

Sonderdruck aus

Kratylos

Kritisches Berichts- und Rezensionsorgan
für indogermanische und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft

Annual Review of Indo-European
and General Linguistics

Jahrgang/Volume 65

2020

Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag · Wiesbaden

Inhalt

I. Forschungsbericht

- Toponomastik der älteren Sprachschichten (Mittel-)Europas (Teil I) – WIESINGER, PETER und GREULE, ALBRECHT: Baiern und Romanen (HARALD BICHLMEIER) 1

II. Rezensionenartikel

Sprachübergreifende Sammelwerke

- Miscellanea Indogermanica. Festschrift für JOSÉ LUIS GARCÍA RAMÓN zum 65. Geburtstag. Herausgegeben von IVO HAJNAL, DANIEL KÖLLIGAN und KATHARINA ZIPSER. (GIULIO IMBERCIADORI) 87

Indogermanistik allgemein

- STEER, THOMAS: Laryngalverhärtung hinter /n/ im Indogermanischen. (DANIEL KÖLLIGAN) 99
- RUPPEL, ANTONIA: Absolute Constructions in Early Indo-European. (HARALD BICHLMEIER) 110

Latein

- WEISS, MICHAEL: Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin. (STEFAN HÖFLER) 114
- HOFFMANN, ROLAND: Lateinische Linguistik. Morphosyntax und Syntax in einzelsprachlicher und typologischer Perspektive. (AUDREY MATHYS) 132

Griechisch

- GODART, LOUIS und SACCONI, ANNA: Les archives du roi Nestor. Corpus des inscriptions en linéaire B de Pylos. (TORSTEN MEISSNER) 139
- GODART, LOUIS und SACCONI, ANNA: Les archives du roi Nestor. Corpus des inscriptions en linéaire B de Pylos. (OSWALD PANAGL) 146

Anatolisch

- QAZZU warrai. Anatolian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of KAZUHIKO YOSHIDA. Edited by ADAM ALVAH CATT, RONALD I. KIM, and BRENT VINE. (RÜDIGER SCHMITT) 153

Indisch

LOWE, JOHN J.: Transitive Nouns and Adjectives. (LAURA GRESTENBERGER) 163

PINAULT, GEORGES-JEAN: Védica. I. Etymologica. (RÜDIGER SCHMITT) 186

MYLIUS, KLAUS: Wörterbuch altindoirischer geographischer Namen. (RÜDIGER SCHMITT) 197

Tocharisch

HACKSTEIN, OLAV; HABATA, HIROMI; BROSS, CHRISTOPH: Tocharische Texte zur Bud-
dhalegende. (RUIXUAN CHEN) 203

Rezensentinnen und Rezensenten dieses Bandes:

Bichlmeier, Harald	1, 110	Kölligan, Daniel	99
Chen, Ruixuan	203	Mathys, Audrey	132
Grestenberger, Laura	163	Meißner, Torsten	139
Höfler, Stefan	114	Panagl, Oswald	146
Imberciadori, Giulio	87	Schmitt, Rüdiger	153, 186, 197

Hoffmann, Roland: *Lateinische Linguistik*. Morphosyntax und Syntax in einzelsprachlicher und typologischer Perspektive. Studienbücher zur lateinischen Linguistik (SZLL), 03. Buske Verlag Hamburg, 2018. xii, 301 Seiten. Broschiert, 26,90 EUR. ISBN: 978-3-87548-765-7.

The book under review is intended as an introduction to modern Latin linguistics. The first part of the volume (p. 1–39) is a general presentation defining modern Latin linguistics, as opposed to a more traditional approach of Latin grammar, and providing a list of tools, reference works and institutions where this type of research is supported. The rest of the book is comprised of a series of nine papers published by Roland Hoffmann between 1994 and 2014 and which are deemed representative of the different issues at stake in modern Latin linguistics. These selected papers have been updated and translated into German when needed. In addition, the book contains a general reference list (p. 247–263) as well as several indices, including an index of passages (p. 265–270), an index of Latin words (p. 271–274), an index of concepts (p. 275–289), an index of languages (p. 291–292) and an index of modern authors (p. 293–297). The book is neatly laid out, with only occasional typos (e.g. *du langue Latin* p. 19, $\phi\omega\nu\eta$ p. 83, etc.). In this regard, the only point leaving room for improvement is the list of abbreviations used in the glosses of the paper titled “Lateinische Adverbialsubordinatoren typologisch betrachtet” (p. 191–224): nothing in the text indicates that it is to be found at the end of the paper (p. 224) and not in the front or back matter of the book.

In the general introduction (p. 1–39), R. Hoffmann offers a brief summary of the evolution of research in Latin linguistics since the 1960s. His emphasis lies on the influence research on modern languages has had on the understanding of the Latin language in general, and he rightly insists on the importance of theoretical frameworks such as structuralism, generative grammar and functional discourse grammar in the literature during the last sixty years. He also calls attention to the fact that pragmatics has played an important paper in our understanding of certain aspects of Latin syntax, e.g. word order. The distinction he draws, p. 2–3, between *Sprachwissenschaft*, which he deems static, and *Linguistik*, which is, according to him, more research oriented, seems slightly artificial. It does not seem to reflect the current use of these terms in German academia, and it fails to acknowledge that historical and comparative linguistics are increasingly taking into account “modern” theoretical frameworks. Yet, this is understandable in a book with an intended audience of Classicists: in the current shortage of permanent positions, few Classics departments hire linguists, and students stand an increasing risk of having almost no exposure to modern Latin linguistics. In this regard, the section titled “Neuere lateinische Satzlehren”

(p. 15–35), where Hoffmann summarises five major works on Latin syntax¹, provides valuable insight for students lacking access to a serious linguistics course; and it is all the more commendable as it is not limited to works in English or German. The section “Impulse für eine lateinische Linguistik” (p. 12–14), where Hoffmann lists important institutions and conferences regarding Latin linguistics, should prove helpful for young researchers in a field where isolation and some degree of self-teaching are often the norm. In the last pages of the introduction (p. 35–39), Hoffmann gives an outline of the papers gathered in the book, which “können wohl als repräsentativ für syntaktische Studien dieser Zeit gelten” (p. 35), making it clear that the aim of the book is to provide young researchers with examples of research carried out within the framework of modern linguistic theory.

The first section, “Zur Verbalmorphologie” (p. 43–86), contains three papers. The first one, titled “„*Sint ora faventia sacris.*“ Zur periphrastischen Funktion des Präsenspartizips” (p. 43–55) discusses the hypothesis stating that periphrases with present participles in Latin result from the influence of Ancient Greek, as defended, among others, by W. Dietrich (1973) in his monograph *Der periphrastische Verbalaspekt in den romanischen Sprachen* (Tübingen, Niemeyer). According to Hoffmann (p. 44), this stands against the relatively widespread use of such periphrases in all stages of Latin literature. He argues further that the (mostly semantic) criteria used by Dietrich to eliminate the earliest examples containing the verb *esse* and a predicative present participle are inconclusive. For this reason, Hoffmann proposes to assess whether the valency of the periphrases in question is comparable to the valency of the corresponding synthetic verb forms. From a theoretical standpoint, this is a perfectly valid approach. However, the practical consequences are less convincing. Hoffmann takes into consideration 21 possible examples of periphrases in Archaic and Classical Latin. Among these few examples, only five contain an object in the accusative; the others either do not govern an object, or seem to govern a case which can also be used with an adjective or a noun (e.g. *tibi sum obædiens* “I am at your service” Plaut. *Mil.* 1129, which can be compared to structures such as *inimicus alicui*, or to the rare cases where a noun seems to govern the dative, e.g. Plaut. *Am.* 166 *opulento homini servitus* “servitude to a rich man”). It is not clear whether such a small number of instances is significant. Some nouns occasionally admit accusative objects in Old Latin (e.g. *quid*

1 Touratier, C., 1994, *Syntaxe Latine* (Louvain-la-Neuve, Peeters) ; Serbat, G. (ed.) et alii, 1994-2003, *Grammaire fondamentale du latin* (10 volumes, Louvain, Peeters) ; Torrego, E., de la Villa, J. and Baños Baños, J.M., 2009, *Sintaxis del latín clásico* (Madrid, Liceus E-Excellence) ; Baldi, P. and Cuzzolin, P. (2009-2011), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax* (4 volumes, Berlin, Mouton-de Gruyter) and Pinkster, S. 2015-, *The Oxford Latin Syntax* (Oxford, OUP).

tibi hanc curatio est rem? “What business have you in this matter” Plaut. *Am.* 519). Thus the fact that participles in the rare instances where they seem to belong to periphrases apparently govern the accusative does not necessarily prove the existence of a grammaticalised periphrasis at an early stage. Additionally, and more importantly, the question arises whether it is methodologically sound to choose one only criterion – here valency – to assess whether a poorly attested morphosyntactic category exists. In this paper, the choice relies on an implicit hierarchy putting syntax and presumed verbal government above anything else (semantics, frequency, relative chronology, etc.). Such choices are often made without questioning the presupposition underlying them; and often incur a risk of carrying more information on what is important in a given theoretical framework than on how the language really works.

The second article of this section, “Funktionsverbgefüge im Lateinischen” (p. 57–70), is devoted to support verbs² in Latin, that is to say, constructions such as *coniecturam facere* “make a conjecture”, *spem capere* “lit. take hope”, where the meaning of the conjugated verb, when associated to an abstract noun, is partly bleached, yielding a periphrasis semantically equivalent to a simple verb (thus *coniecturam facere* = *conicere* “to infer, to guess”...). Hoffmann (p. 8) provides a definition of what he terms *Funktionsverbgefüge*: the verb is “mit einem [abstrakten] Substantiv so eng verbunden, dass beide zusammen das Prädikat bilden”. This results in a syntactic unit, where neither the verb nor the abstract noun can be omitted and where a substitution with simple verb of the same meaning is possible, as well as in a semantic unit: the abstract noun carries the lexical meaning of the periphrasis, the verb loses its concrete meaning and becomes a marker of aspect, *Aktionsart*, or diathesis. Hoffmann then proceeds then to describe the function of *adferre* “to bring, to carry” as a causative support verb in Cicero's works (p. 61–70). A detailed corpus study suggests that *adferre* has undergone desemantisation and decategorialisation (i.e. some morphosyntactic possibilities of the lexical verb *adferre* are not found in its causative uses, in this case passivisation, which is only found twice in Hoffmann's corpus, p. 65), and that abstract substantives with *adferre* behave as expected for nouns in support verb constructions.

In the last paper of this section, “Beobachtungen zur Kategorie des Konverbs im Spätlatein” (p. 71–86), Hoffmann provides an introduction to the category of converbs as defined by typologists (p. 71–73), and then proceeds to assess which verbal forms can be analysed as such in Latin (p. 73–77); the last section discusses the Late Latin evidence (p. 77–86). Starting from the definition of Haspelmath (“a non-finite

2 For this term, see Pinkster, S., 2015, *The Oxford Latin Syntax. Volume 1*, p. 73.

verbal form whose main function is to mark adverbial subordination”³), Hoffmann then goes on to suggest that Classical Latin only has quasi-converbs, that is to say, forms which behave syntactically as converbs when marking adverbial subordination, but which allow for other functions. According to Hoffmann, only gerunds in adverbial functions, present and past participles, conform to the definition provided by typologists. Hoffmann's analysis of the situation in Late Latin, which relies on a comparison between Greek and Latin versions of the Gospel of Mark leads to the interesting conclusion (p. 83) that the choices made by the translators of the Bible to render Greek participles increasingly tend to restrict present participles to contexts where their subject is coreferent with the subject of the main clause, whereas passive past participles in the ablative absolute are used in other cases. According to Hoffmann (p. 83), this might reflect the development of a contrast between same subject converb (the present participle) and different subject converb (past participle in the ablative absolute).

The section titled “Kausativität” contains only one paper, “Kausativ-Konstruktionen in spätlateinischen Bibelübersetzungen” (p. 87–109), but the topic of causativity is pervasive in the book. The author examines how Hebrew synthetic causative verb forms are translated in Late Latin, which lacks productive synthetic causatives. After an introduction defining causatives and presenting Hebrew causative verbs and Late Latin causative constructions (p. 88–97), Hoffmann provides statistics on a corpus containing about 1000 causative forms in Hebrew. These are not always explicitly translated by causative constructions; however, the construction with *facere* + infinitive seems increasingly frequent to render them.

The third section is devoted to word order and is comprised of only one paper, titled “Lateinische Wortstellung erneut untersucht: zur Informationsstruktur von Topik und Fokus” (p. 111–131). Hoffmann starts from the observation made by H. Pinkster (1990) in his book *Latin Syntax and Semantics* (London, Mulder) that although SOV order is frequently observed in Latin, other typical features of SOV languages as stated in Greenberg's implicational universals, e.g. the widespread use of postpositions instead of prepositions, are lacking. This could reflect the fact that constituent order is conditioned by information structure, rather than strictly syntactic criteria. Thus, Latin should not be analysed as an SOV language. Hoffmann proceeds to prove his point by a careful examination of a Classical Latin corpus of over 100000 words, comprising works of Catullus, Cicero, Livy, Seneca and Vergilius. He con-

3 M. Haspelmath (1995), “The converb as a cross-linguistically valid category”, in M. Haspelmath and E. König (eds.), *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective: structure and meaning of adverbial verb forms – adverbial participles, gerunds* (Berlin and New York, Mouton de Gruyter, p. 1-55, here p. 3), quoted by Hoffmann (2018, p. 73)

cludes that SOV order, which is the most frequent, is used when the subject is the topic; in most examples, the focus lies on the object (p. 118). Unfortunately, although it is clear that the general idea of a word order conditioned by pragmatic criteria is valid for Latin (and it is now the *communis opinio*), the paper leaves a mixed impression. A first minor problem concerns the readership of the book: if it is intended as an introductory textbook, the author should clarify his notations, or at least provide a means to elucidate some abbreviations. Thus, readers need to know that σ_{P1} , σ_{P2} , etc., in the tables on p. 117–119 refer to S. C. Dik's hierarchical structure of the clause, as described for instance in Dik (1997, p. 49–55), *Theory of functional grammar, 1. The Structure of the Clause* (Berlin – New York, Mouton de Gruyter), which is the theoretical framework used by Hoffmann in this paper (p. 112). The second problem regards the evaluation of the data. Hoffmann's statistics do not distinguish between prose and verse, although discontinuous phrases are notoriously more frequent in Latin verse than in prose. This is especially problematic in examples such as *at me tum primum saevus circumstetit horror* “And then first dire horror surrounded me” (Verg. *Aen.* 2.559), which Hoffmann (p. 117) classifies as OVS without mentioning that the epithet related to the subject is located before the verb. He does not attempt either at distinguishing between the placement of pronouns, especially enclitic pronouns, and the placement of nouns or prepositional phrases, although the existence of Wackernagel's law and other constraints on the position of unstressed pronouns should at least be discussed⁴. Despite these reservations, some of Hoffmann's observations are extremely valuable, e.g. the fact the first position is always marked (p. 121–122), or the discussion about the function of passivisation vs. the use of an active sentence with the object in first position as two means to mark the object of the verb underlying the passive construction.

The next section (p. 133–224) is devoted to language typology and contains three papers. The first one, titled “Versuch einer typologischen Beschreibung des Lateinischen im Kontext universaler Sprachenvielfalt” (p.133–161) is a general attempt at characterising the Latin language from a typological standpoint. After a brief presentation of the theories which Hoffmann deems compatible with language typology, including S. C. Dik's functional grammar and the framework implemented by R. D. Van Valin Jr. and R. J. LaPolla in their 1997 book *Syntax. Structure, Meaning and Function* (Cambridge, CUP), the author proceeds to a description of the typological characteristics of Latin. He offers a well-informed and comprehensive presentation of the *communis opinio* regarding typological issues, without neglecting more problem-

4 On this topic, see J.N. Adams (1994), “Wackernagel's Law and the Position of Unstressed Personal Pronouns in Classical Latin”, *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 92/2, p. 103–178.

atic questions, such as the position of Latin in Greenberg's word order universals (p. 153–158)⁵ or the question of Standard Average European (p. 158). The most interesting remarks regard the differences between noun phrases, in which, according to the author, “einiges kontextuell Verfügbare unmarkiert bleibt” (p. 139, e.g. definiteness and possession, which are not systematically marked in the noun phrase), and verb phrases, where more information is explicitly marked. Hoffmann also takes a stance on the question of the precedence of agreement over dependency, which, according to him, shows especially well in structures such as *ab urbe oppugnanda* “(the Carthaginian was deterred) from besieging the city” (Liv. 23.1.10), where the verbal adjective agrees with the noun in case as if it were a dependent, although it should be viewed as the head of the phrase.

The two other papers of the section (“Latein und Griechisch in typologischen Perspektiven”, p. 163–189, and “Lateinische Adverbialsubordinatoren typologisch betrachtet”, p. 191–224) are slightly less convincing. In the first one, Hoffmann, based on the equal cultural importance of Latin and Ancient Greek in Europe, sets out to characterise typologically Latin and Ancient Greek, and to assess how they relate to modern European languages. This approach seems methodologically fraught: by providing Latin and Greek examples of the “same” phenomenon without analysing the position of these constructions independently in each language, one faces the risk of missing important differences between constructions which are superficially alike; and equivalent cultural importance does not imply that the language systems are comparable. Also, one should be careful in using syntactic tests relying on sentence transformation, such as passivisation (p. 187): although common practice in publications regarding Latin syntax in the 70s and 80s, examples created by linguists are not extremely compelling for languages whose native speakers cannot be consulted for acceptability.

In his discussion of Latin adverbial subordinators (p. 191–224), which heavily relies on B. Kortmann's monograph *Adverbial Subordination. A Typology and History of Adverbial Subordinators Based on European Languages* (1997, Berlin and New York, Mouton de Gruyter), Hoffmann attempts at identifying the unique features of Latin adverbial subordinators, which are interesting in that although the language has up to 52 different subordinators (p. 197), most of adverbial clauses are introduced by just a few very polyfunctional morphemes, such as *cum* and *ut*. After a classification of Latin adverbial subordinators according to the interclausal relations they are apt to express (p. 198–202) and a contrasting description of participles in adverbial subordination (p. 203–204), the author provides cross-linguistics statistics regarding morphological structure and mono- or polyfunctionality of adverbial connectors, and then

5 It should be noted that in table (39), p. 157, NPo and PrN have been reversed.

proceeds to draw conclusions from the correlations he observes (p. 204–211). Latin adverbial subordinators tend to be comprised of only one word, are often unable to express other types of syntactic relations, and often express several different semantic relations. The last section of the paper is devoted to a comparison between Latin, Chinese, Yima, Kham and Tariana (p. 212–223). The author's aim seems to be to demonstrate that adverbial subordination can be expressed by means which strongly differ from what is found in Latin; yet it is not always clear how comparisons with languages chosen arbitrarily contribute to the argument.

The only paper of the last section of the book, which deals with theoretical questions, is titled “Kongruenz und Dependenz im Lateinischen. Zum Verhältnis von morphologischer Markierung und syntaktischer Struktur” (p. 225–245). In this paper, Hoffmann tackles the problem of the relation between agreement and dependency in Latin. He especially focuses on cases where what he considers the semantic or the syntactic head agrees with its dependent, e.g. the *summa arbor* “top of the tree” type, the *ab urbe oppugnanda* “from besieging the city” (Liv. 23.1.10) structure, and the constructions with dominant participles, such as *post caesos Scipiones* “after the Scipios had been killed” (Liv. 28.19.2). In these cases, the element agreeing with the substantive cannot be omitted without substantially altering the meaning of the phrase (e.g. *ab urbe* “far from the city”) and thus seems to function as a head, although it does not trigger agreement. As noted by Hoffmann, other languages show such mismatches between agreement and syntactic dependency.

All in all, the volume succeeds in providing a general idea of current research on Latin syntax from a theoretical and typological standpoint. Although some reservations regarding methodological issues can be made, and despite some repetitions, which are inevitable in a collection of papers, the author's systematic attempts at taking typology and non-European languages into account in order to reach a better understanding of Latin syntax is extremely commendable. Thus, this book should prove a valuable addition to the library of students interested in Classics.

Audrey Mathys

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Lehrstuhl für Historische und Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft

Geschwister-Scholl-Platz 1

D-80539 München

audreymathys@gmail.com