

expressed by grammatical means. Analysing cases in several languages Lehmann shows certain universal tendencies in development of case systems particularly in processes of grammaticalization. These tendencies can be used with success in explaining historical changes not only from Latin to Romance languages but also changes in the prehistoric state of Latin.

In Part II, which is the most extensive, the following themes are discussed: verbal valency and case-marking (H. Pinkster, M. Bolkestein, E. Vester, E. Heilig), subordination and nominal phrases (J. Denooz, M. Lavency, Ch. Elerick, R. Coleman, J. Herman, G. Calboli), syntax and style (J. Dangel, J—P. Chausserie-Laprée). Pinkster's "Latin cases and valency theory" and Bolkestein's "Discourse and case-marking" are excellent presentations of functional grammar with their exact categories and ample documentation. In addition, I want to single out for special mention the articles by Coleman and Calboli. Coleman's study of the origins and Latin development of the ACI is very exhaustive and certainly indispensable to anyone who will encounter this much-debated and problematic issue in the future. Calboli, "Relatif de liaison et absence d'article en latin", extends his well established thesis about the relationship of the absence of the article and the extensive use of the ACI in Latin to concern also the Latin "relatif de liaison". Lacking the usual means of referential connection Latin makes frequent use of the relative as a connective. The thesis is based not only on Latin data but also on the logic of the information structure of sentences.

Part III contains two contributions on the classification of parts of speech (M. Griffe, Chr. Touratier); five others concern both syntax and semantics: suffix functions (M. Fruyt), delocutive verbs (X. Mignot), verbal aspect (B. García-Hernández), concessive and restrictive adverbs (F. Letoublon), and negation (A. Orlandini). Touratier's "Les unités minimales de l'analyse syntaxique" can be said to represent most clearly structural functionalism or the structural approach to language. After defining the notions of the word, the morpheme and the syntagm, he distinguishes with Tesnière (cf. also Intr. p. 8) the linear and the structural order of the utterance. It is precisely the latter, the structural order, that determines the classification of the minimal units of the utterance according to syntactic criteria, i.e. according to the rules governing their combination in sentences.

In the narrow limits of this review I have been able to take up only a few details concerning the merits of the book. Almost all articles are of high quality containing fresh and interesting methodological aspects, giving well founded results and opening new perspectives. In all the book is indispensable to anyone who wishes to do effective research work in the syntax and development of the Latin language.

Toivo Viljamaa

Walter Belardi, Palmira Cipriano, Paolo Di Giovine, Marco Mancini: Studi latini e romanzi in memoria di Antonino Pagliaro. Biblioteca di ricerche linguistiche e filologiche, 14. Dipartimento di studi glottoantropologici, Università "La Sapienza", Roma 1984. XII, 352 p. Lit. 60.000.

This volume, dedicated to the memory of the great Maestro of Indo-European (esp.

Iranian) and classical studies Antonino Pagliaro (whose 70th birthday was celebrated by means of a triptychon volume in 1969), contains 12 studies by the above scholars. Of the contributions seven pertain to Latin linguistics. All the papers are ingenious and thought-provoking.

Walter Belardi offers five Latin contributions. “Una questione di metodo (lat. *fides - dium, capis, capula*)” (pp. 1—10) attacks E. Peruzzi’s thesis of a Mycenaean loan-word substrate in early Latin. Whereas Belardi’s etymologies of *fides*, *capis* and *capula* are certainly more probable than Peruzzi’s, they do not suffice to falsify the Mycenaean thesis (cf. Peruzzi, PP 40 [1985] 41f.). “Gli allofoni di /l/latino dalle origini alla fase romanza” (pp. 63—110) is a substantial investigation into the phonological processes conditioned by or connected with the Latin /l/ phoneme. It is regrettable that W. Cowgill’s equally impressive study on Latin *vīs* (<**wel-si*; Sprache 24 [1978] 25—44) has not been drawn on. Due attention is paid to conceptual clarifications of ancient terminology of phonetic description (*exilis*, *pinguis*, *tenuis*). This line is continued and deepened in “I termini tecnici *tenuis/exilis*, *plenus/pinguis* e i loro antecedenti greci” (157—165). The paper on “Lucilio e la datazione dei nomi dei casi” offers a refinement of an earlier article. Accordingly, except for εὐθεῖα, the names for cases date back to 150—125 B.C. only. “La Siria, la scalogna e il gatto soriano” (pp. 175—186) derives σκαλώνια, (*cepa*) *ascalonia*, etc. from the underlying root *(*a*)*skal-*, which he considers to be of “Mediterranean” extraction.

Palmira Cipriano and Marco Mancini offer an imposing joint paper on “Enclisi e morfologia del verbo “essere” nel latino e nell’osco” (pp. 11—62). In her well-researched section, titled “Effetti fonetici dell’enclisia del verbo “essere” nel quadro storico della fonologia latina”, P. Cipriano is able to show that the present reviewer (in Lg. 53 [1977] 39—60) overstated the role of morphological factors in explaining the allegro variant *st* of the copula *est*. The author argues very strongly for phonetic development (aphaeresis due to enclisis) as the true source, but in doing this she unduly presses the point that I deny cliticization and phonetic factors altogether, when accounting for the historical evolution of the Latin copula. Such implications are valid only for those who do not endorse multiple causation. I was simply preoccupied with the morphological aspect, which I felt to be generally neglected. Despite Cipriano’s scrupulous rehabilitation of the phonetic explanation due recognition must be given to the way in which historical evolution and synchronic structure intertwine. The reduced *st* variant was probably a lexicalized unit. My “protoparadigm” *sum s(s) st sumus estis sunt* serves to bring home the point that *st* was scarcely created from *est* by the sole application of “aphaeresis”. Notice that *enim*, too, was enclitic, and yet no reduced variant that might be ascribed to the workings of “aphaeresis” is attested (**’nim*). It seems to me that Cipriano does not pay due attention to lexicalization. Given that the reduced variants were historically due to (phonetic factors consequential upon) enclisis, I still claim that the variants *s(s) st* were semiotically as autonomous as, say, *’m ’re ’s* in English. The latter make up a paradigm insofar as they involve lexicalized units. It would be rather vacuous to contend that these variants are phonetically processed from *am are is*, respectively, every time they are used; rather, they are ready-made lexical items that are selected according to certain stylistic preferences. That the loss of the word-final *s* was a variable rule has been known at least since F. Leo (Plaut. Forsch. 1912). Now this fact has

been brought into the context of the evolution of Romance languages by R. Wallace (AJPh 105 [1984] 213—225; Papers fr. the XII Ling. Symposium on Romance Languages [ed. by P. Baldi; Amsterdam: Benjamins 1984], 565—575). However, it is not without significance that the *-s* dropping was systematized so as to take place in antecorsonantal position only. Hereby the rule lost, in literary Latin, its natural phonetic character and acquired a semiotic function (genre, style, context). In spite of these self-defensory remarks my general impression of Cipriano's paper is positive. The paper contains many valuable suggestions. So does also M. Mancini's section, entitled "Un caso di sandhi esterno in osco e l'interferenza tra congiuntivo e indicativo del presente nell'italico e nel latino". Let me point out only one point of general linguistic interest: in Ve 127 *culchnasim* 'I am the κολίχνη' (in lieu of *culchnu sim*) shows nicely that *sim* is indeed enclitic (cf. Zwicky, Lg 61 [1985] 286). M. Mancini's paper on "Lat. lorica" (pp. 111—137) constitutes a rebuttal of a direct loan from Greek θώραξ. This paper is also an elegant rehabilitation of the ancient etymology "*lorica a lorum*". A theme of semantic reconstruction is dealt with by P. Cipriano in the paper "Una concordanza latino-iranica sul valore positivo della sinistra" (pp. 139—149). She relegates the positive connotation of *sinister* to the context of the *auspicia*. The contributions of P. Cipriano are rounded off by her paper on "L'etimologia di *dictator* presso gli antichi" (pp. 167—174).

Martti Nyman

Quibus locis inveniantur additamenta titulorum voluminis VI Corporis Inscriptionum Latinarum. Collegit Ursula Lehmann. Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. Auctarium. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin—New York 1986. VIII, 169 S. DM 98.—

Hunc indicem, seorsum expressum ex Corporis Inscriptionum Latinarum voluminis VI partis 7 fasciculo 7 (praeparatur), instrumentum utilissimum esse patet. Constat enim inter omnes permultos esse titulos urbanos qui in volumine sexto Corporis Berolinensis additamentis instructi, quin etiam pluries editi sunt. Qui loci in indice ab E.J. Jory et D.G. Moore machina computatoria confecto omissi ut facilius reperirentur, haec tabula nostrum ad usum composita est. Aucatrix etiam rationem duxit, quoad fieri potuit, eorum titulorum quos Corporis editores alterum aut saepius quasi novos proposuerunt. Loci alterius cuiusdam Corporis voluminis tandem saepius commemorati sunt, quibus tituli urbani inserti sunt. Contra tituli falsi voluminis VI parte 5 editi in tabula nusquam enotati sunt, paucis exceptis casibus, de quibus videas praefationem. Additamenta extra Corpus publici iuris non adhibita sunt, sed dolendum est omnino omissas esse novas lectiones emendatas, quae disperse editae illa utilitate carent quam collectae et coniunctae haberent; moles laboris autem nimia fuisset huius finis sequendi.

Constat igitur hanc tabulam instrumentum utilissimum studiis epigraphicis esse. Hoc unum in ea vitupero, quod neglexit de titulis et in VI et in alio quodam Corporis volumine publici iuris factis communicare utrum sint potius urbani necne. Ita exempli gratia titulus 21647 = XI 2939a mihi quidem certe non est urbanus, sed Volcentanus. — Addendum hoc