

mankind and the succession of world empires, is a feast for the analysis of false closure in a visual text. Closure in this artefact is always in the eye of the beholder. The river narrative begins at its source and ends in the Delta, where the Ptolemaic rulers, the successors of Alexander the Great, are celebrating a local festival. The image tells us that closure is to be found in the establishment of this empire but, for the intended viewer of the Middle Roman Republic, aware of the fortunes of the Ptolemies, the end of this image is historically false. The pictorial narrative may also suggest false closure on other levels, especially as viewers reflect on the cyclical character of empire as an enterprise *sine fine*. The impression of endlessness is also central to the narrative strategies of Greek hymns (e.g. the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, Hesiod's *Theogony* and the refrains of choral hymns), as I. Petrovic shows in Section 4. As gifts for the gods, the immateriality of hymns suggested ideas of longevity and durability. Furthermore, hymns could be endlessly re-performed. Yet the most convincing aspect of their false closure was their etymological connection with the verb *hypomenein* (to remain). The volume (falsely?) closes with an essay on *fama* by P. Hardie in Section 5. Hardie analyses contrasting meanings of *fama* as closure and false closure from Virgil and Horace to Petrarch and Vida. While the goal of *fama* in a literary life aims to convey a final image of achievement and recognition, its meaning of 'story' or 'rumour' denotes the constant circulation of words. Hardie explores how Petrarch, Chaucer, Milton and Vida attempt to transcend the mutable aspects of *fama* by associating their literary lives with Christian texts and God.

The jacket blurb informs the reader that the volume seeks 'to frame a future discourse on false closure in particular as an artistic phenomenon'. I would suggest that this collection already serves as such, and that subsequent research might result in (overly) refined versions of a fully occupied area. I suspect that the success of future research in the topic will also depend on what happens within and outside of Classics. As with the post-structural works that first informed Fowler, it is worth considering further interdisciplinary conversation. A dialogue with disciplines which characteristically confront notions of closure, such as the Performing Arts, Film Studies, Translation Studies and Classical Reception in its most recent configurations, may be profitable. As for the current state of play, this volume amounts to the first full work devoted to exploring how Fowler's sophisticated formulations can be elaborated further into exciting topics of discussion.

*University of Bristol*

LAURA JANSEN  
[laura.jansen@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:laura.jansen@bristol.ac.uk)

## LATIN SYNTAX

DANCKAERT (L.) *Latin Embedded Clauses. The Left Periphery*. (Linguistics Today 184.) Pp. xviii + 368, figs. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2012. Cased, €105, US\$158. ISBN: 978-90-272-5567-9.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X14001814

This impressive volume is innovative in two complementary respects. From the theoretical perspective, it represents a sustained application to an aspect of Latin syntax of the concepts of the current Chomskyan framework, in particular within its so-called 'cartographic' variant. Empirically, by contrast, it is distinguished by a reliance for the most part on a computationally searchable corpus of texts, thereby allowing for quantitative evidence to be adduced in support of the analysis of those Latin constructions which constitute the

book's central focus. Since these aspects of the work are likely to appeal to separate audiences, D. helpfully includes two substantial introductory chapters (pp. 1–93) which describe the constructions in traditional terms and explain the theoretical background. To accommodate further readers not well versed in Latin, he provides for every cited example not only translations but also part-of-speech annotations couched in the format of the Leipzig Glossing Rules. That said, for those without some grounding in modern syntactic theory, the book is unlikely to be an easy read. And while it is good that D. has considered the needs of different types of reader, some of the detail seems unnecessary. We do not, for example, need five pages in Chapter 2 on different uses of the subjunctive to prepare us for a brief allusion to one sub-type of subjunctive some 200 pages later.

The 'embedded clauses' of the title are of a particular kind, namely those which are introduced by a subordinating conjunction such as *cum*, *ut* and *si* and which contain a finite verb, in short what are here called 'adverbial clauses' (ACs). This excludes on the one hand clausal complements, with which the term 'embedded' is perhaps more commonly associated, and on the other non-finite adverbial expressions such as the ablative absolute. The properties of ACs are examined in some detail in Chapter 2, while Chapter 3 addresses the other half of the title: the left periphery. This is a term that derives from work by Luigi Rizzi in the late 1990s and represents a move to include what might otherwise be labelled pragmatic categories such as Focus and Topic into an extended syntactic representation. An example is *eum cum videro Arpinum pergam* (Cic. *ad Att.* 9.15.1), where the word *eum* appears to have been shifted out of the subordinate clause to which it logically belongs and to occupy the initial, or in the model adopted here a higher, position in the clause. Languages which instantiate such properties in their syntax have come to be called 'discourse configurational languages' and one of D.'s theses is that Latin belongs to this typological class. The study thus falls within the broad tradition of work inspired by Marouzeau's dictum: 'l'ordre des mots en latin est libre, il n'est pas indifférent' (quoted here on p. 19).

Although, when it is necessary, D. is prepared to adduce individual examples from elsewhere, for the most part he restricts himself to a body of prose texts of various genres drawn from the period 180 B.C. to A.D. 120 and amounting in total to some 650,000 words. The authors included in this corpus are Cato, Cicero (*Ad Atticum*), Varro, Velleius Paterculus, Columella, Pliny the Younger, Tacitus, Fronto and Apuleius together with the anonymous *Bellum Africum*, *Bellum Hispaniense* and *Bellum Alexandrinum*. These in turn are sub-divided according to text type (technical, epistolary, etc.) and period.

The example *eum cum videro Arpinum pergam* is an instance of one kind of hyperbaton, called here Left Edge Fronting 1 (LEF1), in which the preposed element is a pronominal element. This in turn falls into sub-classes, the first of which involves a relative pronoun and the second, as here, an anaphoric element functioning as a topic. The properties of each and the proposed analyses are discussed in detail in Chapters 4 and 5 respectively. The remaining two chapters are devoted to a different construction, dubbed LEF2, in which the conjunction is preceded by one or more full phrases. A notable difference between the two constructions is that LEF1 only occurs in absolute sentence initial position, as one might expect for an element functioning as a topic, whereas LEF2 is attested both when the AC begins the sentence and when it occurs after the main clause as in *conloqui videbamus in Tusculano cum essem* (*ad Att.* 13.17–18.2). In the final chapter, D. makes the intriguing suggestion that these types differ not only in their internal structure and their external distribution but also in their behaviour over time. In particular, LEF2 is well attested in texts from Cato down to the beginning of the Christian era, but tails off thereafter. There is a slight rise again in writers like Fronto and Apuleius, but this is attributed to a conscious imitation of older styles rather than to a reversal of the process of

linguistic change. This loss of LEF2 is then linked to the increased frequency of the order verb–object (VO), which comes in due course to rival and ultimately replace the classical OV order. The theoretical mechanism which accounts for this correlation is one of the technically most complex parts of the narrative. Moreover, D. admits that at this stage the diachronic argument is somewhat speculative and not yet fully supported by the statistical evidence. We need, for example, to be convinced that the differences are not to do with content and text type. It would also be good to see what the profile looks like when texts from later centuries are added into the picture. Even so, the overall conclusion, if sustainable, is a striking one and suggests more subtle and indirect ways of identifying change than simply looking at the superficial placing of the main clausal elements.

An obvious point of comparison is the volume *Latin Word Order* by Devine and Stephens (2006, reviewed in *CR* 60 [2010], 424–6), in which the authors likewise deploy the techniques of formal linguistics in an attempt to elucidate the structural factors determining the sequence of elements in the clause. Empirically the two studies complement each other since the focus of Devine & Stephens is on simple sentences whereas, as we have seen, D. has targeted a specific type of complex sentence. Yet the differences run deeper than this. Devine & Stephens borrow from the store cupboard of theoretical syntax in order to offer a new and more sophisticated elucidation of Latin grammar to those who work on the language. And yet, when all is said and done, they are Latinists writing for other Latinists. In the present volume, in a sense, the loan is repaid since in these pages the theoretician will also find much to ponder. This difference of approach is reflected in the way the theoretical model is handled. Devine & Stephens do not hesitate to introduce idiosyncratic features of their own, so that readers who have mastered their system may well be puzzled if they choose to move on to the general linguistic literature. D., by contrast, uses concepts and notations which are consistent with what is found in current mainstream syntactic research so any effort spent here is well invested for future forays. He offers too the possibility of typological comparison. Although this study is, as the title indicates, principally devoted to Latin, there is a substantial presence of material from other Indo-European languages (Greek, both Ancient and Modern, Sanskrit, Gothic, German and Bulgarian), from Romance descendants of Latin, most notably Italian (with one example rather strangely labelled as ‘Ancient Tuscan’), and from non-Indo-European languages such as Basque, Finnish, Hungarian, Malagasy and Quechua.

The book is in general well produced although there are occasional misprints and infelicities of English that more careful copy-editing would have eliminated. However, it will not do to end on a negative note. Although it is impossible in a short review to do full justice to the depth and detail of this excellent study, there can be no doubt that it is a significant contribution to our understanding of Latin syntax. I look forward to the ‘future research’ which D. promises us in the volume’s closing sentence.

*The University of Manchester*

NIGEL VINCENT  
[nigel.vincent@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:nigel.vincent@manchester.ac.uk)