Wirklichkeitsferne ist jedoch ihrerseits konstituierendes Merkmal einer Redegattung, die der Unterhaltungskunst zuzurechnen ist und als solche eine eigenständige literarische Entwicklung nahm\(^{(279)}\). È un effetto dello sviluppo come \textit{Schaudeklamation} che ha acquistato sempre maggiore spazio. Ciò nonostante lo schema retorico come la conservazione delle \textit{partes orationis} resta, soprattutto nelle declamazioni XIV e XV, a tenere vivo un possibile confronto con le \textit{Schuldeklamationen}, mentre nella declamation X la libertà e la distanza dallo schema diviene maggiore. Anche il fondamento giuridico rivela, a giudizio della H., la stessa libertà. È qui io credo che le declamazioni si allontanino sia dalla dottrina retorica, sia dalla pratica giurisprudenziale meno di quanto non pensi la stessa H., come ho cercato di mostrare sopra. Ma è vero che questo si nota più in decl. XIV e XV che in X, e certo il retore ha abbandonato l’antica idea della vittoria nella causa: \textit{scribit non ut vincat, sed ut placeat} (come dice Votieno Montano in Sen.contr.9 pr.1). Sviluppati sono i motivi letterari della \textit{meretrix}, dell’\textit{amator} e del mago. ‘Populärphilosophie’ ed \textit{egressiones} mitologiche svolgono pure la funzione di conferire una risposta a esigenze sociali; nella contrapposizione padri-figli si conferma una aspettativa dei giovani studenti di retorica, anche se la decl. X non ne è un buon esempio. La funzione ‘apologetica’ non si può integralmente negare, ma è in contrasto con la natura mitologica delle declamazioni. La H. è convinta (\textit{282}) che queste declamazioni più che portatrici di reali funzioni sociali, siano portatrici del gioco letterario che, inevitabilmente, interagisce con i rapporti sociali del tempo; essi divengono certo generali, ma non in modo standard. Si è, tuttavia, istituita una unità tematica delle declamazioni tenute da sofisti viaggianti che le ha portate a strumento di presentazione di tematiche universali. Si pone, quindi, il problema del rapporto con altri generi dell’inventiva: caratteristica delle declamazioni sembra essere divenuta la possibilità di scandagliare dettagliatamente tutte le possibilità di azione e riflessione, anche in contrasto, talvolta paradossale, di argomenti e sentimenti. Le declamazioni si avvicinano alle episostole letterarie più che alla commedia, ma costituiscono una particolare forma di intrattenimento, \textit{‘eine besondere Form der Unterhaltung’} (\textit{284}). Anche a questo proposito, sono d’accordo, sarei, solamente, più esitante a escludere ogni intento polemico o apologetico o comunque interessato a presentare posizioni filosofiche del tempo. Molto dettagliata è quindi la conclusione, ma l’idea più importante è, direi, quella che lo sviluppo delle \textit{Schaudeklamationen} ha portato a un cambiamento profondo del genere, senza slegarlo completamente dalla retorica, dalla giurisprudenza e dalla letteratura.

Il giudizio complessivo è, dunque, che questo libro si deve giudicare senz’altro buono. La parte più debole è quella legata alla conoscenza della retorica dei grandi manuali, ma l’attenzione a tutti gli aspetti è costante, i giudizi sono prudenti e ben equilibrati e il contributo alla conoscenza delle declamazioni, non solo delle tre studiate, è notevole e condivisibile. Ho dedicato molto tempo allo studio di questo libro, ma molto vi ho appreso e di molte idee sono debitore alla H. Le sono quindi grato e credo che lo debbano essere tutti coloro che si occupano di questo argomento.

Università di Bologna  

\textit{Gualtiero Calboli}


Definiteness and specificity are terms most commonly associated with discussions of languages which express these concepts overtly through articles. In Latin grammars, definiteness and specificity are often neglected or dealt with in a way...
that must strike modern linguists as bizarre; for instance, in the type *neque is sum qui gravissime ex vobis mortis periculo terrear* (cf. Caes. *Gall.* 3, 30, 1), the subjunctive in the relative clause shows that *is* is specific, but traditional grammars prefer to speak of consecutive relative clauses. For these reasons, I was looking forward to reading Eckert’s study, which promised to be an important contribution to our understanding of specificity in Latin. My expectations were fulfilled in some sections of the book, while I was disappointed in others.

Chapter 1 discusses the secondary literature and terminological questions. I would have wished for a more concise summary of the literature and for a more detailed explanation of the terminology. For instance, Eckert’s definition of a focal element as that part of the clause which contains the central assertion («inhaltlicher Schwerpunkt», p. 41) is somewhat vague, and his assertion that every utterance consisting of at least two elements contains a focal and a non-focal element is not as intuitively obvious as he thinks (p. 44). Consequently, it remains unclear why he believes that relative clauses and indirect questions differ so fundamentally as to what sections of the clause are focal (p. 46).

In chapter 2 Eckert studies the distribution of theme (given information) and rheme (new information) in various types of *ut*-clauses. He tries to back up his claims with a large number of examples, but the explanations he offers are insufficient and no translations are given. In fact, there are no translations anywhere in the book. If Eckert had included his own translations, he would have made it much clearer what elements he regards as focal or as theme / rheme. But he seems to think that this is obvious most of the time. Only on pp. 59–60 does he concede that there are some problematic cases. I would go further and argue that a large number of his examples are unclear in this respect, as I would assign theme and rheme differently.

An example from chapter 4 (p. 103) will illustrate the problems. In Cic. *Marcell.* 16 we find the sentence *nostri enim sensus ut in pace semper, sic tum etiam in bello congruebant*. Eckert describes the *ut*-clause as the rheme and the *sic*-clause as the focal theme. While I agree that the *sic*-clause is probably focal, I would assign theme and rheme the other way round. Actually, since rhemes present new information, they are probably much more often focal than themes, which is why I would for instance interpret most of the examples on p. 331 differently. Eckert himself is not consistent in his interpretations either: the same example from Cic. *orat.* 34 appears twice in chapter 6 (p. 166 and p. 167), each time classified differently.

Definiteness, specificity and genericity are the topics of chapter 3. I was surprised that no mention is made anywhere of C. Lyons, *Definiteness*, Cambridge 1999, a book Eckert would have profited from. While most of the theoretical discussion is useful, Eckert’s practical application of these terms seems less convincing because, unlike most other scholars, he does not restrict specificity to noun phrases. But the problems do not end here. According to Eckert, specific elements precede the verb in theme-focus clauses and in rheme clauses, while non-specific elements follow; in rheme-focus clauses and in theme clauses it is the other way round. If this were correct, word order would be quite predictable in Latin. But since it is so often impossible to establish unambiguously what is theme, rheme or focus, and since Eckert’s use of the term ‘specificity’ is so un-
orthodox, the claims concerning Latin word order do not persuade me. More Latin examples would have been necessary.

Note also that in footnote 174 on p. 96 we are told that quisque is outside the scheme outlined above because it is always specific. This statement about being outside the scope of the rules is made because we do of course find *ut quisque* + verb in focal rhyme clauses, and according to Eckert the constituents preceding the verb are non-specific here. I fail to see why a constituent which is always specific should behave differently from one which can also be non-specific, and I prefer to doubt Eckert’s views on word order.

Eckert turns to *ut*-clauses in chapter 4. He believes that *ita* is used in the specific part of a clause if it correlates with a following *ut*-clause and that it is used in the non-specific part of a clause if it correlates with a preceding *ut*-clause. It is the other way round for *sic*. There are several Latin examples in this chapter, but the discussion is insufficient and I was left wondering why such a pattern should exist.

In chapter 5 the pronouns *is*, *hic*, *iste* and *ille* are examined. Perhaps the most widespread view is that *is* is exclusively used for discourse deixis, while *hic*, *iste* and *ille* are primarily used for spatial deixis and differ in the degree of remoteness from the speaker, *hic* being employed for things near the speaker, *iste* for things near the addressee, and *ille* for things elsewhere. In Eckert’s opinion, all four pronouns can be used for spatial deixis. He distinguishes between only two degrees of remoteness. *Is* and *hic* are employed for things close by and *iste* and *ille* for remote things. *Is* and *iste* are, like *ita*, non-specific when referring back in a text, but specific when referring to something that is to follow. *Hic* and *ille*, by contrast, are specific when referring back, but non-specific when referring to something that is to follow; they resemble *sic* in this regard. These are striking claims and a thorough discussion with a large number of examples and explanations would have been needed to make them plausible; as it is, I find them unconvincing.

Chapter 6 deals with pronominal correlation and chapter 7 takes up adverbial correlation again. Eckert examines the assignment of focus, theme and rhyme in detail. One of his conclusions is that *quod … hoc* behaves like *ut … sic* and *quod … id* like *ut … ita*. The reason for this is that the specificity patterns of *hic* and *is* are the same as those of *sic* and *ita*, respectively. The criticisms I have are the same as those for chapters 4 and 5.

Eckert looks at some other correlative constructions in chapter 8, for instance *etsi … tamen* and *tam … quam*. According to him, *tamen* is a ‘Konjunktion’ meaning ‘dennoch’ if it is used in the specific part of a clause, while it is an adverb meaning ‘gleichwohl’ if it is used in the non-specific part of a clause. I regard it as an adverb in both cases. What I find more convincing is his statement that *tam*-clauses always agree with their *quam*-clauses in being focal or not and in being theme or rhyme; the explanation is that the two states of affairs compared in these clauses are identical or at least have much in common.

However, in general I have doubts about the validity of Eckert’s way of classifying sentences and of drawing conclusions about theme and rhyme or focus from this. On p. 249, for instance, he cites a sentence from Cic. *Att. 10*, 11, 5: *Vettienum mihi amicum, ut scribis, ita puto esse*. Eckert regards Acl as specific and main clause statements as non-specific. He believes that the Acl can either be the theme, in which case the main
clause is the rhyme, or the rhyme, in which case the main clause is the theme. Since *ita* refers back, it must be in the non-specific part of its clause, and the pre-verbal part of a clause is non-specific in a theme clause, but not in a rhyme clause. Thus, the AcI is said to be the rhyme. According to Eckert’s focus assignment rules, it is the second element that is focal in such an AcI. This means that *mihi* is focal. To me this seems counter-intuitive; I would classify *mihi*, which is in the unstressed Wackernagel position, as the least focal element in the AcI.

Before the bibliography, one finds a short summary of the results (chapter 9, pp. 255–7) and detailed appendices (pp. 258–342). The latter are collections of Eckert’s data, most of which come from Cicero. In the data there are hardly any misprints, but I cannot help wondering how useful the appendices are; even though the examples are classified according to what is focus and theme / rhyme, much remains unclear, especially how Eckert arrived at his classifications.

What, then, should one make of the book as a whole? I have focused on its weaker points. However, it also contains a number of interesting theories which would merit further investigation. I hope that in future work Eckert will take up these issues again and present his arguments in more detail.

Finally, I have noticed some inaccuracies, which I point out in the following list; most of them are minor and do not diminish the value of the book.

p. 33, footnote 59 For «effacius» read ‘efficacius’.
p. 42, footnote 89 For «repräsentativen Sätzen» read ‘präsentativen Sätzen’.
p. 46 For «fokussiert» read ‘fokussiert’.
p. 59 Eckert speaks of consecutive subject clauses, which sounds like a contradiction in terms.
p. 63 «Cic. top. 1» should be ‘Cic. top. 2’ and «der postverbale Positionen» should be ‘der postverbalen Positionen’.
p. 71, footnote 128 «Possessiva» should be ‘Possessiva’.
p. 72, example (b) The definite article has to be replaced by an indefinite article.
p. 73 «Definitheit-/Indefinitheit-Unterscheidung» should be ‘Definitheit-/Indefinitheit-Unterscheidung’.
p. 79, footnote 149 English *man* is always a noun. Eckert seems to confuse it with German *man*.
p. 103 For «ohne bedeutungsunterscheidender Funktion» read ‘ohne bedeutungsunterscheidende Funktion’.
p. 120, footnote 211 ‘15. und’ ought to be ‘15 und’.
p. 129 *διαφανείμενον* should be *διαφανείμενον* and *πρόσομι* should be *πρόσομι.*
p. 130, footnote 225 τούτον should be τούτον and ὁτός should be ὁτός.
p. 131 παρεξελέγω should be παρεξελέγω and τοῦτον should be τοῦτον.
p. 143 For *is* is *read is, istic* in the table.
p. 148 For «zu tun» read ‘zu tun haben’.
p. 169 For «dieselben Verhältnisse wie bei den *hoc* ... quod/ut-Korrelationen» read ‘dieselben Verhältnisse wie bei den *id* ... quod/ut-Korrelationen’.
p. 172, footnote 300 For «relativi» read ‘relativo’.
p. 185 It is unclear to me why Cic. *Tusc.* 3, 49 is cited because it does not contain any word relevant to the discussion.
p. 187, footnote 314 For «der einziger Beleg» read ‘der einzige Beleg’.
p. 198 In the first example ‘AD’ should be ‘Ad’.
p. 202 For *classe* read *classes* under the fourth example.
p. 220 There should be no comma before «läßt».
p. 223 For «konkreteten» read ‘konkreten’.
p. 228 For «nspez*nspez.spezT-Fok» read ‘nspezR*nspez.spezT-Fok’.
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p. 248 Cic. Verr. II 2, 178 is cited; in the footnote that goes with it, Eckert tells us that he prefers the reading of manuscript b instead of num, but in the text itself he writes num, not non, which is what we find in b.

p. 253 Under the first example, vidisse should be vidisset, and under the second example aratorum should be aratorum.

p. 264 The example from Cic. ac. 2, 89 would be easier to understand if there were a question mark after quid.

p. 267 In the last example there should be ‘Vt’ instead of ‘Ut’.

p. 281 In the passage from Cic. Verr. II 1, 71, ‘filius’ should be ‘filium’.

p. 284 In the example from Cic. Client. 6, ‘posulo’ should be ‘postulo’.

p. 292 The example marked as coming from Cic. S. Rosc. 53 is actually from chapter 52 and ‘nugatoria’ should be ‘nugatora’.

p. 298 In the example from Cic. Mantil. 39, ‘quidam’ should be replaced by ‘quidem’.

p. 304 In the example from Cic. div. in Carc. 1, ‘Sì’ should be ‘Sí’.

p. 315 Cic. Phil. 5, 22 ought not to have been cited; it does contain ‘ita’ and ‘ut’, but they are not correlative.

On the whole, the bibliography is accurate. There are some inconsistencies as far as abbreviations of first names are concerned, and Donnellan’s article is in ‘PhR’ rather than «The PhR». The book edited by García-Hernández has ‘autonómia’ in its title, not «autónoma». Haudry’s article should contain ‘Parataxe, hypotaxe et corrélation’, not «Parataxe, Hypotaxe et Corrélation». Hawkins’ article has the word ‘Grammaticality’ in it, but not «Grammatically».

One of the authors of the last book is Strecker, not Stecker.

All Souls College, Oxford

Wolfgang David Cirilo de Melo


In der Einführung (Introduction, 9–13) betont Ch., daß aus der griechischen Literatur klar erkennbar sei, daß die Viehzucht im agrarischen Bereich als etwas Eigenständiges angesehen wurde, eine wichtige Rolle spielte und zu den Beschä-