

Maria SELIG, Die Entwicklung der Nominaldeterminanten im Spätlatein (ScriptOra, 26), Tübingen 1992 (Narr), XX und 238 S.

The development of the Latin pronouns *ille* and *ipse* into definite articles in the Romance languages has been a scholarly issue during the entire last century. Data have been collected and counted, and sometimes analysed, and suggestions have been made with respect to the order of the development and its causes as well as to the relationship with other historical developments such as the development of a more rigid word order. Maria SELIG has succeeded in adding a book to the abundant literature which not only gives new statistical data and intelligent analyses, but also exploits in a creative way recent functionally based insights into the pragmatic organisation of sentences and texts.

In the introductory chapter (1–30) 'Die Entstehung des Artikels im Romanischen' S. presents her view on the feasibility of using the written Latin tradition for constructing a picture of Romance (or the Romance languages) as it was before the period for which we have Romance texts. She argues that the available Latin texts are just pieces that are part of a broad and varied language which offered a spectrum of forms of Latin adjusted to different social, intellectual and esthetic situations in a way similar to modern languages. Our texts reflect for the larger part the standard language and they are moreover subject to well-known rules of written composition, rules that both restrict and widen the number of available expression types. Yet, written standard Latin is Latin and follows major changes in the structure of everyday language. According to S. standard and everyday Latin did not develop into two more or less distinct forms before the third/fourth century A.D. So, the existence of Latin texts is an asset for the Romance scholar (and not, as some colleagues seem to suggest, a liability), which (s)he can turn into an instrument when studying particular developments. Within the Latin corpus the linguist can select the most suitable texts for the topic to be studied.

For her study of nominal determiners S. has chosen two types of texts, juridical documents on the one hand and saint's lives on the other. The juridical texts range from 200 B.C. (the 'Fontes iuris Romani antiqui' of BRUNS) to charters from Cluny (until A.D. 1200).

The five Merovingian saint's lives date from ca. 580–800. The former texts, due to the need of precision, contain an overdosis of determiners. The latter form a highly popular text-type with a long history of oral presentation.

The first chapter contains also a clear overview of the state of the art of this topic and an outline of the remainder of the book.

Although the choice of the corpus is quite well argued it could be expected to have certain negative consequences from the very outset. Given the fact that the main aim is to reach a better understanding of the development of (attributive) *ille* and *ipse* we can on the basis of their classical uses predict that we will not learn much about *ille* in legal documents, whereas the addition of *ipse* is possible in so many circumstances that it is difficult to distinguish excessive usage from 'abnormal' unclassical usage. In Classical Latin *ille* in its non (locally or temporally) deictic use occurs in texts in which several persons or entities participate. In such texts *ille* can be used anaphorically but it is definitely not a simple continuity device. See now BOLKESTEIN/VAN DE GRIFT (Participant tracking in Latin discourse, in: Linguistic Studies on Latin, ed. by J. HERMAN [Amsterdam 1994] 283–302). In fact, *ille* can be used in contrastive situations – see PINKSTER (The pragmatic motivation for the use of subject pronouns: the case of Petronius, in: Études de linguistique générale et de linguistique latine offertes en hommage à G. Serbat, ed. by S. MELLET [Paris 1987] 369–379) – and when there is a Topic shift. This typical use is well-known to the authors of the saint's lives (for example in the 'Vita Trudonis' [ca. A.D. 780] *illi vero pueri*, compare very frequent pronominal *At ille*, etc.). Finally, *ille* is used to indicate that the reader or hearer is supposed to be able to identify a person or thing on the basis of his general knowledge. A well-known example is *senex ille Caecilianus* (Cic. S. Rosc. 46). These are not the type of examples for which one expects parallels in legal documents, which on the contrary try to leave no doubt about the identity of a person or object. We do indeed find extremely few cases of *ille* (*Ille* occurs with some greater frequency only in the 12th century Cluny charters, especially in adverbial expressions.) As for *ipse*, it underlines the identity of a person or thing: 'precisely this person or thing, and no-one (nothing) else', as in *eam ipsam ad te epistulam scripsi* (Cic. Att. 12.37.1). *Ipse* is compatible with *is*, as in the preceding example, but also with *hic*, *idem*, *ille* and *iste* (see also below). In Classical Latin *ipse* has specific distributional properties which distinguish it from the pronouns proper. In fact, the best way to describe it is as a Praedicativum, that is as something that is neither used attributively, nor 'substantively', cf. PINKSTER (Latin Syntax and Semantics [London 1990] 145). In the saint's lives the identity stressing function of *ipse* is frequent and nicely exploited in the following sentence about the miraculous reappearance of a missing swine: *sanctus vir ad monasterium reversus est, ipsumque verrem in ipso introitu monasterii iacentem reperit ...* (Vita Trudonis 290.25–26). The author of the 'Vita Wandregiseli' (ca. A.D. 700) has a high frequency of *ipse*, but this is largely due to his fondness of combinations like *ipse vir Dei*. In this type of text there is no doubt about who is meant by *vir Dei* and, therefore, no need for an article-like determiner. The relative frequency of *ipse* in such texts may be explained in the same way as VÄÄNÄNEN (Le journal Épître d'Égérie [Itinerarium Egeriae]. Étude linguistique [Helsinki 1987] 51, n. 114) has explained it for the 'Peregrinatio': «l'étonnement naïf devant les lieux saints».

Chapter 2 (31–77) contains quantitative data on a number of determiners, on their frequency both when used attributively and when as independent pronouns, on their distribution over functions in the clause such as first actant, adverbial and genitive attribute. The determin-

ers dealt with are *is, hic, ille, iste, ipse, idem, qui* (relative connection), as well as *suprascriptus* and the like and possessive pronouns.

The data seem to be reliable. I have checked the frequencies for the 'Vitae Wandregiseli', 'Hugberti' (ca. 750) and 'Trudonis' and found a remarkable difference from the data of S. only in the case of pronominal *ille* in the 'V. Wandr.' (14 instead of S. 29).

The inclusion of the possessive pronouns is based on the consideration that these too guarantee the identifiability of their head nouns and, therefore, are also some form of definiteness marker. In the 'Vitae' they constitute almost half of the determiners taken into account. However, there are other means to ascertain identifiability, such as genitives of nouns and quantifiers, as in *pietas Domini, omnes habitacionis monasterii*. In all the texts the genitive *eius* is a very frequent sign of definiteness of its Head noun. To get a clear picture of the role of the determiners proper we would like to know how often definiteness is ascertained by such means, how often by determiners 'sensu stricto', and how often definiteness has to be inferred from the context or is obvious on the basis of the meaning of the constituent (for example *sol* and in the 'Vitae' expressions like *beatus puer* (V. Trud. 277.3). (For a paper read at the Vulgar Latin conference in Bologna (1988) I computed that in Caesar definiteness is established most of all by his frequent use of proper names and rarely by *is, hic* and *idem*. In the 'Peregrinatio' proper names are less frequent and determiners are the major means for establishing definiteness. However, in the 'Peregrinatio' too definiteness has to be inferred most of the time and more often so than in Caesar, as is shown by a comparison between the use of means to establish definiteness (def) in Caesar Gal. 1.2–12 (378 noun phrases) and in the 'Peregrinatio' 1–4 (306 NP's):

	Caesar	'Peregrinatio'
non-referring	39	26
referring	339	280
indefinite	57	48
definite	281	232
proper names	107	42
common nouns + def	102	89
common nouns 0	72	101.

For the 'Vitae' the numbers of the determiners proper are low. For example there are only 129 instances of adjectival *ille* and the same number for *ipse*. The distribution is uneven. For example, the 'V. Trud.' has 82 instances of *ille* or *ipse* (more than 3 a page), 73 of them being *ille*. The 'V. Wandr.' has 61 instances of *ille/ipse* (more than 5 a page), 47 of them being *ipse*. The 'V. Trud.' has much more 'classical' Latin than the 'V. Wandr.' Is this an explanation for the uneven distribution? Or is it the fact that the 'V. Trud.' is longer with more detailed adventure passages, in which *ille* has a better 'chance' (Cf. S. 141, n. 58)?

Chapter 3 ('Artikelentstehung und Nominalflexion') (79–105) is devoted to a discussion of the often postulated relationship between the development of articles and the erosion of case/number endings. In one version the determiners are taken to be more conservative with respect to their flexional endings which made them attractive means to signal the functions of the noun phrases in their clauses. S. argues that this time lag cannot be observed in the data. The other thesis that the emergence of articles is related to a wider shift in constituent ordering, which in this case led to the expression of grammatical information in front of the noun, whereas it used to be expressed in its ending, is shown to be equally untenable. Finally S. argues that that the use of the determiners as bearers of grammatical information must

have followed their development into obligatory (in)definiteness markers. A very clear and convincing chapter.

Another argument against assuming a cause/effect relationship between erosion of the declension and article formation is the fact that the spread of articles is uneven in various lexical classes of noun phrases and in various functions in the clause. COMPANY (La extensión del artículo en el español medieval, in: Romance Philology 44 [1991] 402 – 424) shows that in Spanish texts from the period 1044 – 1499 concrete nouns have determiners, among which articles, from the very beginning. The use of articles then spreads to substantivized adjectives (*moros, castellanos*) and then further. The article is rare in preposition phrases, but frequent in subject noun phrases.

Chapter 4 ('Artikelentstehung und (In)definitheit') (107–176) contains the body of the research. It is divided into four parts, a theoretical introduction, an analysis of the data of chapter 3 for the two types of text, and a section on the conditions under which the determiners *ipse, ille, hic* and *iste* are used in the corpus.

In the theoretical section 4.1 S. sets forth what she understands by definiteness: roughly, an entity is definite if the hearer/reader is able (or thought to be able) to uniquely identify that entity. A further distinction is made between 'specific' and 'non-specific' entities. Whereas the determiners under discussion all signal definiteness, S. (113) regards *ipse, idem, qui* and *suprascriptus* as specific, whereas *ille* and *is* are not, in spite of instances of cataphoric use of these determiners in combination with restrictive relative clauses, as in the Longobardian example (CDL 77.228.16 – 18): *et si mihi advenerit ille persona qui mea voluntate faciat, ut post ovito meo in ipsa cellola vivere diveat ad ipso sancto loco serviendum* (I return to this below).

Among the determiners S. (115) regards *is* as the most 'empty' member. The future articles *ille* and *ipse* can be said to have an additional semantic 'component' ('distance' and 'sameness', respectively), which in a sense they lost in the course of the development. However, this 'loss' is not the essential element in the development. The most remarkable thing is that marking definiteness became obligatory and that the Romance languages adopted *ille* and *ipse* instead of the already available *is*, which «von seiner semantischen Struktur bereits dem definiten Artikel entspricht» (115).

In a third subsection S. shows that definiteness may arise through various factors, such as anaphora, knowledge of the world, uniqueness of the referent ('the sun'), occurrence in or with uniquely specifying contexts ('the wife of my uncle') and 'associative anaphora' as in 'I have bought a new house. The roof is leaking, unfortunately', see HAWKINS (Definiteness and Indefiniteness [London 1978]), cf. PINKSTER (Latin Syntax and Semantics [London 1990] 94). These finer distinctions are exploited in the analytic sections which follow.

S. shows a good command of the literature and the exposition is clear and to the point. I only think that her presentation of *is* is incorrect. If we look at *is* in Classical Latin from the perspective of the preceding paragraph it is obvious that the use of *is* is almost restricted to anaphora, and as an anaphoric device is different again from the other devices (BOLKESTEIN/VAN DE GRIFT). It cannot be used for 'knowledge of the world' (whereas *ille* can, see above), and only in a limited way for associative anaphora, an example of which is Suet. N. 21.2 '*Niobam se cantaturum*' per Cluvium Rufum consularem pronuntiavit ... coronamque eam ... in annum sequentem distulit (examples from Plautus onwards can be found in BUCHWALD'S TLL article *is* 470.26 ff). For examples of *is* with substantivally used adjectives see TLL s.v. *is* 459.84 ff.; PINKSTER (Notes on the syntax of Celsus, in: Mnemosyne 45 [1992] 513 – 524, 515 – 516) and MUDRY (Éléments pour une réconsideration de la langue et du style de Celse, in: Latin vulgaire, latin tardif IV, ed. by L. CALLEBAT [Hildesheim 1995, 685 – 697 694 – 696]).

This in my view incorrect description of the relationship between *is*, on the one hand, and *ille* and *ipse*, on the other, leads to incorrect formulations later in the book as well. I do, for example, not believe that *is* has a 'focalizing' function (179), nor that *ille* and *ipse* divided the 'Funktionsgebiet' of *is* between them (182).

Section 4.2 deals with the use of determiners in legal texts. S shows that *is* is gradually diminishing as an anaphoric device, instead of which the metalinguistic expressions of the type *suprascriptus* became popular. From the Longobardian texts onwards *ipse* becomes the prime anaphoric device. Since anaphoric *ipse* is relatively frequent in other text types as well S. concludes that it was used as an «articoloid» in a larger part of the Romania than its successors are used in the modern Romance languages, and this not only in written Latin, but in spoken Latin as well (135). From the 11th century onwards *ipse* decreases again. S. attributes this among other things to the Carolingian policy of adhering to more classical standards. As for *ille* this is used when a new entity is introduced into the discourse, especially when followed by a restrictive relative clause.

S.'s suggestion that the decrease of *ipse* is due to the Carolingian, educated, return to a more conservative form of Latin is not very plausible (see her own note 50 on p. 137), especially since *ipse* and *ille* were functionally different. As to the functional difference between the two, S. finds additional corroboration of this in the lack of instances of cooccurrence with the same Head noun. However, S. gives one example of *is ipse* and there is also one of *hic ipse* in her material (BRUNS, III 121.22). The lack of *ille ipse* is rather due to the infrequency of *ille*. As a third point of criticism I mention S.'s treatment of *ipse* + proper name. She explains the increased use of *ipse* in this context as another proof of the development of the determiner system. However, *ipse* can in all these cases be understood in its basic classical meaning.

In section 4.3 S. deals with the use of determiners in her narrative corpus. Explicit marking by determiners of indefinite newly introduced entities is very rare and in the case of definite newly introduced and anaphorical entities exceptional (139, 142). This means, of course, that we are still far away from a stage with articles. The indefinite determiners *quidam* and *unus* are used when protagonists or localities are introduced with some prominence. Prominence or communicative relevance also favours the use of definite determiners for newly introduced entities. For the use of determiners in the case of referential anaphora an important factor is the distance and the presence of interfering entities. However, in some texts (especially 'V. Wandr.' and 'V. Trud.') marking of immediately contiguous entities occurs. Similar considerations hold for the use of pronouns. In these texts *is* is rarely used for subjects. *Ille* and *ipse* are more frequent in that position. In general S. notes an increase of the use of determiners.

The low frequency of *is* in subject position is a feature of Classical Latin as well. A comparison of nominative forms of *is* and the oblique forms in Cicero's rhetorical works gives a proportion of 1:2.5. The proportion for *ille* is 1:1. As to the increase of determiner use, although I tend to believe S., there are certain facts, mentioned by S., which leave room for doubt. There is, in the first place, the already mentioned inclusion of possessive pronouns in the group of determiners. Secondly (142 – 150), *ipse*, *unus*, *hic (hoc tempore)*, *ille (illis temporibus)* are also used in their proper ('classical') meaning. Especially *ipse* is a difficult case. S. (148) refers to its frequency in 'V. Wandr.' (see above) as a proof of increased marking of anaphorical entities. But the translation 'himself' is quite possible and, as S. mentions elsewhere (153, n. 72), *ipse* by its very meaning almost presupposes that an entity characterized by it is known. Apart from noting an overall quantitative increase S. has good qualitative observations (e.g. the density of anaphorical use of *ille* in parts of the 'V. Trud.') which convince more. I will turn to these now.

Section 4.4 deals with «die Funktionsgebiete der Definitdeterminanten». *Ipse* is most often used anaphorically (see my comments above) and is avoided as ‘unclassical’ in the ‘V. Trud.’ (see again above). It is used when commonly known entities are introduced, but, for example, not (or almost not) when the noun phrase is also accompanied by a restrictive relative clause (see below on *ille*). *Ipse* is used more often adjectivally than as a pronoun (slightly more, I would say) which S. explains on the basis of its meaning. Pronominal *ille*, on the other hand, is much more frequent than adjectival *ille*. In the texts S. has studied *ipse* clearly has a more limited range of use than *ille*.

*Ille* is used anaphorically, although initially in a restricted way. S. explains the anaphoric use, quite plausibly, on the basis of *ille*’s indicating ‘non-nearness’. The main use of *ille* is in introducing new, but known entities into the discourse, especially important ones. This is to be expected (see above). Examples of associative anaphora are rare, but cf. Greg. Tur. Liber S. Iul. 38 *pater ... ad basilicam properat ... pauperibus qui ad matriculam illam erant cibum ... protulit* (‘the almshouse that belonged to, was near, the church’). There are several examples of *ille* determining a noun which has another restrictive or contrastive attribute, such as *illi cinque* – out of six – and *ille alius*, respectively. And, finally, there are quite a few instances of *ille* determining a noun with a restrictive relative clause, such as S. Iul. 32 *nunc pauca de locis illis in quibus eius habentur reliquiae*. The section ends with a few observations on *hic* and *iste*.

As S. rightly observes, all these uses are known from Classical Latin. For associative *ille* compare Pl. Am. 673 *ad aquam praebendam ... adveni ... illi puteo*. Interesting examples can be found in the description of the Basilica of Saint-Denis dated ca. 830 and published by BISCHOFF (Eine Beschreibung der Basilika von Saint-Denis aus dem Jahre 799, in: *Kunstchronik* 34 [1981] 97–103). For *ille* with restrictive or contrastive attributes cf. Quint. I.O. 8.3.30 *illi primi homines* and for *ille alius* LÖFSTEDT (Syntactica I [Lund 1942] 366). For *ille* in combination with a restrictive relative clause cf. Cic. Ver. 5.30 *ex illa domo praetoria quae regis Hieronis fuerat* (see BULKHART art. TLL *ille* 358.8). What is interesting is that, whereas parallels of these uses are rare in Classical Latin, they are relatively frequent in the small corpus S. has studied. She denies specifically that the occurrence of *ille* with restrictive relative clauses can be seen as a widening of the function of *ille*, while suggesting that this use was «obligatorisch» (her quotation marks) already in Classical Latin. However, I do not think it was and the sheer number of these instances must mean something. Interestingly, in Old English there is also an increase of the number of instances of determiner + relative clause (see CHRISTOPHERSEN, *The Articles. A Study of their Theory and Use in English* [Copenhagen 1939]). As for *hic* and *iste*, it is interesting to note their exchangeability in expressions like V. Wandr. 20.9 *mundi istius* and 22.28 *huius mundi*.

The final chapter (‘Zusammenfassung der Ergebnisse’) starts with a discussion about the competition between *ipse* and *ille* (§ 5.1). S. argues for a stage of coexistence of *ipse* and *ille* with different text-pragmatic functions, as described above. When determination became obligatory, *ille* won in most Romance languages because of its unmarkedness (184).

This may well be. Personally I would prefer a different emphasis: *ille* had the potential from Classical Latin onwards and we may be beguiled – as S. (185) also suggests – by the remarkable frequency of *ipse* in this corpus.

Section 5.2 returns to the process of article formation. S. argues that it is not so much the loss of meaning of the predecessors of the articles that licences this process as a gradual expansion of the number of contexts in which they became obligatory. Some form of determination was obligatory in Classical Latin, for example with ‘empty’ nouns like *locus* and *tempus*. In certain other contexts they fulfilled an identifying or a focalizing function when several

potential referents were involved. The decision to use or not to use a determiner in such contexts is to some extent arbitrary on the part of the speaker/writer. The process of article formation can therefore be viewed as an increasing use of an inherent potential rather than as a reaction against developments elsewhere in the language system.

This insistence on internal factors in the process of article formation is certainly laudable. However, it still does not explain why the process took place.

In section 5.3 S. discusses two types of explanation of the article formation in Romance. She returns to the explanation already discussed in ch. 3 according to which the article allows the expression of grammatical information analytically in front of the noun instead of synthetically in the word ending of the noun. In this explanation article formation is just a part of a wider change from synthetic to analytic. S. rightly points out that article formation cannot be put on a par with, for example, the replacement of synthetic forms of the perfect by analytic ones. In the latter case existing forms were replaced. In the case of article formation forms were 'forced' to perform a hitherto not existing function.

The second type of explanation of article formation discussed by S. regards the suggestion by THOMPSON (Modern English from a typological point of view. Some implications of the function of word order, in: Ling. Berichte 54 [1978] 19-35) and others that determiners compensate for the fixation of word order and the loss of word order as a means of ordering theme and rheme constituents within their clause. S. points to certain empirical difficulties in her material for this type of explanation. On the other hand she observes a tendency in the least literary 'V. Eufros.' to mark preverbal subjects by a determiner, whereas postverbal subjects are usually continuous and unmarked. So there may be some, if not yet well understood, correlation between determiners and word order.

The last section is brief and sketchy and evokes more questions than it solves. The degree of fixation of word order is not the same in all Romance languages. It is not clear to what extent this correlates with differences in the determiner system.

In conclusion, S. has written a thorough and thought provoking study. Good empirical observations and analysis. Fair critical discussions of contemporary theories. There is still room for further research, especially, I would say, about *ipse*, but S. has given a good example of how this might be done.

Harm PINKSTER