Danckaert, L.


This book, entitled *Latin Embedded Clauses. The Left Periphery*, is intended “for classical philologists as well as for formal syntacticians”, as is stated in the preface (p. xv) and on the cover page. I will review it as a representative of the first category of readership. The book is divided into seven chapters. Chapter 1 presents the theoretical framework of Generative Grammar adopted. Chapter 2 is devoted to the internal syntax of adverbial clauses. Chapters 3-6 deal with the left periphery of embedded clauses, roughly covering the cases when an element precedes a subordinating conjunction at the beginning of a complex sentence (*Eum cum videro...*), and the connecting relative (*Quem ut...*). Chapter 7 presents these two phenomena in a diachronic perspective. The book also contains three indexes (language, person, and subject index) and references.

As a general conclusion is absent, it is difficult to determine what the new findings of this quite lengthy study are and how the author aims to enrich our knowledge of Latin phenomena. I have several problems with this book.

The main problem is with the discussion of the connecting relative\(^1\) (chapter 4, pp. 123-205), for which the author chooses the French term “relatif de liaison”. However, he does not use it correctly. In French, the *relatif de liaison* means “le pronom relatif de liaison”, and not “la proposition relative de liaison”. As a consequence of this, there are absurd statements such as “where the extracted phrase is a wh-pronoun introducing a so-called *relatif de liaison*” (p. 141), concerning Cicero’s example *Quae ille amennisimus fuerit nisi accipierit* (Cic. *Att.* 7.17.2). Firstly, it is inadequate to call *qua* a “wh-pronoun” (we are talking about Latin, not about English); secondly, *qua* cannot introduce a so-called *relatif de liaison* because it is a *relatif de liaison*. Formulations like “introducing the *relatif de liaison*” appear throughout in the book (*e.g.* p. 181) and make no sense. More importantly, from the beginning (p. 123f.), the author assimilates the phenomenon of the connecting relative with non-restrictive relative clauses, such as *Vos vadenti Hasdrubali ad Alpes Italianque, qui si se cum fratre consiuisset...* (Liv. 26.41.13). In the end he comes to the conclusion that the clauses containing a *relatif de liaison* “can be characterized as ‘quasi-main clauses’”. We already know this. Although there is no unanimous agree-

---

\(^1\) The term "connecting relative" is used by Woodcock, E.C. 1959. *A New Latin Syntax* (London), 188-9. I cannot see any reason why it should not be adopted.
ment about the status of the connecting relative,\textsuperscript{2} it is generally accepted that connecting relatives have anaphoric value and compete with anaphoric pronouns. This has been convincingly shown by Chausserie-Laprée (1969).\textsuperscript{3} The fact that clauses introduced by a connecting relative behave as main clauses and not as subordinate clauses in indirect speech by taking an infinitive, is also well-known.\textsuperscript{4} The absence of any discussion of this question in Latin as well as the absence of relevant references—Lavency’s as well as Lehmann’s monographs on Latin relative clauses\textsuperscript{5} are missing from Danckaert’s bibliography—make the author’s investigation useless. Additionally, without a distinction made between (true) relative clauses and connecting relatives (which must precede a subordinator) one wonders about the interpretation of examples such as Reliqua pars epistulae (= Bruti) est illa quidem in utramque partem, sed tamen non nullos interdum iacit igniculos virilis. Quod quale tibi videretur ut posse interpretari, misi ad te exemplum epistulae (Cic. Att. 15.26.2, quoted p. 131).

In my view, the connecting relative quod clearly resumes previous information, but the author envisages the case of a “non-restrictive relative clause” or, alternatively, exemplum as its nominal antecedent and even epistula from the previous sentence as its logical antecedent (in which case without agreement in gender) (!). The reader may rightfully ask: What is, after all, the relevance of the connecting relative for the general topic of the book, Latin embedded clauses?

There are other problems, such as: “there are reasons to assume that [hic, iste, ille, is] are demonstrative rather than personal pronouns” (p. 217); it is well known that Latin does not have a third person pronoun. The periodisation of Latin (p. 9) poses a problem on its own. The author’s subdivision into (i) Archaic Latin 200-100 BC, (ii) Classical Latin I 100-1 BC, (iii) Classical Latin II 1-50 AD, (iv) Late Classical Latin ca. 90-110 AD, and (v) 2nd century ‘mannerist prose’ ca. 150-180 AD is not what a classicist expects. The representatives of Classical Latin I, except Cicero’s letters, do not belong to Classical Latin prose: Bellum Africum, Hispaniense, and Alexandrinum, as well as Varro’s Res rustica. Furthermore, Varro’s treatise appears abbreviated as Agr. later on in the book (p. 121). Classical philologists use abbreviations following a well-established system, mainly that of the

\textsuperscript{2} Touratier, Ch. 1980. \textit{La Relative: essai de théorie syntaxique} (Paris), is known for contesting this phenomenon.


\textsuperscript{4} See Woodcock 1959, 189. See also, among others, Orlandini, A. 1994. \textit{De l’oratio obliqua comme papier de tournesol; une analyse pragmatique d’un phénomène du discours indirect en latin: le changement des modes}, IF 99, 168-89.

\textsuperscript{5} Lavency, M. 1998. \textit{La proposition relative} (Louvain); Lehmann, Ch. 1984. \textit{Der Relativsatz: Typologie seiner Strukturen} (Tübingen).