

This bulky work might be of some use for students of Romance languages and of English. But it is good to bear in mind that it is not a Meyer-Lübke, which considers only those inherited words that show a continuing existence and evolution through the late classical and medieval periods, labelling any later borrowing a *Buchwort* or omitting it altogether, whereas Dee also takes into account these later developments. Thus, it can serve as a sort of supplement to Meyer-Lübke, but its scholarly value does not seem to be considerable.

I have no desire to go into details here. Sometimes I have wondered about the criteria of the selection of the words to be treated. To take one example of the proper names just from the first page, the town name *Abella* has an own entry (why? because of *Abellana nux?*), whereas many other much more important towns have not found their way into the *Lexicon*, e.g., some place-names of the neighbourhood like *Abellinum*, *Nola*, *Salernum*; not even *Neapolis* has succeeded in catching the attention of the author, in spite of Naples' multifarious importance also in vocabulary.

*Heikki Solin*

ROLAND HOFFMANN: *Lateinische Verbalperiphrasen vom Typ amans sum und amatus fui. Valenz und Grammatikalisierung (Primäres Textkorpus: Ovid)*. Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe XXI, Linguistik; Bd. 175. Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main 1997. ISBN 3-631-49473-4. xvi, 465 S. CHF 95.

Based on his dissertation in 1994, this book by Roland Hoffmann examines thoroughly the difficult problem of a certain type of verbal periphrasing in Latin, i.e., the types *amans sum* (PPA) and *amatus fui* (PPP). The aim of this research is twofold: First, to find means to keep verbal periphrases separate from adjectival participles and secondly, to use the method to show that verbal periphrasing was a grammaticalized device even in classical Latin. This contrasts strongly with views adopted by earlier scholars, notably Sten Eklund.

The book is divided into four parts. The first section introduces the problem of defining verbal periphrases and adjective + copula constructions. To argue for the existence of the periphrasis, one should be able to tell whether a syntagm participle + *esse* functions as a verbal form, or whether it is to be seen as simply the copula combined with an adjectival participle. Earlier research has approached the question from a morphological (e.g., comparative formation) and contextual (e.g., co-ordination with an adjective) viewpoint. Hoffmann considers these approaches inadequate. For him, the solution lies in valency analysis, originally developed by Lucien Tesnière, and adapted for Latin mainly by Heinz Happ (*Grundfragen einer Dependenz-Grammatik des Lateinischen*, Göttingen 1976). Hoffmann stresses that a sharp dichotomy between periphrases and adjectival constructions is not necessary and perhaps not even possible. This unclear state of affairs already emerges from the original definition problem and suggests that the shift from periphrases to adjectival constructions is gradual.

In short, the decision whether a participle is of verbal or adjectival nature is made by examining the valency status of the compound and by comparing it to the valency of synthetic forms of the same verb. The working hypothesis is that adjectivization results

in changes of the valency structure. With this method one should be able to answer the question, whether the participle + *esse* construction forms a grammaticalized functional unity and, therefore, belongs to the same paradigm as the simple verb. A simple example of valency difference is that of the genitive case (instead of the accusative) with frequently used participles, e.g., *amans* and *metuens*. It should be noted, however, that for Hoffmann the mere change from the accusative to the genitive is not an adequate criterion to take the participle as an adjective.

The second part, devoted to the description and evaluation of the chosen method, begins with a short introduction to the theoretical framework, which is helpful to a reader not acquainted with this syntactical theory. The basic idea is to regard the verb as a central node in the clause, on which all other elements are, in one way or another, dependent. In this, the valency analysis has much in common with Functional Grammar, the latter however making semantics a more prominent part of the discussion. By using a distinct method, Hoffmann wants to avoid making conclusions intuitively, as has sometimes been the case in earlier studies. A series of important issues is discussed, including grammaticalization and different realizations of the function agent. The most important point Hoffmann makes concerning agenthood is that the agent can be implicit, inferrable from the immediate or more general context. To put it in other words, the agent can be present in the argument structure although it is not visible on the surface level as an actual word. Here he takes a position quite different from that of Elseline Vester. Also other arguments, e.g. objects, can be left out elliptically, which is the so-called absolute use. Here semantic and pragmatic factors occupy a prevalent place. This discussion is relevant for the valency analysis in the next chapter.

The third part puts the theory into action. Hoffmann analyzes all instances of both (PPA and PPP) types in the Ovidian corpus (chosen because of suitable time period and adequate, but not too large, size of corpus). The syntactic contexts are recorded and the valency status of each participle determined. After that, the argument structure with normal forms of each verb is stated, including close parallels whenever possible. If the valencies are equal, the decision is in favour of the periphrasis. If not, then there is probably an adjectival use at hand.

Hoffmann finds 23 certain PPA-periphrases (of 66 instances) and 95 PPP-periphrases (of 122 instances). In a handful of cases, the judgment is left open, which was only to be expected on the basis of the author's initial remarks about a continuum. In these instances (usually monovalent present participles and comparatives), the author acknowledges that the method is not an adequate tool. In quite a few cases, additional semantic criteria are used to corroborate the valency analysis. Often it seems to be the case, as the author himself notes, that frequent use correlates with adjectival status. The valency analysis, however, does seem to be a suitable method to solve this problem, even if additional criteria are sometimes needed.

Because the existence of the PPA-type as a grammaticalized syntagm has been thought to be especially doubtful, the fourth part consists of comparative data concerning PPA-periphrasis, from Plautus, Cicero and Vitruvius. Hoffmann offers some interesting observations regarding the sociolinguistic status of this type. Apparently, it was not a colloquialism but rather a technical expression. For example, Cicero favours it more in his philosophical and rhetorical treatises than in the orations or letters.

In general, this work is an ambitious attempt to solve a difficult definition problem and the results are, for the most part, convincing. Although marginal when compared to normal verb forms, the periphrastic usage does indeed seem to form a part of the Latin morphosyntactical apparatus. This applies particularly to the PPP-type. The PPA-type, on the other hand, continues to raise more problems. Hoffmann claims that the relative infrequency of the construction does not prevent considering it a grammaticalized pattern because other established verb forms, like future imperative and future perfect are, likewise, relatively infrequent. Still, further arguments would be needed to make this conclusion plausible.

The bibliography is comprehensive as is the detailed general index. More discussion about the function and motivation of periphrasing in Latin would, of course, have been interesting but that, understandably, does not belong to the scope of this work.

*Hilla Salovaara*

*XI Congresso Internazionale di Epigrafia Greca e Latina, Roma, 18-24 settembre 1997. Atti I-II.* Edizioni Quasar, Roma 1999. ISBN 88-7140-152-2. 889, 797 pp. ITL 390.000.

The *Atti* of the Epigraphic Congress held in Rome in September 1997 have been published with remarkable speed, as the two volumes came out exactly two years after the congress. No editor is mentioned on the front page, but from the Prefazione in vol. I, p. 11, one learns that the editorial work was done by Dr. S. Evangelisti and Dr. L. Galli with the help of Dr. M. G. Macciocca, Dr. D. Nonnis and Dr. E. Zappata, "sotto la guida di scrive" (it seems a 'chi' must be added); there is no signature under the Prefazione but I think that one cannot be too wrong if one suspects that this means Professor Silvio Panciera. In any case, clearly we have here an instance of team work at its best.

Vol. I starts with a section containing, besides other introductory items, the programme of the congress, a list of papers presented at the congress but not published in the *Atti* (in some cases some other publication is mentioned), a list of the participants with their addresses (which have for no obvious reason been modified; certainly my professional address is not given in the form it was communicated to the editors). This is followed by speeches held at the opening and closure of the congress, including M. Mayer's invitation to the participants to the next congress in Barcelona in 2002.

The papers themselves are presented in eight sections ("parti") beginning with section II, the last three of them in vol. II. The arrangement of papers into sections follows pretty much the lines of previous congresses. Sections II and III deal with Greek epigraphy (II with inscriptions down to the end of the 5th century, III with Hellenistic epigraphy); sections IV and V are consecrated to Latin epigraphy, IV to the more conventional texts, V to those "in scrittura usuale", this referring to inscriptions using "normal" writing as contrasted with "lapidary" writing (here we find papers on the Vindolanda Tablets, etc.). Section VI is on "Varia", a fairly varied collection indeed. Sections VII, VIII and IX all deal with both Greek and Latin inscriptions; section VII is on the period between Augustus and the Antonines, VIII on the period between the Severans and Constantine, and IX on Late Antiquity after Constantine. Perhaps the