

However, it seems to me that Tengström shows a clear insight into the various questions arising from Juvenal's tenth satire and into the scholarly discussion that surrounds them, although he quotes the texts of other classical scholars rather too frequently and, moreover, in a rather inelegant manner. He does not himself indulge in bold assumptions; his own opinions are very well considered, argued and documented, especially when dealing with the supposed length of the introductory part of the satire and the poem's connexions with rhetoric: "A discussion of the structure of the tenth satire can benefit from a comparison between this poem and a speech belonging to the *genus deliberativum*", he writes (p. 23). I think that he is also right arguing that the satire indirectly refers to Roman society in the poet's own time — modern scholarship has, as is well known, over-emphasized the universal character of Juvenal's tenth satire. Tengström's study of the relation of Juvenal's satire to the idea of the return of the *saeculum aureum* propagated by Hadrian is very illuminating in this respect (pp. 50—52).

*Hannu Riikonen*

*Giulio A. Lucchetta: Una fisica senza matematica: Democrito, Aristotele, Filopono.*  
Pubblicazioni di Verifiche 4. Verifiche, Trento 1978. 188 p. Lit. 8000.

Aristotle's conception of physics — in particular of the problem of movement — its dominating influence upon subsequent thought throughout Antiquity and the Middle Ages, the impact of the atomists, on the one hand, and of Philoponus' impetus theory, on the other, and the fundamental difference between these approaches and those of modern physics, are the chief themes of this monograph. The argument is fluent and coherent. It has an air of reliability, an impression acquired not only from its impressive apparatus of learned references (indeed, many more relevant references could have been made). The ancient sources are quoted in translation. Obviously the book is intended, in the first place, for Italian students of the history of ideas and of the philosophy of physics. But classical scholars may also read it with profit as an example of a non-philological way of interpreting a body of material which far too often has remained the property of the philologists alone.

*H. Thesleff*

*Recherches de linguistique. Hommages à Maurice Leroy.* Éditées par Jean Bingen, André Coupez, Francine Mawet. Université Libre de Bruxelles, Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres, LXXIII. Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1980. XX, 216 p. FB 850.—.

This Festschrift for a distinguished Belgian scholar contains, besides a usefully organized bibliography (pp. XVI—XX), 24 papers, of which 11 deal with general

linguistics (L. Apostel, É. Buyssens, E. Coseriu, A. Coupez, R. Engler, A. Henry, [E. F.] K. Koerner, G. Lepschy, B. Malmberg, G. Mounin, R. Rocher) and 13, with specific problems in Indo-European languages (J. André, F. Bader, G. Bonfante, W. Dressler, P. Guiraud, M. Lejeune, M. Mayrhofer, V. Pisani, G. Redard, L. Rocher, C. J. Ruijgh, R. Schmitt, O. Szemerényi). From this wealth of papers I single out those directly relevant to Greek and Latin linguistics. Also a few papers in general linguistics will be considered.

J. André (1—7) offers some interesting cases of "deformation" undergone by Greek loan words in Latin. From the Latin point of view, such deformations epiphenomenally reflect naturalization of foreign material in the receiving system: E.g., given the fact that the suffix *+iacus* was productive in late Latin (*column+iacus*, *comit+iacus*), esp. in medicine (*elephant+iacus*, *splen+iacus*), retailoring *cardiacus* (καρδιακός) as *cord+iacus* in fact establishes the latter as a morphologically motivated Latin word. André is certainly right in arguing for a suffix substitution (a typical phenomenon in bilingual contexts) in *ergastulum* (ἐργαστήριον).

A typological characterization, in terms of case-grammar, of the polysemy in Greek and Latin agent and instrument suffixes is the theme of W. Dressler's paper (68—73), which is a small contribution to his "polycentric" theory of grammar (cf. *Grundzüge der Morphologie*, Wien 1977): Word-formation takes place in a specific component by means of universal processes, which generate polysemous meaning structures. From this pool of universal polysemy each language makes its choice. Although Dressler's argumentation is difficult to follow without a familiarity with his other work, the present study shows the (at least heuristic) usefulness of case-grammar (not necessarily the Fillmorean format) in historical linguistics (cf. L. Apostel [see below]) and in etymology (cf. M. Nyman, *Arctos* 14 (1980) 69—73).

No better suggestion having been offered, Latin pass. 2nd pl. *+minī* is usually explained as *\*+menoi* (*estis*). Now V. Pisani (158—162) proposes to reconstruct IE *\*+enoi* on the basis of some scant reflexes. To account for the nasal "onset" *\*+|m|enoi* in Latin, Pisani invokes Sanskrit med.pres.pl, which shows the allomorphy *+māna+* (them.)/*āná+* (athem.) and argues that Latin generalized the originally thematic pattern. This is a very daring reconstruction, of course; but fresh food for thought is always welcome. (Incidentally, though periphrastic origin of only one member of a paradigm may be an odd thing, this is not a conclusive argument against the traditional explanation; cf. Finnish *laulavat* 'cantantes' > 'cantant'.)

G. Redard (163—171) challenges the traditional etymological interpretation of *testis* as "the third man" and comes up with the original meaning 'by-stander' (cf. παραστάτης in all its acceptations). This is very plausible semantically, but morphological constituency now becomes even more problematic than before. Redard vaguely suggests IE *\*ter+*, which must be glossed 'through; across'. The IE reflexes of this root all come from the zero-grade. The Latin reflexes are *trāns* and *trān+*

(attested in *tranquillus*; M. Nyman, IF 84 (1979) 132—156), and the latter, earlier, variant can be analyzed as  $*tr + H_2m$  (Nyman, 152). The underlying form  $*tr + stis$  would be formally possible, but still semantically problematic.

C. J. Ruijgh's study (189—198) on some unexpected zero-grades witnesses the heuristic power of Benveniste's well-known root theory in grammatical systematization. Given that  $\kappa\alpha\rho\tau\alpha$ ,  $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha$ , etc. are adverbs in  $+n$ , the non-occurrence of full-grade roots ( $*\kappa\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha$ ,  $*\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha$ ) demands an explanation. Ruijgh suggests that the pervasive zero-grade in  $*krt + n$ ,  $*ml + n$  stems from the use of adverbs of this type as quasi-proclitic constituents; e.g.  $*kr\grave{e}t\eta + mrgh\acute{e}w + >$   $*krt\eta + mrgh\acute{e}w + >$   $*\kappa\alpha\rho\tau\alpha + \beta\rho\alpha\chi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha$  (cf. Hdt. 3,123,2  $\kappa\alpha\rho\tau\alpha$   $\beta\rho\alpha\chi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\zeta$ ).

Of the general linguistic studies I mention L. Apostel's sketchy, but nonetheless theoretically interesting paper (8—20), in which it is proposed that combining diachronic generative grammar with diachronically interpreted pragmatics will produce an explanatorily powerful theory of language change. It is important indeed to relate grammar to language use, but notice that Searle's speech act theory and Grice's conversational maxims are based on a philosophical reflection on what it is rational to do in communicative interaction. So, it is not the case, as Apostel seems to think, that pragmatic considerations take us amidst sociological reality. Viewing language change from the pragmatic angle brings forth the problem of teleological explanation; but surprisingly the author does not even mention the word.

É. Buysens (44—47) argues that "V(owel)" and "C(onsonant)" are not phonetic, but "exclusively" phonological concepts, because all phonetic definitions of the "V:C" opposition leak. The author proposes to define "V" as a phoneme which functions as the nucleus of a syllable. (Since the author devotes some lines to a study of interjections, it should be pointed out that /s/ in *psit!* would counter-intuitively be defined as "V".) Certainly Buysens has a point in that "V" and "C" cannot be defined in phonetic terms. But how is he now to pin down the concept of the syllable without lapsing into a circular argument? (I am certain that this can be done, but how to do it is not self-evident.)

Historiography of linguistics is well-represented. The enigmatic characters of Sir William Jones and Ferdinand de Saussure continue to inspire the epigones. R. Engler (74—81) offers some precizations on Saussure's views on the φύσει/θέσει problem; and K. Koerner (100—109) proposes V. A. Bogorodickij and R. La Grasserie as possible sources of Saussure's term "synchronic". R. Rocher (172—180) proposes that Sir William Jones was influenced by the comparative work done by his friend Nathaniel Brassey Halhed. Also Lucien Tesnière is becoming a classic, as is witnessed by the contributions by E. Coseriu (48—62) and G. Mounin (153—157).