Medium; Art und Weise der sprachlichen Darstellung.

Auf den angeführten Kriterien werden fünf analytische Kapitel gebaut, in denen allmählich behandelt werden: 1^o Epische Scholien exemplifiziert an

Apollonios Rhodios (21 – 60); 2° Dramatische Scholien am Beispiel des Sophokles (61 – 92); 3° Lyrische Scholien zu Pindar (93 – 118); 4° Rhetorische Scholien zu Aischines (119 – 148); 5° Historiographische Scholien zu Thukydides (149 – 172). Die einzelnen Kapitel des Buches sind offensichtlich nicht nur wohlproportioniert, sondern folgen einem willkommenen festgestellten Schema. Jedes Kapitel beginnt nämlich mit der Geschichte der Scholien zu dem betreffenden Autor, danach werden die Grundtypen, d. h. die sprachlich, literarisch, rednerisch, metrisch, mythologisch oder anders orientierte Scholien diskutiert, dann die Stellungnahme des/der Scholiasten zu dem kommentierten Autor untersucht und zum Schluß die Art und Weise der Zitationen und Verweise bzw. intertextuellen Beziehungen nähergebracht. Wie man sieht, ließ Radová keine von den Trägergattungen der griechischen Literatur außer Acht und wählte die breite Zeitspanne von der archaischen bis zu der hellenistischen Epoche der griechischen Literatur.

Radová ist überzeugt, dass es für eine Gattungsdistinktion reicht, wenn die Merkmale von mindestens fünf Dimensionen verweisbar sind. Im *Schlusswort: Scholien als Genre* (173 – 187) stellt sie rekapitulierend und sich noch einmal an Wolfgang Raibles Studie *Was sind Gattungen?* (1980) berufend fest, dass „die Scholien bestimmte Zeichen aus allen sechs für die Beschreibung der Literaturgattungen wesentlichen Dimensionen aufweisen“ (S. 185), sodass man sagen kann, „dass die antiken Scholien ein spezifisches Genre darstellen, obwohl sie als solches in der Antike nicht anerkannt wurden“ (S. 186).

Man kann nicht daran zweifeln, dass die Scholien eine sehr heterogene Menge darstellen und folglich kaum in ein einziges Genre eingeschachtelt werden können. Wenn der Zweifel mit ja beantwortet werden soll, erbiertet sich dann sicher die Frage, ob der exegetische Apparat der modernen kommentierten Editionen auch irgendwie genrebezogen klassifizierbar ist. Auch wer sich durch Radová's fundiertes und interessantes Exposé nicht überzeugen lassen hat, findet in der reichen, auf Quelleneditionen (40 Einträge), Übersetzungen (6 deutschsprachige Einträge) und Sekundärliteratur (162 vorwiegend deutsche und anglophone Titel) aufgegliederten Bibliographie (S. 187 – 198) Beweise über eine rege Forschungsbewegung auf diesem Gebiet und vielleicht für sich selbst Impulse zum weiteren Studium. Es sei noch gesagt, dass zu dem hohen Fachstandard des Buches ein vorbildliches Verzeichnis der zitierten Stellen und der Personenregister gehören.

Daniel Škoviera

Alfred DUNSHIRN: *Griechisch für das Philosophiestudium*. Wien: Facultas Verlags- und Buchhandels AG 2008. 172 pp. ISBN 978-3-8252-8403-9

Despite the present-day materialistic orientation of society that emphasizes immediate and especially financial gains as its main concern, the study of philosophy continues to fascinate hundreds of students who choose it every year as the main subject of their university studies.

Education in any field necessarily begins with the origin and history of that specific field, and so students of philosophy acquaint themselves *ab initio* with the ideas of ancient Greek philosophers. Until a few decades ago, graduate students were able to read classical texts or fragments in their preserved original form. Unfortunately, nowadays this is no longer possible since the so-called modern “living languages” and other subjects have completely superseded Latin and Ancient Greek in the educational process at secondary schools. Students now come to university to study philosophy without any knowledge of these important languages. However, a basic elementary knowledge of Greek (and Latin, of course) is still perceived as *desideratum* (instead of the previous *necessitas*), and so within a limited time period students become familiar with the basics of Greek morphology and syntax. Textbooks must be adapted to this time restriction by being strictly specialized in philosophical terminology, rather than burdening students with expressions from historical, geographical or theological writings.

Amongst such teaching materials may be included *Griechisch für das Philosophiestudium* written by Alfred Dunshirn, who works at the Institute of Philosophy of the University of Vienna. As a trained classical philologist and philosopher, he encountered problems while teaching *Griechische Philosophie im Original lesen*, due to lack of textbooks specifically addressing the needs of this field, and thus he decided to create his own text. Its purpose, as Dunshirn writes in the Introduction, is: “den Interessierten die Möglichkeit bieten, einige kurze Zitate griechischer Philosophen in ihrer überlieferten Form zu lesen und Informationen zu deren Umfeld zu gewinnen.” (Vorwort, p. 5). Therefore, this is not a book that could be compared, in its scope, with Frank Beetham’s textbook *Learning Greek with Plato*. Although Beetham’s text focuses mainly on Plato’s dialogue Menon (part 70a1 – 81e6), it also provides students with a commentary on ancient Greek grammar in its entirety and prepares them for reading other philosophical texts. Dunshirn’s concept resembles the Olomouc’s coursebook *Úvod do řecké filozofické terminologie a četby* (2000) written by

K. Floss and M. Navrátil. From a philosophical aspect, the teaching material is divided into three areas: 1. Pre-Socratic philosophers (Parmenides, Heraclitus, Anaximander, Xenophanes and Anaxagoras), 2. Socrates – Plato, 3. Aristotle. In this regard, Floss – Navrátil is more detailed, but Dunshirn is much more consistent in the grammar section. While the Czech coursebook has no linguistic introduction (lacks opening remarks on the Greek alphabet and its specifics; lacks explanation of basic terms such as declination, conjugation; begins directly with inflection of the words ἡ ἀρχή, τὸ τέλος and τὸ ὕδωρ without any assignation to the 1st, 2nd and 3rd declination etc.) Dunshirn's text largely reflects his classical training. His interpretation of the material in the introductory chapter (B. Vorbemerkungen, pp. 11 – 22) is systematic. In addition to the usual information (alphabet, derivation from the Phoenicians, enactment under archon Eucleides, various kinds of alphabets, breathings, accent, punctuation, proclitics and enclitics, conventional pronunciation, paradigm of article, division into thematic and athematic verbs, conjugation of indicative present of λέγω and εἰμί, paradigm of participle ὄν), Dunshirn provides many interesting facts not found in other textbooks – different print types of the Greek alphabet (σεμνός ⇔ σεμνός), the use of Greek alphabet in mathematics, science and technology, development of minuscule in the 8th century A. D. etc. The philosophical focus of this teaching material is confirmed at the end of the first part, where discourse about the category of being can be found (p. 21).

The introductory chapter is followed by selected texts from philosophers (C. Texte, pp. 23 – 139). In this chapter, Dunshirn decided to introduce the principal ideas of eminent philosophers in their original, unaltered form, which is certainly commendable, but can cause many problems for the inexperienced. Moreover, it is not quite clear which criteria Dunshirn has used to select these texts, especially in the first subsection (I. Philosophie vor Sokrates, pp. 23 – 53). It is unlikely that chronological order was employed, since the statement of Parmenides is inserted before Heraclitus and is followed by the principal ideas of Anaximander. Dunshirn also significantly refrains from the systematic interpretation of grammar – he deals with linguistic phenomena that occur in the selected *dicta*, therefore, in the quotation from Heraclitus optative, aorists (strong, weak) and *verba contracta* with έω ending are explained. In the Socrates – Plato chapter, the following paragraphs from grammar are dealt with: interrogatory pronomina τίς, τί, comparison of adjectives, perfect active and medio-passive, indicative present of φημί, middle future, imperfect med.-passive, the pronoun αὐτός etc. Many grammatical phenomena are only briefly outlined and

without examples (e. g. breathings, accent, comparison of adjectives). Dunshirn is trying to interpret the majority of Greek grammar in a limited space of 170 pages, which accordingly results in a lack of examples. The author is aware of this fact and encourages students to consult other grammatical manuals and dictionaries (the complete list is on pp. 160–163). The quantity of grammatical commentary is narrowed down by numerous philosophical comments and many discursions of non-philosophical nature (e. g. excursus to textual editions of presocratics, textual tradition, dictionaries – Passow / Liddell – Scott, Greek dialects, and the complete overview of extant works of Aristotle and Plato). At the end of each subchapter of textual part C are exercises to strengthen perception of grammatical rules and explanations. Although there are solutions to these exercises in part E, and translations of all dicta of philosophers from the textual part C in part D, it is not possible to use Dunshirn’s textbook for self-study, mainly due to lack of examples and his unsystematic interpretation of grammar. Of course, the use of textbook for self-study was not Dunshirn’s intention. He wanted to introduce students to the secrets of the Greek language and, by means of an absorbing narrative full of digressions, to inspire them to further study this interesting and, for philosophy, vital language. In the absence of textbooks of similar nature (except those mentioned earlier by F. Beetham and Floss – Navrátil are available: the hardly accessible textbook by F. H. Fobes *Philosophical Greek* (1959), Danish *Filosofgræsk* by S. Ebbesen (1982), Swedish *Grekiska för filosofer* by J. Blomqvist (2002) and Czech multimedia CD by J. Petrželka *Základy řecké (a latinské) filosofické terminologie* published in 2007), any addition to this humble family of Greek philosophical terminologies is more than welcomed, particularly when coming from a classical philologist and philosopher who has the necessary understanding and passion for both disciplines.

Alexandra Kavečanská

Gabriël C. L. M. BAKKUM: *The Latin Dialect of the Ager Faliscus. 150 Years of Scholarship*. University of Amsterdam 2009. 678 pp. ISBN 978 90 5629 562 2; e-ISBN 978 90 4850 875 4

In 2009 a new, overall monograph *The Latin Dialect of the Ager Faliscus, 150 Years of Scholarship* appeared as a long awaited study of Italic languages. As the heading claims within the vivid debate about the genetic relationship

between Latin and Faliscan, Gabriël C. L. M. Bakkum clearly supports the view that Faliscan is not a separate language but a dialect of Latin. This claim is a starting point for a comprehensive critical examination of the Faliscan language material provided by the inscriptions dated back to the period between c. 700 – 150 BCE as well as for a comparison of Faliscan to the languages spoken in the neighbouring areas.

The structure of the monograph is clear and easy to follow. It consists of two main parts: linguistic (pp. 1 – 360) and epigraphic (pp. 361 – 630) supported by exhausting bibliography (corpora, catalogues, publications referred to by author, sources and editions ...) maps, reproductions of inscriptions, a Dutch summary, concordances and an index of sources.

The first, linguistic, part contains a discussion of the linguistic data: socio-linguistic aspects, the phonology, the inflectional morphology of the nouns and the pronouns, the verbs, the lexicon, the onomasticon, the syntax and the language contact. This part is ended by the author's conclusions concerning the linguistic position of Faliscan with regard to Etruscan, Sabellic and Latin languages. From the point of view of methodology, the reliability of the diachronic approach is evaluated against the synchronic approach at the individual stages of the development of the language. The second part presents the epigraphic data on which the discussion contained in the first part is based. It includes a discussion of the material, the Faliscan alphabet and orthography. The inscriptional material is divided into the earliest inscriptions, the inscriptions from Civita Castellana, S. Maria di Falleri, Corchiano and the northern ager Faliscus, the south-eastern ager Faliscus and the ager Capenas, the inscriptions of unknown or non-Faliscan or non-Capenate origin, and the Etruscan inscriptions.

The material for the study of Faliscan consists predominantly of fragmental inscriptions; glosses add only very little to them. Most of the Faliscan inscriptions are sepulchral; their prevailing onomastic character limits the possibilities to draw a comprehensive picture of all language levels. Bakkum therefore presents the Faliscan material in several cases against the background of much better documented processes known from Latin. This is methodologically allowed by his assumption that Faliscan is a dialect of Latin. Nevertheless, the combination of the epigraphic, historical and archaeological material enables Bakkum to formulate convincing assessments about the language and its speakers. Out of the total of 535 inscriptions thoroughly analyzed, 355 are recognized by him as clearly Faliscan and most of them contain features relevant as linguistic data. The epigraphic material has been divided into several age/alphabet

groups, further specifying the categories already proposed by G. Giacomelli ('Il Falisco', in: *LDIA*, 1978): 1. *Early Faliscan* (EF), 2. *Middle Faliscan* (MF), 3. *Middle or Late Faliscan* (MLF), 4. *Late Faliscan* (LF), 5. *Latino-Faliscan* (LtF), 6. *Capenate* (Cap). Beside these categories, there are the *Latin* (Lat) inscriptions, *Middle Faliscan/Etruscan* (MF/Etr) and *Etruscan* (Etr) inscriptions.

The Early Faliscan period (between the late seventh and the fifth centuries) is documented by very fragmentary material (10 – 12 inscriptions); however the Middle Faliscan period (between the late fifth century and the war of 241 BCE), reflecting the stage of Faliscan relatively free from Latin influence, provides relevant material even for a synchronic description as well as for a comparative analysis with other Italic languages. This explains why many discussions are based on this period.

As the main conclusion proposed by Gabriël C. L. M. Bakkum in the monograph is that Faliscan can be regarded as a dialect of Latin, his crucial arguments should be briefly summarized here. Although Bakkum himself admits that from a strictly sociolinguistic definition Faliscan can be described as a language, not a dialect of Latin, because – among other things – it had an identity of its own, shown e. g. by the existence of ethnonym, local customs, etc., his final verdict is based on a combination of arguments among which the diachronic perspective prevails. According to the arguments gathered under the paragraph 10.1.3. *The diachronic perspective* (p. 346sq.), planned by the author as 10.1.4. (for explanation see further), and also in the subchapter 10.3. *Faliscan, a Latin dialect* (p. 358sq.), Faliscan belongs to the Latin branch of the Italic family. This is documented by diachronic developments of Proto-Latin date at the phonological level, e. g. the preservation of the labiovelar occlusive series, also at the morphological level, e. g. the second declension genitive singular ending /-osyo/ preserved in Proto-Latin, as well as the lexical level, e. g. the innovation */ϕīlyos/, */ϕīlyā/ against Proto-Sabellic */puklom/ and */ϕuγ(i)tēr/, and possibly even at the syntactic level. These are shared by Faliscan with Latin. The only early feature (preceding the earliest inscriptions) that separates Faliscan from Latin is the development of the word-internal reflexes of the PIE voiced aspirates; Bakkum stresses that the difference is an "old", claiming that "what we call the 'Latin' development was originally limited to Roman Latin" (p. 359). During the historical period Faliscan sided with Latin in innovations: morphological ones, e. g. the replacement of the second-declension genitive ending /-osyo/ by /-ī/ during the fifth and fourth centuries, the replacement of the ending *-ed* in the third person singular perfect

by *-et* during the late fourth century (the nature of which from Bakkum's point of view (p. 161) is */-ēt/*), as well as phonological ones, e. g. intervocalic rhotacism in the fourth century. Some of the recent phonological innovations also occur in Sabellic languages, e. g. monophthongization of the diphthongs, or in some other Latin dialects, e. g. a development */#fV/ → /#hV/* for which Bakkum assesses that "the forms where *h-* occurs for an expected *f-* are due to a Middle and Late Faliscan development */#fV/ → /#hV/*, whereas the forms where *f-* occurs for an expected *h-* are hypercorrect forms due to the same development" (p. 71).

In the historic period also the innovation of the perfect, in Faliscan to *faced/ facet /fak-/* and in Latin to *feced /fēk-/* (both stems originally belonging to the aorist), probably arose. This change – according to Bakkum (p. 358) – could be an example of a general tendency to replace reduplicative perfects from verbs with a root in */f-/* to which also the original perfect form *fifiked/ ff.ffiqod*, evidenced in the Early Faliscan, might have succumbed. A supposed replacing aorist form of this verb is unattested in Middle or Late Faliscan, however. Regarding the grammar and the lexicon, "Faliscan is a Latin dialect" (p. 359). Differences in significant features, e. g. the word-internal reflexes of the PIE voiced aspirates, are attributed to the isolation from the rest of the Latin-speaking area, not to one continuous process of divergence or convergence.

The monograph presents original results of systematic investigations of the inscriptional material at all language levels backed with convincing arguments. The methodology of diachronic linguistics was combined with that of synchronic linguistics. Historical and archeological sources complementing epigraphic and linguistic analysis allowed the author to produce basic sociolinguistic statements regarding Faliscan.

Some of the more interesting points are worth mentioning. As a result of a thorough analysis of all documented inscriptions, Bakkum can make more precise the traditional point of view about Faliscan as not having vowel-weakening. Leaving aside Early Faliscan forms, as *pepara/i* EF 1 which pre-date the supposed changes due to stress, he concentrates on Middle and Late Faliscan. Regarding the weakening in medial syllables, few documented lexical forms, e. g. *hari.sp[ex]* LtF 231 and *harisp[ex]* LtF 232, allow more than just one interpretation: besides the weakening due to stress, the forms with *i* could be explained as formed after compounds. There is much more onomastic material relevant to the issue; however, still a variety of interpretations is acceptable:

e. g. *pupelio* MF 149, which can represent either *Pupellius* with *e* after the vowel weakening or *Pupilius* without reduction of *i* written as *e* due to the open pronunciation of short *i*. Bakkum admits the interpretation as learned reconstructions for well-known forms *cuncaptum* LF/Lat 214 and *falesce* Lat 218. Non/weakening or reduction of vowels in final syllables of the Middle and Late Faliscan period is much better-attested than the weakening of middle syllables. For instance, the weakening has not affected nominal endings of o-stems nominative singular /-os#/, *cauios frenaios* MF 471, nominative, accusative singular neutres /-om#/, *uino* MF 60, neither the forms from Latino-Faliscan and Capenate inscriptions [---] *jilio* LtF 215, and *donom* Cap 430. The non-reduced /-es/ is probably attested by genitive in *-e(s)* in [---] *fate* MLF 285. On the other hand, e. g. the genitive plural [fel] *icinatiu* LF 384, the verbal form *esú* Cap 389, 404, 465, (*ú* probably representing the Sabellic vowel /o/), probably the unexplained *cl·anu* or *clanu* Cap 397 and the unclear *murū*[?---] LtF 173 have been affected by the weakening. The result of the thorough analysis of the material from Middle and Late Faliscan shows that although non-reduced forms significantly prevail in general, there is still a certain amount of forms with reduction and several forms allow various interpretations.

Although the monograph brings highly valuable results of solid research, I have several reservations about the book. What is sometimes missing in morphological interpretations is a deeper insight into the prehistory of the sound development of endings involved. For instance, the statement about the reflex of Proto-Italic */-eys/ in the genitive singular of the third declension, which is – according to Bakkum (p. 144) – also found in Latin, is unacceptable. This reflex is found neither in Latin¹, nor (most probably) in Faliscan. Then the connection with some of the PIE accent and ablaut classes is missing in the characteristics of the ending *-e(s)* of the genitives *feliçinate* MF 42 and [---] *fate* MLF 285 proposed by Bakkum as the *i*-stem ending with the phonological value /-es/ or /-is/ (p. 145), partially in the dependence on Wachter². In fact, the connection of this *-e(s)* with some of the PIE *i*-stem accent-ablaut class does not even seem possible. In the cognate Latin only the *-is* could be (purely from

¹ Cf. Gert KLINGENSCHMITT: *Die lateinische Nominalflexion*. In: Latein und Indogermanisch. O. Panagl, T. Krisch (Hrsg.). Innsbruck 1992, p. 113; Peter SCHRIJVER: *Substrateinflüsse und historische Lautlehre: Latein und Sabinisch*. In: Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel. Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17. – 23. September 2000, Halle an der Saale. G. Meiser und O. Hackstein (Hrsg.). Wiesbaden 2005, p. 585.

² Rudolf WACHTER: *Altlateinische Inschriften*. Bern & New York: Peter Lang. etc 1987, p. 495.

the point of view of sound development) explained as the possible reflex of the PIE *-yes in the hysterokinetic or amphikinetic accent and ablaut class, or of the PIE *-is of the acrostatic class. All these types, however, are extremely rare in *i*-stems in PIE and therefore their continuants appear very much improbable both in Latin and Faliscan. It seems more plausible to ascribe only the phonological value /-es/ to the Faliscan inscriptional -e(s) of the *feliçinate*, -fate for which no connection with any of PIE *i*-stem accent-ablaut class is to be found and to join it with Latin (consonant stem) -es; Faliscan forms *feliçinate*, -fate would then be very similar and most probably cognate with Latin SALUTES *CIL* I².450³.

The way of referencing causes confusion and harms the otherwise solidly presented final chapter of the linguistic part *Conclusion: Faliscan as a Latin dialect* (p. 341sq.). In the key part of his argumentation, Bakkum several times refers to the paragraph 10.1.4., which, unfortunately, cannot be found throughout the whole book except the table of contents (p. VI.). The confusion was caused by the incorrect numbering of the paragraphs. Instead of number 10.1.3., the chapter *Synchronic comparison* received number 10.2.2., and the chapter *The diachronic perspective*, which should have been referred to under number 10.1.4. appeared as number 10.1.3. Nevertheless, these are only minor mistakes or lapsuses that do not diminish the high quality and value of the monograph from which much can be learnt.

Although the fragmentary material does not allow to draw an absolutely complete picture of Faliscan and its speakers, Gabriël C. L. M. Bakkum using all material available to investigation has made this picture as complete as possible. This impressive and important treatment of Faliscan cannot be dismissed by anyone interested in the history of Italic languages.

Ludmila Buzássyová

Jana GRUSKOVÁ: *Untersuchungen zu den griechischen Palimpsesten der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. Codices Historici, Codices Philosophici et Philologici, Codices Iuridici* (Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung XX. Denkschriften der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Österreichischen Aka-

³ Ludmila BUZÁSSYOVÁ: *Some remarks on the genitive of the Latin third declension and its Faliscan pendant*. GLIEP 3, 8th – 10th July 2010, Comenius University Bratislava. In print for IJDL (International Journal of Diachronic linguistics and linguistic Reconstruction).

demie der Wissenschaften 401). Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 2010. 263 pp. (72 plates). ISBN 978-3-7001-6802-7⁴

The research of palimpsests reveals texts which were erased centuries ago for recycling the parchment (papyrus palimpsests are rare). The chemicals used to read palimpsests in the 18th and 19th centuries were destructive, the upper text had to be sacrificed in order to recover the lower one. In the 20th century, scholars abandoned such harsh procedures. Subsequently, photographic techniques and ultraviolet light were applied. An essential step in the palimpsest research was the introduction of modern high-quality digital imaging, making texts visible without risk of damage to the reader or to the manuscript. In the last 15 years several projects focusing on digital re-examination of Greek palimpsests, especially the European project “Rinascimento virtuale” (2001 – 2004), have been carried out.

The latest results of the research on Greek palimpsests preserved at the Austrian National Library in Vienna (ÖNB) are presented in the publication elaborated by Jana Grusková. The “Einleitung” (pp. 17 – 28) introduces the topic of Greek palimpsests, its aspects and the current state of research, focusing on the palimpsests of the Austrian National Library. The book complements the catalogue descriptions processed by Herbert Hunger and Otto Kresten in 1960s and 1970s through a comprehensive analysis of five *codices rescripti* (four of them having come from the collection of Johannes Sambucus, 1531 – 1584): Vind. Hist. gr. 10 (pp. 31 – 41), Vind. Hist. gr. 73 (pp. 42 – 53), Vind. Phil. gr. 158 (pp. 54 – 102), Vind. Phil. gr. 286 (pp. 103 – 129) and Vind. Iur. gr. 18 (pp. 130 – 169). Each of the five main book units concerns one of these manuscripts; it begins with a list of literature and a brief introduction to the cultural and historical backgrounds, followed by detailed analysis of both the upper manuscript and the fragments of the lower (reused) manuscript(s). The descriptions comprehend codicological, palaeographical and textual aspects. A collection of 72 plates with images of selected palimpsests (pp. 171 – 245) allows the reader to follow the author’s observations.

Grusková’s monograph delivers exact data on the palimpsests in question, announcing furthermore some valuable new discoveries, e. g. of unknown historical fragments in Hist. gr. 73 (ff. 192^r – 195^v), which might have come from

⁴ An extended version of this review was published in German in *Byzantinoslavica* 70, 2012.

the *Scythica* of the 3rd-century historian Dexippus, or of a bifolium in Iur. gr. 18 with a passage from book 1 of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius (ff. 32^{rv}, 39^{rv})⁵.

The manuscript fragments presented by Jana Grusková in her new book should be definitely taken into account in the upcoming editions of the particular Ancient Greek and Byzantine texts.

Eva Serafinová

Josef HEJNIC – Jan MARTÍNEK: *Rukověť humanistického básnictví v Čechách a na Moravě. 6. Dodatky A – Ž. / Enchiridion renatae poesis Latinae in Bohemia et Moravia cultae. 6. Supplementa A – Ž.* Edidit Marta Vaculínová. Praha: Academia 2011. 334 S. ISBN 978-80-200-1986-8

Endlich! Mit diesem Wort fing Miloslav Okál seine in *Listy filologické* 106/1983 erschienene Besprechung des 5. Bandes des böhmisch-mährischen Enchiridions an, weil er das neun Jahre dauernde Warten auf den Band S – Ž als allzu lang empfand. Viel besser passt allerdings der Ausdruck zum Supplementband A bis Ž. Es hat nämlich nicht weniger als 30 Jahre gedauert, bis die Ergänzungen des Vademecums erschienen sind.

Schon während der Arbeiten an der Grundreihe hat sich gezeigt, dass es notwendig sein wird, noch zwei Bände hinzufügen, um das Projekt zur Vollständigkeit zu bringen: Den 6. Band, der neue Funde, neuere Fachliteratur und verkürzte lateinische Lebensbeschreibungen bedeutenderer Humanisten enthalten sollte, und den 7. mit verschiedenen Indizes. Umso mehr ist es schade, dass die acht Jahrzehnte dauernde und fruchtbringende tschechische Humanismus-Forschung praktisch unterbrochen wurde, nachdem die Arbeitsverträge beider Autoren im 1991 gelöst wurden.

Obwohl das Nachschlagewerk mit zwanzigjähriger Verschiebung und ohne die vorgesehenen lateinischen *summaria* erscheint, erlitt sein Wert eigentlich sehr wenig. In der bewährten Standardstruktur der Lemmata und mit vorbildlicher Gründlichkeit bringen Hejnic und Martínek Angaben über mehr als 630 Dichter; von diesen ist ungefähr eine Hälfte in den vorigen 5 Bänden nicht zu finden. Ein neu zugeordnetes Lemma ist das der *carmina gratulatoria*. Von 1050 hier registrierten Werken stammen 505 aus dem 16., der Rest aus dem 17.

⁵ See the paper of Jana Grusková in this volume, pp. 69 – 82, concerning a new project which aims at studying and editing these fragments.

Jahrhundert. Ein Bestandteil des Vademecums sind die Bildwiedergaben der Titelblätter oder der Lesestücke; 14 von 16 kommen von der Wolfenbüttler Bibliothek. Soviel die interessantere Zahlen.

Das *Enchiridion* orientiert sich zwar ausschließlich auf die bohemikalen Drücke und zitiert aus den umfassenderen Editionen die zum tschechisch-lateinischen Schrifttum gehörigen Gedichte bzw. Verse, es ist jedoch logisch, dass es angesichts des Charakters des Kultur- und Literaturlebens des damaligen Europas einen wesentlich breiteren Bereich trifft. Ohne zu übertreiben darf man behaupten, dass es zu einem unentbehrlichen Hilfsmittel der Forschung wird. Dies gilt besonders für die Forscher, deren Interesse sich an die mitteleuropäische Länder konzentriert; so z. B. für die slowakische oder ungarische Humanismus-Forschung sind die neuen Lemmata über Valerian Mader, Martin Nesselius, Nicolaus Olah, oder die Ergänzungen zu Johannes Bocatius, Andreas Calagius, Johannes Filiczky, Petrus Fradelius, Johannes Jessensky de Jessen von Belang.

Die Peripetien des Projektes bringt Irena Zachová's Einleitungsstudie *Die hundert Jahre des Handbuches* näher; ihre englische Version *A Hunderd Years of the Enchiridion* entspricht den legitimen internationalen Ambitionen des Werkes. Für die zukünftige Forschung wird es bestimmt zweckdienlich sein, wenn dieses verdienstvolles *monumentum aere perennius* in einer zweiten Auflage erscheint. Durch das analoge *Enchiridion* der humanistischen Prosa in Böhmen und Mähren, das das Kabinet für Klassische Studien der Tschechischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zusammenzustellen beabsichtigt, kann seine Wirkung noch potenziert werden. Einem derartigem Projekt kann man nur viel Glück wünschen.

Daniel Škoviera