# LATIN LINGUISTICS

H. Rosén: *Aspects of Latin. Papers from the Seventh International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics. Jerusalem, April 1993.* Pp. 735. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 1996. Cased. ISBN: 3-85124-6594.

This volume comprises fifty-five papers, twenty-three in English, twenty-four in French, and four each in German and Spanish, on a wide variety of Latin linguistic topics ranging chronologically from the 'Duenos' inscription to a sixteenth-century grammarian, but largely concentrated on the classical language. The papers naturally enough vary a good deal in approach and scope; some do little more than summarize what is already known (albeit often usefully), while others point the way to new insights, but the overall impression is one of lively interest and intellectual stimulation. Hannah Rosén, who has done an impressive editorial job, comments on the diversity of approaches, which evidently can be a challenge for some readers; she quotes a review of the proceedings of a previous conference in this series, in which the critic claimed that the diversity of theoretical points of departure obstructed true fact-finding and progress in Latin linguistics (!). Let us hope that this kind of reader is in a minority. For others, the variety can only show the vigour of scholarship in this area. No doubt, readers from any given corner of the field may occasionally find their comprehension taxed by a different terminology or standpoint; also not to be overlooked is the difficulty sometimes caused by the recasting of complex thoughts into a language not the author's own. R. notes with satisfaction the breaking down of barriers between different kinds of Latin linguists; for example, Indo-Europeanists now talk to syntax theorists in a way that they did not a generation ago. But there are other potential lines of communication that have yet to be properly established or at least need to be strengthened: one cannot help reflecting that serious study of the Latin language, such as is exemplified in this volume, still counts as a fairly esoteric interest from the point of view of the classical profession in the English-speaking countries.

I now list the papers, grouped as in the volume, with selective comments. Comment on every article, or longer discussion of any individual one, is precluded by lack of space; the absence of a comment does not imply any adverse judgement but merely that the content is reasonably obvious from the title.

*Territories of Latin*. A. Bartoněk, 'Literacy in Archaic Latium'. E. Coseriu, 'Latin et grec dans le latin dit "vulgaire" ': a real eye-opener to the influence of Greek on spoken Latin and hence on modern European languages, which explains incidentally why Greek constructions are easier to learn than classical Latin ones from a modern European perspective. J. Geiger, 'How Much Latin in Roman Palestine?': more than has usually been assumed; interesting particularly on Egeria's references to the use of Latin, and on Commodian's origins in Gaza. Hannah Rosén, 'Classical Literary Latin in Medieval Reflection: the Case of Paulus Diaconus': an interesting case-study which might prompt further research on Carolingian Latin.

*Phonology and writing*. E. N. Ballester, 'Remarques sur la monophtongaison de /oi/ en latin archaïque': a somewhat speculative attempt to refine the normal view of the process of change from /oi/ to /i:/ in non-initial syllables. P. M. Suárez Martínez, 'La quantité de *-u* chez les neutres de la quatrième déclinaison latine': claims that the *-u* of *genu* etc. was short, as expected from IE; passages implying long *-u* are to be emended or explained as ablative. C. Seidl, 'Die finanziellen Schwierigkeiten eines

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.91 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Getreidehändlers und der Profit, den die Linguistik daraus ziehen kann': on the Novius Eunus tablets.

*Word structure*. L. Nadjo, 'Composition nominale et règle de dérivation zéro en latin': a word like *magnanimus* is not simply *magn-animus* but *magnanim-us*, the *-us* being a genuine suffix. Haiim B. Rosén, '*Pons*, *mons*, *fons*, *dens* and the Indo-European stock of the Latin lexical heritage': those masculines are old participial fomations. C. Lamberterie, 'Latin *pignus* et la théorie glottalique': links the fall of an IE laryngeal with deglottalization, but the argument seems to me to beg the question of the phonetic quality of laryngeals. J. Untermann, 'Sprachwandel, beobachtet an lateinischen Präverbien'. G. Haverling, 'On *sco*-verbs, on Prefixes and on Semantic Functions': verbs in *-sco* with prefixes are broadly speaking perfective, those without are imperfective (e.g. *exaresco* 'dry out' vs. *aresco* 'dry'; Slavonic parallels spring to mind); the prefix *in-* focuses on the beginning of the process, while *ex-* focuses on the end. M. Esperanza Torrego, 'Conditions syntaxiques pour la formation des noms d'agent en latin'. M. Fruyt, 'Noms de procès en latin: Evaluation des positions benvenistiennes dans "Noms d'agent et noms d'action en indo-européen" '.

*Grammatical categories*. F. Biville, 'Le statut linguistique des interjections en latin'. C. Kircher-Durand, 'L'adjectif en latin: aspects flexionnels, syntaxiques, énonciatifs et lexicaux': replies affirmatively to the question whether the adjective in Latin is a distinct part of speech. C. Arias Abellán, 'La sustantivación del adjetivo latino: El caso de los adjetivos derivados': particularly with reference to adjectives in *-arius*. P. de Carvalho, 'Cas et préposition en linguistique latine et en linguistique théorique'. J. de la Villa: 'Lexical Parameters of Prepositional Phrases in Latin': how the meaning of prepositional phrases is affected by the lexical category of the noun concerned, according to whether it is (a) animate or inanimate, (b) abstract or concrete, (c) an expression of time. B. García-Hernández, 'Aspecto verbal y grado de transitividad': verbs meaning 'see' and 'hear' are resultative; those meaning 'look' and 'listen' are non-resultative; the latter are more likely to lose their transitivity. J.-L. Moralejo, 'Subjuntivo oblicuo y subordinación'. G. Smith, 'Futur et subjonctif': with particular reference to Plautine Latin. L. Sznajder, 'Sur la concurrence entre présents historiques et infinitifs de narration chez les historiens latins'. M. Kooreman, 'The Use of the Active Periphrastic Future in Some Biblical Translations'.

*Simple sentence structure*. C. Touratier, 'Troisième personne du singulier: Analyse morphématique et analyse syntaxique': tries to establish a difference in Latin between *avis volat* 'l'oiseau vole' and *avis, volat* 'l'oiseau, il vole', which, I fear, just shows how easy it is to be influenced in one's view of Latin by the structures of one's native language. F. Heberlein, 'Über "enge" Appositionen': appositions are not to be seen as noun plus attribute. M. I. Romero, 'The Partitive Reading of *summus mons*': applies the theories of Government and Binding and Montague Grammar to these phrases. C. Cabrillana, 'Multifunctional Analysis of Word Order': a comparatively modest study of the order of subject and verb, and of verb and object. J. Herman, 'L'emploi des noms indéclinables et l'histoire de la declinaison latine', esp. on Biblical names; claims that, in sentences like 'dimisit Isac Iacob' in the *Vetus Latina*, word order alone could distinguish subject and object; but one wonders whether there are not also contextual factors at work.

Complex sentence structure. R. Coleman, 'Conditional Clauses in the Twelve Tables'. G. Calboli, 'The Accusative as a Default Case in Latin', attempting in particular to explain how the use of the acc. as subject of the infinitive extended from e.g. *praedicare te audio* where it can be seen as the object of *audio*, to e.g. *constat inventas esse leges*. M. Maraldi, 'The Single Infinitive as a Control Structure: The Case

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.91 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the Verbs of Wishing in Latin': on the difference between e.g. *cupio esse clementem* and *cupio me esse clementem*. A. M. Orlandini, 'Phénomènes de polarisation dans certaines complétives en latin': attempts to explain, in terms of illocutionary forces, why verbs of fearing take *ne* for what it is feared may happen and *ut* for what it is feared may not happen, and why *dubito an sit* means that I am inclined to believe that it is, while *dubito an non sit* means that I am inclined to believe that it is not. P. Molinelli, 'Subordination and Moods in Nonstandard Latin of Egyptian Papyri': just as little subordination as one would expect. A. M. Hernández, 'The Ablative Absolute in Late Latin': the absence of this construction from Biblical translations is due to the special circumstances of those translations, not to a general disappearance of the abl. abs. from the Latin of the period. D. Longrée, 'La concurrence entre "rallonge" et "parataxe" chez Tacite: Conditionnements linguistiques, choix stylistiques': on e.g. the difference it would make if Tacitus had written *Nihil de ea re Tiberius apud senatum disseruit, patris iussa simulans* rather than *simulabat* (*Ann*. 1.6.1).

*Cohesion and the text*. J. R. de Jong, 'The Borderline Between Deixis and Anaphora in Latin'. D. P. Ross, 'Anaphors and Antecedents in Narrative Text'. C. Bodelot, '*Is*, *hic*, *ille*, *iste* coréférentiels d'une proposition complétive: Étude distributionnelle'. A. Bertocchi, 'Some Properties of *ipse*': on the difference between *ipse* as part of the subject noun-phrase ('Cicero himself did it') and *ipse* as part of the predicate ('Cicero did it himself'). A. M. Bolkestein, 'Is "*qui*" "*et is*"? On the So-called Free Relative Connection in Latin'. O. Álvarez Huerta: 'Relativo de unión y estilo indirecto en latin'. B. Campbell, 'Textual Functions of Conjunction in Vergil's *Aeneid*'. B. Frischer, 'How to Do Things with Words per Strong Stop: Two Studies on the *Historia Augusta* and Cicero': a computer analysis of sentence-lengths in these two corpora. The sentences in Cicero's speeches start at an average of 12.81 words in the *Pro Quinctio* and rise not very steadily to a maximum of 23.44 in *Post Reditum ad Quirites* (in which speech, a cynic might observe, he had least to say to the largest audience); then they decline again, reaching a low point of 10.67 in the eighth *Philippic*. F.'s favoured explanation is more pulmonary than stylistic.

*Semantics and the lexicon*. M. Kienpointner, 'Structural Semantics and Latin Linguistics': a case-study on the semantics of *amor* and *odium*. O. Panagl, 'Implikationen und Präsuppositionen als Faktoren im lateinischen Bedeutungswandel': studies semantic change with reference to the following examples: *oboedire*, *opportunus*, *spondeo*, *pareo*, *dignus*, *iubeo*, *egeo*, *careo*. S. Kiss, 'Synonymie syntaxique, paraphrase et présentation grammaticale en latin': on choices between different ways of saying roughly the same thing, e.g. active and passive, different word orders, perfect and imperfect subjunctive in result clauses. H. Fugier, 'Verbes latins à construction locative: Les contraintes et le système'. A. M. Martín Rodríguez, 'Le fonctionnement des verba promittendi dans le champ sémantique de "donner" '. H. Petersmann, 'From Concrete to Abstract Thinking: The Development of Moral Concepts in Archaic Latin', starting with the 'Duenos' inscription: *duenos* (later *bonus*) is from the root of *dare* (cf. esp. subjunctive *duim*) and means 'gifted', 'rich', 'prosperous', as still in Cicero's *boni viri et locupletes*; *manos* 'good' is connected with *maturus* 'ripe'; *malus* means 'small' (cf. Russian *maliy*); *scelestus* means 'bent' (cf. Greek *skolios*), then 'deformed' and so 'polluted'; *pius* means 'clean'. R. Freundlich, '*Intrinsecus* in Ecclesiastical and Medieval Latin: Some Remarks on the Indirect Impact of Biblical Language on Late Latin': *intrinsecus* reflects the Biblical Hebrew *bekerev* 'in the inward parts', with reference to the mind or emotions. I. Klutstein, 'L'âme et l'esprit dans la terminologie philosophique de Marsile Ficin'.

*Grammatical thought*. R. Amacker, 'Le traitement des diphtongues grecques et

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.91 Published online by Cambridge University Press

latines chez Térentianus le Maure: Bref chapitre d'histoire de la grammaire'. P. Flobert, 'Les observations d'Aulu-Gelle sur la syntaxe de l'accusatif latin': on a number of archaic constructions studied by Gellius, linked (accidentally, I suspect) by the fact that they contain an accusative. M. Lavency, ' "Régime" et "mutation" chez Despautère'; D. was the author of a treatise on Latin syntax published in 1509.

It would be a dull Latinist who did not find something of interest in this volume.

*Royal Holloway, London* J. G. F. POWELL

## TABULA SIARENSIS

A. Sánchez-Ostiz (ed.): *Tabula Siarensis. Edición, Traducción y Comentario.* Pp. xxiv + 486, 7 ills. Pamplona: Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, 1999. Paper. ISBN: 84-313-1665-9.

The *Tabula Siarensis* is one of four great Roman historical documents brought to light in the last two decades of the past century, the others being the *SC de Cn. Pisone patre*, the *Tabula Irnitana*, and the *Lex portorii Provinciae Asiae*. It belongs to the same shattering historical episode as the *SC*, the death of Germanicus, each part of the 'ciclo epigráfico de Germánico', illuminating the other. Historians of the episode are also brought under scrutiny, especially Tacitus, whose account of Germanicus' honours the author agrees (p. 34) with predecessors in regarding as drawn from the *Acta Senatus*. So it has a twofold claim to attention, redoubled again when we recall that the text it embodies (*SCC* of A.D. 19, *Rogatio Valeria Aurelia* of A.D. 20) is that of the long-masticated *Tabula Hebana*, and again for its relationship with other measures honouring deceased *principes.* The *Tabula*, by far the shortest of the four great documents in its surviving form, thoroughly merits the depth of treatment that a book of this size promises.

The fact that the volume is in Spanish, like the earliest publications by J. González and F. Fernández (*Iura* 32 [1981 {1984}], 1–36; *ZPE* 55 [1984], 55–100), should not deter anyone with Latin and French or Italian and access to a dictionary. The author writes clearly. Indeed, overall the document has been fortunate in having him to work on it (as his doctoral dissertation in the first instance).

He begins conventionally and methodically with an introduction surveying previous work and thanking his coadjutors, passing to archaeological data and text. He offers other maps—sites of memorials to Germanicus in Rome, Syria, and the 'Gates', with a superfluous inset of the eastern Mediterranean; astonishingly, especially as there is a complex discussion (pp. 314–8) of Siarum and the Siarenses Fortunales, the area of the findspot 'en las cercanías de Utrera' is not illustrated; there is a scrap attached to the essay by M. M. Ruiz Delgado in J. González and J. Arce (edd.), *Estudios sobre la Tabula Siarensis. Anejos de Archivo Español de Arqueología* 9 (Madrid, 1988), pp. 75–89.

The annotated majuscule is underpinned by legible plates (no. 2 carelessly cut); slightly undermined by them in fr. I l. 5, where there is an obvious slip (ADSV[.] ẸṬẠ); and hardly sustained at the end of l. 6; but there the reading is supported by the author's inspection of the bronze. (Other slips are few, mainly foreign names and titles; something is wrong with the military treasury, p. 117, and M. Corvinus is *cos.* thirty years too early, p. 258.) The author then outlines the epigraphic and literary context of the monument, first other copies of the documents embodied in the text, notably *CIL* 6.31199a–c, the *Tabula Hebana*, and the Todi fragment, *CIL* 11.63322, identified by

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.91 Published online by Cambridge University Press