LL Latin Linguistics Toulouse 2015

18e Colloque international de linguistique latine, Toulouse, 8-13 juin 2015
18th International colloquium on Latin linguistics, Toulouse, June 8-13, 2015

Livret d'abstracts

Book of abstracts

Hinc colloquium cum veniunt in unum locum loquendi causa.

SÉANCES PLÉNIÈRES / PLENARY SESSIONS

Latinophonie et diastratie complexe : pour un repositionnement du rapport latin écrit / latin parlé

Michel BANNIARD
Université de Toulouse Jean Jaurès

Cette communication s'intègre à une problématique pluridisciplinaire, puisque, partant des recherches modernes sur la genèse des langues romanes, et sur l'évolution du latin dit « vulgaire » et tardif, elle cherche à faire remonter l'étude de l'outillage conceptuel encore couramment employé dans ces deux champs à un reparamétrage aux temps antérieurs, ceux du latin dit classique. L'idée première part d'une constatation inévitable : la lecture des éditions commentées des grands auteurs « classiques » conduit le linguiste un peu attentif à un certain étonnement, puisque la réalité palpable de la « bonne langue » se réduit comme une peau de chagrin dès que le lecteur sort des quelques auteurs du canon, autrement dit s'il s'aventure avec attention chez Tite-Live, Salluste, Sénèque, Tacite, etc… : les notes infrapaginales, comme les introductions fourmillent de remarques du type « la langue classique ne dirait pas ainsi » (sans parler du pullulement des variantes dans le monument de référence *Hoffmann-Szantyr*). Bien entendu, la poésie provoque une pluie de commentaires semblables (remontant parfois aux grammairiens latins eux-mêmes) sur les écarts par rapport à la norme. Un peu de recul par rapport à cet *habitus*, conduit à se demander précisément ce qu'est cette norme, car si toutes les fluctuations (qualifiées d'anomalies, métaplasmes, licences poétiques, voire vulgarismes) étaient intégrées dans la norme, celle-ci prendrait un tout autre sens, ne serait-ce qu'en se libérant d'une tautologie : une fois décrétés « hors norme » des tours qui n'ont aucune raison linguistique d'être singularisés, on crée en fait un artefact. Cet artefact « classique » a provoqué par ricochet l'invention de l'artefact « vulgaire », les spécialistes navigant ainsi entre deux hypostases. Mais ce faisant, les philologues ont créé un monde langagier imaginaire qui, d'une part a peu de chances d'avoir eu une réalité objective et d'autre part réduit l'évolution langagière à un phénomène entropique dépourvu de dynamique positive. Il est proposé d'appliquer au latin d'époque classique au sens large (-200 >> + 200) une grille inspirée de la sociolinguistique moderne en s'occupant uniquement de la catégorie des variations diastratiques. Leur répartition en une série de niveaux distincts, mais en interférence réciproque, construit un modèle complexe où les écheveaux langagiers se mettent en place selon une topologie moderne.

Complément : registres du et en LPC, continuum latinophone

I) Acrolecte : Latin parlé d'apparat : celui des grands discours (*ars dicendi*, "art de plaider") et de la philosophie (conférences, symposiums).

II) Métalecte : Latin parlé soutenu : celui des rapports solennels au sénat (*rationem reddere*, "rendre des comptes"), des généraux et des proconsuls de retour de mission, etc. en situation ritualisée.

III) Katalecte : Latin parlé contenu : celui par exemple des officiers subalternes, mais aussi celui des régisseurs (*uillicus*) quand ils s'adressent au propriétaire de manière un peu surveillée ou d'un esclave domestique quand il s'entretient avec son maître de questions personnelles (éducation). Ce niveau de langue correspond au phénomène bien connu de la *mimésis*. Même un *rusticus* illettré peut imiter certains traits du latin soutenu.

IV) Hypolecte : Latin parlé familier : celui des échanges privés ou semi-publics dans les face à face non formalisés, mais plus ou moins contrôlés. On le rencontre – par séquences - dans les lettres de Cicéron, dans les pièces de Plaute, chez Horace, etc.

V) Basilecte : Latin parlé relâché : celui des surprises, des confits, des accidents, de l'intimité désordonnée, etc... Il n'est pas réservé au *uulgus*, mais peut très bien apparaître dans la bouche de l'élite, justement en situation hors norme. On le rencontre aléatoirement dans des graffitis, sur des tablettes...

VI) Paralecte : Latin parlé technique : celui des marins, soldats, cochers de cirque, gladiateurs, artisans qui comporte ses propres boucles informationnelles, ses tics, son lexique, etc... Il ne forme évidemment pas une langue à part, mais s'incruste dans l'ensemble latinophone. Il a été repéré notamment sur des papyri, poteries, etc...

Références

Adams J. N., 2007, *The Regional Diversification of Latin, 200 BC-AD 600*, Cambridge.

–– 2013, *The Social Diversification of Latin,* Cambridge.

Banniard M., 2012, Le latin classique existe-t-il ?, in Duvauchelle F. (éd.), *Latin vulgaire-latin tardif IX.* 57-78.

–– 2013, *The Transition from Latin to the Romance Languages,* in Maiden M., Smith J. Ch. (dir.), *The Cambridge History of Romance Languages*, t. 2, Cambridge, 56-107.

Labov W., 1978, *Le parler ordinaire, La langue des ghettos noirs des Etats-Unis*, 2 vol., Paris.

Löfstedt E., 1933, 1942, *Syntactica*, *Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins*, t. 1 (2è ed.), Lund, 1942 ; t. 2, 1933.

Lüdtke H., 2009, *Der Ursprung der romanischen Sprachen. Eine Geschichte der sprachlichen Kommunikation, Zweite vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage,* in *Dialectologia pluridimensionalis romanica*, Kiel.

Reichenkron G., 1965, *Historische Latein-Altromanische Grammatik,* t. 1, *Das sogenannte Vürlagrlatien und das Wesen des Romanisierung*, Wiesbaden.

Retour sur les marges de la subordination complétive en latin

Colette Bodelot
Université Blaise Pascal – Clermont-Ferrand 2

En donnant au terme « marges » le double sens de « périphérie ; bords » et de « cas atypiques ou non standard », nous nous attacherons tout d'abord à l'étude de l'extraposition de certains constituants de la proposition complétive ((pro)nom, SN, termes en *qu-*) par prolepse, *traiectio* ou (re)montée (*move*) du thème en **kw-*. Nous montrerons que ces phénomènes, qui ont, du moins en ce qui concerne l'extraposition ou l'anticipation d'un (pro)nom ou SN, une motivation pragmatique, entament les limites « naturelles » segmentales des propositions et ont, de ce fait, des répercussions variables sur l'interprétation structurale, et la morpho-syntaxe de la (macro-)phrase.

Dans un deuxième temps, nous étudierons, en partant de la définition usuelle de la proposition complétive comme une proposition substantive, capable de commuter, comme actant ou argument d'un noyau verbal, avec un pronom neutre du type de *id*, des « cas-limites » de construction complétive, et nous interrogerons, à propos de certaines subordonnées qui semblent indûment intervenir en lieu et place de complétives, quels facteurs rendent possibles de tels corrélats insolites.

L'étude sera menée dans une optique de synchronie large, du latin préclassique au latin postclassique – avec, à l'occasion, une échappée de vue sur le latin tardif. Sans prétendre à l'exhaustivité, nous nous proposons de soumettre à l'étude une sélection de structures complexes, qui semblent particulièrement intéressantes dans l'optique qui est la nôtre, en les illustrant d'exemples empruntés à différents auteurs de Plaute à Tacite.

Notre approche sera essentiellement syntaxique et pragmatique, sans que nous négligions entièrement les points de vue morphologique et sémantique. L'unité et l'apport nouveau de l'étude consistent dans l'intérêt constant porté à l'ordre tactique ou à la succession des constituants dans l'énoncé, d'une part à ses motivations pragmatiques, d'autre part à ses répercussions morphosyntaxiques sur la chaîne phrastique.

Références

Amacker, R., 1998, Ordre des mots et subordination : la *traiectio* chez Varron, dans B. García-Hernández (ed.), *Estudios de Lingüística Latina*, Madrid, Ediciones Clásicas, 139-154.
Bodelot, C., 1987, *L'interrogation indirecte en latin. Syntaxe – Valeur illocutoire – Formes*, Paris, Société pour l'Information Grammaticale.
–– 2000, *Espaces fonctionnels de la subordination complétive en latin. Étude morpho-syntaxique et sémantico-énonciative*, Louvain-Paris, Peeters.
–– (éd.), 2003, *Grammaire fondamentale du latin. Tome X, Les propositions complétives en latin*, Louvain-Paris-Dudley, MA, Peeters.
Bortolussi, B., 2014, La construction proleptique avec *facere (ut)*, dans B. Bortolussi, P. Lecaudé (éd.), *La causativité en latin*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 113-130.
Christol, A., 1989, Prolepse et syntaxe indo-européenne, dans G. Calboli (éd.), *Subordination and Other Topics in Latin*, Amsterdam-Philadelphie, J. Benjamins, 65-89.
Danckaert, L., 2012, *Latin Embedded Clauses. The left periphery*, Amsterdam / Philadelphie, J. Benjamins.
Muller, C., 1996, *La subordination en français*, Paris, A. Colin.
Rosén, H., 1992, Die Arten der Prolepse im Lateinischen in typologischer Sicht, dans O. Panagl, Th. Krisch (éd.), *Latein und Indogermanisch*, Innsbruck, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 243-262.
Spevak, O., 2010, *Constituent Order in Classical Latin Prose*, Amsterdam-Philadelphie, J. Benjamins.

Argument/satellite distinction and absolute verbal use in Latin stative verbs

Conceptión Cabrillana
University of Santiago de Compostela

As the title suggests, this study adopts a functional framework, in which the lexicon of predicates is taken to be the predetermining factor in their syntactic conditions of use: the number of the obligatory elements required and their lexical and functional characteristics. For the theoretical model that argues for the relation between the meaning of the verb and the properties of constituents considered obligatory that accompany the predicate, cf. Dik (1989), Van Valin-LaPolla (1997), Pinkster (2015) (I thank H. Pinkster for giving me the opportunity to read his work, which is still unpublished). Some applications of this model can be found in Baños *et al.* (2003), Torrego *et al.* (2007).

Accordingly, this paper will begin by addressing the problematic issue of the distinction between constituents obligatorily demanded by the predicate for the grammaticality of the construction (arguments) and elements which are not necessary for this (satellites). The issue arises not only from a general perspective, but also in specific cases, such as that of three Latin predicates that share —among other things— a semantic notion of "permanence": *maneo*, *permaneo* and *remaneo.* At the same time, and given that these verbs are also linked by the mechanism of preverbation, it is essential to examine also whether the presence of different preverbs modifies the syntactic characteristics of structures forming the verbs, as well as the potential semantic differences between them. For this reason, the current session consists of two different but closely interrelated blocks.

In the first section I will begin with a study of material drawn from use-based lexicons and corpus analysis of the verbs in question, with the aim of facilitating a first approach to the differentiation (i) of the semantic content that they can have, and (ii) of their possible general complementation patterns. It will be, firstly, the treatment in the database of the research group REGLA ("Corpus of government and complementation on Greek and Latin"). On specific points of the analysis, this corpus will be extended to include other authors and works, or the whole PHI. It is in this part of the investigation that a fuller assessment will be made of the problems that arise in the determination of the possible argumental nature of some constituents and the question of absolute verbal uses; this point is seen with greater complexity given the proximity between the content of a locative, existential and/or copulative nature found in various stative verbs. The study of lexical features of the various constituents with which the verb combines, the comparison with the behaviour of other (quasi-)synonymous predicates, and the importance of pragmatic information, will be mechanisms to help identify the syntactic-semantic nature of each case, without the existence of ambiguous cases being possible to rule out entirely.

The study of syntactic-semantic differences between the simple verb and its corresponding compounds will be addressed in the second section. For this purpose, various procedures of analysis will serve to confirm the possible differences proposed thus far; these procedures will be, essentially, the study (a) of the expression of the duration of permanence, and (b) of the contexts of co-occurrence of simple verbs and verbs with a preverb. Differences will not always be clear, which suggests a possible neutralization of the expected distinctions in some cases, in such a way that the language is seen to be compelled occasionally to draw on additional lexical and grammatical means for explicitly specifying these presumed distinctions.

References

Baños, José M., Cabrillana, Concepción, Torrego, M. Esperanza & de la Villa, Jesús (eds.) 2003, Praedicatiua. *Complementación en griego y en latín*, Anejo 53 de *Verba*, Santiago de Compostela, Universidad de Santiago de Compostela.

Database REGLA ("Rección y complementación en griego y latín" ["Corpus of government and complementation on Greek and Latin"]): < http://www.uam.es/proyectosinv/regula/index.html>.

Dik, Simon C. 1989, *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part I: The structure of the clause*, Dordrecht, Foris.

Pinkster, Harm, 2015, *Oxford Latin Syntax. I: The Simple Clause*, preliminary version (accessed on 02/2015).

Torrego, M. Esperanza, Baños, José M., Cabrillana, Concepción & Méndez Dosuna, Julián (eds.) 2007, Praedicatiua II. *Esquemas de complementación verbal en griego antiguo y latín*, Zaragoza, Universidad de Zaragoza.

Van Valin, Robert D. & LaPolla, Randy J. 1997, *Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function*, Cambridge, CUP.

Latin linguistics and literary interpretation

Caroline KROON
Amsterdam Centre for Ancient Studies and Archaeology
University of Amsterdam / VU University Amsterdam

As Latin linguists we do not work in isolation. On the one hand, we are involved in a constant exchange of ideas with general linguists and linguists of other languages, in a joint attempt to detect the universal principles of language and human communication, and to draw up general theories of language and language use.

On the other hand, as Latin linguists we also have a natural discussion partner in our Latinist colleagues working in the field of literary studies and literary criticism. When philology developed as an academic discipline in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, literary and linguistic methods went hand in hand. But the situation quite drastically changed in the twentieth century. The integration of linguistics and literary studies was given up, also in classical philology, and both disciplines went their own, separate ways, each employing its own methods, jargon and descriptive tools.

In the last few decades, linguistics has moved into new directions (e.g. pragmatics, discourse linguistics, cognitive linguistics, discourse analysis) which have brought the linguist closer to the literary critic. Pioneering work has for instance been done by Leech & Short, in their influential monograph *Style in Fiction* (1981, 2nd revised ed. 2007). A more recent study worth mentioning for its use of the methods and concepts of linguistics in the study of literary style is Dancygier (2012), working within the framework of cognitive stylistics. Dancygier (2012: 30) speaks of this modern form of stylistics as a "field of research where language is discussed in terms of specific textual choices and their impact on the special quality of the individual text or genre." A major research aim of this 'bridge discipline' is to provide language-based evidence in order to support, adapt or challenge the subjective interpretations and evaluations of literary critics and cultural commentators (Burke 2014: 2).

In the field of Classics, a comparable reunification of linguistics and literary studies is currently high on the research agenda of Dutch scholars (see e.g. Allan & Buijs 2007, and the current NWO research program *Ancient War Narrative,* Van Gils et al. to app.). In my paper I will present some of the results of this research agenda thus far. In the first part I will discuss the outlines of our 'Amsterdam' tool of analysis of narrative texts, which unites, in a complementary way, insights and concepts from discourse pragmatic linguistics, cognitive linguistics, and narratology. In the second part, I will then illustrate how the application of this tool may yield more insight into the use of the historic present across different Latin narrative texts and authors, and how the type of 'stylistic' analysis involved may complement and support literary approaches to these texts. Starting with the historic present in Virgil's *Aeneid* (Pinkster 1999; Adema 2008), I will make some observations on Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (Kroon 2007) and *Heroides* (Kroon 2012), after which I will turn my attention to Caesar's *Gallic War* (e.g. Stienaers in prep.) and Tacitus' *Annals*.

References

Adema, S. M. 2008. *Discourse Modes and Bases. A Study of the Use of Tenses in Vergil's Aeneid.* Diss. VU University Amsterdam.

Allan, R. J. & M. Buijs 2007. *The Language of Literature: Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts.* Leiden: Brill.

Burke, M. 2014. Stylistics: From Classical rhetoric to cognitive neuroscience. In: M. Burke (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Stylistics*. London/New York: Routledge, 1-7.

Dancygier, B. 2012. *The Language of Stories. A Cognitive Approach.* Cambridge: CUP.

Gils L.W., I.J.F. de Jong and C.H.M. Kroon to app. *Textual Strategies in Greek and Latin War Narrative*. Leiden: Brill.

Kroon, C.H.M. 2007. Discourse Modes and the use of tenses in Ovid's Metamorphoses. In R. J. Allan & M. Buijs (eds.). Leiden: Brill. 65-92.

–– 2012. *Voce voco*. Some text linguistic observations on Ovid *Heroides* 10. *Mnemosyne* 65.2, 238-250.

Leech, G. and M. Short. 1981, 2nd revised ed. 2007. *Style in Fiction. A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. Harlow: Longman.

Pinkster, H. 1999. The present tense in Virgil's Aeneid. *Mnemosyne* 52.4, 705-717.

Stienaers, D. (in prep.) Report in Latin War Narrative. Diss. VU University Amsterdam.

Déchiffrer les chiffres : la linguistique latine a-t-elle besoin de comptages et de statistiques ?

Dominique LONGRÉE
Université de Liège, LASLA et Université Saint-Louis Bruxelles, SeSLa

La linguistique latine ne pouvant se concevoir que comme une linguistique de corpus, les dénombrements, comptages et pourcentages se sont largement imposés aujourd'hui aux latinistes. Ainsi, les tableaux chiffrés, encore rares à l'origine des colloques internationaux de linguistique latine, sont depuis devenus omniprésents et presque incontournables.

On peut toutefois s'interroger sur la significativité et, dès lors, parfois également sur l'intérêt des chiffres fournis et ce, pour plusieurs raisons : on remarquera tout d'abord que la prise en compte d'une occurrence unique ou de quelques occurrences peut suffire à remettre en cause ce qui paraissait auparavant une certitude (par exemple, l'analyse de la coordination comme un marqueur d'isofonctionnalité syntaxique) ; ensuite, tout comptage pose la question de la représentativité du corpus et des critères retenus pour l'identification des items à dénombrer ; enfin et surtout, reste à interpréter les chiffres et à préciser quels types de phénomènes ceux-ci peuvent révéler.

Pour tenter de mieux percevoir dans quelle mesure les comptages ont été et sont encore réellement utiles à la linguistique latine, on se placera en premier lieu dans une perspective historique : après avoir envisagé les prémices d'une linguistique latine quantitative, on montrera comment celle-ci a pu se développer grâce à la création de bases de données textuelles, d'abord mécanograhiques, puis numériques, grâce à la création d'index qui requéraient lemmatisation et analyse morphosyntaxique des textes et, plus récemment, grâce à la mise en ligne sur le web de ces bases textuelles.

On s'intéressera dans un second temps à l'utilisation que les latinistes ont pu faire des données chiffrées recueillies. La plupart du temps, elles ont donc été utilisées pour étudier des distances entre textes : tantôt ces données ont mis en évidence une évolution diachronique, tantôt elles ont permis de distinguer des genres, des styles ou des idiolectes particuliers. Plus rarement, les comptages ont servi à dégager des corrélations entre phénomènes, et se sont avérés être de précieux auxiliaires pour la description même des systèmes linguistiques.

On s'interrogera dans un dernier temps sur la manière dont les comptages doivent être appréhendés : dans la plupart des disciplines scientifiques faisant appel aux chiffres, le recours aux tests statistiques semble un préalable à toute interprétation ; en matière de linguistique en général, et de linguistique latine en particulier, c'est loin d'être systématiquement le cas. Cette position est souvent pleinement assumée par le linguiste, partant du principe que des variations langagières ne peuvent être le fruit du hasard. A partir de l'examen de quelques cas concrets, on montrera que le principe de précaution peut, et même doit, toutefois s'appliquer également quand il s'agit de dénombrer des mots, lemmes ou catégories linguistiques. Grâce aux outils informatiques dont on dispose aujourd'hui, la contrainte qui en résulte n'est que fort limitée, par rapport au bénéfice évident que peut en tirer la linguistique latine.

Références

Charpin François, 1989, Étude de syntaxe énonciative : l'ordre des mots et la phrase, in G. Calboli (éd.), *Subordination and other topics in Latin, Proceedings of the third Colloquium on Latin linguistics, Bologna, 1-5 April 1985*, Amsterdam / Philadelphie : John Benjamins, 503-520.

Évrard Étienne & Mellet Sylvie, 1998, Les méthodes quantitatives en langues anciennes, *LALIES* 18 : 111-155.

Longrée Dominique & Mellet Sylvie, à paraître, The contribution of the research on Latin texts to the French quantitative linguistics : From lemmatization to the grammaticometry and textual topology, *in* S. Loiseau (éd.), *Quantitative Linguistics in France*, RAM Verlag.

Mellet Sylvie, 1987, *L'imparfait de l'indicatif en latin.* Louvain/Paris : Peeters.

Mellet Sylvie & Purnelle Gérald, 2002, Les atouts multiples de la lemmatisation : l'exemple du latin, *in* A. Morin & P. Sébillot (éds.), *JADT 2002, 6èmes Journées internationales d'Analyse statistique des Données Textuelles,* Saint-Malo : Irisa et Inria, vol. 2, 529-538.

Accusative and Infinitive, prolative infinitive, and nominative and infinitive

Harm PINKSTER
www.harmpinkster.nl

The verbs *iubeo*, *veto* (*voto*), *patior*, and *sino* receive separate discussion in Kühner and Stegmann: I.715–18. These verbs, according to them, have two major constructions, exemplified by (a) and (b). Ex. (a) shows an accusative and an active infinitive; (b), an accusative and a passive infinitive.

(a) Iubet igitur **nos** Pythius Apollo *noscere* nosmet ipsos.
('Accordingly the Pythian Apollo bids us "learn to know ourselves".' Cic. *Fin*. 5.44)

(b) *Pontem* qui erat ad Gen<a>vam iubet *rescindi*.
('He ordered the bridge at Geneva to be broken down.' Caes. *Gal*. 1.7.2)

K.-St. describe *nos* in (a) as the object/patient of the governing verb and the infinitive as a 'prolative' infinitive (my terminology); (b), by contrast, they take as an instance of a 'proper' accusative and infinitive clause, which as a whole functions as object of the verb. In other words, the first series represents a three-place pattern, the second series a two-place pattern. As evidence for the existence of the three-place pattern they cite instances like (c), where the governing verbs are in the passive and the object of the corresponding active governing clause is the subject of the passive governing clause. This is normal for three-place verbs governing an accusative and a prolative infinitive, such as *admoneo*.

(c) ... *decemviri* libros *adire* atque *inspicere* iussi (*sc*. sunt) ...
('… the decemvirs were instructed to approach and consult the Sacred Books ...' Liv. 22.36.6)

Bennett: I. 379–82 calls all clauses governed by *verba voluntatis* object clauses (that is: AcI) and García de la Calera (2008) also concludes that this is the case for all instances in Caesar and Sallust. In that case (c) must be analysed as a nominative and infinitive, comparable with (d) And (b) can be compared with (e).

(d) ... hasce aedis esse oportet / *Demaenetus* ubi dicitur *habitare*.
('... it ought to be this house here where Demaenetus is said to live.' Pl. *As*. 381–2)

(e) Hoc commode reprehenditur, si dici possit ex hostibus *equus esse captus* ...
('A proper answer is made to this if it can be said that the horse was captured from the enemy ...' Cic. *Inv*. 1.85)

Lavency (2003: 111–3) makes fun of K.-St.'s assumption of two different constructions in view of the existence of instances of coordination like (f). He concludes that both (a) and (b) have an object accusative and a prolative infinitive.

(f) Sub vesperum Caesar *portas claudi milites*que ex oppido *exire* iussit ...
('At eventide Caesar ordered the gates to be closed and the troops to leave the town ...' Caes. *Gal*. 2.33.1)

Alii alia. I will re-examine the data and conclude that Kühner and Stegmann are right.

References

Bennett, Charles E. 1914, *Syntax of Early Latin*, 2 vols., Boston (reprint Hildesheim, Olms, 1966).
García de la Calera, Roberto, 2008, *Iubeo* en César y Salustio: verbo de dos o de tres posiciones, *Cuadernos de filología clásica* (*Lat*) 28, 5-15.
Kühner, Raphael & Stegmann, Carl, 1912-1914, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, II, *Satzlehre*, 1-2. Hannover: Hahn.
Lavency, Marius (2003) 'Les proposition infinitive', in: C. Bodelot, (ed.) *Les propositions complétives en latin*, Louvain/Paris, Peeters, 97–192.

Magis magisque **: de plus sur *magis* et ses continuateurs**

Paolo POCCETTI et Anna ORLANDINI
Université de Rome Tor Vergata et Université de Toulouse 2 Jean Jaurès

Dans les langues romanes, *magis* latin a connu une double évolution, aboutissant à deux particules distinctes : d'une part, une particule de coordination adversative, par ex. , esp., cat. prov. *mas*, en fr. *mais*, en it. *ma*, en roum. *ma*, de l'autre, un adverbe, par ex., le port. *mais*, l'esp. *más*, le gasc. *mes*, le roum. *maĭ* "plus", le fr. *jamais*, l'it. *mai* "jamais". L'évolution de *magis* est le résultat des différentiations zonales : dans les langues d'Occident et d'Orient de la Romania, les continuateurs de *magis* gardent la valeur de "plus", (port. *mais* ; esp. *más* ; cat. *mes* ; gasc. *més* ; roum. *maĭ*), alors que, dans l'aire centrale, la zone gallo-romane et italo-romane, cette fonction est exprimée par les continuateurs de *plus* (ex. fr. *plus*, it. *più*). Les langues qui utilisent les continuateurs de *plus* latin ont développé une autre valeur issue de *magis* accentué : l'adverbe français *jamais* et l'italien *mai*.

Nous enquêterons le parcours sémantique qui va de l'expression de la quantité (*magis quantitativum*) à la rectification (*magis correctivum*), passant par la valeur limitativo-adversative et par la concession directe et indirecte. Plusieurs savants pensent que l'adversative romane est issue du *magis correctivum*, mais c'est n'est pas notre avis, Nous envisageons plutôt deux parcours parallèles, sans filiation. E. Lerch (1929, 94-96) rapproche du *magis quantitativum*, ayant le sens d'accroissement de *plus*, la valeur limitative de "mais/aber", et du *magis correctivum*, ayant le sens de *potius*, l'interprétation correctivo-substitutive de "mais/sondern". Nous croyons qu'on peut reconnaître des éléments structuraux faisant le clivage entre les deux emplois :

1. La négation : elle est 'polémique' dans l'emploi correctif, mais 'descriptive' dans l'emploi quantitatif.
2. Dans l'emploi correctif, le prédicat est souvent, le même dans les deux propositions.
3. En italien, les connecteurs « però », « tuttavia », « nondimeno », en français les connecteurs « toutefois », « pourtant », « néanmoins » sont exclus de l'emploi correctif.
4. Seul l'emploi quantitatif admet les cumuls de « ma »/« mais » et de ces connecteurs.
5. Dans l'expression de la comparaison entre deux qualités : X *magis quam* Y exprime le correctif, X (comparatif en -*ior*) *quam* Y (comparatif en -*ior*) exprime le quantitatif.

Notre hypothèse est que *magis quantitativum* se rapproche du fonctionnement de *et* exprimant la coordination connective, dont la fonction est additive, tandis que *magis correctivum* de substitution se rapproche de la valeur de la disjonction exclusive (*aut*). Plusieurs connecteurs couvrent le domaine du *quantitativum*, seuls *sed* et *uerum*, selon Kroon 1995, ont un emploi correctif.

Le *magis correctivum* est, à notre avis, une stratégie ancienne et fermée qui n'a pas abouti à des développements successifs. En revanche, le *magis quantitativum,* à travers ses succédanés, a évolué vers la valeur contrastive, adversative, concessive.

Nous analyserons de près certains passages latins cités par J. Melander (1916) et repris par Marconi-Bertinetto (1984, 484 ss.) dont l'interprétation relèverait du *magis quantitativum* à mi-chemin entre la valeur d'accroissement (*plus*) et une nuance adversativo-limitative (*tamen* = "mais /toutefois").

Notre analyse se développera par niveaux sémantiques différents : au niveau de l'organisation textuelle, on analysera les marqueurs de transition ("topic shifters") et les focalisateurs, au niveau illocutoire, les emplois adversatifs dotés de force argumentative exprimant une opposition forte, au niveau interpersonnel, les marqueurs de reformulation.

Références

Kroon, C. 1995. *Discourse Particles in Latin. A Study of nam, enim, autem, vero and at,* Amsterdam, Gieben.
Lerch, E. 1929. *Historische Französische Syntax,* voll. 2, Leipzig, O. B. Reisland.
Marconi, D., Bertinetto, P.M. 1984. Analisi di 'ma', *Lingua e Stile* 19, 2, 223-258; 3, 475-509.
Melander, J. 1916. *Étude sur "magis" et les expressions adversatives dans les langues romanes*, Uppsala, Almqvist & Wiksell.

SESSIONS GÉNÉRALES / GENERAL SESSIONS

On the dialectology of the Vulgar Latin merger of /b/ and /w/: Evidence from inscriptions

Béla ADAMIK
Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest

According to Adams' (2013: 189-190) summary: "Attempts have been made to establish that the merger of *b* and *u̯* occurred earlier in some regions than others. (...) In inscriptions B for V seems to be more common in e.g. Africa and parts of Italy, including Rome, than in Gaul and Spain, and particularly Britain, where it is hardly attested. But it is not acceptable without good reason to argue from the absence of a phonetic misspelling from a written text that the underlying phonetic feature was also absent from the speech of the writer. A good speller will conceal by his mastery of the traditional written language phonetic features of his speech. The variations in the incidence of misspellings in the inscriptions of one area compared with another may simply reflect variations in the literacy skills of those composing and engraving the inscriptions. Misspellings may be rare in Gallic and Spanish inscriptions, but it must be remembered that in those areas too mergers did occur by the time of the Romance languages. The lower incidence of misspellings would at best reveal that change was resisted longer there, but even that conclusion may be unsafe, because nothing is known about the drafters of the inscriptions and of their educational level. The available statistics are also incomplete."

A propos of this summary, the present paper first of all wishes to solve the problem how the *absence* of a linguistic change, in this case of the merger of /b/ and /w/ from inscriptional corpora can be evidenced, while the *presence* of a linguistic phenomenon, in this case the merger of /b/ and /w/ can necessarily be evidenced by the relevant misspellings, by the spelling confusions of B and V. As for evidencing the actual absence of a phenomenon from a written corpus, two separated, however interconnected methods, both suggested by J. Herman, can be used. As for the first method the absence of a linguistic phenomenon from a corpus will be evidenced by establishing the so-called profile of faults of a given corpus, i.e. by revealing the proper practice of making mistakes in a specific group of inscriptional texts (cf. Adamik 2012), since from the characteristic and polarized distributional patterns of faults we may infer not only the presence and frequency of certain types of misspellings and their underlying linguistic changes but also the absence and infrequency of others. The second method is limited to the contrastive analysis of lexical items potentially relevant for the phenomenon under consideration and therefore it is suitable rather for controlling and corroborating the evidence achieved with the help of the first one (cf. Adamik forthcoming): accordingly, if there are several items for misspelled variants but not for the merger of /b/ and /w/, such as OBIET for *obiit*, VIVS for *vivus*, VIXET for *vixit* or BENI for *bene* etc. but no, or only isolated examples are to be found for B~V confusion, such as OVIIT, VIBVS, BIXIT or VENE etc., then the absence of the merger of /b/ and /w/ must be taken at face value. By involving both methods in the analysis of data sets recorded from selected Roman provinces in our LLDB-Database we intend to offer a more realistic picture of the frequency of the merger of /b/ and /w/ in Late Latin than given so far (e.g. by Barbarino 1978) and to diminish the "scepticism about our ability to detect localised phonetic developments from misspelt inscriptions" (Adams 2007: 730).

References

Adamik, B. 2012. In Search of the Regional Diversification of Latin: Some Methodological Considerations in Employing the Inscriptional Evidence. in: Biville, Fr. et al. (ed.) *Latin vulgaire - latin tardif IX. Actes du IXe colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Lyon, 6 - 9 septembre 2009*. Lyon 123-139 (cf. http://lldb.elte.hu/documents.php).

–– forthcoming. The frequency of syncope in the Latin of the Empire: A statistical and dialectological study based on the analysis of inscriptions. in: Poccetti, P. (ed.). *Proceedings of the XVIIth International Colloquium of Latin Linguistics, May 20th – May 25th 2013, Italy, Rome* (cf. http://lldb.elte.hu/documents.php).

Adams, J. N. 2007. *The Regional Diversification of Latin 200 BC–AD 600*. Cambridge.

–– 2013. *Social variation and the Latin language*. Cambridge.

Barbarino, J. L. 1978. *The Evolution of the Latin /b/–/u̯/ Merger: A Quantitative and Comparative Analysis of the B–V Alternation in Latin Inscriptions*. Chapel Hill.

LLDB-Database = *Computerized Historical Linguistic Database of Latin Inscriptions of the Imperial Age* (http://lldb.elte.hu/)

Narrative progression and the historical present in Vergil's Aeneid

Suzanne ADEMA
Vrije Universiteit / Universiteit van Amsterdam

When Latin tense usage is discussed, the maxim *perfecto procedit, imperfecto insistit narratio* is often quoted. This maxim is a sound conclusion when we investigate the interaction between the semantic value of the perfect and imperfect in the specific environment of narrative contexts. However, how is narrative progression effectuated when its main tense is another tense, viz. the (historical) present?

A first step in such an investigation should be a more general inventory of types of states of affairs vis-à-vis the temporal advancement in a narrative sequence. In this paper, I use the inventory in table 1, with a main distinction between bounded states of affairs (events) and unbounded states of affairs (situations).

Table 1: Main types of states of affairs in narrative contexts

Type of state of affairs	**Advancement of reference time**
Event	advances reference time
Event anterior to reference time	generally does not advance reference time
Situation	generally does not advance reference time
Frame	functions as the background for a subsequently presented event
Start of a situation	generally advances reference time
Situation anterior to reference time	generally does not advance reference time

Using this inventory, I analyze the indicative historical present tense forms in the *Aeneid*. In this corpus, the present tense is used to denote events, situations, frames and starting situations. I will present a quantitative overview of these interpretations, as well as explaining and illustrating how these interpretations are brought about. The main mechanisms concerned are the telicity of the predicate frame, adverbial clauses and specific features of preceding and following clauses.

My analysis and quantitative overview will give insight into the narrative progression and rhythm of present tense narrative in the *Aeneid*. By alternating different types of states of affairs in present tense narrative, a steady narrative pace is created that imitates that of real life (i.e. a scenic pace), evoking the literary effect of *evidentia*.

References

Adema, S.M., 2007, Discourse Modes and Bases in Virgil's Aeneid, in R.J.Allan, M.Buijs (ed.), *The Language of Literature: Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts,* 42-64, Leiden.
Boogaart, R.J.U., 1999, *Aspect and Temporal Ordering. A Contrastive Analysis of Dutch and English,* Amsterdam.
Depraetere, I., 1995, On the Necessity of Distinguishing between (Un)boundedness and (A)telicity, *Linguistics and Philosophy,* 18, 1-19.
Hinrichs, E., 1986, Temporal Anaphora in Discourse, *Linguistics and Philosphy* 9, 63-82.
Jong, I.J.F. de, R. Nünlist 2007, *Time in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative,* Volume 2, Leiden.
Kroon, C.H.M., 2007, Discourse Modes and the Use of Tenses in Ovid's Metamorphoses, in R.J. Allan, M. Buijs (ed.), *The Language of Literature: Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts,* 65-92, Leiden.
Mack, S., 1978, *Patterns of Time in Virgil,* Hamden.
Partee, B., 1984, Nominal and Temporal Anaphora, *Linguistics and Philosophy 7,* 243-286.
Pinkster, H., 1990, *Latin Syntax and Semantics,* London.
–– 1999, The Present Tense in Virgil's Aeneid, *Mnemosyne* 52, 705-717.
Smith, C.S., 2003, *Modes of Discourse. The Local Structure of Texts,* Cambridge.

Normativity and language change: Two case studies on Roman brick stamps

Tommi ALHO & Ville LEPPÄNEN
University of Turku

The concept of *normativity* has thus far been neither recognized nor employed in explaining language change in action. *Norms* determine the correctness of linguistic expressions (see Itkonen 2003) and they should not be confused with prescriptions. Norms are social by nature, and every form of language, including all written and spoken varieties (dialects, sociolects, etc.), consists of norms, without which no communication would be possible. From time to time, however, old norms are replaced by new ones; this is our starting point for the description of language change. There is a distinction on the one hand between discrete and non-discrete norms, on the other between norms and normative behaviour (Itkonen 2008: 295); in other words norms can (and will) be broken. When norm-following behaviour falls below a certain threshold, language change takes place (Itkonen 2008: 295–296). We argue that normativity is essential in explaining language change, especially in cases where synchronic variation is abundant.

We demonstrate this with two case studies. The data consist of a number of Roman brick stamp texts from the first three centuries AD (for the most part collected in *CIL* XV, 1). Stamps represent *locatio conductio* contracts (Steinby 1982: 233–234, 1993: 140), and correspondingly the texts are of technical nature. The source value of brick stamps is significant, as they can be dated more precisely than inscriptions in general. We utilize the traditional methods of historical linguistics applied in the normative frame of reference.

The first case concerns stamp texts in which the prepositions *ex* and *de* govern the accusative rather than the ablative. We show that by the third century AD at the latest, the choice of case in Latin prepositional phrases had become arbitrary, and that there is no *direct* causal relationship between phonetic, morphological or syntactic factors in the process of morphosyntactic change that eventually resulted in the collapse of the Latin case system. In the third century AD there existed two norms in the language: *ex/de*…ABL was the only correct expression in higher registers, while *ex/de*…ACC was not incorrect (and probably in common use) in lower registers.

The second case concerns the origin of the first declension genitive singular ending *-aes*/*-es* (for *-ae*), which has been often and variously explained (see Galdi 2004: 18–22 for reference to the various interpretations). Based on the occurrence of the ending in brick stamps we confirm the view that the morpheme is a Latinate form of the Greek ending -ης, having its origins in the bilingual Graeco-Latin communities of Rome. We argue, *pace* Adams (2003: 479–483; 2007: 673–674), that the ending was conventionalized from early on (i.e. it became normative), was pragmatically unmarked, and did not involve code-switching: it was a 'simple' morphological borrowing from Greek in a contact situation, which most likely involved imperfect learning of Latin. A similar phenomenon has been recently described in the case of Estonian-Finnish interaction (Verschik 2012).

References

Adams, J. N. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: CUP.

— 2007. *The Regional Diversification of Latin 200 BC–AD 600*. Cambridge: CUP.

Galdi, Giovanbattista, 2004. *Grammatica delle iscrizioni latine dell'impero (province orientali). Morfosintassi nominale*. Roma: Herder.

Itkonen, Esa 2003. *What is Language? A Study in the Philosophy of Linguistics*. Turku: University of Turku.

— 2008. The Central Role of Normativity in Language and in Linguistics, in Zlatev, J., Racine, C., Sinha, C. & Itkonen, E. (eds.). *The shared mind: Perspectives on intersubjectivity*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 279–305.

Steinby, Margareta 1982. I senatori e l'industria laterizia urbana, in *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio I (tituli 4)*. Roma, 227–237.

— 1993. L'organizzazione produttiva dei laterizi: un modello interpretativo per l'*instrumentum* in genere?, in W. V. Harris (ed.), *The Inscribed Economy. Production and distribution in the Roman empire in the light of instrumentum domesticum*, Ann Arbor, 139–143.

Verschik, Anna 2012) Practising receptive multilingualism: Estonian–Finnish communication in Tallinn, *International Journal of Bilingualism* 16, 265–286.

Los verbos de temor *timeo*, *metuo* y *uereor*

Olga Álvarez Huerta
Universidad de Oviedo

En este trabajo se intentan determinar las posibles diferencias de significado de esos tres verbos latinos con el establecimiento de sus marcos predicativos, a partir del despojo de un amplio corpus de textos latinos que abarcan todos los géneros y todas las etapas del latín, desde el latín arcaico hasta el postclásico. La necesidad de realizar un estudio sistemático del campo semántico del temor en latín surge del hecho de que los tres verbos aparecen como intercambiables. Así, vemos que concurren *metuo* y *uereor* en (1), o *metuo* y *timeo* en (2):

(1) *nonne ostendis id te uereri quod praeter ceteros tu metuere non debes, ne quando liberis proscriptorum bona patria reddantur* ? (Cic. *S. Rosc*. 145,14)
(2) *etiamsi nos uobis non timeremus, tu tibi metuere deberes* (Sen. *contr*. 1,2,3)

Es de esperar que el estudio en profundidad de su complementación en los distintos autores y épocas saque a la luz las diferencias entre ellos.

Latin 1st class -ā- verbs as thematic formations: On the deficiency of IE roots

Davide BERTOCCI
Università di Padova

The 1st class of Latin presents represents a puzzle for any attempt to explain the distribution of the morphological element -*ā*- as well as its diachronic origin. In this study I claim that -*ā*- as a verbal morpheme should be traced back to the denominal verbs (type *multāre),* and that it spread in other verbs as a consequence of morphological processes.

An unitary value of -*ā*- seems doubtful since I class gathers different kinds of verbs: frequentatives, causatives, simple transitives, prefixed verbs, denominal, deadjectival (e.g. *cantāre, placāre, vetāre, appellāre, multāre, novāre);* furthermore, -*ā*- presents exhibit different morphological structures: -o-/normal/zero grade verbs *(forāre, secāre, dĭcāre),* allotrops of other types, either with actional distinctions or not *(calāre, edŭcāre ~ dūcĕre).*

Wrt. diachrony, current explanations involve the presence of the PIE suffix *-*yo* (from inherited -H_2- laryngeal roots like *tonāre* < **(s)tenH₂-ye/o-*, cf. Rix 1999), which is shared by denominal -*ā*- verbs (also in other IE languages, cf. Gk. timā́ō, Gmc. *salbōn* etc).

This explanations is not fully convincing for deverbal formations, since not all of them come from a -$H_{(2)}$- laryngeal root (e.g. *cēlare* < **kel-, arāre* < **HerH₃-),* and the alternative would be to postulate an autonomous frequentative suffix -*ā*- (De Vaan 2012), which is not primary in PIE, and does not have always frequentative meaning at all.

Thus, there remains the possibility to pick out -*ā*- from the only category where it is an original (at least West-)IE morpheme, viz. to argue that it became a verbal morpheme after reanalysis of denominal verbs derived either through bare conversion (*mult-ā-*$_N$ > *mult-ā-re*$_V$) or, more probably, through suffixation with *-*yo* (**mult-ā-ye-ti* > *mult-ā-t*). Within a Distributed Morphology framework (Embick 2000), -*ā*- is interpreted as the most suitable Vocabulary item for licensing a complex set of VP/vP features: since most denominal/deadjectival verbs project an agentive subject in SpecvP position, -*ā*- is linked to the feature +Voice, which makes it apt for other kinds of mostly agentive verbs, like causatives, prefixed/ compounded ones, and frequentatives.

As to primary verbs, the spreading of -*ā*- was triggered by two factors: i) the feature +Voice conflates with the feature +v (Embick 2000) possibly after deletion of intervocalic -*y*-; ii) a large set of IE roots are no longer available as verbal morpheme, i.e. they are not able to project a VP directly (Embick 2012): in order to repair this deficiency, the +v feature is licensed by selection of the -ā- morph.

The claim for a deficiency of many IE roots in Latin is grounded on the asymmetry between the I-IV classes and the III: only III class verbs retain the archaic 'strong' and root-based paradigms, whilst I and IV classes largely display weak and stem-based patterns. More in details, IE derivational rules seems blurred within classes I and IV since roots do not allow cyclic processes (Calabrese 2014) anymore. This opens a new research task toward the analysis of -*ā*- as a thematic vowel in romance fashion.

References

Calabrese, A., Locality Effects in Italian Verbal Morphology, in Di Domenico E., C. Hamann, S. Matteini (eds.), *Structures, Stategies and Beyond. Studies in Honour of Adriana Belletti*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia.
De Vaan, M., 2012, Latin Deverbal Presents in -*ā*-, in C.H. Melchert (ed.), *The Indo-European Verb*, Wiesbaden, 315-332.
Embick, D., 2000, Features, Syntax and Categories in the Latin Perfect, *Linguistic Inquiry* 31/2, 185-230.
–– 2012, Roots and Features (an acategorial postscript), *Theoretical Linguistics* 38(1-2), 73-89.
Leumann, M., 1977, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*, München.
LIV, *Lexicon des indogermanischen Verben*², 2001, ed. H. Rix et alii, Wiesbaden.

Existe-t-il des « noms nus » (*bare nominals*) en latin ?

Bernard BORTOLUSSI
Université de Paris Ouest Nanterre

D'un point de vue typologique le latin est classé dans les langues à « noms nus », c'est-à-dire dans lesquelles les SN sont dépourvus d'article, par opposition aux langues pourvues d'un article. Pourtant ces dernières, comme l'anglais, permettent dans certains cas la forme nue d'un N :

- noms massifs : *Do you want **sugar** in your coffee ?*
- pluriels : *There are **dogs** in the garden.*
- constructions prépositionnelles : *at **school***

Par extension l'appellation « bare nominals » a été donnée à des N associés à certains phénomènes :

- Expressions idiomatiques : *step by step*
- Exclamations : *Nice day !*
- Titres : *Pride and prejudice*, etc.

Les noms nus peuvent présenter d'autres propriétés que l'absence de déterminant :

- Ils sont faiblement référentiels
- Ils sont réfractaires aux qualifications et aux complémentations

Nous proposons d'identifier des « noms nus » en latin d'après les paramètres précédents, puisque l'absence d'article n'est pas décisive. Les constructions qui sont candidates à l'identification des noms nus sont notamment :

- l'objet interne : *uitam uiuere*
- l'accusatif de la possession inaliénable : *Latagum saxo ... occupat os faciemque*
- le complément des *verba affectuum* : *doleo pedem*

Dans ces constructions le N n'est généralement accompagné d'aucun déterminant ou autre forme de qualification et il ne peut faire l'objet d'une reprise pronominale.

Références

Bortolussi, B., 1988, L'accusatif d'objet interne, in R. Zuber, H. Weber (éds), *Linguistik Parisette* (*Akten des 22 Linguistischen Kolloquiums*, Paris 1987), Tübingen, Niemeyer, 73-81.

–– 2006, Le double accusatif dit de la possession inaliénable, in P. Brillet, E. Parmentier (éds.) Φιλολογία, *Mélanges offerts à Michel Casevitz*, Lyon, MOM, 211-222.

Krifka, M., 2004, Bare NPs: kind-referring, indefinites, both or neither?, in R. Young, & Y. Zhou (éds.) *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, CLC Publications (13), 180-203.

Swart, H., Winter, Y., & Zwarts, J., 2007, Bare nominals and reference to capacities, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25, 195-222.

Lat. *amosio*: An unnoticed -*osio* genitive in Latin with a few remarks on time terminology

Francesco BURRONI & Michele BREZIGIA
Universiteit Leiden & Independent

In recent years the morphemes used to mark thematic (*o*-stem) genitive in the Italic branch of Indo-European have attracted much attention (most notably Eska and Wallace 2001; Prosdocimi 2002, 2009) in regard to linguistic history, distribution, possible interplay of -*ī* and -*osio* (Orlandini and Poccetti 2013) and on the basis of "new" epigraphical evidence (Biella 2009).

In this paper we will try to show that, in order to complete the dossier and address the problem of Italic genitive(s), a previously unnoticed form must be taken into account. A close look at the gloss *amosio: annuo* (Festus p.24 L), reveals that this form is highly relevant for the nature and history of -*osio* genitives. In the past the *amosio* has been retained (Lindsay 1913) or variously emended as *annoso* (Whatmough 1931) or *anosio* (Lindsay 1930); those solutions, however, remain unsatisfactory both from a philological and from a linguistic point of view. It is, in fact, hard to conceive of a plausible textual scenario leading from earlier *annoso* or *anosio* to the attested *amosio*; furthermore, *annoso* "old" does not completely overlap semantically with *annuo* "yearly". In view of these unsolved issues we propose a rather simple paleographical and philological account: *nn* contained in *annosio* was misread and transcribed as *m* within a synchronically no longer transparent form (as an -*osio* genitive was). Furthermore, from a semantic point of view, *annosio,* meaning "of the year" or "in the year" could well be a very old genitive of *annus* (perhaps reflecting an original **atnosio* < PIE **$h_2$etnosio*)*.* This reported form, *annosio*, crystalized as an adverb, perfectly overlaps Lat. *annuo* "yearly." If this hypothesis is correct, then a few historical and linguistic inferences may be drawn. *Annosio* would represent the first literary attestation of an -*osio* genitive in Latin beyond the epigraphical *poplosio valesiosio*, found in the so-called *Lapis Satricanus*. For the first time, in *annosio* the old Indo-European genitive marker -*osio* is not found in combination with a proper noun (as in Faliscan or in the *Lapis Satricanus* itself), but with a common noun. This clearly shows that the morpheme was inherited with a real "genitival" meaning i.e. was retained in inflectional morphology within Italic itself, perfectly matching Skt -*asya* and Hom. Gr. -οιο < *-*osio*.

Finally, we will claim that it is not due to chance that an -*osio genitive* was preserved specifically in an instance of time terminology: as convincingly shown recently (Vine 2009) for Greek, new inflections for terms relating to time were created not on the basis of PIE nominative, but rather on the basis of PIE genitives reinterpreted synchronically as nominatives, as it has been suggested for Lat. *mēnsis* (Burroni 2014). Various hints also point to the idea that genitive may have been the original case employed to express time reference at least in Italic (and Celtic), perhaps also in Indo-European; in the present work such an hypothesis will be addressed and evaluated.

References

Burroni F. 2014. *Fasti Peregrini: analisi linguistica della terminologia di calendario nelle lingue sabelliche*. B.A. thesis Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore. Milano.

Eska, J. F. and R. E. Wallace. 2001. Remarks on the thematic genitive singular in ancient Italy and related matter. *Incontri Linguistici* 24:77–97.

Lindsay W. M. 1913. *Sexti Pompei Festi De verborum significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Lindsay W. M. and J. W. Pirie. 1930. *Glossaria latina*. vol. 4. Paris: Les Belles lettres.

Orlandini A. and P. Poccetti. 2013. *-i* and *-osio* genitives in archaic Latin: different markers for different possession types?, *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 12(1):101-121.

Prosdocimi, A. L. Il genitivo dei temi in *-o* nelle varietà italiche (osco, sannita, umbro, sudpiceno, etc.), *Incontri Linguistici* 25:65–76.

—— 2009. Sul genitivo dei temi in *-o* in alcune lingue indoeuropee, *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 94:50–78.

Vine, B,. 2009. A *Yearly Problem.* In *East and West: Papers in Indo-European Studies* by K. Yoshida and B. Vine (ed.), Bremen: Hempen, 205-224.

Whatmough J. 1931. The Calendar in Ancient Italy outside Rome, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 42:157-179.

Alcune osservazioni sulla lingua degli storiografi arcaici

Luca CARDINALI
Università di Perugia

Il contributo riguarderà l'analisi di Cic. *De Orat.* II, 64 e le sue osservazioni sulle carratteristiche della storiografia a lui precedente. Attraverso le osservazioni della *Rhet. ad Herennium* relative ai *tria genera dicendi* si mostrerà, attaverso l'nalisi dei frammenti degli storiografi arcaici del II sec. A.C , ed in particolare di quelli di Lucio Calpurnio Pisone Frugi come le critiche di Cicerone risultino fondate e non siano da ascrivere al pregiudizio classicistico di un oratore scaltrito e dal gusto raffinato quale fu l'Arpinate. In effetti, per quello che possiamo ricostruire, gli storici del II sec. A.C. furono effettivamente dei semplici *narratores rerum*, privi di qualsiasi cura dello stile.

Matris animula « serpolet », médecine et folklore autour d'un phytonyme

Alain CHRISTOL
Université de Rouen

Isidore de Séville donne deux notices étymologiques sur le thym et le serpolet :

> *Timum appellatum quod flos eius odorem refert.* (*Et.* 17,9,2)
> *Erpillus quod apud nos serpillus uocatur pro eo quod radices ipsius longe serpiant, eadem et matris animula propter quod menstrua moueat.* (*Et.* 17,9,51)

La première notice s'explique bien par la proximité, en grec, de θύμον « thym » et θύω « brûler en offrande aux dieux » (θυμίαμα « encens » => all. *Thymian* « thym »).
La seconde est peut-être née de l'homonymie entre θύμον et θυμός « énergie vitale », *animula* traduisant θυμός. Isidore crée volontiers des néologismes latins sur des modèles grecs.
Dans un second temps, on s'intéressera au succès populaire du nom *matris animula* pourtant isolé en latin. La perception qu'en avaient les locuteurs dépendait du sens qu'ils imaginaient pour *mater.*

(a) « femme » : rôle emménagogue du thym en gynécologie (Isidore), avec une métonymie possible *mater* = *matrix* (Gaide 1996,88).

(b) « mère de famille » : une légende tchèque (Erben 1901) raconte comment la *mateřídouška* (« serpolet ») est née des larmes d'orphelins sur la tombe de leur mère. On est devant un conte étiologique.

(c) « Mère divine » : russe богородская трава « herbe de la Mère de Dieu (*Bogorodica*), thym, serpolet ».

On joindra au dossier angl. *mother of thyme* « serpolet » qui pourrait être une réécriture de *matris animula,* par croisement avec des expressions comme *mother of herbs.*

Références

Adams J. N. 1982. *The Latin sexual vocabulary*, Londres, Gerald Duckworth & C°.

Bonet Valérie, 1993. Le thym médicinal antique : un cadeau divin, in M.-Cl. Amouretti et G. Comet (éd.), *Des hommes et des plantes*, Aix-en-Provence, Publ. de l'U. de Provence, 11-21.

Erben Karel Jaromir, 1901. *Kytice z povestí národních* (Le bouquet des contes populaires), Prague.

Gaide Françoise, 1996. Les noms des "plantes des femmes" dans les textes médicaux latins, lexicologie et ethnologie, in M. Fruyt et Cl. Moussy (éd.), *Structures lexicales du latin*, Paris, PUPS, 85-95.

Hensłowa Maria, 1977. Z badań nad wiedzą ludową o roślinach, II. Thymus serpyllum L. – macierzanka piaskowa, *Slavia Antiqua* 24, 163-181.

Novotný František, 1964. Mateří douška – Matris animula, *Sborník Filosofické Fakulty Brněnské Universitety* A 12, 35-36.

Sofer Johannes, 1930. *Lateinisches und romanisches aus den Etymologiae des Isidorus von Sevilla*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

The phonological conditioning of Latin inflectional allomorphies

András CSER

Pázmány Péter Catholic University

This paper offers a comprehensive synchronic analysis of the inflectional morphology of Latin in terms of the allomorphies and the environments governing the distribution of allomorphs. It is demonstrated that all the attested allomorphies in both verbal and nominal morphology can be described as functions of a vocalic scale, practically the sonority scale of vowels plus the undifferentiated class of consonants as the least sonorous extreme (improving on the analysis found in Spaelti 2004 and Emonds–Spaelti 2005, which is based on a similar idea but is restricted to nouns and has difficulty handling certain morphological types). Thus reference to inflectional classes and the use of thematic vowels in morphological description (as, for instance, in Aronoff 1994) is made redundant. The distribution of allomorphs along the vocalic scale crucially displays the property of contiguity, i.e. the subsections of the scale that trigger one particular allomorph are uninterrupted. It is also demonstrated that short *i*-stem verbs do not constitute a separate class but represent systematic heteroclisy (an idea harking back to the ancient grammatical tradition). The analysis of *i*-stem nouns and adjectives also involves heteroclisy, though of a different kind.

The analytical goal of the paper is to offer a properly formalised and simplified model of Latin inflectional morphology, with an analysis of environments that proves to be identical for nominal and verbal morphology. The conceptual goal is to explore the nature of scale-based generalisations in the domain of morphophonology.

All the data referred to in the paper are taken from volume 1 of the Brepols Corpus (CLCLT-5 – Library of Latin Texts by Brepols Publishers, release 2002).

References

Aronoff, Mark, 1994, *Morphology by Itself*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Emonds, Joseph, Philip Spaelti, 2005, Fully Distributing Morphology : The Phonology and Syntax of Latin Case Inflections. *Theoretical and Applied Linguistics at Kobe Shoin* 8:1–20.

Spaelti, Philip, 2004, Some Phonological and Morphological Patterns in the Latin Noun Declension System. *Theoretical and Applied Linguistics at Kobe Shoin* 7:131–137.

On the relationship between the personal and impersonal constructions of *uideri*

Pierluigi CUZZOLIN

Università degli Studi di Bergamo

It is well known that, according to the grammars of Latin, the predicate *uideri* 'to seem' shows either a personal or an impersonal construction.

(1) *Neque sane iam causa* ***videtur*** *esse cur secernamus ea praecepta, quae de suasionibus tradenda sunt aut laudationibus, sunt enim pleraque communia, sed tamen suadere aliquid aut dissuadere gravissimae mihi personae videtur esse.* (Cic. *de orat*. 2.333)

(2) *Quamquam facienda mentio est, ut quidem mihi* ***videtur****, duorum adulescentium, qui si diutius vixissent, magnam essent eloquentiae laudem consecuti*. (Cic. *Brut*. 279)

In recent years syntacticians have tried to account for the different constructions on the base of various parameters at different level of analysis such as raising, agreement or animacy of the logical subject of the predicate.

The aim of the present paper is to investigate *uideri* combining its syntactic properties with its pragmatic values. In particular those aspects of *uideri* will be considered that relate to modality and possibly to evidentiality. According to recent studies on this issue devoted to some Romance languages, the impersonal construction seems to be less subjective and more interpersonal than the personal construction. This result seems to hold even for Latin: the aim of my paper will be to test and possibly refine this claim.

References

Cornillie, Bert. 2007. "The continuum between lexical and grammatical evidentiality: A functional analysis of Spanish *parecer*".

La polyvalence de l'adverbe *nunc*

Joseph Dalbera
Université de Corse

L'adverbe *nunc* est l'un des mots-clefs de la linguistique de l'énonciation, en tant qu'il instaure le moment de l'énonciation comme repère temporel de l'énoncé. Pourtant, la valeur déictique du mot mérite examen tant les conditions d'emploi de l'adverbe sont nombreuses et sa polyvalence remarquable. En s'appuyant sur un large corpus constitué de genres littéraires variés (discours, dialogues, échanges épistolaires, récits historiques, romanesques et poétiques…) on cherchera à faire apparaître les différentes valeurs d'emploi de l'adverbe latin. On s'intéressera particulièrement aux occurrences dans lesquelles *nunc* paraît s'écarter de la valeur déictique pour pour référer à un point du temps qui ne coïncide pas avec celui de son emploi effectif. Les occurrences sont en effet nombreuses, depuis les cas où le repère temporel désigné par l'adverbe semble déborder du moment où l'on prononce le mot, avec l'emploi du présent de l'indicatif, et plus largement, lorsque les emplois de *nunc* sont afférents à d'autres tiroirs verbaux, qu'il s'agisse de temps du passé ou du futur. Mais l'on étudiera encore son emploi dans le cadre de la corrélation *nunc*… *nunc*, ou dans celui de l'*oratio obliqua*, où l'adverbe apparaît parfois au cœur d'une structure énonciative pourtant inscrite dans la narration et censée relever de son repérage initial. On abordera enfin les cas où *nunc* glisse d'un emploi temporel-adverbial à un emploi logique de connecteur marquant l'opposition. Il s'agira ainsi de tenter de comprendre s'il existe une véritable continuité entre ces différentes valeurs en discours de *nunc*, et, le cas échéant, de ramener ses emplois à un signifié unique, susceptible de subsumer l'ensemble des usages : on devrait ainsi pouvoir apprécier dans quelle mesure la valeur déictique de *nunc* lui est intrinsèque. On n'hésitera pas à s'inspirer notamment d'études récentes menées sur l'adverbe *maintenant* du français.

Références

De Mulder W., Vetters C., 2008, Le sens fondamental de maintenant : un token-reflexive, *Cahier Chronos* 20, 15-33.

Dominicy M., 1974, Les premières attestations de *modo* au sens de *nunc*, *L'antiquité classique* 43, 1, 267-303.

Fruyt M., 2008, Adverbes latins, grammaticalisation et lexicalisation, in *Adverbes et évolution linguistique : le domaine latin*, M. Fruyt & S. Van Laer (éds.), L'Harmattan, Paris.

Jollin-Bertocchi J., 2003, La polyvalence de l'adverbe maintenant, *L'information grammaticale* 97, 26-30.

Mellet S., 2008, Réflexions énonciatives autour de *maintenant* argumentatif, *Cahier Chronos* 20, 77-92.

Nef F., 1990, Maintenant 1 et maintenant2 : sémantique et pragmatique de maintenant temporel et non-temporel, *Recherches linguistiques*, tome 5, *La Notion d'aspect*, Université de Metz, 145-166.

Recanati F., 2008, D'un contexte à l'autre, *Cahier Chronos* 20, 1-14.

Risselada, R., 1996, And now for something completely different? Temporal discourse markers: Latin nunc and English now, in R. Risselada, J. R. D. Jong & A. M. Bolkestein (Eds.), *On Latin. Linguistic and literary studies in honour of Harm Pinkster,* Amsterdam: Gieben, 105-125.

Sznajder L., 2005, Stratégies de prises en charge énonciatives dans le discours indirect, *Latina Lingua*, proceedings of the 12th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Papers on Grammar IX, 2, ed. G.Calboli, Herder, Rome, 749-761.

Vuillaume M., 2008, Maintenant en cotexte narratif non-fictionnel, *Cahier Chronos* 20, 35-51.

The diachrony of subject placement in Latin: A corpus-based study (ca. 200 BC - 600 AD)

Lieven DANCKAERT
Ghent University

Aims The descriptive aim of this study is to offer a first full-scale overview of the positional distribution of subject noun phrases in the history of the Latin language, from Archaic to Late Latin. Analytically, I wish to test the claim put forward in Danckaert (2014), viz. that in Archaic and Classical Latin, the canonical (i.e. information structure neutral) subject position is inside the verb phrase (VP), and that in later stages, a second, higher subject position becomes available in the inflectional layer of the clause (TP).

Theoretical background The theoretical framework assumed is the cartographic variant of generative grammar (Rizzi 1997; Cinque 1999; Danckaert 2012), which assumes fine-grained, articulated representations to underlie the structure of a clause. This approach entails a phrase-structure based model of Latin syntax, which is also assumed in e.g. Ledgeway 2012 and Danckaert 2012. The present study can be expected to supplement work on Latin subject placement where only linear word order is taken into account (see, among others, de Jong 1989; Cabrillana 1993-4; Bolkestein 1995; Spevak 2004, 2010).

Methodology To answer the above-mentioned question, a large-scale corpus study is carried out, analysing the facts on subject placement in 33 prose texts from Cato (first half of the 2nd century BC) until Gregory of Tours (end of the 6th century AD). Only lexical (noun phrase) subjects are taken into account, leaving aside pronominal and clausal subjects, as well as all non-ambiguously left-peripheral subject NPs. Distinctions are made between (i) active and passive clauses, (ii) clauses with a single synthetic verb and clauses with a (modal or Tense/Voice) auxiliary and (iii) transitive, unergative and unaccusative predicates (in the case of active clauses). All quantitative results are evaluated by means of the appropriate statistical techniques.

Results The results of this study support the hypothesis that in Late Latin, a structurally higher subject position becomes available. Particularly strong empirical support for this conclusion can be derived from the discrepancy between earlier and later Latin derived subjects (i.e. subjects of passive clauses), which gradually appear at higher frequencies in more leftward (and thus hierarchically higher) positions in the clause.

References

Bolkestein, 1995, Functions of verb-subject order in Latin, *STUF* 48, 32-43
Cabrillana 1993-4, Posiciones relativas en la ordenación de constituyentes I + II, *Habis* 24, 249-66; 25, 451-60.
Cinque, 1999, *Adverbs and functional heads*. OUP.
Danckaert, 2012, *Latin embedded clauses*. Benjamins.
–– 2014, Changing EPP parameters and the diachrony of the VPAux-AuxVP alternation. Ms. Ghent University.
de Jong, 1989, The position of the Latin subject. In: Calboli, G. (ed.), *Subordination and other topics in Latin*, Benjamins 521-540.
Ledgeway, 2012, *From Latin to Romance*. OUP.
Rizzi, 1997, The fine structure of the left periphery. In: Haegeman, L. (ed.), *Elements of grammar*, Kluwer, 281-337.
Spevak, 2004, Verb-subject order in Latin, *C&M* 55, 381-96.
–– 2010, *Constituent order in Classical Latin prose*. Benjamins.

Verbal alternations in Latin

Jesús DE LA VILLA
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

The seminal work of Levin (1993) on English alternations was the starting point of similar investigations for many other languages. These investigations not only offered additional objective evidence for the semantic classification of verbs within each language, but allowed to discover the existence of several typological patterns of organization of the argumental structures which are very often repeated among languages. Up to now, there has not been a systematic research on the existence of alternations of argumental structures in Latin. Nevertheless, they exist.

Sometimes the type of alternation in Latin is similar to those proposed for English and other languages, as, for instance, the so-called Locative alternation (1), exemplified in (2)-(2').

(1) Frame A: X_{Agent} Verb $Y(Stuff)_{Patient}$ $Z(Location)_{Location}$
Frame B: X_{Agent} Verb $Z(Location)_{Patient}$ $Y(Stuff)_{Instrument}$
(2) *in mensa pingere castra mero* (Tib. 1.10.32)
'…to paint castles in the table with the wine'
(2') *anni tempora pingebant uiridantis floribus herbas* (Lucr. 5.1396)
'the times of the year were painting the green of the grass around with flowers'

In other cases, there seem to be also particularities in Latin. Some of them are only partial differences with the so far proposed alternations, as, for example, the possibility of substitution of the Locative by a dative in the Frame A of an alternation similar to the Locative alternation, as presented in (3), exemplified in (4)-(4').

(3) Frame A: X_{Agent} V $Y_{Patient}$ $Z_{Benefactive}$
Frame B: X_{Agent} V $Z_{Patient}$ $Y_{Instrument}$
(4) *si extra hos cancellos egredi conabor quos mihi ipse circumdedi* (Cic. *Quinct.*36)
'…if I attempt to overstep those barriers to which I have confined myself'
(4') *muro circumdari templum uoluerunt* (Liv. 29.18.16)
'they planned to surround the temple with a wall'

But sometimes there are alternations not recognized by Levin, but systematically active in Latin, as what could be labeled as Predicative alternation (5), exemplified in (6)-(6').

(5) Frame A: X_{Agent} V $Y_{Patient}$
Frame B: X_{Agent} V $Y_{Patient}$ $Z_{Complement\ of\ the\ Patient}$
(6) *Idem ego istuc quom credebam credidi*. (Pl. *Cur.* 541)
'I believed this same thing when I entrusted you with it.'
(6') *Afros Romanam crederes aciem.* (Liv. 22.46.4)
'You could think that the Africans were an array of Romans.'

The present paper offers the results of an on-going systematic research on Latin alternations. I will try to answer two questions:

i) How extended are alternations among argumental structures of Latin verbs?

ii) To what extent are Latin alternations similar to those of other languages, in particular of Romance languages and of English?

References

Levin, B. 1993, *English verb classes and alternations. A preliminary investigation*, Chicago, U.Chicago Press.

L'étymologie du verbe latin *subō*

Éric Dieu
Université de Toulouse 2

Le verbe latin *subō* « être en chaleur, être en rut » (en parlant de femelles, et en particulier de la truie, tandis que le verbe *suriō*, de même sens, se dit de mâles) n'a pas d'étymologie sûre : son rapport avec *sub* « sous » relève vraisemblablement de l'étymologie populaire, et les rapprochements qui ont pu être avancés avec des gloses d'Hésychius telles que σύβακα· συώδη (« semblable à un porc »), σύβας· λάγνος (« débauché ») et συβάλλας· ὁ καραφερὴς πρὸς τὰ ἀφροδίσια (« celui qui est enclin aux plaisirs de l'amour ») ne sont nullement évidents. Un examen des occurrences de ce verbe révèle qu'il était associé à une forme de mouvement rapide et violent, d'agitation. Ce constat peut donner lieu à une hypothèse étymologique, d'autant qu'il apparaît, par ailleurs, que ce type de vocabulaire implique fréquemment, d'un point de vue étymologique, une forme de mouvement originelle (cf. Henderson 1991 : 151 sq.) : c'est par exemple le cas, en grec, du verbe θυάω « être en rut » (en parlant de porcs ou de sangliers), qui est dérivé de θύω « bondir, s'élancer avec fureur », ainsi que du verbe ληκάω « coire, futuere », qui signifiait originellement « sauter » (cf. letton *lẽkât* « voler, sauter, sautiller »), ou bien encore de certains emplois secondaires en un sens obscène de κινέω « mettre en mouvement, remuer, agiter » (cf. Ar., *Ran*. 148, etc.). Inversement, suivant l'analyse avancée par C. Watkins 1975 : 11-26), la valeur sexuelle héritée de l'indo-européen de la racine **$h_1$erĝ^h*- « couvrir (sexuellement), saillir, être excité » a pu s'effacer, à des degrés divers selon les langues, pour laisser la place à la dénotation d'un simple mouvement : cf. védique *r̥ghāyáte* « trembler ; se déchaîner », qui présente encore bon nombre d'emplois dans le *Rigveda* où une valeur sexuelle se laisse déceler, et grec ὀρχέομαι « danser » (si du moins ce verbe provient effectivement de la racine *$h_1er\hat{g}^h$-) où, en revanche, une telle valeur sexuelle ne se rencontre guère que dans des graffiti obscènes de Théra.

L'objet de notre communication sera de proposer un rattachement nouveau de lat. *subō* à la racine indo-européenne **kseu̯b*^{h}-, représentée en indo-iranien (notamment dans la racine sanskrite *kṣubh-* « être agité, être secoué, trembler, être en mouvement ») et en slave (ru. dial. *xibát'* « faire chanceler », pol. *chybać* « balancer, agiter », etc.). Ce rapprochement s'accorderait bien avec les emplois du verbe latin *subō*, et il ne poserait aucune difficulté formelle : *subō* serait soit un verbe primaire issu du degré zéro de cette racine **kseu̯b*^{h}-, soit un dénominatif de **suba* < **ksub*^{h}*-eh*$_2$ « agitation, secousse ». Le traitement de **ks-* > lat. *s-* est documenté par ailleurs dans *sentis* « buissons, ronces » < **ksn̥-ti-s*, forme apparentée, suivant la reconstruction admise par H. Rix (1994 : 110), à gr. ξαίνω (< **ksn̥-i̯*$^e/_o$-) « carder ; déchirer, lacérer » et à véd. *vi-kṣan-* (< *-*ksen-*) « carder de la laine ».

Références

Henderson, J., 1991, *The Maculate Muse. Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*, New York - Oxford.
Rix, H., 1994, *Historische Sprachforschung* 107, 110.
Watkins, C., 1975, *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 70, 11-26.

L'anaphore rhétorique dans l'*Histoire naturelle* de Pline l'Ancien

Pedro DUARTE
Université d'Aix-Marseille

À en croire Quintilien, la répétition n'est pas nécessairement bien vue dans la rhétorique latine, où elle peut être synonyme de redondance ou indice d'une absence de clarté (*e.g.* Quint. *I.O.* IV, 2, 43). Au regard de cette critique rhétorique, nous nous sommes interrogés sur la place réservée à la répétition dans la prose latine contemporaine de Quintilien, notamment dans l'œuvre de Pline l'Ancien où, à vrai dire, le recours somme toute assez fréquent à la brachylogie peut contrarier a priori l'emploi même de segments répétés. Cette répétition trouve ainsi quelque saillance sur laquelle il est intéressant de s'attarder pour en voir le fonctionnement et la motivation même. Dans le cadre de la présente communication, il s'agira de s'intéresser à une figure microstructurale de la répétition, à savoir l'anaphore rhétorique.

Nous avons déjà pu dégager un emploi particulier de l'anaphore chez Pline l'Ancien, lorsque l'encyclopédiste intègre de longs discours rapportés : il est alors possible d'observer une pragmaticalisation de *idem* pour maintenir une cohérence énonciative dans une structure du type *idem* + AcI : *idem* marque le maintien du même énonciateur dont le propos est rapporté ; immédiatement après ce *idem* suit la structure AcI, qui constitue le discours rapporté (*e.g.* Plin. *N.H.* VII, 12).

Il s'agit désormais d'envisager une étude systématique des emplois de l'anaphore chez Pline pour parvenir à dégager les différentes valeurs sémantico-pragmatiques et les conditions syntaxiques d'emploi de ces anaphoriques rhétoriques. Pour ce faire, nous considérerons aussi une approche énonciative, en reprenant l'appareil théorique développé ces dernières années par l'école niçoise de linguistique française (particulièrement Watine 2012). Nous espérons ainsi éprouver notre hypothèse d'une figure microstructurale pensée en adéquation avec un type de discours, à savoir un discours que nous saurions qualifier d'encyclopédique.

En particulier, l'anaphore nous paraît ainsi concilier, au fond, une certaine brachylogie – contrairement à l'impression première mentionnée ci-dessus – et une certaine clarté du propos : par la cohésion textuelle qu'elle permet, l'anaphore rhétorique apparaît comme un outil linguistique commode pour produire des séquences homogènes et dont le bornage à gauche est ainsi facilité. Dans la réception du texte, l'anaphore participe ainsi d'un effet de « rubrique », comme dans tel catalogue des productions assignables à un artiste (*e.g.* Plin. *N.H.* XXXIV, 57 : *Fecit… Fecit…*).

Assurément, il ne faut pas omettre que pour Pline, le lecteur devait pouvoir prendre tout livre de l'*Histoire naturelle* en n'importe quel point sans en être gêné : cette contrainte même que s'est assignée Pline dans l'écriture de son œuvre trouve, à notre sens, une traduction dans cet emploi particulier de l'anaphore rhétorique. Nous préciserons alors toutes les modalités de ce bornage à gauche et de cet effet de « rubrique » permis par l'anaphore rhétorique.

Références

AAVV 2011, *Anaphora : forme della ripetizione*. *Atti del XXIV Convegno interuniversitario*, Bressanone-Brixen.
Bonhomme, Marc, 2005, *Pragmatique des figures du discours*, Paris, Champion.
Cova, Pier Vicenzo *et al*., 1986, *Studi sulla lingua di Plinio il Vecchio*, Milan.
Magri, Véronique et Rabatel, Alain, 2013, Quand la répétition se fait figure, Nice.

Mayaffre, Damon, 2013, Anaphore rhétorique et cataphore grammaticale dans le discours sarkozyste : "ça ne peut plus durer…", Colloque « Figures du discours et contextualisation ».
Pinkster, Harm, 2005, The Language of Pliny the Elder, in T. Reinhardt *et al*. (eds), *The Language of Latin Prose*, Oxford, OUP, 239-256.
Rabatel, Alain, 2012, Positions, positionnements et postures de l'énonciateur, *Travaux neuchâtelois de linguistique*, 56, 23-42.
Watine, Marie-Albane, 2012 , La réduplication : une interprétation dialogique, in F. Calas *et al*. (dir.), *Les figures à l'épreuve du discours*, Paris, PUPS, 149-160.
–– 2012 [2013], La réduplication et son contexte, *Le discours et la langue*, 4-2, 61-72.

***Ille* introducteur de citation chez Cicéron**

Emmanuel DUPRAZ
Université Libre de Bruxelles

Le démonstratif *ille* est fréquemment attesté chez Cicéron pour renvoyer à une citation littérale, soit que le texte de celle-ci précède le démonstratif, soit, le plus souvent, qu'*ille* précède la citation. La présente communication souhaite analyser les traits syntaxiques, sémantiques et pragmatiques qui caractérisent cet emploi d'*ille*, en mettant en œuvre le cadre théorique mis au point par N. Himmelmann (1997) et H. Diessel (1999). Le corpus utilisé comprend le *De Senectute*, le *De Amicitia*, le livre I du *De Officiis* et les livres I à III des *Tusculanes*, c'est-à-dire un échantillon de prose philosophique, le genre littéraire où Cicéron utilise le plus fréquemment des citations, pour illustrer son argumentation.

L'emploi d'un démonstratif pour introduire une citation n'est nullement obligatoire chez Cicéron. *Ille* est cependant courant pour cela. Son emploi doit être considéré d'un point de vue sémantico-pragmatique comme anamnestique : le démonstratif distal renvoie à un énoncé supposé accessible dans la mémoire à long terme de l'interlocuteur, parce que la citation est notoire parmi les Romains cultivés auxquels s'adressent Cicéron ou les personnages de celui-ci. La citation n'a pas besoin d'être complète, il arrive que Cicéron cite seulement le début du passage auquel il pense, parce que le démonstratif est suffisant pour renvoyer à l'ensemble du passage dans la mémoire stable de l'interlocuteur (ainsi *De Senectute*, XVII, 61).

Ille renvoie à une formulation qui est celle d'un énonciateur second, en l'occurrence un poète du passé dont Cicéron cite un ou plusieurs vers. Il doit donc être analysé non seulement comme anamnestique, mais également comme déictique textuel : il renvoie au contenu propositionnel du passage cité, mais aussi à sa matérialité, c'est-à-dire à la chaîne parlée exacte qui a été employée par le poète.

Fréquemment le démonstratif *ille* est employé de manière adnominale, c'est-à-dire qu'une catégorisation substantivale est présente dans le même contexte, ou bien *ille* fonctionne comme un sujet auquel est associé un prédicat. Dans ces emplois le démonstratif recatégorise la citation comme un tout et sert d'intermédiaire syntaxique permettant de prédiquer un substantif ou un adjectif à la citation.

A côté d'*ille*, *hic* est également documenté pour renvoyer à une citation. Une différence sémantico-pragmatique apparaît cependant. *Hic* est un simple déictique discursif. Il renvoie seulement au contenu propositionnel attribué à l'énonciateur second cité et non à la littéralité d'un passage notoire. Il peut être employé pour renvoyer à une citation poétique, si c'est seulement le contenu propositionnel de celle-ci qui est visé, mais il est plus courant pour une longue citation de prose (ainsi *De Senectute*, XXII, 81). Cicéron tend donc à faire une distinction entre les citations poétiques, qui renvoient à la connaissance littérale d'un passage en vers parmi les interlocuteurs du dialogue ou les lecteurs qu'il envisage, et les citations de prose, pour lesquelles seul le contenu propositionnel est pertinent et l'emploi d'un démonstratif renvoyant à la notoriété d'un texte précis et à sa forme exacte n'est pas nécessaire.

Références

Diessel, Holger, 1999, *Demonstratives - Form, Function and Grammaticalization,* Amsterdam et Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
Himmelmann, Nikolaus, 1997, *Deiktikon, Artikel, Nominalphrase - zur Emergenz syntaktischer Struktur,* Tübingen, Niemeyer.

On the use of prefixed verbs in Early Latin

Vera DÜRRSCHNABEL
University of Zurich

This paper deals with the use of prefixed verbs in Early Latin, with particular attention to Ennius. The function of prefixes on Latin verbs has recently been investigated by Haverling (2000), who showed on the basis of *sco*-verbs how previous assumptions explaining the use of prefixes as a change of imperfective to perfective aspect have been too simplistic. She also indicated how prefixes may variously modify the meaning of the predicate, in terms of both aspect and actionality, in different stages of Latin and in different authors (cf. also Mellet 1994). In the same vein, we shall observe how the usage of prefixes in conveying temporal, aspectual and actional functions may be flexible in Ennius' poetry. As can be seen in the following examples (1)-(2), prefixed and non-prefixed variants of a certain predicate may occur in seemingly very similar contexts.

(1) *summo sonito quatit ungula terram* (Ann. 277)
"with loudest rattle their hoof(s) shattered the ground"

(2) *plausu cava concutit ungula terram* (Ann. 439)
"the knocking of their hollow hoof(s) shattered the ground"

Accordingly, in order to identify possible factors underlying the distribution of prefixed verbs, we cannot limit ourselves to consider single passages, but rather we have to gather systematically all occurrences of predicates in prefixed and non-prefixed structures. On the one hand, we shall take into account relevant literature on aspect and actionality (Comrie 1978; Smith 1997). On the other hand, we shall discuss problems of the philological research tradition, due to Ennius' complex transmission and reception. Owing to Ennius' retention of remarkable archaic features of Latin, all this may be also revealing for a study of the development of the Latin verbal system from Early Latin to Classical Latin.

References

Comrie, B. 1978, *Aspect: An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems*, Cambridge, CUP.
Haverling, G. 2000, *On sco-verbs, prefixes and semantic functions: A study in the development of prefixed and unprefixed verbs from early to late Latin*, Göteborg, Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
Mellet, S. 1994, *Le signifié du verbe*, Louvain, Ed. Peeters.
Smith, C. S. 1997, *The parameters of aspect*, Dordrecht, Kluwer

El ritmo y la sonoridad como impulsores del patetismo en el '*Lamento de Ariadna*' de Catulo

Sergio EMBLETON MÁRQUEZ
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

Este trabajo tiene el propósito de mostrar que el vínculo existente entre el ritmo de los versos y la sonoridad de las palabras son generadores retóricos de la intención patética en el célebre pasaje del 'lamento de Ariadna' hallado en el poema 64 de Catulo. Para lograrlo, haré un análisis fonético-fonológico y métrico del fragmento (vv. 132-201), y mostraré algunos ejemplos que considere más representativos. La edición del *Lamento* en la que basaré mi análisis es la que se encuentra en el corpus latino del Packard Humanities Institute (PHI), es decir, la de G.P. Goold (Londres, Duckworth, 1983). Como un antecedente de esta clase de estudio se puede mencionar, por ejemplo, el notable trabajo de Jeffrey Wills intitulado *Repetition in Latin Poetry* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1996).

Una lectura recitada del fragmento revela la existencia de gran cantidad de sonidos guturales que dan al oído un efecto de golpeo que estaría relacionado con el patetismo reflejado por Ariadna durante su execración, querella y conmiseración. El ritmo dado Por otra parte, la repetición constante de palabras (anáfora, paralelismo, políptoton, derivación, aliteración, consonancia, asonancia, etc.) desempeña la función de reforzar el mensaje del personaje y dotar a su discurso de una mayor fuerza dramática, a la vez que trata de evocar un manejo de lengua semejante al del habla natural. Tenemos una primera aparición de estas figuras de repetición desde el comienzo del episodio: la anadiplosis de *perfide* (vv. 132-3). Dentro del ámbito sonoro, podemos destacar un sintagma nominal del verso 162, *liquidis lymphis*, que ofrece una sinestesia y ayuda a la creación de la imagen narrada por la mujer abandonada que imagina una vida al lado de Teseo.

Con este análisis pretendo contribuir a los estudios sobre fonética y fonología latinas y también a los incontables estudios sobre poética y sobre Catulo, pues el sonido y el ritmo son elementos esenciales dentro de la poesía, y este *Lamento* es prueba de ello.

Les emplois de *quando* dans l'*Histoire romaine* de Tite-Live

Fabienne FATELLO
Université Blaise Pascal, Clermont-Ferrand

Nous avons répertorié à partir du CD-ROM de la *Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina* (BTL-4) 78 occurrences de *quando* dans l'*Histoire romaine* de Tite-Live : ces emplois sont essentiellement causals. Pour appréhender leur spécificité par rapport à d'autres conjonctions considérées comme sémantiquement proches, nous nous appuierons sur les travaux effectués sur les subordonnées circonstancielles de cause en latin ; d'après ceux-ci, un critère essentiel oppose *quoniam/quando* aux conjonctions *quod/quia* : alors que *quod* et *quia* instaurent une relation sémantico-logique de causalité entre deux contenus propositionnels et forment une unité syntaxique avec la principale, *quando* et *quoniam* justifient un acte de parole. Aussi, du point de vue de la grammaire fonctionnelle, les propositions introduites par *quando*/*quoniam* sont à considérer comme des satellites disjoints (*disjunct satellites*) fonctionnant au niveau interpersonnel (*interpersonal level*).

Nous montrerons par l'analyse des occurrences de *quando* que cette caractérisation en tant que *disjunct satellite* s'applique à la majorité des emplois chez Tite-Live. Nous tenterons de déterminer quelles sont les caractéristiques syntaxiques et énonciatives propres à l'emploi de *quando* causal : le contenu propositionnel de *quando p* est-il toujours « présupposé » ? Que peut-on en déduire quant à la valeur argumentative de *quando* ? Quel acte de parole est justifié ?

Les exemples au discours indirect peuvent être particulièrement intéressants à cet égard : *quando p* justifie-t-il toujours un acte d'énonciation et, dans ce cas, à qui faut-il imputer cet acte d'énonciation ? Nous serons ainsi amenée à nous interroger également sur les cas de polyphonie.

Finalement quelques extraits de facture archaïque et d'allure juridique mettront en évidence la plurifonctionnalité de *quando* : relatif indéfini ou encore conjonction circonstancielle de temps, *quando* se montre polyvalent dans le corpus livien.

Références

Bolkestein, A.M., 1991, Causally related predications and the choice between parataxis and hypotaxis in Latin, in *New Studies in Latin Linguistics*, R. Coleman (éd.), Amsterdam- Philadelphia, J. Benjamins, 427-451.

Dik, S.C., Hengeveld, K., Vester, E., Vet, C., 1990, The hierarchical structure of the clause and the typology of adverbial satellites, in *Layers and Levels of Representation in Language Theory. A Functional View*, J. Nuyts, A.M. Bolkestein, C. Vet (éd.), Amsterdam-Philadelphia, J. Benjamins, 25-70.

Ducrot, O., 1972, 1984, *Le dire et le dit*, Les éditions de minuit, Paris.

Fugier, H., 1989, *Quod, quia, quoniam* et leurs effets textuels chez Cicéron, in *Subordination and other topics in Latin*, *Actes du 3e Colloque de Linguistique Latine,* G. Calboli (éd.), Amsterdam-Philadelphia, J. Benjamins, 91-119.

Mellet, S., 1994, Eléments pour une étude de la synonymie syntaxique : l'exemple des conjonctions de cause, in *Les problèmes de la synonymie en latin*, Colloque du centre Alfred Ernout, 3 et 4 juin 1992, C. Moussy (éd.), Paris, 203-221.

–– 1995, *Quando, quia, quod, quoniam* : analyse énonciative et syntaxique des conjonctions de cause en latin, in *De usu : études de syntaxe latine offertes en hommage à Marius Lavency,* D. Longrée (éd.), Peeters, Leuven, 211-228.

Pinkster, H., 2010 The use of *quia* and *quoniam* in Cicero, Seneca and Tertullian, dans *Studies in classical linguistics in honor of Philip Baldi*, B. R. Page, A. D. Rubin (éds.), Leiden, Brill, 81-96 (http://dare.uva.nl/document/191812).

DiSCIS: a new sociolinguistic and pragmatic corpus of Plautus' comedies

Chiara FEDRIANI
University of Bergamo

This paper aims to illustrate and discuss the empirical and methodological bases which have been crucial for designing and annotating a corpus based on the Plautine comedies, and to present some preliminary analyses and results. This corpus is currently under construction at the University of Bergamo and will be soon freely available at www.mediling.eu. It is annotated (and therefore searchable) according to both sociolinguistic features (including gender, age, and social status of speakers) and pragmatic parameters: once pragmaticalized –or pragmatically connoted– elements have been individuated in the comedies under scrutiny, they have been tagged according to Social Act (e.g., request, order, promise), type of Discourse Unit (intervention, turn, act, subact: see Pons Bordería 2014), and type of contact or contact-like phenomena (loan-words, code-switching), if any. Moreover, these pragmatic elements are also classified according to the position they occupy in the sentence, in order to retrieve possible associations between their occurrence in the right or left periphery and their pragmatic or discursive function (see Beeching & Detges 2014).

After a brief presentation of the tagset, we will turn to data and results of some preliminary analyses, which clearly rest upon a corpus-based methodology. A first case study concerns pragmatic traits which have been claimed to be distinctive of male vs. female speech in different languages: women, for instance, use polite forms more often than men (cf. Trudgill 1974: 90ff.) and this holds also for Latin (Gilleland 1980, Ferri 2008). Taking into account politeness markers, for instance, Adams (1984) shows that *amabo* is typically used by women to mitigate order and requests, while *quaeso* is predominantly uttered by males, opposed to equi-functional forms which however were gender-insensitive, like *sis* (Dutsch 2008: 53). Our corpus-based approach confirms this result, but also highlights some interesting exceptions to these tendencies: in the rare cases in which *amabo* is uttered by males in Plautus' comedies, for instance, we will see that the character undergoes indeed some kind of context-bound identity negotiation.

A second case study concerns the distribution of Greek loan-words and code-switches in the Plautine corpus. As known, Greek is typically found in Plautus in the speech of men of low social status like cooks, parasites, slaves, artisans (see e.g. Maltby 1995). This is due to the fact that Greek was mimetically oriented to a social-identitary characterization of slaves in the 3rd cent. BCE (Adams 2003: 352). Again, a corpus-based research reveals some new insights. For instance, if we search for contact phenomena uttered by socially high characters, we find cases like Cas. 727–732, where Lysidamus inserts Greek words and phrases in his speech much like his servant Olympio, and this may be seen as evidence of the degradated role to which he has reduced himself due to his frequent associations with his slave.

This paper ends with some remarks on the process of annotating a pragmatically-oriented corpus and the empirical outcomes of this may serve to redefine and constantly re-model the functional domain at issue, possibly leading to a reassessment of theoretical matters.

References

Adams, J. N. 1984. Female speech in Latin comedy. *Antichthon* 18: 43–77.
–– 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: CUP.
Beeching, K. & U. Detges (eds.) 2014. *Discourse Functions at the Left and Right Periphery*. Leiden: Brill.
Dutsch, D. 2008. *Feminine Discourse in Roman Comedy: On Echoes and Voices*. Oxford: OUP.
Ferri, R. 2008. Politeness in Latin Comedy: Some Preliminary Thoughts. *MD* 61: 15–28.
Gilleland, M. E. 1980. Female speech in Greek and Latin. *American Journal of Philology* 101: 180–183.
Maltby, R. 1995. The Distribution of Greek Loan-Words in Plautus. *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 8: 31–69.
Pons Bordería, S. 2014. Paths of grammaticalization in Spanish o sea. In C. Ghezzi & P. Molinelli, *Discourse and Pragmatic Markers from Latin to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: OUP, 109–136.
Trudgill, P. 1974. *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society.* Baltimore: Penguin.

Las formas "atemáticas" del presente L *ferō*

Elisa FERRER
Universidad Nacional de Córdoba (Argentina)

Este trabajo se ocupa del posible origen de las formas del latín clásico *fers*, *fert*, *fertis*, *fer* etc., de apariencia atemática, en lo que suele llamarse la flexión "semitemática". Se considera la variedad de explicaciones sobre este origen (formaciones atemáticas de raíz PIE, formaciones sincopadas en período PIE, o síncopa específica del grupo itálico o del latín) en el marco general de la conservación de formas atemáticas en otros verbos latinos, la comparación con presentes radicales formados sobre esta raíz en otros dialectos IDE, las teorías sobre la distribución original de las conjugaciones temática y atemática, y los cambios fonéticos específicamente itálicos que pueden dar cuenta de estas formaciones. En este contexto, se intenta determinar si las formas latinas mencionadas constituyen desarrollos dialectales posteriores a la escisión del latín con respecto al protoidioma, o si, por el contrario, son testimonio de antiguas formas atemáticas.

Referencias

Adrados, F.R., 1975, *Lingüística Indoeuropea*. Madrid: Gredos.
Baldi, Ph., 2002, *The Foundations of Latin*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Buck, C.D., 1933, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.
Clackson, J. (ed.), 2011, *A Companion to the Latin Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Ernout, A., 1989, *Morphologie historique du latin*. Paris: Klincksieck.
Lehmann, W.P., 1993, *Theoretical Bases of Indo-European Linguistics*. New York: Routledge.
Rix, H., 2001, *Lexikon der Indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
Sihler, A.L., 1995, *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Oxford: OUP.
Szemerényi, O., 1978, *Introducción a la lingüística comparativa* (trad. A. Álvarez). Madrid: Gredos.
Szemerényi, O., 1964, *Syncope in Greek and Indo-European and the nature of Indo-European accent*. Naples: Istituto Orientale.

La syllepse comme indice de modalisation autonymique

Frédérique FLECK
École normale supérieure (Paris)

Si les phénomènes relevant de l'autonymie en latin ont déjà été assez largement traités (par C. Nicolas notamment), ceux qui relèvent de la modalisation autonymique n'ont été que rarement abordés. Ces cas où il y a à la fois usage et mention sont en effet souvent difficiles à identifier en l'absence d'une modalisation en discours second (du type « selon ses propres termes », « comme dirait X ») car les termes dont il est fait mention sont parfaitement intégrés à la syntaxe régulière de la phrase. Notre communication s'inscrit dans un programme de recherche plus large portant sur le repérage des formes non explicites du discours représenté en latin (discours indirect libre, discours direct libre, îlots textuels…). Certains indices d'hétérogénéité énonciative ont déjà été mentionnés par M. Biraud et S. Mellet, L. Sznajder, F. Fleck, mais beaucoup méritent encore d'être mis en évidence.

Notre communication se concentrera sur la question du blocage de la synonymie propre à l'autonymie. Ce blocage de la synonymie est souvent illustré par des exemples d'emploi autonyme (sans usage) dans lesquels une glose du terme autonyme indique le niveau de langue auquel il appartient, son étymologie, le nombre de lettres qui le composent, etc. Ce critère du blocage de la synonymie n'a, en revanche, pas été utilisé comme critère de repérage d'une modalisation autonymique. Dans ce type d'emploi, les gloses évoquées ci-dessus sont exclues. Nous proposons d'examiner, dans le corpus épigrammatique de Martial, différents jeux sur la polysémie d'un terme qui bloquent, comme les gloses, la synonymie et constituent de ce fait des indices de modalisation autonymique. La figure de la syllepse nous paraît emblématique, mais nous élargiront notre étude à d'autres cas (antanaclase, verbe à constructions multiples…).

Nous nous appuierons principalement, en ce qui concerne l'analyse des formes d'hétérogénéité énonciative, sur les travaux de J. Authier-Revuz et, pour l'autonymie, sur ceux de J. Rey-Debove et de C. Nicolas. L'analyse des figures de style jouant sur la polysémie sera menée à l'aide des travaux de F. Rastier dans le cadre de l'analyse sémique.

Notre étude devrait nous permettre d'identifier un certain nombre de mentions et d'îlots textuels qui n'avaient pas encore été repérés comme tels chez Martial et d'affiner ainsi la connaissance que nous avons de cet auteur et, plus précisément, de la manière dont il joue avec les mots des autres dans ses épigrammes. Elle devrait également établir l'existence d'un type d'indice particulier pour le repérage des formes non explicites de discours représenté : le blocage de la synonymie à travers les jeux sur la polysémie d'un terme. Ce critère pourra prendre place dans une typologie des indices d'hétérogénéité énonciative. L'établissement d'une telle typologie est un enjeu particulièrement important pour l'étude du latin, les textes qui nous ont été transmis ne portant pas de marques typographiques (guillemets, italiques) facilitant le repérage des mentions comme dans les langues modernes.

Références

Authier-Revuz, J., 1992-1993, Repères dans le champ du discours rapporté I et II, *L'Information grammaticale*, 55, 38-42 et 56, 10-15.
–– 1995, *Ces Mots qui ne vont pas de soi. Boucles réflexives et non-coïncidences du dire*, Paris, Larousse.
Biraud, M. & Mellet, S., 2000, Les faits d'hétérogénéité énonciative dans les textes grecs et latins de l'Antiquité, *Cahier Chronos* 5, 9-48.
Fleck, F., 2015, La possibilité d'un îlot. La répétition comme indice de littéralité, *De Lingua Latina* 11, *Le discours rapporté en latin.*
Nicolas, C., 2005, Sic enim appello... *Essai sur l'autonymie terminologique gréco-latine chez Cicéron*, Louvain-Paris-Dudley, Ma, Peeters.
–– 2005, Typologie de l'autonymie en latin, *De Cyrène à Catherine : trois mille ans de Libyennes. Etudes grecques et latines offertes à Catherine Dobias-Lalou*, F. Poli et G. Vottéro (éd.), Nancy, ADRA Paris, 415-428.
Rastier, F., 1994, *Sémantique pour l'analyse – de la linguistique à l'informatique*, Paris, Masson.
Rey-Debove, J., 1997 (1978[1]), *Le Métalangage*, Paris, Armand Colin.
Sznajder, L., 2005, Stratégies de prises en charge énonciatives dans le discours indirect, *Papers on Grammar IX. Latina Lingua ! Proceedings of the Twelfth International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*, G. Calboli (éd.), Rome, Herder, 749-761.

On so-called adversative *nisi*

Giovanbattista GALDI
University of Ghent

The Latin connector *nisi* has attracted the attention of several scholars. Specifically, recent studies have convincingly shown the existence of two main uses of the particle. For one thing, there appears (a) an exclusive or restrictive function, by which the *nisi*-phrase *p* is strictly related to a preceding (more seldom following) negative phrase *q* and both constitute a syntactic and semantic unity, which corresponds to a restrictive assertion ("only *p*", "nothing else than *p*"), ex. Suet. Claud. 35 *neque conuiuia inire ausus est, nisi ut spectatores cum lanceis circumstarent*. For the other thing, there is (b) an exceptive or limitative use, by which *q* is accomplished in all cases, except the one expressed by *p* (thus, "unless *p*", "except (if) *p*"), and the connection between the two sentences is much looser than in (a), ex. Sall. Iug. 17,6 *plerosque senectus dissoluit, nisi qui ferro aut bestiis interiere*.

Furthermore, standard grammars mention a third, adversative function, by which the *nisi*-phrase expresses a contrast with the preceding (typically negative) text segment, hence displaying a meaning very close to *sed*, ex. Plaut. Cist. 4-5 *qui magis potueritis mihi honorem ire habitum, nescio, nisi, ut meus est animus, fieri non posse arbitror*. Adversative *nisi* is found several times in Plautus and Terence, is rare in classical times and becomes quite spread in imperial and late times, especially in Christian sources. Therefore, it is generally assumed that this feature belonged to colloquial or "vulgar" registers and, consequently, was "filtered out" in standard classical Latin.

The aim of our contribution is twofold. On the one hand, we will discuss the occurrences of adversative *nisi* in Roman comedy and we will suggest that they can fundamentally be put down to the two main functions of the particle. On the other hand, we will show that, despite apparent similarities, the adversativity emerging in archaic Latin is not of the same type as the one attested in late sources and therefore these two uses must be kept apart.

References

Bertocchi, A. – M. Maraldi, 2010, Conditionals and concessives, in Ph. Baldi, P. Cuzzolin (eds.) *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax. Volume 3: Constituent Syntax: Quantification, Numerals, Possession, Anaphora*, De Gruyter Mouton, 19-173.

Hofmann, J. B. – A. Szantyr (1972) *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, Beck.

Kühner, R. – C. Stegmann (1955) *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Satzlehre,* Zweiter Teil, Max Hueber,

Löfstedt, E. (1936) *Vermischte Studien zur lateinischen Sprachkunde und Syntax,* C.W.K. Gleerup.

Orlandini, A. (2001) *Négation et argumentation en Latin*, Grammaire fondamentale du latin, tome VIII, Peeters.

–– 2002, Les emplois adverbiaux de *nisi*: une approche discursive, in L. Sawicki, D. Shalev (eds.), *Donum grammaticum. Studies in Latin and Celtic Linguistics in Honour of Hannah Rosén*, Peeters, 277-286.

Foret versus *esset*

Julie GALLEGO
Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour, CRPHLL

Foret est généralement présenté comme le doublet du subjonctif imparfait *esset*. Mais les conditions de distribution de la forme plus rare ne sont pas claires. On trouve peu d'explications linguistiques à son emploi et la stylistique semble convoquée à défaut de mieux (mise en valeur de la forme verbale par sa fréquence peu élevée, sonorité en écho à d'autres mots importants de la phrase…). Nous nous proposons donc d'essayer de définir les conditions d'apparition de cette variante, que l'on trouve en proposition régie comme non régie, mais le plus souvent en système hypothétique, semble-t-il, au vu des premières données observées grâce à la base de *PHI*.

Les formes majoritaires de cette variante rare sont effectivement à la 3^e^ personne du singulier et du pluriel (avec un rapport de 1 à 3 entre elles, en faveur du singulier) et les autres personnes ne sont pas représentées (1^re^ et 2^e^ pl.) ou très peu (1^re^ et 2^e^ sg., avec presque toutes les occurrences chez Ovide). Les composés en *-*foret* sont presque inexistants face à ceux en *-*esset/-essent*.

De plus, une grande disparité existe entre les auteurs : aucune occurrence chez César (*BG* et *GG*, 1 dans les *Carmina*), moins de 10 chez Cicéron, Lucain, Pétrone ou Suétone, entre trente et cinquante chez Justinien, Salluste ou Aulu-Gelle et plus de cent chez Tacite, Ovide ou Tite-Live (pour ne citer que quelques exemples représentatifs par catégorie). Si la forme n'est pas chez César, c'est sans doute que *esset* lui suffit pour exprimer ce qui est régulièrement spécifié par *foret* chez Tite-Live, pour raisonner sur les deux extrêmes, mais il reste à identifier dans quel(s) contexte(s) exact(s) un auteur comme Tite-Live privilégie la forme. Nous retiendrons comme corpus principal pour le dépouillement des formes les trois auteurs présentant le plus grand nombre d'occurrences de *foret*/*forent* (Ov., Tac. Liv.), en confrontant, dès que nécessaire, leurs emplois à *esset/essent*, mais sans exclure une analyse de *foret/forent* chez d'autres auteurs, pour permettre des recoupements dans l'analyse syntaxique, pragmatique et éventuellement stylistique des formes.

La subordinación en la diplomática del Reino de Asturias (718-910)

Alfonso GARCÍA LEAL
Universitat de Oviedo

Conservamos de la diplomática del Reino de Asturias un limitado conjunto de documentos originales que abarcan un periodo de aproximadamente siglo y medio (775-910).

En nuestro estudio se describen los variados tipos de subordinación empleados, así como los nexos y conjunciones que la introducen, con el objeto de mostrar la evolución experimentada por la lengua en este período, en comparación tanto con el latín clásico como con las lenguas romances.

Destaca la importancia y extensión de las oraciones relativas, las más habitualmente empleadas, mientras que otros tipos de subordinadas aparecen con menos frecuencia, introducidas por variados nexos. A pesar de la especificidad del tipo de textos estudiados (de tipo fundamentalmente jurídico, y muy constreñidos por el uso de una formulística muy repetitiva) constituyen prácticamente la mejor manera de conocer el estado de la lengua en el período indicado, puesto que los textos epigráficos de la época son aún más escasos.

Nuestro trabajo complementa el histórico estudio realizado en 1953 por Bastardas Parera: la conocida monografía _Particularidades sintácticas del latín medieval (cartularios españoles de los siglos VIII al XII)_.

Lexicalización y gramaticalización. Los indefinidos latinos como bases léxicas

Benjamín García-Hernández
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

La constitución de morfemas gramaticales suele hallarse al final de un proceso evolutivo que desciende del nivel léxico y más allá del fraseológico. Esa es la perspectiva habitual; pero la evolución inversa que asciende del nivel gramatical al léxico, aun siendo menos frecuente, no deja de ser común. Cualquier unidad gramatical es susceptible de lexicalizarse. La palabra _autobús_, p. ej., reúne dos morfemas que funcionan por separado como sustantivos. Vamos a considerar aquí las vertientes fraseológica, léxica y gramatical de los indefinidos.

Ahora bien, más que la gramaticalización de unidades fraseológicas o léxicas en la formación de los indefinidos (lat. _rem natam_ > fr. _rien_, esp. _nada_; lat. _homo_ > fr. _on_), nos interesa el proceso inverso: los indefinidos como bases léxicas de formaciones verbales o sustantivas. Junto a ejemplos conocidos (_adnullare_, _adnihilare_, med. _adnichilare_, etc.), hay otros menos explorados Los relativos _quantus_ y _qualis_ disponen de importantes derivados abstractos (_quantitas_, _qualitas_); pero ¿qué hay de sus correlativos _tantus_ y _talis_? ¿Agotaron su existencia en el latín antiguo y del latín al romance en su uso como indefinidos?

Sur les para-participes en -_cundus_ du latin

Romain Garnier
Université de Limoges

La classe des adjectifs en -_cundus_ entre dans ladite catégorie des para-participes en latin, qui compte en outre -_bilis_ et -_bundus_ (Brachet 2012). En regard de des formations, qui sont d'une productivité presque infinie, le type en -_cundus_ fait figure de parent pauvre : quasiment hors système, et ne commutant point librement avec -_bilis_, il se caractérise par l'étroitesse de son corpus : six formes en tout (sans compter les composés). Il s'agit tout d'abord du couple _fācundus_ (_in_°, _per_°) et _fēcundus_ (_in_°, _præ_°), dont le détail morphologique est totalement obscur : la doctrine commune, exposée chez Leumann (1977 : 333), hésite entre un prototype *_fātŭ-cundus_ syncopé et une formation radicale *_fā-cundus_. Les quatre autres éléments de ce micro-système sont _īrācundus_, _iūcundus_ (_in_°, _per_°), _rubicundus_ (_sub_°) et _uerēcundus_ (_in_°). Reste le problème du suffixe -_cundus_ – qu'il est 'chimérique' selon Ernout (_DELL_ : 223) de vouloir expliquer par une réinterprétation synchronique de l'adjectif _secundus_ (_in_°, *°_ob_-), lequel est issu de pré-lat. *_sek_^{w}_-ondo-_. Notons que, dans son récent manuel, Weiss (2011^{2} : 299) adopte encore cette explication ancienne. Benveniste (1933 : 186) pose pour -_cundus_ une sorte de 'gérondif' *_ḱuH-ond-ó-_ formé sur la racine i.-e. *_ḱuH-_ « être gonflé ». L'hypothèse de Szemerényi (1950 : 178) d'un dérivé thématique *_ḱuH-tn-ó-_ formé sur un neutre i.-e. *_ḱúH-tr̥_ « gonflement » ne vaut guère mieux.

Dans cette contribution, j'offre une hypothèse alternative, reposant sur le postulat d'une nouvelle loi phonétique latine : {*_-t-w-_ > *_-k-w-_}. Soit le type _fācundus_ : il faudrait ici – selon moi – poser un it. com. *_φā-tu-_ m. « capacité à parler » (< i.-e. *_b_^{h}_éh_$_{2}$_-tu-_), avec un dérivé possessif *_φātuw-ó-_ « doté de capacité à parler », lui-même à l'origine d'un abstrait *_φātuwo-dṓ_^{n} f. « faconde ». On en tirait un dérivé possessif thématique *_φātuwo-dn-ó-_ « doté de faconde » qui aboutissait à pré-lat. *_fātuwodn-o-_, d'où *_fātuwond-o-_ > *_fātwond-o-_ > *_fākwond-o-_ (v.-lat. *_fāquond-o-_), d'où procède _fācundus_ « facond ». De même, _fēcundus_ « fécond » reflète un étymon it. com. *_θētuw-o-dn-ó-_ « doté de fécondité » formé sur un nom d'action it. com. *_θē-tu-_ m. « fécondité » (< i.-e. *_d_^{h}_éh_$_{1}$_-tu-_). Les autres adjectifs de cette micro-classe sont d'émergence latine, et s'appuient sur d'anciens noms d'actions en -_tus_ : *_īrātus_, _-ūs_ m. « capacité de se mettre en colère » (*_īrāqu-ondos_) *_uerētus_, _-ūs_ m. « crainte » (*_uerēqu-ondos_), *_iuuitus_, _-ūs_ m. « agrément » – d'après le tour impersonnel *mḗ=iuuat* (**iuuiqu-ondos*) et **rubitus*, *-ūs* m. « rougeur » (**rubiqu-ondos*).

Je proposerai en outre deux études étymologiques inédites (*hircus*, *-ī* m. « bouc » et *tescum*, *-ī* n. « endroit désert ») visant à étayer l'hypothèse de cette nouvelle loi phonétique voulant que *-*t*-*w*- soit reflété par un groupe *-*k*-*w*- dans la préhistoire du latin.

Références

Benveniste É. 1933, Les adjectifs latins en *-cundus*, *BSL* 34, 186-190.
Brachet J.-P. 2012, Sur la formation du suffixe *-bilis* : étude morphologique et sémantique, *Latomus* 71, 649-667.
Ernout A.-Meillet A. 1985, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine, histoire des mots*, Paris.
Leumann M. 1977, *Lateinische Laut- und Formen-Lehre*. München.
Szemerényi O. 1950, The Latin gerundive and other *-n*-formations, *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1950 : 169-179.
Weiss M. 2011[2], *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. Beech Stave, Ann Arbor.

Contentio et la racine **tend*-

Laurent GAVOILLE
Université de Bordeaux, Ausonius UMR 5607 CNRS

Nous nous intéresserons ici au sémantisme de *contentio*, terme surtout connu pour entrer dans une opposition cicéronienne avec *sermo* : au sein de l'*oratio* ("parole" en général), *contentio* renvoie à la parole forte de l'éloquence, et *sermo* à la parole douce de la conversation. Mais cet usage du mot dans le champ de la parole résulte d'une évolution sémantique qu'il convient de préciser, à partir d'un sens premier qui est lui-même à définir. Comment s'articulent les acceptions de "tension", "lutte", "rivalité", "comparaison" ? Quel rôle joue, dans ce sémantisme, le préverbe *con-* ? Le sens de celui-ci est-il univoque ? La question est rendue encore plus complexe par l'indécision étymologique : pour *tendere* et *contendere*, le *L.I.V.* propose, à côté de l'explication traditionnelle par **ten*- "s'étendre, s'allonger", une autre par **tend*- "(s')affaiblir", au premier abord sémantiquement surprenante. Notre analyse sémantique de *contentio* a pour but d'aider, sinon à choisir entre ces deux hypothèses, du moins à montrer la pertinence de cette seconde étymologie.

Nous aurons recours, pour mener cette étude, aux méthodes de l'analyse componentielle, afin de dégager des sèmes pertinents, de construire des sémèmes, d'établir entre eux une hiérarchie en distinguant *sens*, *acception* et *emploi* (cf. F. Rastier), et de définir les relations de sens qui les unissent (cf. R. Martin). Notre étude étant centrée sur *contentio*, le corpus sera essentiellement constitué de Cicéron et Quintilien, mais la revue des verbes et des noms de la même famille imposera de se référer à d'autres auteurs. Pour définir des sèmes pertinents, nous opposerons *contentio*, dans des études de synonymie, à des termes plus ou moins voisins tels que *intentio*, *comparatio*, *certamen*, *disputatio*, *sermo* et *oratio*. Nous travaillerons aussi sur les correspondances avec le grec, pour définir d'éventuels emprunts de sens. L'examen des relations sémantiques entre des termes relevant du champ de la parole nous conduira à utiliser les concepts de l'analyse conversationnelle (C. Kerbrat-Orecchioni, R. Vion), ainsi que ceux de la pragmatique (F. Récanati).

Nous montrerons ainsi que *contentio* (parallèlement à *contendere*) signifie fondamentalement la tension d'un sujet destinée à se porter sur un adversaire, c'est-à-dire une lutte où deux concurrents se mesurent l'un à l'autre et qui prend fin par la victoire de l'un sur l'autre, c'est-à-dire par le relâchement de la tension initiale. L'adversaire est inclus comme but à atteindre dans le signifié de *contentio*, ce qui n'est pas le cas pour *intentio*. Ce sens premier de la compétition ainsi que son développement dans le champ de la parole conduit à établir un parallèle avec ἀγών et ses dérivés, jusque dans les emplois rhétoriques ; le caractère duel de la confrontation, ainsi que la victoire finale, violente, distinguent *contentio* de *certamen* et de *comparatio*. On privilégiera donc pour *contentio* et *contendere* la racine **tend*-, à laquelle on peut donner peut-être des implications religieuses et juridiques.

Negation and indefinites in Late Latin

Chiara GIANOLLO
Universität zu Köln

I investigate the interplay between sentential negation and indefinites in some Late Latin texts (III-IV century CE), with the aim of tracing to this stage later developments affecting the early Romance varieties. The work is based on previous extensive treatments of Latin negation and Latin indefinites (a.o. Orlandini 1981, Molinelli 1988, Orlandini 2001, Bertocchi, Maraldi, Orlandini 2010), and on a quantitative evaluation of new corpus data, collected and analyzed according to recent theoretical models of the syntax and semantics of negation and polarity (a.o. Zanuttini 1997, Zeijlstra 2004).

Indefinites interact with negation since the existential quantification they convey (∃) may entertain different relations with the negative operator (¬), outscoping it in some cases (∃ > ¬), or remaining in its scope (¬ > ∃). The ∃ > ¬ reading is usually referred to as 'specific', whereas the ¬ > ∃ one is typically found with negative indefinites (Lat. *nemo, nihil, nullus*) and negative polarity items (Lat. *quisquam, ullus* a.o.).

Latin's very rich system of indefinites sharply distinguishes between negative indefinites and negative polarity items. Negative indefinites always bring about a negative reading, i.e. they may not co-occur with another overt expression of negation without yielding a 'double negation' reading. All (early) Romance varieties, instead, exhibit Negative Concord: a negative marker can co-occur with a negative indefinite, yielding only one semantic negation. Moreover, new negative polarity items have been grammaticalized, often from a Latin source that was not dependent on licensing by negation or other downward-entailing contexts (e.g. *aliquis*, cf. Gianollo 2013). I will explore the possibility that this typological shift in the domain of negation may be linked to another major shift happening from Latin to Romance, namely the change from OV to VO (cf. Spevak 2010 and 2005 respectively for Classical and Late Latin, Danckaert 2012, Ledgeway 2012). Non-strict Negative Concord varieties (e.g. Italian, Spanish) allow negative indefinites to co-occur with the negative marker only if they follow the finite verb. Negative indefinites preceding the verb suffice to express sentential negation and may not co-occur with the negative marker. I will propose that Late Latin is also, in fact, a language of this type, and that the absence of co-occurrence with the negative marker is linked to the fact that also objects may precede the inflected verb. In Late Latin negative indefinites become rarer, and the pattern where the indefinite is expressed by a negative polarity item more frequent. Quite strikingly, in the entire *Vulgata*, of the 35 occurrences of accusative *neminem*, 33 show the OV order (despite the general increase in VO order); all the 47 occurrences of *nullum/nullos/nullam/nullas* are preverbal. Similarly, in the *Itinerarium Egeriae*, there are only 20 instances of negative indefinites, all of which precede the verb. I will argue that, since negative indefinites are licensed only when preverbal, the pattern with negative polarity items becomes more frequent in order to accommodate for the new VO grammar, thus prompting the grammaticalization of a whole new inventory of indefinites.

References

Bertocchi, Alessandra, Mirka Maraldi, Anna Orlandini. 2010. Quantification. In Philip Baldi & Pierluigi Cuzzolin (eds), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*, Vol. 3, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 19-173.

Danckaert, Lieven. 2012. *Latin embedded clauses*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Gianollo, Chiara. 2013. Latin *aliquis* as an epistemic indefinite. In Sofiana Chiriacescu (ed.), *Proceedings of the VI Nereus international workshop 'Theoretical implications at the syntax/semantics interface in Romance'*, 55–81. Universität Konstanz: Arbeitspapier 127.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2012. *From Latin to Romance: Morphosyntactic typology and change*. Oxford: OUP.

Molinelli, Piera. 1988. *Fenomeni della negazione dal latino all'italiano*. Firenze: La Nuova Italia.

Orlandini, Anna. 1981. Semantica e pragmatica dei pronomi indefiniti latini. *Lingua e Stile* 16(2). 215–234.

–– 2001. *Négation et argumentation en Latin.* Grammaire fondamentale du Latin, Tome VIII. Louvain: Peeters.

Spevak, Olga. 2005. Itinerarium Egeriae. L'ordre des constituants obligatoires. *Mnemosyne* 58, 235–261.

–– 2010. *Constituent order in Classical Latin prose*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Zanuttini, Raffaella. 1997. *Negation and clausal structure: A comparative study of Romance languages*, Oxford: OUP.

Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2004. *Sentential negation and Negative Concord*: Universiteit van Amsterdam dissertation.

Quelques réflexions à propos de *olim*

Guillaume GIBERT
Université de Clermont Ferrand

L'adverbe *olim* fait partie de la classe des adverbes construits sur une base pronominale, *ollus* (Ernout-Meillet 2001[4] : 460), remplacé par *ille* et relié à la forme ombrienne *ulu* / *ulo* (Dupraz 2012 : 120).

D'un point de vue sémantique, cet adverbe est considéré comme un adverbe temporel qui prend plusieurs valeurs :

(1) *...quos **olim** Fauni uatesque canebant (Enn., ann. 213)*
*« ...que **jadis** les Faunes et les devins chantaient. »*

(2) *Non, si male nunc, et **olim** sic erit (Hor., carm. 2,10)*
*« Si nous sommes malheureux aujourd'hui, il n'en sera pas toujours ainsi. (litt. **Un jour**, il n'en sera pas ainsi. »)*

(3) *Si mouet ac simat nares, delphinus ut **olim** (Lucil., 7,14 (284 M)*

*« S'il remue et rabaisse les narines comme le dauphin **habituellement**... »*

(4) ***Olim** nescio quid sit otium (Plin., epist. 8,9,1)*
*« **Depuis longtemps** je ne sais pas ce que c'est que le loisir. »*

Il peut ainsi paraître pertinent de chercher à dégager un fonctionnement unitaire et de voir comment ces différentes valeurs apparaissent.

Il sera possible de s'interroger sur un possible rapprochement avec le fonctionnement de *ille* défini par Joffre (2009) comme marquant une rupture, sur d'éventuels emplois anamnestiques, et sur le lien qui unit *olim* aux énoncés comparatifs, contexte privilégié de sa présence.

D'un point de vue syntaxique, l'association de l'adverbe avec différentes subordonnées, notamment en *cum* :

(5) *nam **olim** quom abiit, argento haec dies / Praestitutast (…) (Plaut., Pseud. 622-623)*
« car autrefois, au moment de son départ, c'est ce jour qui a été fixé (…) »

invite à préciser le lien entre l'adverbe et la subordonnée. On pourra étudier un éventuel fonctionnement ana-cataphorique de l'adverbe. *Olim*, au niveau syntaxique, peut il être comparé à *tum* et dès lors, entre-t-il dans le cadre plus général de la corrélation (Bodelot 2004) ?

Enfin, au niveau énonciatif, il conviendra de s'interroger sur la valeur de l'adverbe dans la deixis temporelle, son impact sur le fonctionnement aspectuel et sur sa valeur de cadre discursif (Charolles 1997) :

(6) *Fuit **olim**, quasi ego sum, senex. Ei filiae / Duae erant (…). (Plaut., Stich. 539-540)*
*« Il y avait **une fois** un vieillard, comme moi. Il avait deux filles (…) ».*

Afin de rendre compte du fonctionnement de cet adverbe singulier, nous adopterons une approche plurielle ainsi qu'un croisement des points de vue : morphologique, syntaxique, sémantique et énonciatif.

Références

Bodelot C., 2004, *Anaphore, cataphore et corrélation en latin, Actes de la journée d'étude de linguistique latine, Université Blaise Pascal - Clermont-Ferrand II, 7 janvier 2003*, C. Bodelot (éd), Clermont-Ferrand.
Charolles M., 1997, L'encadrement du discours : Univers, Champs, Domaines et Espace, *Cahier de Recherche Linguistique* 6, 1- 73.
Culioli A., 1999, *Pour une linguistique de l'énonciation, II, III*, Paris-Gap.
Diessel H., 1999, *Demonstratives, Form, Function and Grammaticalization*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
Dupraz E., 2012, *Sabellian Demonstratives, Forms and Functions*, Leiden, Boston.
Ernout A.-Meillet A., 2001[4], *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, Paris.
Joffre M.D., 2009, *Ille* : réflexions sur ses emplois dans l'*Eunuque* de Térence et le livre XLII de Tite-Live, *RELat* 9, 15-34.

Case alternation within Latin infinitival complements: Some diachronic considerations

Sean GLEASON
Yale University

The Latin *accusativus cum infinitivo* (AcI), exemplified in (1), can be passivized in two ways (2):

(1) *dicit te venisse*
'He says that you have come.'

(2) a. *tu diceris venisse*
'you are said to have come'

b. *dicitur te venisse*
'it is said that you have come'

The personal passive, or *nominativus cum infinitivo* (NcI), is seen in (2a), where the subject of the infinitive has raised to the matrix clause, is marked in the nominative, and is now the matrix subject as well. The other option is found in (2b), often referred to as the impersonal passive (cf. Maraldi 1983, Pinkster 1990, a.o.), where the subject of the infinitive remains in the lower clause, maintains its accusative case, and is not the subject of the matrix verb (which receives default third person singular agreement).

Synchronic analyses of the AcI (e.g. Bolkestein 1979; Maraldi 1983; Pinkster 1990; Cecchetto and Oniga 2002; Schoof 2003) have often addressed the alternation between these two passivization strategies, yet there exists a diachronic issue that has received less attention. As noted in Maraldi (1983), it is only from Cicero in the first century BCE onwards that the AcI can be found as a complement to passive matrix verbs—prior to this only the NcI was available. How and why this change came about remain open questions in understanding the development of Latin infinitival complementation.

The purpose of this paper is to address this diachronic change, looking at what may have given rise to it. Utilizing data from Bennett (1910) as well as my own corpus work, it is noted that in addition to Maraldi's observation that there are no instances of passive matrix verbs taking AcI complements in pre-Classical Latin, there do exist examples with the formally identical deponents:

(3) *ego me amare hanc fateor* [Terence *Andria* V.iii.25]
'I grant that I love her (lit. 'this one')'

Given this, it is argued that these deponents are a source for the extension of the AcI to passive matrix verbs. Tying this to ideas found in Calboli (1990) and Rosén (1999), the change is viewed as part of the continued development of the Latin passive as a grammatical category from the pre-Classical to Classical periods, particularly with respect to the co-opting of certain morpho-syntactic properties from the inherited PIE category of medio-passive.

This line of argumentation raises interesting questions about the relationship between the categories of case and voice within Latin, particularly in light of generative linguistic claims that the presence of accusative case under passives is unexpected (cf. Burzio 1986; Butt 2006). While pre-Classical Latin adheres to this generalization, the change described above results in a language that does not. Therefore, in addition to supplementing our understanding of the development of Latin infinitival complements, this paper also seeks to touch upon the implications such developments have for syntactic theory and the contributions to it that Latin can make.

References

Bennett, C.E. 1910. *Syntax of Early Latin*. Norwood, MA: Norwood Press.
Bolkestein, A.M. 1979. Subject-to-object Raising in Latin?, *Lingua* 48, 15-34.
Burzio, Luigi 1986. *Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
Butt, Miriam 2006. *Theories of Case*. Cambridge: CUP.
Calboli, G. 1990. "Das latinische Passiv und seine Beziehung zur nominalen Quantifikation.", *IF* 95: 104-160.
Cecchetto, C., and R. Oniga 2002. Consequences of the Analysis of Latin Infinitival Clauses for the Theory of Case and Control. *Lingue e Linguaggio* 1: 151-189.
Maraldi, M. 1983. New Approaches to Accusative Subjects: Case Theory vs. Raising, in Harm Pinkster (ed.), *Latin Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 167-176.
Pinkster, H. 1990. *Latin Syntax and Semantics*. London: Routledge.
Rosén, Hannah 1999. *Latine Loqui: Trends and Directions in the Crystallization of Classical Latin*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
Schoof, S. 2003. Impersonal and Personal Passivization of Latin Infinitive Constructions. In Jong-Bok Kim and Stephen Wechsler (eds.), *The Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on HPSG*. Stanford: CSLI, 293-312.

A corpus-based study of *secundum X* constructions: Spatio-temporal, logical and subjective meanings

Caterina GUARDAMAGNA
University of Lancaster

The existence of an evolution path of the type FOLLOW > ACCORDING TO is recorded by Heine & Kuteva (2002:139), who point out that "more research is required on the exact nature… of the process". This paper aims at filling this gap by presenting a diachronic analysis of the Latin construction *secundum X* across five centuries (BC 106 –AD 469). My study consists of a qualitative and quantitative analysis of a 5 million sub-corpus of Latin prose extracted from the *Latin Library* corpus, a 12 million word resource created for my research. As such, it represents a contribution to the developing field of Latin Corpus Linguistics (McGillivray 2013).

My analysis, situated within the framework of cognitive linguistics (e.g. Goldberg 2006, Langacker 2008) and constructionalisation (Traugott & Trousdale 2013), presents a richer description of the evolution of the *secundum X* construction than previous accounts based on Grammaticalisation Theory (Vieira Ferrari 1998, Matos Rocha 1998, Guardamagna 2011) because it accounts also for those changes occurring after the grammaticalisation of the gerund/gerundive *secundum* into the preposition *secundum*. Within the framework I adopt, the constructional changes affecting *secundum X* can be viewed as changes in a network of related constructions.

Over time, *secundum X* moves its centre away from the physical (spatio-temporal) domains (*secundum mare* 'along the sea', *secundum quietem* 'during sleep, in a dream') towards the logical domain, indicating conformity (*secundum naturam* 'in accordance with nature') and limitation (*filius dei secunudum spiritum* 'the Son of God as far as the spirit is concerned'). The conformity construction becomes more productive over time, as shown by an increase of type and token frequency. Christian Latin brings along the bridging context favouring the emergence of the evidential-reportative meaning out of the conformity meaning, that is a context of prophecy (*caeli eum receperunt secundum prophetiam* 'the heavens received him back as foretold by the prophecy' or 'the heavens received him back, which I know because the prophecy says so'). The inferential meaning also emerges in Christian Latin out of the conformity meaning (*duos enim magistratos secundum ista colligimus* 'according to/based on these observations, we gather that there are two masters'). Christian Latin also sees the appearence of the attribution meaning out of the limitation sense of *secundum X* (*secundum meum consilium* 'in my opinion', *secundum me* 'for me, to my mind').

My research highlights how the attribution, the inferential and the reportative meanings are distinct senses, which are often erroneously conflated in the literature (e.g. Guentchéva 1996, Wiemer 2006, Pietrandrea 2007). Furthermore, the evidential and the attribution constructions show an increase in scope from the verb phrase to the whole sentence or the speech act: these meanings are therefore more grounded in the conceptualizer, showing a trend towards subjectification consistent with other case studies in the literature. Finally, my research shows that metonymy plays a crucial role in the development of the more subjectified meanings, instead of metaphor *contra* Vieira Ferrari (1998) and Matos Rocha (1998).

References

Goldberg, A.E. 2006. *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*. Oxford: OUP.

Guardamagna, C. 2011. Following the path from 'follow' to 'according to'. Interpreting layering of functions of Italian *secondo*, *seguendo* and *a seconda di* as clues to the grammaticalisation of Latin *sequor* via *secundum*. *Papers from the 5th Lancaster University Postgraduate Conference in Linguistics and Language Teaching (LAEL PG)*, 51-80.

Heine, B. &. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: CUP.

Langacker, R.W. 2008. *Cognitive Grammar. A basic introduction*. Oxford: OUP.

Matos Rocha, L.F. 1998. Anàlise do caràter polissêmico do vocàbulo latino SECUNDUS. *Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora, Departimento de Letras, Lingüìstica – Grupo Gramàtica & Cognição. Principia Caminhos da Iniciação Cientifica 3*, 173-9.

McGillivray, B. 2013. *Methods in Latin Computational Linguistics*. Leiden: Brill.

Pietrandrea, P. 2007. The grammatical nature of some epistemic-evidential adverbs in spoken Italian, *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 2, 39-64.

Traugott, E.C. & Trousdale, G. 2013. *Constructionalization and constructional changes*. Oxford: OUP.

Vieira Ferrari, L. 1998. A gramaticalização de formas não-finitas como evidência da motivação conceptual do léxico. *Revista de Estudos Linguísticos Veredas 2(1)*, 103-115.

Wiemer, B. 2006. Particles, parentheticals, conjunctions and prepositions as evidentiality markers in contemporary Polish (A first exploratory study). *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 3, 5-67.

Left-dislocation in republican Latin

Hilla Halla-Aho
University of Helsinki

In this paper I present some of the findings of my research project on left-dislocation in republican Latin. Left-dislocation here means those constructions that are traditionally called the *nominatiuus pendens* (1) and the *attractio inuersa* (2):

(1) Lex agraria (Crawford ed. 1996 no. 2) 15 **ager publicus populi Romanei, quei** in Italia P. Mucio L. Calpurnio co(n)s(ulibus) fuit, eius ag//r//i IIIuir a(gris) d(andis) a(dsignandis) ex lege plebeiue scito sortito quoi ceiui Roman[no quod dedit adsignauit, quod eius agri neque is --- abalie]nauit abalienaueritue neque heres eius abalienauit abalienau[eritue]

(2) ***hos quos uidetis*** *stare hic captiuos duos,*
illi quia astant, hi stant ambo, non sedent (Plaut. Capt. 1)

The material consists of republican Latin before Cicero (but including Varro). Most important subcorpora are the republican laws and comedy. I shall demonstrate the most typical left-dislocated constructions in these genres and describe their syntactic properties: type and grammatical case of the left-dislocated element, form of the usually following relative construction, case form of the resumptive pronoun in the following main clause (usually the anaphoric *is*). I shall also point out typical contexts of use of these constructions and show that their use in most cases is motivated by certain types of pragmatical settings. The left-dislocated element often introduces a topic, but typically one that has already been mentioned and is now only reactivated (instead of introducing completely new topics). It will be shown that the use of left-dislocation is heavily dependent upon the text type or genre in question. I shall also discuss the relationship between the two construction types (*nominatiuus pendens* and *attractio inuersa*) as well as the implications of my findings for the identity of the latter construction.

On the use of tenses with temporal adverbials and conjunctions from early to Late Latin

Gerd HAVERLING
University of Uppsala

With durative temporal expressions (1a–c) and conjunctions like *postquam* the present and the imperfect tenses indicate 'anterior continuing' in early and classical Latin (2a–b):

1a) Cic. *Verr*. II 4.38 *is Lilybaei multos iam annos habitat* 'he has now been living at Lilybaeum for many years'
1b) Nep. *Att*. 12.3 *qui complures annos studio ductus philosophiae* *habitabat* *<Athenis> habebatque in Italia pretiosas possessiones* 'who for many years *had been living* at Athens because of his interest in philosophy and who had valuable possessions in Italy'
1c) Liv. 24.29.3 *nam et illis, quod iam diu* *cupiebant*, *nouandi res occasio data est* ... 'for one party was given an opportunity for revolution, which they had wished for for a long time'
2a) Plaut. *Men*. 234 *hic annus sextust, postquam ei rei operam* *damus* 'this is the 6th year since we started dedicating us to that'
2b) Sall. *Iug*. 28.2 *qui postquam Romam* *aduentabant*, *senatus a Bestia consultus est* 'As this deputation drew near the city, Bestia referred the question to the senate'

In later Latin, however, the use of the infectum becomes rare in the clauses with *postquam* (3) and anterior continuing is not always indicated when the imperfect occurs with durative temporal adverbials (4a–b):

3) Don. *Ter. Phorm*. 1.2 *postquam apud ueteres non praeterito modo sed etiam praesenti tempori adiungi* 'in earlier Latin not only past tense but the present too was used with *postquam*'
4a) Vulg. *Luc*. 1.24 *Post hos autem dies concepit Elisabeth uxor eius et* *occultabat se* *mensibus quinque* ... 'After these days his wife Elizabeth conceived, and for five months she hid herself'
4b) Amm. 28.1.49 *Abienus apud Anepsiam diu* *delitiscebat* 'Abienus remained hidden for a long time in the house of Anepsia'

There is also an increase in the use of the pluperfect with durative temporal adverbials (5) as well as with *postquam* (6):

5) *Vitas Sanctorum Patrum Emeritensium* 4.10.8 *illo benigne reddente atque illa cum gaudio quae diu* *desiderauerat* *recipiente* 'after he had graciously returned and she had joyfully received what she had so long desired'
6) Vulg. *Gen*. 17.1 *postquam uero nonaginta et nouem annorum* *esse coeperat* *apparuit ei Dominus dixitque ad eum "ego Deus omnipotens ambula coram me et esto perfectus ..."* 'When Abram was ninety-nine years old the Lord appeared to Abram, and said to him, "I am God Almighty; walk before me, and be blameless"'

In this paper I intend to take a closer look at the development of the use of tenses in such contexts in Late Latin. The purpose is to provide a better explanation for the development as well as a better description of the usage met with in various registers in Late Latin.

References
Haverling, Gerd V. M., 2010, Actionality, Tense, and Viewpoint, in *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*, vol. 2, ed. by Philip Baldi & Pierluigi Cuzzolin, 277–523.
Pinkster, Harm, forthcoming, *Oxford Latin Syntax*.

Latin cleft constructions: synchronic, diachronic, and typological observations

Roland HOFFMANN
Mainz

Focus, the most salient constituent of the sentence within the information structure (Dik 1978), is, especially in Latin, a keyword of the analysis of its widely pragmatically determined word order (Spevak 2010). Nevertheless, in this language it is not always easy to find focus constituents, since word order often seems to be the only, but sometimes not unambiguous marking strategy. On the other hand, a special focalization strategy which can be found in many languages (cf. Harries-Delisle (1978); Drubig & Schaffar (2001)) are so-called cleft constructions. In these bi-clausal syntagms a copula clause is used containing the FOCUS constituent on the left of the former main clause, which is attached to it as a relative or complement clause (cf. (1) and (2)), from Hartmann and Veenstra (eds. 2013: p.4.324):

(1) It was CHICKEN WINGS that Peter ordered for lunch.
(2) C'est LA FEMME LA PLUS AGÉE qui ait eu un enfant.

Since cleft constructions are widespread, it is not surprising to find such constructions in the Latin language, too, though they do not seem to be popular there:

(3) Equidem is sum, qui istos plausus [...] semper contempserim. (Cic., *Phil.* 1.37)

After several analytic studies on Latin cleft constructions by P. Jochimsen (1907: 16-21), B. Löfstedt (1966), H. Rosén (1989), B.L.M. Bauer (2009: 282-6), E. Goria (2013) and books like the one edited by K. Hartmann and T. Veenstra (2013) it is easier to answer questions like: What is/are the exact morphosyntactic form(s) of Latin cleft constructions? What is their grammatical status? Is focus cleaving the only function or is isolation of topical constituents also possible? What is the relationship with normal focus marking? Furthermore diachronic lines may be outlined by comparing cleft constructions of Old Latin, Classical and Post-Classical Latin. Typologically, one may ask where Latin cleft constructions are standing within the languages of the world.

References

Bauer, Brigitte, 2009. Word order. In Baldi, Ph. & P. Cuzzolin (eds). *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*. Berlin. Vol.1: 241-316.
Dik, Simon C., 1978. *Functional Grammar*. Dordrecht.
Drubig, Bernhard & K.W. Schaffar 2001. Focus constructions. In M. Haspelmath e.a. (eds). *Language Typology and Language Universals. An International Handbook*. Berlin. Vol.2: 1079-1104.
Goria, Eugenio, (2013). Towards a taxonomy of Latin cleft sentences, *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 12: 147-72.
Harries-Delisle, H., (1978). Contrastive emphasis and cleft sentences. In Greenberg, J. (ed.). *Universals of human language*. California: Vol.4: 419-86.
Hartmann, Katharina & Tonjes Veenstra (eds), 2013. *Cleft structures*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia.
Jochimsen, Paul, 1907. *Beiträge zur Hervorhebung des einzelnen Satzteiles, bezw. eines Satzes mittelst c'est (…) que (qui)*. Diss. Kiel.
Löfstedt, Bengt, 1966. Die Konstruktion *c'est lui qui l'a fait* im Lateinischen, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 71: 253-77.
Rosén, Hannah, 1989. General subordinators and sentence complements. In Calboli, G. (ed.). *Subordination and other topics in Latin.* Amsterdam: 197-217.
Spevak, Olga, 2010. *Word order in Latin*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia.

Observations on the *palma* rule

Stefan HÖFLER
University of Vienna

§1 In Latin historical phonology, there has been long-standing acceptance that Lat. *palma* 'front part of the hand' (Plaut.+) displays a different outcome of a sequence **CR̥HC* (in pre-laryngealistic terms: **CR̥̄C*) than otherwise attested in Latin. The usual result of such a sequence was *CRāC*, as many clear-cut examples demonstrate: **(a)** Lat. (*g*)*nātus i* m. 'son' < **ĝn̥h*$_1$*-tó-* (Ved. *jātá-* m. 'born (man); son', Gk. κασί-γνητος 'brother', OIc. *kundr* 'son', etc.), **(b)** Lat. *strātus* 3 'spread (out)' < **str̥h*$_3$*-tó-* (*cf*. Gk. στρωτός, Ved. *stīrtá-* 'id.', Lith. *stìrta* f. 'haystack'), etc.

§2 For Lat. *palma*, the commonly accepted etymology operates with a reconstructed pre-form **pl̥h*$_2$*-meh*$_2$ that regularly gave OIr. *lám* f. 'hand', MW *llaw* f. 'id.', OHG *folma* f. 'id.', etc. To account for an outcome Lat. *palma* instead of

†*plāma*, a probable solution is offered by the Greek equivalent παλάμη f. '(flat) hand', which suggests that the accent fell onto the first syllable of the word, viz. **pĺ̥h_2-meh$_2$*. So, similarly to the Greek state of affairs, it has been proposed to accept a two-fold outcome of a sequence **CR̥HC* in Latin as well, depending on whether the sequence was unstressed (giving *CRāC*; *cf*. the examples above, **§1**) or stressed, resulting in **CaRaC > CaRC* via the well-known syncope of medial syllables in the vicinity of a sonorant (*cf*. Leumann 1977:95-7; Meiser 1998:66f.; Weiss 2009:122f.). For Lat. *palma*, this amounts to the assumption of a development **pĺ̥h_2-meh$_2$ > *palamā* (*cf*. παλάμη) > *palma*.

§3 To be sure, *palma* has remained the sole conclusive example for the proposed sound development. As a result, we currently find ourselves in the awkward quandary that the *palma* rule is widely accepted (*cf*. Nussbaum 1997:186[42]; Vine 2012:546; differently on *palma* e.g. Schrijver 1991:210; Sihler 1995:111; de Vaan 2008:441) and mentioned in most of the recent handbooks (*cf*. Meiser 1998:108f.; Weiss 2009:110), with *palma*, however, being the only stalwart evidence (as pointed out recently by Zair 2012:212[63]).

§4 After briefly discussing previously adduced comparanda and alleged counter-examples, I will try to show that new words can be added to the squad of *palma*-like samples: Starting from a hitherto neglected type of denominal derivatives, namely possessive adjectives built on *s*-stem bases that show a double zero grade (e.g. Lat. *russus* 3 'red(-haired)' < *$*h_1rud^h$-s-ó-* 'having redness' from *$*h_1réu̯d^h$-es-* n. 'redness' as in Lat. *rōbur* n. '(red) oak-wood', Gk. ἔρευθος n. 'redness') and were liable to substantivization via accent retraction (*cf*., e.g., Ved. *útsa-* m. 'well, spring' ← **ud-s-ó-* 'having water', or Gk. μύξος m. 'a fish' ← **muk-s-ó-* 'slimy'), new morphological interpretations will be offered for Lat. *parra ae* f., Umb. **parfa-** 'certain bird' (as **(s)pŕ̥H-s-o-* 'the one having feathers/wings' from an *s*-stem **(s)pérH-es-* 'feather, wing' as in Slovene *peró*, *-ésa* n. 'feather'), Lat. *palla ae* f. 'mantle; curtain' (as **pĺ̥H-s-o-* 'the covering one'), and similarly for Lat. *gallus ī* m. 'cock' and *marra ae* f. 'hoe' (plus perhaps a few more), which hopefully helps to strengthen the canonical status of this sound law within Latin historical phonology.

References

de Vaan, Michiel, 2008, *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*, Leiden: Brill.
Leumann, Manu, 1977, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*, München: Beck.
Meiser, Gerhard, 1998, *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der Lateinischen Sprache*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaft. Buchgesellschaft.
Nussbaum, Alan J., 1997, 'The "Saussure Effect" in Latin and Italic', in: *Sound Law and Analogy*, *FS Robert S.P. Beekes*, A. Lubotsky (ed.), Amsterdam: Rodopi, 181-203.
Schrijver, Peter, 1991, *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.
Sihler, Andrew L., 1995, *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, Oxford: OUP.
Vine, Brent, 2012, PIE mobile accent in Italic: Further evidence, in *The Sound of Indo-European*, *Phonetics*, *phonemics*, *and morphophonemics*, ed. by B. Nielsen Whitehead et alii, Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 545-75.
Weiss, Michael, 2009, *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*, Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press.
Zair, Nicholas, 2012, *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Celtic*, Leiden: Brill.

Esse and *-que* in Late Latin prose rhythm

Nigel HOLMES
Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, Munich

In an earlier paper (*Metrical Words and Accent in Late Latin Prose Rhythm,* given at the ICLL in Rome 2013) I discussed the behaviour of word groups like *vel nolle*, a pair of words used in a clausula instead of a single word of the same metrical shape. The types of words involved are: *esse;* prepositions; conjunctions; particles of negation; certain adverbs; unstressed pronouns. In the 2013 lecture I left aside two special cases, which are the subject of this investigation.

The first is auxiliary *est*. While many writers avoid vowel contact between words in the clausula, they are happy to allow it before final, auxiliary *est*. When that happens, prodelision seems to occur (in contrast to other instances of vowel contact in late prose rhythm, where hiatus is the rule in most writers). Some, however, think that final *est* simply does not count towards the clausula.

The behaviour of *-que* and similar enclitics is also problematic, since the grammarians viewed it as causing the previous syllable to be accented. It is often disputed whether this is a mistaken transference from Greek or actual linguistic reality.

In both cases I look at the evidence that a sample of Latin writers from the third to the sixth centuries gives, and consider whether the pronunciation implied by the prose rhythm reflects literary convention or actual spoken Latin.

References

Hagendahl H. 1937, *La prose métrique d'Arnobe*, Göteborg.
Holmes N. 2007, False Quantities in Vegetius and Others *CQ* 57, 668-86.
–– 2002, Metrical Notes on Vegetius' *Epitoma Rei Militaris*, *CQ* 52, 358-73.

A comparative analysis of Latin double accusative

Rossella IOVINO & Giuliana GIUSTI
Università Ca'Foscari Venezia

In this paper we show that a comparison with English, a better studied but apparently far-related language, can lead us to uncover some features of Latin overlooked by (traditional) grammars.
A small class of ditransitive verbs in Latin display the so-called double accusative construction (henceforth DAC): *(e)doceo*, *(re)posco*, *flagito*, and *celo*, where both Theme and Addressee have accusative case (Ernout & Thomas 1051: 31-32; Traina & Bertotti 1985: 64-68; García-Hernández 1994; Touratier 1994: 248-249; Oniga 2014: 243-244):

(1) a.[Catilina]$_{\text{<Agent>}}$ iuventutem$_{\text{<Addr.>}}$ ... mala facinora$_{\text{<Theme>}}$ edocebat (Sall. *Cat.* 16,1)

English displays the DAC with a larger number of verbs, among which *give*, *bring*, *lend*, *offer*, *send*; *tell*, *read*, *write*; *ask*; *allow*; *teach* (2a). These verbs can also have the prepositional construction (henceforth PC) with a prepositional Addressee (2b):

(2) a. Catilina$_{\text{<Agent>}}$ taught students$_{\text{<Addr.>}}$ bad things$_{\text{<Theme>}}$
b. Catilina$_{\text{<Agent>}}$ taught bad things$_{\text{<Theme>}}$ to students$_{\text{<Addr.>}}$

If passive applies to a DAC, only the Addressee can be the subject (3). However, the Theme can be the subject of a passive PC sentence (4):

(3) a. Professors$_{\text{<Agent>}}$ teach students$_{\text{<Addr.>}}$ linguistics$_{\text{<Theme>}}$
b. Students are taught linguistics (by professors)
(4) a. Professors$_{\text{<Agent>}}$ teach linguistics$_{\text{<Theme>}}$ to students$_{\text{<Addr.>}}$
b. Linguistics is taught to students (by professors)

Latin is not known to display the two choices available to English. Thus, in a comparative perspective, the Addressee is expected to be the only possible subject in a passive sentence, as in (5):

(5) a. *Nervii*$_{\text{<Addr.>}}$ *haec*$_{\text{<Theme>}}$ [...] *ab eis*$_{\text{<Agent>}}$ *docebantur* (Caes. *Gall*. 5,42,2)
b. *Id*$_{\text{<Theme.>}}$ *Alcibiades*$_{\text{<Addr.>}}$ *diutius celari non potuit* (Nep. *Alc*. 5,2)

However, *verba rogandi* are reported to be an exception, in that only a Theme can be the subject of a passive. Note that in this case the Addressee is missing:

(6) *Poscebatur argentum*$_{\text{<Theme>}}$ (Cic. *Verr*. II 4,31)

It is less observed that the Addressee can also be the subject of the sentence, and that in these cases the Theme can be either present or not realized, showing an unexpected parallel with English:

(7) *Petreius atque Afranius*$_{\text{<Addr.>}}$ *cum stipendium*$_{\text{<Theme>}}$ *ab legionibus paene seditione facta flagitarentur,* … (Caes. *civ*. 1,87,3)
(8) [*Ego*$_{\text{<dest>}}$] *flagitabar bonorum expostulatione*. (Cic. *dom*. 16)
(9) [*nos*$_{\text{<dest>}}$] *reposcemur: alium alio tempore fata comprehendent, neminem praeteribunt*. (Sen. *Polyb*. 11,3)

At this point, we may wonder whether (6) is a real DAC or a PC in disguise. A hint that the latter is the case is provided by (10), where the Addressee is prepositional:

(10) *A me*$_{\text{<Addr.>}}$ *annona*$_{\text{<Theme>}}$ *flagitabatur* (Cic. *dom*. 15)

Therefore, the comparison with English, a language studied by formal linguistics, made us uncover two properties of Latin DAC verbs which are not usually considered: (i) the possibility for a subject Addressee of a passive DAC *verbum rogandi*, and (ii) the existence of a PC with some double accusative verbs.

References

Ernout, A. & Thomas F. 1951, *Syntaxe latine*, Paris, Klincksieck.

García-Hernández, B. 1994, From lexemics to syntax. The double accusative with *doceo* and the dative with *sum*, in H. József (ed.), *Linguistic Studies on Latin: Selected papers from the 6th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics (Budapest, 23–27 March 1991)*, Berlin, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 379-392.

Oniga, R. 2014, *Latin. A Linguistics Introduction*, Oxford, OUP.

Touratier, C. 1994, *Syntaxe Latine*, Louvain, Peeters.

Traina, A. & Bertotti T. 1985, *Sintassi normativa della lingua latina*, Bologna, Cappelli.

Deixis spatiale, deixis temporelle. Le cas de *hic*, *haec*, *hoc*

Marie-Dominique JOFFRE
Université de Poitiers

On se limitera, pour cette communication, à une réflexion sur les emplois exophoriques de *hic*. Dans ce cas, la forme désigne directement un référent concret, immédiatement et simultanément perceptible par tous les acteurs de l'énonciation. Ainsi Amphitryon, tendant une coupe, peut dire à Alcmène :

> *Nunc tibi* ***hanc pateram*** […] *condono* « Je te donne dès maintenant cette coupe » (Pl. *Am*.534).

À partir de ce type d'emploi, on s'interrogera, dans un premier temps, sur la ligne de partage entre l'endophore et l'exophore. En effet, quel que soit le type de deixis, la désignation passe par la langue, par un énoncé, par des mots.

Et que faire des emplois où le déictique désigne directement un référent pour l'inscrire dans le temps et le faire coïncider avec le *nunc* de l'énonciation ?

> Pl. *Am*.272 *Credo ego* ***hac noctu*** *Nocturnum obdormisse ebrium* « Je crois que, cette nuit, Nocturnus s'est endormi ivre »
>
> Pl. *Am*.279 *Neque ego* ***hac nocte*** *longiorem me uidisse censeo* « Et je n'ai jamais vu, je crois, de nuit aussi longue que celle-ci »

On proposera quelques pistes pour expliquer de quelle manière s'articulent dans le pronom-adjectif *hic* l'endophore, l'exophore, l'espace et le temps.

Spondees and dactyls and their prosodic basis in the Latin hexameter

Andreas KERÄNEN
University of Gothenburg

By comparison with the Greek hexameter its Latin counterpart developed some distinctive characteristics. I here mention three: 1) The frequency of spondees in the first four feet. 2) The coincidence of word accent and 'ictus' of the two last feet. 3) The non-existence of metrical bridges. The reason for the frequency of spondaic feet of the Latin meter are usually claimed to reflect the general higher percentage of heavy syllables in the Latin language itself. (Raven 1965, Duckworth 1969). In my talk I want to readjust that statement. The preponderance of dactyls (– oo) in the Greek hexameter and, conversely, of spondees (– –) in the Latin version was not just a mere statistical trend caused by the ratio of heavy and light syllables of the two languages in question. Instead I argue that the reason is embedded in the metrical foot structure of prosodic words and stress assignments. The proof for that can be detected in the use of metrical bridge constraints. In the Greek hexameter there are three so-called 'spondee zeugmas' (Devine & Stephens 1984). This means that word end after spondees is avoided in the second, fourth and fifth foot.

– oo –⁀– oo –⁀–⁀– –

These constraints favor dactylic feet, since dactyls are always 'right', while spondees are only 'right' conditionally, i.e. – oo⁀, – oo|| and – ⁀ are okay, but NOT – –||. The sensitivity of spondees before word ends have been explained as a matter of stress. The existence of spondee zeugma is thus a constraint on stressable elements in weak metrical positions. In Latin final syllables are extrametrical, i.e. not applicable to stress rules, and spondee zeugmas are not found in the Latin hexameter either. As pointed out by Allen (1973), both a dactylic fourth foot, as e.g. *dúlcia* || *línquimus* | *árua*|||, or a spondee, as e.g. *ton*|*déntī* || *bárba ca*|*dḗbat*||| will in either case avoid stressed syllable in the weak part of the foot. A dactyl in the fifth foot, on the other hand, if monosyllabic and pyrrhic words were excluded, resulted in agreement between accent and strong position, thus either ́– oo|| ́– –||| or ́– o||o ́– –|||. To conclude, in Greek the avoidance of prominent word-final heavy syllables in the weak part of the foot, recognized as spondee zeugmas, caused the statistical higher ratio of dactylic feet, especially in the fourth and fifth foot. The Romans, on the other hand, striving after an imitation regarding the number of verse elements, feet and caesuras (i.e. the artificial or 'learned' structure of verse) found instead another rhythmic effect of providing a spondaic fifth foot, appealing to the rhythmical important coda of the line.

References

Allen, William Sidney 1973. *Accent and rhythm. Prosodic features of Latin and Greek: a study in theory and reconstruction.* Cambridge: CUP.

Blumenfeld, Lev 2011. Abstract similarities between Greek and Latin Dialogue Meters. In *Froniers in comparative prosody*, Mihhail Lotman and Maria-Kristiina Lotman (eds). Peter Lang, 275-294.

Devine, Andrew M. / Stephens, Laurence D. 1984. Language and metre: resolution, Porson's bridge and their prosodic basis. *American Classical Studies 12*. Chico: Scholar Press.

Devine, Andrew M. / Stephens, Laurence D. 1994. *The prosody of Greek speech.* Oxford: OUP.

Duckworth, George E. 1969. *Virgil and Classical Hexameter Poetry: a Study in Metrical Variety.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Golston, Chris 1998. Constraint-based metrics. *Natural language and linguistic theory.* 16, 719-770.

Jacobs, Haike 2003. The emergence of quantity-sensitivity in Latin: Secondary stress, Iambic Shortening, and theoretical implication for "mixed" stress systems. In *Optimality Theory and Language Change,* D. Eric Holt (ed.), 229-247. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Mester, R. Armin 1994. The Quantitative trochee in Latin. *Natural language and linguistic theory.* 12, 1-61.

Prince, Alan / Smolensky, Paul 1990. Quantitative Consequences of Rhythmic Organization. In Deaton, Karen et al. (eds.) *CLS 25-II: Papers from the Parasession on the Syllable in Phonetics and Phonology.* Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society, 335-398.

Raven, David Sebastian 1965. *Latin metre: an introduction.* London: Faber and Faber.

West, Martin Litchfield 1982. *Greek metre.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Weather verbs in Latin, German and other languages. Contrastive and typological remarks

Manfred Kienpointner
University of Innsbruck

This paper first presents an overview about sentence patterns containing weather verbs in Latin and German. The focus will be on basic, that is, unmarked sentence patterns describing meteorological processes, such as *Pluit/Ninguit/Tonat* in Latin and *Es regnet/Es schneit/Es donnert* in German. The treatment of these patterns in handbooks of Latin and German syntax will be briefly discussed (cf. e.g. Kühner/Stegmann 1962: 4; Pinkster 1990: 23; Touratier 1994: 326ff.; Engel 1988: 190; Zifonun et al. 1997: 713; 1079). But more complex, marked constructions such as Latin *Imbres cadunt/Lapidibus pluit/Aurora rorat* or German *Regen fällt/Es gießt in Strömen/Es regnet Hunde und Katzen* will be dealt with, too (cf. Kienpointner 1995, 2010: 272).

In a second step, this bilateral comparison will be extended towards a multilateral comparison, taking into account some Japanese and Turkish weather verbs (cf. Ogawa/Weinberger/Kienpointner, in preparation).

Furthermore, a *tertium comparationis*, the so-called „meteo-scale" will be sketched, that is, a conceptual model which situates language-specific sentence patterns containing weather verbs as preferred spaces on a continuum between two poles: the „phenomenon pole" and the „entity pole", with intermediate spaces in between. At the phenomenon pole, the weather process is represented as a pure process, with the help of verbs only. At the entity pole, the main forces and objects involved in weather processes, such as sun/moon/rain etc. are represented as nouns, often accompanied by semantically rather general verbs (e.g. Russian *Идёт дождь* [Idjot dožd']: „Comes rain"). In the intermediate zone of the continuum, impersonal pronouns (cf. German *Es regnet*, English *It's raining*, French *Il pleut*, Dutch *Het regent*) or nouns combined with cognate verbs (cf. Turkish *Yağmur yağıyor* "Rain rains") can be found.

The meteo-scale thus shows that languages can prefer the phenomenon pole, with a focus on the verb ([V]), the entity pole with a focus on the noun ([N]) or an intermediate position ([Pro + V/N + Vcognate]).

Finally, other typological approaches to meteorological verbs will be discussed in order to explore the explanatory potential of the meteo-scale (cf. e.g. Mettouchi/Tosco 2011; Salo 2011; Bleotu 2012).

References

Bleotu, A. C. 2012, Why does IT Always Rain in Me? On Weather Verbs. In: B. Surányi/D. Varga (eds.): *Proceedings of the First Central European Conference in Linguistics for Postgraduate Students.* Budapest. 59-81.

Engel, U. 1988, *Deutsche Grammatik*. Heidelberg.

Kienpointner, M. 1995, Sentence Patterns in Latin and German: A Contrastive Analysis. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics* 30. 65–84.
–– 2010, *Latein – Deutsch kontrastiv*. Tübingen.
Kühner, R./Stegmann, C. 1962, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache.* II. Teil. *Satzlehre*. 1. Bd. Darmstadt.
Mettouchi, A./Tosco, M. 2011, Impersonal Configurations and Theticity: The Case of Meteorological Predications in Afroasiatic. In A. Malchukov/A. Siewierska (eds.): *Impersonal Constructions*. Amsterdam. 307-322.
Ogawa, A./Weinberger, H./Kienpointner, M. (in preparation), Witterungsverben im Deutschen, Türkischen und Japanischen. Eine typologische Fallstudie.
Pinkster, H. 1990, *Latin Syntax and Semantics*. London.
Salo, M. 2011, Meteorological Verbs in Uralic Languages – Are there any Impersonal Structures to be Found. In A. Malchukov/A. Siewierska (eds.): *Impersonal Constructions*. Amsterdam. 395-438.
Touratier, Ch. 1994, *Syntaxe latine*. Louvain-la-Neuve.
Zifonun, G. et al. 1997, *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache.* Berlin.

Schéma narratif et subjectivité du narrateur chez quelques historiens de l'Antiquité tardive

Sándor Kiss
Université de Debrecen

Ces remarques portent sur le texte de quelques ouvrages d'histoire du IV^e siècle qui se caractérisent comme des « abrégés » (*breuiaria*), parce que leurs auteurs – il s'agira surtout d'Aurelius Victor, d'Eutrope et de Festus – se proposent de résumer et de confier à la mémoire de leurs contemporains une série d'événements de l'histoire romaine, conçue comme un tout cohérent. Ainsi, ces auteurs, tout en « s'appropriant la langue », outil de formulation et de communication (Benveniste 1966), doivent également organiser le temps, en y marquant des subdivisions successives, cadres des événéments à relater. Sous un angle comparatif, l'exposé s'intéressera aux moyens linguistiques mis au service de cette organisation, tels qu'ils apparaissent dans les différents textes. Cet examen concernera trois types de phénomènes. Il s'agit d'abord d'envisager certains traits syntaxiques fondamentaux qui fonctionnent à l'intérieur de la phrase et au-delà de la phrase également : d'une part, les temps et les modes verbaux ont un rôle à la fois phrastique et textuel (Weinrich 1973) ; d'autre part, l'ordre des constituants, responsable de la perspective communicative de la phrase, doit être considéré également dans sa dépendance par rapport au contexte interphrastique (Spevak 2010). Deuxièmement, au niveau proprement textuel, l'examen comparé des textes a pour objet les modalités de la progression thématique (Combettes 1983), le fonctionnement des réseaux anaphoriques (Bolkestein 2000), les éléments démarcatifs, les éléments continuateurs et les marqueurs du discours en général (Kroon 1995). Enfin, sur le plan de la narration, se pose la question des sommaires et des scènes (Genette 1972), ainsi que celle de la structure linguistique globale des ouvrages. En dehors de cette approche des problèmes du récit, l'attitude subjective du narrateur sera également étudiée. Sur ce point, on doit distinguer les commentaires explicites et les manifestations plus subtiles de la subjectivité, telles que la présence d'une construction syntaxique ou d'un lexème expressifs, l'emploi de certaines épithètes marquant une évaluation implicite ou la distribution des points d'insistance indiquée par des arrangements emphatiques. Ce recensement des traits linguistiques des « abrégés » est aussi une occasion pour confronter leurs schémas stylistiques avec ceux des historiens classiques (Chausserie-Laprée 1969), ainsi qu'avec la manière d'écrire, sans doute plus fruste, des chroniqueurs du Haut Moyen Âge – comparaisons qui révèlent indirectement les tendances d'évolution de la langue latine postclassique.

Références

Benveniste, É. 1966, *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Paris,\.
Bolkestein, A. M., « Discourse Organization and Anaphora in Latin ». In : S. C. Herring – P. Van Reenen – L. Schøsler (eds.) : *Textual Parameters in Older Languages*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, 2000, 107-137.
Chausserie-Laprée, J.-P. 1969, *L'expression narrative chez les historiens latins*. Paris.
Combettes, B. 1983, *Pour une grammaire textuelle*. *La progression thématique*. Bruxelles.
Genette, G. 1972, *Figures III*. Paris.
Kroon, C. 1995, *Discourse Particles in Latin*. Amsterdam.
Spevak, O. 2010, *Constituent Order in Classical Latin Prose*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia.
Weinrich, H. 1973, *Le temps*. Paris.

Becoming default case: Accusative in later Latin

Timo Korkiakangas
University of Helsinki

This paper is about the development of the Latin morphosyntactic alignment and, especially, the destiny of the accusative case. In the last 25 years, several studies have examined the change of the Latin case system by postulating that the Latin nominative/accusative aligned case system changed partially and temporarily into active/inactive alignment before the final neutralization of the case opposition (e.g. La Fauci 1997, Cennamo 2009, Rovai 2012). (The neutralization is likely to have been preceded by an ergative/absolutive alignment.) The described development is explained by a resemanticization of the nominative/accusative case opposition. However, the scarcity of appropriate evidence material weakens this appealing theory.

By Late Latin Charter Treebank (LLCT), I seek to shed light on those little-known phases of the Latin case system that immediately preceded its breakdown. The 519 charters of LLCT (198,714 words) come from Tuscany from between AD 714 and 869. Although there are early attestations of 'extended accusative' subjects from the 4th/5th centuries, charters are practically the only material that has been preserved as originals and that can provide abundant information on non-standard language.

My intention is to show whether any functioning case system can still be found in the Latin underlying the highly formulaic surface of LLCT. The study approaches the supposed semantically-motivated intransitivity split by analyzing the degree of control exercised by the subject over the verbal process. The method consists of a corpus analysis of the subjects subsequently classified according to a) their inherent semantic features (animacy, definiteness), b) the clause type within which they occur (passive, unaccusative, unergative, transitive), c) the transitivity degree of the clause defined by Hopper and Thompson's (1980) transitivity scale. I consider also the impact of the structural (syntactic) context in which the subjects occur (distance from verb, depth of coordination).

The preliminary results show in LLCT a correlation between the animacy and case of the subject, and between the transitivity of the clause and the case of the subject. The mentioned correlations may imply that in the (spoken) Latin of the time some residues of a semantically-based alignment still persisted although the nominative/accusative alignment seems to have remained the principal coding strategy (50–80%). Of course, the written code reflects the oral code only partially because most of the scribes still knew how to adhere to the 'standard' Latin norm (cf. Fiorentino 1994). The neutralization of the case opposition was likely to be well advanced in the spoken Latin.

The following generalizations can be drawn from the above results: the less control the subject has over the verbal process and the less attached it is to the verbal nucleus, the more easily it seems to slip into accusative. Adams (2013), who justly criticizes the use of term 'default case' in earlier Latin, shows that, up to Late Imperial Latin, the unmarked default case was rather clearly the nominative. The markedness change seems, thus, to have taken place somewhere between the Late Empire and the time range of LLCT.

References

Adams, J. N. 2013. *Social variation and the Latin language*. Cambridge: CUP.

Cennamo, M. 2009. Argument structure and alignment variations and changes in Late Latin, Barðdal, J. & Chelliah, S. L. (eds.). *The role of semantic, pragmatic, and discourse factors in the development of case*, 307–346.

Fiorentino, G. 1994. Aspetti della morfosintassi nominale nelle carte cavensi del IX secolo, *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 79:1, 23–50.

Hopper, P.J. & Thompson, S. A. 1980. Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse, *Language* 56:2, 251–299.

Korkiakangas, T. & Lassila, M. 2013. Abbreviations, fragmentary words, formulaic language: treebanking mediaeval charter material, in *Proceedings of The Third Workshop on Annotation of Corpora for Research in the Humanities* (ACRH-3), Sofia, 61–72.

Korkiakangas, T. & Passarotti, M. 2011. Challenges in Annotating Medieval Latin Charters, Proceedings of the ACRH Workshop, Heidelberg, January 5th, 2012. *Journal of Language Technology and Computational Linguistics* 26:2, 103–114.

La Fauci, N. 1997. *Per una teoria grammaticale del mutamento morfosintattico*. Dal latino verso il romanzo. Pisa: ETS.

Pensado, C. 1986. Inversion de marquage et perte du système casuel en ancien français, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 102, 271–296.

Rovai, F. 2012. *Sistemi di codifica argomentale. Tipologia ed evoluzione*. Pisa: Pacini.

Vincent, N. 1997. 'The emergence of the D-system in Romance', van Kemenade, A. & Vincent, N. (eds.). *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*, Cambridge: CUP, 149–169.

Latin directives and (im)politeness

Barbora KRYLOVÁ
(Prague/Munich)

Applied to the particular case of Latin directives (the analysed data originate mainly from Plautus and Terentius), the proposed paper will discuss (i) the general question of the conventionalisation of the relation between illocutionary force and its modifications on one hand and their relational perlocutionary effects, i.e. their (im)politeness status, on the other hand, as well as (ii) methods how to theoretically account for the fact that the (im)politeness impact of various language items and phenomena might be conventionalised to a different degree and that even language items and phenomena displaying a particularly high degree of conventionalisation for a specific (im)politeness effect might still be used for other (im)politeness purposes.

According to the seminal and still very influential politeness model of Brown & Levinson (1987 [1978]), (almost) every directive amounts to a *face threatening act* (FTA) as it inherently presents an imposition on the addressee and thus threatens his *negative face* as well as speaker's *positive face*. The degree of the face threat depends in this model on three (static) variables – the degree of imposition, social distance between the interlocutors and their hierarchical difference. This would imply that an increase/decrease of the degree of imposition - e.g. by means of increase/decrease of bindingness or speaker's involvement - would almost automatically evoke an increase/decrease of face threat potential of the directive. However, the situations proves to be more complex - although these factors are undoubtedly very important, the (im)politeness impact of a certain modification of illocutionary force depends on more factors, some of which may under favourable conditions turn out to be decidedly more substantial.

The main drawbacks of the approach of Brown & Levinson are that it is (i) limited to single utterances, (ii) of static character, (iii) rather unable to account for linguistic and culture specificity of the analysed material, and that (iv) it interprets (im)politeness as a particularised implicature which must be derived by every individual in every situation anew. The alternative discourse based "postmodern" approaches (such as Watts 2003, Locher & Watts 2005, Locher 2006, Mills 2003) bring the concepts of situated politeness and of politeness as a dynamic *relational work*, i.e. as a means of forming and reinterpretation of relations between the interlocutors in the course of the conversation. On the other hand, they practically abandon the idea of norms and conventionalisation, so that (im)politeness is still viewed as particularised implicature, even more consequently than by Brown & Levinson.

It will be argued that it is more adequate to differentiate between conventionalised and non (or less) conventionalised (im)politeness effects, i.e. between generalised implicatures (which are in a specific type of settings unmarked and more or less automatically accessible, i.e. need not to be derived from the whole "broad" context) and particularised ones (which are marked and come into play if the generalised implicature is not applicable in the specific context or even not existent) – as proposed in the frame-based approach of Terkourafi (2005, 2008) and genre based approach to politeness by Garcés-Conejos Blitwich (2010).

References

Brown, P., Levinson S.C. 1987 [1978]. *Politeness. Some universals in language use.* Cambridge: CUP.
Bousfield, D. 2008. *Impoliteness in Interaction*. Philadelphia/Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Culpeper, J. 2011. *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence*, Cambridge, CUP.
Dickey, E. 2012, How to say 'please' in Classical Latin. *Classical Quarterly* 62, 731-748.
Garcés-Conejos Blitwich, P. 2010. A genre approach to the study of Im-politeness. *International Review of Pragmatics*, 46-94.
Levinson, S. 1992. Activity types and language. In P. Drew - J. Heritage (edd.), *Talk at Work*. Cambridge: CUP, 66-100.
Locher, Miriam A. 2006. Polite behaviour within relational work: The discursive approach to politeness. *Multilingua* 25, 249-267.
Locher, M. A., Watts, R. 2005. Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1, 9-33.
Mills, S. 2003. *Gender and politeness*. Cambridge: CUP.
Risselada, R. 1989. Latin illocutionary parentheticals. In M. Lavency and D. Longrée (eds), *Proceedings of the Vth Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters, 367-378.

Ablaut in Latin language history: "relicization" of a grammatical device

Ville LEPPÄNEN
University of Turku

In Proto-Indo-European the pattern of vowel gradations traditionally known as *ablaut* was a morphophonemic device, i.e. vowel variation that encodes morphological functions. Some IE languages have preserved the patterns more or less faithfully, whereas Latin inherited the forms of PIE ablaut in a distorted shape: the ancient patterns became virtually non-existent at the surface level due to destructive effect of sound changes and levelling analogy. Latin seems to offer little useful evidence for PIE ablaut, and even from a synchronic Latin point of view the remaining reflexes clearly do not represent a system with much relevance to the grammar as a whole. Most of the singular Latin etymologies that contain a reflex of PIE ablaut (e.g. the vowel length patterning of *dīcō~dĭctus*, *dūcō~dŭctus*, etc.) can be explained satisfactorily without commenting on the general development of ablaut; however the systemic perspective has largely been ignored even in historical treatments (e.g. in Sommer/Pfister 1977: 47–52).

In this paper I propose a new approach to account for the development and eventual decay of ablaut in Latin. The main questions are: in what way could the aforementioned change be described and explained adequately, and with what kind of theoretical apparatus? My approach is based on a combination of micro level (how the individual forms change) and macro level (how the language as a system changes) factors. I operate in the traditional theoretical frame of reference of historical linguistics (Anttila 1989, Fox 1995) complemented by the proposed additions. The methods thus include the comparative method and internal reconstruction, as well as an inductive analysis of Latin historical grammar. The data consist of the descriptions of PIE and Latin historical phono- and morphology and the individual forms (phonemes and morphemes) that constitute them.

I argue that an adequate explanation is possible only if the existing theories are perfected with new concepts. Drawing from the tradition of grammaticalization studies (Lehmann 2002, Hopper & Traugott 2003), I propose the novel concept of *relicization* as a new contribution to the theory of language change. The concept in its simplest form refers to the marginalization of a particular grammatical structure into a linguistic *relic*. A relic is defined in this context as a paradigm-independent linguistic form which is a reflex of a pattern of an older stage of the language, and which in synchronic analysis appears to stand outside of any regular and/or productive grammatical pattern. Relicization in its most typical manifestation results in a number of non-paradigmatic word forms (e.g. irregular verb forms), and often (but not necessarily) involves such related processes as lexicalization and grammaticalization. By using several prototypical examples from Latin historical verb morphology, I show, firstly, that the decay of ablaut can be explained as a case of relicization, and secondly, that this concept constitutes an adequate explanation for the systemic change.

References

Anttila, Raimo, 1989 [1972]. *Historical and Comparative Linguistics*, second revised edition. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Fox, Anthony, 1995. *Linguistic reconstruction: an introduction to theory and method*. Oxford: OUP.
Hopper, Paul & Traugott, Elizabeth, 2003 [1993]. *Grammaticalization*, 2nd edition. Cambridge: CUP.
Lehmann, Christian 2002 [1982]. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*, revised ed. Erfurt: Seminar für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.
Sommer, Ferdinand/Pfister, Raimund (1977). *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*, vierte, neubearbeitete Auflage, Band I: Einleitung und Lautlehre. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Finite infinitives in cross-clausal (non-)agreement

Blake LEWIS
University of Calgary

Infinitive constructions in Attic Greek and Latin can be inflected for tense and aspect. In Greek infinitives can be inflected as imperfective, future, perfect, or aorist, while Latin infinitives can be inflected as present, future, or perfect (Sevdali 2013). However, infinitives in Greek are interpreted in relation to the utterance time, while infinitives in Latin are interpreted in relation to the matrix verb (Morwood 2001, LaFleur 2011). Consider the following data data in (1).

(1) a. με ἐφέηκε καλέειν νηὸς πρόμον
'[she] sent me to call the captain' (Apollonius Rhodius: Argonautica 1, 79)
[Iphinoe addresses the Minyae (sailors), announcing the reason she is there.]
b. denuntiabat universis se funditus eversurum esse illam civitatem.
'he announced that he would completely destroy the whole city itself'
[the announcement was in the past for a future action that already occurred by utterance time.]
(M. Tullius Cicero: In Verrem 2, 4, 76, 9)

As shown in (1) and despite the fact that both languages show a mismatch between the matrix verb and infinitive in tense, Greek infinitives are interpreted based on utterance time, while Latin infinitives are interpreted based on the matrix verb. Phase theory predicts that there is no interaction between clauses and therefore the matrix verb should not be able to communicate with the embedded verb (Chomsky 2008). Via corpus work, I compare the behaviour of infinitives between

Attic Greek and Latin. This paper explores the one empirical question, and one theoretical question. What is the syntactic distribution of infinitives? and how can the data in (1) be captured within a phase-based account such that the relationship across clauses is captured in a manner that can be parametrized to account for the contrast between Greek and Latin? In addressing these questions, I consider three alternatives: a left edge/operator movement approach (Haegeman and Ürögdi 2010), the possibility of two different infinitives (Toivonen 1995, Ylikoski 2003, Wurmbrand 2014), and the possibility that Latin has a co-referential IP that allows communication between the clauses (Sohn 1995). I also compare sequence of tense patterns (Giorgi 2009) for each language and show parallels between infinitives and other verbs in their event versus utterance time relations. Based on the availability of internal and external clause movements, following Haegeman and Ürögdi (2010), I suggest that Greek possesses an operator, which blocks movement and communication between the temporal layers that is not present in Latin.

References

Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On phases. Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory, ed. by Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 133–166.

Giorgi, Alessandra. 2009. Toward a syntax of the subjunctive mood. *Lingua* 119.12: 1837-1858.

Haegeman, Liliane and Barbara Ürögdi. 2010. Referential CPs and DPs: An operator movement account. *Theoretical linguistics* 36.2-3: 111-152.

LaFleur, Richard A. 2011. *Wheelock's Latin*, 7th Edition. New York: HarperCollins.

Morwood, James. 2001. *Oxford Grammar of Classical Greek*. New York: OUP.

Sevdali, Christina. 2013. Ancient Greek Infinitives and Phases. *Syntax* 16.4: 324-361.

Sohn, Sung-Ock S. 1995. *Tense and aspect in Korean*. Center for Korean studies Vol. 18. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Toivonen, Ida. 1995. *A study of Finnish infinitives*. Diss. Brandeis University.

Wurmbrand, Susi. 2014. Tense and aspect in English infinitives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45.3: 403-447.

Ylikoski, Jussi. 2003. Defining non-finites: action nominals, converbs and infinitives. *SKY Journal of linguistics* 16: 185-237.

L'espressione della denominazione tra genitivo e apposizione

Felicia LOGOZZO & Edoardo MIDDEI
Università di Roma Tor Vergata

Il contributo si propone di focalizzare gli ambiti di concorrenza tra l'uso del genitivo e l'apposizione in differenti contesti del latino, soprattutto nelle espressioni della denominazione.

I casi di impiego del genitivo con valore appositivo sono registrati dalle grammatiche descrittive tradizionali sotto varie definizioni: *genitivus definitivus* o *epexegeticus* (Hofmann – Szantyr 1965), *genitivus appositivus* (Kühner – Stegmann 1962) che riuniscono espressioni quali *urbs Romae, citri arbor, nomen Marci*, *laetitiae voluptas, continentiae virtus* ecc.

Una distinzione tra questi tipi di sintagmi è operabile in base all'intercambiabilità con la costruzione appositiva (*urbs Romae* = *urbs Roma*, vs. *laetitiae voluptas* = **laetitia voluptas*), che passa attraverso la funzione di identificazione o denominazione, segnalata, in gran parte dei casi, dalla presenza di un nome proprio.

Non tutti gli autori e non tutti i sostantivi sembrano autorizzare l'impiego del genitivo appositivo nei medesimi contesti: Cesare, ad esempio, non lo utilizza al seguito di *flumen* e *mons,* ma in età augustea e posteriore, esso è attestato in testi poetici: Lucilio 126, *Silari ad flumen*; Virgilio, Aen. 6.659 *Eridani amnis*, 7.714 *flumen Himellae*, 1.244 *fontem Timavi*, 8.231 *Aventini montem*, Livio 24.12.4 *lacum Avernae.*

Il genitivo appositivo ricorre anche in dipendenza da *nomen*, *cognomen* (*nomen Marci*) e in espressioni come Poen. 273 *monstrum mulieris*, Pers. 204 *deliciae pueri*, Cicerone, Fam. 5.8.2 *quaedam pestes hominum* che hanno sempre funzione identificativa (*monstrum mulieris* = *monstrum Corneliae*)

Obiettivo del contributo è individuare la distribuzione di questo tipo di genitivo, soprattutto in dipendenza da nomi geografici, in rapporto anche con la costruzione appositiva sia in sincronia, sia in diacronia, fino agli sviluppi nelle lingue romanze: Cesare, Bell. Gall. 7.13.3 *oppidum Avaricum* vs. Anonimo Bell. Afr. 36.2 *ex oppido Thysdrae*; it. 'città di Roma' vs. 'fiume Tevere'; fr. 'ville de Paris' vs 'rivière Seine'.

Si procederà altresì al confronto tra il *genitivus explicativus* latino e le strutture parallele in altre lingue antiche e moderne (es. il genitivo epesegetico del greco: Κάνης ὄρος ἔχων ἐν ἀριστερῇ "tenendo il monte Cane a sinistra" Hdt. 7, 42, 1; Ἰλίου πόλις "la città di Ilio" Eschilo, Ag. 29) allo scopo di poter contribuire a elaborare riflessioni generali sulla categoria della denominazione e sulle sue espressioni linguistiche.

Riferimenti

Baldi Philip 1977, Morpho-syntax and the Latin genitive, *Folia Linguistica* 11: 1/2, 93-108.

Hahn Adelaide 1953, Vestiges of Partitive Apposition in Latin Syntax, *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 84, 92-123.
Hofmann Johann B. 1924, Syntaktische Gliederungsverschiebungen im Lateinischen infolge Erstarrung ursprünglich appositioneller Verhältnisse, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 42, 75-88.
Hofmann Johann B., Szantyr Anton 1965, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, Munich.
Kühner – Stegmann 1962, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, Hannover.
Longrée Dominique 1990, À propos du concept d'apposition: les constructions *rex Ancus* et *urbs Roma*, *L'Information Grammaticale* 45, 8-13.
Pasquali Giorgio 1939, In casa i Frescobaldi, *Lingua Nostra* 1, 8-10.
Serbat Guy 1996, *Grammaire fondamentale du Latin* VI, Louvain-Paris.

The mechanisms of affix borrowing through Latin-Greek hybrid formations

Elisabetta MAGNI
Università di Bologna

In recent years the literature on language contact has seen a growing attention towards bilingualism, with a special focus on ancient languages and written texts (Adams 2002, 2003, Evans & Obbink 2010). The widely explored domain of interference between Latin and Greek has particularly benefited from this renewed interest thanks to the opening of new perspectives on loanwords. On the one hand, typological work has concentrated on establishing borrowing scales and hierarchies (Haspelmath & Tadmor 2009) to define which forms are more likely to be borrowed, while on the other hand, research on affix borrowing has focused on the mechanisms of morphological loan (Seifart 2013) to determine how forms are borrowed.

Under conditions of bilingualism, morphological interference is likely to occur and surface in a peculiar way through hybrid formations that, although classified as indirect borrowing and considered as marginal phenomena (Haspelmath & Tadmor 2009: 39), are relevant to the dynamics of language contact (Onysko 2007).

Considering the exchanges between Latin and Greek, we can observe that "Hybridization is to single words what code-switching is to sentences or utterances: Greek and Latin are yoked together to produce a superior linguistic unit" (Biville 2002: 98). As a matter of fact, due to the relatively stable coexistence, rather than 'languages in contact', the notion of 'languages of contact', or 'mixed codes' (Leiwo 2003), seems here more appropriate to describe the 'supra-langue' (Biville 2008: 50) that generates so many hybrid compounds like *inanilogista* (< Lat. *inanis* + Gr. λογιστής) or *filograecus* (< Gr. φίλος + Lat. *Graecus*), and derived forms like *lupatria* (< Lat. *lupa* + Gr. -τρια) or *excatarisso* (< Lat. *ex* + Gr. καθαρίζω).

This communication aims to investigate such complex loanwords, and in particular derived hybrids, in order to understand the mechanisms by which borrowed affixes spread to Latin native stems, often following paths of language-internal analogical extension. These phenomena are not only "a sure sign of the close contacts between Latin speakers and the speakers of the other language" (Adams 2003: 165), but they can also prove that "a bilingual's contribution to a transfer may be creative" (Adams 2003: 491). In principle, affix borrowing can take place under ideal conditions, when the recipient language already has a suffix that resembles phonetically a suffix in the donor language, but in general what is crucial to successful innovations is the speaker's role in detecting similarities, modulating adaptive strategies, balancing competing motivations, or conflicting rules.

In this perspective, hybrids can thus offer an interesting perspective not only on morphological interference, but also on language change. This will be illustrated by discussing the borrowing of various affixes, and by observing in particular the extraction, spread and competition of the suffix *-ĭnus,* (cf. Gr. φήγινος, Lat. *faginus*, and Lat. *triticinus/triticeus*, *thalassinus/thalassicus,* etc.), as well as its functions vis-à-vis the suffix *-īnus*, which in late Latin starts to develop diminutive functions in substandard formations (Adams 2013: 566 ff., Magni 1999).

References

Adams, J.N. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: CUP.
–– 2013. *Social Variation and the Latin Language.* Cambridge: CUP.
Biville, F. 2002. The Graeco-Romans and Graeco-Latin: A terminological framework for cases of bilingualism. In J.N. Adams, M. Janse & S. Swain (eds) *Bilingualism in Ancient Society. Language Contact and the Written Text*. Oxford: OUP, 77-102.
–– 2008. Situations et documents bilingues dans le monde gréco-romain. In F. Biville, J.-C. Decourt & G. Rougemont (eds), *Bilinguisme gréco-latin et épigraphie*. *Actes du colloque international, Lyon, 17-19 mai 2004*, 35-53. Lyon: MOM.
Evans, T.V. & D.D. Obbink (eds) 2010. *The Language of the Papyri*. Oxford: OUP.
Haspelmath, M. & U. Tadmor (eds.) 2009. *Loanwords in the World's Languages. A Comparative Handbook*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
Leiwo, M. 2002. From contact to mixture. In J.N. Adams, M. Janse & S. Swain (eds), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society. Language Contact and the Written Text*, 168-194. Oxford: OUP.

Magni, E. 1999. Sémantique du diminutif et relations d'appartenance. *Silexicales* 2. *La morphologie des dérivés évaluatifs*. *Forum de morphologie* (*2e rencontres*). *Actes du colloque de Toulouse* (*29-30 avril 1999*), 139-148.
Onysko, A. 2007. *Anglicisms in German: Borrowing, lexical productivity, and written codeswitching*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
Seifart, F. 2013. *AfBo: A World-wide Survey of Affix Borrowing*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Available online at http://afbo.info.

A pragmaphilological approach to code-switching in Cicero's letters

Aleksi Mäkilähde & Veli-Matti Rissanen
University of Turku

During the past couple of decades, code-switching and other multilingual practices have become a central topic in linguistics. Larger-scale studies on historical code-switching (i.e. by historical linguists and philologists) in the form of monographs or edited volumes have been conducted especially in the context of English (e.g. Schendl & Wright 2011) and the Classical languages (e.g. Adams, Janse & Swain 2002; Adams 2003; Mullen & James 2012). Previous studies on code-switching have focused particularly on its functions, and it has been shown that code-switching is often connected to such aspects as identity-construction, power-relations and the negotiation of social roles (e.g. Diller 1997/1998; Nurmi & Pahta 2010). Our aim is to contribute to the discussion by applying a novel methodological framework to the study of code-switching in Classical Latin. We will show, firstly, what the pragmatic functions of code-switching in our data are, and secondly, what other linguistic strategies are used for the same functions. We will also demonstrate how an analysis of multiple discourse strategies simultaneously adds to our understanding of the multilingual practices themselves.

The methodology chosen for the study can be described as a *pragmaphilological* approach, which is understood here as a combination of *pragmatics* and *philology* (for another definition see Jacobs & Jucker 1995: 11-12). The framework takes as its point of departure Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory and especially the concept of *face*. The methodology was outlined in Mäkilähde (2012), and it draws also from several other theoretical models (e.g. Goffman 1967, Clark 1996, Itkonen 2003, Culpeper 2011). By combining material-driven and theory-driven approaches we are able to present a coherent classification of the functions of code-switching while taking into account the socio-historical context of our material.

The data for the present paper consist of a selection of Cicero's letters. A preliminary analysis has shown that switching in the letters is intimately connected to the roles assumed by the sender and the receiver of the letter (cf. Adams 2003). Greek seems to occur especially in informal letters to Atticus, Quintus and Tiro. However, the context is crucial even in these cases, since during a crisis and in official letters Greek is rarely used. Common pragmatic functions for code-switching in the letters were found to be solidarity, identity construction, exclusion and euphemisms. Similar functions were identified by Adams (2003), but instead of mere ad hoc categories we propose formal definitions for these functions by connecting them to the theoretical and methodological framework outlined above. Our analysis shows that such functions can also be achieved through other discourse strategies such as intertextuality. For example, Cicero often uses Greek quotations in his letters to Atticus, and while he does not use Greek to his younger friend Trebatius, he does employ Latin quotations for the same effect. We argue that focussing on only code-switching obscures the multiplicity of strategies the speakers and writers were able to choose depending on the situation and the participants involved.

References

Adams J. N. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. New York: CUP.
Adams J. N., Janse M. & Swain Simon (eds.) 2002. *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Word*. Oxford: OUP.
Brown Penelope & Levinson Stephen C. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: CUP.
Clark Herbert H. 1996. *Using Language*. Cambridge: CUP.
Culpeper Jonathan 2011. *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence.* Cambridge: CUP.
Diller Hans-Jürgen 1997/1998. Code-switching in medieval English drama. *Comparative Drama* 31 (4): 506-537.
Goffman Erving 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-face Behavior*. New York: Anchor Books.
Itkonen Esa 2003. *What is Language? A Study in the Philosophy of Linguistics*. Turku: University of Turku.
Jacobs Andreas & Jucker Andreas H. 1995. The historical perspective in pragmatics. In Andreas H. Jucker (ed.), *Historical Pragmatics: Pragmatic Developments in the History of English*, 3-33. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Mäkilähde Aleksi 2012. *The Forms and Functions of Multilingual Practices in Early Modern School Drama from the King's School, Canterbury*. Unpublished MA thesis. Turku: University of Turku.
Mullen Alex & Patrick James (eds.) 2012. *Multilingualism in the Graeco-Roman Worlds*. Cambridge: CUP.
Nurmi Arja & Pahta Päivi 2010. Preacher, scholar, brother, friend: Social roles and code-switching in the writings of Thomas Twining. In Pahta Päivi et al. (eds): *Social Roles and Language Practices in Late Modern English*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 135-162.
Schendl Herbert & Wright Laura (eds.) 2011. *Code-Switching in Early English*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter Mouton.

Auxiliaries in double-negation settings (*non potest non* + INF.): semantic gliding and syntactic description

Adriana MANFREDINI
Universidad de Buenos Aires

The existing semantic relations between the modal notions of 'possibility' and 'necessity' by means of the presence of negation are frequently accounted for in the bibliography (for instance, Bertocchi-Orlandini 2002; Palmer 1995). It is the aim of this paper to go deeper into them, in attention to examples like:

Nam ceteri dolores mitigantur vetustate, hic ***non$_1$ potest non$_2$*** *et sensu praesentis miseriae et recordatione praeteritae vitae cottidie* ***augeri***. (Cic. *Att.* 3.15.2)

It seems more or less clear that the scope of *non$_1$* falls on the modal auxiliary whereas that of *non$_2$* affects the non-finite predication. This could be taken as a proof of the auxiliary functioning as a modal operator rather than as a constituent of an auxiliary phrase, in accordance with the proposal in Manfredini (in eval.). But it is not less important that the peculiar combination of two negation operators presumably located on different syntactic levels might cause the gliding from a 'possibility' meaning to that of 'necessity'. Now, if this 'necessity' can be understood as 'epistemic necessity' (*i.e.* "it follows that X") this initial research seeks to answer these questions:

a) Does *non potest non*+INF always convey this 'epistemic necessity' meaning?

b) If this is so, does this meaning entail that *non$_1$* must needs have scope on 'epistemic' *possum*? Analogously, there is no clear proof that *non$_1$ possum* meaning 'prohibition' derives from *non$_1$*+ 'deontic' *possum* (*cf.* Manfredini 2014)

c) Does *non$_2$* play any role in this semantic gliding of the auxiliary (*cf.* the logical oppositions in Bertocchi-Orlandini 2002: nec p ≅ ~poss~p) being located at the same level as *non$_1$*, in opposition to what has been just suggested a few lines above?

Data for this study will be initially selected from prose writers, mainly Cicero and young Seneca. Theoretical frame is fundamentally that of Dik's Functional Grammar, but formal approaches won't be dismissed if they afford useful descriptive devices.

References

Bertocchi, A.- A. Orlandini 2002, Impossible n'est pas latin. Sur les concepts modaux de "possible" et d'"impossible", et leur réalisation en latin" in Fruyt, M.- C. Moussy (eds). *Les modalités en latin: Colloque du Centre Alfred Ernout*, Université de Paris IV, 3, 4, et 5 de juin 1998, 9-23. Paris: Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne.

Di Tullio, A. 2014, *Manual de Gramática del Español*, Buenos Aires: Waldhuter Editores.

Heine, B. 1993, *Auxiliaries. Cognitive Forces and Grammaticalization*. New York/ Oxford: OUP.

Magni, E. 2010, Mood and Modality, in Baldi P.- P.Cuzzolin (eds.) *New Perspectives in Historical Latin Syntax. Volume 2: Constituent Syntax: Adverbial Phrases, Adverbs, Mood, Tense.* Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 193-275.

Manfredini, A. (in eval.) Auxiliaries within comparative clauses: some remarks concerning their syntax and grammatical description, *Proceedings of the XVIIth International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics,* Rome, May 20-25, 2013.

–– 2014, 'No poder' en *Las Catilinarias* de Cicerón: aportes para la investigación sobre la sintaxis y semántica de *possum*, unpublished paper presented at the *XXIII Simposio Nacional de Estudios Clásicos***,** Universidad Nacional de Salta, Facultad de Humanidades – Asociación Argentina de Estudios Clásicos, 7-10 de octubre de 2014.

Palmer, F. 1995, Negation and the modals of possibility and necessity, in Bybee, J.-S. Fleischman (eds.) *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 453-471.

–– 2001^2, *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: CUP.

van der Wouden, T. 1997,*Negative Contexts. Collocation, polarity and multiple negation*, London/New York: Routledge.

Dos locuciones preposicionales en latín: *in loco / locum* e *in uice / uicem*

Cristina MARTÍN PUENTE & Matilde CONDE SALAZAR
Universidad Complutense de Madrid & CSIC

Las locuciones preposicionales son expresiones constituidas por varias palabras que adquieren conjuntamente el sentido y el funcionamiento gramatical de las preposiciones. En la actualidad estas construcciones se están estudiando en profundidad en español y en otras lenguas modernas con gran provecho tanto para la sintaxis como para la lexicografía (cf. bibliografía). Sin embargo, se percibe un gran descuido en el análisis de estructuras muy similares que existen en latín, las cuales se pueden estudiar siguiendo la misma metodología.

En el marco de los estudios que venimos llevando a cabo sobre las fórmulas de sustitución en latín, queremos dedicar nuestra intervención a dos construcciones que se pueden considerar locuciones preposicionales: *in loco / locum* + genitivo e *in uice / uicem* + genitivo. Con ambas se expresa uno de los sentidos de la preposición *pro*, el de 'en lugar de'. Así se documenta desde época clásica y, aunque sólo la primera se emplea en la Edad Media, las dos perviven en las lenguas modernas.

Referencias

Cifuentes Honrubia, J.L. 2003, *Locuciones prepositivas. Sobre la gramaticalización preposicional en español*, Alicante, Publicaciones de la Universidad.

De Bruyne, J., 1999, Las preposiciones, cap. 10, tomo I de la *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española,* de Bosque y Demonte (1999), RAE, Madrid, Espasa.

Gaatone, D., 1976, Locutions prépositives et groupes prépositionnels, *Lingüistas* 167, p. 15-33.

Gómez Asencio, J.J., 2008, El tratamiento de lo que ahora se llama 'locuciones prepositivas' en sesenta y cuatro gramáticas del español (1555-1930), *Quaderns de filología. Estudis lingüístics* 13, 39-103.

Koike, K., 1997, Valores funcionales de las locuciones prepositivas en español, *Onomazein* 2, 151-179.

Martín Puente, C. - Conde Salazar, M. 2014, El paso de la preposición latina *pro* a prefijo. Una gramaticalización poco productiva, *Latomus* 73.3, 577-594.

Montoro del Arco, E.T. 2006, *Teoría fraseológica de las locuciones particulares. Las locuciones prepositivas, conjuntivas y marcadoras en español*, Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang.

Nueva gramática de la lengua española 2009. RAE 2009-2 (Sintaxis II), 2281-2282

Pavón Lucero, M.V., 2014, À propos des locutions prépositionnelles et des dictionnaires, *Cahiers de lexicologie* 104, 113-132.

Santos Río, L. 2003, *Indagaciones semánticas, sintácticas y lexicográficas*, Salamanca, Varona.

Ueda, H., 1990, Frases prepositivas del español, *Revista de la Facultad de Ciencias Humanísticas de la Universidad de Tokio* 22, 9-33.

***Concubina, paelex* y *riualis*: interferencias en el eje de la diacronía**

Antonio María MARTÍN RODRÍGUEZ
Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria

La distinción enfatizada por Eugenio Coseriu entre el significado lingüístico y la designación extralingüística resulta útil para el análisis del significado de *paelex*. Aun cuando se asimila con frecuencia a la concubina, la amante o incluso la prostituta, lo cierto es que su uso primigenio se acerca más bien al concepto de rival. Mientras que *concubina* pone en relación a una mujer con un hombre, *paelex* supone en el uso normal en latín arcaico y clásico una relación no recíproca entre dos mujeres que tienen trato sexual habitual con el mismo hombre: una mujer se considera *paelex* con respecto a la esposa legítima del hombre con quien mantiene relaciones sexuales, pero el término no se aplica a la esposa con respecto a la amante o concubina del marido; Alcmena, en efecto, puede considerarse *paelex* de Juno, pero Juno no es la *paelex* de Alcmena. Una misma mujer puede ser a la vez, desde luego, *concubina* y *paelex*, pero no en el mismo sentido: Casandra, por ejemplo, puede considerarse *paelex* de Clitemnestra, pero *concubina* de Agamenón. Estos dos términos no pueden, en cambio, aplicarse de manera recíproca a Clitemnestra, que no es *concubina* sino *uxor* de Agamenón, y no es tampoco *paelex* de Casandra. Para tratar de hallar un término susceptible de expresar de manera recíproca la relación entre Clitemnestra y Casandra podría pensarse, a partir de la situación en las lenguas romances, en *riualis*, pero esta hipótesis se enfrenta a la evidencia de que *riualis*, en su empleo clásico en la lengua amorosa, no se aplica a mujeres, sino normalmente a varones.

Nuestro objetivo es analizar en qué medida la situación que presentan en latín arcaico y clásico estos tres términos se ha mantenido o se ha visto alterada en la evolución sufrida por el latín en el eje de la diacronía, estudiando, en particular, la vigencia o no de los siguientes fenómenos:

- Mantenimiento o no de *paelex* en el ámbito propio de las relaciones entre mujeres, en función de la admisión o no de un complemento adnominal de referencia masculina (especialmente, genitivos o posesivos) o de la generalización de un uso sin complementación adnominal de naturaleza relacional, bien sea masculina o femenina. La extensión de los ejemplos de complementación adnominal referida a varones mostraría un acercamiento a la esfera semántica propia de la *concubina*, mientras que la extensión de usos sin complementación adnominal podría ser indicio de una aproximación a la esfera semántica de la prostituta.
- Extensión o no de las posibilidades de aplicación de *riualis* en la lengua amorosa, analizando, en primer lugar, si se ha desarrollado, y en qué momento histórico, la capacidad de aplicarse a mujeres y, de ser ello así, si se ha generado un

sentido recíproco o, en caso de aplicarse únicamente al tipo de relación entre mujeres expresado originariamente por *paelex,* unívoco.

Latin presents in -*t*- and the etymology of *flecto* 'bend, curve'

Ranko MATASOVIĆ
University of Zagreb

The class of verbs with the present stem suffix –*t*- is rather small in Latin: *flecto* 'bend, curve', *necto* 'bind', *pecto* 'comb' and *plecto* 'braid, plait' (Leumann 1977: 314, Sihler 1995: 535). Of these, there is comparative evidence for a present stem in thematic *-te- only for *pecto* and *plecto.* For *pecto,* Pinault (2006: 136-140), posits a reduplicated present *pe-pk'-, dissimilated to *petk'-, with the derived n-stem *petk'-n- / *ptk'-en- 'comb'. Thus, the evidence for a t-present in PIE is then reduced to the root *plek- 'plait', and it may have got its *-t- by analogy with *pek'- already in PIE, because of their formal and semantic similarity.

As far as Latin is concerned, it is likely that the present stem suffix -*t*- is original in *plecto* and *pecto,* and that it spread analogically to *necto* and *flecto*. Of these two verbs, Lat. *flecto* does not have a clear PIE etymology (De Vaan 225). We propose to derive Lat. *flecto* from a PIE root *g^{wh}leg'^{h}- 'to bend', perhaps also 'to soften'. Besides in Latin, this root is reflected in PSl. *gleznъ, *glezno 'ankle' (OCS Ndu. *glezně,* Cz. *hlezen*, Croat. *glȅžanj*, Bulg. *glézen* 'ankle-bone'). The semantic motivation for this connection is obvious, as the ankle is the flexible joint on the leg. A similar semantic connection exists between E *ankle*, Germ. *Enkel* < OHG *anchal* (Kluge 222) and Lat. *angulus* 'corner', OCS *ągъlъ* 'id.' < PIE *$h_2$eng(u)-lo- 'something bent' (?). It is also possible to connect Lith. *glèžti* 'lose stiffness, rigidity, soften', from which we also have the derived adjective *glèžnas* 'weak, puny, delicate', identical to Latv. *glęzns* 'id.' and the derived verb Lith. *glìžti* 'become slippery' (Smoczyński 188). Further cognates are difficult to establish. It is possible that OIr. *glecc* 'wrestling' developed from PCelt. *g^{w}lekkā 'bending, twisting', but the geminate is difficult to account for. We might assume a nominal suffix *-kā added to a PCelt. root *g^{w}leg- < PIE *g^{wh}leg'^{h}-, with subsequent voicing assimilation.

References

Derksen Rick. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden: Brill.
De Vaan Michiel. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*, Leiden: Brill.
Ernout, A. & Meillet, A. 1967. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, Paris.
Pokorny J. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern.
Kluge F. 1999. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, Berlin: De Gruyter.
Leumann, Manu. 1977. *Lateinische Grammatik. Laut- und Formenlehre, Syntax und Stilistik*, München: Beck.
Rix H. et alii. 2003. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, Wiesbaden: Reichert.
Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2006. Sur l'évolution phonétique *tsk > tk* en tokharien commun, *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 62 [2002]: 103-156.
Sihler, Andrew. 1995. *New comparative grammar of Latin and Greek.* New York and Oxford: OUP.
Smoczyński W. 2007. *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*, Vilnius: Vilniaus Universitetas.
Walde A.& Hofmann J. B. 1938. *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg: Winter.

The locative alternation in Latin: A typological perspective

Jaume MATEU & Víctor ACEDO-MATELLÁN
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona-CLT & Queens' College, University of Cambridge

In this paper we deal with an argument structure alternation that is often referred to as the locative alternation or the *spray/load* alternation (cf. Iwata 2008; among others), which is the possibility some verbs display of heading two different predicates, one expressing change of location (a.k.a. MAT(erial) alternant: see (1a)) and the other one expressing change of state (a.k.a. LOC(ation) alternant: see (1b)).

(1) a. *In os$_{LOC}$ farciri pannos$_{MAT}$ imperavit.* (Sen. *Ira* 3.19)
b. *Medios parietes$_{LOC}$ farcire fractis caementis$_{MAT}$.* (Plin. *Nat*. 36, 172, 5)

Besides the unprefixed variants like the ones exemplified in (1), it is well-known that Latin has cases of locative alternation where some alternant or both are marked with a prefix (e.g., cf. García Hernández (1980f.), Lemaire (1983), Bolkestein (1985), and Acedo-Matellán (2010), i.a.):

(2) a. *Terrae pedem <u>in</u>-cutere.* (Quint. *Inst.* 2, 12, 10)
b. *Terram quatiunt pede.* (Hor. *Carm*. 1, 4, 7)
(3) a. *Ulceri medicamentum* [...] *<u>in</u>-ducatur*. (Cels. 7, 7)
b. *Albentique umeros <u>in</u>-duxit amictu*. (Stat. *Silv*. 5, 2, 66)
(4) a. *Ad* [...]*radices amphoram* [...] *amurcae* [...] *<u>ad</u>-fundi*. (Plin. *Nat*. 17, 263, 3)
b. *Caput tamen aqua frigida <u>per</u>-fundere*. (Cels. 1, 4)

Following Talmy's (2000) typology of motion events, we will show that the prefixal pattern exemplified in (2a), (3a,b), and (4a,b) is typical of so-called "satellite-framed languages" like Latin, and less so of so-called "verb-framed languages" like Romance (cf. Acedo-Matellán & Mateu 2013; Lewandowski 2014). The locative alternation patterns in (2a), (3a,b), and (4a,b) are indeed satellite-framed constructions: the satellite prefix encodes the Path, whereas the verbal root encodes the Manner component.

When dealing with these prefixed patterns, we will also show the usefulness of drawing an important distinction between the *constructional meaning* (the one related to the resultative/Path prefix, which, according to Talmy (2000), encodes the "core schema") and the *verbal meaning* (the verbal root expresses the so-called "co-event" or Manner component).

Furthermore, we differentiate two types of locative alternation as regards to the integration of the verbal root into the argument structure patterns: the unprefixed ones in (1a,b) will be shown to involve Result incorporation, whereas the prefixed ones in (2a), (3a,b), and (4a,b) will be shown to involve Manner conflation (cf. Mateu 2012). We will also argue that the locative alternation patterns in Latin obey the so-called Manner/Result complementarity (cf. Mateu & Acedo-Matellán (2012), i.a.).

References

Acedo-Matellán, V. 2010. *Argument Structure and the Syntax-Morphology Interface. A Case Study in Latin and other Languages*, Phd thesis, Universitat de Barcelona. http://hdl.handle.net/10803/21788

Acedo Matellán, V. & Mateu J. 2013. Satellite-framed Latin vs. verb-framed Romance: A syntactic approach. *Probus*. *International Journal of Latin and Romance Linguistics* 25, 227-265.

Bolkestein, A. M. 1985. Discourse and case-marking: Three-place predicates in Latin. In Ch. Touratier (ed.). *Syntaxe et latin. Actes du IIème Congrès International de Linguistique Latine*. Aix-en-Provence, Université de Provence, 191-225.

García Hernández, B. 1980. *Semántica estructural y lexemática del verbo*. Reus: Avesta.

Iwata, S. 2008. *Locative Alternation. A lexical-constructional approach*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lemaire, M. 1983. Un aspect de l'échange des arguments du verbe: les verbes à double régime de l'objet en latin, *BSL* 78, 1, 283-324.

Lewandowski, W. 2014. The locative alternation in verb-framed vs. satellite-framed languages. A corpus study of Spanish and Polish. *Studies in Language* 38.4, 864-895.

Mateu, J. 2012. Conflation and incorporation processes in resultative constructions". In V. Demonte & L. McNally (eds.). *Telicity, Change, and State. A Cross-Categorial View of Event Structure*. 252-278. Oxford & New York: OUP.

Mateu, J. & Acedo-Matellán V. 2012. The Manner/Result Complementarity Revisited: A Syntactic Approach. In M. C. Cuervo & Y. Roberge (eds.). *The End of Argument Structure?*, Bingley: Emerald, 209-228.

Talmy, L. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. *Vol. 2: Typology and Process in Concept Structuring.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

"Trapping" in Latin

Michael L. MAZZOLA
Northern Illinois University

Mester (1994) proposed a quantitative trochee for Latin, characterized as bimoraic and realized as a sequence of two light syllables or as a single heavy syllable illustrated in (1a) and (1b) respectively: (1) a. ['σ σ] b. ['σ:] c. ['σ: σ] d. ['σ]. This is in contrast with the earlier theory of metrical phonology (e.g. Hayes 1985), where two other realizations of the trochaic foot were also recognized. The first is given in (1c) as a heavy syllable followed by a light syllable (i.e. a classic trimoraic trochee); and the second, as a single light syllable (i.e. monomoraic), given as (1d).

Mester presents numerous data in support of his proposal, among which is the phenomenon of syncope in Latin and Romance. With regard to Early Syncope, a light penult "trapped" between a heavy antepenult and a heavy final syllable is deleted, as summarized and exemplified in (2):

(2) {['σ:] σ [σ:]} → {['σ:] [σ:]}
la:ridi: → lardi (gen. sg); perrego: → pergo: ; porrigo: → porgo: (pres 1st sg);
pu:rigo: → purgo: (pres 1st sg), aevita:s → aeta:s (nom sg); u:vido:s → u:do:s (acc pl)

His example of *aevita:s* → *aeta:s* is appropriate, since the operation applies not only in the nominative singular, but throughout the whole paradigm. Examples like *u:vid:os* → *u:do:s*, however, present a problem, since the claimed syncope occurs not only in the accusative plural, but in the nominative singular as well, where, the penult can not be claimed to be trapped between two heavy syllables: *u:vidus*. The effect of this facilitates the leveling of the paradigm through analogy.

Mester contrasts trapping with a later form of syncope which, he contends, took place between Latin and Romance. He argues that this Late Syncope can also be accounted for by a bimoraic foot. The examples in (2) are in contrast to Late Syncope, where a trisyllabic, proparoxytone --- displaying no trapped syllable --- was continued into Vulgar Latin and the Romance Languages: (3) {[σ σ] [σ:]} ; calidi:. Given that vowel quantity was no longer distinctive in Vulgar Latin, Mester next posits the formation of a bimoraic foot, this time consisting of two light syllables, {[fábu]<lam>}. Through this notation, syncope is achieved by the deletion of the unstressed light syllable of the foot, as given in (3):

(3) {[σ σ] [σ:]}

Classical Latin	[fá:] bu <lam>	[cáli] <dus>
Late Latin	[fábu] <lam>	[cáli]<du>
French	f*able*	*chaud*

Mester's proposal on trapping in conjunction with recourse to analogy neglects the rhythmic structure inherent in syncopated forms. The *trimoraic* trochaic rhythm of the items in question allows us to discern left branching structures as crucial in a novel phonological perspective on syncope regardless of the morphological case involved. It is the final vowel of the left-branching trochee which is deleted; e.g. [[áe wi] tas] → [áe tas], [[àe wi] [tá tem] →[ae [tá tem]]; [[ú wi] dus] → [údus], [[ú wi] dos] →[údos]. This phenomenon should not then be viewed as related to the weight of the syllables, but rather to the rhythmic property of Latin.

References

Allen, W. Sidney, 1973. *Accent and Rhythm: Prosodic Features of Latin and Greek: a Study in Theory and Reconstruction*. Cambridge, CUP.

Hayes, B., 1985, *A Metrical Theory of Stress Rules*. New York: Garland.

Hayes, B., 1995, *Metrical Stress Theory*. Chicago: University Chicago Press.

Mazzola, M. L., 1999, Tuscan Geminates and Trochaic Feet, in J. Franco *et al*. (eds.), *Grammatical Analyses in Basque and Romance Linguistics*, Amsterdam, 151-164.

–– 2006, Rhythm and Prosodic Change, in D. Arteaga & R. Gess (éds.), *Historical Romance Linguistics: Retrospective and Perspectives*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 97-110.

–– 2007, L'analyse soujacente à la diglossie, in D. Trotter (éd.), *Actes du XXIVe Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes,* Tübingen, 533-9.

–– 2008, The Two-norm Theory as an Emblem of Political Power and Historical Invention, in R. Wright (éd.), *Actes du VIII*e *colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif,* Hildesheim, 591-599.

Mester, A., 1994. The Quantitative Trochee in Latin, *Natural Language and Lingtic Theory* 12, 1-61.

Morin, Y.-Ch., 2003, Syncope, apocope, diphtongaison et palatalisation …, in F. Sánchez Miret (éd.), *Actas del XXIII Congreso Internacional de Lingüística y Filología Románica*, Vol. I, Tübingen, 113-169.

Otero, Carlos P. 1988. From Latin to Romance: the Vowel Systems. *On Language. Retorica, Phonologica, Syntactica: A Festschrift for Robert P. Stockwell from His Friends and Colleagues*, ed. by C. Duncan-Rose & T. Vennemann, London: Routledge, 233-256.

Pope, M. K., 1934, *From Latin to Modern French*, Manchester, UK.

Plural pronouns and social deixis in Latin: A pragmatic development

Piera MOLINELLI
University of Bergamo

Romance languages all have first or second person plural pronouns that are pragmatically motivated in terms of politeness strategies. This situation is clearly inherited from Latin, where we first find some uses of first plural pronouns as a means of expressing involvement with sociative and inclusive meanings (referred to by traditional grammars with distinctions such as *pluralis auctoris*, *pluralis modestiae*, *pluralis affectus*: Hofmann & Szantyr 1997[1965/1972]: 19–21), which have been mentioned in earlier studies such as Hofmann (1985: 291), Kaster (1988: 181), and Adams (1995: 134), among others.

Some studies have claimed for an original connection between power and the use of plural forms of address in Latin. Migliorini (1957: 187) asserted that the domain of use of the second person plural pronoun *vos*, originally used to refer to the emperors, would have progressively expanded to address people of higher ranks. This view received great support in subsequent works (e.g. Brown & Gilman 1960, Finkenstaedt 1963: 19–24).

This contribution, however, will follow the different view taken by Haverling (1995), who argued that 'illogical' uses of first plural *nos* reference instead of first singular reference *ego*, found above all in epistolography, have triggered also the use of 'illogical' second plural reference in place of a second singular reference – which was later re-interpreted as a deferent address form, then continued in Romance languages (see also Niculescu 1974: 12, Watts et al. 1992: 92–93). This phenomenon is worth looking into further according both to diaphasic parameters, since different textual genres can be characterized in terms of different address systems, and to a consistent pragmatic perspective. This paper therefore aims at exploring the pragmatic development of this pluralization strategy, which seems to have stemmed out from the sociative and inclusive *ego–nos* opposition. Subsequently, the second person dichotomy between *tu* and *vos* was analogically reinterpreted as a means of expressing courtesy and deference. In other words, the discussion in point is that the official politeness function is secondary and developed from inclusive values pointing to cooperative meanings and emphatic involvement.

What is, however, the link between the sociative/inclusive *nos* and the reverential *vos*? I will suggest that these pragmatic uses of plural pronouns can be better understood and accounted for if linked to the notion of "face", that is, "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact" (Goffman 1967: 23). Accordingly, sociative and inclusive values deployed by pragmatically connoted plural pronouns have to be connected with positive face needs, such as the need to be valued, to maintain a positive self-image and to establish sympathetic relations. Reverential values, by contrast, seem to be pragmatically motivated by the need not to impose on others and to create social distance – i.e., they have to be linked with the notion of negative face.

References

Adams, James Noel. 1995. *Pelagonius and Latin Veterinary Terminology in the Roman Empire*. Leiden: Brill.

Brown, Roger & Albert Gilman. 1960. The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T.A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in language*. Cambridge (MA): The MIT Press, 253-276.

Finkenstaedt, Thomas. 1963. *You und Thou. Studien zur Anrede im Englischen (mit einem Exkurs über die Anrede im Deutschen)*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Goffman, Erving. 1967. *Interaction ritual. Essays on face-to- face behavior*. London: The Penguin Press.

Haverling, Gerd. 1995. Illogical *vos* in Late Latin. In Louis Callebat (ed.), *Latin vulgaire, latin tardif IV*, 337-353.

Hofmann, Johann B. 1965. *La lingua d'uso latina*. Trad. it. a cura di L. Ricottilli. Bologna: Pàtron.

Hofmann, Johann B. & Anton Szantyr. 1997 [1965/1972]. *Lateinische Grammatik*. II: *Syntax und Stilistik*. München: Beck.

Kaster, Robert A. 1988. *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Migliorini, Bruno. 1957. Primordi del "lei", Saggi linguistici. Firenze: Le Monnier, pp. 187-196.

Niculescu, Alessandro. 1974. *Strutture allocutive pronominali reverenziali in italiano*. Firenze: Olschki.

Watts, Richard J., Sachiko Ide, Konrad Ehlich (eds). 1992. *Politeness in Language: Studies in Its History, Theory and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Expressions de quantité chez Plaute et Térence : les « quantifieurs » *multus* et *magnus*

Laurent Moonens
Université Paris-Sud

Nous proposons, durant cette communication, d'examiner le cas de quelques expressions de la quantité, en syntagme nominal, dans les comédies de Plaute et Térence. Plus précisément, nous nous intéresserons aux « quantifieurs » *multus* et *magnus*, en tâchant par avance de délimiter en quoi ces deux termes participent de l'expression de la quantité.

Nous prendrons appui, pour l'essentiel, sur le cadre théorique offert (pour la quantification dénombrable) par M. Wilmet (1986), en prenant soin de l'adapter aussi à la quantification « non-dénombrable » opérant aussi, au singulier, avec les occurrences de *multus* et *magnus*. Tirant profit de la terminologie introduite par le grammairien belge, et de la description du Syntagme Nominal (SN) proposée par O. Spevak (2014), nous nous efforcerons de délimiter précisément la catégorie des « quantifieurs », et de montrer dans un premier temps en quoi *multus* et *magnus* y participent.

Le temps sera alors venu de classifier les emplois de ces deux quantifieurs, en fonction notamment du *type* du nom quantifié : les « oppositions dénombrable » *vs* « non-dénombrable », l'appartenance à la catégorie des noms dits « massifs » y seront pertinentes, tandis qu'un examen du corpus choisi montrera le phénomène très particulier de la quantification des « noms de patrimoine » (tels *pecunia*) par *magnus*, où l'on pourrait attendre *multus* par analogie avec la quantification des noms « massifs ».

Références

Fugier, H. 1983, Le syntagme nominal en latin classique, in W. Haase (éd.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2, 29, 1, Berlin, W. de Gruyter, 212-269.

Pinkster, H. 1990, *Latin Syntax and Semantics*, Romance Linguistics, London/New York, Routledge.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. et Svartvik, J. 1985, *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, London, Longman, 1985.

Ripoll, A. 2010, À propos de la quantification en latin : de la nature de *multum*, in P. Anreiter et M. Kienpointner (éds), *Latin Linguistics Today. Akten des 15 Internationalen Kolloquiums zur Lateinschen Linguistik, Innsbruck, 4-9 April 2009*, Innsbrück, Innsbrücker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 301-312.

Spevak, O. 2014, *The Noun Phrase in Classical Latin Prose*, Amsterdam, Brill.

Touratier, Ch. 2010, Syntagme nominal et quantification en latin, in M. Fruyt et O. Spevak (éds), *La quantification en latin*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 121-37.

Wilmet, M. 1986, *La détermination nominale. Quantification et caractérisation*, Paris, PUF.

Lat. *fundo*, *exfuti*. Réflexions sur la position dialectale du latin

Moreno Morani
Université de Gênes

La racine **gh'eu-* est une des racines les plus diffusées et remarquables dans la sphère du vocabulaire religieux et on la trouve dans nombre de dérivations assez importantes dans plusieurs langues. En latin on a un présent *fundō*, c'est-à-dire que la racine dans son emploi normal connaît un élargissement avec dentale : cette même innovation se trouve dans les langues germaniques, où l'on a p.ex. goth. *giutan*. Le latin donc partage une innovation très caractéristique avec les langues indo-européennes occidentales et on peut, d'une façon raisonnable, considérer cette innovation comme assez récente. D'autre côté l'innovation latine se colloque dans une période où la formation de thèmes de présent avec un infixe nasal était encore connue, quand même avec des formations thématiques (comme dans *iungō* etc.). La dentale a été diffusée ensuite aussi au parfait (autre innovation commune latin-germanique : *fūdī* < **gh'oud-* pareil au gothique *gaut*) et d'ici au participe *fūsus*, qui tient aussi le vocalisme du parfait avec degré normal de la racine.

Mais en latin on trouve aussi des traces de formations plus anciennes où la dentale n'était pas encore passée au reste du paradigme et la racine était employée dans sa forme originaire **gh'eu*: la forme *ec-futī*, attestée par PF, nous donne un indice de l'existence de ces formes, qui peuvent être aussi envisagées indirectement à travers des formations telles que *futō* (*con-futō*), *futilis* etc.

Donc, le latin se présente comme una langue à la fois archaïque et innovative : tout cela nous porte à una réflexion sur l'histoire de la langue et de sa formation.

Un autre problème encore est donné par la présence de *f-* < *gh'-* dans tout le groupe. Il faudra aussi considérer cette caractéristique, dans laquelle il serait difficile de supposer un fait de nature dialectale, semblable aux alternances du type *Helena* ~ *Felena* etc. On a à rappeler plutôt la présence d'évolutions de *gh'* en *f-* en contact avec *w* p.ex. dans *fērus* < **gh'wer-* etc. (est-il possible que *f-* relève de formes telles que **gh'wonti* 'il versent'?).

Verbs with double accusative and their passivization

Maria NAPOLI
Università del Piemonte Orientale Amedeo Avogadro

This contribution focuses on verbs governing two accusatives, i.e. the accusative of the inner object and the accusative of the person affected: these are mainly verbs meaning ‘to teach’, ‘to ask’, ‘to demand’, ‘to inform’, ‘to hide’. An example is quoted below (from Bennet 1914: 247):

(1) *istaec flagitia me celavisti et patrem* (Pl., *Bacch*. 167)

As is well-known, the passive form of verbs allowing this construction is quite rare. As pointed out by Pinkster (1990: 44), in the passive, the finite verb agrees with the constituent that indicates the animate entity (corresponding to the accusative of the person in the active voice rather than to the accusative of the object), with a few exceptions (cf. Flobert 1975: 400-401). An example is provided in (2):

(2) *Petreius atque Afranius cum stipendium a legionibus flagitarentur* (Caes., *Civ*. I, 87, 3)

The verbs with ‘thing and person’ Objects, as Pinkster (1990) called them, apparently represent “an exception to the rule that within the nuclear predication cases merely have a distinctive function” (Pinkster 1990: 44). To my knowledge, a detailed study of these verbs is still lacking. The aim of this paper is to investigate them through a corpus based approach, by looking both at their active and passive forms. I will analyze data taken from texts by various authors, from Archaic Latin to Classical Latin. In particular, the following research questions will be addressed:

(1) How may we explain the presence of verbs governing two accusatives within the nominative-accusative system traditionally considered as proper of the Latin language?
(2) Which is the specific function of the two accusatives?
(3) How may we explain the fact that the subject of the passive form of these verbs corresponds to the person affected in the active voice? Is this feature related only to the parameter ‘animacy’, as stated in previous studies?

In my talk, I will try to answer these questions by examining the particular syntactic pattern shown by these verbs in the light of the recent results of typological linguistics and theoretical linguistics on the alignment of the actants (cf. Siwierska 2003).

References

Bennett C. E. 1914. *Syntax of Early Latin*, vol. II, *The cases*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
Flobert P. 1975. *Les verbes déponents latins des origines à Charlemagne*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
Meillet A. and J. Vendryes. 1927. *Traité de Grammaire comparée des Langues classiques*. Paris: Champion.
Pinkster H. 1990 (revised edition). *Latin Syntax and Semantics*. London: Routledge.
Siewierska A. 2003. Person agreement and the determination of alignment. In *Transactions of the Philological Society* 101, 2, 339-370.

On the term and concept of 'metaphor' in Quintilian and Fronto

Anna NOVOKHATKO
Albert-Ludwigs-Universität, Freiburg i. Breisgau

This paper constitutes a part of my research project on the theory of metaphor in ancient linguistic thought. It follows on from my paper presented at the 17th ICLL where the use of the term ‘metaphor’ in Roman grammatical discourse before Quintilian (mainly the Rhetorica ad Herennium, Cicero and Verrius Flaccus) was discussed.

The use of the term ‘metaphor’ in Latin texts has not sufficiently been investigated. As part of this project, the corpus of Latin authors has been analysed with the aim of examining the uses of the term metaphora (or translatio or similar) in both semantic and pragmatic aspects (on general translation methods of the Greek terminology by Latin-speaking scholars, see McElduff 2013, 115-117; for Quintilian’s usage specifically, see also Cousin 1936, 104). The discussion of metaphor in the 1st and 2nd centuries CE by Quintilian (e.g. Inst. or. 8, 6, 1-19) and Fronto (e. g. Ad am. 1, 11, 1, Ad M. Caes. et inv. 4, 3, 7, and Ad M. Ant. Eloq. 3, 1) is examined as part of this paper. Semantic change is seen within social and linguistic contexts (Nerlich 2010). The paper will argue that the semantic and pragmatic aspects of the term 'metaphor' determine its meaning, as also its relationship with the theory of figures and tropes as established in ancient grammatical discourses (Novokhatko 2014a, 2014b, 2014c).

While according metaphor the function of embellishment in the rhetorical field, consciously Quintilian and Fronto, it will be argued, regard it as an essential linguistic element in cognitive process (Quint. Inst. or. 8, 6, 6: Id facimus aut quia necesse est aut quia significantius est; Front. Ad M. Ant. Eloq. 4, 10: ubi semel patefactae sunt, facile cognitae negleguntur). Further passages on metaphor in Greek and Latin texts written in Rome in the 1st and 2nd centuries CE will be explored with the aim of broadening our understanding of the philological context in which Quintilian and Fronto worked, and against which they developed their arguments. Examples include Festus (136, 23-138, 2 Lindsay), Plutarchus (Quaest. conviv. 747 c-d), Hermogenes (De ideis 1, 6), and 'Longinus' (Subl. 32, 1-5). Metaphor is thus examined, pragmatically oriented, in the broader grammatical, social and cultural context of linguistic debates of the time.

References

Cousin, J. 1936. *Études sur Quintilien*. Bd. 2. *Vocabulaire grec de la terminologie rhétorique dans l'Institution oratoire*. Paris: Boivin.

Eco, U., U. Niklas, F. Edeline 1986. Metaphor, in Th. A. Sebeok (ed.), *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Semiotics*, I, Berlin/New-York/Amsterdam, 534-549.

Guidorizzi, G. and S. Beta. 2000. *La metafora: testi greci e latini*, trad. e comm., Pisa: Edizioni ETS.

McElduff, S. 2013. *Roman theories of translation: surpassing the source*. New York/London: Routledge.

Nerlich, B. 2010. *Metaphor and metonymy,* in A. H. Jucker and I. Taavitsainen (eds), *Historical pragmatics*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 193–215.

Novokhatko, A. 2014a. Ancient theories of figures, in G. K. Giannakis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*. vol. 1: A-F. Leiden/Boston, Brill, 589-592.

–– 2014b. Ancient theories of metaphor, in G. K. Giannakis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, vol. 2: G-O. Leiden/Boston, Brill, 414-418.

–– 2014c. Ancient theories of tropes, in G. K. Giannakis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*. Ed. by G. K. Giannakis. Vol. 3: P-Z. Leiden/Boston, Brill, 441-445.

Prandi, M. 1992. *Grammaire philosophique des tropes: mise en forme et interprétation discursive des conflits conceptuels*. Paris.

–– 2004. *The building blocks of meaning: Ideas for a philosophical grammar*. Amsterdam.

Schenkeveld, D. M. 1991. Figures and tropes: a border-case between grammar and rhetoric, in G. Ueding (ed.), *Rhetorik zwischen den Wissenschaften: Geschichte, System, Praxis als Probleme des 'Historischen Wörterbuchs der Rhetorik',* Tübingen, 149–157.

Between aspect and deixis: *vado* in Classical Latin and the evolution of motion verbs

Andrea NUTI
Università di Pisa

Late Latin texts (e.g. *Vulgata, Peregrinatio Egeriae*) present an increasing competition between *eo* and *vado*, which has been related mainly to phenomena of phonetic erosion (e.g. *it~iit*) and to the tendency to avoid monosyllables (Löfsted 1933: 38-41; Ernout 1954: 156-9). Allegedly, early examples would be in Cicero's letters, where *vado* seems to be a synonym of *eo* (cf. *Att*. 4.10.2 *ad eum postridie mane vadebam*). Dynamics between *eo* and *venio*, on the other hand, are explained according to an aspectual differentiation (non-perfective *eo* vs. perfective *venio*; Hofmann-Szantyr 1965: 301-3; Ricca 1993: 127-31). A closer look, however, shows that a functional polarity between *eo* and *venio* according to a deictic principle is already observable in pre-Classical texts and it is *in acto* in Classical Latin (e.g. in Cicero; cf. Nuti, forth.; cf. also Orlandini-Poccetti 2001: 26; Brachet 2000: 64-5; and, for a comparison with other languages, Wilkins-Hill 1995).

A survey of the occurrences of *vado*, which I propose in this paper, points out that in Classical Latin this verb is not a mere synonym of *eo*: rather, it neatly displays distinctive features such as [+inchoative] or [+iterative] (Liv. 2.10 *Vadit inde in primum aditum pontis*; Sen. *ep.* 3.28.3 *Vadis huc illuc*), and this accounts also for most of the occurrences in Cicero (cf. *Att*. 14.11.2 *cras mane vadit*; cf. Pinkster 1990: 224). While *eo* is aspectually neutral, *venio*, because of its telicity, is naturally inclined to highlight the terminal point of a motion. Within this frame, *vado* behaves as a functional by-form of *eo*, with an aspectually marked scope that highlights the initial point of a motion in progress or, alternatively, the duration of the motion. *Vado*, therefore, is typically employed to describe motion as an *ongoing* process (cf. Catull. 63.31 *furibunda simul anhelans vaga vadit*; Liv. 7.35 *per corpora sopita vadetis*; Sen. *ep.* 4.37.4 *vade certo gradu*).

Examples of what appears to be full synonymy are as early as the 1st cent. AD (e.g. Mart. 2.69.5 *ad cenam gaudebat Apicius ire... Si tamen invitus vadis, cur, Classice, vadis?).* At this stage, however, synonymy should be better interpreted as the surface outcome (possibly triggered by external factors: e.g. style, metrics) of a "division of labour" in progress between *eo* and *vado*, which is mainly due to their different aspectual profiles.

According to the hypothesis advanced here, therefore, prior to a Late Latin stage where the lexical choice between *eo* and *vado* can be connected to phonetic phenomena and syllabic length, *vado* is already exploited in Classical Latin as an aspectually marked doublet of *eo*. Consider, moreover, that an early occurrence (2nd cent. BC) where *vado* refers to centripetal motion (Accius, Ribbeck 499*, Exprome quid fers, nam te e longo vadere itere cerno*), shows that, at this stage, *vado* shares with *eo* the feature of deictic neutrality. Passages from Classical Latin, however, suggest that *vado* is beginning to keep pace with *eo* in the drift towards a deictic-sensitive characterization, at least with reference to a textual centrum deicticum (cf. Mart. 11.1.4 *vadas et redeas inevolutus*).

References

Brachet, J.-P. 2000. *Recherches sur les préverbes* dē- *et* ex- *du latin*. Bruxelles: Latomus.

Ernout, A. 1954. *Aspects du vocabulaire latin*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Hofmann, J. & Szantyr, A. 1965. *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. München: Beck.

Löfstedt, E. 1933. *Syntactica. II, Syntaktisch-Stilistische Gesichtspunkte und Probleme.* Lund: Gleerup.

Nuti, A. forthcoming. A Matter of Perspective: Aspect, Deixis and Textual Exploitation in the Prototype Semantics of *eo* and *venio*, in William M. Short (ed.). *Embodiment in Latin Semantics*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Orlandini, A. & Poccetti, P. 2011. La référence spatio-temporelle et métalinguistique des verbes de mouvement en latin et leurs évolutions romanes. in C. Moussy (ed.). *Espace et temps en latin*. 25-45. Paris: PUPS.

Pinkster, H. 1990. *Latin Syntax and Semantics*. London & New York: Routledge.

Ricca, D. 1993. *I verbi deittici di movimento in Europa: una ricerca interlinguistica*. Florence: La Nuova Italia.

Wilkins, D. & Hill, D. 1995. When *go* means *come*: Questioning the basicness of basic motion verbs. *Cognitive Linguistics* 6 (2/3): 209-59.

Latin 'nouns of instrument' with the suffix **-ti-*

Teigo ONISHI
Kyoto University

It has been claimed that the Indo-European abstract suffix **-ti-* is well represent in Latin with the semantics of 'instrument'. As stated in Reichler-Béguelin (1986: 65), "Il s'agira plutôt de montrer que, de ce groupe passablement hétérogène, à vocalisme souvent peu orthodoxe si l'on se réfère à la formation en **-ti-* productive au plan indo-européen, se détache un noyau résiduel cohérent et bien représenté de noms d'instrument." However, forms with the suffix**-ti-* in Latin are rather rare since another abstract suffix **-t(y)ōn-* came to be used productively. The comparative evidence of Greek and Sanskrit shows that nouns with the deverbal suffix **-ti-* surfacing with instrumental semantics are not a common type (see Liebert 1949: 142-148, Schwyzer 1953: 504f., Wackernagel-Debrunner 1954: 622 and 635-637, and Irslinger 2002: 184f.). My research question is as follows: Are forms in Latin which have inherited the suffix **-ti-* predominantly instrument nouns in contrast to other Indo-European languages?

In this presentation, I would like to approach this problem by listing all Latin forms I collected from etymological dictionaries. My survey shows that more than twenty forms with the primary suffix **-ti-* are found in Latin. Through the comparative method and internal reconstruction, their prehistory will emerge.

I would like to distinguish here nouns which denote a tool which is used in order to carry out the action which a verbal root denotes from nouns which denote a tool which is created as a result of the action. Since the former belong to a verbal action which has not yet been accomplished while the latter has, I call only the former a 'noun of instrument', while the latter is classified as a result noun. My research reveals that in Latin 'nouns of instrument' are not frequently attested but are a rather rare type whose their origins are sometimes disputed (e.g. Lat. *fūtis* 'a water vessel'< **$\hat{g}^{h}$ew-ti-* 'a tool which is used to pour' and Lat. *vectis* 'a lever, a crowbar' < **we$\hat{g}^{h}$-ti-* 'a tool which is used to lift up', see de Vaan 2008: 249f. and 658).

It turns out that these forms with instrumental semantics did not constitute the main group of forms with the archaic suffix **-ti-* in Latin. Rather what we find in Latin are forms with result, action, agent, and collective semantics. These observations lead us to assume that the archaic suffix **-ti-* functioned as a deverbal suffix and that forms with the suffix **-ti-* were nominalized with various ways in their semantic development in Latin.

References

de Vaan, M. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and Other Italic Languages.* Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Irslinger, B. S. 2002. *Abstrakta mit Dentalsuffixen im Altirischen.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Lievert, G. 1949. *Das Nominalsuffix -ti- im Altindischen.* Lund: Håkan Ohlssons Boktryckeri.

Reichler-Béguelin, M.-J. 1986. *Les noms latins du type* mēns*: Étude morphologique.* Brussels: Latomus.

Schwyzer, E. 1953. *Griechische Grammatik, I: Allgemeine Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion.* Munich: Beck [repr. 1990].

Wackernagel, J. — A. Debrunner 1954. *Altindische Grammatik. Band II, 2 Die Nominalsuffixe.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

A note on the textual distribution of *habeo* + passive perfect participle

Silvia PIERONI
Università per Stranieri di Siena

A great amount of literature has been devoted to the structures *habeo* / *sum* + perfect participle, mainly from the perspective of their development into the Romance verbal periphrastic forms. As concerns *habeo* + passive perfect participle, in particular, there is discussion on the time when the first true examples of the compound verbal periphrasis appear. However, occurrences which hint at this functional development may be certainly found in the history of Latin; for instance, circumstances favouring the reanalysis are the following: 1) the subject of *habeo* and the agent of the passive participle coincide; 2) the semantics of the participle excludes a possessive interpretation of the relationship between *habeo* and its object, as in the case of cognition verbs or similar; 3) the participle cannot be freely omitted (cf., among many others, Pinkster 1987, Jacob 1995, Loporcaro 1995, Squartini - Bertinetto 2000, La Fauci 2005 and Haverling 2010, in particular pp. 370-374).

It is also well known that in the Romance languages the functional distribution of the perfective verbal periphrases with *habeo* and *sum* as compared with the simple past form is dependent on text-types: to borrow Benveniste's words, "la distinction […] entre deux plans d'énonciation (i.e., "historique" and "de discours") traverse la distinction entre temps simples et temps composés" (Benveniste 1959 [1966: 245]). Or, to refer to Weinrich's (1964) formulation, the periphrastic forms are functional to the expression of a a retrospection in the *besprochene Welt*, as opposed to the basic past value of the simple perfect in the *erzählte Welt*. The diachronic development from Latin to Romance may therefore be described as the shift from a system where the *perfectum* covered both the function of narrative past and the function of anteriority with respect to (the temporal coordinates of) the utterance (Mellet 2000) to a system where these two functions split into two different forms.

The main question of this paper is whether Latin texts foreshadow the emergence of this functional distinction, which is in fact a textual distinction: at this initial stage of the research, I will focus on the *habeo* + passive perfect participle structure to verify whether the contexts where it prefigures the Romance periphrasis are characterized by an utterer with a specific status and relevance. I will check my hypothesis on the basis of the scrutiny of the cases which are traditionally quoted as foreshadowing the Romance outputs (among which the cases assembled by Bulhart in the *TLL*, *s.v. habeo*, and by Thielmann 1985) and against a corpus extracted from Cicero's works. The corpus from Cicero will also be used in order to describe the different values carried by the Latin perfect according to the status of the utterer in different text units, i.e. depending on its dialogic or non-dialogic attitude.

References

Benveniste Emile, (1959), *Les relations de temps dans le verbe français*, "Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique" LIV/1; republished in Id. (1966), *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, 1, Paris, Gallimard, 237-250.

Haverling Gerd, (2010), *Actionality, Tense, and Viewpoint*, in Pierluigi Cuzzolin - Philip Baldi (eds), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*, vol. 2: *Constituent Syntax: Adverbial Phrases, Adverbs, Mood, Tense*, Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 277–523.

Jacob Daniel, 1995, *A propos de la périphrase «habeo» + participe parfait passif*, in Louis Callebat (ed.), *Latin vulgaire - latin tardif*, Hildesheim, Olms, 367-381.

La Fauci Nunzio, 2005, *Il fattore HABEO. Prolegomeni a una nuova considerazione delle genesi del perfetto e del futuro romanzi*, in Sándor Kiss - Luca Mondin et Giampaolo Salvi (eds), *Latin et langues romanes. Etudes de linguistique offertes à József Herman à l'occasion de son 80ème anniversaire*, Niemeyer, Tübingen, pp. 441-451.

Loporcaro Michele, 1995, Grammaticalizzazione delle perifrasi perfettive verbali romanze e accordo del participio passato, *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 80, 144-167.

Mellet Sylvie, 2000, Le parfait latin, un "*praeteritum perfectum*", *Cahiers Chronos* 6, 95-106

Pinkster Harm, 1987, *The Strategy and Chronology of the Development of Future and Perfect Tense Auxiliaries in Latin*, in Martin Harris et Paolo Ramat (eds), *Historical Development of Auxiliaries*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, 193-223.

Squartini Mario - Bertinetto Pier Marco, (2000), The Simple and Compound Past in Romance Languages, in Östen Dahl (ed.), *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*, Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 441-478.

Thielmann Philipp, 1885, *Habere* mit dem Partizip Perfekt Passiv, *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik* II, 372-432; 509-549.

Weinrich Harald, 1964, *Tempus. Besprochene und erzählte Welt*, Stuttgart, Kohlhammer.

Construction Grammar and Latin: the case of *habeo*

Anna POMPEI
Roma Tre University

Construction Grammar is a theoretical approach emphasizing the relevance in language of constructions, i.e. form-meaning pairs, in language.

In Latin linguistics the idea that language is constituted by constructions is not original, and some interesting research studies have been made, e.g. the studies on so-called light verbs (Marini 2000, 2007; Baños 2012, 2013, 2014a, 2014b). However, a unified treatment of different constructions might perhaps be improved.

German linguistics, for instance, speaks of *Komplexe Verben* (V+X) for all verbs made by two parts, i.e. the so-called *Vorverb*, which rises to the second position in main clauses, and the *Nachverb*, which stays at the very end of the clause, thus creating a sort of 'parenthesis' (*Klammerung*):

daher/
auf und ab/
/*ich ging nun auf einer Gasse* *ans Werk*/
heim/
spazieren/

◊_________________________◊
Klammerung
Vorverb *Nachverb*

Mutatis mutandis (e.g., there can be univerbation between the two parts, for instance in dependent clauses), this schema clearly shows:

(a) the sharing of predicative meaning between more than one word;
(b) the similarity in the syntactic behavior of the complex verb, independently of its second part category status of (i.e. preposition/adverb, prepositional phrase, noun, verb in infinitive form).

Adopting the notion of complex verb, the aim of this work is to investigate whether a unified treatment of different constructions fits Latin verbs, as well. The case study will be *habeo*, starting from the following constructions:

Constructions (V + X) *Instantiations* (*habeo* + X)
(*verba habeo*, *laetitiam habeo*, *rationem habeo*, etc.)
(*in animo* / *animo habeo*, *in numero* / *numero habeo*, *pro certo habeo*, etc.)
V + Adv (*bene* / *male habeo*, *satis* / *parum habeo*, etc.)

For light verb constructions (V + $NP_{[+acc]}$), a battery of syntactic and semantic tests is usually used to evaluate their different degrees of cohesion, and the degree of referentiality of the $NP_{[+acc]}$:

- Fixed order and adjacency of constituents (in Latin applicable only in frequency terms; cf. e.g. Baños 2012).
- Topicalization and relativization of $NP_{[+acc]}$, its coordination with another NP; passivization.
- Presence of determiners and modifiers of $NP_{[+acc]}$.

The application of these tests to V + X constructions is not always possible: e.g., referentiality is not relevant for V + Adv constructions, and passivization only applies to constructions where NP is [+acc]. However, the frequency of fixed order (specifically X + *habeo*) and adjacency are significant for all constructions (cf. Cic., *Att.* 2.8.1: *bene habemus nos*). Likewise, the application of other tests gives interesting results. For instance, the comparison of the following excerpts shows that coordination is possible when the PP (*in animo*) in a V + PP construction is referential (1), and impossible in the opposite case (2):

(1) Cic. *epist*. 5.16.2: [*consolatio… illa*], *quam semper* in ore atque in animo *habere debemus*
(2) Cic. *S Rosc.* 52: *nam istum exheredare* in animo *habebat*.

Moreover, the treatment of all *habeo* + X constructions as instances of a complex verb is sustained by the equivalence of the specific instantiations with synthetic verbs (e.g. *laetitiam habeo* ~ *laetor*; *in numero* / *numero habeo* ~ *numero* / *adnumero*; *male (se) habeo* ~ *aegroto*).

References

Baños Baños, J. M., 2012, Verbos soporte e incorporación sintáctica en latín: el ejemplo de *ludos facere*, *Revista de Estudios Latinos* 12, 37-57.

–– 2013, Sobre las manera de 'hacer la guerra' en latín (*bellum gero*, *belligero*, *bello*), in J.A. Beltrán Cebollada *et al*. (eds.), *Otium cum dignitate: Estudios en homenaje al profesor José Javier Iso Echegoyen*, Zaragoza, Universidad de Zaragoza, 27-39.

–– in print, Algunas consideraciones sobre los verbos soporte en latín: sintaxis y semántica", *XVII Simposi d'Estudis Clàssics: Omnia mutantur*, Barcelona.

–– in print, *Bellum gerere* y *proelium facere*: sobre las construcciones con verbo soporte en latín y en griego, Sobre las construcciones con verbo soporte en latín (y en griego), *VII Congreso de la Sociedad de Estudios Latinos*, Toledo.

Fillmore C., Kay P. & O'Connor M. C., 1988, Regularity and idiomacity in grammatical constructions: the case of *let alone*, *Language* 64, 501-538.

Gross, G. & Pontonx de, S. (eds.), 2004, *Les verbes supports: nouvel état des lieux*, *Special Issue of Lingvisticae Investigationes* 27, 2.

Goldberg, A., 1995, *Constructions. A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.

Goldberg, A., 2006, *Constructions at Work*, Oxford, OUP.

Marini, E., 2000, Criteri di individuazione di una costruzione a verbo supporto: due esempi latini (*opem ferre* e *morem gerere*)*, Studi e Saggi Linguistici* 38, 365-395.

–– 2007, Deux démarches pour un Lexique-Grammaire des verbes supports latins", *XIV International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*, Erfurt 2007.

Simone, Raffaele 2006, *Constructions: types, niveaux, force pragmatique*, in Prévost, Sophie (ed.), *Mélanges pour Christiane Marchello-Nizia*, Parigi, ENS.

Voghera, M., 1994, Lessemi complessi: percorsi di lessicalizzazione a confronto, *Lingua e Stile*, 29, 2, 185-214.

The Latin *bonus – melior – optimus*

Lucie PULTROVÁ
Charles University, Prague

In most Indo-European languages there exists a group of basic adjectives that have irregular comparatives and superlatives, with the maximum grade of irregularity represented by the so called suppletion. This is probably due to the fact that semantics of these adjectives did not originally permit gradation/comparison, and that the semantic shift (and the newly acquired need to compare) occurred only when the derivation by the inherited comparative and superlative suffixes had no longer been productive; a concurrent condition for the suppletive comparison is that the adjectives in question are extremely frequent ones.

The possibility, or impossibility of comparison depends on whether the adjective is scalar, i.e. an adjective that denotes a quality that can exist on a scale, can vary in grade (e.g. *small*, *broad*, etc. in contrast to non-scalar adjectives, e.g. *red* or *Latin*). The quality of "good" (expressed by the adj. *bonus*) can undoubtedly exist on a scale; nevertheless, in many Indo-European languages the adjectives with the meaning of "good" do not have regular comparatives and superlatives. In addition, there is no uniform Indo-European expression for this quality, which suggests that the adjectives with the given meaning did not stabilize till the post-Indo-European period and developed from other (semantically related) adjectives.

The etymology of the Latin adj. *bonus* is not quite unambiguous, but the current opinion, i.e. that it is an original verbal adjective from the root **dewh*$_2$- with the meaning "to combine" (LIV, p. 123), is in accord with the theoretical hypothesis that it was originally non-gradable. The use of suppletive forms for higher grades is thus in accord with the general pre-conditions for suppletion. What is more difficult to interpret, however, is why suppletion occurs also on the level of comparative (*melior*) vs. superlative (*optimus*) (in contrast to e.g. the English *better – best*, or the Czech *lepší – nejlepší*).

A key theoretical question that must be raised in this context is what type of quality may be expressed as being of higher grade on the scale (comparative), but not of the highest (superlative). Some gradable adjectives express the full grade of a quality already in the positive, e.g. *empty*. To emphasise the maximum grade we can use the expression *completely empty*. The regularly formed superlative *emptiest*, on the other hand, refers not to the reality of the maximum measure of "emptiness", but to the one of the "not completely empty" most closely approaching it. The regularly formed superlative thus has only a limited use. The quality denoted by the root from which the comparative *melior* is derived must have most probably been of this type.

The (arguable) etymology of the adj. *melior* given in etymological dictionaries does not semantically correspond with this hypothesis. Moreover, the equivalents from other Indo-European languages are neither semantically nor formally quite plausible and it also encounters considerable problems from the point of view of the phonological development of Latin. The lecture will therefore attempt to outline other possible etymologies of the adj. *melior*.

Les œuvres rhétoriques en latin au premier siècle av. J.-C. Essai d'analyse lexicale

Amedeo Alessandro RASCHIERI
Università degli Studi in Milano

À propos des traités rhétoriques en latin du premier siècle av. J.-C. nous avons à disposition quelques recherches sur des œuvres particulières ou sur des groupes d'œuvres et quelques analyses sur des sujets spécifiques, mais nous n'avons pas encore une étude approfondie et systématique. L'image la plus répandue est que certains maîtres grecs étaient présents à Rome, qu'il y a eu des tentatives d'enseignement en latin, que la connaissance de la rhétorique était souvent approfondie par les voyages en Grèce, mais que l'apprentissage traditionnel chez les orateurs de renom restait toujours fondamental. En effet, la réalité est plus complexe : les sources témoignent une pluralité de maîtres, nous avons des nouvelles à propos de la présence à Rome de nombreux manuels de rhétorique, l'attention pour la rhétorique n'était pas seulement liée à l'art du discours, mais l'omniprésence de la parole sous forme orale justifiait une réflexion à ce sujet qui impliquait une plus large expérience philosophique et littéraire.

Par rapport à ce contexte et en vue d'une recherche systématique sur ces concepts dans leur évolution linguistique en latin, je souhaite analyser quelques-uns des mots fondamentaux du lexique rhétorique au premier siècle av. J.-C. par une discussion et une mise à jour du *Lexicon Technologiae Latinorum Rhetoricae* de Johann C. Ernesti (1797). Je conçois cette recherche comme une première tentative d'enquête, qui est préliminaire à la rédaction d'un outil lexicographique complet, spécialisé sur les termes rhétoriques du latin et complémentaire aux travaux systématiques, comme le *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* de Heinrich Lausberg (1960), ou encyclopédiques, comme le *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* et l'*Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik* édité par Gert Ueding (1992-2012).

L'époque (le premier siècle av. J-C.) et les œuvres étudiées (les travaux rhétoriques de Cicéron, la *Rhétorique à Herennius*, les fragments d'autres œuvres rhétoriques) constituent un laboratoire fondamental pour la création, l'évolution et la fixation du vocabulaire rhétorique en latin. Il est donc nécessaire dérouler une enquête approfondie sur les termes rhétoriques utilisés en cette période afin de comprendre leur spécialisation rhétorique en relation avec leur emploie général et avec les éléments de la variabilité sémantique par rapport aux termes grecs correspondants et à leur utilisation dans les époques suivantes, lorsque le système d'enseignement rhétorique était marqué par une plus grande stabilité et une plus forte normativité. En particulier, je voudrais concentrer mon attention sur les mots liés aux parties du discours selon le schéma proposé par Cicéron dans le *De inuentione* : *exordium*, *narratio*, *partitio*, *confirmatio*, *reprehensio*, *digressio*, *conclusio*.

Références

Ludwig, W. (ed.), 1982, *Éloquence et rhétorique chez Cicéron*, Genève.
Dominik, W. J., Hall, J. (eds.), 2007, *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric*, Oxford.
Ernesti, J. C. G., 1797, *Lexicon Technologiae Latinorum Rhetoricae*, Lipsiae.
Fuhrmann, M., l960, *Das systematische Lehrbuch. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in der Antike*, Göttingen.
May, J. M. (ed.), 2002, *Brill's Companion to Cicero. Oratory and Rhetoric*, Leiden, 445-480.
Gunderson, E. (ed.), 2009, *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rhetoric*, Cambridge.
Lausberg, H., 1960, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, München.
Lévy, C., 2010, *Rhétorique et philosophie dans les Partitiones oratoriae*, in M. Baratin *et alii* (eds.), *Stylus: la parole dans ses formes. Mélanges en l'honneur du professeur Jacqueline Dangel*, Paris, 247-262.
Narducci, E., 2009, *Cicerone. La parola e la politica*, Roma-Bari.
Ueding, G. (ed.), 1992-2012, *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, 10 vol., Darmstadt.

Markers of reciprocity/symmetry in Latin

Antonio R. REVUELTA PUIGDOLLERS
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

Recent research into the notion of reciprocity has broadened our knowledge of this phenomenon both from a typological (König & Gast 2008) and a language-specific perspective (see for Latin Bertocchi 1994, Bortolussi 2010, Cuzzolin forthcoming). The purpose of this paper is to give a general account of this phenomenon in Latin and to explain the differences and similarities between the numerous markers (contextual distribution). The paper will address some of the following issues:

(i) The differences between intrinsic (symmetric predicates) and syntactic reciprocals. The label reciprocity includes many different phenomena. Reciprocity can be an intrinsic property of predicates (verbs, nouns, adverbs and prepositions) and in this case the label used should be rather 'symmetry' or 'intrinsic reciprocity'. These predicates present some features as for example alternative predicate frames ('A pugna cum B' / 'A et B pugnant'). These intrinsic reciprocal predicates can be simple lexemes like *luctor* or *pugno*, or they can be derived compounds of the preverbs *com-* (Revuelta forthcoming) and *dis-*. In contrast reciprocals in the narrow sense or 'syntactic reciprocals' are States of Affairs which are the result of the combination of verbs ('A amat B') and some reciprocal markers ('A et B amant inter se' = 'A et B amant alter alterum' ('A and B love each other') ≠ 'A et B amant' ('A and B love (somebody else)')).

(ii) Multiple and simple-clause reciprocals. Reciprocity can be expressed through one ('A et B amant inter se') or more clauses ('[A amat B] et [B amat A]').

(iii) Reciprocity can be established between two ('A et B amant inter se') or more entities ('A et B et C amant inter se') and among different sets in the second case. The expression 'A et B et C amant inter se' can refer to different situations like the following: a) '[A amat B et C] & [B amat A et C] & [C amat A et B]'; b) '[A amat B] & [B amat C]' & [C amat A], and so on.

(iv) The list of reciprocal markers usually mentioned (Cuzzolin forthcoming) is very large and includes different word and constituent classes: a) adverbials (*contra*, *rursum*, *inter nos/vos/se*, *invicem*); b) pronouns (*alter alterum*, *alius alium*, *uterque utrumque*); c) preverbs (*re(d)-*, *com-*, *dis-*); d) light verbs (*reddo,* e.g. *reddo salutem* 'to gret back'). The paper will discuss whether all these markers can be used in the same cases of reciprocity previously mentioned or whether there are distributional differences. Distributional differences would support the semantic distinctions previously established.

(iv) Reciprocity is a notion connected to other phenomena. Some of the reciprocity markers are used in Latin and other languages for conveying other concepts like distribution, contrast/adversativity, or restitution (Cruse 1997, Cuzzolin forthcoming).

The following table gives a preliminary idea of the issues and the combinatorial possibilities that will be discussed in the paper:

Markers		**'Reciprocity'**			**Other**
		Multiple clause	Simple clause	Symmetric predicates	
Pronouns	alter alterum	?	+	?	Distribution
	alius alium	?	+	?	
	uterque utrumque	?	+	?	
Adverbiales	inter nos/vos/se	?	+	+	
	contra	+	?	?	Contrast/ Adversativity
	rursum	+	?	?	
	invicem	?	?	?	
Preverbs	re(d)-	+	?	?	Restitution
	com-	?	?	+	
	dis-	?	?	+	
Light verbs	red-do	+	?	?	Restitution
		?	?	?	

Although the paper will mainly discuss the Latin facts, parallels in other languages (Ancient/Modern Greek, Spanish, German and English) will be provided in order to situate the Latin data into a typological/comparative perspective.

References (for further references see Cuzzolin and Revuelta)

Bertocchi, A. & A. Orlandini 1994, L'emploi distributif des indéfinis latins alius et singuli, *Faites de langue* 4, 41–48.
Bortolussi, B. 2010, Alius: réciprocité et distributivité, in Fruyt, M., & O. Spevak (eds.), *La quantification en latin*, Paris, 75–91.
Cruse, David A. 1997. *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: CUP.
Cuzzolin, Pierluigi (forthcoming) Reciprocals in Latin. A reappraisal. *Proceedings of the 16th Conference on Latin Linguistics Uppsala*.
Evans, Nick 2008. Reciprocal constructions: Towards a structural typology. In König & Gast (eds.), 33-104.
König, Ekkehard & Gast, Volker (eds.). 2008. Reciprocals and Reflexives. Theoretical and Typological Explorations. Berlin: de Gruyter.
Revuelta Puigdollers, Antonio R. 2012. Non-prototypical reciprocals in Greek, Spanish and other languages. In *Studies in Greek Linguistics 32* (forthcoming). Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
–– (forthcoming): The verbal compounds of com- in Latin and the morphology-syntax interface. *Proceedings of the 16th Conference on Latin Linguistics, Uppsala.*

-ī e -osio di 'genitivo' alla luce di una iscrizione falisca arcaica di recente pubblicazione

Luca RIGOBIANCO
Università Ca'Foscari, Venezia

La recente pubblicazione di un'iscrizione falisca di VII secolo a.C. (Biella 2009) che riporta la forma *titi*, evidentemente 'genitivo' in *-i* [ī] di un tema in *-o- tit-o-* 'di Tito', è stata lo spunto per un ritorno alla *vexata quaestio* del 'genitivo' in *-ī* e in *-osio*. Si tratta di una questione ampia e complessa, entro cui rientrano temi capitali quali la genesi di *-ī* e di *-osio*, la relazione tra essi e con altri morfemi di 'genitivo' – entro le singole varietà e in un quadro comparativo –, e, a monte, la definizione stessa di 'genitivo'.

-ī di 'genitivo' di un tema in *-o-* in una iscrizione falisca di VII secolo a.C. è di importanza fondamentale, in quanto da una parte costituisce la prova documentale dell'insussistenza delle ipotesi di una origine di *-ī* da *-osio* oppure da *-ei* di locativo – ipotesi escludibili ed escluse già su altre basi, nonostante qualche resistenza – nonché di *-ī* quale morfema indotto in falisco dal romano, dall'altra rende verisimile l'ipotesi di una coesistenza entro la stessa varietà (il falisco arcaico) di *-ī* e *-osio*. Nonostante l'importanza di tale iscrizione, essa è stata ripresa esclusivamente da Poccetti, in due lavori con Napolitano (2011→2013) e la Orlandini (2013), rivolti alla individuazione delle ragioni che regolerebbero la selezione di *-i* e di *-osio* nelle iscrizioni falische arcaiche.

Nella mia comunicazione riprenderò la questione alla luce della nuova iscrizione falisca, privilegiando programmaticamente l'aspetto formale-semico su quello semantico-funzionale. Data la vastità del tema, angolerò la questione dalle varietà latine e falisca, pur entro un quadro che tenga conto dei dati della comparazione con altre varietà indoeuropee e di riflessioni di ordine generale sul 'genitivo' quale funzione morfo-sintattica/-semantica (genitivo adnominale (di 'relazione' ~ argomentale) ~ genitivo predicativo ~ genitivo adverbale; genitivo e aggettivo; etc.). Nello specifico dapprima presenterò la fenomenologia relativa al genitivo dei temi in *-o-* nelle varietà latine (romano *-ī*, *-oeo* (grecismo?); prenestino *-ī*, *-io*; satricano (?) *-osio*) e falisca (*-ī*, *-osio*, *-oio* (?), *-oi* (?)). Di qui passerò a considerazioni generali di natura ricostruttiva: nella fattispecie intendo dimostrare che, contrariamente a una vulgata, *-ī* in latino e falisco sarebbe una formazione derivata *recta via* dall'indoeuropeo (<*$-j(e/o)H_2(-)$, da cui anche *-ī* di 'genitivo' in celtico e, stando a ipotesi da verificare, in venetico e in messapico); di contro *-osio*, *-oio*, etc. sarebbero formazioni seriori sorte a partire dalla base tematica (*-e/o(-)*) mediante la conglutinazione di morfemi (**-i-*, **-s(o-)*, **-jo*) secondo (ri)strutturazioni proprie delle diverse varietà indoeuropee (es. celtiberico *-o* < **-o*, ittito *-as* < **-o-s*, sanscrito *-asya* < **-os-jo* (lex Brugmann), leponzio *-oiso* < **-o-i-so*) riconducibili ad una matrice astratta **-e/o(-)* ± *-i-* ± *-s(o-)* ± *-jo*. Susseguentemente avanzerò qualche ipotesi sulla distinzione funzionale (semantica e/o sintattica) originaria tra *-ī* e *-osio, -oio*, etc., implicata dalla compresenza delle due forme in varietà quali il falisco arcaico: al proposito è ipotizzabile che le due forme avessero funzioni semantiche ('inerenza' *versus* 'appartenenza'?) e/o sintattiche (genitivo 'di relazione' *versus* genitivo 'argomentale'?) distinte ma potenzialmente interferenti, da cui la possibile estensione dell'una a scapito dell'altra.

Riferimenti

Bader, F., 1991, Problématique du génitif thématique sigmatique. I. Substituts sigmatiques, *BSL* 86, 89-157.

–– 1992, Problématique du génitif thématique sigmatique. II. Substituts non sigmatiques, *BSL* 87, 71-119.

Biella, M. C., 2009, Una nuova iscrizione falisca di VII sec. a.C., *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 168, 273-277.

Devine, A. M., 1970, *The Latin Thematic Genitive Singular*, Oxford.

Eska, J. F. - Wallace, R., 2001, Remarks on the thematic genitive singular in ancient Italy and related matters, *Incontri Linguistici* 24, 77-97.

Lejeune, M., 1990, Notes de linguistique italique. XXXIX. Génitifs en *-osio* et génitifs en *-ī*, *REL* 67, 63-77.

Napolitano, F. - Poccetti, P., 2013, La *thafna* di *titos:* alcune notazioni a margine, in G. Cifani (ed.), *Tra Roma e l'Etruria. Cultura, identità e territorio dei Falisci*, Roma, 287-312.

Orlandini, A. - Poccetti, P., 2012, *-i* and *-osio* genitives in archaich Latin: different markers for different possession types?, *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 12, 101-121.

Prosdocimi, A. L., 2012, Genitivo in -io a Preneste?, in G. Borghello, V. Orioles (eds), *Per Roberto Gusmani. Linguistica storica e teorica. Studi in ricordo*, Udine, 335-354.

Schlerath, B., 1994, Hatte das Indogermanische einen Genitiv?, in G. E. Dunkel, G. Meyer, S. Scarlata, C. Seidl (eds), *Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch.* Akten der IX. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft (vom 5. bis 9. Oktober 1992 in Zürich), Wiesbaden, 337-348.

The pragmatics of 'at least': *saltem, utique, dumtaxat, certe*

Rodie RISSELADA
University of Amsterdam

In Latin we find a number of particles that may indicate, as their basic meaning or as a side effect in some of their uses, a 'lower boundary' on a relevant scale of expectation, and can be translated as 'at least': *saltem, utique, dumtaxat, certe*. These particles differ, however, in their orientation and scalar implications (cf. Bertocchi 1998) and, as a consequence, also in the ways in which their scalar meaning functions in wider contexts.

Thus, as is convincingly shown by Bortolussi & Sznajder (2001), *saltem* is used to focalize an item whose referent is less preferable, but more feasible than an alternative P', to which it is implicitly or explicitly compared (cf. 1); they claim that *saltem* is always used for argumentative purposes. A similar argumentative and focalizing value seems to be involved in the case of *utique*, which in some of its uses is assumed to convey 'at least' (cf. the *Oxford Latin Dictionary, s.v.* 4, where ex. (2) is quoted; cf. also Pfrenzinger 1919). *Dumtaxat,* on the other hand, seems to mark a 'lower boundary' (cf. ex. 3) in a much more factual and less argumentative way, without expressing an evaluation of the feasibility or desirability of the item it focalizes (cf. 4). Finally, in the cases of scalar use of *certe* (cf. ex. 5, taken from Schrickx, 2011 : 17), it is not preference or feasibility that is primarily involved, but truth commitment.

(1) eripe mihi dolorem aut minue *saltem* (Cic. *Att.* 9.6.5)
(2) velim ante possis; si minus, *utique* simul simus cum Brutus veniet in Tusculanum. (Cic. *Att*. 13.4.2)
(3) Temptavi enim imitari Demosthenen semper tuum, Calvum nuper meum, *dumtaxat* figuris orationis (Plin. *Ep.* 1.2)
(4) 'quattuor milia' inquit, 'peditum et sescentos equites *dumtaxat* scribere in animo est (Liv. 10.25)
(5) Varus imperium se habere dicebat; fascis *certe* habebat (Cic. *Lig.* 22)

In my paper, I will compare the uses of these scalar particles in Classic Latin prose. Relevant parameters are, first, sentence type and illocution, the nature of the scales invoked, scope of the particles, focality and expectations. Furthermore, the pragmatics and the argumentative value of these particles will be investigated on the basis of their distribution over different genres and discourse types, and the discourse constellations in which they are predominantly found. A comparison along these lines not only reveals the differences among these scalar particles as a group, but also sheds more light on the basis functions of each individual particle.

References

Bertocchi, A. 1998, Scalar predicates and adversative correlatives. In B. García-Hernández (ed.) *Estudios de lingüística latina*. Madrid: Ediciones clásicas, I, 155-168.
Bortolussi, B. & Sznajder L. 2001, Syntaxe et interprétation de *saltem*. In A. Bertocchi *et al.* (eds) *Papers on Grammar* 7, 35-59.
Pfrenzinger, A. 1919. *Die partikel utique.* Diss. Universität Würzburg.
Rosén, H. 1989. Coherence, sentence modification, and sentence-part modification – the contribution of particles. In P. Baldi & P. Cuzzolin (eds.) *New perspectives on historical Latin syntax*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 317-442.
Schrickx, J. 2011. Lateinische Modalpartikeln. *Nempe, quippe, scilicet, videlicet* und *nimirum*. Leiden: Brill.

ILA – Iscrizioni Latine Arcaiche

Giovanna ROCCA, Manuela ANELLI, Marta MUSCARIELLO & Giulia SARULLO
Università IULM Milano & Università Kore

In occasione del XVIII Colloquio Internazionale di Linguistica Latina vorremmo presentare il sito del progetto *Iscrizioni Latine Arcaiche* (ILA), realizzato all'Università IULM di Milano dal gruppo di lavoro coordinato da Giovanna Rocca. Il progetto è parte di *EAGLE - Europeana network of Ancient Greek and Latin Epigraphy* e si inserisce nel network *Europeana* che raccoglie su una piattaforma digitale tutto il patrimonio artistico europeo.

Il nostro progetto consiste in un'edizione digitale disponibile on-line, ad accesso libero, delle iscrizioni latine *antiquissimae* (VII-V secolo a.C.). Il *corpus* in questione comprende quasi un centinaio di testi, fra i quali figurano, in gran parte, frammenti di iscrizione su *instrumentum domesticum* e un certo numero di iscrizioni più complesse che ci restituiscono una fase linguistica assai distante dal latino 'classico' e testimoniano il momento iniziale della *literacy* latina.

Ogni iscrizione è illustrata da una scheda epigrafica che fornisce una serie di informazioni: i dati archeologici del supporto e del contesto di ritrovamento, le fotografie e, in qualche caso, l'apografo, un'accurata analisi epigrafica (*ductus*, alfabeto, segni divisori, caratteristiche peculiari delle singole lettere), la tipologia testuale, le trascrizioni diplomatica e interpretativa e la bibliografia completa.

Per le trascrizioni ci troviamo di fronte a problematiche particolarmente spinose a causa della complessità di alcuni testi (le iscrizioni sul cippo del Foro, sul vaso di *Duenos*, sulla base di Tivoli e sull'altare di Corcolle, per citare solo alcuni esempi): per le iscrizioni maggiori, le numerose letture proposte negli anni dagli studiosi sono state messe a confronto e verificate alla luce di criteri linguistici per approdare a un'edizione del testo che, se anche non può giungere a un'interpretazione definitiva e non risolve tutte le questioni in sospeso, si pone come nuovo punto di partenza per future ricerche.

L'intero progetto è stato codificato seguendo le specifiche di *EpiDoc* che ormai si è imposto come standard nelle pubblicazioni epigrafiche digitali per i vantaggi offerti dall'uso di un linguaggio XML.

***Incendere*, *accendere* et *succendere* : 'incendier' ou 'augmenter' ? Étude sémantique**

Sophie ROESCH
Université François Rabelais, Tours

Les verbes *incendere*, *accendere* et *succendere* sont tous trois formés sur le simple *-*cando*, non attesté en latin, au sens de « faire brûler, mettre le feu » (cf. le *DELL* s.*u.* -*cando*, p. 92) qui, initialement, évoque le feu et la chaleur. Dans une bonne partie de leurs emplois, ils sont associés à un feu bien réel et signifient « incendier, mettre le feu à » (*cf.* Cicéron, *Pro Milone*, 73 : *eum qui aedem Nympharum incendit*).

Le fait que les substantifs désignant le feu ou la chaleur soient susceptibles d'un emploi métaphorique pour désigner la colère ou la passion amoureuse (*cf*. Kövecses 2000) suscite pour ces verbes, dès leurs occurrences les plus anciennes (Plaute), des emplois parallèles pour indiquer l'embrasement de quelqu'un par ces sentiments, assimilés à un feu (voir Roesch, à paraître).

Mais la situation est complexe dans la mesure où, suivant la nature des actants du verbe (humain, concret, abstrait) et leur fonction par rapport à lui, le sens de ces préverbés de *-*cando* est susceptible de changer (cf. par exemple pour ce type de question les travaux de Moussy 1994 sur la polysémie de *mactare*). Nous nous attacherons donc tout d'abord à décrire le plus finement possible la polysémie de ces verbes suivant leur construction, en nous appuyant sur les œuvres de Plaute, Cicéron et Virgile où ils sont bien représentés.

Nous nous efforcerons ensuite de comprendre comment ces verbes ont pu passer de ces emplois métaphoriques où la notion de chaleur est sous-jacente (avec, en général, le sens d'« embraser »), à ceux où ils prennent une valeur intensive (« augmenter ») : *cf.* Virgile*, Aen*. 5, 455 : *pudor incendit uires*. Pour ce faire, nous nous appuierons notamment sur les travaux de Lakoff et Johnson sur les métaphores (en particulier sur les métaphores spatiales du type « more is up » ; 1980 : 15), ou ceux de Lakoff et Kövecses sur l'expression de la colère en anglais américain (1983 : 6-7 : « anger is the heat of a fluid in a container » ; « when the intensity of anger increases, the fluid rises »). Les résultats de leurs analyses trouvent en effet de nombreuses similitudes dans les emplois de la langue latine (cf. Roesch à paraître).

Dans cette entreprise, nous ne pourrons pas éluder la question de savoir si le sens du préverbe a pu jouer un rôle dans l'évolution des verbes vers cette valeur d'intensification (voir par exemple, sur le rôle du préverbe, l'étude de Moussy 2007 sur *procurare*).

Références

Augustyn, M., et Grossmann, F., 2009, Je nage dans la joie, la colère me submerge... Etude de quelques métaphores spatiales dans le champ des affects, in Berchoud, M.J. (ed.), *Les mots de l'espace : entre expression et appropriation*, L'Harmattan, Paris, 57–76.

García Hernández, B., 1995, Polysémie et signifié fondamental du préverbe '*sub-*', *BSL* 90/1, 301-312.

Kövecses, Z., 2000, *Metaphor and emotion ; language, culture and body in human feelings*, Cambridge, CUP.

Lakoff, G., and Johnson, M. 1980, *Metaphors we live by*, Chicago, The Univ. of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G., and Kövecses, Z., 1983, *The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English*, Univ. of Berkeley, consultable en ligne : https://georgelakoff.files.wordpress.com/2011/04/the-cognitive-model-of-anger-inherent-in-american-english-lakoff-and-kovecses-1983.pdf

Moussy C., 1994, La polysémie du verbe *mactare*, in *Nomina rerum. Hommages à J. Manessy-Guitton*, LAMA 13, Nice, 323-336.

–– 2007, Esquisse de l'histoire du verbe *procuro*, *REL*, 85, p.236-255.

Van Laer, S., 2010, *La préverbation en latin : étude des préverbes « ad- », « in- », « ob- » et « per-» dans la poésie républicaine et augustéenne*, Bruxelles, Latomus.

Roesch, S., à paraître, Le feu de la colère en latin : une métaphore basée sur la température, à paraître en 2015 dans les *Actes du 17ème colloque international de linguistique latine (Rome, 20-25 mai 2013).*

Wierzbicka, A., 1988, L'amour, la colère, la joie, l'ennui : la sémantique des émotions dans une perspective transculturelle, *Langages*, 89, 97-107.

***Quasi*: Its Grecizing [?] syntactic patterns**

Hannah Rosén and Donna Shalev
Hebrew University, Jerusalem

Latin *quasi*, contrary to its (internal) etymology and against the grain of a line of adverbs which serve as conjunctions in later Latin, is most commonly used as a modifier. Along the spectrum of syntactic uses of *quasi*, whether conjunctional or modifying, some have been dubbed Grecisms. In this talk, we add to the accepted taxonomies of Grecism (partial vs. whole, secondary vs. primary, …), and we examine two syntactic patterns involving *quasi*, vis-à-vis germanely constructed patterns in Greek: *quasi* introducing substantival actantial clauses; and *quasi* + future participles. This examination must be done in two tracks: (a) tracing the prevalence of the patterns, a trajectory of their evolution over time, and syntactic constraints of the constructions in Greek, and in Latin, independently; and (b) analysis of Latin translations of extant Greek originals, with careful attention to syntactic constraints in the source and target languages. Here the scrutiny of detail in the constraints and conditions anchored in each language is crucial.

The jurist Gaius (2nd c.) was chosen as a good starting point for our examination for a number of reasons: among them, the significant role of pinpointing Grecisms when assessing Gaius' Greek identity, still under debate; and the expectation of accountability evoked by writings of a juristic nature. From this point of departure, we look forwards and backwards in time in tracing the syntactic properties at issue. For translated texts, we give an account of findings of these two constructions, attested in Latin sources over a range of periods, including medieval and humanist translations (from Chrysoloras to Bruni to Ficino) of select dialogues of Plato from Greek into Latin.

References

Bennett, Charles E. 1900. Die mit *tamquam* und *quasi* eingeleiteten Substantivsätze. *ALL* 11: 405-417.

Bertocchi, Sandra and Anna Orlandini. 1988. *Quasi*: une analyse pragmatique des propositions comparatives conditionnelles en latin. In B. Caron (ed.), *Actes du XVIe Congrès International des Linguistes (Paris, 20-25 juillet 1997)*, Oxford: Elsevier, CD Rom.

Bodelot, Colette. 2000. *Espaces fonctionnels de la subordination complétive en latin*. Louvain – Paris: Peeters.

–– 2011. La grammaticalisation de latin *tanquam* (*si*) + verbe fini: de l'origine corrélative comparative à l'emploi complétif. *BSL* 106/1: 263-291.

Botley, Paul. 2004. *Latin Translation in the Renaissance. The Theory and Practice of Leonardo Bruni, Giannozzo Manetti and Desiderius Erasmus*. Cambridge: CUP, 5-62.

Calboli, Gualtiero. 2009. Latin syntax and Greek. In Ph. Baldi and P. Cuzzolin (eds), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*, vol. I, Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 65-193.

Hankins, James. 1990. *Plato in the Italian Renaissance*. I-II. Leiden: Brill.

Kalb, Wilhelm. 1884. Über die Latinität des Juristen Gaius. *ALL* 1: 82-92.

Orlandini, Anna. 2004. Comparatives et comparatives conditionnelles dans des structures corrélatives. In C. Bodelot (ed.), *Anaphore, cataphore et corrélation en latin*. Clermont-Ferrand: Blaise Pascal, 95-111.

Rosén, Hannah. Greek in Latin, Greek into Latin – reflections on the passage of patterns. In: J. Glucker and Ch. Burnett (eds), *Greek into Latin from Antiquity until the Nineteenth Century*. London/Turin: Nino Aragno, 1-18.

Latin *sermo*, its pragmatic and sociolinguistic connotations

Ivan Salgado
Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico

It is very well known that ancient grammarians developed certain ideas still under discussion and analysis among modern linguists, one of those is the notion of *sermo* and its implications for pragmatics and sociolinguistics. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Cicero's *Orator, Brutus,* Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* and Varro's *De lingua Latina*, among many other works and authors provide very valuable information regarding sociolinguistic dynamics in the ancient Latin speaking world, these authors and the information that comes from inscriptions and poets can improve our understanding of the Latin language. I will show the different characterizations of the *sermo* (*humilis*, *elegans, facetus, rudis, tenuis*, etc.), their definitions and descriptions, the context of their uses and their possible implications for sociolinguistics. The list of passages has been extracted from the PHI-5 Latin corpus using Diogenes, many information has been gathered from ancient inscriptions and other latin authors, special attention has been put on those who did not write prescriptive or *linguistic* texts. However, since the number of occurences of this word in the PHI-5 is excessive for a short presentation, I will focus on the passages from Cicero (about 500), and show examples from other authors only for illustrative and contrastive purposes. The final aim of this talk is to revisit and try to propose parameters for the study of Latin from modern views, particulary sociolinguistics and ideologies of language.

Bibliographical references for this work are those regarding the study of *sermo cotidianus*, Latin dialects and geographic variation, bilingualism and, in minor scale, Roman social stratification and processes. An exhaustive list of references and a bibliographical orientation can be provided at the conference in a handout.

This work is part of a major project regarding Latin Phraseology and Renaissance Latin Lexicology held at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Lexicon and style in the works attributed to Firmicus Maternus

María Asunción SÁNCHEZ MANZANO
University of León

Firmicus Maternus' *De errore profanarum religionum* is transmitted through a single manuscript. Mathias Vladich found it at Minden in 1559, but it was lost for more than a century and then *recognitus* by Scaliger; C. Bursian made a new edition in 1856. Robert Turcan gave an up to date commented edition (specially on *realia,* 1982; 2002) taking into account A. Pastorino's commentary on *Matheseos'* language and style. The conclusion after so detailed studies is the common attribution of both works to the same author.

On the grounds of this attribution, we assumed that Firmicus wrote *De errore* around 346-347. But it is worth considering the rhetoric structure, which determines the selection and the use of vocabulary. Focusing the proper context of each word, there can be found new aspects of the works, and a different view on their style. The commentary deals with some features:

a) Rate and quality of passive and deponent forms: Which were ground classic vocabulary? Which words of Firmician corpus were not in use before 4th Century?
b) Selection of adjectives: morphology and derivative patterns.
c) Suffix in nouns: which one is 4th Century?
d) Selection of adverbs.
e) The lexicon in the so called "Firmician tags" inside the syntactic and rhetoric structure of periods.
f) The connecting tools of speech: lexical resources.

The results of this research will be compared to other 4th Century texts, selecting the comparison that fits, and trying to obtain a new perspective on Firmician corpus.

Most studies on Firmician works were suggested for their attractive (bizarre) topics; never mind the exotic Eastern Mediterranean cults, and Astrology inside their pages! But there are less bibliographic references dealing with style.

The different hands in the correction of the manuscript, and the accurate editions give us the chance of reading the works. Is it a kind of rhetoric diatribe? Are the sources of each topic a straight line to find the ordinary expressions?

On the other hand, the proposed study on lexicon will provide some results on the better method to reveal the supposed "polemic" Christian style. Is the imitation of Arnobian's the pattern? Or there were the ordinary citizen's speech, or any wise form of thinking, which the Christian polemist learnt? The frequency of some clauses is a ground to make a little clearer position on this point.

The choice of very common words allows the suspicion of a regular speech, to which audience was written? R. Turcan talked about very doubtful explanations about the circumstances and context. But it is also doubtful the true veiled message the text was transmitting, either the nonsense of these religious rites, or the followers' reversed ironic blame against its prosecutors.

This debate raises the question of the lack of a specific Christian speech. On one hand, the grounds of most arguments are pointed out in recent studies on Late Latin. On the other, we can explain this lack because there was no Christian school, which could develop a well-defined learned tradition.

'Let alone' in Latin: *nedum* and alternatives

Josine SCHRICKX
Thesaurus linguae Latinae, Munich

Nedum typically follows a negative sentence or phrase, in the form *non* p, *nedum* q, with *nedum* in the meaning 'let alone', or 'much less' (cf. TLL s.v. *nedum*, to appear; Goldstein, 2013). The content of the first expression entails that of the second one.

1. TER. Haut. 454 satrapes si siet amator, numquam suffere eius feminae sumptus queat, <u>nedum</u> tu possis.
   If she had a satrap for a lover, he'd never be able to sustain her extravagance, <u>let alone</u> you.

Sometimes however an affirmative sentence or phrase precedes: p, *nedum* q. We can paraphrase *nedum* here with 'much less':

2. HOR. ars 69 mortalia facta peribunt, <u>nedum</u> sermonum stet honos et gratia vivax.
   all mortal things shall perish, <u>much less</u> shall the glory and glamour of speech endure and live.

or with 'much more':

3. SEN. suas. 6, 8 posuit turpe esse cuilibet Romano, <u>nedum</u> Ciceroni, vitam rogare.
   he placed the argument that it is shameful for any Roman, <u>let alone</u> (<u>much more</u> for) Cicero, to beg for his life.

The question I will discuss is what decides whether we find 'much less', or 'much more' and how these opposite uses of *nedum* can be explained. Here it is important to take a look at the etymology of *nedum*. It is composed of *ne* and *dum*, but what kind of *ne* do we find here?

Another possible paraphrase of *nedum* is 'not to mention'. But why should a speaker say something which he doesn't need to say? This is the second item I will talk about: the pragmatic reasons for using *nedum*. Here it can be helpful to compare with equivalents form modern languages ('let alone' in English, 'geschweige denn' in German, 'laat staan' in Dutch).

Besides *nedum* there are other possibilities in Latin to express 'let alone' or 'much less': the scalar adverbs *adeo* and *modo* (Bertocchi, 2001), the negation *ne … quidem* (TLL vol. IX 1 p. 320, 71 ff.; Bertocchi & Maraldi, 2012, p. 17 ff.; Orlandini, 2001, p. 214 ff.) and the phrase *ne dicam* (Fedriani & Molinelli, 2013). What are the differences and similarities between these alternatives?

Translations are taken form the Loeb Classical Library.
TLL: *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. 1901 ff. Leipzig, München.

References

Bertocchi, A. 2001. The scalar interpretation of the restrictive adverb « modo ». In A. Bertocchi, M. Maraldi & A. Orlandini (eds.), *Papers on grammar 7. Argumentation and latin = Journal of Latin Linguistics 7*. Bologna: CLUEB, 87-111.
Bertocchi, A., & Maraldi, M. 2012. La scalarité: application à certains phénomènes de la langue latine. *Revue de Linguistique Latine du Centre Alfred Ernout De lingua Latina, 8*.
Fedriani, C., & Molinelli, P. 2013. *Ut ita dicam* and cognates: forms and functions in (con)texts. *Journal of Latin Linguistics 12*(1), 71-99.
Goldstein, D. 2013. The Synchrony and Diachrony of a Scalar Coordinator: Latin 'Let Alone'. *Indo-European Linguistics 1*(1), 68-106.
Orlandini, A. 2001. *Grammaire fondamentale du latin 8. Négation et argumentation en latin*. Louvain, Paris: Peeters.

De Plaute à Térence

Gérard SMITH

Seventy years intervene between Plautus and Terence. As regards to social environment widly remote are the situations of these authors. Therefore one could expect a pretty variance between their languages. Nothing of the kind. Parsing their main clauses expressing command, wish, fear, protest, deliberative question discloses hardly noticeable differences. It's the same with their dependant clauses conveying cause, condition, concession and so on. That's what I shall try to demonstrate.

Traduzioni letterali dal greco in latino negli *Atticismi* di Prisciano: la sintassi del participio

Elena SPANGENBERG YANES
Sapienza Università di Roma

L'*Ars grammatica* di Prisciano è conclusa da un lessico sintattico greco-latino (*GL* III 278-377), che il grammatico realizzò – secondo gli studi più recenti (Rosellini 2010; 2012; Ferri 2014; Sonnino 2014; Ucciardello 2014; Valente 2014) – integrando una fonte lessicografica atticista con i lemmi latini corrispondenti e la relativa esemplificazione tratta da autori latini. Questo lessico contiene un numero cospicuo di traduzioni letterali in latino dei lemmi o delle citazioni greche, introdotte con le espressioni *et/ similiter nos/ nostri/ Romani/ Latini.* Spesso queste rese *ad verbum* dal greco violano la proprietà linguistica del latino da un punto di vista sintattico (ad es. *GL* III 310, 9-12 *Cratinus in poetina:* 'ἀτὰρ ἐννοῦμαι δῆτα τὰς μοχθηρίας/ τῆς ἠλιθιότητος τῆς ἐμῆς'. *Similiter nos 'cogito quae sunt difficultates stoliditatis meae'*; 375, 11 *Attici* 'φθόνον μοι συνάγει'. *Et nos 'invidiam mihi colligit'*). L'esame sistematico di tutte le traduzioni letterali dei lemmi greci consente di individuare alcuni aspetti ricorrenti nel confronto tra le due lingue, che causavano difficoltà al grammatico.

Il caso particolare al quale vorrei dedicare la mia attenzione è quello del participio congiunto e predicativo: strutture sintattiche che includono il participio sono oggetto, infatti, di una dozzina di voci del lessico (*GL* III 284, 17; 288, 13; 293, 23; 314, 11; 323, 15; 324, 13; 329, 6; 343, 8; 358, 18; 360, 9; 360, 15; 373, 4; 374, 11). Poiché la lingua greca possiede anche dei participi di tempi storici con diatesi attiva, assenti in latino, e prevede un uso più esteso di costrutti participiali, Prisciano è costretto ad una serie di soluzioni traduttorie 'bizzarre' (ad es. *GL* III 288, 13-14 *Illi* 'ἐξαρκεῖ αὐτοῖς τόδε πεποιηκόσιν' καὶ 'πεποιηκέναι'*; nos 'sufficit illis pransis esse' et 'prandisse'*; 343, 8-9 *Illi* 'παύω τόνδε λυπούμενον' καὶ 'λυπεῖσθαι' καὶ 'μὴ ποιεῖν τόδε'*, et nostri 'compesco illum insanientem' et 'insanire' et 'ne insaniat'*).

Le traduzioni improprie di costruzioni greche con il participio verranno in primo luogo esaminate dal punto di vista della riflessione linguistica moderna e confrontate con l'uso realmente attestato nel latino letterario, sia classico sia tardo, allo scopo di verificare se esse occorranno mai fuori dal lessico priscianeo. Intenderei poi confrontare queste traduzioni letterali con gli altri esempi di resa del participio greco in latino ad opera dello stesso Prisciano (nei *Praeexercitamina* tratti dallo Ps. Ermogene) e in altri testi bilingui (i glossari editi da Goetz e da Kramer, gli *Idiomata casuum* del Par. lat. 7530). La resa latina del participio greco negli *Atticismi* sarebbe infine esaminata alla luce delle teorizzazioni di Prisciano e altri grammatici latini circa gli usi sintattici del participio.

L'indagine della teoria linguistica tardoantica riguardante il participio e la corrispondente prassi traduttoria, dal greco in latino, potrebbe infine portare utili nuovi elementi di riflessione sull'impiego di costrutti participiali nel latino tardo.

Riferimenti

Ferri R. 2014, Alcuni aspetti della metodologia e delle fonti del glossario priscianeo, in L. Martorelli (ed.), *Greco antico nell'Occidente carolingio. Frammenti di testi attici nell'*Ars *di Prisciano*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York, 85-113.

Goetz G. (ed.) 1888-1923, *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, I-VII, Berlin-Leipzig.

Kramer J. (ed.) 1983, *Glossaria bilinguia in papyris et membranis reperta*, Bonn.

–– (ed.) 2001, *Glossaria bilinguia altera*, München- Leipzig.

Rosellini M. 2010, Le costruzioni verbali nel libro XVIII di Prisciano, *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 65, 69-94.

–– 2012, Exempla utriusque doctrinae: analisi del testo e individuazione di criteri editoriali per il lessico sintattico greco-latino del l. XVIII di Prisciano *(GL III 278, 13-377, 18)*, in L. Gamberale et al. (eds), *Le strade della filologia. Per Scevola Mariotti*, Roma, 195-211.

Sonnino M. 2014, I frammenti della commedia greca citati da Prisciano e la fonte del lessico sintattico del libro XVIII dell'*Ars*, in L. Martorelli (ed.), *Greco antico nell'Occidente carolingio. Frammenti di testi attici nell'*Ars *di Prisciano*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York, 163-204.

Ucciardello G. 2014, Il lessico sintattico-atticista fonte di Prisciano e la tradizione lessicografica bizantina, in L. Martorelli (ed.), *Greco antico nell'Occidente carolingio. Frammenti di testi attici nell'*Ars *di Prisciano*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York, 33-60.

Valente S. 2014, La fonte sintattico-atticista di Prisciano e la lessicografia greca, in L. Martorelli (ed.), *Greco antico nell'Occidente carolingio. Frammenti di testi attici nell'*Ars *di Prisciano*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 61-81.

Esemplare e contemporaneo: tensioni linguistiche nell'*Ars de orthographia* di Agrecio

Maddalena Sparagna
Università di Cassino e del Lazio Meridionale

Agrecio, futuro vescovo di Sens, compone l'*Ars de orthographia* all'incirca alla metà del V secolo. Nata come integrazione del *De orthographia* dello Ps.-Capro ricevuto in dono da Eucherio di Lione, in essa si raccolgono questioni di ortografia e morfologia, ma anche lessicali, legate alla tradizione delle *differentiae verborum*. Non è opera di un grammatico di professione, né concepita per un impego in aula, bensì, come emerge dall'epistola prefatoria, strumento di erudizione destinato alla pratica dell'*emendatio* e alla formazione superiore dell'uomo di Dio. I contenuti non assumono un ordinamento coerente, ma si riconoscono blocchi tematici di lemmi, sedimentati probabilmente per analogia o per comune derivazione. Spesso quelli dedicati a problemi di grafia/pronuncia ricalcano argomenti ricorrenti nella manualistica, fin dalle prime attestazioni, mentre rare sono le formule prescrittive, più caratteristiche di raccolte quali *Appendix Probi* III e *De orthographia* dello Ps.-Capro.

Scopo della relazione è mostrare come anche in un contesto tradizionale e di impronta tendenzialmente erudito-letteraria possano emergere alcuni elementi connotativi dello standard linguistico coevo, sebbene con riferimento prevalente all'orizzonte di formazione di Agrecio e dell'aristocrazia gallo-romana. Stando alla frequenza delle tematiche affrontate, l'autore tende a concentrarsi su ambiguità derivanti da un indebolimento del sistema vocalico: intere serie di lemmi sono ad esempio dedicate agli scambi di timbro *e/i*. La casistica dell'*Ars* si presta dunque ad un confronto con gli studi di Herman sull'incidenza statistica per regione degli errori in ambito epigrafico. Sebbene il trattato di Agrecio sia già di per sé localizzabile, l'esame dei suoi contenuti marca una significativa distanza sia dalle aree interessate prevalentemente da una crisi del sistema consonantico, sia da quelle in cui si registra un equilibrio tra le tendenze disgregative. Tra i lemmi dedicati alla neutralizzazione *b*/*v*, poi, non si riscontrano casi di fenomeno operativo a inizio di parola, attestati invece a Roma e nell'Italia centromeridionale. Affrontando processi di trasformazione di lunga durata e già ben attestati, l'autore fa affidamento su fonti eterogenee (anche commenti e manualistica grammaticale), che fonde nel nuovo contesto. Il taglio che riceve la selezione di materiali però restituisce la misura di ciò che per Agrecio andava censurato, degli errori cioè che potevano ormai essere commessi anche da chi aveva dimestichezza con un livello di lingua socialmente e culturalmente elevato. Il suo personale apporto si intravede nell'impostazione metodologica ricorrente, ovvero la rimozione anche forzosa dell'ambiguità, procedimento evidente quando un fenomeno evolutivo in atto rischia di dare origine a forme di omofonia.

Agrecio stesso si ritiene coinvolto in prima persona nel processo: il trattato attribuito a Capro necessita un'integrazione *non quod vir tantae peritiae aliquid praetermiserit* [...], *sed quia nos difficilia putamus quae ille ut facilia neglexit.* E prosegue: *Ego autem credidi haec ambigua aliquantis videri, quia mihi obscura frequenter fuissent* (*praef*. p. 35, 10-14 Pugliarello = *GL* VII 113, 10-114, 2). L'*Ars de orthographia* testimonia dunque a suo modo un punto di svolta, quello in cui anche chi per tradizione ha nel suo *curriculum* di formazione superiore la pratica dell'*emendatio* rischia di non percepire più un certo tipo di corruttele nei testi.

Riferimenti

Asperti, S., Passalacqua, M. (eds), 2014, *Appendix Probi (*GL *IV 193-204)*, Firenze.

Biville, F., 2008, Normes 'orthographiques' et oralité dans la latinité tardive : le latin du *De orthographia* de Cassiodore, in Wright, R. (ed.), *Latin Vugaire Latin tardif VIII*. *Actes du VIIIe colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif*, Hildesheim, 381-391.

De Paolis, P., 2010, Problemi di grafia e pronunzia del latino nella trattatistica ortografica tardoantica, in Anreiter, P. Kienpointner M. (eds), *Latin Linguistic Today*. *Akten des 15. Internationalen Kolloquiums zur Lateinischen Linguistik (Innsbruck, 4.-9. April 2009)*, Innsbruck, 57-74.

–– 2014, Tracce di latino volgare e tardo nella trattatistica ortografica tardoantica, in Molinelli, P., Cuzzolin, P., Fedriani, P. (eds), *Latin Vulgaire Latin Tardif X*. Actes *du Xe colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Bergamo*, III, 765-788.

Herman, J., 1998, La chronologie de la transition : un essai, in Id. (ed.), *La transizione dal latino alle lingue romanze*, Tübingen, 5-26.

Loporcaro, M., 2007, L'*Appendix Probi* e la fonologia del latino tardo, in Lo Monaco, F., Molinelli, P. (eds), *L'*Appendix Probi. *Nuove ricerche*, Firenze, 95-124.

Mancini, M., 2005, La formazione del «neostandard» tardolatino : il caso delle *differentiae verborum*, in Kiss, S. Mondin, L., Salvi, G. (eds), *Latin et langues romanes. Études linguistiques offerts à József Herman à l'occasion de son 80ème aniversaire*, Tübingen, 135-153.

–– 2007, *Appendix Probi* : correzioni ortografiche o correzioni linguistiche ?, in Lo Monaco, F. Molinelli, P. (eds), *L'*Appendix Probi. *Nuove ricerche*, Firenze, 65-94.

Pugliarello, M., 1978, *Agrecio,* Ars de orthographia, Milano.

Sparagna, M., 2013, Fonti grammaticali e ortografiche nell'*Ars* di Agrecio, in R. Casavecchia *et al.* (eds), *Libri e testi. Lavori in corso a Cassino*. *Atti del Seminario internazionale, Cassino, 30-31 gennaio 2012, Cassino*, 13-49.

Ex Anniana Milonis domo : les syntagmes nominaux avec deux compléments de possession

Olga SPEVAK
Université de Toulouse Jean Jaurès

Cette contribution a pour objectif d'étudier les propriétés syntaxiques et sémantiques des syntagmes nominaux de type *ex Anniana Milonis domo* (Cic. *Att.* 4.3.3) où le nom régissant est accompagné d'un génitif possessif et d'un adjectif d'appartenance. Le syntagme cicéronien sera confronté avec la proposition de Campanile (1985) d'interpréter la séquence POPLIOSIO VALESIOSIO SVODALES MAMARTEI, attestée sur le *Lapis Satricanus* (CIL I^2 2832a), comme « i sodali marziali di Publio Valerio » (« les compagnons martiaux de Publius Valerius »), c'est-à-dire comme un double complément de possession du nom *suodales*.

Objectifs

Les syntagmes de type *ex Anniana Milonis domo* ont échappé aux grammairiens modernes (mais voir le commentaire Shackleton Bailey *ad* Cic. *Att.* 4.3.3) ; on a seulement étudié la question de la concurrence entre le génitif et l'adjectif d'appartenance (Löfstedt 1928 : 86-88, en réponse à Wackernagel 1908 ; cf. Baldi-Nuti 2010). Nous allons essayer de montrer que ces syntagmes (2) s'inscrivent dans le même cadre que les syntagmes accompagnés de deux génitifs (1). Ils se laissent interpréter comme le phénomène de « nesting » (Pinkster 1990/1995 § 6.4) où le second génitif (*Praxiteli*) et l'adjectif d'appartenance (*Anniana*) ont une portée plus large le premier génitif. La présence du second complément de possession se justifie par l'existence d'une pluralité d'objets (*signum Cupidinis* et *domus Milonis*) qu'il faut distinguer l'un de l'autre. En même temps, deux compléments de possession sont possibles seulement s'ils fonctionnent comme des satellites pour compléter un nom avalent. Tel n'est pas le cas de *suodales*, un nom relationnel, monovalent, qui ne peut admettre qu'un seul argument : le génitif ou l'adjectif d'appartenance.

(1) (signum) *unum Cupidinis marmoreum Praxiteli* (Cic. *Ver.* 2.4.4)
[[[signum] Cupidinis] Praxiteli]
(2) *ex Anniana Milonis domo* (Cic. *Att*. 4.3.3)
[[[domus] Milonis] Anniana]

Méthode

Nous nous proposons de vérifier l'hypothèse mentionnée en examinant une série de noms avalents dénotant des entités concrètes (*aedes*, *templum*, *fabula*...), pour lesquels une double expression de possession est attendue, une série de noms monovalents (*sodalis*, *socius*, *amicus*, *familiaris*), ainsi que des adjectifs d'appartenance tel *Martius* et *Martialis.* Nous nous servirons principalement du *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* et de la base de données *The Library of Latin Texts*.

Résultats

L'étude des syntagmes nominaux accompagnés d'un génitif et d'un adjectif d'appartenance montrera que de telles combinaisons sont attestées seulement avec les noms qui dénotent des **artefacts** humains (maisons, villas, temples...) qui appartiennent à quelqu'un et qui existent en des versions multiples. L'adjectif d'appartenance a une valeur distinctive. Cependant, les syntagmes de ce type sont relativement peu fréquents, ce qui est en partie du à la métonymie, par exemple, *Diana Cornificiana* pour *templum Dianae Cornificianum*, ainsi appelé du nom de son restaurateur.

Références

Baldi, Philip et Andrea Nuti, 2010, Possession, in Ph. Baldi and P. Cuzzolin (eds), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*, vol. 3: *Constituent Syntax: Quantification, Numerals, Possession, Anaphora*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton, 239-387.
Campanile, E. 1985, Riflessioni sui piu antichi testii epigrafici latini, *Annali del Dipartimento di studi del mondo classico e del mediterraneo antico, Sezione linguistica (AION)* 7, 89-100,
Library of Latin Texts, Series A, www.brepolis.net.
Löfstedt, Einar, 1928, Syntactica: *Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins*, vol. 1. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup.
Pinkster, Harm, 1990/1995, *Latin Syntax and Semantics*. London: Routledge, and its revised and enhanced edition *Sintaxis y semántica del latín.* Madrid: Ed. Clásicas. http://perseus.uchicago.edu/cgi-bin/philologic/navigate.pl?NewPerseusMonographs.19
Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, 1900-, Leipzig: Teubner.
Wackernagel, Jacob, 1908, Genetiv und Adjektiv, in *Mélanges de linguistique offerts à M. Ferdinand de Saussure.* Paris: H. Champion, 123-152 [*Kleine Schriften,* vol. II, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1969, 1346-1373].

Quelques avatars tardifs de l'ablatif absolu

Beata SPIERALSKA
Université de Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński

Dans les textes latins tardifs (ceux du X^{e} siècle par exemple) on retrouve des nombreuses occurrences des constructions nommées traditionnellement l'*accusatif absolu* et le *nominatif absolu*. Les grammairiens qui mentionnent ces constructions les expliquent souvent comme extension de l'usage de l'accusatif et du nominatif respectivement. Leurs origines peuvent être tracées dans l'usage de l'accusatif en fonction du nominatif (cf. par exemple Ernout et Thomas, p. 23-24) ou dans celui du *nominativus pendens*, ou nominatif *d'emphase* (cf. Hofmann et Szantyr, p. 143-144). Selon cette optique, les deux constructions semblent issues de la croissance – pour ainsi dire – des domaines du nominatif et de l'accusatif, plutôt que de l'évolution (voire dégénérescence) du classique *ablativus absolutus*, évolution résultant de l'amuïssement des désinences et de l'érosion générale de la flexion nominale. L'accusatif et le nominatif absolus seraient donc, "modelés sur l'ablatif absolu traditionnel", pour reprendre l'expression de Herman (p. 54) et auraient concurrencé ce dernier. Mais il y a aussi le phénomène du "mélange casuel", quand les éléments formant la construction absolue sont pourvus des désinences diverses. Väänänen y voit un "terme intermédiaire entre l'ablatif absolu et le nominatif absolu" (p. 168). Pour Fry "ce flottement casuel résulte bien, semble-t-il, d'une déroute fonctionnelle" (p. 67). Dans mon exposé je me propose de poursuivre cette enquête en analysant des exemples tardifs, extraits des textes des chartes, des chroniques et des récits hagiographiques. Mon but est d'étudier dans quelle mesure nous avons affaire à l'expansion du nominatif et de l'accusatif, et dans quelle – aux remaniements de l'ablatif absolu.

Références

Ernout A., Thomas F., 1951, *Syntaxe Latine*, Paris.
Fry C., 2007, L'ablatif absolu: une histoire de flou, in C. Bodelot (éd.), *Éléments "asyntaxiques" ou hors structure dans l'énoncé latin*, Clermont-Ferrand.
Herman J., 1997, *Vulgar Latin*, University Park (Pa.) : Pennsylvania state UP.
Hofmann J. B., Szantyr A., 1965, *Lateinische Grammatik*. vol. 2, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, Munich.
Väänänen V., 1963, *Introduction au latin vulgaire*, Paris.

Sources:

Chronique de Benoit de Saint André (ms. BAV Chig.F.IV.75)
Vita Sancti Blasii (ms. BAV Cap. S. Pietro A5)
Chronicon Salernitanum (éd. U. Westerbergh), Stockholm 1956.
I placiti del "Regnum Italie" (éd. C. Manaresi), Roma 1957

Le vocatif en *-ī* de la deuxième déclinaison latine

Pedro Manuel SUÁREZ-MARTÍNEZ
Université d'Oviedo

Face aux formes régulières des vocatifs en *-ĕ* des noms de la deuxième déclinaison latine qui font le nominatif en *-us*, comme *dominus, domine*, on trouve, d'une façon surprenante, une terminaison en *-ī* chez les noms de la même déclinaison qui font le nominatif en *-ius*, comme *filius, filī* ou *Antonius, Antonī*.

Bien que la tradition de nos études ait bien essayé de trouver une explication pour cette forme étrange, elle n'a pas encore réussi à en donner une interprétation convaincante et capable de rendre compte aussi d'autres raretés constatées historiquement, comme le fait que le vocatif et le génitif de noms comme *Valerius*, apparemment égaux, se prononçaient d'une manière différente : *Váleri / Valéri.*

Dans notre communication on essaiera d'éclaircir tout le problème en proposant une nouvelle hypothèse bien plus simple que les précédentes.

Constructions subordonnées en *quod* ou *quia* après verbes assertifs en latin biblique

Lyliane SZNAJDER
Université de Paris Ouest Nanterre

L'augmentation significative, chez les auteurs chrétiens, des constructions conjonctives en *quod, quia, quoniam* après verbes assertifs, d'attestation précédemment très clairsemée, est un fait bien attesté et repéré. C'est en outre en contexte de citations ou réminiscences bibliques que, dans la littérature d'inspiration chrétienne, ces constructions conjonctives sont particulièrement fréquentes. Sur ces deux points, voir notamment les études de Mayen 1889, Perrochat 1932, Herman 1963, Wirth-Poelchau 1977, Cuzzolin 1994, Calboli 2012.

Or, par ailleurs, la construction infinitive n'est absolument pas en perte de vitesse –au contraire- dans les textes de niveau de langue dit « vulgaire » (Adams 2005) et elle continue à être vivace en latin tardif dans des textes de niveau de langue très divers.

Les sources latines de l'apparition des complétives en *quod* ont été très bien étudiées (Cuzzolin 1994). On voudrait examiner et dégager ici un certain nombre de tendances à l'œuvre dans l'emploi de ces complétives conjonctives après verbes assertifs en latin biblique précisément, et en particulier la répartition entre infinitives et conjonctives, notamment selon les verbes introducteurs, la sélection *quod* ou *quia* à mettre en regard avec la langue source de la traduction (hébreu ou grec), les conditions dans lesquelles les complétives conjonctives se substituent à un DD des langues sources (par ex. le double enchâssement du discours rapporté). L'étude s'appuiera sur une comparaison avec les constructions subordonnées auprès des mêmes verbes introducteurs dans un texte de Jérôme qui ne soit pas de traduction, comme sa Correspondance.

> *Repente nobis nuntiatum est sanctissimam leam exisse de corpore* (Hier. *ep.* 23, 1)
> *Nuntiatum est Laban die tertio quod fugeret Iacob* (*gen*. 31, 22)
> *Nuntiauit Iudaeis quia Iesus esset qui fecit eum sanum* (*Ioh*. 5, 15)

Cette enquête contrastive, dans une langue de traduction et même de double traduction comme le latin biblique, devrait apporter sa contribution à l'étude des conditions de propagation et de répartition des constructions conjonctives en contexte de discours rapporté, et permettre d'évaluer les paramètres à l'œuvre dans l'acclimatation ou le blocage des calques quantitatifs, notamment en fonction de la langue source et du registre de la langue cible (cf. Cuzzolin 2013 sur les constructions en *quia*).

Références

Adams J. N. 2005, The accusative + infinitive and dependent *quod-/quia-* clauses. The evidence of non-literary Latin and Petronius, in S. Kiss, L. Mondin, G.Salvi (eds), *Latin et langues romanes. Etudes de linguistique offertes à J. Herman,* Tübingen, Niemeyer, 195-206.

Calboli G., 2012, Syntaxe nominale et subordination en latin tardif, in F. Biville, M.-K. Lhommé, D.Vallat (eds), *Latin Vulgaire-Latin Tardif IX*, Lyon, MOM, 439-451.

Cuzzolin P., 2013, Some remarks on *quia* as a subordinator after verbs of saying and thinking, *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 12, 1, 51-69.

García de la Fuente O., 1981, Sobre el empleo de *quod quia quoniam* con los verbos de lengua y entendimiento en Samuel-Reyes de la Vulgata, *Analecta Malacitana*, IV, 3-14.

Greco P. 2008, *Accusativus cum Infinitivo* and *Quod* clauses in the first and sixth books of the *Historiae* of Gregory of Tours, in R.Wright (ed.), *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif VIII, H*ildesheim/Zürich/New York, Olms-Weidmann, 371-380.

Herman J., 1989, Accusativus cum infinitivo et subordonnée à *quod quia* en latin tardif- Nouvelles remarques sur un vieux problème, in G.Calboli (ed.), *Subordination and other topics in Latin, Proceedings of the 3rd Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Bologna April 1985,* Amsterdam, Benjamins, 133-152.

Mayen G., 1889, *De particulis quod quia quoniam quomodo ut pro Acc.cum Infinitivo post verba sentiendi et declarandi positis*, Inaug. Diss., Kiel.

Sznajder L. 2013, Quelques réflexions sur des discours hybrides du latin biblique : *oratio recta* ou *oratio obliqua* ?, communication à la table ronde sur l'*oratio obliqua,* ICLL 17 (Rome 20.5-25.5.2013), à paraitre A.Orlandini , P.Poccetti (eds), 2015.

Wirth-Poelchau L., 1977, *AcI und* quod-*Satz im lateinischen Sprachgebrauch mittelalterlicher und humanistischer Autoren*, th., Erlangen.

Variations syntaxiques et polysémie verbale: l'exemple de préverbés latins en *de-*

Jean-François THOMAS
Université de Montpellier

Jean-Paul Brachet (2000) reconstitue l'histoire de la formation des verbes en *de-* à travers les valeurs du préverbe et les types morphologiques, mais n'étudie guère la polysémie. Or les sens peuvent être à première vue assez éloignés : *deficere* « se détacher de » et « abandonner, faire défaut à », *defigere* « fixer » et « maudire », *despondere* « promettre » et « abandonner ». Ces trois verbes sont considérés comme représentatifs et ils sont étudiés sur une période déjà longue, de Plaute à Tacite. Pour l'investigation des relations sémantiques est utilisée l'analyse sémique. Tout le problème est de déterminer si le développement des significations se fait seulement par des variations à l'intérieur des sémèmes ou s'il s'y ajoute des phénomènes extérieurs car affectant les constructions. Robert Martin (2007) parle respectivement de polysémie interne et de polysémie externe. Cette typologie permet de mettre en évidence la part du sémantique et celle du syntaxique. Elle donne une arborescence des significations, selon que les sens se ramènent à un noyau abstrait (polarité hyperonymique), découlent d'un sens prédominant (polarité prototypique) ou présentent un sens plus isolé (polarité disjointe). Une fois caractérisée, la polysémie doit être expliquée : à côté des facteurs d'ordre sémanticologique (restriction ou extension de sens, métonymie, etc.), les raisons peuvent résider dans le rôle du préverbe, car le préverbé est de nature à développer des sens et des constructions que le verbe simple ne connaît pas. Si la construction attachée au sens premier du préverbé peut être analogue à celle du simple (*defigere* et *figere* « attacher »), il n'est pas rare qu'elle soit différente (*facere* transitif et *deficere* d'abord intransitif et probablement *spondere* intransitif « s'engager » et *despondere* transitif « promettre en mariage »). Le sens premier du préverbé est à l'origine d'une polysémie interne aux seuls sémèmes (*despondere* « promettre en mariage », « promettre » et « renoncer à »), ou liée aux seuls actants (polysémie extériorisée de *deficere* + abl. « se détacher de » et *deficere* + acc. « abandonner »). Le développement sémantique s'opère à la fois dans les sémèmes et à travers des variations syntaxiques : *defigere in* + acc. « fixer » et *defigere* + acc. « paralyser », « envoûter » ; *deficere* + abl. « se détacher de », *deficere* « défaillir ». Cette dernière polysémie, dite externe dans la terminologie de R. Martin, constitue le cas le plus fréquent et les sens concernés peuvent même être assez distants avec des polarités prototypiques allant jusqu'à la disjonction. Est-ce un fait secondaire ? c'est plutôt l'indice d'un phénomène plus profond : l'association d'un verbe et d'un préverbe, relateur plus abstrait, serait un facteur favorisant le développement des structures syntaxiques et du sémantisme.

Références

Brachet Jean-Paul, 2000, *Recherches sur les préverbes* dē- *et* ex- *du latin*, Bruxelles.
Martin Robert, 2007, Sur la nature du « signifié de langue ». Réflexions d'un lexicographe, *BSL* 102-1, 17-33.

Condicionales de acto de habla en dos obras de Cicerón: *In Verrem* y *ad Atticum*

Rogelio TOLEDO
UNAM Mexico

Esta ponencia trata sobre un tipo especial de periodos condicionales que, a raíz de la metodología aplicada aquí para su estudio y clasificación, hemos decidido llamar *condicionales de acto de habla*, pero que en otros estudios han recibido nombres como condicionales marginales, pseudocondicionales, condicionales de la proposición, condicionales de la enunciación, etc. Los periodos condicionales de acto de habla estudiados se limitan al latín de Cicerón, en específico a dos de sus obras: los discursos contra Verres y las cartas a Ático.

En gramáticas latinas como la de Pinkster (1990) y Baños Baños (2009) se ha reconocido la existencia de diversas condicionales que no expresan una causa supuesta. Sin embargo, la aproximación de la que se parte en estas gramáticas es de corte sintáctico y semántico, por lo que este tipo de condicionales son catalogadas como disjuntos oracionales, i.e., una estructura que es innecesaria tanto en contendido proposicional como formal.

Aquí, por el contrario, se parte de una perspectiva pragmática en la que todas las condicionales comparten ciertas características nucleares: todas están compuestas por dos actos ilocutivos a partir de los cuales pueden interpretarse a) en un nivel de contenido, como una causa supuesta; b) en un nivel epistémico, como una conclusión inductiva; o c) en un nivel de actos de habla, como la explicitación de alguna de las máximas de Grice (1975) o de las condiciones de éxito de Searle (1969 y 1975). Esta aproximación ha permitido analizar y explicar, además de todos los casos prototípicos de condicionales, ocho tipos diferentes de las tradicionalmente llamadas condicionales marginales.

Esta nueva aproximación se ha logrado, en primer lugar, a partir de la revisión de la bibliografía precedente y de la comparación y unión de diversas teorías ahí encontradas: Ducrot (1972), por un lado, había propuesto el análisis de condicionales como actos ilocutivos; por otro lado, Sweetser (1990) proponía una interpretación semántica en tres niveles –contenido, epistémico y acto de habla–; y, finalmente, Lauerbach (1979) consideraba que todas las condicionales de acto de habla podían ser analizadas, en efecto, con las máximas de Grice o con las condiciones de éxito de Searle; sin embargo, no siempre explicaba en sus ejemplos cómo había que proceder, o a veces, sencillamente, no podíamos coincidir con ella en su análisis. Esto se debe a que, en gran medida, la aproximación aquí presentada al estudio de condicionales de acto de habla ha surgido de la observación de los datos que nosotros mismos hemos encontrado en las dos obras de Cicerón aquí analizadas.

Así pues, partir de un total de 2042 periodos condicionales introducidos por la conjunción *si* –716 en Verres y 1336 en Ático–, se ha conformado un corpus de 61 ejemplos –13 en verrinas y 48 en cartas a Ático– que nos han permitido aplicar y comprobar la teoría de condicionales de acto de habla en la lengua latina.

Referencias

Ducrot, Oswald, 1982, *Decir y no decir*: *Principios de semántica lingüística,* trad. Minetto, Walter y Amparo Hurtado, Barcelona, Anagrama.

Grice, Paul, 1975, Logic and Conversation, in Cole, Peter, et Jerry L. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and semantics*, Vol. 3, *Speech Acts*, Nueva York, Academic Press, 41-58.

Lauerbach, Gerda, 1979, *Form und Funktion englischer Konditionalsätze mit >if<: Eine konversationslogische und sprechakttheoretische Analyse*, Tubinga, Max Niemeyer.

Martín Puente, Cristina, 2009, Condicionales y concesivas, in Baños Baños, José Miguel (coord.), *Sintaxis del latín clásico,* Madrid, Liceus, 667-675.

Pinkster, Harm, 1990, *Latin Syntax and Semantics,* trad. Hotze Mulder, Londres y Nueva York, Routledge, http://perseus.uchicago.edu/cgi-bin/philologic/getobject.pl?c.19:1:1.NewPerseusMonographs

Searle, John, 1969, *Speech Acts: An essay in the Philosophy of Language,* Londres, CUP.

Sweetser, Eve, 1990, *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*, Cambridge, CUP.

Variantes de complémentation :
Infinitif / Proposition Subordonnée avec les verbes d'empêchement et d'interdiction

Esperanza Torrego
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

L'objectif de ce travail est la recherche des facteurs qui règlent la sélection des variantes de complémentation Infinitif / PS (Proposition Subordonnée) dans les cas où les différences ne comportent pas de motivation sémantique de modalité. Cela arrive dans les verbes impressifs (p. e. *iubeo / impero* + Infinitif / PS = message impressif), à la différence d'autres verbes de parole, comme *dico*, où les variantes de complémentation d'AcI et de *ut* expriment des modalités différentes (déclarative – impressive).

Je pars de l'idée, soutenue dans les études linguistiques (depuis de nombreuses perspectives théoriques), que les langues ne conservent habituellement pas de variantes formelles sauf s'il y a une motivation fonctionnelle (sémantique ou d'un autre genre). Dans le cas des variantes de PS / Infinitif avec les verbes directifs, on a soutenu que la variation n'était pas arbitraire et l'on a évoqué divers facteurs la conditionnant, comme le degré de complexité de la subordonnée et l'ordre des mots (Panchón 2003: 377-79, pour *ut* + Subj.), la négation syntaxique du verbe principal (Orlandini 2003: 500, 510, pour *ne / quominus /quin* avec des *uerba impediendi*). Du point de vue de la typologie linguistique, Lehmann (1988) et Givón (1990: 537-545), parmi d'autres, associent les variantes syntaxiques avec de différents degrés d'intégration, plus hauts dans le cas de l'infinitif par rapport à la PS. La différence d'intégration impliquerait des interprétations sémantiques diverses, concernant la force de l'empêchement, la plus ou moins grande distance ou implication de l'Agent par rapport au contenu du message subordonné, etc. Dans ce travail j'essaie de voir si, en latin, on peut dégager, outre la négation syntagmatique proposée par Orlandini, d'autres facteurs sémantiques du genre de ceux que Givón décrit. J'étudierai comment ils se reflètent dans le texte et me demanderai également si le choix des variantes peut répondre à des considérations pragmatiques ou formelles. Voici les questions auxquelles on essaie donc de répondre :

1) Quelles différences sémantiques y a-t-il entre la complémentation avec Infinitif et la PS? Quelles propriétés linguistiques se trouvent à la base de ces différences ?
2) Ces variantes sont-elles conditionnées uniquement par des considérations sémantiques ou aussi par des facteurs pragmatiques ?

3) La structure morphosyntaxique du latin influe-t-elle sur le choix des variantes ?

Pour répondre à ces questions j'analyserai d'abord les PS de *ne* / *quominus / quin* avec les verbes d'empêchement et d'interdiction. J'examinerai ensuite, en plus de la négation syntagmatique, des facteurs comme le type de Sujet de la principale, la présence ou non d'un récepteur du message, le type de verbe de la subordonnée. Je vais enfin considérer aussi la fonction pragmatique des messages et tâcherai de voir s'il existe des cas de conflit de marques lorsque la variation dépend de plus d'un facteur.

Références

Bodelot, C. (ed.) 2003, *Grammaire fondamentale du Latin, tome X: Les propositions complétives en Latin,* Louvain-Paris-Dudly, Ma., Peeters.

Givón, T. 1990, *Syntax. A Functional-Typological Introduction*, Vol. II, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, Benjamins.

Lehmann, Ch. 1988, Towards a typology of clause linkage, in J. Haiman-S.A. Thompson, *Clause combining in Grammar and Discourse,* Amsterdam-Philadelphia, Benjamins, 181-225

Orlandini, A. 2003, Les complétives en *ne, quominus, quin*, in C. Bodelot (ed.), 482-527.

Panchón, F. 2003, Les complétives conjonctives. Les complétives en *ut*, in C. Bodelot (ed.), 627-640.

La préposition latine *prae*, un cas de grammaticalisation ?

Hamida TRABELSI
Institut Supérieur des Études Appliquées aux Humanités, Tunis

À travers cette étude, nous essaierons de voir dans quelle mesure l'hypothèse de la grammaticalisation permet de mieux cerner la formation et l'évolution de la préposition latine *prae*. Une étude sur corpus montrerait que cette forme s'employait d'abord en latin archaïque comme adverbe de lieu pour désigner « devant » (en avant). Puis à l'époque classique nous la retrouvons comme préposition et préfixe pour exprimer l'ancienne acception de « devant » et comme préposition dans le sens de « auprès de ». Comment est-on passé du premier sens adverbial à la signification de proximité a constitué l'une de nos questions principales dans cette proposition de contribution. En nous basant sur les propos de Meillet et Vendryes :

> « Les éléments adverbiaux qui sont devenus les prépositions étaient en indoeuropéen autonomes comme tous les éléments de la phrase, et par suite indépendants du verbe comme du nom. Ils servaient à préciser la situation en ajoutant des nuances au sens propre des formes verbales ou nominales. Ils marquaient par exemple si l'action indiquée dans la phrase avait lieu au dedans ou au dehors, en haut ou en bas, en compagnie ou à l'écart de quelqu'un ou de quelque chose, etc. Or, ces éléments, qui par leur caractère accessoire tenaient pour le sens et pour la prononciation soit à un verbe, soit à un nom, ont tendu peu à peu à se lier au verbe (en qualité de préverbes) ou au nom (en qualité de prépositions) ; dans le premier cas on les nomme en effet préverbes, et dans le second, prépositions »,

nous distinguerons un deuxième type de grammaticalisation. À côté de celle qui permet le passage d'une unité lexicale à une unité grammaticale, nous retrouvons celle qui part du moins grammatical vers le plus grammatical. À ce niveau nous nous situerons en décalage par rapport à la conception de Svorou qui considère toute formation de prépositions à partir d'autres sources que les noms et les verbes comme une étape ultérieure de l'évolution.

C'est le cas de la préposition *prae*. Ce serait un ancien adverbe latin qui aurait progressivement perdu son autonomie et serait devenu, en se liant à un nom, une préposition et en se liant à un verbe, un préfixe. Ce changement catégoriel s'accompagne de changements sémantiques et au fur et à mesure que le mot lexical devient outil grammatical sa forme se réduit et son sens s'appauvrit.

De plus, si nous visons à circonscrire les sens de près en français moderne (préposition et préfixe qui tiennent leur origine de la forme latine *prae*), il en ressort que les premières attestations de cette préposition manifestent un emploi spatial qui va vers une nuance de proximité. Il semble bien que l'idée de proximité soit l'élément central de l'espace sémantique dans lequel s'est développé *prae*.

À la lumière de ces données, nous essaierons de voir comment la grammaticalisation en tant que processus de changement linguistique contribue à la formation de la préposition latine et à l'extension de ses emplois. Pour ce faire, il nous a paru opportun de focaliser notre attention, tout d'abord, sur le changement qui a tiré ces catégories du grammatical vers le plus grammatical. Nous envisagerons, ensuite, l'évolution sémantico-syntaxique de *prae* adverbe, préposition et préfixe en essayant de suivre leurs destinées dans le latin classique et postclassique en cherchant, enfin, à établir des parallèles avec le français moderne.

Références

Amiot D. et De Mulder W., 2002, De l'adverbe au préfixe en passant par la préposition, *Linguisticae Investigationes* 25/2, Benjamins, Amsterdam, 247-273.

Antoine F., 1855, *Syntaxe de la langue latine*, Paris, Vieweg.

Goyens et De Mulder, 2002, Présentation, *Linguisticae Investigationes* 25/2, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 185-203.

Meillet A., Vendryes J., 1963, *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*, Champion, Paris.

Svorou S., 1993, *The Grammar of space*, Amsterdam/ Philadelphia : J. Benjamins.

Latin negative (*nē*, *nĕ*, *nī*, *nei*...) particles: morphonological features and diachronic evolution

Elena Triantafillis
University of Padua

The paper deals with negative (*nē*, *nĕ*, *nī*, *nei,* etc.) preverbal particles in Latin and, in particular, focuses on their morphonological structure. The formal features of this set of particles (which are formed by *n-* with the addition of a syllabic vowel; shortly: '*nV* class') have been traditionally explained by reconstructing a series of phonetic changes (see for instance Walde-Hofmann[3]; Ernout-Meillet[3]); according to this view, an original source *nĕ* (outcome of Indo-European **ne*; see e.g. Walde-Hofmann[3]II: 150) would have yelded *nei* (*ne*+ epideictic particle *–i*;) and *nē*. This array reveals some weaknesses: first of all, this reconstruction merely aims to connect forms with each other by hypothesizing a diachronic development, that seems drawn *ad hoc* and that is in contrast with documental evidence (note, for example, that in the traditional view *nī* would go back to *nei*, but some Latin archaic inscriptions attest '*ni* cases' pre-existing the evolution *ei>ī/)*; secondly, this proposal shows some technical difficulties: for instance, numerous solutions for the form *nĭsĭ* have been suggested, none completely satisfactory; (Peruzzi 1958; Walde-Hofmann[3]-II: 170; Ernout-Meillet[3]: 783); *nēue* can not be justified; etc.

Starting on this basis, the paper will be structured as follows:

1) I will try to point the limits of the prevailing view: the problems posed from the phonetic approach will be minutely examined.

2) In the second part of my talk, I will attempt to suggest an alternative solution: the variation that characterizes the '*nV* class' could be interpreted by hypothesizing an original allomorphy (going back to the early stages of Latin linguistic history); such an allomorphy would be founded on the variation of the syllabic vowel; in detail, I assume that the original 'allomorphic series' should include the syllabic vowels *ĕ*/*ei*/*ĭ* (i.e.the allomorphs *nĕ*, *nĭ*, *nei*...). Such an explanation is supported from several facts: a) it allows to surmount the phonetic difficulties mentioned above; b) it relies on an original 'vocalic alternance' that concerns the '*nV* class' as well as other *deictic* elements: it can be found, for example, in Latin demonstrative pronouns (traces of such a 'system' can be seen also in other Indo-European varieties; for Latin deictic functions see Rosén 2009, Bader 1990, Prosdocimi 2002). The analysis will be supported with data offered from Latin archaic inscriptions (attesting e.g. the existence of a primary form *nĭ*). It is to assume that the setting of the Latin standard system (i.e. 'classical Latin') is the result of a diachronic evolution, whose starting point is the set of allomorphs I sketched above: firstly, I hypothesize that some phonetic developments took subsequently place, yelding secondary forms; secondly, standard Latin set of negation particles includes some 'variants' displaying specific syntactic and pragmatic funcions (e.g.Orlandini-Poccetti 2002): such a frame can be interpreted as outcome of a diachronic specialization process.

Lastly, I shortly argue that this 'morphological interpretation' could be extended to the set of hypothetical Latin particles (*se*, *si*, *sei*...) which present a parallel structure.

References

Bader, F., 1992, Formes, fonctions, étymologies pronominales*,* in M.-A. Morel & L. Danon-Boileau (dir.), *La deixis. Colloque en Sorbonne* (8-9 juin 1990), Paris, 27-41.

Ernout, A., Meillet, A. 1951[3], *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire de mots*, Paris.

Meiser, G., 1986, *Lautgeschichte der umbrischen Sprache*, Innsbruck.

Orlandini, A.-Poccetti, P. 2007, Il y a *nec* et *nec*: trois valeurs de la négation en latin et dans les langues de l'Italie ancienne, in F. Floricic (dir.)*, La négation dans les langues romane*, *Linguisticae Investigationes. Supplementa*, 26, 29-4**.**

Peruzzi, E., 1958, L'iscrizione di Duenos, *La Parola del Passato*, 13, 328-346.

Prosdocimi, A.L., 1986, Sull'accento latino (e) italico, in A. Etter (ed.), *Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75 Geburtstag*, Berlin-New York, 601-618.

–– 2002, La cosiddetta sors di Fiesole (ILLRP 1070)*,* in Del Tutto, L., - Prosdocimi, A.L.,- Rocca, G. (eds), *Lingua e cultura intorno al 295 a.C.: tra Roma e gli Italici del Nord*, Roma, 75-159.

Rosén, H., 2009, Coherence, sentence-modification and sentence-part-modifcation. The contribution of particles, in Ph. Baldi and P. Cuzzolin (eds), *New perspectives on Historical Latin Sintax.1. The sentence*, Berlin, 317-442.
Rix, H., *Sabellische Texte*, Heidelberg.
Walde, A. - Hofmann, J.B., 1954[3], *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, I-II Heidelberg.

Pour une reconsidération des verbes latins en *-isso*/*-izo*/*-idio*

Liana TRONCI
Università per Stranieri di Siena

La classe des verbes latins en *-isso*/*-izo*/*-idio* est issue d'emprunts et de calques au grec (voir *atticissare* et *graecissare* dans Plaute), qui ont été le modèle morpho-lexical pour de nouvelles formations, complètement latines (voir *betizare* dans Suétone). Les études proposent que la classe s'est répandue de façon productive dans le lexique latin (ca. 120 *types*), ce qui justifierait leur grande productivité dans les langues romanes, voir l'it. *-eggiare*/*-izzare*, le fr. *-oyer*/*-iser*, l'esp. *-ear*/*-izar* (cf. Funck 1886, Leumann 1948, Biville 1990, Dardano 2008, Cockburn 2012). Mais en fait la comparaison avec le grec, d'un côté, et les langues romanes, de l'autre côté, montre que les verbes latins ne sont pas nombreux, ni comme *types*, ni comme *tokens* (ils sont souvent de *hapax legómena*). De plus, l'occurrence de ces verbes se limite à certains textes : les comédies de Plaute, d'un côté, la littérature chrétienne et les traités techniques, de l'autre. Ailleurs, leurs occurrences sont très rares. Le grec et les langues romanes montrent en revanche une très grande productivité de formes comparables et aucune restriction textuelle, ce qui fait que le latin constitue une sorte de discontinuité diachronique.

Dans cette étude nous proposons une nouvelle description de la classe des verbes latins en considérant à la fois les facteurs « internes » et « externes » à la langue. Nos questions portent alors sur la valeur de ces formes dans le système lexical de la langue latine (cf. Fruyt 2011), des points de vue de la linguistique interne (structure des emprunts et des nouvelles formations, leurs valeurs sémantiques, syntaxiques et pragmatiques, relation avec d'autres formes, comme les noms en *-ismus* et *-ista* qui ont une origine comparable) et externe (fonctions sociolinguistiques, rôle des emprunts et des nouvelles formations face aux différents types de textes, interaction avec les modèles grecs). Notre approche sera comparatif : les formes latines seront analysées face à leurs modèles grecs et à leurs descendants romans, dans la perspective de la continuité/discontinuité. Du point de vue méthodologique, notre analyse portera, d'un côté, sur la syntaxe, la sémantique et la pragmatique des occurrences et, de l'autre côté, sur leurs emplois textuels, leurs sources grecques et leurs descendants romans (en particulier, pour les formes bibliques). Notre base de données est constituée par les occurrences des verbes en *-isso*/*-izo*/*-idio* dans la littérature latine à partir du III^ème^ siècle avant J.-C. et le VI^ème^ siècle après J.-C., c'est-à-dire la période prise en compte aussi par Cockburn (2012). De ces formes, nous considérerons les correspondants grecs (pour les emprunts) et les modèles grecs (pour les nouvelles formations), ainsi que les descendants dans les langues romanes (en particulier, en italien). Cette analyse comparative nous permettra de préciser le rôle du latin dans les parcours diachroniques des formes concernées (voir les deux suffixes des langues romanes : it. *-eggiare*/*-izzare*, fr. *-oyer*/*-iser*, etc.) et de tracer les « barrières » sociolinguistiques et identitaires de la diffusion du grec à Rome (cf. Kaimio 1979, Biville 2002, Dubuisson 1992, Adams 2003).

Références

Adams, J. N. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge : CUP.
Biville, F. 1990. *Les emprunts du latin au grec. Approche phonétique. Tome I: Introduction et consonantisme*, Louvain – Paris : Peeters.
–– 2002. The Graeco-Romans and Graeco-Latin: A Terminological Framework for Cases of Bilingualism, in J. N. Adams, M. Janse, S. Swain (éds), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society*, Oxford : OUP, 77-102.
Cockburn, O. C. 2012. *Los verbos latinos en -IZARE (-ISSARE, -IDIARE)*, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
Dardano, P. 2008. Contatti tra lingue nel mondo mediterraneo antico: i verbi in *-issare/-izare* del latino, in V. Orioles, F. Toso (éds), *Circolazioni linguistiche e culturali nello spazio mediterraneo*, Genova : Le Mani, 49-61.
Dubuisson, M. 1992. Le grec à Rome à l'époque de Cicéron. Extension et qualité du bilinguisme, *AESC* 47, 1, 187-206.
Fruyt, M. 2011. Latin Vocabulary, in J. Clackson (éd.), *A Companion to the Latin Language*, Chichester/Malden, MA: Blackwell, 144-156.
Funck, A. 1886. Die Verba auf *-issare* und *-izare*, *ALL* 3, 398-442.
Kaimio, J. 1979. *The Romans and the Greek Language*, Helsinki : Societas Scientiarum Fennica.
Leumann, M. 1948. Griechische Verben auf *-ίζειν* im Latein, in *Mélanges de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes offerts à J. Marouzeau*, Paris : Les Belles Lettres, 371-389.

La respuesta al agradecimiento y a la disculpa en la comedia de Plauto y Terencio

Luis UNCETA GÓMEZ
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

El presente trabajo pretende ser una contribución al análisis de la expresión de la cortesía lingüística en la lengua latina (véase un estado de la cuestión en Unceta 2014a). Como continuación de algunos estudios de dos actos de habla inherentemente corteses, como son el agradecimiento (cf. Unceta 2010) y la disculpa (cf. Kruschwitz & Clary-Venables 2013; Unceta 2014b), se abordará en esta comunicación el análisis de las respuestas dadas a esos dos tipos de mensajes en las comedias de Plauto y Terencio, un corpus óptimo para este tipo de análisis.

En el caso del agradecimiento, por ejemplo, es frecuente y esperable la minimización por parte del interlocutor, como se aprecia en los siguientes versos:

> PA. *quid ad illas artis optassis, si optio eueniat tibi?*
> PL. *huius pro meritis ut referri pariter possit gratia,*
> *tibique, quibu' nunc me esse experior summae sollicitudini.*
> *at tibi tanto sumptui esse molestumst.* PE. *morus es.*
> *nam in mala uxore atque inimico si quid sumas, sumptus est,*
> *in bono hospite atque amico quaestus est quod sumitur* (Plaut., *Mil*. 669-674).

Pero las respuestas son múltiples y su variación responde a distintas causas.

Así pues, utilizando como marco teórico prioritario el propuesto por Brown & Levinson (1987) y partiendo de algunos trabajos sobre esos mismos fenómenos en las lenguas modernas (Fischbachera & Utikalc 2013; Schneider 2005; Rüegg 2014), se plantean los siguientes objetivos: (1) determinar tanto las posibilidades de expresión a disposición de un hablante latino en el corte sincrónico elegido y su mayor o menor grado de formalidad y fijación; y (2) establecer cuáles son los pares de adyacencia preferentes y no preferentes para cada uno de esos actos de habla. En los casos en los que sea posible, se intentará igualmente realizar algunas inferencias de tipo sociolingüístico.

Referencias

Brown, Penelope & Stephen C. Levinson, 1987, *Politeness. Some universals in language usage*, Cambridge, CUP.

Fischbachera, Urs & Verena utikalc, 2013, On the acceptance of apologies, *Games and Economic Behavior* 82, 592-608

Kruschwitz, Peter & Alicia Clary-Venables, 2013, How to apologise in Latin: a case study, in T. J. Moore & W. Polleichtner (eds.), *Form und Bedeutung im lateinischen Drama / Form and meaning in Latin drama*, Trier, WVT, 53-86.

Rüegg, Larssyn, 2014, Thanks responses in three socio-economic settings: A variational pragmatics approach», *Journal of Pragmatics* 71, 17-30.

Schneider, Klaus P., 2005, No problem, you're welcome, anytime: responding to thanks in Ireland, England, and the USA, in A. Barron & K.P. Schneider (eds.), *The Pragmatics of Irish English*, Berlín-Nueva York, Mouton de Gruyter, 101-139.

Unceta Gómez, Luis, 2010, La expresión del agradecimiento en la comedia latina, in P. Anreiter & M. Kienpointner (eds.), *Latin linguistics today. Akten des 15. internationalen Kolloquiums zur lateinischen Linguistik*, Innsbruck, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 625-637.

–– 2014a, La politesse linguistique en latin: Bilan d'une étude en cours, *Dictionnaire Historique et Encyclopédie Linguistique du Latin*, Paris-Sorbonne: <http://www.linglat.paris-sorbonne.fr/encyclopedie_linguistique:notions_linguistiques:syntaxe:formules_de_politesse>.

–– 2014b, Pedir perdón en latín. El acto de habla de la disculpa en las obras de Plauto y Terencio, *Emerita* 82/1, 69-97.

Narrative Negation: the combination of historic present and negation in historiography

Lidewij VAN GILS
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

Linguistic features of narrative discourse like tenses, particles, word order and anaphoric references, have been studied within the field of pragmatics (among others Pinkster 1983; Kroon 1995; Bolkestein 2001; Adema 2008; Spevak 2010). Within this pragmatic framework, I have examined a linguistic feature of argumentative discourse in typically narrative contexts: negation. A first review (Van Gils, in prep.) of negations in Cicero and Vergil revealed five typically narrative functions of negation. In this paper, this line of research is further pursued by analyzing the use of negated *praesentia historica* by Livy and Tacitus. The historic present is generally defined as a typically narrative tense, albeit with a variety of uses (Adam 1998; Pinkster 1998; Kroon 2007; Adema 2008; Kroon 2010; Viti 2010). The results of this investigation underscore the idea that a narrative is characterized not only by the representation of a chain of events involving a disruption and the experience of what it's like by the human(-like) participants of the story world, but also by the specific discourse context the narrative is situated in (Herman 2009). Negation may refer to this discourse context, which includes all kinds of common ground shared by the author and the addressee, concerning genre conventions, social distance between author and addressee, and knowledge of the world. With this paper, I show the possibility of intrusion of the discourse context in the story world by means of negation.

References

Adema, Suzanne Maria. 2008. *Discourse modes and bases : a study of the use of tenses in Vergil's Aeneid.* Diss. VU Amsterdam.
Bolkestein, A.M. 2001. Discourse Organization and Anaphora in Latin. In: S.C. Herring, P. van Reenen & L. Schoesler (eds), *Textual Parameters in Older Languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins
Van Gils, L.W. in prep. Common ground in Latin Discourse: two case studies of narrative negation in Cicero and Vergil. (Presented at the International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics in Rome 2013).
Herman, D. 2009. *Basic Elements of Narrative.* Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
Kroon, C.H.M. 1995. *Discourse particles in Latin. A study of nam, enim, autem, vero and at*. Amsterdam: Gieben.
–– 2007. Discourse modes and the use of tenses in Ovid's Metamorphoses. In R.J. Allan & M. Buijs (eds.), *The Language of Literature. Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts*. Leiden: Brill, 65-92.
–– in prep. Narrating the Unnarratable: Narrative Structure in the Pisonian Conspiracy (Tacitus Annals 15.47-74)
Lasagna, Mauro, Anna Orlandini & Paolo Poccetti (eds) 2012: *Intorno alla negazione: analisi di contesti negativi, dalle lingue classiche al romanzo. Atti della giornata di studi, Roma, 26 febbraio 2009*, Linguarum Varietas: An International Journal, 1.
Orlandini, Anna. 1994. *Grammaire fondamentale du latin*, eds G. Serbat, S. Mellet, M.D. Joffre, M. Lavency, C. Kircher-Durand, A. Orlandini & C. Bodelot, Louvain.
Pinkster, H. 1983. Introduction. In: H. Pinkster (ed.), *Latin Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
–– 1999. The present tense in Virgil's Aeneid. In: *Mnemosyne*. Leiden.
Spevak, O. 2010. *Constituent Order in Classical Latin Prose. Studies in Language Companion Series (SLCS) 117.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

L'intensification de l'adjectif en latin : le cas des préfixes *per-* et *prae-*

Sophie VAN LAER
Université de Nantes

L'intensité, appelée également 'haut degré' ou 'intensification', reste une notion linguistique difficile à définir, notamment du fait des liens qu'elle entretient avec la quantification et avec la scalarité (sans pour autant pouvoir s'y réduire : cf Anscombre et Tamba, 2013 : 4).

Les adjectifs, « encodeurs naturels des qualités » (Bertocchi et Maraldi, 2012 : 1), se prêtent à une étude en termes de scalarité (ou de gradation). Mais envisager leurs degrés dans la perspective de l'intensité semble permettre, en en adoptant une autre représentation que celle de l'échelle, de s'attacher au rapport entre haut degré et catégorisation prototypique (à travers un représentant de la qualité envisagé comme le meilleur exemplaire).

L'étude se limitera au degré de l'adjectif que l'on appelle traditionnellement le 'superlatif absolu'. Plusieurs formations coexistent en latin : utilisation d'un suffixe spécifique, préfixation (*per-* ou *prae-*) ou encore formation analytique avec un adverbe :

> *uolumina numerosiora* ***percopiosis*** *scaturrientia sermocinationibus* (Sidon. *ep*. 1,1,4) / ***copiosissimum*** *fructum nostri laboris adipiscimur*. (Sidon. *ep.* 2,10,1)
> *Statim ergo coepimus ire cum eo pedibus totum per uallem* ***amoenissimam****, donec perueniremus usque ad hortum pomarium* ***ualde amoenum*** (*Itin. Eg.* 1,15,2)

En prenant notamment appui sur la structuration du domaine notionnel telle qu'elle est définie par A. Culioli (deux modes de centrage : 'type' et 'attracteur', constitution d'un 'gradient' : 1991 : 54-61 ; 1999 : 11-13 ; 86-87), il s'agira de mieux cerner le mécanisme sémantico-logique qui permet d'exprimer le haut degré dans les formations synthétiques préfixées. Il conviendra alors de s'interroger sur la coexistence de ces différentes formations et sur leur distribution. L'étude, prenant aussi en compte des facteurs discursifs, se fera sur corpus.

Références

Anscombre J.-C. et Tamba I. 2013, Autour du concept d'intensification, *Langue française* 177, 3-8.
Bertocchi A. et Maraldi M. 2012, La scalarité : application à certains phénomènes de la langue latine, *Lingua latina* 8, revue en ligne.

Culioli A. 1991, *Pour une linguistique de l'énonciation*, tome 1, Gap / Paris, Ophrys.
–– 1999, *Pour une linguistique de l'énonciation*, tome 3, Gap / Paris, Ophrys.

Latin reflexive pronouns on the crossroads of syntax and pragmatics

Elena ZHELTOVA
St. Petersburg State University

Some uses of Latin reflexive pronouns (*se* and *suus*) cannot be explained from the purely syntactic point of view. According to the syntactic rules, the reflexive pronoun can refer to the subject of the clause in which it occurs (the direct reflexive), or to the subject of the matrix clause in reported speech and other types of subordination (the indirect reflexive) [Riemann 1935: 24-25; Blatt 1952: 138; Ernout, Thomas 1953: 182-183; Hofmann, Szantyr 1965: 174], but in fact, the antecedent of Latin reflexive does not need to be a grammatical subject at all. It can instead be a direct object, an indirect object or a prepositional phrase. This use of Latin reflexives can be explained more satisfactorily if they are analyzed from pragmatic, rather than syntactic point of view: the reflexive pronouns *se* and *suus* can refer to the topic of the clause in which they occur, or to the topic of discourse (macrotopic) in cases of subordination, independently of their syntactic realization [Puddu 2007: 95].

The second problem to be explained is the confusion of personal and reflexive pronouns in syntactically similar conditions: in some cases, the personal pronoun is used instead of reflexive even if the reference is made to the term with topic function. Presumably, these uses depend on the pragmatic function of empathy, or, more precisely, the focus of empathy, which has different manifestations in languages. It can determine the choice of a verb predicate in Japanese [Kuno, Kaburaki 1977: 630], or the choice of pronouns in Russian and English [Падучева 1985: 207; Тестелец 2001: 464]. It is the focus of empathy, to my mind, that influences the alternation of Latin personal /reflexive pronouns in syntactically similar conditions: if the focus of empathy is on the referent with topic function, the reflexive is used, on the contrary, if the focus of empathy is on the non-topic referent, the personal pronoun is used.

This method combining syntactic and pragmatic dimensions, allows us to formulate the exhaustive rules of Latin reflexive: it can be used if the topic of the clause and the focus of empathy are not in conflict, i.e. when
1) the topic of the clause and the focus of empathy coincide, or
2) the focus of empathy is zero.

References

Blatt F. 1952, *Précis de syntax latine*. Lyon.
Ernout A., Thomas F. 1953, *Syntax latine*. Paris.
Hofmann, Szantyr 1965, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. München.
Kuno S., Kaburaki E. 1977, Empathy and Syntax, *Linguistic Inquiry* 8, 4, 627- 672.
Падучева Е.В. [Paducheva E.V.] 1985, Высказывание и его соотнесенность с действительностью [Utterance and its correspondence to reality]. Moscow.
Puddu N. 2007, Reconstructing reflexive markers in Indo-European: evidence from Greek and Latin, Greek and Latin from Indo-European Perspective, *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, Suppl. vol.32., p. 89-100.
Riemann O. 1935, *Syntax latine*. Paris.
Тестелец Я.Г. [Testelets Ya. G.] 2001, Введение в общий синтаксис [Introduction to general syntax]. Moscow.