
This little book sets out to take a fresh look at a few well-known morphosyntactic problems in Latin. It contains three chapters by Pieroni and two by La Fauci. The chapters by Pieroni are all synchronic and discuss pronouns: she examines demonstrative and reflexive pronouns as well as *ipse* ‘himself’, the pronoun of identity or emphasis. By contrast, La Fauci studies inflections from a diachronic perspective: he examines the disappearance of case endings and the rise of periphrastic future and perfect formations in later Latin.

The main demonstrative pronouns of Latin are *hic*, *iste*, and *ille*. The traditional view is that *hic* refers to persons or things in physical proximity to or otherwise associated with the speaker. *Iste* is the demonstrative of the second person and *ille* that of the third. Interestingly, the Romance continuations of these pronouns do not always reflect the meanings found in Latin. Thus Spanish has a threefold distinction among its deictic pronouns, yet *este*, the reflex of Latin *iste*, is no longer used for persons or things close to the addressee, but for entities near the speaker. In the first chapter of the book, Pieroni makes a number of interesting observations concerning the usage of demonstrative pronouns. In historians, for example, *iste* only occurs in passages of dialogue. The traditional explanation would be that outside dialogue there are no addressees as such, so the use of *iste* would make no sense. Pieroni, on the other hand, tries to account for this phenomenon differently. For her, *hic* and *ille* are both ‘non-correlative’ deictic pronouns, the former for first-person deixis, the latter for other types of deixis. *Iste* is considered a ‘correlative’ deictic pronoun. This means that it is used by speakers who talk about entities associated with an addressee from the perspective of the addressee.¹ To me, this is just a complicated reformulation of the traditional theory. Besides, it does not really explain the reanalysis of *iste* found in Spanish.

I liked the second chapter of the book best. Here Pieroni discusses the use of reflexive pronouns, albeit in a somewhat outdated relational grammar notation. Reflexive pronouns are typically used to show that a third-person subject is doing something to itself or for itself rather than to or for someone or something else. But such reflexive pronouns do not always refer to the grammatical subject. The following examples, quoted from Pieroni’s article, demonstrate that things are more complicated:

¹ With regard to deictic shifts, Pieroni refers to Bühler’s theories, which by now are completely out of date; among the more modern works on the subject, one could e.g. have mentioned Haviland, J.B. 1996, *Projections, Transpositions, and Relativity*, in: Gumperz, J.J., Levinson, S.C. (eds.) *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity* (Cambridge), 271-323.
(1) A. Atilius et eius filius L. Atilius . . . dixerunt . . . (Cic. Caec. 27)
‘Aulus Atilius and his son Lucius Atilius said.’

(2) Neque eam (sc. sapientiam) umquam sui paenitet. (Cic. Tusc. 5.54)
‘And Wisdom is never dissatisfied with herself.’

(3) Erat ei hospes par sui. (Pl. Rud. 49)
‘He had a guest equal to himself.’

Ex. 1 contains the non-reflexive possessive eius, not suus. The reason is that a reflexive pronoun has to refer to the subject as a whole. If the subject consists of two co-ordinated noun phrases, suus can only be used with respect to both noun phrases taken together. In ex. 2 we find the impersonal verb paenitet, which requires an ‘experiencer’ constituent in the accusative. As this accusative is the most salient entity, it can select a reflexive pronoun. (Traditional grammars would call this accusative a ‘logical subject’; on subject properties of experiencers see Palmer, F.R. 1994. *Grammatical Roles and Relations* (Cambridge)). In ex. 3 hospes, the possessum, is the syntactic subject, but sui refers to the dative ei, the possessor constituent, which is more salient than the syntactic subject. This chapter by Pieroni is full of interesting examples which show that there is more to reflexivity than syntactic subjecthood; what I would have liked to see, though, is a more thorough discussion of what factors are involved in the selection or non-selection of reflexive pronouns. The so-called actor hierarchy (Foley, W.A., Van Valin Jr., R.D. 1984. *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar* (Cambridge), 59) would have been a good starting-point:

volitional agent > non-volitional agent > locative > theme > patient,

where $x > y$ means that $x$ is more likely to select reflexive pronouns than $y$. Similarly, the antecedent of a reflexive pronoun has to be higher on such hierarchies than the pronoun itself (see Van Valin Jr., R.D., La Polla, R. 1997. *Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function* (Cambridge), 398).

In the third chapter, Pieroni discusses the pronoun ipse. Like the English self-pronouns or German selbst, ipse can function as an intensifier (type a senior figure, *I think the minister himself, wrote the report*) or as a pronoun of identity (type the minister wrote the report himself, without help). As this double function is quite widespread across languages, it is worth asking what the two functions have in common. Pieroni believes that there is a basic meaning and that the two interpretations depend on distributional factors. The distribution of ipse is actually interesting in several respects. Regardless of function, for example, it can combine with