

**Frieda Edelstein, Carmen Fenechiu & Dana LaCourse Munteanu, *Sintaxă latină*.
I. *Sintaxa cazurilor*, Presa Universitară Clujeană, Cluj-Napoca, 2012, 166 p.;
II. *Sintaxa modurilor*, Presa Universitară Clujeană, Cluj-Napoca, 2014, 218 p.**

Maria Aldea*

Faculty of Letters, "Babeş-Bolyai" University, Str. Horea 31, 400202 Cluj-Napoca, Romania

As authors of the two volumes on the *Latin Syntax* published in 2012 and 2014, respectively, Frieda Edelstein, Carmen Fenechiu, and Dana LaCourse Munteanu bring to the attention of a wide audience the Latin syntax, a linguistic discipline pertaining to the classical philology, without which the study of the Romanian language syntax could not be fully covered and which unrighteously has lost ground.

In their analytical and interpretative approach, building on "the use of Saussure's notions of *signifiant* and *signifié* for the Latin syntax (i.e. the differentiation between the form and the content in the analysis of the syntactic relationship) and intending to present in a more systematic manner the syntactic material searching and identifying several uniform criteria applicable consistently throughout the analysis process" (p. 13), the volumes we herein present are working tools for "both advanced students and teachers" meant to provide them "a clear and concise work on the syntax of the Latin language" (p. 13).

The first volume deals with the syntax of cases and begins with a theoretical clarification which is fundamental for the comprehension of the purpose of syntax, namely the syntactic relationship. Created as a link "between two items forming a binary structure" (p. 17), the syntactic coordination and subordination relationship is essential for the interpretation of language facts, because it involves "two aspects: the **content** which refers to the nature of the link (in the case of coordination situations) or to the function (=F) (for subordination situations) and the **form** represented by the means of expression, i.e. the marker (=M)" (p. 17).

*Email address: aldea_maria@yahoo.com.

¹It is worth mentioning that when referring at the taxonomy of cases in the presentation of syntactic functions, the linguists relates their analysis to the model suggested by D.D. Draşoveanu.

It is well known that in Draşoveanu's opinion, the category of case has, according to the criterion of functional degree, three hypostases or ranks: (1) *1st rank cases* (or inflectional cases) which include "those cases expressed in nouns and pronouns, where the cases themselves generate functions" (in nominative – subject, subjective predicative complement, and false appositive; in accusative –

After describing the way in which the coordination and subordination relationships can be achieved (p. 17–24), the authors consider the agreement (p. 25–35) and proceed to its taxonomy in accordance with two criteria: rigorousness and extension; thus, they put forward the following typology according to the subordinated item: the rigorous, full grammatical agreement; the rigorous, partial grammatical agreement or simultaneous variation; the full grammatical agreement by attraction and *ad sensum* agreement.

Then, the linguists focus on the Latin system of cases. Keeping on the same systematic structure in their explanation, the authors provide for each grammar case a concise etymological information accompanied by the presentation of syntagmatic structures and the functions they generate with quite a few examples "extracted from both grammar books and the authors' readings. Poets and writers, whose works the factual material is based upon, are especially those taught throughout the Latin classes, e.g. Plautus and Terence for the Archaic period, Căsar, Cicero, and Sallust for the Republican period, Virgil, Horace, Titus Livy, and Tacitus for the Augustan and Imperial period, whereas the incursions in the Christian and medieval ages are few and only when the understanding of the syntactic evolution so requires" (p. 13).

As for the nominative (p. 37–41), we note that "from the point of view of the functional content, it is the case specific to the subject, the subjective predicative complement and to the appositive" (p. 37), with a "1st, 2nd, and 2nd prime order status"¹

(p. 37). Together with the 2nd prime order status, the nominative also carries out the function of subjective predicative complement which “is not under a double subordination situation since there is no verb subordination marker”² (p. 38). Concerning the vocative (p. 43), we notice that “it is encountered alone as a 1st order case, with no syntactic function and without a status of Tr³ [head element, M.A.’s note], though there are also recorded various situations where the vocative is head for a V2 [second order vocative, M.A.’s note] with the function of adjectival attribute” (p. 43). Particular attention will be paid to the genitive (p. 45–68). If from a synchronic point of view the adnominal genitive is most often encountered, the interpretation of the language facts from a diachronic perspective raises questions regarding “the chronology of the head of phrase and, implicitly, the function it carries out” (p. 45). According to several researchers, “the original and specific function of the genitive lies in the fact that it determines more closely the content of a noun”, while for others the genitive had first received an adverbial use. With regard to the dative (p. 69–82), the authors note two trends in the specialist literature concerning the functions the dative carries out: on

the one hand, it is considered “the case of the indirect object” but, on the other hand, this function is contested: “In the first case, absolutisation generates confusion, because the dative can accomplish other functions, too (attribute or adverbial uses) [...] In the second case, the elimination of indirect object function leads to inaccuracies and inconsistencies, to a lack of determination for the functional content of certain relations, as well as to the recognition of various species or values as syntactic functions” (p. 69). As for the accusative (p. 83–126), the authors draw attention to the wrong translation of the name of the case, considering that it should be “*causativus casus*”, because it denominates “which or who is the cause of causation” (p. 83). The linguists present scrupulously numerous syntactic values of the accusative and underline for each identified value “the heads of phrase, because, on the one hand, the description gains more consistency, and, on the other hand, one can observe more clearly the relationship settled between Tr – Ts [the head of phrase and the subordinate (dependent) term – M.A.’s note] and the syntactic function the accusative carries out” (p. 83).

Subsequently, they focus on the locative (p. 127–128) and the ablative (p. 129–163). If, for the loca-

direct object, adverbial of time, attribute, and objective predicative complement; in dative – indirect object, adverbial of place, and attribute; in genitive – genitival attribute); (2) 2nd rank cases, such as “cases involved through (by) the agreement, expressed in words agreed (in gender, number, and case)” which “generates the same function, i.e. the adjectival attribute”; (3) 3rd rank cases, i.e. “the cases required by prepositions and expressed in nouns and pronouns [...], according to the rule of prepositions” (Draşoveanu, 1997d, p. 94–96; see also Draşoveanu, 1997c, p. 80–81). When some structures raising problems in terms of case identification as in the following construction: “*baltă* [matter] from *las-o baltă* [let the matter drop], [...] «non-casus» or «casus generalis»”, otherwise, when there is an “identity of cases, the agreement excepted” (Draşoveanu, 1997e, p. 118), the solution suggested by the Cluj Professor of Romanian syntax is to “reveal a new means of expression of the syntactic relationships, i.e. the simultaneous casual variation or the second casual inflection”, which is in fact “a means of intra-clause subordination, other than the agreement” (Draşoveanu, 1997h, p. 286; see also Draşoveanu, 1997f, p. 128–130).

However, in comparison with Professor D.D. Draşoveanu’s opinion, the authors always consider the objective predicative complement and the subjective predicative complement as belonging to the 2nd rank cases, governed by an agreement, whether they are expressed by bare nouns or adjectives.

²According to D.D. Draşoveanu, the objective predicative complement and the subjective predicative complement are subordinated only to a nominal head, but in the presence of a verb (“mono-subordination thesis”). However, despite the fact that both form a syntagm with a verb, none of them is subordinated to the verb (“thesis of conditioning syntagms”). Moreover, the objective predicative complement and the subjective predicative complement are defined by the term ‘conjunct’, which means something else than subordinate or dependent, because the subjective predicative complement is a remote attribute dislocated by the copula verb *a fi* ‘to be’ or by a full lexical verb, while the objective predicative complement is a remote attribute dislocated by a full lexical verb (in this respect, see Draşoveanu, 1997g). In comparison with English, we remark that in Romanian a remote attribute dislocated by a full lexical verb occurs both in nominative and in accusative.

³D.D. Draşoveanu conceives the syntagm as “the basic item—both minimal and maximal—of syntagmatics, i.e. the general category which subordinates both the clause and the phrase as its species”, while defining the syntagm as a group of two lexemes, in a given hypostasis, and the relationship between them (term – relationship – term), where the relationship “is not generated by the presence of terms, but the terms are created by the presence of a relationship” (cf. Draşoveanu, 1997a, p. 40, 42).

Therefore, according to the type of relationship—i.e., coordinator or subordinator as expressing ‘the various forms of the same general concept’—, D.D. Draşoveanu identifies a subordinate syntagm (= head – subordinating relationship – dependent word) and a coordinate syntagm (= preceding conjunct – coordinating relationship – succeeding conjunct) (see Draşoveanu, 1997b, p. 50–51).

tive, the researchers observe that “the Indo-European locative is not preserved in the Proto-Indo-European period with its specific inflectional markers except the endings in *-a*, *-o* / *-e* [...] (rarely a root-final consonant)”, but can be identified in the Pre-classical period, especially in the use of *domi* ‘at home, in the house’, *ruri* ‘in the country’ (p. 127), as well as in other nouns or names of towns, for the ablative we witness a turning point, because this case “[...] presents the most numerous functions and species compared to other Latin cases, not surprisingly given the fact that it is the result of the syncretism of three Indo-European cases: the ablative (with a separation role), the instrumental and the locative [...]”; as a consequence, this “caused largely its connection with prepositions for disambiguation reasons, without ceasing to work alone, synthetically [...]” (p. 129).

The second volume deals with the syntax of verbal moods. Structured in two units with two appendices, the work begins with a series of general remarks (p. 9–11) on “the grammatical categories where it [the verb – M.A.’s note] is involved: aspect, type of action, mood, tense, voice, person, and number.” (p. 9).

The first part is entitled *Modurile personale* [Finite Verb Forms] (p. 13–154) and focuses on this subject as shown by the title; among other topics, “the unit includes the particular use of the infinitive as a substitute for some finite verb forms, as well as the case of the infinitive (both historical / narrative and exclamatory / interrogative)” (p. 11). The authors draw up a typology of clauses and make distinction between the main clauses (p. 28–30) and the subordinate (dependent) clauses (p. 33–39); thus, they examine the values of verbal moods and tenses in the main clauses (p. 15–27) and subordinate ones (without connective, p. 39–41, and with connective, p. 42–154) by identifying and explaining the various contexts of occurrences; in the latter category (subordinates with connective) the authors place emphasis

on clauses introduced by a conjunction (p. 63–154).

The second part, entitled *Modurile nepersonale* [Non-finite Verb Forms] (p. 155–205), deals with those “noun forms of the verb which don’t have morphological inflectional markers for the category of person” (p. 155). The linguists draw up an inventory of the situations specific for each class, i.e. the infinitive (p. 157–173), the participle (p. 174–186), the gerund (p. 187–192), the gerundive (p. 193–202), and the supine (p. 203–205), while emphasizing the complex structure of non-finite verb forms (illustrated by a double nature with morphological and syntactic effects), namely verbal and nominal “substantival—for the infinitive, the gerund and the supine—or adjectival—for participle and gerundive” (p. 155).

Two appendices accompany the presentation of verbal moods: the first deals with the sequence of tenses (p. 207–211) in subordinate clauses with a predicate in both indicative and subjunctive moods, while the second develops the reported or indirect style (p. 213–215).

Backed by a sound critical apparatus revealed by numerous footnotes and reference lists related to both volumes, the *Latin Syntax* of Frieda Edelstein, Carmen Fenechiu, and Dana LaCourse Munteanu reached its goal. A logic, clear, and coherent work due to its precise manner of classifying the language facts, the volumes acquire a double value: on the one hand, a real scientific value thanks to the sound information and its substantiation, that makes it readable and comprehensible for both specialist and non-specialist audience; on the other hand, a symbolic value due to its circumscription to the model established by the founder of the Cluj syntax, professor D.D. Drașoveanu whose concepts, ideas, taxonomies—*syntagm*, *relation*, *simultaneous casual variation*, *typology of cases*, etc.—the authors use in the description of the Latin syntax, apart from certain occurring differences.

Bibliography

- Drașoveanu, D.D. (1994–1995). *Sintaxa limbii române* [The Syntax of Romanian], a course taught at the Faculty of Letters of “Babeș–Bolyai University”, Cluj-Napoca.
- Drașoveanu, D.D. (1997). *Teze și antiteze în sintaxa limbii române* [Theses and Antitheses in the Syntax of Romanian], Clusium Publishing House, Cluj-Napoca, 1997.
- Drașoveanu, D.D. (1997a). *Relația – creatorul termenilor* [Relationship as a Maker of Terms], in Drașoveanu, 1997, p. 40–44.
- Drașoveanu, D.D. (1997b). *Relația – organizatorul termenilor* [Relationship as an Organiser of Terms], in Drașoveanu, 1997, p. 45–51.

- Drașoveanu, D.D. (1997c). *Categoriile gramaticale de relație ale limbii române* [The Relational Grammatical Categories of Romanian], in **Drașoveanu, 1997**, p. 78–93.
- Drașoveanu, D.D. (1997d). *O clasificare a cazurilor cu aplicare în problema posesivelor*, in **Drașoveanu, 1997** [A Classification of Cases Applied to the Possessive Issues], p. 94–100.
- Drașoveanu, D.D. (1997e). *Variație cazuală concomitentă* [Simultaneous Casual Variation], in **Drașoveanu, 1997**, p. 113–118.
- Drașoveanu, D.D. (1997f). *Nominativul și acuzativul – schițe sintactice cu adnotări* [The Nominative and the Accusative – Annotated Syntactic Drafts], in **Drașoveanu, 1997**, p. 119–130.
- Drașoveanu, D.D. (1997g). *Predicatul. Definiție. Clasificare – desinențial și intonațional* [The Predicate. Definition. Classification – Inflectional and Intonational Predicate], in **Drașoveanu, 1997**, p. 195–208.
- Drașoveanu, D.D. (1997h). *Postfață* [Afterword], in **Drașoveanu, 1997**, p. 284–286.