

19th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics

Munich

24th-28th April 2017

The *19th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics* has been sponsored by



Bayerische
Akademie der Wissenschaften

Bavarian Academy of Sciences and
Humanities



Deutsche
Forschungsgemeinschaft

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft

GS DW



Graduate School
Distant Worlds

Graduate School Distant Worlds, Munich



UNIVERSITEIT VAN AMSTERDAM

University of Amsterdam: Amsterdam School
of Historical Studies & Amsterdam Centre for
Language and Communication

The *19th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics* is organised under the auspices of the *International Committee on Latin Linguistics*, whose members are

- Gualtiero Calboli (Università degli Studi di Bologna)
- Michèle Fruyt (Université de Paris IV-Sorbonne)
- Benjamin García Hernández (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid)
- Gerd Haverling (Uppsala Universitet)
- Manfred Kienpointner (Universität Innsbruck)
- Caroline Kroon (Universiteit van Amsterdam)
- Dominique Longrée (Université de Liège et Université Saint-Louis-Bruxelles)
- Paolo Pocetti (Università di Roma Tor Vergata)
- Hannah Rosén (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
- Olga Spevak (Mirail – Université de Toulouse)

The organising committee consists of

Bavarian Academy of Sciences and Humanities/ Thesaurus linguae Latinae:

- Manfred Flieger
- Nigel Holmes
- Marijke Ottink
- Josine Schrickx
- Maria Selig

University of Amsterdam:

- Suzanne Adema
- Lidewij van Gils
- Caroline Kroon
- Rodie Risselada

Content

General Abstracts in alphabetical order according to authorp. 9

Abstracts Workshop ‘Linguistics and Latin Learning’p. 148

List of Participantsp. 160

The Problem of the Omission of Word Final -s as Evidenced in the Inscriptions of the Imperial Period

Béla Adamik

Eötvös Loránd University

It was exactly thirty years ago that József Herman published the findings of his investigation of the omission of word final -s in imperial inscriptions. He concluded that the relevant omissions can be explained by morphosyntactic changes rather than by purely phonetic developments. He argued that the frequency of such omissions is much lower than expected based on cases where a phonetic development lies behind a misspelling (e.g. in the case of the merger of *b* and *v*, or the loss of word final -*m*). He also drew attention to the high frequency of omissions in the nominative of -*us* nouns and names in African curse tablets from Hadrumetum (from the second and/or third century), where -*u* nominatives (after the omission of -*s*) seem to have become interchangeable with -*u* accusatives (after the omission of -*m*) (e.g. *Latrone, Vagulu cadant* < *Latro, Vagulus cadant* ~ *Latronem Vagulum cadant*). This morphosyntactic explanation of Herman (1987=2006: 41) placed this phenomenon at the beginning of the development which, starting by this functional extension of the accusative to the nominative, might have led to the accusative becoming the base form or default case of nouns in African Latin (contrary to the situation of Gallo-Romance, which retained the nominative -*s*). Herman's explanation has been received favourably by Adams (2013: 143) as follows: "There may be something in this idea".

Our paper intends to reconsider Herman's morphosyntactic explanation in the light of inscriptional data of regions other than Latin Africa. Herman suggested that the (linguistically relevant) omission of the word final -*s* in inscriptions recorded from other regions of the Empire may be explained by the same morphosyntactic oscillation as in the case of the African curse tablets from Hadrumetum. According to our preliminary investigation, however, relevant items with the omission of the word final -*s* after -*u* recorded from regions other than Latin Africa are hard to be explained by morphosyntactic factors, or at least by a functional extension of the accusative to the nominative, since in the relevant inscriptions confusions between the nominative and the accusative (e.g. LLDB-43687: HIC REQVI|ISCIT ALBINVM EPISCOPVM = *hic requiescit Albinus episcopus* or LLDB-46856: P SIGERIVS = *per Sigerium*) are extremely rare as compared to the massive attestation of confusions between the accusative and the ablative (e.g. LLDB-8547: PER VALERIO = *per Valerium* or LLDB-1235 EX VOTVM = *ex voto*).

This situation compels us to reconsider all items of the omission of -*s*, especially those after a -*u*, recorded to date in the LLDB Database, and analyse them not only according to their territorial and chronological distribution, but also their phonetic context, and reintroduce the phonetic and/or phonosyntactic approach alongside or instead of the morphosyntactic one. This might help account for those cases where extralinguistic factors cannot explain the omission of word final -*s*.

Bibliography:

- Adams, J. N. (2013), *Social variation and the Latin language*. Cambridge.
- Herman, J. (1987=2006), La disparition de -s et la morphologie dialectale du latin parlé. In: J. Herman, *Du latin aux langues Romanes II. Nouvelles études de linguistique historique* (réun. S. Kiss). Tübingen 2006, 333-42.
- LLDB = Computerized Historical Linguistic Database of Latin Inscriptions of the Imperial Age (<http://lldb.elte.hu/>)

From Greek to Latin: Language Shift in Ancient Rome

Tommi Alho

Åbo Akademi University

Angela Bartens

University of Turku

In this paper we examine the transfer of inflectional morphology from Greek to Latin. In Latin inscriptions in general and mainly in female names of the first declension in particular, several inflectional morphemes occur which deviate from the classical standard: 1) genitive singular in *-(a)es, -enis, -etis* (e.g. *IPO A 43 Axiaes...suaes, CIL VI 9576 Philiaes Callistenis, ICUR 3559 Irenetis*); 2) dative singular in *-e, -eni, -eti* (e.g. *IPO A.5 Mariae Deutere, IPO A 225 Septimiae Tycheni, ICUR 15353 Hermioneti*); and nominative singular in *-iane* (e.g. *IPO A 214 Aelia Saluiane*). Our data consist of several Roman inscriptions from the first three centuries AD, drawing special attention to two coherent groups of inscriptions, namely the funeral inscriptions from l'Isola Sacra, and Roman brick stamps. As previously argued (e.g. Adams: 2003: 473-491, Alho & Leppänen: in press), the transferred morphemes reflect the language use of the Greco-Latin communities of Rome.

However, we wish to argue that such a transfer of inflectional morphology must have involved language shift from Greek to Latin. Our approach is based on the contact-linguistic framework proposed by Van Coetsem (1988, 2000). He defines *transfer* as any kind of cross-linguistic influence. In all cases of transfer there is a source language (SL = Greek) and a recipient language (RL = Latin), and the direction of transfer is always from the SL to the RL. The agent of the transfer is either the SL speaker (SL agentivity) or the RL speaker (RL agentivity). If a Latin speaker, for instance, uses Greek while speaking Latin, we have RL agentivity, or *borrowing*. If, on the other hand, a Greek speaker uses Greek while speaking Latin, we have SL agentivity, or *imposition*. The distinction between borrowing and imposition is, essentially, based on the concept of linguistic dominance, i.e. proficiency but potentially also sociolinguistic relations in the sense of diglossia.

Even though borrowing of morphology (in the above sense) is not totally uncommon (see e.g. Matras & Sekel 2007, Gardani 2008, Meakins 2011), imposition of morphology, on the other hand, seems to remain a rare phenomenon. In fact, it is only attested, as far as we know of, in situations of language shift (for some examples, see Thomason 2001: 111-113; 147-148). We wish to argue that due to imperfect language learning the learners of L2 (Latin) had, in the first instance, retained an element (an

inflectional morpheme) of their linguistically dominant language L1 (Greek) in speaking L2. Through first-language acquisition such an element was then reanalysed as part of the inflectional paradigm, being subsequently generalized in the Greco-Latin linguistic community (cf. Andersen 2003: 6).

References

- Adams, J. N. (2003). *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge.
- Alho, T. & Leppänen, V. (in press). 'On Roman brick stamps and the Latin -(a)es genitive', *Pallas - Revue d'études antiques*.
- Andersen, H. (2003). 'Introduction' in H. Andersen (ed.), *Language Contacts in Prehistory: Studies in Stratigraphy*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia: 1-10.
- Gardani, F. (2008). *Borrowing of Inflectional Morphemes in language Contact*. Frankfurt.
- Matras, Y. & Sakel, J. (2007). *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin.
- Meakins, F. (2011). *Case-Marking in Contact: The development and function of case morphology in Gurindji Kriol*.
- Thomason, S. G. (2001). *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Edinburgh.
- Van Coetsem, F. (1988). *Loan Phonology and the Two Transfer Types in Language Contact*, Dordrecht.
- Van Coetsem, F. (2000). *A General and Unified Theory of the Transmission Process in Language Contact*, Heidelberg.

Timeo y metuo: sintaxis y semántica

Olga Álvarez Huerta

Universidad de Oviedo

Este trabajo pretende establecer las posibles diferencias semánticas entre dos verbos con una frecuencia de uso muy semejante, y que en ocasiones parecen comportarse como meros sinónimos, según muestran los textos de (1):

(1a) *intercessorem dictaturae si iuuerit manu et praesidio suo, Pompeium metuit inimicum; si non iuuerit, timet ne per uim perferatur* ("si ayuda al opositor a la dictadura con su guardia, teme a Pompeyo como enemigo; si no lo ayuda, teme ser llevado a ello por la fuerza", Cic. *ad Q. fr.* 3,6,6)

(1b) *illum quo ante confidebant metuunt, hunc amant quem timebant* ("temen a aquél en quien antes confiaban, y aman al que antes temían", Cic. *Att.* 8,13,2)

En el estudio se seguirá el método propuesto por Levin (2009) para establecer el significado de un verbo. En primer lugar, se realizará un estudio sintáctico (Pinkster, 2015), en la idea de que 'a verb's meaning appears to determine its arguments realization options'. En segundo lugar, se identificarán los componentes del significado, que no siempre se manifiestan en la estructura sintáctica, sino en el léxico de los argumentos. Para ello seguiremos fundamentalmente el trabajo de tipo cognitivo de Wierbizcka (1988) sobre los verbos de temor en inglés.

En las lenguas es frecuente que los verbos de temor expresen contenidos que no se corresponden con un sentimiento o emoción incontrolada, sino que refieren un pensamiento, una evaluación intencional (Kitis, 2009), esto es, expresan una modalidad epistémica. Veremos si *metuo* y *timeo* tienen estos usos y las posibles diferencias entre ellos.

Referencias

- Kitis, E. (2009), "Emotions as discursive constructs: the case of the psych-verb 'fear'", en Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk & Katarzyna Dziwirek (eds). *Studies in Cognitive Corpus Linguistics*. Frankfurt/Main, Peter Lang, 147-172.
- Levin, B. (2009), "Lexical Semantics of Verbs I: Introduction and Role-centered Approaches to Lexical Semantic Representation", <http://web.stanford.edu/~bclevin/lisa07intro.pdf>.
- Pinkster, H. (2015), *The Oxford Latin Syntax, Volume I, The Simple Clause*, Oxford, University Press.

Análisis y causas de la diversidad semántica y lexicológica del adjetivo latino *uiridis*

María Carmen Arias Abellán

Universidad de Sevilla

El objetivo de mi comunicación es la indagación de las causas que subyacen a la diversidad de acepciones significativas en el adjetivo *uiridis*, cuestión que abordo siguiendo los principios teóricos y metodológicos de la semántica estructural y que se inserta, lógicamente, en el campo de la Filología y Lingüística Latinas.

Esta concepción relacional (saussureana), ha sido aplicada muy raramente al léxico y desde luego no ha sido aplicada al campo léxico de los adjetivos de color latinos ya que con anterioridad a mis trabajos sobre este léxico (véase bibliografía), el sector cromático había sido investigado en la obra de J. André (cf. bibliografía), pero este autor lo analizó desde el punto de vista "historicista", de modo que la posición de mi comunicación es la de ser la primera investigación que aborda este tema estructuralmente, siendo totalmente novedosa y no existiendo otras publicaciones sobre la cuestión concernida.

Sabemos que el significado más predominante de *uiridis*, el cromático, se da básicamente cuando el adjetivo determina a la naturaleza vegetal (su campo de mayor frecuencia: "la langue paysanne" "la langue "rustique" que nos recuerda la filología francesa¹) –donde se asocia al frescor y vigor de la misma–, mientras que el señalamiento de estados "no cromáticos" se corresponde, por el contrario, con la calificación a sustantivos indicadores de otros ámbitos y ciclos (cf. por ejemplo el "estado sereno del cielo" (*uiridi caelo*)).

Partiendo de un análisis exhaustivo –filológico y lingüístico– del corpus de los agrónomos, donde predomina el significado cromático, me propongo, pues:

- a) perfilar las causas del surgimiento de los significados "no cromáticos" de *uiridis*;
- b) describir dichos significados no cromáticos;
- c) aclarar los mecanismos del deslizamiento, a través de estos significados no cromáticos, a otras esferas semánticas (igualmente no cromáticas);
- d) realizar, por tanto, una delimitación completa de todas las acepciones de *uiridis*.

¹ Cf. André 1949, p. 186; Ernout-Meillet 1994, s.u.: "emploi fréquent dans la langue rustique".

El análisis detenido de los datos aportados por los textos propuestos, nos ofrece como resultado captar el cuadro significativo completo de nuestro adjetivo, y, lo que es más importante, captar las causas y relaciones subyacentes que han originado dicho cuadro significativo.

Esta investigación de las “relaciones y causas” de todas las acepciones de *uiridis* – y este es también otro de los resultados de mi análisis– viene a suplir las descripciones –normalmente meramente “enumerativas”– legibles en los diccionarios.

Bibliografía

- ANDRÉ J. 1949, *Étude sur les termes de couleur dans la langue latine*, París.
ARIAS ABELLÁN C. 1994, *Estructura semántica de los adjetivos de color en los tratadistas latinos de Agricultura y parte de la enciclopedia de Plinio*, Sevilla.
ARIAS, C., *Peruiridis*, *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, X,1, fasc. XII, Leipzig, 2000, col. 1877.
LEUMANN, M. -HOFMANN, J. B.- SZANTYR, A., “Lexikographie, Etymologie, Wortforschung”, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, München, 1972, 67*.
THESAURVS Linguae latinae (editus iussu et auctoritate consilii ab academiis societatibusque diversarum nationum electi), Leipzig, 1900 ss.

Politeness Strategies in the Opening of the Roman Comedy Dialogue

Lukasz Berger

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznan (Poland) & Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (Spain)

The framework of the Conversational Analysis suggests that every dialogue is being shaped (both locally and globally) by its participants (see Monserrat Roig 2015: 136-141). The aim of this paper is to investigate the most ritualistic part of the dialogue, the opening sequence, in Plautus and Terence in the light of linguistic politeness theory. By following Laver (1981: 290), it is assumed that “maximum routine reflects highest risk” for the interactional self of the interlocutors. Hence, the initial phase of the conversation is an important context for politeness strategies (e.g. in opening up the dialogue or introduction of the first topic slot) which help the interlocutors to structure the on-going interaction.

The opening sequence in Roman comedy was tentatively studied by Hoffmann (1983) and Letessier (2000). The most interest of the scholars, however, was put in the greeting formulae (Forberg 1913, Echols 1950, Poccetti 2010, Torrego 2013). The main focus here is to analyse the Plautine and Terentian *salutatio* scenes (of 26 best transmitted comedies) applying the recent developments in the politeness theory, as advanced by Watts (2003) and adapted for Latin and Roman comedy by Ferri (2009) and Unceta Gómez (2016).

Accordingly, it is stated that the greeting ritual is an example of political behaviour (Watts 2003: 21), appropriate for the dialogue opening and expected from both participants (cf. Plaut. *Pseud.* 967-968: SIMI. *Heus tu, [...] responde quod rogo.* /BAL. *Eho, an non prius salutas?*). There are, nevertheless, instances of *salutatio* that go beyond what is perceived as conventional and necessary (cf. Plaut. *Aul.* 114-115: EUC. [...])

me benignius / omnes salutant quam salutabant prius), which, thus, are opened for either polite or impolite interpretation.

The present paper will elaborate on the types of greeting scenes (intimate, formal, casual, ceremonious, etc.) and the linguistic tokens conventionally ascribed to them in order to trace the distinction between the non salient linguistic ritual, on one hand, and some strategic use of the (im)politeness phenomenon, on the other.

References

- Echols, E. C. (1950), "The Quid-Greeting in Plautus and Terence." *Classical Journal*, 45.4, pp. 188–190.
- Ferri, R. (2009), "Politeness in Latin Comedy. Some Preliminary Thoughts", *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, 61, pp. 15- 28.
- Forberg, M. (1913), *De salutandi formulis Plautinis et Terentianis*. Thomas et Jubert.
- Hoffmann, Maria, E. (1983), "Conversation Openings in the Comedies of Plautus", In. H. Pinkster (ed.), *Latin Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, Amsterdam 1983, pp. 217- 226.
- Laver, J. (1981), "Linguistic routines and politeness in greeting and parting" In. F. Coulmas (ed.) (1981), *Conversational routine*, The Hague: Mouton. pp. 289-304
- Letessier, P. (2000), "La salutation chez Plaute. Adaptation ludique d'un rituel social", *Lalies*, 20, pp. 151-163.
- Montserrat Roig, C. (2015): "Otras perspectivas para el análisis lingüístico de Plauto: los vocativos insultantes en la reacción conversacional", *Minerva: Revista de filología clásica*, 28, pp. 133-161.
- Poccetti, P. (2010), "Greeting and farewell expressions as evidence for colloquial language: between literary and epigraphical texts", In. E. Dickey, A. Chahoud (ed.) (2010), *Colloquial and Literary Latin*, Cambridge, pp. 100-126.
- Torrego Salcedo, M. E. (2013), "Iubeo salvere: una forma de saludo con directivo léxico", In. J. A. Beltrán et al. (ed.), *Otium cum dignitate*, Zaragoza, pp. 173-84.
- Unceta Gómez, L. (2016), "Conceptualization of Linguistic Politeness in Latin: the Emic Perspective", paper given during the *Historical Politeness Symposium*, University of East Anglia, June 2016, (in press).
- Watts, R. J. (2003), *Politeness*. Cambridge.

Towards a Morpho-Syntactic Analysis of *-īscō* and *-āscō* Verbs

Davide Bertocci

University of Padua

Francesco Pinzin

Università Ca' Foscari - Venezia

The target of the paper is a number of verbal forms in *-īscō/-āscō* which seem innovative with respect to diachrony (Weiss 2009:407, Leumann 1977:535ff), but also challenge synchronic analysis of Latin morphology. In particular our goal is to explain the reasons triggering the selection of *-ī-* and/or *-ā-* with the morph *-sc-*, considered as inchoative.

Keeping apart the most ancient verbs where *-sc-* is directly inherited (cf. *gnōscō*), it forms three classes, *-āscō*, *-ēscō* and *-īscō*, according to the stem it applies to, for instance:

- *amāscō, corporāscō, generāscō*
- *pacīscor, frūnīscor, cupīscō*
- *rubēscō, callēscō, albēscō*

Our goal is to discuss the morpho-syntactic properties related to these formations. Taking as a starting point the well-known inchoative meaning of the suffix *-sc-* (Havering 2000 a.o.), we will stress that:

- (a) some differences arise with respect to the underlying forms, which can be verbal roots (*amāscō, cupīscō*) as well as nouns/adjectives (*pacīscor, puerāscō*) or adjectives (*rubēscō*);
- (b) whereas the proto-typical semantics of *-ēscō* verbs is ‘to begin to have the property X_{Adj} ’, *-āscō* and *-īscō* are more complex: the former may mean ‘to begin to X_V ’ as well as ‘to act like X_N ’; the latter may mean ‘to make X_N ’ as well as ‘to begin to X_V ’ or have intensive values (*frūnīscor*).
- (c) unlike other actional affixes, which selects for roots (*cap-iō, iu-n-g-ō*) *-sc-* requires that the underlying elements are embedded in stems, marked by *-ā-/ē-/ī-*, not necessarily corresponding to any attested form (*pac-ī-scor, ap-ī-scor*);
- (d) the morpho-syntactic functions which *-ā-* and *-ī-* have in other verbal formations appear quite blurred when followed by *-sc-*.

In order to treat data, we will follow a constructivist model, according to which morphological processes are the reflex of syntactic principles (Cuervo 2015, Mateu 2012, Harley 2005 a.o.), and the morphological items involved in word formation are the better available candidates in order to spell out functional properties (Halle-Marantz 1993, Embick 2000, Embick 2010).

Our hypothesis is that *-sc-* patterns in Latin as a productive suffix, and that it is able to modify the argument structure of underlying verbal or nominal formations. In *-ēscō* verbs *-sc-* licenses a V_{GO}/V_{BE} configuration (Cuervo 2015), with a stative component represented by the morph *-ē-*. In *-āscō* and *-īscō* instead it seems to activate V_{GO} readings (simple inchoative, with underlying verbs, cf. *dormīscō, amāscō*), V_{DO} readings (activities, with nouns, *puerāscō* ‘to act like a kid’) and even operate at a higher syntactic level (intensive verbs).

This indicates that with *-āscō* and *-īscō* verbs a stative sub-component of the event is no longer required, that is, *-sc-* became more productive and it selected for bare stems, in which the long vowel markers can be thought as morphological fillers, that is like proper thematic vowels. This in turn may be relevant to focus on the productivity of *-ā-* and *-ī-* classes in the history of Latin.

References

- Cuervo, M.C., 2015. Causation without a cause. *Syntax* 18.4: 388-424.
- Embick, D., 2000. Features, syntax and categories in the Latin perfect, *Linguistic Inquiry* 31/2: 185-230.
- Halle, M., A. Marantz, 1993. Distributed Morphology and the pieces of inflection. In K. Hale - S.J. Keyser (eds.), *The view from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, 111-176. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Harley, H., 2005. How do verbs get their names? Denominal verbs, manner incorporation and the ontology of verbs in English. In N. Erteschik-Shir and T. Rapoport (eds.), *The Syntax*

- of aspect. *Deriving thematic and aspectual interpretation*, 42-63. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haverling, G., 2000. *On -sco Verbs, Prefixes and Semantic Functions*. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Leumann, M., 1977. *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*⁵. München: Beck.
- Mateu, J., 2012. Conflation and incorporation processes in resultative constructions. In D.V. Demonte and L. McNally (eds.), *Telicity, Change, and State: A Cross-Categorical View of Event Structure*, 252-278. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Weiss, M., 2009. *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor, MI: Beech Stave Press.

La forme des SN dans les énoncés génériques

Bernard Bortolussi

Université Paris Nanterre

La lecture générique d'un énoncé est liée à la forme des SN concernés : la désignation de l'espèce, en intention ou en extension, prend une forme spécifique (article défini, *bare nominals* au pluriel, etc.), au caractère plus ou moins permanent de la prédication (propriété stable), rendu explicite de différentes manières: emploi du présent, adverbes comme *toujours*, etc.

L'étude des énoncés génériques en latin se heurte à l'absence d'article. On sait en effet que les langues à article utilisent l'article pour discriminer, au moins partiellement, SN particulier et SN générique :

Beavers build dams (énoncé générique) vs. ***The beavers you see built these dams*** (énoncé particulier)

En latin, un même SN peut avoir aussi bien une lecture particulière, définie ou indéfinie, qu'une lecture générique, et ce aussi bien au singulier qu'au pluriel. En conséquence c'est la forme des prédicats qui a surtout fait l'objet de recherches (Orlandini 1990, Casadio & Orlandini 1991).

La présente étude est centrée sur la forme des SN et sur les stratégies développées en latin pour exprimer la généricité.

- traits morphologiques sans réalisation lexicale : *si in ius uocat, ito; ni it, antestamino* (*Leg. XII tab.* 1,1)
- noms nus (Bortolussi 2016) : *auarus damno potius quam sapiens dolet*. (Publ. Syr.)
- relatives substantives, avec éventuel antécédent postiche : *cui testimonium defuerit, is tertiis diebus ob portum obuagulum ito* (*Leg. XII tab.* 2,1)
- *si quis* P, exprimant a quantification universelle : *Si qui in iure manum conserunt*. (*Leg. XII tab.* 6 S.25 Bruns = Gell. 20,10,8)

Ces stratégies visent soit à définir l'espèce en compréhension (liste des propriétés définitoires de l'espèce), soit en extension (quantification universelle de l'ensemble de l'espèce).

L'étude combine donc une approche de type sémantico-référentiel et une approche syntaxique concernant la forme du SN ou de son substitut.

Elle sera menée à partir de 3 corpus d'époques différentes: un échantillon des *leges regiae* et des *senatus consulta*, les *sententiae* de Publius Syrus et le livre des *Proverbes* dans la Vulgate de Jérôme.

Références

- Bortolussi, B. 2010, « *si quis* », in P. Anreiter, M. Kienpointner (éds) *Latin linguistics today. Akten des 15. Internationalen Kolloquiums zur Lateinischen Linguistik, Innsbruck, 4.–9. April 2009*, Innsbrücker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 217-228.
- Bortolussi, B., 2016, « Existe-t-il des noms nus en latin ? ». In O. Spevak (éd.) *Etudes de linguistique latine*, Pallas, 102, 15-24.
- Calboli, G. 2006, « L'emploi de la proposition relative dans les textes juridiques latins », in J.-P. Brachet et C. Moussy (éds) *Latin et langues techniques*, Paris, Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 233-250.
- Casadio, C., Orlandini, A., 1991. « On the interpretation of generic statements in Latin », in Coleman (éd.) *New Studies in Latin Linguistics: Selected Papers from the 4th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*, 349-365.
- Delfitto, D., 2002. *Genericity in Language. Issues of Syntax, Logical Form and Interpretation*. Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Dobrovie-Sorin (éd.) 2005. *Généricité et détermination nominale*, PUV, Saint-Denis.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 2006. Généricité. In D. Godard, L. Roussarie et F. Corblin (éd.), *Sémanticopédie: dictionnaire de sémantique*, GDR Sémantique & Modélisation, CNRS, <http://www.semantique-gdr.net/dico/>.
- de Swart, H. et D. Farkas 2005, « Groupes nominaux génériques définis et indéfinis », in Dobrovie-Sorin (2005).

Cicero vs. Mark Antony: Identity Construction and Outgroup Formation in *Philippics I and III*

Merlijn Breunese

Friedrich Schiller University Jena

This study tries to establish the starting point of the conflict between Cicero and Mark Antony, which was sparked by the orator's performance of the *Philippics* and ended with his death in 43 BCE. Taking a Social Constructionist approach to identity, it analyses the linguistic construction of identity in *Philippics I and III* along the three dimensions mentioned in Bamberg (2011)—sameness/difference, agency, and diachronic identity navigation. Through a qualitative analysis of the linguistic phenomena that contribute to identity construction and outgroup formation in these speeches, it argues that the conflict between Cicero and Antony started with *Philippic III*.

The starting point of Cicero's conflict with Antony has been the subject of much debate and modern scholars, either investigating the complete speeches (Ramsey (2003); Manuwald (2007)), or primarily concerned with the conflict itself (Usher (2010)), have expressed convincing arguments in favour of either of the two speeches as the conflict's beginning. However, since their arguments are based on Cicero's intent with and Antony's interpretation of the speeches, the content of the speeches, and

the political climate of 44–43 BCE Rome, their conclusions are necessarily partially based on their own interpretation of the texts. This study, on the other hand, investigates the objective issues of, amongst other things, agency expression, footing shifts, person reference, and dissociating and contrasting demonstratives to show that Cicero actively avoids presenting Antony as an enemy of the senate in *Philippic I*, but that he changes his course drastically in *Philippic III* to convince his audience of Antony's threat to the Republic.

Apart from offering a solution to the ongoing debate mentioned before, this study also shows that insights from Membership Categorization Analysis, Conversation Analysis, and Critical Discourse Analysis can easily be applied to old material, despite the fact that these approaches are concerned with different kinds of data (cf. Jucker (2008)). In this way, the audience will be made aware of the benefits of pragmatic research in this particular case and in our field in general. Further research is necessary to determine whether there are differences to be found regarding ingroup and outgroup formation between Cicero's senate speeches and those speeches that he performed in front of the Roman people. Moreover, an analysis of other ancient texts of the same genre, such as the *Philippics* of Demosthenes, might give us a better understanding of the linguistic aspects of these speeches, and of the genre of political speech in general.

References

- Bamberg, M., 2011, 'Who am I? Narration and its contribution to self and identity', *Theory and Psychology* 21(1), 3–24.
- Jucker, A., 2008, 'Historical pragmatics', *Language and Linguistics Compass* 2(5), 894–906.
- Manuwald, G., 2007, *Cicero, Philippics 3–9*, 2 vols., De Gruyter, Berlin.
- Ramsey, J., 2003, *Cicero: Philippics I–II*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Usher, S., 2010, 'Cicero's *First Philippic* and the fall of the Republic', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 53(1), 129–136.

-sc- Latin Verbs and Derivation. A Large-scale Exploration and Formal Analysis

Marco Budassi

University of Pavia

Marco Passarotti

Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, Milano

In Latin, -sc-verbs are traditionally considered dynamic/intransitive counterparts of stative/transitive base verb forms (e.g. *dormisco*, dynamic < *dormio*, stative). Actually, by focussing on prefixation, Haverling (2000) demonstrated that such verbs hold more complicated aspectual and actional functions. For instance, *aresco* is a dynamic atelic verb form. The prefixed verbs *inaresco* and *exaresco*, however, display an ingressive and a completive meaning respectively, stressing “the initial and the final phrase [...] of the situation” (Viti, 2015: 174).

The on-going project of compilation of a word formation based morphological dictionary of Latin (Litta and Passarotti, 2016) offers a suitable bedrock to go further in

the matter of -sc-verbs derivations. The dictionary aims at recording the word formation processes underlying the Latin lexicon, connecting Latin lexical items on the basis of word-formation rules (WFR) by employing computational linguistics methods.

As far as derivations of -sc-verbs from other lemmas are concerned, they have been inserted into the dictionary via seven WFR. Three of them are verb-to-verb (V-to-V) rules; accordingly, -sc-verbs are created by adding the suffix -sc- to base verbs (e.g. *amo* → *amasco*). Two rules build -sc-verbs from nouns (N-to-V; e.g. *puella* → *puellasco*). Two rules derive -sc-verbs from adjectives (A-to-V; e.g. *fortis* → *fortesco*).

In our talk, in the first place we aim at discussing a few methodological problems raised by such an approach. In the second place, we will focus on those derivations that have -sc-verbs in input (e.g. *irascor* > *irascibilis*). These derivations will be discussed in light of distribution of WFR in the whole Latin lexicon.

References

- 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.
- Litta, E. and Passarotti, M. 2016. Morphology beyond inflection. Building a wordformation based dictionary for Latin. In *Digital Humanities 2016: Conference Abstracts*. Kraków, Jagiellonian University & Pedagogical University: 612-614.
- Viti, C. 2015. The use of frequentative verbs in Early Latin. In G. Haverling (ed.) *Latin linguistics in the early 21st century: acts of the 16th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*. Uppsala, Uppsala Universitet: 170-182.

Praedicativum and Subject Complement: a Question Revisited

Concepción Cabrillana

University of Santiago de Compostela

The problematic distinction between the Praedicativum (*P*) and the Subject Complement (*SubjC*), especially when these elements appear in certain contexts, has been discussed on various occasions;¹ despite some progress, difficulties in the identification of each of these functions persist² in specific circumstances, such as with verbs susceptible to having copulative uses and, even more frequently, non-copulative uses.

This is the case with the predicate chosen to be the basis for the present study (*sto*), which in addition is not normally included in the traditional list of copulative verbs;³ thus, a further objective of research here will be to see the extent to which *sto*, in the contexts under analysis, behaves like other verbs which are unquestionably copulative in nature.

¹ Cf., e.g., Pfister (1973), Longrée (1989), Pinkster (1983, 1991, 1995: 181-210).

² Cf. Pinkster (2015: 176).

³ Cf. Kühner-Stegmann (1912, I: 15-19), where we find –in addition to *sum*– *fieri*, *nasci* - *renasci*, *exorior*, *existere*, *exstare*, *manere* - *permanere* - *remanere*, *uideri*, *apparere*, *euadere*. The passive forms of various types of verbs, such as *creor*, *existimor*, *habeor*, etc., are also mentioned.

Based on the conclusions of a previous study,¹ we will (i) review omissibility as a fundamental criterion in the distinction between P and SubjC, and (ii) propose and verify the relevance of a new aspect –constituent order– as a subsidiary criterion in the disambiguation between the two functions. For this, and among other means, we will compare the main sequences that appear in the structures of *sto* –both as P and potential SubjC– with those which show parallel constructions of *sum*, *fio*, *maneo* and *exsisto*.

The corpus used is that analyzed in the REGLA Database, where the number of examples of the verb under investigation here is 458x: Cato (*agr.*), Plaut. (*Amph.*, *Asin.*, *Aul.*, *Bacch.*, *Capt.*, *Cas.*, *Curc.*, *Epid.*), Caes. (*Gall.*), Sall. (*Cat.*, *Iug.*), Cic. (*Verr.*, *Catil.*, *S. Rosc.*, *Mil.*, *Mur.*, *Sest.*, *dom.*, *off.*), Ov. (*met.*), Liv. 1–10, Colum., Plin. (*paneg.*), Plin. (*Nat.*), Tac. (*ann.*), Sen. (*dial.* 6, 12; *epist.*), Petron.²

The results of the study will make it possible to shed some light on the restrictive mode and linguistic levels at which the test for omissibility would need to be tested, the possible gradual distinction between the two syntactic functions analysed –especially in certain contexts, and in the verb *sto* in particular– and the relevance of the criterion of constituent order to the task of differentiating the two structures. In addition, these findings may also allow for a strengthening of the proposal³ of *sto* as a verb in which, since classical times, the existence of a gradual process of copulativization is observed.

References

- REGLA Database (“Rección y Complementación en Griego y en Latín”):
<http://www.uam.es/proyectosinv/regula/index.html> .
- Cabrillana, Concepción (2010), “Praedicativum and Subject Complement”, in P. Anreiter & M. Kienpointner (eds.), *Latin Linguistics Today*, Innsbruck, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft: 233-245.
- Cabrillana, Concepción (forth.), “La exploración de concomitancias sintáctico-semánticas como vía de caracterización verbal en la lengua latina”, *Latomus*.
- Kühner, Raphael & Stegmann, Carl (1912-1914), *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache II Satzlehre* (2 vol.), Hannover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung.
- Longrée, Dominique (1989), “The syntactic function of the so-called praedicativum in classical Latin”, in M. Lavency & D. Longrée (eds.), *Actes du V^e Colloque de linguistique latine*, Louvain, Peeters: 245-256.
- Pfister, Raimund (1973), “Prädikationsbezogene Sprachbetrachtung im Lateinischen”, *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 31: 151-167.
- Pinkster, Harm (1983), “Praedicativum”, in H. Pinkster (ed.), *Latin Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, Amsterdam, Benjamins: 199-217.
- Pinkster, Harm (1991), “Le ‘Praedicativum’ ”, in C. Touratier (ed.), *Compléments prédictatifs et attributs du complément d’objet en Latin*, Aix-Marseille, Université de Provence: 72-78.
- Pinkster, Harm (1995), *Sintaxis y Semántica del latín*, Madrid, Ediciones Clásicas.
- Pinkster, Harm (2015), *Oxford Latin Syntax. I: The Simple Clause*, Oxford, OUP.

¹ Cabrillana (2010).

² In the case of *sto*, Lucretius has also been included.

³ Cf. Cabrillana (forth.).

***Iam* confirmativum**

Emilia Calaresu

Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia

Silvia Pieroni

Università per Stranieri di Siena

In its most straightforward use as a temporal adverb, *iam* indicates that a certain state of affairs takes place (or starts) at a different point, usually interpreted as earlier, than is somehow expected:

- (1) *Mne. Iam* imperatum in cera inest. (Plaut. *Amph.* 104)
“What’s been commanded is already in the wax.”
- (2) *Theo. Quin* sex menses *iam* hic nemo habitat. (Plaut. *Most.* 954)
“No, no one’s lived here for the last six months.”

As other temporal adverbs, *iam* may also function as a discourse marker, i.e. as a connector between discourse units:

- (3) *Statarius uterque miles, ordines servans; sed illa phalanx immobilis et unius generis, Romana acies distinctior, ex pluribus partibus constans, facilis partienti, quacumque opus esset, facilis iungenti. Iam* in opere quis par Romano miles [...]? (Liv. 9,19)
“Both armies were formed of heavy troops, keeping to their ranks; but their phalanx was immobile and consisted of soldiers of a single type; the Roman line was more open and comprised more separate units; it was easy to divide, wherever necessary, and easy to unite. Moreover, what soldier can match the Romans in entrenching [...]?”

In all these cases *iam* allegedly indicates a co-textual relation, not a deictic one; however, other uses are traditionally acknowledged where the co-textual relation – if there is any – can only be supposed to be implicit. These occurrences of *iam* are usually rendered in translations with ‘now, right now, soon’, when not neglected due to the difficulty of interpretation:

- (4) *Amph. Quid est? Quomodo? Iam* quidem hercle ego tibi istam scelestam, scelus, linguam apscidam. (Plaut. *Amph.* 555-556)
“What’s that? How so? I’ll cut out this villainous tongue of yours **this instant**, you villain.”
- (5) *Bro. Magis iam* faxo mira dices. (Plaut. *Amph.* 1107)
“I’ll make you call it stranger still.”

Without renouncing a unified account of the various uses of *iam*, as defended by Kroon & Risselada (1998), we would like to draw particular attention to cases such as (4) and (5) and analyse the specific discursive functions that *iam* fulfils in them.

Rosén (2009: 330, 360) identified a modal function of *iam* in passages such as *Ite iam* (Plaut. *Cas.* 834) “Go now” and suggested that an asseverative-reinforcing value, i.e. a modal one, may be detected in other specific cases. In harmony with this, we

would like to claim that *iam* in cases such as (4) and (5) acts as an asserting modalizer, thus revaluing a line of interpretation which may be also found in Hand (1836 [1969, 114]: [...] *ut iam affirmandae rei inserviat et significet rem fieri vel fore suo tempore certo*; cf. *TLL* s.v. *iam* [J.B. Hofmann], 105,19: *de sensu hic illic magis confirmativo quam temporali ponitur iam* [...] *ubi res dicuntur certo evenire*). Moreover, we wish to emphasize that this modal assertive value has a close similarity to that of some Romance outputs of *iam* (Bazzanella et al. 2005; Calaresu 2015). While many discourse functions described for the Romance descendants of *iam* are often considered innovations (cf. Squartini 2013, 2014), in our opinion the hypothesis of discontinuity should be revised, at least as far as modal values are concerned.

We will eventually suggest that this description can also shed light on other uses of *iam*, e.g. on its use in concessive clauses:

- (6) Nunc, si **iam** res placeat, agendi tamen viam non video. (Cic. *Att.* 5,4,1)
 “As it is, even if I were to approve in principle, I see no way of going to work.”

Our analysis will include the full set of occurrences of *iam* found in Plautus and specimens from other authors. We will take into consideration the correlation among the occurrence of *iam* and variables such as person (first and second person vs third), tense (in particular, the correlation with the future and the *praesens pro futuro* turns out to be relevant for the use under investigation) and illocutionary types (since this assertive use especially emerges in future-projecting acts such as threatening and guaranteeing), as well as the compatibility of *iam* with other temporal adverbs and particles.

Some references

- Bazzanella C., Bosco C., Calaresu E., Garcea A., Guil P., Radulescu A. (2005), *Dal latino iam agli esiti nelle lingue romanze: verso una configurazione pragmatica complessiva*, *Cuadernos de Filología Italiana* 12: 49-82.
- Calaresu E. (2015), *L'avverbio GIÀ da operatore temporale aspettuale a operatore modale di asserzione. Usi preverbal di Sardegna (sardo e italiano regionale) vs. usi olofrastici in italiano standard*, in K. Jeppesen Kragh and J. Lindschouw (eds), *Les variations diasystématiques et leurs interdépendances dans les langues romanes*, *Actes du Colloque DIA II à Copenhague* (19-21 nov. 2012), Strasbourg, ELiPhi, 113-127.
- Ghezzi C. and Molinelli P. (2014) (eds), *Discourse and Pragmatic Markers from Latin to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Hand F. (1836), *Tursellinus seu de particulis latinis commentarii*, vol. III, Amsterdam, Hakkert [reprint. 1969].
- Kroon & Risselada (1998), *The discourse function of iam*, in B. García Hernández (ed.), *Estudios de lingüística latina*, Madrid, Ediciones Clásicas, 417-433.
- Kroon C. (1995), *Discourse Particles in Latin. A study of nam, enim, autem, vero and at*. Amsterdam, Gieben.
- Kroon & Risselada (2002), *Phasality, polarity, focality: A feature analysis of the Latin particle iam*, *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 16, 63-78.
- Orlandini A. (2001), *Négation et argumentation en latin*, Leuven, Peeters.
- Pinkster H. (1972), *On Latin Adverbs*, Amsterdam, North-Holland.
- Pinkster H. (2004), *Attitudinal and illocutionary satellites in Latin*, in H. Aertsen, M. Hannay, R. Lyall (eds), *Words in Their Places: A Festschrift for J. Lachlan Mackenzie*, Amsterdam, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 191-198.

- Risselada R. (1994), *Modo and sane, or what to do with particles in Latin directives*, in J. Herman (ed.), *Linguistic Studies on Latin. Selected Papers from the 6th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics* (Budapest, 23-27 March 1991), Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 319-343.
- Rosén H. (1989), *On the use and function of sentential particles in Classical Latin*, in M. Lavency and D. Longrée (eds), *Actes du V^e Colloque de Linguistique Latine* (Louvain-la-Neuve/Borzée, 31 mars - 4 avril 1989), Leuven, Peeters, 391-402.
- Rosén H. (2005), *Particles: Hypercharacterization and status shift in Latin and Romance*, in S. Kiss, L. Mondin, G. Salvi (eds), *Latin et langues romanes. Études de linguistique offertes à József Herman*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 227-236.
- Rosén H. (2009), *Coherence, sentence modification, and sentence-part modification: The contribution of particles*, in P. Baldi and P. Cuzzolin (eds), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax. Vol. I: Syntax of the Sentence*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 317-441.
- Schrickx J. (2011), *Lateinische Modalpartikeln. Nemp, quippe, scilicet, videlicet und nimirum*, Leiden, Brill.
- Squartini M. (2013), *From TAM to discourse: The role of information status in North-Western Italian già 'already'*, in L. Degand, B. Cornillie, P. Pietrandrea (eds), *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles: Categorization and Description*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 163-190.
- Squartini M. (2014), *The pragmaticalization of 'already' in Romance: from discourse grammar to illocution*, in C. Ghezzi and P. Molinelli (eds), 190-210.

La victoria de *praesidens* sobre *praeses*

Matilde Conde Salazar & Cristina Martín Puente

Universidad Complutense de Madrid

Continuando con la investigación sobre el léxico latino del poder (Conde Salazar – Martín Puente 2004, Martín Puente – Conde Salazar 2014) y sobre el origen y evolución del vocabulario latino (Callebat 1990, Fruyt 2011, García Hernández 1980, Luiselli 1977, etc), examinamos el origen de *praesidens* y su evolución hasta desbancar al sustantivo *praeses* para designar a quien está al mando.

Existen en latín clásico dos verbos con sentidos muy próximos. Por un lado, *praesum* tiene desde César y Cicerón las acepciones de “estar al mando”, “dirigir” y “ser gobernador de una provincia”, aunque su participio de presente *praesens* no se emplea en este sentido. Por otro lado, *praesideo*, verbo regular con el sentido de “proteger” (*huic iudicio praesidentibus* Cic. Mil. 101), y el de “presidir”, “estar al mando”, “dirigir” (*Metellus in agro Piceno praesidebat*, Sall. Cat. 57,2). Quizá debido a que los derivados de *sum*, salvo *possum*, en general desaparecieron y a que los autores cristianos dieron a *praesideo* el sentido de *praesentem esse*, parece que *praesideo* sustituyó paulatinamente a *praesum* para expresar el sentido de “dirigir”.

Praeses, sustantivo con el sentido de “guardián”, “protector” (*ite, inquam, domum ambo nunciam ex praesidio praesides* Pl. rud. 1051), que no se percibe ligado etimológicamente a *praesum*, designa también a “el que preside” (*armipotens, praeses belli, Tritonia uirgo* Verg. Aen. 11.843; Suet. Tib. 32.2) y, en época de Diocleciano, se especializa en la denominación del “gobernador de una provincia” con funciones civiles, frente al *dux*, que ostentaba las funciones militares, hasta que la separación de poderes civiles y militares de Constantino lo relegó a tareas judiciales (Bravo 1981-1985; Christol 1997).

El participio *praesidens* se usó pronto con el sentido de “el que está al mando” o más específicamente de “gobernador de una provincia (*M. Valerium praetorem uenerunt, praesidentem classi* Liv. 24.40.2). Por esto y quizá por otras razones fonéticas, morfológicas, etc. terminó desbancando a *praeses* y sobrevivió en las lenguas modernas donde continúa vigente.

Bibliografía

- Bravo, G. (1981-1985), “El praeses de Diocleciano: Título y función”, *Hispania antiqua*, N° 11-12, 37-80.
- Callebat, L. (1990), “Langages techniques et langue commune”, en G. Calboli (ed.), *Latin vulgare – latin tardif II*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 45-56.
- Christol, M. (1997), “M. Simplicinius Genialis: ses fonctions (vir perfectissimus agens vice praesidis)”, *Cahiers G. Glotz* 8, 231-241.
- Conde Salazar, M. – Martín Puente, C. (2004), “La denominación de los gobernantes en la historiografía latina tardía. Estudio léxico”, *Emerita* 72, 266-285.
- (2005b), “Los cargos de la corte en los historiadores latinos de la Antigüedad tardía. Estudio léxico”, en *Filología y Lingüística. Estudios ofrecidos a Antonio Quilis*, vol. 1, Madrid, 701-723.
- Fruyt, M. (2011), Word-Formation in Classical Latin, en J. Clackson (ed.), *Companion to the Latin Language*, Malden, Mass., 157-175.
- García-Hernández, B. (1980), *Semántica estructural y lexemática del verbo*, Reus.
- Luiselli, B. (1977), “Aspetti Della situazione linguistica latina dell’antiquità al medioevo”, *Romano Barbarica* 2, 59-89.
- 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.

Clausula, un terme technique de la métrique à la morphologie

Cécile Conduché

Fondation Thiers

The presentation studies the uses of *clausula* by Latin grammarians for the purpose of morphological analysis. Such uses often go unnoticed. Nevertheless, we propose to read the term as an ancestor to our notion of suffix.

Philology: *clausula* in a morphological meaning (word ending) is attested for the first time in Quintilian, and reappears in Late Antiquity in some grammatical treatises (by Phocas, Eutyches), in contexts similar to those of *terminatio*, *finis*, *finalitas*.

History of the word: based on the formation and meanings of *clausula*, we submit the hypothesis of a semantic loan from Greek κατάληξις, which is attested in both metrics and morphology.

Clausula in Eutyches (*Grammatici Latini*, vol. 5, p. 447-488), towards the notion of suffix: it’s the largest body of evidence and the only one to allow for some precise semantic analysis. We point a specialisation of meaning foreshadowing the notion of suffix, using the following criteria: difference between the *clausula* and the derivational basis, use of the term with reference to the formation of verbs as well as that of nouns, opposition between the *clausula* and the flexion marks.

Bibliography

- Gaide, Françoise, « Les substantifs « diminutifs » latins en ...*LVS*, ...*LA* ou ...*LVM* », *Revue de Philologie* LXVI, 1992, p. 15-27, repris avec des modifications dans *Grammaire fondamentale du latin*. Tome IX, Louvain, 2002, p. 111-123.
- Schad, Samantha, *A lexicon of Latin grammatical terminology*, Pisa, Roma, 2007.
- Thesaurus linguae Latinae*, vol. 3, Lipsiae, 1912.

Exploring the Semantic Complexity of the Voces Mediae: *Magus, Magicus, Magia*

Leonardo Costantini
University of Leeds

The study of the semantic complexity and development of the Latin terms *magus*, *magicus*, and *magia* has been deeply influenced by the anthropological trends adopted in recent scholarship (e.g. Graf, Collins, Luck, Ogden), where ‘magic’ has been employed as a transcultural label describing preternatural beliefs often unrelated to the term *magus* and its derivatives. Bremmer, Dickie, and Rives argue, instead, that research on Greco-Roman ‘magic’ should follow an emic approach (i.e. examining a term from the viewpoint of the culture in analysis), but they make a case for a twofold meaning of *magus* and its cognates: according to them, these terms would have either indicated the Persian priests, followers of Zoroaster, and their lore, or the ‘sorcerers’ (i.e. *malefici*, *venefici*) and their unlawful practices.

While I agree with the importance of an emic approach, I propose to disentangle the semantic polyvalence of *magus*, *magicus*, and *magia* by adopting a more elaborate semantic taxonomy. In this paper, I shall distinguish between three main connotations of such terms: the first (‘philosophical or religious magic’) occurs when *magus* indicates the Persian wise men, whose superior lore was sought after by the philosophers. The second connotation (‘goetic magic’) refers to the real magical practitioners and practices condemned by the *Lex Cornelia de sicariis et veneficiis* (Paul. *Sent.* 5.23.15–18). The third connotation (‘literary magic’) designates the dramatized descriptions of goetic magic in poetry and in prose fiction. This paper will focus on a selection of sources in which the semantic complexity of *magus* and its cognates and their development are clearly observable, namely the *Naturalis Historia* of Pliny the Elder, Apuleius’ *Apologia*, Tertullian’s *De Anima*, and Augustine’s *De Civitate Dei*.

This new semantic taxonomy will make it possible to cast more light on the synchronic variation in this set of terms, and to understand their diachronic evolution from the imperial age to late antiquity, while also explaining the reasons for the progressive shift towards ‘goetic magic’ as the primary connotation. This study ultimately aims to prepare a revision of the entries *magus*, *magicus*, and *magia* in the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*.

Bibliography

- Bremmer, J.N. 2008. ‘The Birth of the Term «Magic»’. In: *Greek Religion and Culture, the Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Leiden–Boston. 235–248; 353–356.

- Collins, D. 2008. *Magic in the Ancient Greek World*. Malden (Mass.)–Oxford.
- Dickie, M.W. 2001. *Magic and Magicians in the Greco-Roman World*. New York–London.
- Graf, F. 1997. *Magic in the Ancient World*. Translated by Franklin Philip. Cambridge (Mass.)–London.
- Luck, G. 2006. *Arcana mundi: magic and the occult in the Greek and Roman worlds*. Baltimore (Md).
- Ogden, D. 2009. *Magic, Witchcraft, and Ghosts in the Greek and Roman Worlds*. Oxford.
- Rives, J.B. 2010. ‘*Magus* and its Cognates in Classical Latin’. In: Gordon, R.L., Marco Simón, F. eds. *Magical Practice in the Latin West*. Leiden–Boston. 53–77.

***Huennius, hostrea* and the German Voices of Vindolanda: a Case Study of Initial *h*-**

Francesca Cotugno

Università di Pisa & Universiteit Gent

Research question: The paper aims at a comparison between the context in which Latin words are written with an etymologically unjustified *h*- (*aspiratio viti-osa*) and those without it. In the Vindolanda writing-tablets there are six cases in which the etymologically correct *h*- has been omitted (e.g. Tab. Vindol. 717 *habeas*) and ten cases in which a spurious *h*- has been inserted (e.g. Tab. Vindol. 184 *Huetti[us]*). Conversely, there are sixty cases in which initial *h*- is correctly spelled.

The lexical categories involved are mainly proper names and words pertaining to the *sermo cotidianus* (Tab. Vindol. 862 *Huennius*, Tab. Vindol. 622 *hostrea*). Moreover, it is interesting to consider that the *h*- insertion is a feature available only in the ink-written tablets of Vindolanda and in a few other epigraphic texts nearby (i.e. Housteads, Benwell, Netherby and Carrawburg). In other documents, dating from before and after the *Corpus Vindolandense* (1st and 4th century AD, e.g. *Tabulae Lugualienses*, British *defixionum tabellae* and *Tabulae Londinienses*), the one and only feature available is the deletion of the etymological initial *h*- (Bowman and Thomas 1983; 1994; 2003; Bowman, Thomas and Tomlin 2010; 2011; Tomlin 1988; 1998; 2016).

Latin already experienced diatopic variation during the time of the Empire. An important question is whether non-literary text can provide any evidence for the regional diversification of this language (Adamik 2012). It is rather pointless to evaluate absolute phonological features in isolation, inasmuch this method would measure only extra-linguistic factors as the literacy level (Herman 2000a; Cotugno 2015).

Approach and method: In this study the frequency of the deviant forms will be evaluated focusing on possible nuances in the pronunciation of the Latin spoken in Roman Britain instead of showing a sharp contrast between Classical and non-classical tokens (Herman 2000b; Adams 2007). Moreover, the deviations from the Classical norm have been divided into two different subgroups: non-classical tokens which are due to mere graphic factors and those due to other linguistic reasons. For this reason, the research method adopted in this study rests on a quantitative and a qualitative ap-

proach, highlighting the occurrence of specific features in their ethnic/cultural environment and in comparison with other non-literary corpora (i.e. *Tabulae Lu-guualiensis*, British *defixionum tabellae* and *Tabulae Londinenses*).

Expected results: The Roman conquest of Britain resulted in the extensive voluntary and forced movement of people coming from regions such as Gallia Belgica, Gallia and Spain. The auxiliary units often took the name of the ethnic community from which the soldiers were originally recruited. For this reason, it is known that this area was occupied also by *auxiliares* coming from Belgium and Germany, which left behind a rich number of attestations (Birley 1979; Mattingly 2006). Therefore, the research is based on a broader framework of the phonological features available in non-literary texts from Roman Britain. The use of the non-etymologically motivated initial *h-* arises as a *unicum* in this area. The presence of this specific feature in this ethnic context suggests that there could have been the writers' interference of their L1 in writing Latin.

References

- ADAMIK B. (2012), In search of the regional diversification of Latin: some methodological considerations in employing the inscriptional evidence, in F. BIVILLE, M. LHOMMÉ, D. VALLAT (eds.) *Latin vulgaire – Latin tardif IX, Lyon, 2-6 septembre 2009*, Lyon, Collection de la Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée 49, série linguistique et philologique 8 ; Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée, pp. 123-140.
- ADAMS J. N. (2004), *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- ADAMS J. N. (2007), *The Regional Diversification of Latin, 200 BC–AD 600*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- ADAMS J. N. (2007), *Social Variation in the Latin Language*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- BOWMAN A. K. and THOMAS J. D. (1983), *Vindolanda: The Latin Writing Tablets*. London, Britannia Monographs 4, London Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.
- BOWMAN A. K. and THOMAS J. D. (1994), *The Vindolanda Writing Tablets (Tabulae Vindolandenses II)*. London, British Museum Press.
- BOWMAN A. K. and THOMAS J. D. (2003), *The Vindolanda Writing Tablets (Tabulae Vindolandenses III)*. London, British Museum Press.
- BOWMAN A. K. and THOMAS J. D., TOMLIN R. S. O. (2010), *The Vindolanda writing-tablets (Tabulae Vindolandenses IV part 1)*, «*Britannia*» 41, pp. 187-224.
- BOWMAN A. K. and THOMAS J. D., TOMLIN R. S. O. (2011), *The Vindolanda writing-tablets (Tabulae Vindolandenses IV part 2)*, «*Britannia*» 42, pp. 113-144.
- COTUGNO F. (2015), *I longa in iato nel Corpus Vindolandense*, in «*Studi e Saggi Linguistici*» 53, 2, pp. 189-206.
- HERMAN J. (2000a), Differenze territoriali nel latino parlato dell'Italia tardo-imperiale: un contributo preliminare, in J. HERMAN, A. MARINETTI, L. MONDIN (eds.), *La preistoria dell'Italiano: atti della Tavola Rotonda di Linguistica Storica, Università Ca' Foscari di Venezia, 11-13 giugno 1998*. Tübingen, pp. 123-135.
- HERMAN J. (2000B), *Vulgar Latin*. University Park, Pennsylvania University Press.
- MATTINGLY D. (2006), *An Imperial Possession. Britain in the Roman Empire*. London, Penguin History of Britain Series.
- TOMLIN R.S.O. (1988), *Tabellae Sulis: Roman inscribed tablets o tin and lead from the sacred spring of Bath*, in B. CUNLIFFE (ed.), *The temple of Sulis Minerva at Bath Vol 2, The finds from the Sacred Spring*. Oxford, Oxford Univ. Comm. Archaeol. Monogr. 16, pp. 59-269.

- TOMLIN R.S.O. (1993), The inscribed lead tablets, in A. WOODWARD and P. LEACH (eds.), *The Uley Shrines: Excavation of a Ritual Complex on West Hill, Uley, Gloucestershire, 1977–79*. London, English Heritage, pp. 113–126.
- TOMLIN R.S.O. (1998), Roman manuscripts from Carlisle: the ink-written tablets, «*Britannia*» 29, pp. 34–84.
- TOMLIN R.S.O. (2016), *Roman London's First Voices. Writing Tablets from the Bloomberg excavation, 2010–2014*. London, MOLA.

Introductory *quid*: Reconsideration of Utterances Traditionally Edited as “*Quid?*”

Michal Ctibor

Charles University, Prague

This contribution shows that a majority of utterances traditionally edited as “*Quid?*” in the Ciceronian corpus should not be edited the way it is. There are two major constructions edited as “*Quid?*”. The first one is *quid* for expression of surprise (“*What?!?*”, cf. Risselada 1993: 210); this construction is edited appropriately. The other one is introductory *quid* which introduces a new topic (*What about...?*). Words following after this introductory *quid* syntactically depend on it, so the question mark should follow them.

Whereas in other authors introductory *quid* is recognized and edited correctly (cf. 1–2) in editions of Cicero it is frequently mistaken for “*Quid?!?*” (“*What?!?*”) for expression of surprise (cf. 3–4).

- (1) *quid puer Ascanius? superatne et vescitur aura?* (Verg. *Aen.* 3.339)
- (2) *quid cordis globus aut oculi? quid membra? quid artus? quantula sunt!* (Lucr. 4.119f)
- (3) *Quid? Pompei tertius consulatus in quibus actis constitit? Nempe in legibus.* (Cic. *Phil.* 1.18) >>> *Quid Pompei tertius consulatus? In quibus...*
- (4) *Quid? Theophrastus mediocriterne delectat?* (Cic. *Fin.* 1.6) >>> *Quid Theophrastus? Mediocriterne delectat?*

My contribution stems from the Construction grammar. I will present arguments (syntactic and pragmatic) for the existence of two different constructions (i.e. “*Quid?!?*” and introductory “*Quid...?*”). Introductory *quid* introduces entities which were previously omitted and which refute the opponent’s interpretation of facts; it has frequently the force of an objection; it is, thus, prone to occur in polemics. Syntactically, introductory *quid* is no case of ellipsis (contrary to a general belief). Note also the position of question words *-ne*, *quantula*, *quibus* and *-ne* in (1) – (4) above.

I excerpted all occurrences of *quid* from a selection of Ciceronian speeches, which represent the core of my corpus (*S. Rosc.*, *Man.*, *Cat.* 1–4, *Arch.*, *Mil.*, *Phil.* 1–14). Out

of 569 occurrences, introductory *quid* constitutes 81 occurrences (14%), the *quid* for expression of surprise only 12 (2%).

Pinkster (2015: 321) mentions that “*Quid?*” introduces a new topic. Most translators translate the passages correctly. But there is no full-length treatment (Risselada 2005 and Müller 1997 focus on dialogues in comedies) and many errors occur, too: Dyck (2008: 81) inadequately compares one occurrence of introductory *quid* to Spanish inverted question mark. Horsfall (2006: on Verg. *Aen.* 3,339) counted 60 cases of introductory *quid* in Virgil, though there less than 15.

References

- Dyck, Andrew R. (2008): *Cicero. Catalinarians*. Cambridge: University Press.
Horsfall, Nicholas. (2006): *Virgil, Aeneid 3: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.
Müller, Roman (1997): *Sprechen und Sprache. Dialoglinguistischen Studien zu Terenz*. Heidelberg: Winter.
Pinkster, Harm (2015): *The Oxford Latin Syntax. Vol. 1. The Simple Clause*. Oxford: University Press.
Risselada, Rodie (1993): *Imperatives and Other Directive Expressions in Latin. A Study in the Pragmatics of a Dead Language*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.
Risselada, Rodie (2005): ‘Particles in questions’. In G. Calboli (ed.) *Latina Lingua! Papers on Grammar IX.2*: 663–79.

(When) Inflection Needs Derivation. A Word Formation Based Lexicon for Latin

Chris Culy

independent scholar

Eleonora Litta

CIRCSE Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore

Marco Passarotti

CIRCSE Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore

Although the number of lexical resources and NLP tools for Latin is now large and varied, there has not yet been any attempt to create a derivational morphology tool, where lemmas are segmented and analysed into their formative components, to establish relationships between them on the basis of word formation rules. Yet enhancing textual data with derivational morphology tagging has the potential to provide solid results: the study of derivation allows for a fine-grained organisation of the lexicon by linking words that share the same lexical ancestor or the same word formation process. Likewise, because core semantic properties are shared at different extent by derivate words built by a common word formation process, derivational morphology can act like a kind of interface between morphology and semantics.

The *Word Formation Latin* project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 658332-WFL) to create a derivational lexicon for Classical Latin. The project expands on a pre-existing model for the semi-automatic extraction of word

formation rules, and the subsequent pairing of lexical entries and their derivational ancestor(s) (Passarotti and Mambrini 2012).

The lexical basis used for the resource comprises the whole 69,682 lemmas featured in the morphological analyser for Latin LEMLAT (Passarotti, 2004).

The word formation lexicon is built in two steps:

1. Word formation rules (WFRs) are detected.
2. They are applied to lexical data.

WFRs are found both according to previous literature on Latin derivational morphology (Fruyt, 2011; Oniga, 1988) and in semi-automatic fashion. A number of MySQL queries provide candidate lemmas for each WFR, which are then checked manually for consistency. All those lemmas that share a common (not derived) ancestor belong to the same “morphological family”.

The word formation based lexicon is work-in-progress – having currently covered 508 morphological families, 152 WFRs, and 21,149 output lemmas – is due to be completed by October 2017. It is already accessible on-line through a visualization query system (<http://wfl.marginalia.it>). The lexicon can be browsed either by WFR, affix, input and output PoS or lemma. Results are visualized as interactive tree graphs, whose nodes are lemmas and edges are WFRs. Clicking on a node shows the full derivational tree (“word formation cluster”) for the lemma reported in that node. Clicking on an edge shows the lemmas built by the WFR concerned in the edge.

References

- Fruyt, Michèle. "Word-Formation in Classical Latin." *A Companion to the Latin Language* (2011): 157-175.
- Oniga, Renato. *I composti nominali latini: una morfologia generativa*. Vol. 29. Pàtron, 1988.
- Passarotti, Marco Carlo. "Development and perspectives of the Latin morphological analyser LEMLAT." *Linguistica computazionale* 20, no. A (2004): 397-414.
- Passarotti, Marco, and Francesco Mambrini. "First Steps towards the Semi-automatic Development of a Wordformation-based Lexicon of Latin." In *Eighth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation, (LREC 2012)*, pp. 852-859. European Language Resources Association (ELRA), 2012.

Some Remarks on the *Infinitivus indignantis*. Is This Label Necessary?

Pierluigi Cuzzolin

Università degli Studi di Bergamo

If one of the reasons of the current research in modern linguistics is to update categories and labels inherited from the Greek and Latin grammarians in order to describe languages, the label “infinitivus indignantis / admirantis” is particularly interesting. Hofmann & Szantyr describes this type of infinitive as follows: “Der Infinitivus indignantis (admirantis usw.) ist ebenso wie der Akk. des Ausrufs ... ein umgangssprachlicher Kurztypus des Affekts; ... ein spezielles Verbum der Gemütsbewegung, von dem diese Inf. ursprünglich abhängig waren” (Hofmann & Szantyr 1972: 366).

The example provided to illustrate this particular type of infinitive is the following, taken from Plautus, *Asinaria* 580:

Edepol senem Demaenetum lepidum fuisse nobis

By gad, old Demaenetus did do the handsome thing by us

As far as one can see, it is clear that this infinitive expresses what in other languages, currently spoken, corresponds to the category of “mirativity” (Lazard 1999), which ultimately is one of the forms in which evidentiality is expressed (Aikhenvald 2004, 2015; Brugmann & Macaulay 2015).

In this sense the label “infinitivus indignantis / admirantis” turns out to be superfluous. The phenomenon, however, that this label tries to capture deserves describing. In particular, its peculiarity resides in the fact that an infinitive is employed, whose illocutionary force has to be still determined.

Bibliographical references

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2015. “Evidentials: Their links with other grammatical categories”.

Linguistic Typology 19.2: 239-277.

Brugmann, Claudia M. and Macaulay Monica. 2015. “Characterizing evidentiality”. *Linguistic Typology* 19.2: 201-237.

Hofmann, Johann Baptist & Szantyr, Anton. 1972. *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. München, Beck.

Lazard, Gilbert. 1999. “Mirativity, evidentiality, mediativity, or other?” *Linguistic typology* 3.1: 91-109.

Valeurs de *nunc* dans l'*oratio obliqua* latine

Joseph Dalbera

Université de Corse

On s'intéressera ici à la polyvalence de l'adverbe latin *nunc*, dans le cadre de l'un de ses contextes d'emploi les plus remarquables : le Discours Indirect. Prototype même de l'adverbe embrayeur, *nunc* apparaît en effet fréquemment au cœur d'une parole rapportée selon les modalités de l'*oratio obliqua* : la structure énonciative, inscrite dans la narration et censée relever de son repérage initial est pourtant soumise aux règles de subordination syntaxiques et énonciatives. Or, loin de perdre sa valeur déictique, l'adverbe y constitue un discordancier qui amorce la construction d'une bivocalité et met ainsi à mal l'homogénéité énonciative du passage, en permettant l'émergence des coordonnées déictiques du personnage dont le récit rapporte les propos.

A travers une lecture inspirée de la linguistique de l'énonciation et l'analyse du détail de quelques occurrences extraites de la narration historique et romanesque, on cherchera à rendre compte de l'étendue de la palette des valeurs d'emploi de *nunc* dans ce contexte spécifique de l'*oratio obliqua* : depuis la simple valeur temporelle de l'adverbe, jusqu'à celles, argumentatives, où l'embrayeur glisse vers un emploi logique de

connecteur marquant l'opposition, voire la fermeture d'une hypothèse irréaliste ou contrefactuelle.

Il s'agira corrélativement de souligner la continuité sémantique et énonciative de *nunc*, et de montrer, sur le plan narratologique, comment l'embrayeur contribue à la construction textuelle d'un point de vue, d'une subjectivité qui sert la dramatisation du récit. Et d'éclairer, en retour, le fonctionnement de l'*oratio obliqua* latine et des systèmes hypothétiques qu'elle est susceptible de construire.

Bibliographie

- BIRAUD M., MELLET S., 2000 : « Les faits d'hétérogénéité énonciative dans les textes grecs et latins de l'Antiquité », *Cahiers Chronos* 5, p. 9-48.
- DALBERA J., 2015, « L'infinitif et la mise à distance du discours rapporté en latin », *Actes du colloque sur le Discours rapporté en latin*, Centre Ernout, n°11, http://www.paris-sorbonne.fr/IMG/pdf/DLL_11_J-Dalbera.pdf.
- DALBERA J., à paraître, « *Nunc* et les deux niveaux de la narration », *Actes du 18^{ème} ICLL*, Toulouse, 2015.
- JOLLIN-BERTOCCHI J., 2003, « La polyvalence de l'adverbe maintenant », in *L'information grammaticale* 97, pp. 26-30.
- MELLET S., 2008, « Réflexions énonciatives autour de *maintenant* argumentatif », in *Cahier Chronos* 20, *Ici et maintenant*, Rodopi, pp. 77-92.
- ORLANDINI A., 2005, « Polysémie et modalités de l'expression périphrastique avec l'adjectif verbal en -urus en latin », Sandor Kiss et al. (éds.), *Latin et langues romanes*, De Gruyter, p. 65-75.
- RABATEL A., 2001, « La valeur délibérative des connecteurs et marqueurs temporels *mais, cependant, maintenant, alors*, et dans l'embrayage du point de vue », *Romanische Forschungen*, p. 113,2, p. 153-170.
- 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, pp. 105-125.
- RISSELADA R., 1998, « *Nunc*'s use as a discourse marker of cohesive shifts », dans *Actes du colloque Oratio soluta-oratio numerosa*, C.M. Ternes (éd.), *Études luxembourgeoises d'histoire et de littérature romaine*, vol. 1, p. 142-159.
- SZNAJDER L., 2001, « Discours indirect et dépendance syntaxique », in *De Lingua latina nouae questiones : proceedings of the 10th ICLL*, Louvain, Peeters, p. 609-626.
- SZNAJDER L., 2005, « Stratégies de prises en charge énonciatives dans le discours indirect », in *latina Lingua*, proceedings of the 12th ICLL, Papers on Grammar IX, 2, ed. G. Calboli, Herder, Rome, p. 749-761.

More on Late Latin BE-Periphrases: Word Order Between Syntax and Prosody

Lieven Danckaert

CNRS/Université de Lille 3

Research question The starting point of this talk is the observation that unlike combinations of a modal verb and a dependent infinitive, Late Latin *be*-periphrases

display a remarkably robust preference for the ‘head-final’ order ‘PaPa-*sum*’. As discussed in Danckaert (2017: ch. 6), in earlier authors like Cicero and Caesar the order ‘*sum*-PaPa’ is attested in over 35% of the cases, and it reaches frequencies of around 70% in Hyginus and Vitruvius. In contrast, all authors after 200 AD only produce this head-initial pattern at frequencies below 25%. Given that the Romance languages only allow for the head-initial order, the observed effect is highly unexpected, and calls for an explanation.

Methodology and data description Based on the analysis of a 3.7 million word corpus (with a total of 25.572 be-periphrases, from 39 different authors), I show that the Late Latin preference for the order ‘PaPa-*sum*’ cannot be observed in all syntactic contexts. Specifically, the effect is much stronger with monosyllabic forms of *esse* than with polysyllabic ones. In addition, in negated clauses we actually observe a clear preference for the order ‘*sum*-PaPa’. The effect of negation on word order is most extreme in a sample from the Vulgate, where the pattern ‘*sum*-PaPa’ is only attested 87 times in a total of 2.250 affirmative clauses (3.87%). In contrast, in negated clauses we find head-initial patterns of the type *non est amatus* in 56 out of 60 tokens (93.33%).

Analysis I will propose that after *ca.* 200 AD, there were two distinct lexical entries for auxiliary *esse*, viz. a prosodically ‘strong’ and a ‘weak’ variant. Evidence comes from the above-mentioned observation that monosyllabic be-auxiliaries are more likely to follow past participles than polysyllabic ones: assuming that syntactic rules cannot be sensitive to syllable count, I will conclude that the observed facts are indeed to be explained in prosodic terms. Particularly, assuming a version of the prosodic hierarchy from Nespor & Vogel ([1986] 2007²), I propose that Late Latin weak *esse* is subject to the phonological constraint in (1):

- (1) Weak *esse* can only survive as a single metrical foot at the level of the prosodic word if it appears at the right edge of a phonological phrase, where it counts as ‘extrametrical’.

Evidence for the extrametrical status of post-participial monosyllabic forms of *esse* comes from Late Latin prose rhythm facts first discussed in Havet (1892: 66-74), and recently revisited in Holmes (2015): as illustrated in (2), in Late Latin monosyllabic forms of *esse* can be disregarded for the purpose of clausula formation, a possibility which was not available in Classical Latin.

- (2) — ◡ — ◡ — — — ||
polluisse mentiti sunt
‘they lied that [I] violated [my conscience]’ (Boeth. Cons. 1.4)

References

- Danckaert, L. (2017). *The Development of Latin Clause Structure: A Study of the Extended Verb Phrase*. Oxford: OUP.
Havet, L. (1892). *La prose métrique de Symmaque*. Paris: Bouillon.
Holmes, N. (2015). ‘*esse* and *-que* in Late Latin Prose Rhythm’, Paper presented at ICLL 2015.
Nespor, M. & I. Vogel ([1986] 2007²). *Prosodic Phonology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Greek in Varro's *De lingua Latina*

Wolfgang de Melo
University of Oxford

Panagiotis Filos
University of Ioannina

In this paper we examine how Varro views the relationship between Latin and Greek, and how he deals with Greek loans in the etymological part of his work.

In the first part of the paper, we will show that Varro does not simply view Greek as the source of borrowings. The relationship between Latin and Greek is considered to be more complex, with parallel developments in morphology and vocabulary. Where Varro does accept Greek influence, it is purely lexical. He often classifies Greek loans according to dialect, even though his dialectal distinctions are different from our own.

In the second part, we will look at selected examples of loanwords. Of particular interest are cases where Varro does not recognize Greek words as Greek (e.g. *magida* 'bowl' derived from *magnitudo* 'large size' rather than Greek *μαγίς* (-ῖδος), ἡ 'bowl'), or where he looks at older forms of Greek. We will see that his failure to recognize Greek words is often the result of them being Hellenistic rather than classical, while the older forms he is familiar with are those that he would have learned during his formative years at school.

References

- André, J. 1968. 'Les changements de genre dans les emprunts du latin au grec'. *Word* 24 (2): 1-7.
- Biville, F. 1981. 'L'intégration des mots grecs dans les déclinaisons latines, et le problème des métraplasmés'. *RPh* 55: 123-32.
- Biville, F. 1990-95. *Les emprunts du latin au grec : approche phonétique*, I-II. Louvain.
- de Vaan, M. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*. Leiden-Boston.
- Ernout, A. & A. Meillet. 1985. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. Paris.
- Frei, P. 1958. *Die Flexion griechischer Namen der 1. Deklination im Latein*. Zürich, Winterthur.
- Jannacone, S. 1950. *Recherches sur les éléments grecs du vocabulaire latin de l'empire*. Paris.
- Leumann, M. 1977. *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. München.
- Pfaffel, W. 1981. *Quartus gradus etymologiae : Untersuchungen zur Etymologie Varro's in 'De lingua Latina'*. Königstein.
- Schröter, R. 1960. *Studien zur varronischen Etymologie*. Mainz-Wiesbaden.
- Walde, A. & J. B. Hofmann. 1938-56. *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, I-II. Heidelberg.

The Expression of Relative Time in Latin

Jesús de la Villa

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

Every language has procedures to indicate that an event happens before, while or after another. These procedures are of various types, lexical, grammatical or syntactical. Latin, like other Indo-European languages, did not inherit any grammatical procedure to express relative time, but developed several strategies to express it, as, for example, lexical procedures (adverbs like *antea*, *simul*, *post*), prepositional phrases (*ante noctem*, *simul cum aduentu patris*, *post noctem* etc.), conjunctive connectors (*prius quam*, *postquam*, *cum* etc.) and even word order, as in constructions of the type *ueni, uidi, uici*, which reflect in an iconic disposition the temporal sequence of the events described. Only in the case of the system known as *consecutio temporum*, the Latin language developed, within a relatively delimited syntactic pattern, a procedure to express relative time through verbal tenses (cf. e.g. Pinkster 2015: 552-605).

All these procedures and some other combine in the expression of relative time in Latin. To my knowledge, however, there have not been extensive studies to determine how all these devices combine, whether there are variations in the use of the different devices over time or whether there are differences among authors.

In a previous paper (Villa 2013), I made a preliminary approach to the subject. Now, I want to present the results of a larger research, where I have analysed data taken from various Latin authors, in particular historians, comparing the way they express relative time and trying to find general usage patterns and possible diachronic and stylistic differences.

References

Pinkster, Harm (2015): *Oxford Latin Syntax*. Oxford: OUP.

Villa, J. de la (2013): “La expresión del tiempo relativo en la narración latina: Plinio el Joven 6.16”, en J.A. Beltrán et alii (eds.) *Otium cum dignitate. Estudios en homenaje al profesor José Javier Iso Echegoyen*. Zaragoza: Universidad de Zaragoza. 195-210.

Verbal Class Selection in Macaronic Latin. A Corpus-based Analysis

Sime Demo

University of Zagreb - Center for Croatian Studies

Nathalie Tassotti

Universität Wien

Macaronic Latin is an early modern parody of Classical Latin, linguistically consisting of regular Latin text and sporadic hybrids composed of modern vernacular stems and Latin endings, such as in the following example:

Angla Flochosque canam, qui wachsunt pulvere schwarzo
E Waßroque simul fließente et Schweißide warmo (Floia, in Blümlein 1900: 101)

Macaronic tradition originated in the Renaissance Italy and lasted from the late 15th century until at least 1960s, with no less than 130 authors having used this curious linguistic form. Eleven European languages are paired with Latin to build these texts.

A great majority of the linguistic analyses of macaronic Latin deal with work of Teofilo Folengo (1491–1544), who was the main model for almost all later authors (e.g. Bonora 1956, Paoli 1959, Chiesa 1972, Paratore 1979). Some research has been done on non-Italian macaronics (Giraud 1977, Garavini 1978 on Provençal macaronics, Glidden 1982 French tradition, Keipert 1988 and Ballester 1997 on Latin-Polish mixing) – however, all these studies mostly investigate authors and languages separately from one another.

Although the use of hybrid words that make up the core of macaronic Latin is strictly limited to the genre, they are formally no different from the fully integrated loans such as *phalanx* or *sabbata*. In other words, they grammatically belong to Latin and behave like regular Latin words. However, it has remained unclear whether and to what extent the strategy of mixing depends on the properties of the language that is coupled with Latin in the macaronics.

In order to investigate into this, we propose the first comprehensive and comparative analysis of macaronic Latin morphology. It is our intention to test the hypothesis that the choice of the language that is intertwined with Latin influences the way the mixing is realised. The topic of the analysis will be the selection of verbal class (i.e. conjugation) in hybrid verbs. We will see whether the fact that verbal endings in most languages involved phonetically resemble Latin verbal endings (e.g. Spanish *-ar* vs. Latin *-are*, German *-en* vs. Latin *-ere*, Portuguese *-ir* vs. Latin *-ire*), affects the frequency of respective verbal class selection.

We will use a balanced annotated ~23 000 token digital corpus of macaronic poetry, representing all 11 language pairs. The control corpus will be ~34 000 token corpus of Classical Latin literature. In total, 1083 hybrid verbal forms and 6549 Latin verbs will be subjected to the analysis.

Using raw counts, as well as tools such as correspondence analysis (Greenacre 2007) and significance tests, we will graphically represent and statistically examine the relative frequencies of all four conjugations in our classical subcorpus and then in both hybrid and Latin parts of our macaronic works. We hope to show that languages tend to prefer various verbal classes and that this can be in part accounted for by the morphological properties of the respective languages.

References

- Ballester, X. (1997), A propósito de dos poemas macarrónicos de Ruiz de Moros, in: Luis Carlo Brea José María Maestre Maestre, Joaquín Pascual Barea, eds, *Humanismo y pervivencia del mundo clásico*, Cádiz: Excelentísimo ayuntamiento de Alcañiz, 1107-1125.
- Blümlein, C. ed. (1900), *Die Floia und andere deutsche maccaronische Gedichte*, Strasbourg: J. H. Ed. Heitz (Heitz & Mündel).
- Bonora, E. (1956), *Le Maccheronee di Teofilo Folengo*, Venice: Neri Pozza.
- Chiesa, M. (1972), La tradizione linguistica e letteraria cristiano-medievale nelle "Macaronee", *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 149, 48-86.

- Garavini, F. (1978), *Gentilgallantes sunt omnes instudiantes*, in: *Testi e interpretazioni*, Milan-Naples: Ricciardo Ricciardi, 357-407.
- Giraud, Y. (1977), La Babel facétieuse du macaronique: A. d'Arena décerveleur de langage. Discussion, *Bulletin de l'Association d'étude sur l'humanisme, la réforme et la renaissance* 7, 60-65.
- Glidden, H. H. (1982), Latin, français, graphisme dans les jeux linguistiques de Tabourot des Accords, *Bulletin de l'Association d'étude sur l'humanisme, la réforme et la renaissance* 15, 56-62.
- Greenacre, M. (2007), *Correspondence Analysis in Practice*, London: Chapman and Hall.
- Keipert, H. (1988), Sprachprobleme der makkaronischen Dichtung in Polen, *Die Welt der Slaven* 33, 354-388.
- Paoli, U. E. (1959), *Il latino maccheronico*, Florence: Le Monnier.
- Paratore, E. (1979), Il maccharoneo folenghiano, in: Ettore Bonora, Mario Chiesa, eds, *Cultura letteraria e tradizione popolare in Teofilo Folengo: atti del Convegno di studi promosso dall'Accademia Virgiliana e dal Comitato Mantova-Padania 77*, Mantova, 15-16-17 ottobre 1977, Milan: Feltrinelli, 37-61.

Predicative Structures in Latin Expression Verbs: "to shout" Verbs

Marina Díaz Marcos

Universidad de Salamanca

This research aims to account for an essential but not commonly addressed field of Latin Vocabulary, the metalanguage (the ability of the language to speak about itself, that is, the use of the language as a referential object instead of as an instrument), through the analysis of usual language by corpus-driven analysis rather than from the Linguistic Historiography discipline. The corpus, based on verbal and nominal forms of expression verbs, such as *dicere* (Ramos, 2007), comprises a series of texts of all the literary genres from the Classic Period, gathered from the *Packard Humanities Institute* database.

In Latin, as in other languages, there is a range of metalinguistic terminology, but it also allows for the possibility of employing ordinary vocabulary, not the metalinguistic one (Rey-Debove refers to such words as “autonymes”), in order to talk about themselves in terms of object. Nevertheless, in the study of expression verbs we will be able to measure more easily the metalinguistic dependence or the independence of some concepts. Transitive expression verbs play an essential role because they allow language to become metalanguage in the sentence and the fusion between the metalinguistic system *stricto sensu* and the autonymic system. For example: *cum aqua conclamata est, quomodo | exeat, non quid efferat, quaerit* (Sen. Ep. 17.3.5-6) and *vicina horum quiritare, iubilare* (Var. LL. 6.68.1), where *aqua* and *quiritare*, *iubilare* are metalinguistic employs of the Direct Object and the Subject, respectively.

The research questions that my work pursues are the following:

- To study and analyse a certain group of expression verbs that contain the manner of talking built-in in their semantics as a meaning: (*balbultio* ‘babble’,

murmuro ‘murmur’, etc.), as well as the different contexts in which these verbs are inserted, and the arguments depending on them.

- To apply present linguistic theoretical and methodological perspectives, mainly functional and typological ones, as well as others provided by Cognitive Linguistics, to an ancient language such as Latin.

This presentation will consist on an approximation to syntax and semantics of the verb ‘to shout’ (*clamo*, *clamito*, *quirito*, etc.) within the corpus of verbs explained above (verbs that content the manner of the message built-in in their meaning), to show through a comparison between dictionaries¹, that their predicative frames are not clear and there are different structures and meanings according to their arguments. Nevertheless, those verbs derived from other verbs by prevervation (for example *conclamo* from *clamo*) are not included in this paper.

Sources

- Ramos Guerreira, A. (2007). "La complementación de *dicere*. Sobre causatividad, incorporación de instrumento y metalinguaje". En J. M. Baños, C. Cabrilla. . . J. de la Villa, J. Baños, C. Cabrilla, J. Méndez Dosuna, & M. Torrego (Edits.), *Praedicativa II: Esquemas de complementación verbal en griego antiguo y en latín* (pp. 151-178). Zaragoza: Ediciones Universidad de Zaragoza.
- Rey-Debove, J. (1978). *Le metalangage: étude linguistique du discours sur le langage*. Paris: Le Robert.

The Origins of Western Language Teaching and Why They Matter Today

Eleanor Dickey
University of Reading

Language teaching in Europe today is the development of a continuous, unbroken tradition of teacher-pupil transmission going back to antiquity; this is particularly true of Latin teaching. Some of the techniques, terminology, and assumptions we use are inherited from the ancients, and others are reactions against inherited practices: both types are ultimately dependent on the ancients. Yet the origins of the tradition are obscure, and we rarely even wonder how systematic language teaching first entered the European educational tradition and what this earliest language teaching was like.

There is, however, general agreement on the time and place of that earliest systematic language teaching: Republican Rome, where aristocratic children regularly learned Greek at school. Can we know anything about how they learned? The hints provided by Roman authors are tantalizingly few, but a major unexploited source of evidence exists: the language-teaching materials used by speakers of Greek (and other languages) to learn Latin during the Empire. These materials share certain characteristics (including a particular format, ‘columnar translation’) indicating an origin in a

¹ Oxford Latin Dictionary (1968) and Dictionnaire Gaffiot (1934).

developed language-teaching tradition not native to the Greek-speaking world – almost certainly from Republican Rome.

What can that insight tell us about the materials and methods used to teach language in Rome? Can we work out anything more about the origins of those materials and methods? And what do the Romans' language-teaching methods tell us about how they viewed their own language?

The evidence cited will be the surviving bilingual language-learning materials, chiefly papyri but also texts transmitted via medieval manuscripts (*Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*), together with Roman authors' mentions of language learning (e.g. Quintilian). Some of the Latin grammarians are also relevant.

Select bibliography

Dickey, E., *Colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana* (Cambridge 2012-15)

Dickey, E., 'Columnar Translation: an ancient interpretive tool that the Romans gave the Greeks', *Classical Quarterly* 65 (2015): 807–821.

Dickey, E., *Learning Latin the Ancient Way: Latin textbooks from the ancient world* (Cambridge 2016)

Flammini, G., *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana Leidensia* (Munich 2004)

Fressura, M., "Tipologie del glossario virgiliano," in M.-H. Marganne and B. Rochette (eds), *Bilinguisme et digraphisme dans le monde gréco-romain: l'apport des papyrus latins* (Liège 2013): 71–116.

Kramer, J., *Glossaria bilingua altera* (Munich 2001).

Rochette, B., *Le latin dans le monde grec* (Brussels 1997).

(Un)Persönliche Strukturen im Lateinischen der Vulgata und ihre hebräischen Parallelen

Vera Duerrschnabel

Universität Bern

Obwohl das Lateinische der Vulgata zunächst weniger eine natürliche, gesprochene als vielmehr eine artifizielle, zur Übertragung der Bibel ins Lateinische geschaffene Übersetzungssprache darstellte (cf. Luraghi 2013), beeinflusste der dadurch angestoßene Sprachwandel nicht nur die weitere Entwicklung des christlichen und spätantiken Lateinischen maßgeblich, sondern ist ebenfalls in den verschiedenen romanischen Sprachen greifbar (cf. García de la Fuente 1981).

Während viele der Besonderheiten des biblischen Lateins traditionell als Hebraismen oder Graezismen beschrieben werden (cf. Plater/White 1926), zeigt dieser Tagungsbeitrag nun, dass es sich dabei meist nicht um syntaktische Lehnübersetzungen (*calques*), sondern um die Verstärkung von bereits dem Lateinischen innewohnenden Strukturen handelt.

Verdeutlicht wird dies anhand solcher Verben, welche im klassischen Latein und in den indogermanischen Sprachen (cf. Bauer 2000) häufig unpersönliche Strukturen aufweisen, d. h. mithilfe von Witterungsverben wie *pluit* / *tonat* / *rorat*, Empfindungsverben wie *me miseret* / *mihi placet*, Modalverben wie *necesse est* / *licet*, possessiven

Strukturen wie *mihi est aliquid* und des unpersönlichen Passives wie *dicitur*. Im biblischen Latein ist hingegen eine klare Präferenz kanonischer, d. h. persönlicher Strukturen erkennbar.

Nach einem kurzen Überblick über die diachrone Entwicklung dieser Impersonalia im Lateinischen und ihrer indogermanischen Parallelen sollen unpersönliche Strukturen des biblischen Hebräischen analysiert werden (cf. Melnik 2013), z. B. וַיִּהְיֶה לוֹ *wa yyihar lô* »es erzürnt ihn« oder וְלָנוּ אֵב זָקֵן *weš-lanû 'āb zāqēn* »wir haben einen alten Vater«.

Der Hauptfokus dieses Tagungsbeitrages wird jedoch im Vergleich der Konstruktionen von Witterungs-, Empfindungs- sowie Modalverben, possessiven Strukturen und des unpersönlichen Passives im klassischen und biblischen Lateinischen sowie dem biblischen Hebräischen liegen. Dabei wird sich eine heterogene Übersetzungsentwicklung der einzelnen Gruppen der Impersonalia zeigen.

Bibliographie

- BAUER, B. (2000): *Archaic Syntax in Indo-European: The Spread of Transitivity in Latin and French*. Berlin & New York
- GARCIA DE LA FUENTE, O. (1981): Consideraciones sobre el influjo hebreo en el Latín Bíblico. *Emerita*, Vol. 49, núm. 2, pp. 307-342
- LURAGHI, S.: Contact Trough Translation. In: Giannakis, G. K. (2013): *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*. Leiden & Boston
- Brill Online, 2014. Reference. UZH Hauptbibliothek / Zentralbibliothek Zuerich. 23 December 2014 <http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/encyclopedia-of-ancient-greek-language-and-linguistics>
- MELNIK, N. (2013): Impersonal Constructions. In: KHAN, G. (ed.): *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*. Brill Online. 2014. UZH Hauptbibliothek / Zentralbibliothek Zuerich. 31 December 2014 <http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/encyclopedia-of-hebrew-language-and-linguistics>
- PLATER, W. E. & WHITE, H. J. (1926): *A Grammar of the Vulgate*. Oxford.

Les emplois interrogatifs de *quando* dans différents genres textuels de Plaute à Sénèque

Fabienne Fatello

Université Blaise Pascal

A partir des occurrences de *quando* répertoriées à l'aide du CD-ROM de la *Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina* (BTL-4), nous étudierons les emplois interrogatifs de *quandō* et ses visées argumentatives dans différents genres littéraires : les comédies de Plaute, l'*Histoire romaine* de Tite-Live, les discours de Cicéron, la poésie didactique de Lucrèce et les traités philosophiques de Sénèque. D'un point de vue morphosyntaxique, le terme en **k^w*- introduit une interrogation « partielle » ; du point de vue sémantique, il vise à identifier la circonstance du temps : « quand ? à quel moment ? ». D'un point de vue pragmatique, la question partielle directe de nature informative instaure un « parcours » (Fournier 1998) sur le thème en **k^w*-, à savoir *quando*. Aussi, Lyons (1978), à la suite de Jespersen (1933), qualifie les interrogations partielles de

questions-*x* contenant, comme dans une équation algébrique, une variable *x*. Ainsi, poser une question à un interlocuteur, c'est l'inviter à fournir une valeur pour cette variable.

Pourtant, parmi les interrogations en *quando* relevées, toutes n'ont pas la même valeur illocutoire. Les comédies de Plaute, par l'illusion théâtrale, recréent sur scène d'authentiques situations d'énonciation. Toutes les interrogations en *quando* dans les comédies sont ainsi directes et ont une valeur percontative : elles expriment l'ignorance du locuteur qui sollicite la réponse de son interlocuteur. Si Cicéron s'adresse lui aussi à des auditeurs présents au moment de l'énonciation, les questions directes sont orientées : dans la plupart des cas, quand Cicéron demande « quand », il veut dire « jamais ». L'acte de parole accompli est assertif et non percontatif. Ensuite, dans les traités philosophiques de Sénèque, la forme dialoguée n'est que pur artifice d'exposition, la question fictive de l'interlocuteur ne servant que de point de départ à l'exposé théorique. L'*Histoire romaine* de Tite-Live fournit quant à elle de très nombreuses questions indirectes, qui peuvent accomplir des actes différents selon la valeur du verbe introducteur ou selon la présence de paramètres modaux. Finalement, nous constatons que le *De rerum natura*, exposé des phénomènes naturels selon la philosophie d'Épicure, exposé guidé par le raisonnement logique et une relation sincère entre maître et élève, ne laisse pas de place à la prise en otage du lecteur par des questions rhétoriques ou d'autres artifices d'exposition.

Bibliographie

- C. BODELOT (1987) : L'interrogation indirecte en latin. Syntaxe, valeur illocutoire, formes, Société pour l'Information Grammaticale, Paris.
- A. BORILLO (1981) : « Quelques aspects de la question rhétorique en français », DRLAV 25, p. 1- 33.
- N. FOURNIER (1998) : « Les termes en qu- et l'opposition animé / non animé », IG, 78, p. 4-12.
- J. LYONS (1990) : Sémantique linguistique, traduction de J. Durand et D. Boulonnais, Librairie Larousse, Paris (1978 : Semantics 2)
- J. R. SEARLE (1969) : Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (éd. consultée 2005).

“Apollo ... respondit μὴ κίνει Καμαρίναν”. Greek-Latin Contact in the *Textual Bilingualism in Latin Corpus*

Chiara Fedriani

University of Genoa

Maria Napoli & Nadia Rosso

University of Eastern Piedmont

The aim of this talk is twofold: (i) to discuss methodological issues related to the construction of a corpus of Late Latin literary texts for the study of language contact with Greek, called *Textual Bilingualism in Latin* (TBL); (ii) to provide a comprehensive description of those phenomena attested in this corpus concerning the switch of Latin to Greek, which can be interpreted as instances of “textual bilingualism”.

As is known, Adams' (2003) book offers the first large-scale treatment of bilingualism in the ancient Roman world, and according to Calboli (2008) constitutes "a new frontier of the Latin grammar". However, Calboli also criticized some aspects of Adams' approach, especially the scarce attention devoted to literary texts and the fact that data are chronologically limited only up to the Late Empire.

We first illustrate the TBL corpus, which tries to obviate these needs by providing a more extended amount of data, since it includes pagan and Christian literary texts pertaining to different genres (e.g., epistolography, historiography, technical and encyclopaedic texts) with a focus on a less-investigated time span (3rd-7th century AD). We will contextually discuss our methodology for the linguistic analysis of textual bilingualism from a historical perspective, which guided the development of a multi-layered dataset specific to contact phenomena.

Secondly, we offer a corpus-based account of the range of code-mixing phenomena resulting from contact with Greek: from the insertion of single words (also rendered in Latin script: 1), to the level of phrase (e.g. Latin prepositions governing Greek nouns in the case required by the Latin head: 2, or Latin nouns modified by Greek adjectives: 3) to that of sentence and discourse, where code-switching could be strategically exploited for different functions, including reporting direct speech (4).

- 1) ut **evethen** Graeci dicimus stultum (Amm. Marc. XXII 8, 33)
- 2) ut extra **γυναικωνῖτιν** numquam sit egressa (Macr. Sat. 1, 12)
- 3) virtute **αλλοιωτικῇ** in sucum vertente quidquid acceptum est (Macr. Sat. 7, 4)
- 4) Pylades hac voce securitatem saltantis castigavit: **σὺ βλέπεις**. (Macr. Sat. 1, 17)

Greek/Latin contact phenomena will be considered also from a quantitative perspective, to ascertain which lexical categories are mostly borrowed and which code-mixing strategies are more frequent. A related aim is to compare our results with modern hierarchies of borrowability (cf., e.g., Haspelmath 2008), according to which, for instance, content words are more likely to be borrowed than function words and nouns more likely to be borrowed than "non-nouns".

Since the degree of linguistic "overlap" gives us some indirect information about the competence in Greek of the writer, among the expected results we aim at (i) a corpus-based account about the impact of Greek on Late Latin, assessing the relative "degree of bilingualism" found in each text, (ii) a qualitative and quantitative evaluation of different contact phenomena and bilingual strategies, and (iii) a better understanding of the status and nature of "bilingual competence" as it is witnessed by the texts analysed, possibly in comparison with some Classical Latin texts, which will be progressively annotated as our project proceeds.

References

- Adams J. N. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin language*, Cambridge.
- Calboli G. 2008. Una nuova frontiera della grammatica latina: a proposito del libro di James Noel Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin language*, Cambridge 2003, in "Maia" 60 (3): 474-503.

Haspelmath, M. 2008. Loanword typology: Steps toward a systematic cross-linguistic study of lexical borrowability. In Stolz, T., Bakker D. and Salas Palomo R. (eds.), *Aspects of language contact: New theoretical, methodological and empirical findings with special focus on Romancisation processes*, Berlin, 43-62.

Tum, tunc, and illa hora. Exploring a Semantic-Pragmatic Cycle

Chiara Fedriani

University of Genoa

Piera Molinelli

University of Bergamo

This talk considers competing uses and functions of three temporal expressions, *tum*, *tunc*, and *illa hora*, from a diachronic perspective and focusing on semantic/ pragmatic changes.

Tum and *tunc* refer to a previously specified point of time ('then', 'at that time'), also with regard to temporal sequences and, at a more abstract level, to connection between events, often implying a consequence ('then', 'hence'). These forms constitute an interesting case of polifunctionality, since they express similar values which developed along the same lines of semantic enrichment (from temporal distance to consequential relation), their uses being intriguingly intertwined in the history of Latin.

We first show that in Early Latin *tum* constitutes the unmarked form, whereas *tunc*, derived from *tum* (**tom* > **tom-ke*: De Vaan 2008: 633) was originally more emphatic ('at the very moment when') and used sparingly (e.g., only five occurrences in Plautus). Moreover, *tunc* was originally associated with a lower register and "considered the less urbane form of the two" (Rosén 2009: 379). In Classical Latin *tum* still constitutes the basic form: Caesar uses it in the 95% of cases, Catullus has 28 *tum* against 1 *tunc* (Leumann/Hofmann/Szantyr 1972 II: 520). In Post-Augustean Latin, however, the relative frequency of *tum* and *tunc* changes, with *tunc* being progressively bleached of its pragmatic markedness and freely used in a larger variety of contexts. In Seneca's *Epistulae* the ratio is already inverted (10:95); in Apuleius is 13:120. *Tum* is not attested in the *Vulgata* and in the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, being totally replaced by *tunc*.

In these latter texts another competing form emerges, which plays an important role in later developments: *illa hora* 'at that time' (> It. *allora*, Fr. *alors*). In the *Peregrinatio*, it is often used with phoric reference (1); in the *Vulgata*, we find bridging contexts such as (2) where *illa hora* can be interpreted as a reference to a specific time ('at that hour'), also implying simultaneity ('immediately'), or as connecting two events ('then').

- 1) Nam et *illa hora*, qua omnes nocte in Ierusalima revertuntur cum episcopo ... (Per. 25,12)
- 2) et quaerebant principes sacerdotum et scribae mittere in illum manus *illa hora* (Vulg. Luc. 20,19)

In Romance, the semantic value of *tum/tunc* is taken over by adverbs which continue *illa hora*, also thanks to a switch from an analytic to a synthetic form.

In our study, we look in detail at the diachronic competition of the three forms within a long time span, to shed light on the process of alternation and substitution which constrained their use, emergence and demise. Particular attention will be devoted to their syntactic and semantic contexts of occurrence, considering verbal categories and co-occurring adverbs. Specifically, we expect that features linked to deictic anchoring played a major role in the functional development of *tunc* and *illa hora*.

Moreover, we will argue that such diachronic process can be better described in terms of an onomasiological semantic-pragmatic cycle, whereby the same function comes to be expressed by different forms over time, which gradually replace one another.

References

- De Vaan, M. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*. Leiden: Brill.
- Leumann, M., Hofmann, J. B. & A. Szantyr, 1972. *Lateinische Grammatik*. Munich: C H. Beck.
- Rosén, H. 2009. Coherence, sentence modification, and sentence-part modification: the contribution of particles. Syntax, sociolinguistics, and literary genres. In *New perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*. Vol. 1. *Syntax of the Sentence*, P. Baldi & P. Cuzzolin (eds), pp. 317-442. Berlin: De Gruyter.

The Hermeneumata Celtis and Ancient Bilingual Lexicography

Rolando Ferri

Università di Pisa

I have been working for some time lately on completing an annotated edition of the so far unpublished *Hermeneumata Celtis* (HC), after Conrad Celtis, a German Humanist who taught Greek in Vienna up to his death in 1508. After Dionisotti 1982 first drew renewed attention to the importance of the MS, and published its *colloquium* for the first time, a few partial editions of select chapters have appeared (Kramer 2001, 2004, Gatti 2006, Kraft 2012), but the bulk of the MS remains unpublished. Part of the fascination of HC, as for other works in this bilingual tradition, lies in its focus on everyday language and other lexical items rarely occurring in our written evidence, and in the variety of its structure from the viewpoint of ancient lexicography: sometimes the Greek glosses are accompanied by explanatory comments, sometimes par-etymological adhoc creations are included. I have argued in Ferri 2011 that Celtis' antigraph was a medieval MS, a conclusion which increases the number of copies between the original composition of the dictionary and its discovery in 1495. On the whole, the coincidence between sparsely attested words found in inscriptions and papyri, both Latin and Greek, with the Celtis glossary, seems to reinforce the reliability of this vocabulary in terms of linguistic evidence. The main difficulty of the task is the identification of the entries for which the Greek is clearly corrupt.

Part of the talk will dwell on the methodological issues involved in dealing with lemma and translation: sometimes the exact language of a given word is hard to determine, because the Greek and the Latin scripts were confusingly similar at some stage

in the transmission of this work; in other cases, new loanwords seem to emerge in one or the other language, i.e. a new Grecism or a new Latinism. Among the many novelties I will highlight the numerous occurrences of Latin reconstructed forms, typically found in *REW*, *FEW*, *LEI*, the identification of new regional Latin items, and the numerous Greek nominal compounds and polyrhematic expressions, especially belonging to less well known lexical domains such as ancient cookery, seafaring, medicine.

Bibliography

- Dionisotti, A.C. (1982), 'From Ausonius' Schooldays? A Schoolbook and its Relatives', *JRS*, LXXII, 83-125
- Ferri, R. (2011), 'Hermeneumata Celtis. The Making of a Late-Antique Bilingual Glossary', in R. Ferri (ed. by), *The Latin of Roman Lexicography*, Pisa, 141-169.
- Ferri, R. (2012), 'Vulgar Latin in the Bilingual Glossaries. The unpublished *Hermeneumata Celtis* and their contribution', in *Actes du IXe colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif* (Lyon, 2-6 septembre 2009), Lyon, 753-763.
- Gatti, P. (2006), 'Nomi di pesci negli *Hermeneumata Celtis*', *ALMA - Bulletin du Cange*, LXIV, 105-121.
- Kraft, U. (2012), *Περὶ χρυσέων κοσμημάτων. Ein Titulus aus dem lateinisch-griechischen Celtis-Glossar* in Popko L., Quenouille N., Rücker M., *Von Sklaven, Pächtern und Politikern: Beiträge zum Alltag in Ägypten, Griechenland und Rom. Δουλικά έργα zu Ehren von Reinhold Scholl* (*Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete - Beihefte*, 33), Berlin - Boston, 139-164.
- Kramer, J. (2001), 'Die Ämterliste aus dem Wiener Celtis-Glossar', in *Wiener Papyri, als Festgabe zum 60. Geburtstag von Hermann Harrauer*, herausgegeben von Bernhard Palme, Wien, 249-265.
- Kramer, J. (2004), 'Lateinisches-Griechisches Glossar: Celtis' Abschrift aus einem Papyruskodex', in Cowey J.M.S., Kramer, B. (herausgegeben von), *Paramone. Editionen und Aufsätze von Mitgliedern des Heidelberger Instituts für Papyrologie*, Leipzig, 43-62.

Deixis et endophore en latin dans une perspective évolutive du -2e siècle au +2e siècle: le statut de Sénèque

Michèle Fruyt

Université de Paris-Sorbonne (Paris 4); Centre Alfred Ernout

Nous nous situons dans le cadre de l'étude sémantique et syntaxique des emplois des opérateurs lexicaux d'anaphore, de cataphore et de deixis que sont *is*, *hic*, *iste*, *ille*, *ipse*, *idem*, *qui* (pronom relatif de liaison, notamment) depuis l'époque archaïque chez Plaute jusqu'au +2e siècle, afin de déceler les modalités selon lesquelles se sont déroulés les changements fonctionnels.

Comme nous l'avions montré dans nos articles de 2009, 2010, 2012, les modifications des deux systèmes de l'endophore d'une part et de la deixis de l'autre sont corrélées. Le catalyseur fut, en premier lieu, la diminution de certains emplois de *is* endophorique, visible chez certains auteurs du +1er s. (notamment pour ce qui est de l'emploi adjectival de *is*) alors qu'elle n'avait pas encore eu lieu au -1er s., même dans les niveaux de langue les plus bas de Cicéron.

Ce rétrécissement des emplois de *is* eut pour conséquence un déplacement des positions fonctionnelles de *ille* et *hic* à l'intérieur des deux systèmes. Ces glissements prirent la forme d'une extension de lexèmes d'un système vers l'autre, de la deixis vers l'endopore. Ils eurent, à leur tour, des conséquences sur les fonctions de *ille* et *hic*, lexèmes étendus pour venir secourir *is*.

Etant à la recherche des signes de l'émergence des nouvelles fonctions, nous accorderons, dans cette communication, une importance particulière à Sénèque, en analysant plusieurs de ses œuvres relevant de genres littéraires différents. Nous étudierons la manière dont Sénèque pourrait être considéré comme un point charnière dans l'évolution de la langue latine sur cette question dans son œuvre scientifique des *Questions naturelles*, où il pourrait offrir un stade d'évolution suffisamment avancé pour qu'y soient décelables les nouvelles fonctions de *ille* et *iste*.

Bibliographie

- M. Fruyt, « L'emploi de *is*, *hic*, *iste*, *ille*, *ipse* en latin archaïque et classique », *Revue des Etudes latines* tome 87, 2009, paru en 2010, p. 44-75.
- M. Fruyt, « Deictics and Endophors in the Diachrony of Latin », *Revue de Linguistique latine du centre Alfred Ernout. De lingua Latina* n°5, 2010-1, septembre 2010. Revue électronique hébergée à Paris-Sorbonne (Paris 4) : http://www.paris-sorbonne.fr/IMG/pdf/FRUYT_Revuelingulatine_Actes_Espacetemps25-6-10.pdf.
- A. André & M. Fruyt, « Le rôle de *is* dans les changements de l'endopore et de la deixis en latin », in F. Biville, M.-K. Lhommé & D. Vallat (éds.), *Latin vulgaire-latin tardif IX*, 2012, Lyon, p. 291-307.

On the Use of the Ablative of the Gerund and the Present Participle in Latin Technical Literature

Giovanbattista Galdi

University of Ghent

Jasper Vangaeve

University of Ghent

As is well known, in Republican and Classical Latin the ablative of the gerund is commonly employed with instrumental (or causal) force, e.g. Ter. Andr. 17 *faciuntne intellegendo, ut nil intellegant?* “don’t they show, by their understanding, that they understand nothing at all?”. Occasionally, however, a semantic weakening emerges which causes the gerund to display modal value or even an action concomitant with that of the matrix clause, e.g. Liv. 2,59,9 *consul, cum reuocando nequiquam suos persecutus esset, in pacato agro castra posuit* “the consul, after he had vainly followed his men while calling them back, fixed the camp on a peaceful territory” (cf. Kühner-Stegmann 1955: 752f). Particularly, in Imperial and Late Latin the use of the ablative of the gerund becomes more frequent and looser in comparison with Classical Latin and it often occurs in contexts where one expects a present participle (see Hofmann-Szantyr 1965: 380 and, for a more critical approach, Adams 2013: 725ff). This evolu-

tion is crucial from a diachronic point of view, because the ablative of the gerund survived in most Romance languages (sp. *viviendo*, it. *amando*, etc.), where it ‘became in effect a new present participle, ousting the latter [...] from its verbal function and confining it purely to an adjectival role’ (Elcock 1960: III).

This paper is concerned with the use of the ablative gerund and of the present participle in a wide corpus of technical treatises, ranging from the 2nd c. BC until the 6th c. AD. Specifically, we shall focus on two aspects. On the one hand, we will investigate the semantics of the gerundial and participial forms in order (1) to sketch and compare their diachronic evolution and (2) to confront both forms especially when allowing an analogous semantic interpretation. The main goal will be to analyse which factors, if any, motivate the occurrence of an ablative gerund as opposed to a present participle and vice versa. On the other hand, we will be concerned with word order. The ordering of gerundial and participial clauses with respect to their matrix verb will be accounted for by functional and cognitive principles such as iconicity of sequence, information structure and processing theory (cf. Hawkins 1994; Diessel 2005; Hetterle 2015). Our framework will be functional and cognitive and will be based on recent typological work (e.g. Kortmann 1997; Diessel 2005; Hetterle 2015).

References

- ADAMS, James Noel (2013). *Social variation and Latin Language*, Cambridge: CUP.
- DIESSEL, Holger (2005). «Competing motivations for the ordering of main and adverbial clauses», *Linguistics*, 43, 3, 449-470.
- ELCOCK, William Dennis (1960). *The Romance Languages*, London: Faber and Faber.
- HAWKINS, John (1994). *A performance theory of order and constituency*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HETTERLE, Katja (2015). *Adverbial Clause in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- HOFMANN, Johann Baptist and SZANTYR, Anton (1965). *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, München: Beck.
- KORTMANN, Bernd (1997). *Adverbial Subordination: a Typology and History of Adverbial Subordinators Based on European Languages*, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- KÜHNER, Raphael and STEGMANN, Carl (1955). *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache: Satzlehre. Erster Teil*, 3rd ed. revised by A. Thierfelder, Leverkusen: Hahn.

Origen y significado de *desīdero*: de la nostalgia al deseo

Benjamín García-Hernández

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

Es evidente que el origen de *desīdero* está ligado al de *consīdero*. Lexicógrafos y gramáticos latinos no tuvieron dificultad en señalar el sustantivo *sīdus* como base derivativa de ambos verbos: *desiderare et considerare a sideribus dici certum est* (PAVL. FEST. p. 66, 7). En esa línea, lexicógrafos y estudiosos modernos los han tomado por verbos denominativos parasintéticos, formados a la vez con prefijo y sufijo, como si sus primeros significados fueran ‘contemplar las estrellas’ y ‘perder de vista las estrellas’, en una relación, análoga a la de *contemplor*, con la lengua augural.

Esta explicación clásica no ha estado libre de la sospecha de ser una etimología popular, por lo que se han buscado otras soluciones. Entre ellas, la del parentesco de *sīdus* con el lit. *svidūs* ‘brillante’ (Pârvulescu 1980) o las que ven en el sustantivo latino otros étimos indoeuropeos con el valor de ‘dirección, meta’ (Rix 1985) o de ‘marca’ (Nyman 1990). De ellos se habrían desarrollado los significados de *consīdero* y *desīdero* en sentido positivo y negativo. En una revisión posterior de las diferentes hipótesis, se concluye que se ha perdido el vínculo etimológico de los dos verbos con *sidus* (Artigas 1996).

Por nuestra parte, señalamos en un trabajo de 1990 que *consīdero* no se aplica a objetos estelares hasta Séneca y su significado fundamental es ‘examinar de cerca’ el valor de algo; lo que desdice de la lejana referencia astral. Es más, puede verse en él un término técnico de evaluación mercantil (*diligenter ac lente mercantium more considerare*). Todo ello nos llevó a proponer en *consīdero* un derivado intensivo de *consīdo*: ‘sentarse juntos (a examinar)’.

Aquí hacemos un estudio semejante del contenido de *desīdero*, al que se ha impuesto la referencia estelar de forma más forzada. El análisis semántico nos conduce a ver en él un derivado también intensivo de *desīdo* (‘asentarse abajo, irse al fondo, hundirse’) > *desīdero* (‘deprimirse por una pérdida’, ‘sentir nostalgia por’, ‘echar en falta’). Sin necesidad de apelar al origen indoeuropeo, se trata de dos verbos de morfología compleja surgidos dentro de la lengua latina, no por parasíntesis, sino como derivados intensivos en *-erāre* de *desīdo* y *consīdo*, al igual que *recipero* de *recipio*.

La acción de *desidero*, cargada de sentimientos de nostalgia, es en principio intensiva (‘añorar’). Pero la orientación retrospectiva de la añoranza se torna fácilmente prospectiva y adquiere entonces un valor desiderativo (‘desear’) que la proyecta hacia adelante. Mientras el verbo con la noción de añoranza prefiere objetos de clase ‘animada’, con la noción de deseo afecta a sustantivos de acción y alcanza el régimen de infinitivo. Una cosa será ‘añorar’ a los difuntos (*defunctos desidero*) y otra ‘desear’ verlos (*defunctos uidere desidero*, MIN. FEL. 20, 5).

Bibliografía

- ARTIGAS, E., 1996: “Deseos y estrellas del latín al romance”, A. M^a. Aldama (ed.), *De Roma al siglo XX*, Madrid, Sociedad de Estudios Latinos, vol. I, 481-92.
- GARCÍA-HERNÁNDEZ, B., 1991: “*Considero*. Propuestas etimológicas y contenido semántico”, *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica. Estudios Latinos* 1, 87-98.
- NYMAN, M., 1990: « Hits and Misses : Lat. *considerare* and *desiderare* », *ZVS* 103, 51-68.
- PÂRVULESCU, A., 1980: “Latin *considerare* et *desiderare*”, *ZVS* 94, 159-165.
- RIX, H., 1985: “*Sūdor* und *sīdus*”, *Sprachwissenschaftliche Forschungen. Festschrift für J. Knobloch*, Innsbruck, Universität Innsbruck, 339-350.
- TLL 1900 ss.: *Thesaurus linguae latinae*, Leipzig, Teubner / Múnich, K. G. Saur/ Berlin, De Gruyter.

Syncopated Forms Reanalysed as Primary Ones: the *crētus*-Class in Latin

Romain Garnier

Université de Limoges; Institut universitaire de France

The Latin verb *crēscō*, *crēuī*, *crētus* ‘to grow’ is accounted for as the reflex of a PIE primary stem **k_ṛh₁-sk-é/ó-*, with a sigmatic aorist **k_ṛé_h₁-s-*ṃ* (cf. Gr. κρησί-παῖδα) and a zero grade **to*-stem **k_ṛh₁-tó-*, whence Pre-Latin **krā-sk-ō*, **krē-*u*-ai*, **krā-to*-before a presumed Ablaut-levelling. Contrarily to what I assumed earlier (GARNIER, 2010: 166), such an explanation is incredible: if the PIE sigmatic aorist **k_ṛé_h₁-s-*ṃ* was to be the starting point of such an Ablaut-levelling (pace KÜMMEL, LIV²⁰¹⁵: 48, s.v. **k_ṛeh₁-*), how could the donor form may have lost its causative meaning ‘to make grow’? It is more expedient to assume that Lat. *crēscō* would be rather a back-formation from preverbed *con-crēscō*, *con-crēuī*, *con-crētum* ‘to grow together, condense, congeal’¹, which would reflect a secondary inchoative stem **con-cēr-ēscō* [ˌ ˌ ˌ ˌ], **con-cēr-ētus* [ˌ ˌ ˌ ˌ] with syncope², of the same pattern as Lat. *ex-ōl-ēscō*, *ex-ōl-ētus* ‘to grow to an end, to pass away’ (< **ex-āl-ēscō*). The starting point was a full-grade thematic root-present **cēr-ō*, **cēr-īs*, **cēr-ērē* (< PIE **k_ṛeh₁-e/o-*).**

An analogical extension of this verbal pattern may account for *dis-cēr-nō* (< **dis-k_ṛi-nō*), *dis-cr-ēuī*, *dis-cr-ētum* ‘to separate, part, divide’ (< **dis-cēr-ēuī*, *-ētum*) and *spēr-nō*, *spr-ēuī*, *spr-ētum* ‘to despise, scorn, spurn’ (< **spēr-ēuī*, *-ētum*); the preverbed *con-tēr-ō*, *con-tr-īuī*, *con-tr-ītum* ‘to crumble, to separate in small pieces’ (< **con-tēr-īuī*, *-ītum*) may not reflect a PIE inherited stem **tri_h₁-tó-* ‘rub’ (pace DE VAAN, 2008: 616), but a syncopated ‘vulgar’ past participle in *-ītus* added to the present-stem *con-tērō*.

References

- GARNIER, Romain,
– (2010), *Sur le vocalisme du verbe latin: étude synchronique et diachronique*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Band 134.
– (2012), « Allomorphisme et loi de limitation rythmique en latin », *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 107/1, 235-260.
HAVERLING, Gerd (2000), *On sco-Verbs, Prefixes and Semantic Functions. A Study in the Development of Prefixed and unprefixd verbs from Early to Late latin*. Studia Græca et Latina Gothoburgensia LXIV. Göteborg: Acta Uniuersitatis Gothoburgensis.
KÜMMEL, Martin (LIV²⁰¹⁵), *Addenda et corrigenda zu LIV²* <http://www.martinkuemmel.de/liv2add.html>.
DE VAAN, Michiel (2008), *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*. Leiden IndoEuropean Etymological Dictionary Series. Edited by Alexander Lubotsky, Volume 7. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

¹ With the so-called ‘sociative’ *con-* also found in *co-alēscō* ‘to grow together with’ (HAVERLING, 2000: 268).

² The rhythmic structure [ˌ ˌ ˌ ˌ] was subject to syncope in Latin (GARNIER: 2012).

Auctor adjectif verbal dans la périphrase *auctor sum* “conseiller” : étude morpho-sémantique

Laurent Gavaille

Université Bordeaux-Montaigne / Ausonius, Institut de recherche sur l'Antiquité et le Moyen Âge

L'expression archaïque *auctor sum* (Ennius, Plaute, correspondance de Cicéron), suivie d'une complétive au subjonctif en *ut* (ou d'une proposition infinitive) et signifiant globalement “je conseille”, pose des problèmes d'abord morphologiques : elle est souvent considérée comme un équivalent de la construction courante *auctor sum* suivie du génitif, dans laquelle *auctor* est un nom d'agent (signifiant “l'instigateur, le promoteur”, à côté de *suasor* par exemple) puisqu'il peut être déterminé par un adjectif. Or le syntagme *auctor sum* + complétive peut être déterminé par un adverbe, ce qui en fait bien une formule verbale, dans laquelle *auctor* est un adjectif, indifférent au genre (le féminin en *-trix* du nom d'agent n'apparaît que chez Tertullien). On peut ainsi ajouter *auctor* à la liste des vieux noms d'agent qui sont adjectifs avant d'être substantifs, comme *princeps* (cf. F. Bader) avec lequel il est souvent rapproché dans les textes.

L'existence en védique d'un futur périphrastique ayant recours au suffixe de nom d'agent (*dātāsmi* < **dā-ty-as-mi*) invite à se demander si la formule latine est à considérer elle aussi comme une périphrase verbale, où *auctor* aurait le statut d'un adjectif verbal. Des points de rapprochement avec le futur périphrastique védique, dont Éva Tichy a montré la spécificité, existent. Une telle périphrase verbale serait isolée en latin, mais cela s'explique par le fait qu'elle est très archaïque puisque juridique : nous avons peut-être là la trace d'un état de langue plus ancien. Dans les textes dont nous disposons, la formule semble figée, quasi grammaticalisée.

En tout cas, la formule performative *auctor sum* se comprend sémantiquement en référence au sens de la racine **h₂eug-* “être fort” : elle signifie, pour celui qui la prononce dans un cadre juridique, “j'entre dans le statut d'*auctor*”, c'est-à-dire “je me porte garant, par mon énonciation, de l'action à venir” (d'où son équivalent *auctor fit* dans un récit). Elle permet aussi de comprendre comment s'est construite la famille de mots en latin : *auctor* adjectif se serait dégagé de la formule verbale *auctor sum* pour devenir un adjectif à part entière signifiant “qui en charge d'une force de développement” (“garant” juridique, puis “conseiller” en général, “promoteur”) et aurait donné naissance à un nom d'agent, créant ainsi une base nominale latine *aug-* sur laquelle sera refait ensuite le verbe *augeō*, dénomiatif. *Auctor* peut faire office d'intermédiaire entre la racine **h₂eug-* portant la notion de “force vitale” et *augeō*, au même titre que la forme **augos* souvent citée. *Augeō*, d'abord fientif en conformité avec sa formation en *-*eh₁je/o-* (voir les emplois intransitifs avec le sens de “croître”, c'est-à-dire “entrer dans un état de force”), a dû être réinterprété secondairement comme causatif sous l'influence de formes plus anciennes comme *auctificus* et *augificāre* (de même qu'à côté de *areō* existe *arefaciō*).

Bibliographie

BADER F., 1962, *La formation des composés nominaux du latin*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres.

- , 2005, « Fondements syntaxiques de la composition nominale », in C. Moussy (éd.), *La composition et la préverbation en latin*, PUPS, collection *Lingua latina* n° 8 p. 11-28.
- BELARDI W., 1995, « *Auctor e auctoritas*. Sopravvivenze del significato e del significante nel tempo », *Storia, Antropologia e Scienze del Linguaggio*, 10, p. 127-190.
- BENVENISTE É., 1948, *Noms d'agent et noms d'action en indo-européen*, Paris, Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- BETTINI M., 2005, « Auf unsichtbaren Grundlagen. Eine linguistische Beschreibung der *auctoritas* », dans *Das Sichtbare und das Unsichtbare der Macht*, hrsg. G. Melville, Köln-Weimar-Wien, Böhlau, p. 237-258.
- FRUYT M., 1990, « La plurivalence des noms d'agent latins en *-tor* : lexique et sémantique », *Latomus*, vol. 49, fasc.1.
- GARNIER R., 2010, *Sur le vocalisme du verbe latin : étude synchronique et diachronique*, Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- GAVOILLE L., 2017 (à par.), « La formule de conseil *auctor sum* dans la correspondance de Cicéron. Étude étymologique, pragmatique et sémantique » dans *Conseiller, diriger par lettre*, éd. É. Gavoille & F. Guillaumont, Tours, Presses universitaires François-Rabelais.
- LIV = 2001, *Lexicon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. 2. Aufl., hrsgg. M. Kümmel & H. Rix, Wiesbaden, Reichert.
- MEISER G., 1998, *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*, Darmstadt.
- PINAULT G.-J., 2003, « Sur les thèmes indo-européens en **-u-* : dérivation et étymologie », in : *Indogermanisches Nomen. Derivation, Flexion und Ablaut*. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft (Freiburg, 19. bis 22. September 2001), hrsg. von Eva Tichy, Dagmar S. Wodtko, Britta Irslinger, Bremen, Hempen Verlag, p. 153-188.
- RASTIER F., 1987, *Sémantique interprétative*, Paris, PUF.
- TICHY E., 1992, « Wozu braucht das Altindische ein periphrastisches Futur ? », *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. 142 (n° 2), p. 334-342.
- , 1992, « Zur Rekonstruktion der Nomina agentis auf **-tér-* und **-tor-* », dans *Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie*, éd. par R. Beekes, A. Lubotsky, J. Weitenberg, Innsbruck, p. 411-420.
- , 1995, *Die Nomina agentis auf -tar- im Vedischen*, Heidelberg, C. Winter.
- VERNET i PONS M., 2008, *La segona conjugació verbal llatina : Estudi etimològic i Comparatiu sobre l'Origen Protoindoeuropeu de la Formació dels seus Temes Verbals*, Barcelona.

The World as a Yawning Gap: New Insights into the Etymology of Lat. *Mundus* ‘World’

Simona Georgescu
University of Bucharest

Mundus, -i ‘world’ represents a long-standing etymological *crux*. It is traditionally supposed to have had the original meaning of ‘ornament’, and to have gained the meaning of ‘world’ simply by coining Gr. κόσμος (cf. Buck 1949, Pokorny 1956, Ernout / Meillet 1959 [1932¹], De Vaan 2008). Many other contributions on this issue still leave the problem open, although their solutions are different from the traditional one (Evan- gelisti 1969, Puhvel 1976, Dognini 2001, Milani 2009). It is generally assumed that *mundus* ‘world’ is just an homonym of *mundus* ‘hole, gap’, the latter being generally considered as a word of Etruscan origin (cf. TLL).

I shall argue that it is precisely *this* relation that represents the key towards understanding the origin of *mundus* ‘world’ – the two meanings being strongly related to each other.

To approach this issue I am using, as basic theoretical background, the principles provided by cognitive etymology: thus, an insight into the common cognitive patterns which determine the denominations of ‘world’ in various languages offers a different perspective on the relation between *mundus* ‘world’ and *mundus* ‘pit’. The research on Latin has been conducted by analysing the testimonies to be found in archaic or classical texts (the corpus being mainly based on TLL). The semantic clues are supported by a phonetic analysis of the lexeme in relation to other Indo-European words that we consider to be its cognates.

By analysing the data provided by our Latin corpus, we find that the primordial meaning of *mundus*, -i must have been that of ‘cavity’, evolving towards the image of a yawning gap, just like Gr. *χάος*, afterwards a gap leading to the underworld, hence the underworld itself; at the same time, still having as a starting point the shape of a cavity, yet turned upside down, it could evolve towards the meaning of ‘vault’ of the sky (as it appears in some of its most ancient occurrences), and then, by extension, it came to designate the whole universe.

Bibliography

- Buck, Carl Darling (1949), *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages. A Contribution to the History of Ideas*, Chicago / Illinois, The University of Chicago Press.
- Dognini, C. (2001), *Mundus. Etruria e Oriente in una istituzione romana*, Lecce, Galatina.
- Ernout, A./ Meillet, A. (2001 [1932¹]), *Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Latine*, Paris, Klincksieck, 2001.
- Evangelisti, E. (1969), « Una congruenza lessicale latino-indiana, a proposito del *mundus* sotterraneo », in *Studi linguistici in onore di Vittore Pisani*, I, Brescia, 1969, pp. 347-366.
- Milani, C. (2009), “La nozione di ‘mondo’ in alcune lingue indoeuropee”, in *Varia Linguistica*, a cura di Rosa Bianca Finazzi e Paola Tornaghi, EDUCAtt, Milano, pp. 337-372.
- Pokorny, Julius (1959), *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern, Francke.
- Puhvel, J. (1976), “The origin of Greek *kosmos* and Latin *mundus*”, in *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 97, No. 2, pp. 154-167.
- Vaan (De), Michiel (2008), *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*, Leiden/ Boston, Brill.

Les mots latins d’origine grecque avec diffusion panromane: comment et pourquoi ?

Theodor Georgescu

Universitatea din București

L'ouvrage se concentre sur les grécismes du latin qui sont devenus des lexèmes panromans (selon DÉRom : *aer*, *angelus*, *blastimare*, *bra(c)chium*, *cannabis*, *castanea*, *chorda*, *coma*, *corona*, *marmor*, *masticare*, *pascha*, *sabbatum*, *saccus*, *spatha*, *stuppa*), en visant les points suivants :

- les caractéristiques de leur trajet jusqu'à l'intégration en latin
- la raison de leur adoption en latin
- les paramètres de leur survivance romane.

Les rapports linguistiques entre les Grecs et les Romains, qui constituent le thème d'un chapitre dans la plupart des traités d'histoire du latin, ont été analysés d'une manière approfondie particulièrement par Frédérique Biville, qui a consacré plusieurs articles à ce sujet. Dans le cadre plus large de la théorie de l'emprunt linguistique (voir Haugen 1950), nous appliquons la théorie de Josette Rey-Debove qui vise les étapes d'intégration parcourues par un lexème d'une langue-source avant de faire partie de la langue-cible. Pour déterminer la place que se réservent ces emprunts dans le lexique latin, en rapport soit avec les mots autochtones qui désignaient la même réalité (si c'est le cas), soit avec les autres lexèmes du même champ sémantique, on doit se fonder sur les principes du structuralisme diachronique, tel qu'il a été formulé par Eugen Coşeriu (1964).

Pour ce qui est du corpus, nous partons de TLL pour extraire les contextes les plus édificateurs en ce sens-là, à partir desquels on peut distinguer les étapes de pénétration et d'adaptation de ces hellénismes en latin.

On essaye de voir quels mots ont pénétré par le biais de l'oralité – en témoignant ainsi des besoins quotidiens de la langue latine dans sa vertigineuse croissance – et quels autres ont été empruntés par voie culte, et seulement plus tard intégrés dans la langue populaire (intégration supposée par leur héritage dans les langues romanes). Le résultat de cet ouvrage sera une vue d'ensemble sur le contexte lexical latin où ont pénétré ces grécismes – leur emplacement d'un point de vue structurel, la possible rivalité avec de vieux mots latins et l'éventuelle restructuration des champs lexicaux où ils s'intègrent.

Bibliographie

- Biville, Frédérique (1989), "Grec et latin: contacts linguistiques et création lexicale. Pour une typologie des hellénismes lexicaux du latin", in M. Lavency / D. Longrée (ed.), *Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain, Actes du Ve Colloque de Linguistique latine*, Louvain-la-Neuve, pp. 29-40.
- Biville, Frédérique (1992), "Le grec parlé en latin vulgaire. Domaines lexicaux, structures linguistiques d'accueil", in M. Iliescu / Werner Marxgut (coord.), *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif III, Actes du IIIème Colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif* (Innsbruck, 1991), Tübingen, Max Niemeyer Verlag, pp. 26-39.
- Biville, Frédérique (1998), "Compétence bilingue latino-grecque et manipulations interlinguistiques", in Claude Brixhe (coord.), *La koinégrecque antique III*, Nancy A.D.R.A., pp. 145-160.
- Coşeriu, Eugeniu, (1964a), "Para una semántica estructural diacrónica" in *Principios de semántica estructural*, Madrid, Gredos, 1977.
- DÉRom – Buchi, E. / Schweickard, W. (eds.), *Dictionnaire Étymologique Roman*, <http://www.atilf.fr/DERom>.
- Haugen, Einar (1950), „The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing”, *Language* 26, 210-231.
- Rey-Debove, Josette (1973), „La sémiotique de l'emprunt lexical”, *TraLiLi* XI, 1, 109-123.
- TLL – 1900–. *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, Leipzig, Teubner.

The Diachronic Path of Latin Focus-Sensitive Negation

Chiara Gianollo

Università di Bologna

Latin displays negative particles, like *neque / nec* ‘and not, neither, not even’ and *ne...quidem* ‘neither, not even’, that can express sentential negation while at the same time narrowly focusing on some constituent of the clause. The focusing function is diachronically primary for *ne ... quidem* (Orlandini 2001a: 69, 215-216, Devine & Stephens 2006: 266-277). For the particle *nec* in isolation (non-correlative use) it arises first in Imperial Latin (Orlandini 2001b, Orlandini & Poccetti 2007, 2008); however, I will argue that the Classical correlative uses of *neque / nec* also qualify as focus-sensitive (cf. Hendriks 2004, den Dikken 2006).

In this work I investigate the complex interplay of semantic and syntactic factors that govern the distribution and interpretation of these particles from Classical to Late Latin. I also discuss the diachronic implications of my analysis, in particular with respect to the role played by of *nec* as formative of some new Romance indefinite pronouns and determiners used in negative contexts (cf. Spanish *ninguno*, Old French *neuns*, Italian *niente*, etc.).

I show that *neque / nec* and *ne ... quidem* represent a class of systematic exceptions to the otherwise pervasive one-to-one relation between morpho-syntactic realization and semantic interpretation of negation in Latin (a Double Negation language). Their systematic association with focus leads to specific syntactic patterns that optionally, but quite systematically, may result in the redundant expression of negation (i.e. in multiple expressions of negation which together contribute just one semantic negation). This can be argued to be a possible trigger for the change happening in Romance languages, which are characterized by Negative Concord, where there is redundant marking of negation. Diachronic studies on this syntactic change usually make reference to examples like (1) as a possible starting point (Ernout & Thomas 1953: 154-155):

- (1) **neminem nihil** boni facere oportet
‘nobody should ever do any good’ (Petr. 42.7)

However, examples like (1), where two negative indefinites, or the negative marker and a negative indefinite, co-occur in a single-negation reading are rare, even in later Latin, and are a marked stylistic option, typical of a very colloquial register. Redundancy is, instead, much more systematic when focus-sensitive particles are involved, as in (2):

- (2) a. **non** enim praetereundum est **ne** id **quidem**
‘and the following occurrence should not be overlooked’ (Cic. Verr. 2.60)
b. **non** possum **nec** cogitare **nec** scribere
‘It is impossible for me to think or to write’ (Cic. Att. 9.12.1)

By means of a corpus study over selected texts of the Library of Latin Texts (LLT-A) I show that already in the controlled style of Cicero redundancy is systematic (although not obligatory) with *ne ... quidem* when the latter occurs post-verbally, as in (2.a), cf. Orlandini (2001a: 216). Also with *nec* redundancy strongly correlates with post-verbal placement (2.b). Moreover, being also used in correlative constructions (it is the source of most Romance correlative negation particles), *nec* is generally subject to a form of ‘doubling’ and thus qualifies as a possible source of reanalysis leading to the innovative Romance negation systems.

References

- Devine, Andrew M. & Laurence D. Stephens. 2006. *Latin word order. Structured meaning and information*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- den Dikken, Marcel. 2006. *Either*-float and the syntax of co-or-dination. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 24. 689–749.
- Ernout, Alfred & François Thomas. 1953. *Syntaxe Latine*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Hendriks, Petra. 2004. *Either, both and neither* in coordinate structures. In Alice ter Meulen & Werner Abraham (eds.), *The composition of meaning: From lexeme to discourse*, 115–138. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- LLT-A. Brepols’ Library of Latin Texts, Series A and B, <http://apps.brepolis.net/BrepolisPortal/default.aspx>
- Orlandini, Anna. 2001a. *Négation et argumentation en latin. Grammaire fondamentale du latin*, Tome VIII. Louvain: Peeters.
- Orlandini, Anna. 2001b. *Nec, neque* ou de la disjonction. In Claude Moussy, Michèle Fruyt, Jacqueline Dangel, Lyliane Sznajder & Léon Nadjó (eds.), *De lingua latina novae quaestiones: actes du Xè Colloque International de linguistique Latine* : Paris-Sèvres, 19-23 avril 1999, 525– 538. Louvain: Peeters.
- Orlandini, Anna & Paolo Poccetti. 2007. Il y a *nec* et *nec*: Trois valeurs de la négation en latin et dans les langues de l’Italie ancienne. In Franck Floricic (ed.), *La négation dans les langues romanes*, 29–47. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Orlandini, Anna & Paolo Poccetti. 2008. Three types of negation. Different values of *nec* in Latin and in the languages of ancient Italy. In Roger Wright (ed.), *Latin vulgaire–latin tardif VIII . Actes du VIIIème colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif*. Oxford 6-9 septembre 2006, 1–12. Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann.

AcI- and AcP-Constructions with Verba sentiendi in the Syntax-Semantics Interface

Francesco Giura
University of Pisa

The complex polysemies in perception verbs create links across many semantic fields. Notably, in the neuroscience, including linguistics, evidence perception and knowledge prove to be much correlated. In fact, the cognition of an event or of a state of affairs can be coded by verbs of perception. This semantic function is generally called Indirect Perception (IP), so to distinguish it from Direct Perception (DP), which means an acquisition by senses of images, sounds, smells, etc., in form of objects, people or events (Akmajian 1977, Felser 1999).

Crosslinguistic data show different constructions depending on whether perception predicates are used in the perceptive or in the knowledge sense (Comrie 1976: 40, Noonan 1985: 118 ff., Cristofaro 2005: 105 ff.). Latin syntactic system only partially displays a strict distinction between IP and DP (Bolkestein 1976a and 1976b, Maraldi 1980). Although there is no question that DP is expressed by a progressive-verb complementation, the AcP (Accusativus cum Participio presente, e.g. Pl. *Au. 3 unde ex-euntem me aspexistis* “from which you saw me going out”), the AcI (Accusativus cum Infinitivo) construction is used both for DP (Pl. *Bac. 403-4 sed eccos uideo incedere / patrem sodalis et magistrum* “But here I see my friend’s father and the his tutor come”) and IP (Pl. *Capt. 651 Uerba mihi data esse uideo* “I see that they tricked me”).

This study aims to explore in more detail these syntactic and semantic patterns, especially in the disambiguation of DP and IP in AcI construction. To this purpose, I used a corpus of selected Latin texts ranging from the age of Plautus (3rd -2nd B.C.) to Augustine (5th A.D.), and a morphosyntactic annotation of over 200 instances. The data are considered in the quantitative and qualitative aspects: on the one hand the records outline the frequency distribution of all these syntactic patterns over the centuries (account of AcI and AcP cases in each author and text-type distribution), and, on the other hand, the morphosyntactic context shows the different semantic interpretations in AcI constructions (DP or IP).

References

- Akmajian, A. (1977), *The Complement Structure of Perception Verbs in an Autonomous Syntax Framework*, in Culicover, P. – Wasow, T. and Akmajian, A. (eds.), *Formal Syntax*, Academic Press, New York, 427-60.
- Bolkestein, M. (1976a), *The relation between form and meaning of Latin subordinate clauses governed by verba dicendi*, in *Mnemosyne*, 29, 155-175 and 268-300.
- Bolkestein, M. (1976b), *AcI and ut-clauses with verba dicendi in Latin*, in *Glotta*, 54, 263-291.
- Comrie, B. (1976), *Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*, Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics, Cambridge, CUP.
- Cristofaro, S. (2005), *Subordination*, Oxford, OUP.
- Felser, C. (1999), *Verbal Complement Clauses: A Minimalist Study of Direct Perception Constructions*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Maraldi, M. (1980), *The complement structure of perception verbs in Latin*, in Calboli, G. (ed.), *Papers of Grammar*, 1, Bologna, CLUEB, 47-79.
- Noonan, M. (1985), *Complementation*, in Shopen, T. (ed.), *Complex Constructions*, Cambridge, CUP, 42-140.

On Development of Latin Culinary Vocabulary, Towards a Digital Diachronic Database

Alexandra Grigorieva

Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies

Latin culinary vocabulary is formed according to certain linguistic universals I have discovered analysing 499 recipes ranging from 1st to 6th century AD, ascribed to

the Roman gourmet Apicius. For instance, food words,¹ be it names of raw ingredients like apple, names of products like cheese, or name of dishes like stew, may be divided into five onomasiological categories according to their etymology. The most abundant category in Latin is that of food words formed from the name of the foodstuff, e.g. *porcellus coriandratus* (young pig with coriander). Another major category consists of food words derived from the name of culinary action, e.g. *minutal* (stew of finely chopped ingredients). There are also quite a few food words that take their name from a culinary recipient in a kind of *pars pro toto*, e.g. *patina* (something baked in a pan, usually a kind of thickened casserole), that's the third category. And, much like in the game of Pictionary, there is a P category with food words derived from proper names, geographical like *haedus Parthicus* (kid Parthian style), or personal like *minutal Matianum* (stew Matius style). There is also a special category of food words formed via non-culinary metaphors and fancy wordplay, for instance *salsum sine salso* (salted fish without salted fish) or *circellus* (round sausage).

In this presentation, I propose to study food words of the first onomasiological category formed with the Latin suffix *-atus* that expresses presence of an ingredient (29 different food words in Apicius). I plan to analyse them in context of other *linguae technicae* (agricultural, medicinal) as well as literary sources (e.g. Martial's *mulli rutati*, *polenta caseata* of Apuleius etc.), to answer the question to what extent was the *-atus* word formation specifically a part of Latin *sermo culinaris*.

For this, I will also use diachronic data from later Romance languages that have food words formed accordingly with the same suffix, such as *-ato* in Italian *cassata*, *mandorlato*, *-ado* in Spanish *fabada*, *-é/-ade* in French *jambon persillé* and its earlier etymological double *persillade*, but also *nougat*, *cervelas* and so on. Interestingly, this highly productive suffix also entered many other non-Romance languages with words like *Orangeat*, *Zitronat* in German, *lemonade* in English, *vissinada* in modern Greek.

Results and conclusions will be collected in the first part of the digital diachronic database at <http://gasterea-thesaurus.com> contributing to our knowledge of development and spread of Latin culinary vocabulary in Europe.

References

- André, J. *Apicius: L'art culinaire*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1974.
 Andrei, S. *Aspects du vocabulaire agricole latin*. Roma, L'ERMA di Bretschneider, 1981.
 Apicius. Ed. Grainger, S., Grocock, C. Totnes, Prospect books, 2006.
 Campetella, M. *La terminologia tecnica dell'Opus Agriculturae di Palladio: analisi lessicale diacronica e studio dei derivati italo-romanzi*. In *Latin vulgaire, latin tardif X*. Actes du Xe Colloque international de latin vulgaire et tardif et de linguistique romane (Université de Bergame, Italie, 4-9 septembre 2012), t. II. Bergamo, Bergamo University Press, Sestante edizioni, 2014.
 Geeraerts, D. *Theories of Lexical Semantics*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010.
 Geeraerts, D. *Quantitative corpus onomasiology*. At *Conceptual Change – Digital Humanities Case Studies*, 7–8 december 2015, Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies.
 Grzega, J. *Bezeichnungswandel: Wie, Warum, Wozu? Ein Beitrag zur englischen und allgemeinen Onomasiologie*. Heidelberg, Winter, 2004.
Latin et langues romanes. Études de linguistique offertes à József Herman. Tübingen, Niemeyer, 2005.

¹ In Apicius there are 690 food words ipso sensu, 332 cooking verbs and 66 names for culinary utensils.

- Lexicology: An International Handbook on the Nature and Structure of Words and Vocabularies/ Lexikologie: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Natur und Struktur von Wörtern und Wortschätzen*. Ed. Cruse, A. et al. (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 21), Berlin/New York, Walter de Gruyter, 2002.
- Lingue tecniche del greco e del latino*. Atti del I Seminario internazionale sulla letteratura scientifica e tecnica greca e latina. Università degli studi di Trieste, 1993.
- Onomasiology Online*. Complete collection 2000-2010 by J. Grzega. Accessed on September 30, 2016: <http://www1.ku-eichstaett.de/SLF/EnglVglSW/OnOn-Total.pdf>.
- Sconocchia, S. *La lingua della medicina greca e latina*. In S.Sconocchia-F.Cavalli Coord., M. Baldin-M. Cecere-D. Crismani cur., *Testi medici latini antichi. Le parole della medicina: lessico e storia*. Atti del VII Convegno internazionale (Trieste, 11-13 ottobre 2001), pp. 493-544. Bologna, Pàtron, 2004.
- Vasilieva, N. *Semiological notes on De arte coquinaria by Apicius*. In *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif*. Actes du I Colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif (Pécs, 2-5 septembre 1985). Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1987.

Force Dynamics in Latin *secundum* ‘according to’ and *secundus* ‘favourable’

Caterina Guardamagna
University of Liverpool

The preposition *secundum* NP has only recently gained attention (Guardamagna 2016, forth.a, b, c, d), thus filling a gap in the panorama of studies of Latin prepositions (e.g. Baldi 1979, 1999: 358-360, Brucalè & Mocciano 2011, Bubenik 2006, Lehmann 1983, Luraghi 1989, 2010, Martín Puente & Conde Salazar 2006, 2012, 2014, 2015, Pinkster 1972: 145 ff., 1990: 65-72, 2015; Short 2013, Trabelsi 2015, Vincent 1999).

This talk investigates the diachronic development of *secundum* NP with meaning of conformity (*secundum naturam* ‘in accordance with nature’) and beneficiary (*secundum adversarium* ‘in favour of the opponent’) over a period of 800 years. The analysis is based on 525 instances of *secundum* with conformity and beneficiary meaning out of 890 occurrences (random sample) of *secundum* NP drawn from a 6M word prose sub-section of the 12M word *Latin Library* corpus.

First, this paper shows how conformity is the most frequent meaning over time, whereas beneficiary is marginal and eventually disappears.

Then, this study develops a semantic analysis of *secundum* NP within the theoretical framework of Cognitive Linguistics (Croft & Cruise 2004, Evans & Green 2006, Geeraerts & Cuykens 2010) and in particular, Cognitive Semantics (Talmy 2000). Specifically, this paper discusses the possible origin of the conformity meaning out of an expression meaning ‘downstream’ and argues that an explanation based on the extraction of schemas from the proto-scene and force dynamics (Talmy 1988, 2000) appears to be more plausible. This paper also argues that, although the beneficiary meaning is connected to the spatial meaning via a metaphorical link, force dynamics also play a role, connecting directly to the meaning of conformity. This discussion is complemented by a comparison between specific constructions of the type *secundum flumen* and *secundo flumine* (the latter displaying the adjective *secundus* ‘favourable’), both

translated as ‘downstream.’ The comparison highlights how these two near synonymous expressions actually differ in construal, encoding compliance and assistance respectively.

While contributing to the description of Latin, this paper also leads to an expansion of Talmy’s (2000) force dynamic model of ‘helping’ to capture also assistance/support.

Corpus

The Latin Library corpus. Available at <https://cqpweb.lancs.ac.uk/latinlib/>

References

- Baldi, Ph. (1979). “Typology and the Indo-European prepositions.” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 84, pp. 49-61.
- Brucale, L. & Mocciaro, E. (2011). “Continuity and discontinuity in the semantics of the Latin preposition *per*: a cognitive hypothesis.” *STUF – Language Typology and Universals* 64/2, pp. 148-169.
- Bubenik, V. (2006). “From Latin to Romance.” In Hewson, J. & Bubenik, V. (eds.) *From Case to Adposition: The development of configurational syntax in Indo-European languages*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 247 – 273.
- Croft, W. & Cruse, A. (2004). *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, V. & Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics. An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Geeraerts, D. & Cuykens, H. (2010). *The Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Guardamagna (forth.a). “*Secundum* NP: A cognitive account of the spatio-temporal domains including logical extensions of space.” In Spevak, O. (ed.) *Études de linguistique latine II*, Toulouse: Le Mirail. Special issue of *Pallas* 103 on Latin Linguistics.
- Guardamagna, C. (2016). “Conformity and Beneficiary Meanings of Latin *secundum* NP: a Corpus based Cognitive Analysis.” *Revista Linguística* 12/1 (January 2016), Special issue on Cognitive Linguistics edited by Lilian Ferrari, pp. 33-54.
- Guardamagna, C. (forth.b). “A diachronic semantic map for the Latin preposition *secundum*.” To appear in *Journal of Latin Linguistics*.
- Guardamagna, C. (forth.c). “Reportative evidentiality, attribution and epistemic modality: A corpus-based diachronic study of Latin *secundum* NP (‘according to’ NP).” To appear in *Language Sciences*.
- Guardamagna, C. (forth.d). “Constructionalisation and constructional changes in the evolution of the *secundum* NP construction in Latin.” In Coussé, E. et al. (eds.) *Grammaticalization meets Construction Grammar*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Lehmann, Ch. (1983). “Latin Preverbs and Cases.” In Pinkster, H. (ed.). *Latin Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 145-161.
- Luraghi, S. (1989). “The relationships between prepositions and cases within Latin prepositional phrases.” In Calboli, G. (ed.) *Subordination and other Topics in Latin: Proceedings from the third colloquium on Latin Linguistics*. Bologna, April 1985, pp. 253 ff.
- Luraghi, S. (2010). “Adverbial phrases.” In Baldi, P. & Cuzzolin, P. (eds.) *New Perspectives on Latin syntax. Volume 2. Constituent syntax: adverbial phrases, adverbs, mood, tenses*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 19-109.
- Martín Puente, C. & Conde Salazar, M. (2006). “Ex: de preposición a sustantivo” In Villayandre Llamazares, M. (ed.) *Actas del XXXV Simposio Internacional de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística*. Leon: University of Leon, pp. 315-332.

- Martín Puente, C. & Conde Salazar, M. (2015). “Dos locuciones preposicionales en latín: *in loco/locum e in uice/uicem*.” Paper read at the 18th International Colloquium in Latin Linguistics, Toulouse, France, July 2015.
- Martín Puente, C. & Conde Salazar, M. (2012). “Vice de sustantivo a prefijo (pasando por adposición).” In Molinelli, P., Cuzzolin, P. & Fedriani, Ch. (eds.) *Latin vulgaire, latin tardif X. Actes du X colloque International sur le latin vulgaire et tardif* (Bergamo, 5th-9th September 2012). Bergamo: Bergamo University Press/Sestante Edizioni, pp. 151-161.
- Martín Puente, C. & Conde Salazar, M. (2014). “El paso de la preposición latina *pro* a prefijo: una gramaticalización poco productiva.” *Latomus*, 7/3, pp. 577-594.
- Pinkster, H. (1972). *On Latin Adverbials*. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Pinkster, H. (1990). *Latin Syntax & Semantics*. London: Routledge.
- Pinkster, H. (2015). *Oxford Latin Syntax. Volume 1: The Simple Clause*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Talmy, L. (1988). “Force dynamics in language and cognition.” *Cognitive Science* 12, pp. 49-100.
- Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a Cognitive Semantics. Volume I. Concept structuring systems*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Trabelsi, H. (2015). “La préposition latine *prae*, un cas de grammaticalisation?” Paper read at the 18th International Colloquium in Latin Linguistics, Toulouse, France, July 2015.
- Vincent, N. (1999). “The evolution of C-structure. Prepositions and PPs from Indo-European to Romance.” *Linguistics* 37, pp. 1111-1153.

Notes on Relative Clause Syntax in Roman Comedy

Hilla Halla-aho

University of Helsinki

Preposed relative clauses refer to relative clauses that are placed before their matrix clauses (minimally the matrix clause predicate). These relative clauses occur throughout Latin, but are usually thought to be typical in earlier material, especially when the matrix clause contains an explicit resumptive element. They can be studied as Latin continuators of Indo-European correlative sentences. In this perspective the emphasis is on the construction’s archaic nature. An example is (1):

(1) Plaut. *Amph.* 402

quod mihi praedicās **uitium**, id tibi est

The nominal head can precede the relative pronoun and still be (potentially) internal to the relative clause due to the flexible word order of Latin, as in (2):

(2) Plaut. *Trin.* 16-17

sed de argumento ne expectetis fabulae:

senes qui huc uenient, i rem uobis aperient

But there are even examples like (3) where the antecedent is unambiguously outside the relative clause:

(3) Ter. *Heaut.* 130-1

sed **gnatum unicum**,

quem pariter uti his decuit aut etiam amplius, (...)

eum ego hinc eieci miserum iniustitia mea

This third type of construction is an instance of so-called left-dislocation (an extra-clausal element *gnatum unicum* followed by the resumption *eum*). On the other hand, an otherwise similar construction can appear without the resumption in the matrix clause, cf. (4):

(4) Plaut. *Amph.* 869

Simul **Alcumenae**, **quam** uir insontem probri
Amphitruo accusat, ueni ut auxilium feram

This is a classical construction, whereby the initial element not only takes the case form it has as a constituent of the main clause, but does so even without a co-referent expression in the main clause.

The paper will discuss the distribution and syntax of these four different types in Plautus and Terence. It will be asked whether these constructions serve as indicators of the stylistic difference between the two authors. In particular, it will be shown that left-dislocation cannot be reduced to word order variation in the relative clause and the possibility will be considered that the occurrence of left-dislocation should be attributed to Plautus' personal style rather than an archaic state of language.

Finally, it will be considered how the observed patterns in types (1)-(4) relate to preposed relative clauses without nominal heads, as in (5):

(5) Plaut. *Rud.* 13-15

qui falsas litis falsis testimoniis
petunt quique in iure abiurant pecuniam,
eorum referimus nomina exscripta ad Iouem

Selected bibliography

- Bertelsmann, K. (1885) *Über die verschiedenen Formen der Correlation in der Structur der Relativsätze des ältern Latein*. Diss. Jena.
- Blänsdorf, J. (1967) *Archaische Gedankengänge in den Komödien des Plautus*, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag
- Eckstein, F. (1921), "Syntaktische Beiträge zu Plautus", *Philologus* 31, 142-173.
- Fruyt, M. (2005) "La corrélation en latin: définition et description", in P. de Carvalho and F. Lambert (eds.) *Structures parallèles et corrélatives en grec et en latin*. Saint-Étienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Étienne. 17-44.
- Lehmann, Ch. (1979) "Der Relativsatz vom Indogermanischen bis zum Italienischen", *Die Sprache* 25: 1-23.
- Pompei, A. (2011) "Relative clauses" in Ph. Baldi and P. Cuzzolin (eds.) *New perspectives on Latin Historical Syntax, Volume 4: Complex Sentences, Grammaticalization, Typology*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. 427-547.
- Probert, Ph. (2014) "Relative clauses, Indo-Hittite and Standard Average European", in S. W. Jamison, C. Melchert and B. Vine (2014), *Proceedings of the 25th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*. Bremen: Hempen, 137-64.
- Vonlaufen J. (1974) *Studien über die Stellung und Gebrauch des lateinischen Relativsatzes unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Lukrez*. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag Freiburg/Schweiz.

On the Development of some "Negative" Words from Early to Late Latin

Gerd Haverling
Uppsala university

In early and classical Latin we find a variety of negations and words which have a negating semantic function. In late Latin several of these words tend to disappear: With *dubium est* or *dubito* we often find the accusative with the infinitive or *quod* in later Latin and not the classical use of *quin*; and *ne* is often replaced by *ut non* in the late Latin of for instance Gregory of Tours. Sometimes the survival of a word is connected to register: for instance *neue*, which is common in classical Latin prose, tends to disappear in late Latin prose, but remains in use in late Latin poetry.

In a paper presented at Paris in June 2016, I discussed the use of some "negative" conjunctions in earlier and later Latin. In this paper I intend to continue this work and deal with some other categories of words as well.

References

- Bonnet, Max, (1890), *Le latin du Grégoire de Tours*, Paris.
- Fleck, Frédérique, 2008, *Interrogation, coordination et subordination: le latin quin*, Paris: Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne.
- Haverling, Gerd V. M., (2014), 'Il latino letterario della tarda antichità', *Latin vulgaire – Latin tardif X*, *Actes du X^e colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif*, Bergamo 5–9 septembre 2012, éd. par Piera Molinelli, Pierluigi Cuzzolin et Chiara Fedriani, (Bergamo University Press), Bergamo 2014, p. 845–872.
- Hofmann, J.B., & Szantyr, A., (1965), *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik = Lateinische Grammatik. Zweiter Band*, by Leumann, Hofmann & Szantyr, (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II.2.2), Munich.
- Janson, Tore, 1979, *Mechanisms of Language Change in Latin*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Löfstedt, E., (1911), *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache*, Uppsala - Leipzig (repr. Oxford & Uppsala & Leipzig 1936).
- , (1959), *Late Latin*, (Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning), Oslo.
- Orlandini, Anna, (2001), *Négation et argumentation en Latin* (Grammaire fondamentale du latin: tome VIII), Louvain & Paris: Peeters.
- Skahill, B.H., (1934), *The Syntax of the Variae of Cassiodorus*, (The Catholic University of America, Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin III), Washington, D.C.
- ThLL = *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, Leipzig 1900 –.
- Väänänen, V., (1981), *Introduction au Latin vulgaire* (Bibliothèque Française et Romane, Serie A, Vol. 6), 3rd ed., Paris.
- , (1987), *Le Journal-épître d'Égérie (Itinerarium Egeriae). Étude linguistique*, (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, ser. B, tom. 230), Helsinki.
- Wright, R., (2002), *A Sociophilological Study of Late Latin* (Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy), (Brepols), Turnhout.

Modalität aus Satzreduktion: zum deontischen Gerundiv

Fritz Heberlein

KU Eichstätt-Ingolstadt

Fragestellung: Die durch Gerundivkonstruktionen des Typs *tibi liber legendus est* auf der Basis prädikativer Possession (dazu Heine 1997) vermittelte deontische Modalität ist im Lateinischen ohne morphologischen Ausdruck (vgl. zuletzt Magni 2014), im Gegensatz zu vergleichbaren Konstruktionen in anderen Sprachen. Was ist hier Basis der deontischen Modalität?

Folgend Vorschläge existieren: (1) Obligation aus Possession; dabei verläuft die Entwicklung a. entweder über das Gerund als Variante eines Verbalnomens (Typ: *quid tibi hanc tactio est*; so seit Aalto, verbreitet in den Handbüchern), oder b. über das Gerundiv durch Implikatur nach dem Muster *agendus* »ein durch Treiben charakterisierter« → »einer der von jemandem getrieben werden muss« (Hackstein); (2) Implikatur aus amtssprachlichem Register: *eis rem capitalem faciendam censuere*, »Empfehlung → Befehl« (Risch); (3) Überdeckung ursprünglicher dativischer Kasusmarkierung (*do tibi librum *legendo / mihi signum est *dando*) durch Analogie zu kongruenten Konstruktionen (Hettrich 1993, Strunk).

Diskussion: Zu (1) a.: die Überprüfung anhand eines Corpus zeigt, dass das Modalitätsspektrum des Gerundivs enger ist als das der Verbalnomina und in geringerem Grad durch pragmatische Faktoren determiniert wird. Zu (1) b.: der Dativ beim Gerundiv ist nicht auf agentive Funktion (»Pflicht einer Person«) beschränkt, sondern behält seine alte Experienterfunktion (dazu Luraghi 2016), die hier ikonisch dafür steht, dass der Referent Kausatum einer externen deontischen Quelle ist.– (2) kehrt die Entwicklung offenkundig um, da die semantische Abschwächung (»Empfehlung«) auf der Bedeutung von *censere* beruht.– (3): ursprüngliche Kasusautonomie ist nicht nachweisbar: das Gerundiv im Typ *do tibi librum legendum* verhält sich syntaktisch nicht wie ein autonomer »Zielkasus«, sondern wie ein kongruenter Kasus; für die Nominativkonstruktion ist analoges naheliegend.

Mein eigener Vorschlag nimmt eine Parallelentwicklung an (ähnlich wie bei AcI und NcI, vgl. Hettrich 1992) und zwar aus den ursprünglich appositionellen Strukturen, also Satzgefügen, der Muster a. *do tibi librum [legendum]* und b. *tibi liber est [legendus]*. Im Akkusativ wird die finale Relation des Gerundivs durch das Zusammenwirken von Intentionalität des Hauptverbs sowie Appositionalität und imperfektivem Aspekt des Gerundivs konstituiert, auf die inagentive Nominativkonstruktion geht sie über, weil beide Konstruktionen ein suppletives Valenzpaar »kausativ : nicht-kausativ« bilden. Im Nominativ wird sodann durch die Grammatikalisierung des Existenzverbs zur Kopula das Satzgefüge zum einfachen Satz reduziert; dabei wird die (nur zwischen zwei Prädikationen mögliche) finale Relation zur deontischen Bedeutung der Periphrase grammatikalisiert, und der Dativ bleibt Marker der Kausativum-Funktion mit impliziten Hinweis auf das Vorhandensein eines externen Kausators, der »deontische Quelle«: es entsteht eine konstruktionselle, komposite deontische Bedeutung, die bei fortschreitender Marginalisierung des Dativs schließlich zur periphrastischen wird.

Literatur

Aalto, P. – *Untersuchungen über das lateinische Gerundium und Gerundivum*. Helsinki 1949.

- Hackstein, O. – Zur Entwicklung von Modalität in Verbaladjektiven. E. Tichy (ed.), *Indogermanisches Nomen*. Wiesbaden 2003. 51-66.
- Heine, B. – *Possession*. Oxford 1997.
- Hettrich, H. – Die Entstehung des lateinischen und griechischen AcI. R. Beekes, A. Lubotsky, J. Weitenberg (eds.): *Rekonstruktive und relative Chronologie*. Innsbruck 1992. 221-234.
- Hettrich, H. – Nochmals zu Gerundium und Gerundivum. G. Meiser (ed.), *Indogermanica et Italica*. Wiesbaden 1993. 190-208.
- Luraghi, S. – The dative of agent in Indo-European languages. *STUF* 69, 2016, 19-47.
- Magni, E. – From action nominal to gerund and gerundive. C. Cabrilla & Chr. Lehmann (eds.), *Acta XVI Colloquii Internationalis Linguisticae Latinae*. Madrid 2015. 146-162.
- Risch, E. – *Gerundivum und Gerundium*. Berlin 1984.
- Strunk, K. – Lateinisches Gerundium / Gerundivum und Vergleichbares. J. Jasanoff e.a. (eds.), *Mir Cúrad. Festschrift für C. Watkins*. Innsbruck 1998. 659-668.

Introduction to the Thesaurus linguae Latinae

Michael Hillen
Thesaurus linguae Latinae

The *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* is the largest and most comprehensive dictionary of ancient and late antique Latin. It is based on an archive of about 10 million slips: a ‘treasury’, which contains, in their entirety, all preserved writings from the earliest examples down to Apuleius (later second century CE) and selections compiled by specialists from the later period to about AD 600. Where necessary, this material is supplemented by means of the data banks now available.

We focus here on the process by which the information on the slips is turned into dictionary articles. First, we look at the most important lexicographical principles of the Thesaurus, of which the user should also be aware: for instance, the chronological presentation within articles, their (ideally) dichotomous structure, the illustration of meanings and context through selected quotations. Then we turn to questions of content and to formal aspects, such as the introductory section of an article and the use of brackets. Some of the information given is of interest to specialised areas of classical studies or to related disciplines: for example, the introduction contains a modern etymology, so that the Thesaurus is at the same time an ongoing etymological dictionary. Special morphological features and the later development of words in the Romance languages also receive separate treatment.

The lexicographers arrive at criteria for presenting each word through intensive analysis of all the slips. Linguistics, along with other branches of scholarship, offers a valuable orientation – particularly in the case of verbs, those special favourites of linguists, and discourse particles. As early as 1909 J. B. Hofmann joined the staff; his presence exerted a strong influence on the linguistic and lexicographical development of the dictionary. Over the decades one can trace an increasingly subtle differentiation in the articles.

In recent years the Thesaurus has found new ways of helping its users by extending its website. This talk aims to show how the archives and published volumes of the dictionary can be of use to linguists with diverse interests and to go some way towards dispelling the impression of the Thesaurus as a ‘book of seven seals’.

Der lateinische Dativ – neue Wege in Transitivität und funktionaler Semantik

Satoko Hisatsugi

Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena

Während insbesondere dem Tempus- und Adverbialsystem des Lateinischen große Aufmerksamkeit zuteil wurde, blieb das lateinische Kasussystem von der theoretischen Linguistik lange Zeit unberücksichtigt und wurde erst Anfang dieses Jahrtausends Bestandteil linguistischer Diskussionen (vgl. Pinkster 2015). Dabei ist es vor allem der Dativ, der innerhalb der traditionellen Grammatik von Kühner und der ausführlichen Syntax von Menge hinsichtlich seiner Funktionsbestimmung zahlreiche Probleme aufwirft.¹ Dies liegt in der aus dem Indogermanischen ererbten, funktionellen Mannigfaltigkeit des **freien Dativs** begründet, der einen Blick auf die anderen italischen und indogermanischen Sprachen unumgänglich macht. Im Vortrag werden daher folgende Fragen im Fokus stehen: Woher kommen die vielfältigen Funktionen des lateinischen Dativs und warum übernimmt ausgerechnet der Dativ diese Funktionen? In welchem Zusammenhang stehen Transitivität, Akkusativ und Dativ? Da der Vortrag eine Funktionsanalyse zum Ziel hat, stellt er sich in die 1968 von Fillmore begründete Tradition der Tiefenkasusgrammatik (Vgl. Fillmore 1968). Diese wird im Vortrag mit der syntaktischen Transitivitätstheorie von Hopper & Thompson (1980) kombiniert, die von einer skalaren Transitivität ausgeht, zusammengesetzt aus einer Reihe syntaktischer und semantisch-funktionaler Aspekte. Im Rahmen dieser Theorie sind so die beiden Sätze dt. *Ich folge dem Hund* und lat. *canem sequor* hinsichtlich ihrer Transitivität identisch. Schwieriger ist dagegen die Analyse des Belegs *sed quia studebat laudi et dignitati* (Cic. *fin.* 4, 65). Entsprechend der Transitivitätstheorie von Hopper/Thompson unterscheiden sich diese Sätze nur in einem Merkmal, nämlich der Kinesis: *studere* ist ein stativisches Verb, während *sequi* dynamisch ist. Damit weist der Satz *sed quia studebat laudi et dignitati* eine etwas geringere Transitivität auf.

Das zugrundeliegende Korpus umfasst im Sinne eines *register balanced corpus* folgende Autoren: Sallust, Cicero, Plinius den Jüngeren, Seneca, Plautus, Vergil, Ovid, Martial.

Der Vortrag wird daher neben der Untersuchung der Dativfunktionen anhand der Tiefenkasusgrammatik auch einen innovativen Blick auf die Transitivität im Lateinischen ermöglichen.

Literaturverzeichnis

Bybee & Hopper 2001: Joan L. Bybee & Paul J. Hopper, *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure*. (Typological studies in language 45) Amsterdam 2001.

¹ Vgl. z. B.: Rafael Kühner, Carl Stegmann: *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, 2 Bände, Hannover 1879; Hans Rubenbauer, J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Grammatik*, 12. korr. Auflage, München 1995; Hermann Menge: *Lehrbuch der lateinischen Syntax und Semantik*, 4. Auflage, völlig neu bearbeitet von Thorsten Burkard und Markus Schauer, Darmstadt 2009; *Duden 4 Grammatik*, Mannheim 2005; Elke Hentschel, *Handbuch der deutschen Grammatik*, Berlin 2013 usw.

- Fillmore 1968: Charles J. Fillmore, The case for case. In: *Universals in Linguistic Theory*. Hg. von E. Bach and R. Harms. New York, 1968, 1-88.
- Hopper & Thompson 1980: Paul J. Hopper & Sandra A. Thompson, Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse. *Language* 56/2: 251–299.
- 2001: Transitivity, clause structure, and argument structure: Evidence from conversation. In: *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure*. Hg. von Joan L. Bybee & Paul J. Hopper. (Typological studies in language 45) Amsterdam 2001, 27–60.
- Lehmann 2016: Christian Lehmann, Grammaticalization and automation, 23. LIPP-Symposium "Grammatikalisierung in interdisziplinärer Perspektive". Internationale Konferenz der Graduiertenschule Sprache & Literatur München, 6.–8. Juli 2016.
- Pinkster 2015: Harm Pinkster, Oxford Latin Syntax. Oxford, 2015.
- Schmid 2006: Die freien Dative. In: *Dependenz und Valenz*. Hg. von Hans-Werner Eroms. (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 25/2) Berlin, New York 2006, 953–962.

K.F. Beckers Lehre von den Satzverhältnissen, die lateinische Grammatik des 19. Jahrhunderts und die heutige Linguistik

Roland Hoffmann

Mainz

Die Lehre von den drei Satzverhältnissen, einem prädikativen, einem objektiven und einem attributiven, die von Karl Ferdinand Becker (1775-1849), einem originellen Sprachwissenschaftler des 19. Jahrhunderts, im „Organism der Sprache“ von 1827 (²1841) entwickelt wurde, findet sich u.a. in den Erstauflagen von Kühners großer griechischer und lateinischer Satzlehre von 1834-35 und 1877-78. Im Kern besteht sie aus binären Prinzipien. Nach Perceival (1976) habe diese Lehre über den Psychologen Wilhelm Wundt (1904) auf Bloomfield gewirkt und sei der Ursprung der Konstituentenstruktur des amerikanischen Strukturalismus.

Nach einer Darstellung dieser syntaktischen Lehre von K.F. Becker und ihren deskriptiven Möglichkeiten (Haselbach 1966; Welke 2014) beschreibt der Vortrag in einem zweiten Abschnitt die Rezeption in einigen Lateingrammatiken des 19. Jahrhunderts (vor allem bei Kühner 1842; 1878-79, aber schon bei Feldbausch 1837, Eichhoff & Beltz 1837, Weißenborn 1838) und ihre Kritik bei Haase (1838; 1874) und Steinthal (1855). Im nächsten Teil wird gezeigt, inwieweit Beckers Lehre, von deren Existenz Perceival (1976: 239f.) noch nichts ahnte, über die psychologischen Schriften Wundts, vor allem seine „Völkerpsychologie“, tatsächlich auf den Konstituentenbegriff Bloomfields (1914; 1933) gewirkt hat. Im letzten Teil werden Möglichkeiten und Grenzen dieser syntaktischen Lehre in der Semitistik (Goldenberg 2013) und lateinischen Linguistik diskutiert.

Literatur

- Becker, Karl Ferdinand ²(1841). *Organism der Sprache*. Frankfurt a.M. (online zugänglich).
- Bloomfield, Leonard (1933). *Language*. New York.
- Eichhoff, Karl & Beltz, Karl C. 1837. *Lateinische Schulgrammatik* [...]. Elberfeld (online zugänglich).
- Feldbausch, Felix S. (1837). *Lateinische Schulgrammatik*. Heidelberg (online zugänglich).

- Goldenberg, Gideon (2013). *Semitic Languages: Features, Structures, Relations, Processes*. Oxford.
- Haase, Friedrich (1838). Rez. u.a. v. Feldbausch (1837), Eichhoff & Beltz (1837) und Weissenborn (1838). In: *Ergänzungsblätter zur Allgemeinen Literatur-Zeitung* Nr.65-70: S.513-555 (online zugänglich)
- Haase, Friedrich (1874). *Vorlesungen über die lateinische Sprachwissenschaft*. Hg. v. F. A. Eckstein. Bd. I. *Einleitung. Bedeutungslehre*. Leipzig.
- Haselbach, Gerhard (1966). *Grammatik und Sprachstruktur. Karl Ferdinand Beckers Beitrag zur Allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft in historischer und systematischer Sicht*. Berlin.
- Knobloch, Clemens (1988). *Geschichte der psychologischen Sprachauffassung in Deutschland von 1850 bis 1920*. Tübingen.
- Knobloch, Clemens (1992). „Wilhelm Wundt“. In: M. Dascal u.a. (Hgg.). *Sprachphilosophie. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung*. Berlin & New York. 1. Halbband, 412-431.
- Kühner, Raphael ¹(1834-35). *Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache. Wissenschaftlich und mit Rücksicht auf den Schulgebrauch*. Zwei Teile. 2. Aufl. 1870f.; 3. Aufl. 1897-1904 bearbeitet von B. Gerth. Hannover: Hahnsche Hofbuchhandlung (online zugänglich).
- Kühner, Raphael ¹(1877-78). *Ausführliche Grammatik der Lateinischen Sprache*. 2. Band, 2 Abtheilungen. 2. Aufl. 1912-14 bearb. v. C. Stegmann. Hannover (online zugänglich).
- Perceival, W. Keith (1976). ‘On the Historical Source of Immediate Constituent Analysis’. In: J.D. McCawley (ed.). *Syntax and Semantics. Vol.7: Notes from the Linguistic Underground*. New York: 229-242.
- Steinthal, Heyman (1855). *Grammatik, Logik und Psychologie, ihre Prinzipien und ihr Verhältnis zueinander*. Nachdruck Hildesheim 1968.
- Welke, Klaus (2014). ‘Satzgliedanalyse’. In: J. Hagemann & S. Stoffeldt (Hgg.). *Syntaxtheorien. Analysen im Vergleich*. Tübingen: 21-41.
- Wundt, Wilhelm ²(1904). *Völkerpsychologie*. Zweiter Band: *Die Sprache*. Zweiter Teil. Leipzig.
- Weissenborn, Wilhelm (1838). *Lateinische Schulgrammatik*. Eisenach (online zugänglich).

“I hereby confirm that ...” – On the Hitherto Neglected Use of the 1st Person Perfect Indicative as a Performative

Stefan Höfler
Universität Wien

§1 According to the *communis opinio*, the function of the Latin perfect is confined to its use as a (present) perfect and a past tense (cf. Haverling 2002; Weiss 2009:452ff.; Pinkster 2015:442ff.). These two functions reflect the origin of the Latin perfect which formally continues two separate categories of Proto-Indo-European (PIE): the (resultative) perfect (e.g. *pepercit*) and the (perfective) aorist (e.g. *parat*).

§2 At least from Greek we know, however, that the aorist could also be used in a very specific context as a performative speech act. This phenomenon, the so-called “tragic aorist” (cf. Bary 2012), as in *κατόμωσα* (E. Or. 1517) ‘I hereby swear’ (1st sg. aor. ind. of *κατόμωμι*), expresses the “Koinzidenzfall” (Koschmieder 1965:26ff) — i.e. the condition when the utterance of a sentence does not only speak of an action, but **constitutes the action itself**, as in modern-day formulaic expressions such as Engl. *Herewith I affirm that I completed this application truthfully and totally*, or Germ.

Hiermit erkläre ich Sie zu Mann und Frau, and, for that matter, in the “tragic aorist” of cases like {Op.} ὅμοσον – εἰ δὲ μή, κτενῶ σε – μή λέγειν ἐμὴν χάριν. {Φρ.} τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν **κατώμωσ’**, ἦν ἂν εὐορκοῖμ’ ἐγώ. Or.: “Swear you are not saying this to humor me, or I will kill you.” Phr. “**I hereby swear** by my life, an oath I would keep!” (E. Or. 1516f.).

§3 In this talk, I will try to show that the Latin perfect could also be used in exactly this function. However, since the genre of texts in which we would expect such a usage is not well represented in the extant Latin literature, the use of the 1st person perfect indicative as a performative seems to have remained unnoticed.

§4 In order to make a case for this usage, I will present examples from chirographs (formal legal documents that only through the act of their being handwritten by the contractual partner received their legitimacy), as, e.g., *M(arcus) Lollius Philippus scripsi me accepisse mutua et debere C(aio) Sulpicio Cinnamo* ... “**I**, Marcus Lollius Philippus, **hereby confirm** that I have received a loan and that I owe to Gaius Sulpicius Cinnamo ...” (Tab. Pomp. Sulp. 54.3f.), from non-literary letters, as, e.g., *mihi tibe per Arrianum equitem chiloma* ... “**Herewith I am sending** you a box through the cavalryman Arrianus ...” (CEL 74.12f.), or from *defixiones* (curse tablets, in which the act of writing down the curse arguably constitutes the curse itself), as, e.g., *Mineru(a)e / de(ae) Suli donaui / furem qui / caracallam meam inuolauit* ... “To Minerva the goddess Sulis **I hereby hand over** the thief who has stolen my hooded cloak ...” (Tomlin 1988: no. 10).

§5 Consequently, I will try to assess whether this function is but a mere replica of the Greek “tragic aorist”, or if we are dealing with an inherited relic of PIE age. In favor of the latter claim I will not only adduce similar examples from Oscan (to confirm at least Proto-Italic age of the usage), but also connect the whole matter – though only *en passant* – to the vexed question of how to interpret Av. *stuiiē*, Ved. *stuṣé* ‘**I hereby praise**’.

References

- BARY, Corien (2012), ‘The Ancient Greek tragic aorist revisited’, *Glotta* 88, 31–53.
 HAVERLING, Gerd (2002), ‘On the semantic functions of the Latin perfect’, in: *Theory and Description in Latin Linguistics, Selected Papers from the XIth International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Amsterdam, June 24–29, 2001*, ed. by A.M. Bolkestein et al., Amsterdam: Gieben, 153–167.
 KOSCHMIEDER, Erwin (1965), *Beiträge zur allgemeinen Syntax*, Heidelberg: Winter.
 PINKSTER, Harm (2015), *The Oxford Latin Syntax, Volume I, The Simple Clause*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 TOMLIN, Roger S.P. (1988), ‘The Curse Tablets’, in: *The Temple of Sulis Minerva at Bath, Volume II, Finds from the Sacred Spring*, ed. by B. Cunliffe, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 59–277.
 WEISS, Michael (2009), *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*, Ann Arbor, New York: Beech Stave.

Authorial Error and the Dictionary

Nigel Holmes

Thesaurus Linguae Latinae

Textual critics reasonably assume that their authors have not written nonsense; but where an author is taking over unfamiliar material from another source, a simple misreading or misunderstanding can conjure up words that never existed. At Plin. *nat.* 22, 40 editors print the following text: *leucacantham alii phyllon, alii ischada, alii polygonaton appellant*. In this *phyllon* is a conjecture of Hermolaus Barbarus; the manuscripts have *pymon*, *phimon*, *phinion* and *phimum*. This brings Pliny in line with the corresponding passage in Dioscorides 3, 19, which has λευκάκανθα· οἱ δὲ πολυγόνατον, οἱ δὲ ισχιάδα, οἱ δὲ φύλλον, οἱ δὲ λάδανον (καλοῦσι); but two arguments show that the conjecture is mistaken. Firstly the corruption of ΛΛ in Pliny's Greek source to M is easier than the corruption from Latin LL to M. Secondly, Pliny's first book is a contents index that Pliny supplied for the rest of the work; and there the manuscripts have *phymos* or *phimos*. It is clear that Pliny himself wrote *phymon*. There are several other passages where editors mistakenly correct a text where the error is due to Pliny or his sources.

The transmission of knowledge can also introduce errors that create a new meaning for an existent word. At GLOSS.^L I Ansil. PE 805 Lindsay edits the text as (soles hiberni:) *perifrastici* (-ce) *dies* (h) *hiberni* (*Verg. Aen.* 1, 746), 'winter suns: periphrastically for winter days'. Doubtless this was the genesis of the corrupt text (although *perifrasticos* is a more probable correction than *perifrastice*); but for the compiler of the glossary the lemma is not *soles hiberni*, but *perifrastici*, which meant 'winter days'. This kind of problem led Goetz, the other main editor of the Latin glossaries, not to attempt to edit the individual glossaries. Instead he provides a collation of one manuscript for each glossary, reporting variants from others, but leaving the attempt to establish the original form of the gloss to the index.

Such words and meanings that owe their existence to the author's error are a problem not just for editors, but also for the lexicographer. I intend to look at different approaches in the *Thesaurus* and elsewhere to these problematic words and usages.

Bibliography

Oxford Latin Dictionary (Oxford, ed. 2, 2012)

Thesaurus Linguae Latinae (Leipzig, 1900-)

W. M. Lindsay al. *Glossaria Latina*, Vol. I *Glossarium Ansileubi sive Librum Glossarum* (Paris, 1926)

M. Wellmann, 'Sextius Niger' *Hermes* 24, 1889, 530-69

Impoliteness and Overpoliteness in Roman Confrontations

Federica Iurescia

Zürich Universität

The paper proposed intends to analyse conflictual communication in im/politeness perspective.

The speakers involved in a confrontation have basically two means of dealing with it. They can adopt an aggressive behaviour, which is mainly phrased in impolite forms: they attack their interlocutor's face, as a result increasing the fight. On the contrary, they can deploy strategies to decrease it, as, e. g., appealing to reason, or resorting to prayers. Or, they can enhance their interlocutor's face, showing – or feigning – the highest degree of attention for the other, an intention that is often couched in overpolite formulations.

This paper focuses on impolite and overpolite expressions in confrontations, as two different but related linguistic strategies to manage conflict.

Politeness theories – main research trends being mentioned in Unceta Gómez (2014) to whom I refer for the sake of brevity – and impoliteness theories – the most influential study in the field being Culpeper (2011) – help to appreciate the use and distribution of such linguistic devices. I will draw on this theoretical background, paying particular attention to metapragmatic comments – where available – as emic test of the validity of modern theories applied to ancient texts. Such proceedings will offer the chance to consider aspects of Latin language not yet deeply investigated in the realm of Historical Linguistics. Many scholars worked on politeness – for a comprehensive overview see Unceta Gómez (2014) – but relatively scarce attention has been paid to impoliteness and overpoliteness in Latin texts. The approach that I propose here allows to provide a thorough description of the language in confrontations in ancient Rome, and proved to be useful to reflect on power in interaction.

In order to investigate this particular dimension of communication, the data are to be found in the literary representations of dialogues, the most of which are offered by the Comedy and the Novel. See, e. g., Pl. *Per.* 787-820, where the interlocutors recur both to impoliteness and overpoliteness forms: the latter function here as mock-politeness, i. e. impolite. Compare such usage with Ter. *Eun.* 86-196, where a speaker utters impoliteness forms while the other recurs to overpoliteness as means of persuasion, as Donatus *ad ll.* repeatedly points out. In this case such a strategy leads to successful persuasion; but this is not always the case, as, e. g. Pl. *Cas.* 228-78 shows.

References

- Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness. Using language to cause offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferri, R. (2016). *An Ancient Grammarian's View of how the Spoken Language works. Pragmalinguistic observations in Donatus' Commentum Terentii*, in Ferri, R., Zago, A. (eds.) *The Latin of the Grammarians: Reflections about Language in the Roman World*, Turnhout, Brepols, 237-75.
- Kienpointner, M. (1997). Varieties of rudeness. Types and functions of impolite utterances. *Functions of Language*, 4 (2), 251-87.

Unceta Gómez, L. (2014). La politesse linguistique en latin. Bilan d'une recherche en cours. in *Dictionnaire Historique et Encyclopedie Linguistique du Latin (DHELL) Partie encyclopedie linguistique*, mise en ligne: Octobre 2014, URL: http://www.dhell.paris-sorbonne.fr/encyclopedie_linguistique:notions_linguistiques:syntaxe:formules_de_politesse

Remarques sur l'utilisation à des fins pragmatiques de *uidea(n)tur* dans quelques clausules cicéroniennes : de Cicéron au français voilà

Marie-Dominique Joffre
Université de Poitiers

On sait (cf. Garcia Hernandez 1976) que les verbes signifiant la perception visuelle, et, parmi eux, *uideo*, revêtent très souvent et très facilement un effet de sens cognitif et peuvent exprimer la connaissance, le savoir (cf., pour la racine *weid /*woid/*wid, *oida* et *wissen*).

Il n'est donc pas surprenant que le passif de *uideo*, *uideor*, produise le même effet de sens, à conditions que les données contextuelles y invitent :

Cic.Lae.19 *sic mihi perspicere uideor ita natos esse nos ut inter omnes esset societas quaedam*

La forme *uideor*, *uide(n)tur*, *uideris*, etc., souvent complétée par un personnel au datif de point de vue, signale non seulement l'acte au cours duquel une opinion est émise, mais aussi la manière dont elle a été élaborée. *Videtur* réfère à une idée qui s'impose à l'esprit. Lorsqu'il est exprimé, le datif confirme la présence et l'intervention de l'auteur de l'opinion. *Mihi uideor*, *-ris*, *-tur*, etc. peut alors être rapproché de verbes comme *arbitror*, *opino*, etc. qui, par delà un contenu notionnel différent, insèrent dans l'énoncé l'acte et l'auteur de l'opinion.

Cic.Lae.45 *Nam quibusdam quos audio sapientes habitos in Graecia, placuisse opinor mirabilia quaedam.*

Après avoir rappelé ces faits, cette communication a pour objet d'examiner l'effet de sens produit par *uidea(n)tur* dans certaines clausules cicéroniennes :

Cic. Arch.18 *quare suo iure noster ille Enius sanctos appellat poetas, quod quasi deorum aliquo dono atque munere commendati nobis esse uideantur.*

« c'est pourquoi notre cher Ennius, à juste titre, qualifie de sacro-saints les poètes, parce que, c'est évident (= incontestable, = cela va de soi) ils nous ont été confiés en quelque sorte par un don et une faveur des dieux. » (Pour l'orateur, il est hors de question de mettre en doute la pensée du Père des poètes latins.)

Dans cet emploi, de surcroît en l'absence du datif de point de vue (ou datif de la personne visée), il est difficile de cerner le contenu notionnel de la forme verbal et de proposer la traduction adéquate. Il semble que la pensée de l'orateur est exprimée dans

ce qui précède *uideantur* et que ce verbe, pivot syntaxique de la phrase et terme final de la clause ne joue pratiquement aucun rôle sémantique et ne sert qu'à soutenir le rythme et la musique qui constituent le point d'orgue de la période oratoire.

On montrera que la forme verbale ne conserve ici que les sèmes les plus abstraits et les plus généraux de son contenu notionnel et que son rôle est avant tout pragmatique: produire dans l'esprit des auditeurs une impression durable, ineffaçable, par conséquent incontestable. Et ce sont ces capacités, syntaxiquement et stylistiquement conditionnées en latin, que le français exploitera largement dans la constitution et l'usage du terme *voilà*.

Indications bibliographiques

- Flobert, P., 1974 : *Les verbes déponents latins des origines à Charlemagne*, Paris.
 Garcia-Hernandez, B., 1976 : El campo semantico de « ver » en la lengua latina. Astudio estructural, Salamanca.
 Joffre, M.D. 1995 : *Le verbe latin, voix et diathèse*, Louvain.
 Mellet, S. ; Joffre, M.D. ; Serbat, G., 1994 : *Grammaire fondamentale du latin. Le signifié verbal*, Louvain.
 Pinkster, H., 1988 : *Lateinische Syntax und Semantik*, Tübingen.
 2015 : Oxford Latin Syntax. Vol.1, The simple clause, Oxford
 Serbat, G., 1996 : *Grammaire fondamentale du latin, VI,1 La syntaxe des cas en latin*, Louvain.

Iambic Shortening and Luchs' Law

Andreas Keränen

University of Gothenburg

Iambic shortening, also known as Brevis brevians, is an optional process found in Early Latin poetry where an iambic (Light–Heavy) sequence in a word may occupy a single metrical position by reducing the quantity of the heavy syllable into a pyrrhic (Light–Light) sequence. Mester (1994) has argued that iambic shortening in Latin is a means to achieve exhaustive parsing of syllables into rhythmic even moraic trochees, i.e. into H and LL prosodic feet. However, as shown by Jacobs (2003) there are differential behaviours of the shortening process word-initially and word-finally. In the latter case Jacobs instead suggests a general process of final vowel weakening, which also includes shortening of word final spondees HH# into trochees HL#. In my talk I will reconsider Mester's former approach. When considering the metrical bridge constraint known as Luchs' law a distinction still has to be made between word-final iambs LH# and spondees HH# respectively. Luchs' law says that in the final metron of iambic and catalectic trochaic meters, i.e. in $\sigma\text{HL}\sigma\#$, the first two syllables of that metron cannot constitute an iamb if followed by a word boundary. In other words, a final LH#L $\sigma\#$ sequence is forbidden. Along with Safarewicz (1936) I argue that the avoidance of iambs in this case seems to be rooted in the fact that such words underwent iambic shortening. This constraint on word-final heavy syllable from metrical strong position indicates that these had an ambiguous/half-long quantity, as opposed to the final syllable of spondees that was freely allowed on that same metrical position.

References

- Jacobs, Haïke (2003). The Emergence of Quantity–Sensitivity in Latin: Secondary stress, Iambic shortening, and theoretical implications for ‘mixed’ stress systems. In *Optimality Theory and Language Change*, D. Eric Holt (ed.), 229–247. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Mester, Armin. (1994). The quantitative trochee in Latin. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12: 1 – 61.
- Safarewicz, Jan. (1936). *Etudes de phonétique et de métrique latine*. Vilnius: Nakl. Towarzystwa przyjaciół nauk w Wilnie.

Progression thématique et types de séquences chez quelques historiens romains

Sándor Kiss

Université de Debrecen

Dans un travail précédent (« Schéma narratif et subjectivité du narrateur chez quelques historiens de l’Antiquité tardive », 18^e Colloque de Linguistique Latine, Toulouse), nous avons présenté différents aspects linguistiques du récit chez quelques auteurs postclassiques, pour dégager certains traits structuraux des textes, ainsi que les interventions personnelles de leur narrateur. La présente communication a une thématique plus serrée, dans la mesure où elle vise à saisir l’organisation du récit historique à partir de ses unités textuelles les plus petites, représentant les formes fondamentales de la progression thématique (Combettes 1983). En effet, l’historien est confronté à la double tâche de structurer le temps et de prêter à la succession des événements un relief qui les rende mémorables pour les destinataires. Sur le plan textuel, ce travail de formulation conduit à la constitution de différents types de séquences, espèces de « textèmes », qui se distinguent selon la répartition des fonctions thématiques et rhématiques et qui se combinent en séquences plus larges, grâce au jeu de l’anaphore, de la jonction et de la démarcation (Adam 1992 ; Kroon 1995 ; Bolkestein 2000). La typologie des « textèmes » que nous proposerons montrera comment l’ordre des constituants de la phrase latine – ordre en apparence « libre » – est mis au service du « dynamisme communicatif » du message (Panhuis 1982) : la constance d’un thème accompagné de rhèmes variés, la succession rapide de thèmes différents, ainsi que l’apparition de sous-thèmes et de sous-rhèmes dépendant d’un hyperthème déterminent des passages caractéristiques qui ont leur rôle à jouer dans l’économie d’ensemble du texte (cf. également Spevak 2010). Les différentes formules de l’arrangement des termes à l’intérieur du textème et la variété des moyens de jonction reflètent les besoins de la communication, par le biais des règles syntaxiques synchroniquement valables ; projetées sur le plan diachronique, elles permettent d’entrevoir des mouvements qui aboutiront à des transformations plus profondes (tendance au rapprochement du sujet et du prédicat verbal, explicitation des connexions typiques entre les termes de la phrase). D’autre part, l’alternance des scènes et des sommaires dans la narration (Genette 1972) est un point de vue important pour saisir la structuration du texte ; en même temps, elle rend possible des observations concernant un vocabulaire abstrait, élaboré pour les besoins d’un style récapitulatif. L’investigation portera sur des ouvrages de

Jules César, de Salluste, de Velleius Paterculus, de Florus et d'Eutrope. Ce choix permet des comparaisons d'ordre diachronique (par la confrontation de textes classiques et postclassiques), ainsi que des constatations stylistiques qui aident à comprendre la conception des auteurs concernant l'œuvre historiographique idéale.

Références

- Adam, J.-M. *Les textes : types et prototypes*. Paris, 1992.
- Bolkestein, A. M., « Discourse Organization and Anaphora in Latin ». In : S. C. Herring – P. Van Reenen – L. Schösler (eds.) : *Textual Parameters in Older Languages*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, 2000, 107-137.
- Combettes, B., *Pour une grammaire textuelle. La progression thématique*. Bruxelles, 1983.
- Genette, G., *Figures III*. Paris, 1972.
- Kroon, C., *Discourse Particles in Latin*. Amsterdam, 1995.
- Panhuis, D. G., *The Communicative Perspective in the Sentence. A Study of Latin Word Order*. Amsterdam, 1982.
- Spevak, O., *Constituent Order in Classical Latin Prose*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia, 2010.

The Grammaticalization of the Prepositional Phrase with *de* as an Adnominal Modifier from Classical to Late Latin

Timo Korkiakangas

University of Oslo

Cecilia Valentini

Università degli Studi di Firenze

This study examines the evolution of the prepositional phrase headed by *de* as an adnominal modifier from Classical to Late Latin. In Classical Latin, noun phrases functioning as adnominal modifiers are consistently marked by means of the genitive case, which conveyed various semantical relations, according to the lexical meaning of the nouns involved (Pinkster 2015: 1000). The prepositional phrase with *de*, despite occurring mostly as a verbal adjunct, is not rarely found as a noun phrase modifier, but its use is strongly restricted by semantic and syntactic factors. Indeed, the prepositional phrase with *de* conveys relations close to the primitive meaning of 'source' and 'separation', such as part-whole relations (Cic. *Verr.* 1.32 *aliquam partem de istius impudentia*) as well as non-anchoring relations which involve inanimate nouns (Verg. *Aen.* 6.69 *de marmore templum*; Magni 2013: 180), and it is often used to avoid the recurrence of genitives within a single noun phrase. The prepositional phrase is also used with a more abstract meaning to express the subject of speech or thought, and can occasionally encode the second argument of a verbal noun (Sall. *Catil.* 35.2 *ex nulla conscientia de culpa*). Substitutions of the objective genitive are sporadic in Classical Latin (Spevak 2014: 200); furthermore, prepositional encoding is never attested in the expression of the subjective argument.

The substitution of the genitive with the prepositional phrase headed by *de*, apart from the partitive relation, is by no means complete in Late Latin authors (Väänänen

1956); the preposition *de* increases its frequency as a noun phrase modifier, but shows the same restrictions as in Classical times.

A further step in the grammaticalization process of *de* can be observed in Late Latin charters from Tuscany (7th-9th centuries), which contain the first examples of the substitution of the subjective genitive with the preposition *de* (*cum consensu de sacerdotis; uoluntatem de episcopo*; Väänänen 1956: 9-10). The prepositional phrase is largely used as an adnominal modifier, being excluded only from the expression of kinship and ownership relations, which represent the core of possession with human possessors. Based on the morphosyntactically and semantically annotated Late Latin Charter Treebank (LLCT; 200,000 words), a quantitative analysis has been conducted to check the results of the qualitative analysis: the preposition *de* heads mostly inanimate nouns and toponyms, while animate and proper nouns occur particularly in genitive constructions.

We can thus conclude that the grammaticalization of *de* went on even in early Medieval times, and that semantic factors, such as the animacy of the noun functioning as modifier and the prototypicality of the expressed relation within the possessive domain, continued to be crucial in the evolution from Classical to Late Latin.

References

- LLCT: *Late Latin Charter Treebank*. Collection of Tuscan Charters from AD 714-869.
Magni (2013), *Synchronic gradience and language change in Latin genitive constructions*, Gicalalone Ramat et al. (eds.), *Synchrony and Diachrony*, Benjamins: 177-200.
Pinkster (2015), *Oxford Latin Syntax*, vol. 1, *The simple clause*, Oxford University Press.
Spevak (2014), *Noun valency in Latin*, Spevak (ed.), *Noun valency*, Benjamins: 183-210.
Väänänen (1956), *La préposition de et le génitif*, «Revue de linguistique romane», 20: 1-20.

Two Types of ‘Nearness’. A Cognitive Approach to the Historic Present Tense in Livy and Tacitus

Caroline Kroon & Lidewij van Gils

Amsterdam Centre for Ancient Studies and Archaeology

In the last decades a considerable number of linguistic studies have yielded new insights into the use of tenses in Latin narrative, building forth on the seminal study by Schlicher (e.g. Rosén 1980, Mellet 1988, Klug 1992, Adam 1998, Kroon 1998, Pinkster 1999, Oldsjö 2001, Kroon 2007, Adema 2008, Stienaers 2015). Due to variances in their approach, scope (individual tenses or the system as a whole), and corpus, these studies have led to complementary, and sometimes opposing, views and conclusions. Especially challenging appears to be the use of the historic present tense, which, in individual instances, may remain difficult to account for. Pinkster (2015: 409), for instance, observes that the special effect of ‘nearness’ of the historic present that is common in e.g. comedy and in the orations of Cicero, cannot always be established, and that “the present seems sometimes to be used merely to report events in the most economical way”.

In our paper we intend to show how existing views and approaches with regard to narrative tense in general, and the historic present in particular, may be combined

and/or reconciled by bringing together semantic, discourse pragmatic, narratological, and cognitive research parameters. Inspired by, especially, cognitive linguistic studies of tense which make use of concepts like mental space (Fauconnier 1985), ground (Langacker 1987, Clark 1996), and intersubjectivity (Verhagen 2005), we have developed an eclectic research instrument, and tested it in a historiographical corpus containing all main clause instances of the historic present tense in Livy *AUC* 22 and Tacitus *Annals* XV.

On the basis of a set of linguistic and narratological features, we first draw a clearer distinction than has previously been done between narrative in a strict sense (“erzählen”) and so-called report (“besprechen”) (cf. Weinrich 1964; more recently Smith 2003; for Latin e.g. Kroon 2002, 2007, Adema 2008; Stienaers 2015). This distinction will prove to be essential for demarcating two essentially different cognitive ‘systems’ of tense usage in historiography, and for understanding the wide array of uses of the present tense.

We will argue that the vast majority of instances of the historic present tense in our corpus may well be accounted for by the proposed approach. For a few remaining instances in Livy we propose an explanation in terms of a particular stylistic idiosyncrasy.

References

- Adam, G. (1998), *Tense and Aspect in Roman Historiographic Narrative: A Functional Approach to the Prose of the Memoria Rerum Gestarum*. Diss. University of Chicago.
- Adema, S. M. (2008), *Discourse Modes and Bases. A Study of the Use of Tenses in Vergil's Aeneid*. Diss. VU University Amsterdam.
- Chausserie-Laprée, J.R. (1969), *L'expression narrative chez les historiens latins*. Paris.
- Clark, H.H. (1996), *Using language*. Cambridge
- Fauconnier, G. (1985), *Mental Spaces: Aspects of Meaning Construction in Natural Language*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Klug, W. (1992), *Erzählstruktur als Kunstform. Studien zu künstlerischen Funktion der Erzähltempora im Lateinischen und Griechischen*. Heidelberg.
- Kroon, C.H.M. (1998), Discourse particles, tense, and the structure of Latin narrative texts. In: R. Risselada (ed.) *Latin in use*. Amsterdam: Gieben, *Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology* no. 8, p. 37-62.
- Kroon, C.H.M. (2002), Kroon, C.H.M. (2002), How to write a ghost story? A linguistic view on narrative modes in Pliny *Ep.* 7.27. In: Shalev, D. & L. Szawicky (eds). *Donum Grammaticum: Studies in Latin and Celtic Philology and Linguistics in Honour of Hannah Rosén*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 189-200
- Kroon, C.H.M. (2007), Discourse modes and the use of tenses in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. In R.J. Allan and M. Buijs (eds), *The Language of Literature*. Leiden, 65-92.
- Langacker, R.W. (1987), *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford.
- Mellet, S. (1988), *L'imparfait de l'indicatif en latin classique: temps, aspect, modalité : étude synchronique dans une perspective énonciative*. Louvain
- Oldsjö, F. (2001), *Tense and Aspect in Caesar's Narrative*. Uppsala.
- Pinkster, H. (1999), The present tense in Virgil's *Aeneid*. *Mnemosyne* 52: 705-717
- Pinkster, H. (2015), *The Oxford Latin Syntax*. Volume 1, The Simple Clause. Oxford.
- Rosén, H. (1980), Exposition und Mitteilung. The imperfect as a thematic tense-form in the Letters of Pliny. In Rosén, H. & H.B. Rosén (eds), *On Moods and Tenses of the Latin Verb*, Munich, 27-48.

- Schlicher, J.J. (1931), Historical tenses and their functions in Latin. *Classical Philology* 26: 46-59.
- Smith, C. S. (2003), *Modes of Discourse. The Local Structure of Texts*. Cambridge.
- Stienaers, D. (2015), Tense and discourse organization in Caesar's *De Bello Gallico*. In G. Haverling (ed.), *Latin Linguistics in the Early 21st Century*, Uppsala, 208-220.
- Verhagen, A. (2005) *Constructions of Intersubjectivity. Discourse, Syntax and Cognition*. Oxford.
- Weinrich, H. (1964), *Tempus. Besprochene und erzählte Welt*. Stuttgart.

The Late Latin Merger between /ō/ and /ū/: Epigraphic Evidence from Gaul (330-730AD)

Éloïse Lemay

University of California Los Angeles

Overview & Goals: One of the major Late Latin perturbations to the Classical Latin Vowel system was the merger of CL /ū/ and /ō/ to /o/. It has been claimed that this merger occurred significantly later than the merger of /ī/ and /ē/ (Väänänen 1981:30 n° 42-3). However, the evidence presented so far for its onset and early development has proven to be too scant and ambiguous to be convincing (Powell 2011:115, Adams 1977:9-11, Adams 1995:91-99, and Adams 2007: 669-670 vs. Herman 1971). My contribution is to trace the early history of the merger through a statistical, comparative and philological study of 600 Late Antique and Early Medieval inscriptions from three regions of Gaul: Trier, Clermont-Ferrand, and Vienna.

Evidence: The merger between /ū/ and /ō/ is reflected by a confusion between CL <o> and <u>, resulting in spellings such as *tumolo* or *tomolo* for CL *tumulum*, *tolit* for CL *tulit*, *iouenim* for CL *iuuenem*, and *annus* for CL *annos*. A few very late forms even affect /ō/ (e.g. *pupulo* for CL *populo*).

I retrieved and analyzed all of the forms featuring spelling confusions between CL <o> and <u>. I computed the frequency of occurrence of these forms by decade, in order to isolate the onset and to evaluate the progression of the merger. Such spelling confusions are remarkably absent from the earliest inscriptions. They begin to appear at the turn of the 5th c. and become prevalent, becoming as common a feature of later Merovingian Latin as the confusions between /ī/ and /ē/.

The merger affects accent-bearing syllables as well as accentless ones, but targets forms with liquids and nasals disproportionately. Many examples of /ū/ written as <o> affect l-forms; potentially, we may be dealing with the conditioning effects of light and dark /l/.

A philological examination of the individual forms featuring confusions between <o> and <u> has proven indispensable. Certain forms may not illustrate the merger; other explanations emerge as preferable. E.g.: *soboli* for CL *suboli* may be taken as an instance of regressive assimilation. *Paruolis* for CL *paruulis*: the older *-olus* form of the suffix (*-ulus* < *-olus* < **-elo-*) remains productive for roots ending in vowels (ex *filius* > *filiolus*) until late. Alternatively, this may be an archaizing dissimilatory spelling.

Implications: My statistical and comparative study of the numerous and continuously attested inscriptions of Gaul establishes the last decades of the 4th c. as the merger's onset and tracks its increasing prevalence through the 5th to the early 8th c. Close philological examination of forms featuring <o> and <u> confusions isolates possible sources of conditioning of the merger and separates the instances of the merger from other phenomena.

References

- Adams, J. N. (1977). *The Vulgar Latin of the Letters of Claudius Terentianus* (P. Mich. VIII, 467-72). Publications of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Manchester 23. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Adams, J. N. (1995). "The language of the Vindolanda writing tablets: an interim report". In: *Journal of Roman studies* 85, pp. 86–134.
- Adams, J. N. (2007). *The Regional Diversification of Latin 200 BC-AD 600*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Herman, József (1971). "Essai sur la latinité du littoral adriatique à l'époque de l'Empire". In: *Sprache und Geschichte. Festschrift für Harri Meier zum 65. Geburtstag*. Eugenio Coseriu and Wolf-Dieter Stempel eds. Munich: Fink, pp. 199-226.
- Powell, Jonathan G. F. (2011). "The Appendix Probi as linguistic evidence: a reassessment". In: *The Latin of Roman Lexicography. Ricerche sulle lingue di frammentaria attestazione*, 7. Ed. by Rolando Ferri. Pisa, Rome: Fabrizio Serra Editore, pp. 75–119.
- Väänänen, Veikko (1981). *Introduction au latin vulgaire. Troisième édition revue et augmentée*. Paris: C. Klincksieck.

Zur Entwicklung des Ablauts im lateinischen Verbalsystem

Ville Leppänen

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Das Ziel des Vortrags ist es, die verschiedenen phonologischen und morphologischen Entwicklungsprozesse zu erläutern, die zum Verlust der paradigmatischen Ablautalternationen im lateinischen Verbalsystem geführt haben. Der Ausgangspunkt ist die (spät-)urindogermanische Verbalflexion, wo die Abstufung der Wurzeln und Suffixe morphologisch (und teilweise auch phonologisch, d.h. akzentbedingt) geregelt ist, wie z.B. beim athematischen Wurzelpräsens **h₁éj-ti* 3SG ~ **h₁j-énti* 3PL. Diese Abstufung ist im Altindischen direkt bezeugt (*éti* ~ *yanti*) und auf ähnlichen Alternationen basiert auch die germanische starke Konjugation. Im Lateinischen allerdings sind solche Alternationen fast ausnahmslos verlorengegangen, auch in hochfrequenten, unregelmäßigen Verben wie *īre*, das in der 2SG (*īs*) und 3SG (*it*) noch die ererbten athematischen Formen fortsetzt. Im PL jedoch ist die ererbte Nullstufe durch die vollstufige Wurzelvariante ersetzt worden: *īmus* < **eimos* (statt *†imos*), *ītis* < **eītes* (statt *†itis*), *eunt* < **ejont(i)* (statt *†jent*). Nur in wenigen Fällen (wie *facit* ~ *fēcit*) bildet eine ursprüngliche Ablautalternation noch in der klassischen Sprache einen funktionalen Unterschied.

In der Forschungsliteratur wird die „destruktive“ Wirkung der regelmäßigen Lautveränderungen (wodurch freilich einige wichtige Vokalkontraste neutralisiert wurden)

als entscheidender Faktor genannt (z.B. Sihler 1995: 109). Es gibt allerdings eine bemerkenswerte Anzahl an Fällen, in denen der paradigmatische Ausgleich der ererbten Alternationen unstrittig unabhängig vom regelmäßigen Lautwandel sein muss. Dies bedeutet, dass die Kausalität des systemischen Ablautverlusts hauptsächlich in morphologischen und funktionalen Faktoren zu suchen ist. Diese Beobachtung wurde schon im Rahmen der Entstehung des lateinischen Perfektsystems von Gerhard Meiser (2003) gemacht. In diesem Vortrag werden solche Faktoren (z.B. Isomorphismus, Natürlichkeit grammatischer Kategorien, Grammatikalisierung, Frequenz, usw.) durch sprachgeschichtliche Analyse ausgewählter Beispiele besprochen.

Literatur

- Sihler, Andrew 1995. *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 Meiser, Gerhard 2003. *Veni vidi vici: die Vorgeschichte des lateinischen Perfektsystems* (Zetemata 113). München: Verlag C. H. Beck.

Genitivus denominativus: Local and Personal Names in Contrast

Felicia Logozzo

University of Rome, 'Tor Vergata'

The aim of this paper is to collect and classify the occurrences of *genitivus denominativus* with *praenomen*, *nomen*, *cognomen*, in significant literary and epigraphic texts of the Latin literature and epigraphy, investigating the complex relation between syntax and semantics starting from the idea of “constructional gradience”, and thus to highlight the different behaviours of local and personal names.

The construction known as *genitivus denominativus* was used in Latin language as an alternative to the more frequent appositive constructions: *ex oppido Thysdrae* (Bell. Afr. XXXVI, 2) vs. *o ad oppidum Thysdram* (Bell. Afr., LXXVI, 1); *urbem Patavi* (Virg., Aen., I, 247) vs. *urbem Fidenam* (Virg., Aen., VII, 773).

Genitivus denominativus is mainly found in locative expressions, after nouns like *oppidum* (*in oppido Uzzittae*, Bell. Afr. LVIII, 4), *urbs* (***Troiae*** ... ***urbem*** Verg., Aen. I, 565), *flumen* (***ad Asturae flumen*** Liv., VIII, 13), *mons* (***Aventini montem*** Verg., Aen. 8, 231), but it can also be found after *nomen*, *cognomen* and *praenomen* such as: *Troiae nomen* (Verg. Aen. I, 376); *Belidae nomen Palamedis* (Verg. II, 82) vs. *nomen* ... *Ortygiam* (Verg. Aen. III, 693).

From a semantic point of view, a structure like *Troiae nomen* can be doubly interpreted:

nomen Troiae = “The name of a specific city which is called *Troia*” (*Troia* = a city)

nomen Troiae = “the name *Troia*” (*Troia* = a name)

In the first case, the two nouns involved in the construction are linked by a subordination relation; in the second one, ‘name’ and ‘Troia’ are linked by an appositive relation in which ‘Troia’ is the label of ‘name’. This last kind of relation can consequently be expressed by an apposition such as: *nomen Troiam*.

If the proper name involved in such constructions is a personal name, the relation between semantic and syntax is much more interesting, as the following occurrences

show: *decernitur Othoni nomen Augusti* (Tac., Hist. I, 47) o (*Sulla*) *Felicis nomen assumpsit* (Vell. II 25, 5).

Is *Felix* the proper name of a specific person, which is so called, or rather is it just a name? *Sulla* did not take the name of another person which is called *Felix*, but he took the name 'Felix'. Therefore, *Felicis nomen* does not express a more or less prototypical possessive relation, but it is an unequivocal case of *genitivus denominativus*, which, as expected, may be expressed by an appositive construction: **Sulla Felicem nomen assumpsit*.

References

- Aarts B., *Syntactic gradience: the nature of grammatical indeterminacy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2007.
- Baron I., Herslund M., Sørensen F. (a cura di), *Dimensions of possessions*, Benjamins, Amsterdam – Philadelphia 2001, 1-25.
- Bauer B., *Nominal apposition in vulgar and late latin. At the cross-roads of major language changes*, in: Wright R. (ed.), *Latin vulgaire-latin tardif VIII*, Olms-Weidmann, Hildesheim 2008, pp. 42-50.
- Hahn A., *Vestiges of Partitive Apposition in Latin Syntax*, Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, 84 (1953), pp. 92-123.
- Hofmann J.B., *Syntaktische Gliederungsverschiebungen im Lateinischen infolge Erstarrung ursprünglich appositioneller Verhältnisse*, Indogermanische Forschungen, 42 (1924), pp. 75-88.
- Hofmann J.B., Szantyr A., *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, Beck, München 1965.
- Kühner R., Stegmann C., *Ausführliche Grammatik der Lateinischen Sprache*, Hansche Buchhandlung, Hannover 1955-1976.
- Longrée D., *À propos du concept d'apposition: les constructions rex Ancus et urbs Roma*, L'Information Grammaticale, 45 (1990), pp. 8-13.
- Magni E., *Synchronic gradience and language change in Latin genitive constructions*, in: Giacalone A. et al. (eds), *Synchrony and diachrony: a dynamic interface*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam-Philadelphia 2013, pp. 177-200.
- Orlandini A., *Il riferimento del nome: un'analisi semantico-pragmatica del nome latino*, CLUEB, Bologna 1995.
- Schmalz J.H., *Lateinische Grammatik*, Beck, München 1900.
- Serbat G., *Grammaire fondamentale du Latin*, VI, Peeters, Louvain-Paris, 1996.
- Spevak O., *The noun phrase in classical Latin prose*, Brill, Leiden-Boston 2014.

Recherches lexicographiques et méthode des cooccurrents spécifiques : application à quelques champs lexicaux latins

Dominique Longrée

Université de Liège, LASLA & Université Saint-Louis Bruxelles, SeSLa

Depuis une vingtaine d'années, les travaux de plusieurs membres du Centre A. Ernout (entre autres, Cl. Moussy, 1989 et 1991; J.F. Thomas 2002 et 2007; Cl. Brunet, 2002 ; L. Gavoille, 2007) ont visé à renouveler le domaine de la sémantique lexicale en faisant appel à la méthode de l'analyse sémique. Ces diverses études se sont largement appuyées sur les principes d'analyse proposés par F. Rastier (1987) : complétant

les théories de ses prédécesseurs, ce dernier distingue des sèmes inhérents, appartenant en propre au signifié du lexème « en langue », et des sèmes afférents, actualisés uniquement dans le contexte du discours ; il isole en outre des sèmes afférents « socialement normés », découlant de jugements implicites liés à la culture et à la société dans lesquelles le discours est produit. L'application de ces distinctions dans le domaine de la lexicographie latine a permis d'indéniables avancées, mais la méthode se heurte à une difficulté majeure : l'identification de sèmes, ainsi que la distinction entre sèmes inhérents, afférents et socialement normés reposent largement sur la subjectivité du linguiste...

Une méthode statistique, celle dite des « cooccurrents spécifiques », peut toutefois permettre de limiter cette subjectivité : la méthode consiste à déterminer tout d'abord, par rapport à un mot-pivot (une forme ou un lemme), un empan textuel (le paragraphe, la phrase, ou encore un nombre X de mots), à constituer ensuite deux sous-corpus (d'un côté, l'ensemble des empan textuels ainsi définis, de l'autre le reste du corpus) et enfin à préciser quels sont les mots (formes ou lemmes) qui, dans le sous-corpus constitué à partir du pivot, apparaissent significativement plus souvent que ne le laisserait attendre le hasard. Puisque ce sous-corpus a été constitué sur base du mot-pivot, on peut légitimement supposer que les mots (formes ou lemmes) qui apparaissent en excédent significatif dans ce sous-corpus entretiennent une relation privilégiée avec ce mot-pivot. Ces mots (formes ou lemmes) sont appelés les « cooccurrents spécifiques » du mot-pivot.

L'examen de diverses listes de cooccurrents spécifiques, établies à partir de divers corpus et de divers empan textuels, permet de mieux cerner, sinon les sèmes inhérents, à tout le moins, les sèmes afférents du mot-pivot en fonction des divers types de textes dans lequel celui-ci se rencontre. L'analyse peut par ailleurs être affinée par la confrontation des listes de cooccurrents spécifiques de plusieurs mots-pivots appartenant à un même champ lexical : une telle confrontation permet la mise en évidence de différences de sens et de comportement existant entre ces divers mots-pivots.

La présente communication aura pour objectif d'évaluer les avantages et les limites de la méthode à partir de l'examen de quelques champs lexicaux latins, dont celui, abstrait, du pouvoir (*potestas, imperium, potentia...*) et celui, concret, de la caverne (*antrum, cauerna, specus, spelunca...*).

Références

- Brunet Claude, 2002 : *Etude sémantique de beneficium, iniuria et d'autres noms désignant des actes de bienfaisance et de malveillance en latin dans un rapport d'antonymie*, thèse de l'Université de Franche-Comté à paraître aux PUFC (Besançon, Presses de l'Université de Franche-Comté).
- Célestin Hugues, 2010 : *Antrum, cauerna, specus & spelunca : études contrastives*, mémoire de Master, inédit.
- Gavoille Laurent, 2007 : *Oratio ou la parole persuasive. Etude sémantique et pragmatique*, (Bibliothèque d'Études classiques, 53), Louvain-Paris-Dudley Ma.
- Longrée Dominique & Mellet Sylvie, 2012 : « Asymétrie de la cooccurrence et contextualisation, Le rôle de la flexion casuelle dans la structuration des réseaux cooccurrentiels d'un mot-pôle en latin », in D. Mayaffre et J.M. Viprey (éd.), *La cooccurrence : du fait statistique au fait textuel = Corpus*, 11, pp. 91-128.
- Longrée Dominique, Luong Xuan, Brunet Étienne, Mayaffre Damon, Mellet Sylvie & Poudat Céline, 2010 : « La cooccurrence, une relation asymétrique ? », in S. Bolasco, I. Chiari & L. Giuliano (eds), *Statistical Analysis of Textual Data, Proceedings of the 10th International*

- Conference Journées d'Analyse statistique des Données Textuelles, 9-11 June 2010, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, pp. 321-332.
- Moussy Claude, 1989 : "Les métaphores lexicalisées et l'analyse sémique", in M. Lavency & D. Longrée (éds.), *Actes du 5ème Colloque International de Linguistique Latine*, Louvain-la-Neuve et Borzée, 31 mars - 4 avril = *Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain*, 15, 1-4, Louvain-la-Neuve, pp. 309-319.
- Moussy Claude, 1991 : "La structure du signifié : utilité et limites de l'analyse en traits pertinents (avec application au latin)", in R. Coleman (éd.), *New Studies in Latin Linguistics*, (Studies in Language Companion Series, 21), Amsterdam / Philadelphie, pp. 63-73.
- Rastier François, 1987 : *Sémantique interprétative*, Paris.
- Thomas Jean-François, 2002 : *Gloria et laus. Etude sémantique*, (Bibliothèque d'Études classiques, 31), Louvain-Paris-Dudley Ma.
- Thomas Jean-François, 2007 : *Déshonneur et honte en latin : étude sémantique*, (Bibliothèque d'Études classiques, 50), Louvain-Paris-Dudley Ma.

General Extenders in Latin

Elisabetta Magni

University of Bologna

Over the past decades, increasing interest in spoken interaction has led the attention of researchers on a subset of pragmatic markers such as *and stuff (like that)*, *and everything, or something*, etc. This group of multi-word expressions has been recently referred to as 'general extenders', because they have nonspecific, 'general' reference, and 'extend' otherwise grammatically complete utterances (Overstreet 1999: 3).

In English they are typically phrase- or clause-final expressions with a fairly homogeneous structural template consisting of a conjunction plus a nominal/proform, with an optional comparative phrase. Following Overstreet, general extenders beginning with *and* are called 'adjunctive', while those beginning with *or* are called 'disjunctive'.

For Channell (1994), they are *vague category identifiers* and several scholars point out that the implicated category may be a nonlexicalized one, an *ad hoc* category "created spontaneously for use in specialized contexts" (Barsalou 1983: 211; Overstreet 1999: 38 ff.). Other researchers focus on the role of general extenders as *list completers* (Lerner 1994, Carroll 2007), or on their functions in the interpersonal domain, suggesting that they mark politeness or intensity (Overstreet 2014), change of speaker or topic shift (Winter/Norrby, 2000), and also observing sociopragmatic variation and change in their use (Cheshire 2007, Tagliamonte/Denis 2010).

As forms that are frequent in spoken interaction, general extenders have been investigated in native English discourse, but also in other languages (Overstreet 2005, Parvaresh/Tavangar/Rasekh 2010, Dubois 1992). On the other hand, research on how they function at the textual level has been minimal; moreover, although many studies quote the expression *et cetera* as a typical example, no attempt has been made so far to investigate the structure of general extenders in Latin. Here we find both adjunctive forms with *et* (*et cetera*, *et similia*, *et talia*, *et alia huiusmodi*), and disjunctive forms with *aut* (*aut similia*, *aut aliquid huiusmodi*), which can function respectively as hedges on expectations of informativeness ('more possibilities') and of accuracy ('other possibilities').

This study is an attempt to collect the forms that may be employed as general extenders in Latin (data taken from the LLT-A database) and to discuss questions concerning the structures and their variation, their position and frequency, their role in the organization of the text. In this respect, the referential and interpersonal functions (assuming implicit shared knowledge, classifying by lists, avoiding uncomfortable or negative themes), as well as the pre-closing and speech-reporting functions (bringing a sequence to a close, providing an approximation of what was said) will be detailed through the examples and their context.

The expected results will provide evidence of grammaticalization processes involving reduction in form through morphosyntactic reanalysis, phonological attrition and decategorialization (Hopper/Traugott 2003): e.g. loss of post-modifiers and additional lexical material; lat. *et cetera* > it. *eccetera*; mismatch between the properties of the 'host' nominal and those of the proform included in the general extender. Moreover, the idea that formal variation in these expressions reflects the development from non-subjective to subjective and intersubjective meanings (Traugott 2010, Overstreet 2014), confirms the relevance of pragmatic functions in linguistic change.

References

- Barsalou, L.W. (1983). Ad hoc categories. *Memory and Cognition* 11(3): 211-227.
- Carroll, R. (2007). Lists in letters: NP-lists and general extenders in early English correspondence. In: Moskowich-Spiegel, I. & Crespo-García, B. (eds.), *Bells Chiming from the Past*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 37-53.
- Channell, J. (1994). *Vague language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cheshire, J. (2007). Discourse variation, grammaticalization, and stuff like that. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 11(2): 155-193.
- Dubois, S. (1992). Extension particles, etc. *Language Variation and Change* 4: 179-203.
- Hopper, P. & Traugott, E. (2003). *Grammaticalization* (2nd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lerner, G. (1994). Responsive list construction. *Language and Social Psychology* 13: 20-33.
- Overstreet, M. (1999). *Whales, Candlelight and Stuff Like That: General Extenders in English Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Overstreet, M. (2005). And stuff und so: Investigating pragmatic expressions in English and German. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37: 1845-1864.
- Overstreet, M. (2014). The Role of Pragmatic Function in the Grammaticalization of English General Extenders. *Pragmatics* 24: 105-129.
- Parvaresh, V., Tavangar, M. & Rasekh, A.E. (2010). General Extenders in Persian Discourse: Frequency and Grammatical Distribution. *Cross-Cultural Communication* 6(3): 18-35.
- Tagliamonte, S. & Denis D. (2010). The stuff of change: General extenders in Toronto, Canada. *Journal of English Linguistics* 38: 335-368.
- Traugott, E. (2010). Revisiting subjectification and intersubjectification. In: Davidse, K., Vandelanotte, L. & Cuyckens, H. (eds.), *Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 29-70.
- Tombour, P. (ed.), 2013. *LLT-Series A. Library of Latin Texts*. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers.
- Winter, J. & Norrby, C. (2000). Set marking tags - 'and stuff'. In: Henderson, J. (ed.), *Proceedings of the 1999 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*. Pdf available at: <http://www.als.asn.au/proceedings/als1999/winter%26norrby.pdf>.

The Syntax of Code-Switching in Cicero's Letters: Testing Formal Constraint Models

Aleksi Mäkilähde & Veli-Matti Rissanen

University of Turku

In this paper, we investigate the syntax of code-switching (CS) between Latin and Greek in Cicero's letters by testing grammatical models developed for present-day CS. Although many recent CS studies have been conducted on this particular dataset (e.g. Dunkel 2000; Swain 2002; Adams 2003; Rollinger 2015; Mäkilähde & Rissanen 2016), they have not focussed specifically on the syntactic aspects of CS. In particular, they have not tested any of the available models of CS syntax in a systematic fashion. Furthermore, it has been noted that the applicability of these models to historical data in general has not yet been sufficiently examined (Schendl & Wright 2011: 28). We aim to fill this gap by testing the hypotheses of two such models by applying them to the whole of Cicero's letter corpus. Our research questions are:

- 1) Are modern grammatical models of CS applicable to Latin-Greek CS?
- 2) If any of the predictions of these models are violated, how can we account for them?

We approach these questions by collecting the occurrences of intrasentential CS in the dataset and using them to test the hypotheses of two well-known models of CS syntax. The first of these is the free-morpheme and equivalence constraint model (e.g. Poplack 1980; Sankoff 1998), which operates on the assumption of linear and symmetrical language production. The second is the Matrix Language Frame model (e.g. Myers-Scotton 2002), which assumes asymmetry in CS production. We expect that most of the occurrences of CS follow the predictions of both models, and that *prima facie* deviations may be accounted for within the overall theories.

References

- Adams, J. N. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dunkel, G. E. 2000. Remarks on code-switching in Cicero's letters to Atticus. *Museum Helveticum* 57 (2): 122-129.
- Mäkilähde, A. & Rissanen, V.-M. 2016. Solidarity in Cicero's letters: Methodological considerations in analysing the functions of code-switching. *Pallas* 102: 237-245.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 2002. *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Poplack, S. 1980. Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en Español: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18 (7-8): 581-618.
- Rollinger, R. 2015. Bilingualität, Codewechsel und Zitate im Briefverkehr Ciceros und der späterepublikanischen Oberschicht. *Gymnasium* 122: 133-154.
- Sankoff, D. 1998. A formal production-based explanation of the facts of code-switching. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 1 (1): 39-50.

- Schendl, H. & Wright, L. 2011. Code-switching in early English: Historical background and methodological and theoretical issues. In H. Schendl & L. Wright (eds), *Code-Switching in Early English*, 15-45. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Swain, S. 2002. Bilingualism in Cicero? The evidence of code-switching. In J. N. Adams, M. Janse & S. Swain (eds), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Word*, 128-167. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Greek in Donatus' Terence Commentaries

Robert Maltby

University of Leeds

In an earlier study, Maltby (2013), I investigated the use of Greek in Servius' Virgil Commentaries, especially his use of Greek critical terminology. As pointed out by Adams (2003) 323-9 this kind of code-switching in Latin has a long history in letters and rhetorical works reaching back to the second century BC. It has its roots in the convention that rhetorical schools at Rome made extensive use of a Greek critical vocabulary. The present paper will compare Donatus' use of Greek with that of Servius, and Servius Danielis, not only in the use of Greek technical terms derived from the Hellenistic Greek scholia and grammatical tradition, but also in the curious practice of using Greek terms to gloss Latin words. It will also take into account the choice of Greek or Latin scripts, the morphology of the Greek loan-words found, and will touch briefly on problems concerning the manuscript transmission of Greek, as discussed in Bureau and Nicolas (2013). A final section will discuss areas where Donatus' use of Greek differs from that of Servius but is closer in to that of Servius Danielis.

Bibliography

- Adams, James, N. (2003), *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Biville, Frédérique (1989), 'Grec et latin: contacts linguistiques et creation lexicale. Pour une typologie des hellénismes lexicaux du Latin' *ICLL* 5, p. 29-40.
- Bureau, Dominique and Nicolas Christian (2013), 'Le grec de Donat: de quelques problèmes ecdotiques dans le Commentaire au *Phormion*' in: *Polyphonia Romana, Hommages à Frédérique Biville*, édité par Alessandro Garcea, Marie-Karine Lhommé et Daniel Vallat, vol. I pp. 335-350, Olms Verlag, Hildesheim.
- Craig, J.D. (1948) 'Specilegium Donateum' in: *Mélanges de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes offerts à J. Marouzeau par ses collègues et élèves étrangers*, pp. 103-112, Paris.
- Maltby, Robert (2013), 'Greek in the Virgil Commentaries of Servius' in: *Polyphonia Romana, Hommages à Frédérique Biville*, édité par Alessandro Garcea, Marie-Karine Lhommé et Daniel Vallat, vol. I pp. 441-458, Olms Verlag, Hildesheim.

Potest + Passive Infinitives: Auxiliary Or Impersonal Verb?

Adriana M. Manfredini

Universidad de Buenos Aires

The OLD s.v. *possum* §1.c considers the following instances with passive infinitives as examples of the impersonal use of the verb:

- 1) ... neque ulli civitati Germanorum persuaderi potuit ut Rhenum transiret (Caes. *Gal.* 5.55.2)
- 2) ...modo ut hoc consilio possiet discedi ut istam ducat (Ter. *Ph.* 773)
- 3) neque per castra eorum perrumpi ad Capuam posse (Liv. 26.7.1)

Being *potest* interpreted as *possibile est* in contexts such as these (cf. TLL s.v. 143.61 ss., particularly §II.B.b.α), it is the aim of this paper to examine the so-called impersonal value of the form from a syntactic approach. Taking into account the acknowledged auxiliary status of *possum* in Latin, and its function as a modal operator (Manfredini 2016), an examination of impersonal predicates of the type of *licet* will be in order to discuss *potest* syntactic frame in these contexts against some features of auxiliary verbs, namely, “transparency” (Joffre 1994). It is our expectation to show that it is thanks to transparency that *potest* remains auxiliary in these instances, whereas it is the infinitive phrase under its scope what realizes an impersonal verb frame.

Data will be initially taken from the OLD and the TLL and will be mainly restrained to the classical period.

Bibliography

- FRUYT, M. (2011) “Grammaticalization” in Baldi, P. and Cuzzolin, P. eds., *New Perspectives in Historical Latin Syntax. Volume 4* Berlin/New York.
- FRUYT, M., ORLANDINI, A. (2003) “L’expression de la modalité et les verbes perfectoprésents en latin” in *Revue belge de philologie et d’histoire*, tome 81, fasc. 3, 2003. Langues et littératures modernes - Moderne taal en litterkunde. pp. 693-728.
- HEINE, B. (1993) *Auxiliaries. Cognitive forces and grammaticalization*, New York-Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- JOFFRE, M.D. (1994) “L’auxiliation en latin” in Mellet, S.-M.D. Joffre-G. Serbat *Grammaire Fondamentale du Latin*, sous la direction de Guy Serbat, Louvain – Paris, Éditions Peeters.
- LECAUDÉ, P. (2015) “Le ‘sens lexical plein’ de *possum*” in Haverling, G. ed. *Latin Linguistics in the Early 21st Century. Acts of the 16th ICLL, Uppsala, June 6-11, 2011*. Uppsala, Uppsala Universitet, pp. 456-467.
- MANFREDINI, A. (2016) “Auxiliaries within comparative clauses: some remarks concerning their syntax and grammatical description”, in Pocetti, P. (ed.) *Latinitatis Rationes. Descriptive and Historical Accounts for the Latin Language*, Berlin, De Gruyter, pp. 262-276.
- OLD = *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1968-1982) Oxford, at the Clarendon Press.
- PINKSTER, H. (2015) *Oxford Latin Syntax, vol. 1. The Simple Clause*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- RIGAU, G. (1999) “Los predicados impersonales relativos en las lenguas románicas” in *Revista Española de Lingüística*, 29, 2, pp. 317-355.
- TLL = *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (2007) München, K.G. Saur Verlag/Software, Thomas Technology Solutions Inc.

Spoken Latin, Translation and Re-translation in the Acts of the Ecumenical Councils

Tommaso Mari

Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg

The theological controversies that arose within the Christian Church of Late Antiquity resulted in the convocation of several Ecumenical Councils, where bishops gathered from the whole Christian world to discuss matters of faith and Church politics. The Acts of these Councils include letters, documents relevant to the debates, and most interestingly the allegedly verbatim transcripts of the discussions held there. Bishops from both the Latin and Greek speaking world attended the Councils: the Western representatives normally spoke in Latin, the Eastern ones in Greek, with the mediation of interpreters. A crucial Council was held at Chalcedon in 451, where most participants spoke Greek and the Latin speakers were assisted by interpreters. The original proceedings of this assembly are lost, but we possess a later Greek version, where the Latin utterances have been suppressed, and a Latin version, which is a translation of the original Greek version and occasionally preserves original Latin utterances. Inasmuch as most of the Acts profess to be verbatim transcriptions of actual debates, this extremely long text represents the richest evidence for the spoken Greek and Latin of more or less educated men in antiquity, although the processes of editing and translation must have obscured to some extent the features of spoken language.

My research question, in focusing on the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, is manifold: first, I shall attempt to pinpoint traces of spoken Latin as they emerge from the few original Latin utterances preserved and the sometimes over-literal Greek translations and Latin re-translations; second, I shall investigate the very phenomena of translation and re-translation, comparing the Greek and the Latin version where both are available; related to this, I shall try to work out if and to what extent Greek and Latin bureaucratic prose have influenced each other in this text.

The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, just like those of the other Ecumenical Councils, have been so far ignored by linguists. A few remarks on the language and the translations are to be found in an article of the editor of the Acts, Eduard Schwartz (1933), and in the introduction to the recent English translation by Price and Gaddis (2005).

In addressing issues of spoken language, I follow the syntax- and discourse-based approach to spontaneous spoken language of Miller and Weinert (1998). As for linguistic aspects of translation, I mainly rely on the contrastive linguistic and stylistic approach of Vinay and Darbelnet (1995).

References

- Miller, J. and Weinert, R. (1998), *Spontaneous Spoken Language. Syntax and Discourse* (Oxford).
- Price, R. and Gaddis, M. (2005), *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon* (Liverpool).
- Schwartz, E. (1933), 'Zweisprachigkeit in den Konzilsakten', *Philologus* 88: 245-53.
- Vinay, J.-P. and Darbelnet, J. (1995), *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*, trans. by J.C. Sager and M.-J. Hamel (Amsterdam and Philadelphia).

Incorporation et constructions à verbe-support en latin

Emanuela Marini

Liceo Rodolico Firenze

À plusieurs reprises on a relevé en latin des cas d'incorporation, mais ce phénomène concerne des verbes, composés ou agglutinés, incorporant un objet (Fruyt 1990, Christol 1991, Fugier 1994, Marini 2015). Récemment, la construction à verbe-support *ludos facere* aussi a été interprétée comme exemple d'incorporation 'syntaxique' (Baños Baños 2012).

En aval du latin, dans les langues romanes, sauf en français moderne, on a constaté l'existence d'un type d'incorporation appelé *noun stripping* (Miner 1986 et Gerdts 1998) : c'est la juxtaposition à un verbe d'un 'nom nu', c'est-à-dire dépourvu de sa marque casuelle et/ou de son article, jouant le rôle d'objet direct, qui se positionne après ou avant le verbe et maintient sa place proche de celui-ci. La relation paradigmatique entre les cas d'incorporation et d'autres locutions avec un nom non-incorporé est cruciale pour relever la présence de *noun stripping* dans une langue. Par ex., face à *chercher un mari* en français moderne, en italien on dit *cercare marito* (incorp.)/ *un marito* et en espagnol *buscar marido* (incorp.)/ *un marido*/ *a un marido*.

Dans notre contribution on montrera que les constructions à verbe-support *facere*, *gerere* et *ferre* de notre corpus -du type N_{ACC} + V_{supp}-, ne représentent pas de cas d'incorporation. Dans la perspective du Lexique-Grammaire et de la Grammaire Relationnelle adoptée, la mise en relation entre phrases sera utilisée en tant qu'outil très efficace pour l'analyse des données (Harris 1957 et Gross 1981).

D'abord, on constatera qu'en latin le manque d'article et l'usage exclusif de l'accusatif pour marquer l'objet direct font qu'il n'est pas possible d'opérer une distinction entre les cas d'incorporation d'un 'nom nu' et les constructions non incorporantes (Herslund 1999). Ensuite, on relèvera que, comme les phrases à prédicat verbal, les constructions à verbe-support *facere*, *gerere* et *ferre* de notre corpus sont soumises à des transformations, notamment à la passivation et à la relativisation. En outre, le substantif supporté, à l'accusatif, s'y trouve quelquefois au pluriel et peut recevoir des déterminants, des quantifieurs et des expansions adjectivales, alors que le V_{supp} est dépourvu de sa fonction prédicative qui appartient, par contre, à un verbe à incorporation (Nedergaard Thomsen & Herslund 2002). Enfin, la contiguïté du N_{ACC} et du V_{supp} et l'ordre NV, souvent préservés, manifestent une certaine variabilité dépendant surtout du type de textes où les constructions apparaissent. Par ex. Plaut. *Bacch.* 355 *Hic nostra agetur aetas in malacum modum* ; Cic. *Tusc.* 1,16,36 *Sub terra censebant reliquam uitam agi mortuorum* e Sest. 131 *Cunctae itinere toto urbes Italiae festos dies agere adventus mei videbantur* ; Sen. *uit. beat.* 18,2 *Ne uirus quidem istud ... me inpediet, quo minus perseuerem laudare uitam, non quam ago, sed quam agendam scio* ; Ter. *Ad.* 487 *Iuno Lucina, fer opem* ! ; Liv. 34,39,11 *ut adiuantibus ignem qui alias ad extinguendum opem ferre solent* (Marini 2000 et 2010).

Les enjeux de notre contribution sont une description plus détaillée des propriétés sémantico-syntaxiques des constructions de notre corpus et un apport à l'étude de l'ordre des mots en latin.

Références bibliographiques

- BAÑOS BAÑOS J. M. 2012 : « Verbos soporte et incorporación sintáctica en latín : el ejemplo de *ludos facere* », *Revista de Estudios Latinos* 12, 37-57.
- CHRISTOL A. 1991 : « Dérivation synchronique, dérivation diachronique dans le verbe grec », *Revue de Philologie* 65, 89-98.
- FRUYT M. 1990 : « La formation des mots par agglutination en latin », *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique* 85, 1, 173-209.
- FUGIER H. 1994 : « Le verbe « incorpore »-t-il ses compléments? », in J. Herman (éd.), *Linguistic Studies in Latin*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, Benjamins, 75-90.
- GERDTS D. G. 1998 : « Incorporation » in A. Spencer & A. M. Zwicky (éds.), *The Handbook of Morphology*, Oxford – Malden (USA), 84-100.
- GROSS M. 1981 : « Les bases empiriques de la notion de prédicat sémantique », *Langages* 63, 752.
- HARRIS Z. S. 1957 : « Co-occurrence and transformation in linguistic structure », *Language*, 33, 283-340.
- HERSLUND M. 1999 : « Incorporation et transitivité dans les langues romanes », *Verbum* 21, 1, 37-47.
- 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.
- 2010 : « Remarques sur le verbe *agere* associé aux noms désignant une durée temporelle », *De lingua latina*, 5, 14 p. ([http://www.paris-sorbonne.fr/article/relations-spatio-temporelles-en-12922](http://www.paris-sorbonne.fr/article/rerelations-spatio-temporelles-en-12922)).
- 2015 : « Les verbes à incorporation de l'objet en latin : essai d'aperçu typologique », in *Latin Linguistics in the Early 21st Century (Acts of the 16th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Uppsala, June 6th-11th, 2011)*, G. V. M. Haverling (éd.), Uppsala Universitet, Uppsala, 124-138.
- MINER K. L. 1986 : « Noun stripping and loose incorporation in Zuni », *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 52, 3, 242-254.
- NEDERGAARD THOMSEN O. & M. HERSLUND 2002 : « Complex Predicates and Incorporation- An Introduction », in O. Nedergaard Thomsen & M. Herslund (éds.), *Complex Predicates and Incorporation. A Functional Perspective. Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Copenhague* 32, 7-47.

Patterns of Prosodic Distribution of Latin Long Vowels

Giovanna Marotta & Irene De Felice

University of Pisa

Introduction

In Classical Latin, vowel quantity (VQ) plays a fundamental role, not only for its contrastive value (*lĕvīs* “smooth” ~ *lĕvīs* “light”), but also for stress assignment (Mester 1994; Marotta 2000; 2006): it is vowel length (VL) that, together with syllable structure, determines prosodic weight and assigns word stress in polysyllabic words (*prōvēnīt* ~ *prōvēnīt*). On the contrary, no Romance languages inherited the original VQ contrast, and it is lexical stress that often determines VL (Weiss 2009: 508; Lop-orcaro 2011; 2015).

In this contribution, we argue that the seeds of this change, i.e. from VL assigning lexical stress, to VL determined by lexical stress, were already taking root in Classical

Latin. Although long vowels could occur in any position, we aim to find quantitative evidence for a tendency for long vowels to occur in stressed syllables more frequently than in unstressed syllables, and thus for a general drift towards the progressive loss of the length contrast during the Classical period.

Method

The research was conducted on a corpus derived from the Pocket Oxford Latin Dictionary (Oxford University Press, 2012), a dictionary that also marks VL. All the lemmas constituting the corpus (10874) were automatically divided into syllables (tot. 34905) and annotated with a set of prosodic features, in particular:

- (i) the type and structure of each syllable (open/closed, light/heavy);
- (ii) the quantity and quality of the vowel/diphthong composing a syllable nucleus;
- (iii) the position of the syllable with respect to stress (pre-tonic/post-tonic/tonic position).

Results

The corpus contains 34197 vowels, 708 diphthongs, and 45760 consonants. The distribution of long vowels (together with diphthongs) with relation to the parameters here considered is summarized in the following table:

	Open syllable		Closed syllable		
	Short V	Long V	Short V	Long V	Tot.
Stressed syllable	2445	4065	3596	768	10874
%	22,5%	37,4%	33,1%	7%	100%
Pre-tonic syllable	3057	1858	3278	424	8617
%	35,5%	21,6%	38%	4,9%	100%
Post-tonic syllable	5935	3716	5172	591	15414
%	38,5%	24,1%	33,6%	3,8%	100%

The distribution of long vowels is not entirely independent of stress. Long vowels occur in 44,4% of stressed syllables, but only in 26,5% of the pre-tonic and in 27,9% of the post-tonic ones. Statistical tests (that we cannot report here) confirm that the distribution of long and short vowels in stressed or unstressed syllables is not due to chance (cf. Herman 1968). Moreover, both in stressed and in unstressed position, long vowels are much more frequent in open syllables than in closed syllables (with a proportion of c.a. 5:1), but only in open stressed syllables their frequency even exceeds that of short vowels.

Conclusions

Even if in Classical Latin VQ still had a contrastive value, a strong preference for long vowels to occur in stressed syllables clearly emerges from our data, and in particular in the open ones, i.e. the same context in which many Romance languages show

long vowels. Quantitative evidence clearly indicates that the contrast of VQ still withstood in Classical Latin, but it was already oriented toward the system of the Romance languages, in which inherited VQ is no longer phonologically relevant and VL is largely determined by stress.

References

- Herman, J. (1968). Statistique et diachronie: essai sur l'évolution du vocalisme dans la latinité tardive. *Word* 24: 242-251.
- Herman, J. (1982). Un vieux dossier réouvert: les transformations du système latin des quantités vocaliques. *BSLP* 77: 285-302.
- Loporcaro, M. (2011). Syllable, segment and prosody. In Maiden, M. et al. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages*, Vol. I, 50-108. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Loporcaro, M. (2015). *Vowel length from Latin to Romance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Marotta, G. (2000). Sulla massimalità dei piedi trocaici: il caso del latino. *Lingua e Stile* 35(3): 387-416.
- Marotta, G. (2006). L'algoritmo accentuale latino nel confronto di due teorie fonologiche. In R. Oniga e L. Zennaro (eds.), *Atti della Giornata di Linguistica Latina*, 133-158. Venezia: Libreria Editrice Cafoscarina.
- Mester, R. A. (1994). The quantitative trochee in Latin. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12: 1-61.
- Weiss, M. (2009). *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press.

Ruinam dare: les complexités d'une construction latine à verbe support

Antonio María Martín-Rodríguez

Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria

Le concept et la dénomination de « verbe support », vinculés à l'origine aux études de lexique-grammaire et co-extensifs partiellement avec d'autres dénominations telles que « verbes d'appui », « verbes auxiliaires », « Funktionsverbefüge »..., ont commencé à se répandre au sein de la linguistique latine à partir de 1996 et sont devenus aujourd'hui un sujet d'actualité dans la syntaxe latine, notamment en relation avec le concept de « collocation fonctionnelle ». Les Colloques Internationaux de Linguistique Latine, en fait, accueillent depuis 1993 des contributions sur ce sujet : Flobert (1966), Hoffmann (1966 ; 2005), Martín Rodríguez (1996), Roesch (2001), Brunet (2008), Marini (2014).

Dans la *communis doctrina*, les constructions à verbe support (CVS) sont constituées par un nom abstrait ou verbal accompagné d'un verbe de contenu très général qui se désémantise partiellement ou totalement, donnant lieu à un prédicat analytique dont la complémentation relève déjà du prédicat subjaçant au nom plutôt que du verbe, qui fait la fonction d'un simple support capable de verbaliser la structure de prédicat subjacente au nom qui figure comme son OD. Ce prédicat analytique entre en concur-

rence usuellement avec un verbe synthétique apparenté morphologiquement (ou sémantiquement) à son objet, ou bien, ce verbe synthétique faisant défaut, comble cette lacune conférant au verbe « support » le rôle d'un véritable auxiliaire lexical.

Le verbe « donner », compte tenue de la généricité de son contenu lexicale, donne lieu –aussi bien en latin que dans d'autres langues– à un bon nombre de CVS, ce qui n'a pas laissé d'attirer l'attention des linguistes. Or, il n'y a pas une étude consacrée spécifiquement à l'analyse de la CVS *ruinam dare*, qui semble pourtant d'intérêt puisqu'elle semble contredire un postulat proposé pour les CVS : quand le verbe apparenté à l'objet possède une pluralité de valeurs, la CVS n'en développe qu'une.

Nous proposons, donc, d'analyser, en employant comme corpus les textes recueillis par le Packard Humanities Institute et ayant recours à la méthodologie développée pour l'étude des CVS et des collocations lexicales et fonctionnelles, la combinatoire du substantif *ruina*. Premièrement, nous examinerons les collocations les plus usuelles du substantif, distinguant celles qui sont de nature lexicale de celles qu'on peut considérer, à juste titre, collocations fonctionnelles. Puis, on tiendra compte de celles qui constituent de véritables CVS, et notamment *ruinam dare* et son rapport avec d'autres collocations où le verbe fonctionne également comme support (*facere*...). Troisièmement, on mettra en rapport les deux structures de prédicat de *ruinam dare* (bivalente et trivalente) avec celles de *ruere*, et on analysera leurs rapports avec la structure prédictive usuelle de *dare*, pour calibrer son degré de désémantisation dans ce contexte. Finalement, on tiendra compte du rendement des constructions analytique et synthétique dans les divers auteurs et périodes, pour essayer de découvrir les particularités diachroniques, diastatiques et diaphasiques qui permettent de mieux expliquer l'usage de *ruinam dare* et de *ruere* dans le corpus choisi.

Bibliographie

- ALONSO RAMOS, M. 1997: « Coocurrencia léxica y descripción lexicográfica del verbo DAR: hacia un tratamiento de los verbos soportes », *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 113, 380-417.
- ALONSO RAMOS, M. 2004: *Las construcciones con verbo de apoyo*, Madrid.
- BAÑOS BAÑOS, J. M., 2012: « Verbos soporte e incorporación sintáctica en latín : el ejemplo de *ludos facere* », *Revista de Estudios Latinos* 12, 37-57.
- BAÑOS BAÑOS, J. M. 2016: « Las construcciones con verbo soporte en latín: sintaxis y semántica », in Borrell, E. – De la Cruz, O. (éds.), *Omnia mutantur*, Barcelona, vol. II., pp. 15-39.
- BRUNET, C. 2008: « *Accipere*, verbe support et élément du passif nominal chez Sénèque et Valère-Maxime », in Viré, G. (éd.), *Autour du lexique latin*, Bruxelles, pp. 167-177.
- CORBACHO, M. 2005: « El concepto de *Funktionsverbgefüge*: consideraciones teóricas y correspondencias terminológicas en español », *Anuario de Estudios Filológicos* 28: 35-45.
- FLOBERT, P. 1996, « Les verbes support en latin », in Alfred Bammesberger et Friedrich Heberlein (éds.), *Akten des VIII. internationalen Kolloquiums zur lateinischen Linguistik*, Heidelberg, pp. 193-199.
- GROSS, G. 1993 : « Trois applications de la notion de verbe support », *L'information grammaticale* 59 : 16-22.
- GROSS, G. et PONTONX, S.e de (éds.) 2004, *Verbes supports: Nouvel état des lieux. Special issue of Lingvisticae Investigationes* 27 (2).
- HERRERO INGELMO, J. L., 2002: « Los verbos soportes: el verbo *dar* en español », in Alexandre Veiga et al. (éds.), *Léxico y gramática*, Lugo, pp. 189-202.

- HOFFMANN, R. 1996. «Funktionsverbefüge im Lateinischen », in Bammesberger, A. – Heberlein, F. (éds.), *Akten des VIII. Internationalen Kolloquiums zur lateinischen Linguistik*, Heidelberg, pp. 200-212.
- HOFFMANN, R. 2005: « Functional verb constructions of the type *adferre* + accusative: synchronic and diachronic observations », in Calboli, G. (éd.), *Papers on Grammar 9.2 Proceedings of the Twelfth International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*, Roma, pp. 547-559.
- KOIKE, K. 1993: « *Dar* como verbo soporte », in *Actas del Tercer Congreso de Hispanistas de Asia*, Tokio, pp. 216-225.
- KOIKE, K. 2001: *Colocaciones léxicas en el español actual: estudio formal y léxico-semántico*, Madrid.
- MARINI, E. 2000: « Criteri di individuazione di una costruzione a verbo soporte: due esempi latini (*opem ferre* e *morem gerere*) », *Studi e saggi linguistici* 38: 365-395.
- MARINI, E. 2014: « Deux démarches pour un Lexique-Grammaire des verbes supports latins », en Cabrilla, C. – Lehmann, Ch. (éds.), *Acta XIV Colloquii Internationalis Linguisticae Latinae*, Madrid, pp. 373-389.
- MARTÍN RODRÍGUEZ, Antonio María, 1996: « *Dare*, auxiliaire lexical en latin », in Michèle Fruyt et Claude Moussy (éds.), *Structures lexicales du latin*, Paris, pp. 49-64.
- ROESCH, S. 2001: « Les emplois de *uerbum* et *sermo* dans les expressions à verbe support *uerba facere*, *uerba habere* et *sermonem habere* », in Moussy, C. (éd.), *De lingua Latina novae quaestiones*, Paris, pp. 859-874.
- ROSÉN, H. 1981: *Studies in the Syntax of the Verbal Noun in Early Latin*, Munich.
- SANROMÁN, B. 2009: « Diferencias semánticas entre construcciones con verbo de apoyo y sus correlatos verbales simples », *ELUA* 23: 289-314.
- WILLEMS, D. 2005: « La complémentation verbale en contexte : le cas du verbe *donner* », in Nölke, H. et al. (éds.), *Festschrift in Honour of Michael Herslund*, Bern, pp. 509-522.

Complex Denominal Verbs in Latin: A Syntactic Approach

Jaume Mateu

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

In this talk I provide a syntactic approach to the formation of complex denominal verbs in Latin (see Mignot (1969), Serbat (2001), and Fruyt (2013), i.a., for very useful descriptions of many relevant examples). I concentrate on two classes of prefixed locative verbs:

- | | |
|---|------------------------------|
| (1) <i>aliquem ex hominum communitate exterminare</i> | (Cic. <i>Off.</i> 3, 6, 32) |
| (2) <i>inflammare taedas ignibus</i> | (Cic. <i>Verr.</i> 2, 4, 48) |

On the one hand, when dealing with complex location verbs like *exterminare*, *aggregare* or *inhumare*, I claim that the complex Prep+nominal Ground (e.g., EX TERMIN- in (1)) is syntactically incorporated in the verbal head (cf. Baker 1988). Moreover, in (1) the direct object *aliquem* is claimed to be interpreted both as Figure and as Resultee (i.e., ‘affected by the result’). As for *ex hominum communitate* in (1), this Prepositional Phrase can be claimed to specify the Prep+nominal Ground incorporated in the verb. On the other hand, when dealing with complex locatum verbs like *inflammare*, *edentare* or *decorticare* (e.g., see (2)), I will show how Mateu’s (2008) syntactic analysis of German denominal verbs like *überdachen* ‘to roof over’ is useful to understand why the structure of Latin prefixed locatum verbs can be

claimed to partly correspond to the structure argued for prefixed location verbs (see also Acedo-Matellán 2010). Accordingly, an important correlation can be established in (2) between (i) promoting the Ground argument to a direct object position (e.g., *taedas* moves from the initial complement position of the prepositional prefix *in-*, where it is interpreted as Ground, to the final direct object position where it is interpreted as Resultee) and (ii) demoting the Figure argument, which appears as instrumental adjunct (*ignibus*) and specifies the locatum noun (*flamma*) that is conflated with the verb. This conflation analysis will be shown to be compatible with Serbat's (2001) insightful claim that the nominal root in prefixed locatum verbs like (2) is to be understood as a circumstant. Finally, I will show how the present analysis accounts for the important descriptive generalization that unprefixed locative verbs (e.g., *terminare*, *animare*, *surculare*, etc.) can only be interpreted as locatum predicates, i.e., their nominal root does not express the location but the (dis)locatum object.

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.
- Baker, M. (1988). *Incorporation: A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fruyt, M. (2013). "Les verbes parasynthétiques en latin". Invited talk delivered at the 17th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, May 20th, Rome.
- Mateu, J. (2008). "On the lexical syntax of directionality/resultativity: The case of Germanic preverbs". In A. Asbury et al. (eds.). *Syntax and Semantics of Spatial P*. 221-250. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Mignot, X. (1969). *Les verbes dénominatifs latins*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Serbat, G. (2001). "Aperçu d'une analyse syntaxique des préverbes". In L. Nadjó (ed.). *Opera Disiecta. Travaux de linguistique générale, de langue et littérature latines. Bibliothèque de l'Information Grammaticale* 49. Louvain-Paris: Éditions Peeters.

The Rhythmic Alternative to the Penultimate Stress Rule

Michael L Mazzola

Northern Illinois University

The Latin Penultimate Stress Rule is more a convenient memory aid than an explanation of stress. Accordingly, penultimate quantity as the essential fulcrum for the allocation of stress is questioned. Clearly, stress falls on the first syllable in both oxytones (*pānis*, *cānis*) and proparoxytones (*fābula*, *tābula*) and is unrelated to syllabic quantity. In oxytones, stress is simply a function of the trochaic head. This is also the case in dactyls where the trochee is embedded; e.g. [[fābu]la], [[tābu]la]. In both instances we have a **quantity-insensitive, left-dominant trochee**, where stress is also a function of the trochaic head. In polysyllables where stress is assigned to the heavy penult, e.g. *catēna*, however, the trochee is embedded in the other direction; e.g. [ca[tēna]]. This is similarly the case in [man[dūcat]], where the long penultimate vowel trumps even the heavy antepenult. Only in these latter examples, where we have

a **quantity-sensitive, right-dominant trochee**, is Latin stress exclusively predicated upon syllabic weight with no attention to the right-branching of the embedded trochee.

From a perspective of a rhythmic, suprasegmental – not prosodic – trochaic constituency, this paper emphasizes instead that stress and syllabic weight, although coincidentally right-branching, are evidently independent. From this it is concluded that Latin stress, a function of the trochaic constituency, is determined not by syllabic weight – fixed for each trochee in the lexicon –, but rather by the rhythm of Latin. This rhythm may be distributed to the left or to the right as required by each entry. Free standing and left-branching trochees may have heavy or light heads. Only trochees with heavy heads, however, are allowed for right-branching. Contrary to the Penultimate Stress Rule, therefore, the stress allocated to the penult of polysyllables is not imposed by syllabic weight, but rather required by the trochaic rhythm of Latin for right-branching.

References

- Allen, W. Sidney, 1973. *Accent and Rhythm: Prosodic Features of Latin and Greek: a Study in Theory and Reconstruction*. Cambridge, UK: University Press.
- Mazzola, Michael L., 1997. From Stress in Latin and Romance to Lexical Stress in Italian. *Certamen Phonologicum III*, ed. by P-M Bertinetto, et al., 229-246. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Mazzola, Michael L., 1998. Sullo sviluppo del vocalismo romanzo. *Atti del 21o Congresso Internazionale di Linguistica e Filologia Romanza*, ed. by G. Ruffino, 221-229. Tübingen: M Niemeyer.
- Mazzola, Michael L. 1999. Tuscan Geminates and Trochaic Feet, in J. Franco *et al.*, eds., *Grammatical Analyses in Basque and Romance Linguistics*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: J Benjamins: 151-164.
- Mazzola, Michael L., 2006. Rhythm and Prosodic Change, in D. Arteaga & R. Gess, eds., *Historical Romance Linguistics: Retrospective and Perspectives*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: J Benjamins: 97-110.
- Mazzola, Michael L., 2016. Le Nivellement analogique régi par la phonologie. *Actes XXVII Congrès international de linguistique et philologie romanes. Sect 2: Ling latine/ling romane*, M. Fruyt, G. Haverling, & R. Sornicola, (éds.) Nancy, ATILF. <http://www.atilf.fr/cilpr2013/actes/section-2.html>.
- Mazzola, Michael L., [2017]. The Rhythmic Alternative to Trapping in Latin. *Pallas n° 103: Études de linguistique latine II*, ed. by Olga Spevak.
- Mester, R. Armin, 1994. The Quantitative Trochee in Latin, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12: 1-61.
- Otero, Carlos P., 1988. From Latin to Romance: the Vowel Systems, in C. Duncan-Rose & T. Vennemann, eds., *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.

A Linguistic Analysis of Demonstratives in Genres of Early Latin Fragments

Erica Meszaros

University of Chicago

Scholars have claimed that demonstratives (*hic*, *ille*, *iste*) are used more frequently in Latin comedies than in other genres (Karakasis 2014, Palmer 1975), and have proposed additional hypotheses limiting and describing the use of demonstratives within both comedic and dramatic works. Most of these theories are supported through qualitative analysis of a handful of passages, and when quantitative data are provided they are usually limited to only one author (Wayenberg 2011, Perdicoyianni-Paléologou 2006). This paper presents recent work that provided quantitative data on how demonstratives are used within the fragments of six Early Latin authors. This work also attempts to utilize modern linguistic conventions in the discussion of classical demonstrative usage, reducing ambiguity of meaning and allowing for critical interactions between the two fields.

To provide this analysis, I created a corpus composed of fragments of Naevius, Pacuvius, Accius, Livius Andronicus, Caecilius, and Ennius. Plautus and Terence were excluded because their work remains in un-fragmented form and because they have already been the subject of qualitative demonstrative analysis. The corpus was then mined for occurrences of demonstratives, which were gathered and labelled according to author, genre, demonstrative form (*hic*, *ille*, and *iste*), and syntactic category (pronominal, adnominal, and adverbial). I also examined each demonstrative for affective force (derogatory, laudatory, or neutral), co-occurrence with personal pronouns, and use in multimembral demonstrative sets.

Within the works of the six authors included in this corpus, comedy contained the highest rate of demonstrative use, where 2.9% of all words were demonstratives compared the 2.0% found in tragedy and the 1.2% found in non-dramatic works. Additionally, all forms of drama had a higher rate of demonstrative use than was found in non-dramatic texts. Analysis of the corpus also provided support for theories describing the use of affective force with all demonstrative force and in all genres, the relatively low frequency of forms of *iste* in all genres, and the low frequency multimembral demonstrative sets within comedy. However, theories regarding the correlation of demonstratives to personal pronouns were not supported.

This study provides the first quantitative evaluation of demonstrative use for the often neglected authors of Early Latin plays. It also identifies theories on demonstrative use with greater support within this corpus and suggests why these theories might hold true and how they might impact the overall demonstrative count for comedy, tragedy, and non-dramatic works. Furthermore, this study demonstrates that even in fragmented form, removed from much of the significant context used for interpretation, demonstratives still provide significant information on demonstrative use.

Bibliography

- Karakasis, E. (2014). The language of the *palliata*. In Fontaine, M. & Scafuro, A.C. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy* (pp. 555-579). Oxford University Press.
- Palmer, L. R. (1988). *The latin language*. University of Oklahoma Press.
- Perdicoyianni-Paléologou, H. (2006). The Exophoric and Endophoric Usages of Demonstratives in Euripides' and Seneca's Tragedies. II. *Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica*, 82(1), 21-57.
- Wayenberg, K. Word Order of Demonstrative Pronouns in Terence's Comedies.

Cognitive Linguistics Meets Latin Constructions: Two Case Studies

Egle Mocciano

University of Palermo

William Michael Short

University of Texas at San Antonio

Theories of embodied cognition and language have advanced understanding of how people make sense of and meaningfully communicate about their experience. In particular, Lakoffian cognitive semantics, in positing that the meanings of words often correspond to patterns of sensorimotor experience (“image schemas”) susceptible of transformations in mental space, as well as of figurative interpretation, has made it possible to account for the range of senses typically characterizing lexical semantics under a single unified framework. Similarly, Goldbergian construction grammar, by treating structures at every level of linguistic encoding as meaningful *in and of themselves*, has collapsed the distinction between syntax and semantics in such a way that the organization of grammar and lexicon can be accounted for in terms of the same brain-based mechanisms of meaning construction. The insights of this “embodiment paradigm” are now beginning to penetrate studies of Greek and Latin. The time is ripe, then, for establishing the contours and defining the research agenda of a “cognitive classical linguistics”.

Two case studies suggest how such an approach can provide fresh perspective on long-standing questions. The first concerns word order. Already Marouzeau (1922) had concluded that the position of an adjective in respect to its head noun in Latin varies according to semantic function: if the adjective is meant to somehow distinguish the noun from another, it tends to follow its noun; if it is meant to simply describe the noun, it tends to precede. However, an analysis of ethnonymic adjectives in the corpus of Livy shows that pre- or post-positioning of an adjective actually operates as a phrase-level construction which can be associated with a conventionalized semantic value, related to how the schematic configurational structure of the designated concept is represented: prenominal position corresponds to “multiplex” construal and the post-nominal position to “uniplex” construal, each of which interacts with metaphorical interpretation to produce a cluster of related meanings (PARTITION, HETEROGENEITY,

CONTINGENCY, TRANSIENCE VS. WHOLENESS, UNIFORMITY, INHERENTNESS, PERMANENCE).

The second concerns the preposition *cum*. *Cum*, which expresses simultaneity and is typically used to encode the comitative role, may occur in the so-called “discontinuous reciprocal constructions”, that is, constructions in which one of the two participants of a mutual relation is encoded as a grammatical subject, while the other one is expressed by means of a comitative preposition (*cum* + NP): e.g., *osculari cum aliquo* (Plaut. *Mil.* 243), literally, “kiss *with* someone”. There is a bulk of typological evidence that such constructions tend to involve “naturally” reciprocal verbs”, that is, verbs necessarily or semantically expressing reciprocity (e.g. deponents such as *oscular*, *altercor*, *copulor* etc.). The split occurring in the representation of the reciprocal event suggests that discontinuity is a means to focus on one vantage point only (the participant encoded as a subject), while defocusing the other, who is represented as performing an action *together with* the primary participant. In other words, the discontinuous representation is a matter of construal, allowed by both the “natural” reciprocity of the event and the semantic structure of the preposition *cum*.

The central interest of this new discipline should rest, in other words, in analysing the meanings of words as well as of syntactical constructions in terms of image schemas, their transformations through construal operations, and their metaphorical interpretations. Where it stands to make a special contribution is in the study of polysemy and in classical philology’s traditional concern with the relation of form to meaning.

References

- Allan, Rutger. 2003. *The Middle Voice in Ancient Greek: A Study of Polysemy*. Leiden: Brill.
- Bonifazi, Anna. 2008. Memory and Visualization in Homeric Discourse Markers. In *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World*, E. Anne Mackay (ed), 35–64. Leiden: Brill.
- Cairns, Douglas. 2013. A Short History of Shudders. In *Unveiling Emotions II – Emotions in Greece and Rome: Texts, Images, Material Culture*, Angelos Chaniotis and Pierre Ducrey (eds), 85–107. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Cairns, Douglas. 2015. The Horror and the Pity. *Psychoanalytical Inquiry* 35: 75–94.
- Cánovas, Cristóbal Pagán. 2011. The Genesis of the Arrows of Love: Diachronic Conceptual Integration in Greek Mythology. *American Journal of Philology* 132: 553–79.
- Cuzzolin, P. 2015. Reciprocals in Latin. A reappraisal. In G. Haverling (ed.), *Latin Linguistics in the Early 21st Century. Acts of the 16th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*, Uppsala, June 6th–11th, 20. *Studia Latina Upsaliensia* 35, Uppsala Universitet, 221–239.
- Fedriani, Chiara. 2014. *Experiential Constructions in Latin*. Leiden: Brill.
- García-Jurado, Francisco. 2000. Las metáforas de la vida cotidiana en latín. *Proceedings of the Congreso internacional de semántica* 2: 1571–84.
- Geniušienė, E., 1987, *The Typology of Reflexives*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Goldberg, Adele. 2006. *Constructions at work: the nature of generalization in language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haspelmath M. 2007. Further remarks on reciprocal constructions. In V.P. Nedjalkov (ed.), *Reciprocal constructions*. Vol. 4, 2087–2115. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Lakoff, George and Johnson, Mark. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 2003. *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Maslova E. 1999. Reciprocals and set construal. In Z. Frajzyngier/Traci S. C., (eds.), *Reciprocals: form and function*, 161–178. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mocciaro, E. and W. M. Short, eds. Forthcoming. *The Embodied Basis of Constructions in Greek and Latin*. De Gruyter.
Short, W. M., ed. 2015. *Embodiment in Latin Semantics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Les emplois des « quantifieurs » *quantus*, *quam multus*, *quot* et de leurs corrélatifs en latin classique

Laurent Moonens

Université Toulouse 2 – Jean Jaurès / E.H.E.S.S.

Nous proposons, durant cette communication, d'examiner le cas de quelques expressions de la quantité, en syntagme nominal, dans un corpus de textes allant des comédies de Plaute et Térence à l'*Histoire Romaine* de Tite-Live, et réunissant plus d'un millier d'occurrences de l'ensemble des expressions étudiées, inégalement réparties selon leur nombre grammatical.

Nous focaliserons notre attention sur les emplois, en syntagme nominal, des interrogatifs *quantus* ? et *quot* ? (auxquels nous ajouterons *quam multus* ?) ainsi que de leurs corrélatifs. Dans un précédent travail (voir L. Moonens (2016)), nous avons en effet, à la suite d'O. Spevak (2014), mis ces interrogatifs au cœur de notre *définition* de quantifieur – ce dernier terme désignant pour nous tout modifieur d'un nom *N* susceptible de former avec lui un syntagme nominal répondant à la question *Quot N* ? ou *Quantus N* ? Nous commencerons dès lors par préciser dans quelle mesure cette définition doit être étendue à d'autres expressions interrogatives.

Prenant appui ensuite, 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 », à l'aide par exemple des travaux de G. Kleiber (1989) – et sur la description du Syntagme Nominal proposée par O. Spevak (2014), nous nous efforcerons de délimiter précisément *quels paramètres de la description quantitative* (extensité, extension, extensivité, etc.) ces mots interrogent, et quelles conditions typologiques régissent l'emploi de chacun d'eux à l'exclusion des autres.

Références

- Fugier, H. (1983), « Le syntagme nominal en latin classique », *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2, 29, 1 (W. Haase, éd.), Berlin, W. de Gruyter, pp. 212-269.
Kleiber, G. (1989), *L'article LE générique. La généricité sur le mode massif*, Genève-Paris, Droz.
Moonens, L. (2016), « Expressions de quantité chez Plaute et Térence : les « quantifieurs » *multus* et *magnus* » dans *Pallas 102. Études de linguistique latine* 1, pp. 25-33.
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.
Spevak, O. (2014), *The Noun Phrase in Classical Latin Prose*, Amsterdam, Brill.
Touratier, Ch. (2010), « Syntagme nominal et quantification en latin », *La quantification en latin* (M. Fruyt et O. Spevak, eds), Collection Kubaba, Série Grammaire et Linguistique, Paris, L'Harmattan, pp. 121-37.

Wilmet, M. (1986), *La détermination nominale. Quantification et caractérisation*, Linguistique Nouvelle, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.

***Ego sum Amphitruo* Selbstidentifikation im Dialog**

Roman Müller

Universität Heidelberg

In den plautinischen Komodien, vor allem im “Amphitruo“, wo zur Täuschung Alcumenas Iuppiter in den Namen und in die Gestalt Amphitruos, und sein Begleiter Mercurius in den Namen des Sklaven Sosia schlüpft, begegnet häufig ein deklarativer Satz der Selbstidentifikation, mit dem eine Person: a) sich vorstellt, b) eine Wer-Frage nach ihrer Identität beantwortet, c) auf ihre Erwähnung anaphorisch zurückkommt, d) die eigene Identität gegen den Anspruch einer anderen Person behauptet oder e) statt der eigenen Identität eine fremde vortäuscht, z. B.

(a) DA. *ego sum Daemones* (Rud. 1056)

(b) ME. *quis ad fores est?* AM. *ego sum* (Am. 1021)

SY. *quis tu homo es?* CH. *qui mille nummum tibi dedi ego sum Charmenides* (Tri. 970)

(c) TY. *nunc edepol demum in memoriam regredior audisse me, / ...Hegionem meum patrem uocari.* / HE. *is ego sum.* (Cap. 1023 ss.)

(d) AM. *pro Iuppiter, ego sum Amphitruo* (Am. fr. II, 10)

(e) IV. *Ego sum ille Amphitruo, quod est seruus Sosia* (Am. 861)

Solche Sätze der Selbstidentifikation weisen distinkte Merkmale auf:

(1) Die Zahl der Konstituenten ist – mit genereller Tendenz zur Verkürzung – reduzierbar bis hin zum Ein-Wort-Satz.

(2) Die Wortordnung ist gekennzeichnet durch die feste Phrase *ego sum* mit Tendenz zur Anfangsposition in der Satzsequenz.

(3) Distributionell gehört diese Form der Selbstidentifikation vorwiegend der gesprochenen Sprache an.

(4) In komplexen Sätzen bildet sie immer den Hauptsatz (main clause). Ist der PN Focus, was außer bei emphatischem *ego* immer der Fall ist, kann an diesen eine Apposition oder ein Relativsatz angeschlossen erscheinen, beides nur im Satellitenstatus.

Bibliographie

Bonfante, Giuliano, *La lingua parlata in Orazio*, Venosa 1994

Braun, Friederike, Kohz A. u.a., *Anrede-forschung: Kommentierte Bibliographie zur Soziolinguistik der Anrede*, Tübingen 1986.

- Happ, Heinz, “Die lateinische Umgangssprache und die Kunstsprache des Plautus”, in: *Glotta* 45 (1967), 60–104
- Hoffmann, Maria E., “Conversation openings in the comedies of Plautus”, in: Pinkster, H. (ed.), *Latin linguistics and linguistic theory, Proceedings of the 1st International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*, Amsterdam 1983
- Koch, Peter, Oesterreicher, Wulf, *Gesprochene Sprache in der Romania: Französisch, Italienisch, Spanisch*, Tübingen 1990.
- Lindsay, Wallace M., *Syntax of Plautus*, Oxford 1907.
- Pinkster, Harm, *Lateinische Syntax und Semantik*, Tübingen 1988.
- Pinkster, Harm, *The Oxford Latin Syntax*, Oxford 2015.

***Fors* and *Fortūna*: Linguistic and Cultural Aspects**

Kanehiro Nishimura

Kobe City University of Foreign Studies

The words *fors* and *fortūna* are commonly used in the Roman literature, and the semantic similarity or overlap (‘chance’, ‘luck’, etc.) between these forms has been widely acknowledged. Ernout and Meillet (1985: 249) suggest that the use of *fors* particularly in the nominative or ablative singular resulted from the possibility that its other case forms would have caused formal confusion with *fortis* ‘strong’; *fortūna* may thus have been utilized in order to fill the gap thus engendered. If so, one might expect the meaning of *fors* and that of *fortūna* to be similar to or coincide with each other. In fact, *fors* used in Catullus 64.366 is translated as “Fortune” by Cornish – Goold (1988: 123).

However, Manilius (Book 1) uses *fors* and *fortūna* in rather different contexts. Although he is a Stoic writer and may be heavily influenced by his school’s doctrine, it is worth examining whether his usage of *fors* and *fortūna* reflects the original one. In this paper I will seek an underlying semantic distinction in their morphological difference, that is, *fors*, *fortis* as a *ti*-stem vs. *fortū-na* as a *tu*-stem derivative.

The two stem-building suffixes are generally thought to have existed in Proto-Indo-European (PIE) as **-ti-* and **-tu-*. Both of these have the function to derive abstract nouns usually from verbal roots (see Fortson 2010: 125). In the case of *fors* and *fortūna* the underlying root would have been PIE **b^her-* (> Latin *ferō* ‘carry’; see de Vaan 2008: 236). On the other hand, the difference in function between **-ti-* and **-tu-* has not always been discussed explicitly in previous literature. Yet a tentative solution was offered by Benveniste (1975: 112); **-ti-* for “l’action objective” vs. **-tu-* “l’action subjective.” His theory, though it may not be comprehensive, serves as at least a starting point in order to consider *fors* and *fortūna*. In Manilius, *fortūna* seems to explain a goal-oriented algorithm or system of the universe. Such finality may have emerged from subjective judgments of (sequential) phenomena in the real world. This standpoint, I believe, will open a new path to understanding the difference between *fors* and *fortūna* and further between **-ti-* and **-tu-*.

References

- Benveniste, E. 1975. *Noms d’agent et noms d’action en indo-européen*. Paris: Librairie d’Amérique et d’Orient.

- Cornish, F. W., J. P. Postgate, J. W. Mackail – G. P. Goold, ed. and trans. 1995. *Catullus, Tibullus, Pervigilium Veneris*. 2nd rev. ed. Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- de Vaan, Michiel. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Ernout, Alfred, and Antoine Meillet. 1985. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots*. 4th rev. and enl. ed. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Fortson, Benjamin W., IV. 2010. *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction*. 2nd ed. Malden, Oxford, and Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

The Typology of Linguistic Metaphor in the 1st and 2nd c. CE Roman Thought

Anna Novokhatko

Albert-Ludwigs-Universität, Freiburg

This paper constitutes a part of my research project on the concept of metaphor in Roman theory of language. As part of this project, the corpus of Latin authors has been analysed with the aim of examining the uses of the term ‘metaphor’ (all equivalents) in both semantic and pragmatic aspects. This paper follows on from two talks of mine presented at the 17th and 18th ICLL where the use of the term ‘metaphor’ before Quintilian and the linguistic treatment of metaphor in Quint. *Inst.* 8, 6 were discussed (Novokhatko 2017a, 2017b). The use of the term ‘metaphor’ in Latin texts has not sufficiently been investigated, and metaphor, when it has been studied, has been regarded for the most part as a decorative figure (Armisen-Marchetti 1991).

I argue that both linguistic manifestations of conceptual metaphors (having the form *A is B* / *A as B*, the concept *A* being understood in terms of concept *B*) and cognitive and semiotic concepts were significant in Roman theory of language. In modern theory conceptual metaphors can be classified according to their conventionality (conventionalized vs. unconventional or novel), cognitive function (structural, orientational, ontological), nature (propositional knowledge and images of various kinds) and level of generality (specific-level vs. generic-level) (Kövecses 2010, 33-46, Prandi 2010, cf. Deignan 2005, 34-39, Deignan 2006). The present paper argues that this classification is applicable to the treatment of metaphor in the 1st and 2nd c. CE such as passages in Quintilian (apart from *Inst.* 8, 6 discussed at ICLL 2015), Fronto (*Ad am.* 1, 11, 1, *Ad M. Caes. et inv.* 4, 3, 7, and *Ad M. Ant. Eloq.* 3, 1), Festus (136, 23-138, 2 Lindsay). The typology(ies) of conceptual and linguistic metaphor that stem from this treatment reveal a greater depth to Roman theory of language. Contemporary Greek studies will be drawn on (such as ‘Long.’ *Subl.* 32, 1-5, Plut. *Quaest. conviv.* 747 c-d and Hermog. *De id.* 1, 6) for comparison. Further, a number of contemporary reflections of the typology of metaphor such as Aul. Gell. *NA* 10, 9 will be discussed. The results raise questions about metaphorical correspondence and the structure of linguistics mappings as well as about Roman approaches to the meaning of words (Zanker 2016).

References

- Armisen-Marchetti, M., 1991, Histoire des notions rhétoriques de métaphore et de comparaison des origines à Quintilien. II: La période romaine, *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Bude* 50, p. 19–44.
- Deignan, A. 2005. *Metaphor and corpus linguistics*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- 2006. The grammar of linguistic metaphors, in: *Corpus-based approaches to metaphor and metonymy*, ed. By. A. Stefanowitsch and S.Th. Gries, 106-122. Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin – New York.
- Kövecses, Z. 2010. *Metaphor: a practical introduction*. OUP: Oxford.
- Novokhatko, A. 2017a. The use of the term ‘metaphor’ in Latin linguistic discourse before Quintilian, in: *Latinitatis rationes: descriptive and historical accounts for the Latin language*, ed. by P. Poccetti, 395-409. De Gruyter: Berlin – New York.
- 2017b. The linguistic treatment of metaphor in Quintilian, *Pallas 103: Études de linguistique latine II* (in print)
- Prandi, M. 2010. Typology of metaphors: implications for translation. *Mutatis Mutandis* 3, 2: 304-332.
- Zanker, A. 2016. *Greek and Latin expressions of meaning: the classical origins of a modern metaphor*. Beck: München.

Verborum mutatae significationes. Tracking Semantic Change in Latin with Distributional Semantic Models

Krzysztof Nowak

Institute of Polish Language (Polish Academy of Sciences)

Distributional semantics is an umbrella term covering a great variety of linguistic methods which all share an intuitive and powerful tenet: word context is indicative of its meaning. Various computational implementations (generally called *distributional semantic models*, DSMs) have proved successful in such sense-related tasks as word sense discrimination, collocation clustering, word similarity evaluation and many others. Less frequently, however, the DSMs have been applied to tracking semantic change, a task of crucial interest for diachronic study of lexicon.

In the present paper we argue that the DSMs can be successfully employed in investigating sense evolution of the Latin vocabulary. Firstly, the methods and the corpus are briefly introduced. The terminology used as well as major claims of the distributional semantics are outlined following the work of Widdows (2004), Turney and Pantel (2010), and Baroni and Lenci (2010). The corpus on which the study is based consists of tokenized and lemmatized Latin texts dating from the 1st century BCE to the 7th century CE. The wide chronological span was selected on purpose, as the research is expected to reveal constant evolution of word meaning through all periods of preMedieval Latin history and provide if possible empirical evidence to its periodisation. Some effort will be put into achieving at least rudimentary balance and representativeness, although the resulting corpus will be most probably opportunistic (its content and size is still being subject to adjustments) and built from easily discernible sub-corpora (a convenient choice for variational research).

The software tools used in the study are:

- CWB and CQPweb for corpus indexing and concordance analysis (Hardie 2012);
- R statistical software for statistical analysis and visualisation;
- *wordspace* R package for constructing DSM (Evert 2014).

In the main part of the paper two diachronic analyses of the noun TEMPUS 'time' and CIBUS 'food' are presented. In both cases, slightly different aspects of the word meaning are studied and subsequently the tools employed will differ.

First, we will present how evolution of the collocational profile of the lexical unit reveals changing conceptualisation of time. The theoretical framework of the study is inspired by Kövecses' (2010) reelaboration of Lakoff and Johnson's (2003) theory of metaphor, but also follows to some extent interpretation framework proposed by Evans (2005). In this part of the study, the DSMs are used to reveal collocation clusters which are expected to reflect metaphorical patterns the word under scrutiny is to be found in the corpus. The concordance analysis follows *modus operandi* proposed by Sinclair (2003). In what concerns the second example, apart from methods described above, we will use DSMs to show the evolution of automatically extracted thesaurus of food-related nouns and verbs. The changing shapes of sense relations are believed to be a proxy for underpinning cultural and linguistic changes.

In the conclusion, future areas of research and application will be indicated. In particular, it will be argued that the DSMs may provide sound empirical foundations for the description of lexical change in Latin.

References

- Baroni Marco, Lenci Alessandro. 2010. „Distributional Memory: A General Framework for Corpusbased Semantics”. *Computational Linguistics* 36 (4): 673–721.
- Evans Vyvyan. 2005. „The Meaning of Time: Polysemy, the Lexicon and Conceptual Structure”. *Journal of Linguistics* 41 (1): 33–75.
- Evert, Stefan. 2014. „Distributional Semantics in R with the wordspace Package”. In *Proceedings of COLING 2014, the 25th International Conference on Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, 110–114. Dublin, Ireland: Dublin City University and Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hardie Andrew. 2012. „CQPweb - Combining Power, Flexibility and Usability in a Corpus Analysis Tool”. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 17 (3): 380–409.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 2010. *Metaphor: a practical introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff George, Johnson Mark. 2003. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sinclair John McHardy. 2003. *Reading concordances: an introduction*. London - New York: Pearson/Longman.
- Turney Peter D., Pantel Patrick. 2010. „From Frequency to Meaning: Vector Space Models of Semantics”. *arXiv:1003.1141* [cs].
- Widdows Dominic. 2004. *Geometry and meaning*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

***Gallia est omnis divisa in partes tres*. Sapir's Typology and Different Perspectives on Totality.**

Andrea Nuti

University of Pisa

In Classical Latin *omnis* is a universal quantifier, used in the singular as a distributive meaning ('every') and, especially, in the plural with a collective meaning ('all'); *totus*, 'whole' (a "totality quantifier") is mainly used in the singular. This meaning, nonetheless, is sometimes expressed also by *omnis* (cf. 1). See Bertocchi-Maraldi-Orlandini 2010:126-127; Brugmann 1894; Martzloff 2014. As to Caesar's incipit, Dominicy 1980 posits an (almost logical) equivalence *tota Gallia* = *omnes partes Galliae* and argues that **tota Gallia* would have meant 'every part of Gaul (is divided in three)', which doesn't fit the context. Cf., however, (2); Cuzzolin 2014:58.

In general terms, we can subscribe to Richter 1909:143 ("*Omnis* setzt sich aus einzelnen Ganzen zusammen, *totus* aus Bruchstücken, die erst in ihrer Vereinigung ein ganzes Bilden"). Nonetheless, examples of seeming synonymy between *omnis* and *totus* in the singular (as totality quantifiers) occur since the earliest attestations (3). The scope of this paper is to analyse occurrences of *omnis* and *totus* from Early and Classical Latin to ascertain the extent of their synonymy and, possibly, to reach a finer-grained interpretation of (1).

Omnis (sing.) with a totality meaning is particularly frequent with mass nouns (Pinkster 2015: 991) but its extension is in fact wider and Early Latin shows cases of overlap with *totus* (4), especially with names referring to places (e.g. *urbs*, *domus*) and social groups (e.g. *familia*) (5); names of countries as well (6; cf. 1). *Totus* is more restricted and is typically employed with natural units (single bodies, human individualities). Richter's definition, then, could be modified in terms of natural individuality (*totus*) vs. a less marked expression of totality (*omnis*), apparently more prone to the expression of established totality. The latter can be connected with the notion of "aggregate" we find among the typological classification by Sapir 1930:10, where great heed is paid to connotations and pragmatic uses of totalizers, which appear to be relevant for the analysis of (1) (see the so-called "Evaluated Totalizers", Sapir 1930:19). In principle, almost every phenomenon could be conceived as a single whole or a part belonging to a bigger set. Likewise, many an entity can be described as a monolithic whole or a union of parts, according to which aspect has to be highlighted. Therefore, to apply a totality indicator is often a matter of choice, i.e. of perspective one wants to impart. Especially with natural units (e.g. a body), it can be redundant and produce a marked expression (i.e. *my whole body*). *Totus* is often used accordingly, but this can affect also *omnis* (arguably, **Gallia est divisa in partes tres* wouldn't have modified the denotational content of the sentence).

The semantic spectrum displayed by *omnis* in (1) that eventually emerges from this analysis can be compared to (7) and can be functionally connected with textual features and the political background beyond Caesar's incipit.

- 1) Caes. *Gal.* 1.1 *Gallia est omnis divisa in partes tres*

- 2) Cic. *Fin.* 4.2 *totam philosophiam tris in partis diviserunt*, *N.D.* 3.20.2 *quattuor in partes totam quaestionem divisisti*, Sen. *Const.* 2.2.7 *totus orbis in tres diuisus*
- 3) Enn. *Ann.* 2.246 *totum sudor habet corpus*, 2.258 *manat ex omni corpore sudor*
- 4) Cato *Agr.* 144.4 *omnem oleam puram metietur... in tota oletate...*
- 5) Plaut. *Ep.* 195 *per urbem totam hominem quaesiuieris*, 197 *per omnem urbem* etc.
- 6) Plaut. *Rud.* 544 *totam Siciliam devoraturum insulam?*, Cu. 446 *Libyamque oram omnem omnem Conterebromniam ... subegit*; Sall. *Cat.* 30 *per totam Italiam*, *Iug.* 13 *per omnem Africam brevi divulgatur*
- 7) Caes. *Gal.* 6.16. *Natio est omnis Gallorum admodum dedita religionibus.*

References

- Bertocchi, Alessandra-Maraldi, Mirka-Orlandini, Anna (2010), “Quantification”, in Philip Baldi-Pierluigi Cuzzolin (edd.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax. Volume III. Constituent Syntax: Quantification, Numerals, Possession Anaphora*, Berlin-New York, Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 19-173.
- Brugmann, Karl (1894), *Die Ausdrücke für den Begriff der Totalität in den indogermanischen Sprachen (eine semasiologisch-etymologische Untersuchung)*, Leipzig, Edelmann.
- Cuzzolin, Pierluigi (2014), “L’espressione della totalità in latino” in Alberto Manco (ed.), *L’espressione linguistica della totalità (“Quaderni di AIΩN”, n.s. 2)*, Napoli, Università degli Studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”, pp. 53-70.
- Dominicy, Marc (1980), “*Gallia est omnins divisa in partes tres: pourquoi omnis et non tota?*”, *Ludus Magistralis* 12:33-53.
- Martzloff, Vincent (2014), “Some remarks on the prehistory of *omnis* and other Latin pronouns and adjectives meaning ‘all’ or ‘whole’”, *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 13(2):211-241.
- Pinkster, Harm, 2015. *The Oxford Latin Syntax. Volume 1: the simple clause*, Oxford, OUP.
- Richter, Elise (1909), “*Omnis-Totus*”, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 33:143-147.
- Sapir, Edward (1930), *Totality*, Baltimore, Waverly.

Lateinisch *quisque* – synchrone Verwendungsweisen und diachrone Semantik

Andreas Opfermann

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Das lateinische Indefinitpronomen *quisque*, *quaeque*, *quodque* (bzw. subst. *quid-que*, *quicque*) ist seit Plautus belegt und fand über die gesamte lateinische Sprachgeschichte hinweg Verwendung. Im Vortrag soll die Wortgeschichte dieses Pronomens beleuchtet werden, und zwar weniger aus indogermanistisch-rekonstruierender Perspektive, als vielmehr in Hinblick auf die synchrone Verwendungsweise und die Entwicklung derselben. Als Korpus dient eine nach stilistischen Kriterien ausgewählte Sammlung lateinischer Texte von Plautus bis Augustin, die einen möglichst hohen Grad an Synchronizität aufweisen (vgl. Opfermann 2016: 28–53).

Indefinita können synchron in jeweils spezifischen semantischen Rollen gebraucht werden, z.B. als *free choice*-, *indirect negative*-, *unknown specific*-Referenten. Um einen Einblick in die Verwendungsmöglichkeiten eines Indefinitums zu bekommen, müssen möglichst viele synchrone Belege kategorisiert werden. Aloni et al. haben eine semantische Karte (Aloni et al. 2012: 1512) erstellt, die 13 verschiedene Kategorien von Indefinita abbildet. Mithilfe eines Entscheidungsbaumes (Aloni et al., *annotation guidelines*) können einzelne Belege je einer dieser Kategorien zugeordnet werden, wodurch das synchrone semantische Spektrum des jeweiligen Indefinitums erfasst werden kann. Die semantische Karte hilft, das Untersuchungsergebnis zu visualisieren und somit vergleichbar zu machen. Darüber hinaus macht sie Voraussagen zu (zufällig) nicht belegten Kategorien möglich. Schließlich zeichnet ein Vergleich der semantischen Karten einzelner Phasen der Sprachgeschichte die diachrone Semantik des Indefinitums nach. Durch Verlust und Zugewinn einzelner mikro-semantischer Kategorien wird die Entwicklungsrichtung des Indefinitums ablesbar. Opfermann (2016: 168–195) bietet anhand des Indefinitums *quīvīs* eine erste solche Studie für das Lateinische. Hierbei konnte Haspelmaths semantische Karte (1997: 69 Fig. 4.8.6) präzisiert sowie die diachrone Entwicklung der Semantik von Plautus bis Horaz beschrieben werden. Durch diese Vorgehensweise können Indefinita auch verschiedener Sprachen objektiv verglichen und somit bspw. das Verständnis lateinischer Texte erhöht werden. Als Einzelstudie dient die vorzustellende Untersuchung von lat. *quisque* der Teilerfüllung des Desiderats, eine komplette, diachron mehrschichtige und präzise Beschreibung aller lateinischer Indefinita zu erreichen.

Literatur

- Aloni, Maria / van Cranenburgh, Andreas / Fernández, Raquel / Sznajder, Marta, Building a Corpus of Indefinite Uses Annotated with Fine-grained Semantic Functions. In: Nicoletta Calzolari et al. (Hrsgg.), *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation. Istanbul, Turkey, May 23–25, 2012 (LREC 2012)*. European Language Resources Association (ELRA) 2012, 1511–1515. (online unter: http://www.lrec-conf.org/proceedings/lrec2012/pdf/362_Paper.pdf)
- annotation guidelines* = ALONI, Maria, *Annotation Guidelines for a Corpus of Indefinite Uses*. (online unter: <http://staff.science.uva.nl/~maloni/Indefinites/annotation-guidelines.pdf>)
- Haspelmath, Martin, *Indefinite Pronouns*. (Oxford studies in typology and linguistic theory). Oxford 1997.
- Opfermann, Andreas, *Unverbierung – der passive Wortbildungsmechanismus*. (Studien zur historisch-vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft 8). Hamburg 2016.

Les parcours sémantiques vers l’adversatif : une approche typologique des langues anciennes

Anna Orlandini

Université de Bologne

Paolo Poccetti

Université de Rome 2

Il existe deux parcours sémantiques coordonnants aboutissant à l’adversatif : le

parcours A, du correctif à l'adversatif fort, et le parcours B du quantitatif à l'adversatif non oppositif. Nous essayerons de mettre à jour le fonctionnement des connecteurs *nisi*, *si non*, *si minus*, qui partagent en tout ou en partie ces étapes. Notre intérêt a été stimulé par les connecteurs ayant une origine séparative, au début au sens spatiale (« en dehors de », etc.), d'où se dégage la valeur exceptive, abstraite, proche du sens correctif. Notre approche sera typologique ; sur le modèle des 'semantic's maps' de M. Haspelmath et d'A. Malchukov, nous présenterons une cartographie sémantique détaillée, expliquant les changements de parcours de ces connecteurs.

Nisi aurait pu se grammaticaliser comme marqueur adversatif, comme ἄλλὰ et 'but' avec lesquels il partage plusieurs emplois, en particulier l'emploi séparatif. *Nisi* a parcouru un grand nombre d'étapes, sans pourtant devenir un connecteur adversatif plein. La raison est peut-être que *nisi* évolue vers un emploi conjonctif, l'exclusif, qui est subordonnat et cela est un obstacle à son développement comme particule adversative.

Dans la langue archaïque, *nisi* était à l'origine une particule indépendante, reliant deux propositions *p* et *q* ayant le même prédicat :

(1) TRA. *quae patria sit profecto nescio, nisi scio probiorem hanc esse* (Plaut. Rud. 750)

Quelques traces de la tendance de *nisi* à développer un connecteur adversatif restent en latin tardif, chez Grégoire de Tours ; il s'agit d'emplois exceptifs faibles (2a) ou d'emplois non oppositifs (2b):

(2a) *Fugiente exercitu Sigiberti ipsi inclusus a Chunis retenebatur, nisi postea quos non potuit superare uirtute proelii superauit arte donandi* (Greg. Tur. Hist. 4,29)

(2b) *Nec quisquam scire poterat, quid hoc esset, nisi omnes pauore substrati solo iacebant* (Greg. Tur. Glor. conf. 20)

En ce qui concerne les emplois non conjonctifs de *nisi*, on signale trois structures différentes, présentant un tronc sémantique commun, la *condition exceptive* :

- a) le type *exceptif fort* : *nisi si*, *nisi forte*, *nisi uero*, "p, à moins que q",
- b) le type *irréel/préventif -avertif* : "p était déjà chose faite, *nisi q*" (où p s'est vérifié, ce qui a empêché la réalisation de q : " non p, puisque q") ;
- c) le type *exceptif faible* : "p, si ce n'est que q", (lat. *nisi* ou *nisi quod*, souvent avec l'indicatif).

L'emploi exceptif faible du parcours A coïncide avec l'emploi limitativo-concessif du parcours B qui évolue vers les emplois non oppositifs du latin tardif.

Références Bibliographiques

- HAVERLING, G. à paraître. « Sur l'emploi des conjonctions 'négatives' (*ne*, *quominus*, etc.) dans le latin tardif », Communication présentée au Colloque International du Centre A. Ernout *La négation en latin*, Paris, 6-8 juin 2016
- MALCHUKOV, A.L. 2004. « Towards a Semantic Typology of Adversative and Contrast Marking », *Journal of Semantics* 21, 177-198.

TRAUGOTT, E. 1997. « UNLESS and BUT conditionals : a historical perspective », in A. ATHANASIADOU, R. DIRVEN (eds.), *On conditionals again*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 145-167.

Linguistic Theory in Daily Lexicographical Practice: Dealing with Arguments and Satellites at the *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*

Marijke Ottink & Josine Schrickx
Thesaurus linguae Latinae, München

In most cases the verb frame of a Latin verb is easy to identify. When you write a book (*scribis librum*), ‘to write’ is a so called bivalent verb, it governs two arguments (the writer and the book). When you send somebody a letter (*alicui epistulam mittis*), ‘to send’ is a trivalent or three-place verb with three distinctive arguments (the sender, the letter and the recipient). On the other hand if you write a letter with a pen (*epistulam calamo scribis*), ‘to write’ is still a bivalent verb as *calamo* is in this sentence not an argument, but a satellite (Pinkster 2015; Happ 1976). However, arguments are often left out or satellites may be so prominent that they are hard to distinguish from arguments. These ambiguities are a problem for the TLL, which does not have the option of giving only clear examples (as can be done in the OLD or grammar books), but is bound to take account of all the cases of a lemma until the time of Apuleius and wants to present all semantic and syntactic peculiarities transmitted. In these circumstances it is difficult to present a clear overview of a verb and to treat all the instances, however exceptional. And because the TLL is written in Latin another problem occurs: how can this rather special linguistic vocabulary (‘arguments’, ‘satellites’) be translated into Latin? In our lecture we will look at how the TLL can try to implement the linguistic theory of valency and the kind of difficulties this theoretical system causes in writing a Thesaurus lemma. We will use the examples of the verbs *regnare* (one-place or two-place verb, both sometimes with satellites) and *nectere* (two-place verb with affected and effected object or three-place verb). The entries for these two verbs have already been written but have not yet been published.

Bibliography

- Baños, José Miguel, Concepción Cabrillana, Esperanza Torrego & Jesús de la Villa (eds.) 2003. *Praedicativa: Complementación En Griego Y Latín*. Verba 53. Santiago de Compostela: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela.
- Happ, Heinz. 1976. *Grundfragen einer Dependenz-Grammatik des Lateinischen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Pinkster, Harm. 2015. *Oxford Latin Syntax, Volume 1: The Simple Clause*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Torrego, Esperanza, José Miguel Baños, Concepción Cabrillana & Julián Méndez Dosuna (eds.). 2007. *Praedicativa II: esquemas de complementación verbal en griego antiguo y en latín*. Zaragoza: Área de Filología Latina, Departamento de Ciencias de la Antigüedad, Universidad de Zaragoza.

Thematische Progression und thematischer Sprung. Aspekte narrativer Verfahren in Vergils Aeneis

Oswald Panagl

Universität Salzburg

Die „Funktionale Satzperspektive (FSP)“ wurde im Kontext der Prager Schule der Linguistik der 1920er Jahre von Villem Mathesius als suprasyntaktisches Paradigma methodisch erschlossen und zwei Generationen später von Forschern wie Jan Firbas und František Daneš aufgegriffen, spezifiziert und verfeinert. Dieser Untersuchungs-raster ist als Vorstufe der Textlinguistik zu verbuchen. Anders als die Generative Grammatik bedarf dieses Paradigma keiner heuristischen Instrumente wie Introspek-tion, Elizitation von Daten oder einer Überprüfung der Grammatizität als Instanzen der muttersprachlichen Kompetenz und ist daher für die Anwendung auf Corpussprachen besonders geeignet.

Der eingereichte Tagungsvortrag überprüft am Beispiel ausgewählter Passagen aus Vergils Aeneis Merkmale von deren narrativer Struktur, besonders das Verhältnis zwischen thematischer Progression und thematischem Sprung. Dabei wird auch auf Sub-typen bzw. Sorten epischer Darstellung (wie Erzählung, Vorgeschichte, Dialog, Be-schreibung, Proömium) Rücksicht genommen.

Das Vorhaben greift letztlich auf Ansätze in meiner als Buch publizierten Doktor-arbeit (siehe Bibliographie) mit dem Titel *Die ‚dithyrambischen Stasima‘ bei Euripi-des. Untersuchungen zur Komposition und Erzähltechnik* zurück. Der darin ent-wickelte Terminus bzw. Klassifikationsraster „resultative Erzähltechnik“, welche in den Rezensionen Zustimmung gefunden hat, betrifft Passagen, in denen der narrative Pro-zess nicht linear fortschreitet, sondern bestimmte Handlungsschritte in einem Syn-tagma bzw. einem beschreibenden Kompositum ‚aufgehoben‘ sind.

Ein paar Beispiele mögen mein Vorhaben für das Tagungsreferat illustrieren: In Aeneis I, 25-28 wird der Zorn Junos auf Troja resultativ, d.h. mit Blick auf ihre Zu-rücksetzung im Paris-Urteil, dargestellt. –In der Schildbeschreibung als einer Variante der Ekphrase vollzieht sich die Schilderung graduell, vgl. VIII, 626-728: *Illic res Italas Romanorumque triumphos / haud vatum ignarus venturique inscius aevi / fecerat igni-potens* (626ff.). Die Übergänge innerhalb dieser Partie werden durch Formeln wie *post idem* oder *nec/haud procul hinc* bezeichnet. –Auch bei der Aufzählung von Teilen der Rüstung treffen wir auf ähnliche Merkmale, die zudem häufig Spielarten von Prono-minalisierung aufweisen, vgl. XI, 768-778 mit der Vorstellung eines Priesters : *Fortē sacer Cybelo Chloereus olimque sacerdos/ insignis longē Phrygiis fulgebat in armis / spumantemque agitabat equum, quem pellis aënis/ in plumam squamis auro conserta tegebat.* (768-771). –Einer Spielart des thematischen Sprungs begegnen wir etwa in IV, 584-591, wenn Dido der entschwindenden Flotte nachblickt und dieser Sachverhalt *en bloc* ohne ausdrückliche Verknüpfung der Einzelereignisse narrativ umgesetzt wird.

Bibliographie

- Daneš, F. (ed.): *Papers in Functional Sentence Perspective*, Prag 1974
Dressler, W.U. & Beaugrande, R. : *Einführung in die Textlinguistik*, Tübingen 1981
Eroms, H.-W.: *Funktionale Satzperspektive* , Tübingen 1982

- Firbas, J.: *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication*, Cambridge 1992
- Grewendorf, G.: Funktionale Satzperspektive und deutsche Wortstellung, in: *Linguistische Berichte* 66 (1980) 28-40
- Mathesius, V. : On Linguistic Characterology with Illustrations from Modern English. In *Actes du Premier Congrès International de Linguistes à La Hève*, 1928, 56-63.
- Panagl, O.: *Die dithyrambischen Stasima des Euripides. Untersuchungen zur Komposition und Erzähltechnik*, Wien 1971
- Panagl, O.: *Stilfiguren und sprachliche Interferenzen im Dithyrambos Persai des Timotheos* (Tagungsvortrag Wien, November 2016).

The Division of Labour between the Lexicographer and the Syntactician

Harm Pinkster
Amsterdam

In principle there is a clear distinction between the work of a lexicographer with respect to the Latin data that are taken into account and the work of the syntactician. Whereas the lexicographer tries to describe the behaviour of individual words, the syntactician tries to formulate the rules of the structures in which these and similar words can be used. Obviously there is some overlap. Quite a few TLL articles contain valuable syntactic information and older syntaxes contain much information about individual words. But there are also certain areas that for obvious reasons do not overlap, for example orthographic information in the TLL and a discussion on the semantic motivation of the dative case in a syntax. I will recommend a more prominent role of syntax in the lemmata of the TLL.

Losing Events, Losing Morphology. An Analysis of the Diachronic Evolution of Denominal Deponents

Francesco Pinzin
University "Ca' Foscari" of Venice

Introduction. Denominal Deponents (DDs) are initially characterized by the mandatory presence of the Middle morphology, e.g. *blandior* 'I caress', *recordor* 'I remember', *piscor* 'I fish'.

- | | | | | |
|-----|--|----------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| (1) | Cauda | teneris | blanditur | alumnis (Ov. <i>Fast.</i> 2, 417) |
| | tail.ABL | soft.ABL | soften.3 RD S.PRS.MID | pupils.ABL |
| | It caresses the sweet pupils with the tail | | | |

Many DDs, diachronically, lose the Middle morphology.

- (2) ut animos audentium blandiat (Isid. *Etym.* 3, 20, 14)
 so.that soul.PL.ACC hearer.PL.GEN soften.3RDS.SUBJ.PRS.ACT
 In order to soften the spirit of the audience

I propose to relate this loss to a diachronic syntactic process: the reduction of the event complexity.

Background. Neo-constructivism: argument structure is the by-product of the sequential merge of syntactic eventive heads ([v-do°], [v-go°], [v-be°] Cuervo 2014), which introduce specific arguments (DOER, UNDERGOER, HOLDER). The event complexity is given by the number of eventive heads merged in the syntactic structure.

There are two main verb-formation processes: Conflation of a root into an eventive head and Incorporation of a lower phrasal argument in it (Acedo-Matellán and Mateu 2013). DDs are formed by means of Incorporation: the nominal (nP) is the complement of the lower stative phrase (v-beP) and moves to the higher dynamic head (v-do°) forming the verb. (3) [v-doP [v-do°+nP] [v-beP [v-be°] ~~nP~~]]

The Middle morphology is morphosyntactically justified because DDs are reflexives: the subject is both the HOLDER of the v-beP and the DOER of the v-doP. The Middle morphology allows for the identification of the two arguments (Pinzin 2015).

Research questions. Why do DDs lose the Middle morphology? Can we identify a general syntactic process behind the loss of the Middle morphology?

Database. The data are taken from the LLT (A and B series) and from the ALIM. I followed the occurrences of a large group of relevant DDs from the III-II c. BC to the VIII-IX c. AD.

Analysis. The loss of the Middle morphology is caused by the reduction of the [v-doP [v-beP]] structure in (3) to the simple [v-doP] structure in (4). When the bievental/biargumental structure is lost, the reflexive environment that justifies the Middle morphology disappears too. The reduction of the event complexity, in turn, is caused by the reanalysis of the incorporated phrasal element as a verbal root (√) conflated into v-do°: (4) [v-doP [v-do°+√]]

The presence of a direct Accusative argument is a good diagnosis for this process. In (3) there is no space for a direct Accusative argument, the complement position of v-do° is occupied by v-beP. The only additional arguments that are permitted are adjuncts marked by oblique case. E.g. the verb *blandior* 'I caress', initially, always takes oblique arguments. In the VIc. AD, instead, it starts occurring with direct Accusative arguments. As expected, it also starts occurring without the Middle morphology (see (2)).

Other verbs, e.g. *insidior* 'I ambush', *piscor* 'I fish', follow the same behaviour. In *piscor* the reanalysis is eased by the fact that, phonologically, the noun and the verb diverge: the [sc] cluster gets palatalized [ʃ] in the noun while it is preserved in the verb.

References

- ACEDO-MATELLÁN, VICTOR & JAUME MATEU. 2013. "Satellite framed Latin vs. verb framed Romance: A syntactic approach" *Probus*, 25, 227-265.

- CUERVO, MARÍA CRISTINA. 2014. "Alternating unaccusatives and the distribution of roots" *Lingua*, 141, 48-70.
- PINZIN, FRANCESCO. 2015. "VoiceP Deactivation and Deponency in Latin" *Annali di Ca' Foscari serie Occidentale* 49, 423-452.

More on Preference and Substitutive Clauses in Latin

Jesús Polo

Universidad San Dámaso

The aim of this paper is to study the so-called Preference clauses (1) and Substitutive clauses (2) in Latin:

- (1) qui perpressus est omnia potius quam conscios delendae tyrannidis indicaret (Cic. Tusc. 2.52)
- (2) Aper omni eruditione imbutus contemnebat potius litteras quam nesciebat (Tac. dial. 2.2)

According to Kortmann (1997: 89), in Preference clauses "of two alternatively possible events/activities p and q, q is preferred (by the generally volitional subject referents) and renders p unnecessary or improbable", as in (1). The same author defines the semantics of Substitutive clauses so: "of two alternatively possible events/activities p and q, q happens or is performed although p was rather to be expected" (Kortmann 1997: 88), as in (2).

These clauses were studied in a very descriptive way by Riemann (1888). Recent studies have included these clauses within the chapters of Comparison as in Baños (2002) and Tarriño (2011: 392-295), who study them from a semantic, syntactic and pragmatic perspective.

Taking as a starting point Tarriño's article, it is my purpose to continue the study of these clauses discussing the following topics: 1) From a syntactic point of view, the position of these clauses in the continuum between coordination and subordination, within the theoretical framework of Lehmann (1988) and Villa (2000); 2) Semantically, the criteria proposed by Hengeveld (1998) for the description of adverbial subordinates: Entity type, Time-Dependency and Factuality; 3) From a pragmatic point of view, the relation of these clauses with Focus and Topic (Dik 1997).

The corpus that the research is based on is the one formed by the numerous examples offered by Riemann (1888) which I propose to complete with examples taken from Latin prose writers (Caesar, Sallust, Titus Livius, etc).

Brief bibliography

- Baños, J. M. (2002): "Comparativas con quam y verbo personal en latín", Empar Espinilla, Pere J. Quetglas, and M Esperanza Torrego (eds.), *La comparación en latín*, 39-62. Universidad Autónoma de Madrid - Universidad de Barcelona.
- Bertocchi, A. and Orlandini, A. M. (1996): "Quelques aspects de la comparaison en latin", *Indogermanische Forschungen* 101: 195-232.
- Dik, S. C. (1997): *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part 1. The Structure of the Clause*, Berlin - New York.

- Hengeveld, K. (1998): “Adverbial clauses in the languages of Europe”, in: J. van der Auwera (ed.): *Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe*, Berlin - New York: 335-419.
- Kortmann, B. (1997): *Adverbial Subordination. A Typology and History of Adverbial Subordinators Based on European Languages*, Berlin - New York.
- Riemann, O. (1888): “Remarques sur diverses questions de syntaxe latine. I La construction de *potius quam*”, *Revue de Philologie* 12, 43-59.
- Tarriño, E. (2011), “Comparative clauses”, in: P. Baldi - P. Cuzzolin (eds.): *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax. Volume 4: Complex Sentences, Grammaticalization, Typology*, Berlin - Boston, 373-426.
- Villa, Jesús de la (2000): “La subordinación en griego antiguo: análisis y perspectivas”, in: E. Crespo-M.J. Barrios (eds.), *Actas del X Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos I*, Madrid, 117-65.

Light Verbs and Sound Nouns as Physical Implications

Anna Pompei

Roma Tre University

This proposal aims at studying the occurrence of sound nouns as physical implications in Latin light verb constructions (LVCs).

Sounds can be ‘physical implications’, in Moncó Tarracena’s (2011) terms, when they are produced as physical emissions. This is the case, for instance, of nouns meaning ‘cry’, ‘sigh’, ‘whistle’, and so on. In Romance languages, this class of nouns has an inconsistent behaviour. In fact, Portuguese and Spanish extensively select *dar* ‘to give’. Italian alternates *fare* ‘to do’ and *dare* ‘to give’, as well as French, which actually alternates between the less empty verb *pousser* ‘to push’ – or even *jeter* ‘to throw’ (*jeter /pousser un cri* ‘to give a cry’) – and *faire* ‘to do’ (*faire/pousser un soupir* ‘to have/give a sigh’). Catalan differs from other Iberian languages in the respect that selects *fer* ‘to do’. Conversely, the verb *a da* ‘to do’ is selected in Romanian in such cases, if a LVC is used.

At least two research questions are addressed in this work: (a) to establish whether in Latin there is a preference in the selection of either *dare* (e.g. Verg., *Aen.* 11, 190 *ululatusque ore dedere*) or *facere* (e.g. Cic., *Verr.* 1, 45 *factus est in eo strepitus*) for nouns expressing physically produced sounds; (b) to see at which extent Latin texts actually present the occurrence of so-called *basic light verbs* (according to Gross 2004), rather than of other verbs, even prefixed, expressing a similar semantics (e.g. *ducere* and *edere* instead of *dare*, all denoting a transfer, for instance in *suspiria ducere* – e.g. Ov., *met.* 10, 402-403 *suspiria duxit ab imo / pectore* – and *gemitum edere* – e.g. Liv. 30, 15, 4 *ingenti... edito gemitu*).

Through a diachronic approach (from early to late Latin) any changes in the light verb selection will be evaluated; likewise differences in register will be considered. The method will include (a) searching the verbs governing Latin nouns expressing physically produced sounds (such as *clamatio*, *clamor*, *convicium*, *eiulatio*, *eiulatus*, *gemitus*, *murmur*, *murmuratio*, *ploratus*, *quiritatio*, *sibilum*, *strepitus*, *suspirium*, *suspiratus*, *suspiritus*, *ululatus*, *vociferatio*, etc.) in *ThLL*, from comedy till 4th century A.D.; (b) identifying basic light verbs (probably *dare* and *facere*); (b) identifying the

so-called *extensions* of light verbs, i.e. more specific verbs than basic ones, and their semantic values.

Expected results are

- the identification of all verbs co-occurring with sound nouns and their percentage;
- the recognition of regularities, idiosyncrasies, and possible different contexts for the selection of *facere*-type verbs, *dare*-type verbs, and possible other types;
- the analysis of changes in verb-selection depending on different periods and registers.

References

- Baños Baños, J. M., 2012, « Verbos soporte e incorporación sintáctica en latín: el ejemplo de *ludos facere* », *RELat*, 12, p. 37-57.
- Baños Baños, J. M., 2013a, « Sobre las manera de ‘hacer la guerra’ en latín (*bellum gero, bel-ligero, bello*) », in J.A. Beltrán Cebollada et al. (eds.), *Otium cum dignitate: Estudios en homenaje al profesor José Javier Iso Echegoyen*, Zaragoza, p. 27-39.
- Baños Baños, J. M., 2013b, « *Consilium* (*habere, capere, dare*): un sustantivo hecho predicado », in J. M. Baños Baños (ed.), *Philologia, Universitas, Vita. Trabajos en honor de Tomás González Rolán*, Madrid, p. 103-114.
- Baños Baños, J. M., 2014a, « Algunas consideraciones sobre los verbos soporte en latín: sintaxis y semántica », in E. Borrell-O. de la Cruz (eds.), *Omnia mutantur*, Barcelona, p. 1-28.
- Baños Baños, J. M., 2014b, « Construcciones con verbo soporte, extensiones y elecciones preferentes: *bellum parare, suscipere, trahere, conficere* », *Boletín de la Sociedad de Estudios Latinos*, 1, p. 5-11.
- Brunet, C., 2008, « *Accipere*, verbe support et element du passif nominal chez Sénèque et Valère-Maxime », *Latomus*, 316, p. 167-179.
- Flobert, P., 1996, « Verbes supports en Latin », in A. Bammesberger and F. Heberlein (eds.), *Akten des VIII. Internationalen Kolloquiums zur Lateinischen Linguistik*, Heidelberg, p. 193-199.
- Gross, G., 2004, « Pour un Bescherelle des prédicats nominaux », *Linguisticae Investigationes*, 27, 2, p. 343-358.
- Gross, G. - Pontonx. S. de (eds.), 2004, « Verbes supports. Nouvel état des lieux », *Linguisticae Investigationes*, 27, 2.
- Hoffmann, R., 1996, « Funktionsverbgefüge im Lateinischen », in A. Bammesberger and F. Heberlein (eds.), *Akten des VIII. Internationalen Kolloquiums zur Lateinischen Linguistik*, Heidelberg, p. 200-212.
- Ibrahim, A. H., 1996, « Les supports: le terme, la notion et les approches », *Langages*, 121, p. 3-7.
- Marini, E., 2000, « Criteri di individuazione di una costruzione a verbo supporto: due esempi latini (*opem ferre* e *morem gerere*) », *SSL*, 38, p. 365-395.
- Marini, E., (2010), « Remarques sur le verbe *agere* associé aux noms désignant une durée temporelle », *De Lingua Latina*, 5, p. 1-14.
- Martin, A. M., 1996, « *Dare*, auxiliaire lexical en latin », in M. Fruyt and C. Moussy (eds.), *Structures lexicales du latin*, Paris, p. 49-64.
- Moncó Taracena, S. (2011), « Etude contrastive des verbs *dar* (espagnol) et *faire* (français) », in *Méthodes et analyses comparatives en Sciences du langage. Actes de la 3eme édition des Journées d'Etudes Toulousaines*, Université de Toulouse 2 – Le Mirail, 7-8 avril, p. 125-134.

- Pinkster, H., 2015, *Oxford Latin Syntax: The Simple Clause*, Oxford.
- Roesch, S., 2001, « Les emplois de *verbum* et *sermo* dans les expressions à verbe support *verba facere*, *verba habere* et *sermonem habere* », in C. Moussy (ed.), *De lingua Latina novae quaestiones*, Louvain, p. 859-874.
- Rosén, H., 1981, *Studies in the Syntax of Verbal Noun in Early Latin*, München.
- Sanromán Vilas, B. (2014), « La alternancia *dar/hacer* en construcciones con verbo de apoyo y nombre de comunicación », *An International journal of Hispanic linguistics*, 3, 2, p. 185-222.

Periphrastic Comparison in Latin

Lucie Pultrová

Charles University Prague

Comparison of adjectives (and adverbs) is a grammatical category that has passed practically unnoticed by generations of Latin linguists. Latin grammar books (with few exceptions, cf. Pinkster 2005: 47; Kühner – Holzweissig 1912: 565-566) completely omit the question of which adjectives can be compared and which cannot. Nevertheless, the fact that only some types of adjectives are gradable (the so called scalar adjectives) has been well-known in general linguistics. The data from modern languages show that the category of comparison of adjectives (and adverbs) is actually highly limited, making it essential to address this question for Latin, too.

One of the issues comprehended within the extremely complex area of (non-)gradability of adjectives is periphrastic comparison. Latin grammar books explain, based on the assertions of ancient Latin grammarians, that it applies to adjectives ending in *-eus*, *-ius* and *-uus*, implying, or even explicitly stating that the reason for this type of comparison is phonetic incompatibility of the word-formative suffix with the comparative suffix. However, three facts call for reinterpretation of the matter:

- 1) periphrastic comparison also occurs in other adjectives, where phonetic incompatibility is not the case;
- 2) in contrast, some adjectives in *-eus*, *-ius* and *-uus* actually do have simple forms, which is connected to a more general note, i.e. that
- 3) citing purely phonetic reasons is extremely debatable, because, on the phonetic level, language practically always has the means to deal with the situation (various types of assimilation, epenthetic sounds, etc.).

This paper therefore aims to map the real situation of periphrastic comparison in Latin. The employed corpus comprises all the words marked as adjectives in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (more than 10,000 items) and all their occurrences throughout the database *Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina*.

The results show that periphrastic comparison is used as a variant of synthetic comparison in all types of gradable Latin adjectives. The number of adjectives where periphrastic comparison is the only form of comparison, or prevails over the synthetic form, is extremely low. Adjectives in *-eus* and *-ius* are principally non-gradable; for the adjectives in *-uus*, periphrastic comparison is statistically equivalent to synthetic comparison.

Selected bibliography

- DIXON, R. M. W., 2004. Adjective classes in typological perspective. In: R. M. W. Dixon – Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.). *Adjective Classes: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1–49.
- FRAZIER, L. – CLIFTON, C. – STOLTERFOHT, B., 2008. Scale structure: Processing minimum standard and maximum standard scalar adjectives. *Cognition*, 106/1, pp. 299–324.
- KENNEDY, C. – McNALLY, L., 2005. Scale structure, degree modification and the semantics of gradable predicates. *Language*, 81/2, pp. 345–381.
- KÜHNER, R. – HOLZWEISSIG, F., 1912². *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Erster Teil: Elementar-, Formen- und Wortlehre*. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung.
- KURYLOWICZ, J., 1964. *The inflectional categories of Indo-European*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- MARVAN, J., 2008. *České stupňování – slovanská podoba evropské univerzálie*. Praha: Karolinum.
- PINKSTER, H., 2015. *The Oxford Latin Syntax. Volume I: The Simple Clause*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Quid comedent? Quid ebibent? Completive and Egressive Preverbs in Early Latin

Danica Pušić

John Cabot University; Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa

Preverbs are polyfunctional in their actional role. They often emphasize the *completion* of a given ongoing process without placing specific emphasis on either the beginning or the end. Instead, when the focus lies on the final phase of the event, preverbs express *egressivity*.

It has been commonly assumed that preverbs primarily trigger the distinction between dynamic and non-dynamic verbal forms, particularly in certain perfect tense forms (Ernout & Thomas §238; García-Hernández 1985: 528; Berrettoni 1971: 156–157). The functions of preverbs appear to be more complex.

This paper will demonstrate patterns of prefixation within dynamic verbs in the Early Latin verb system. The analysis focuses on the actional role of preverbs, especially the completive and egressive actional features in Plautus' and Terence's comedies. Based mainly on the research of Haverling (2000, 2010), the preliminary hypothesis developed in the paper is that the Latin *con-* and *ex-* seldom transform a non-dynamic into a dynamic verb; moreover, the preverbs introduce the component of completion/egressivity to the already dynamic verbs. The prefixed verbs in the *corpus* are mostly Activities that become Accomplishments by prefixation (*edere* – *comedere*; *bibere* – *ebibere*, *turbare* – *conturbare*).

While it is true that in the earlier periods of the Latin language the actional functions of the preverbs *con-* (Haverling 2000: 254 and 271) and *ex-* (Haverling 2000: 324) are by far the most common among the verbs with the suffix *-sco*, only a small part of the suffixed verbs in Terence are prefixed with the completive *con-* or egressive *ex-*. It is lexically evident that in those cases the unprefixed lexical counterparts

indicate the processes but without their end-point (*aresco* – *exaresco*). The paper shows how the sample data relate to the general background of the Early Latin.

Among the preverbs considered typically egressive (*ex-*, *de-* and *ab-*), the preverb *ex-* occurs most frequently in the *corpus*. Instead, *ex-* can also emphasize the completion of an ongoing process, as in *expleo*, *exedo* or *ebibo*. The analysis shows that the egressive function of *ex-* is similar to that of the completive function of *con-*. The paper makes a distinction between the verbs expressing completive feature and egressivity, thereby elucidating the importance of the phasal structure of the verb.

References

- Barone, M. (1908): *Sui verbi perfettivi in Plauto e in Terenzio*. Rome: Tipografia della R. Accademia dei Lincei.
- 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* [Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgiensia XLIV] Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Haverling, G. (2010): *Actionality, Tense and Viewpoint*. In: New Perspective on Historical Latin Syntax: Constituent Syntax Adverbial (Vol. II), Baldi P. & Cuzzolin (ed.) Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rosén, H. B. (1992): 'Die Komposita mit *co(n)-* in funktioneller und vergleichender Sicht', *Latein und Indogermanisch: Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Salzburg, 23.-26. September 1986*, ed. by O. Panagl and T. Krisch, Innsbruck.

Non-finite Verb Forms in Valerius Maximus: Some Remarks on the Use of Participles and Infinitives

Amedeo Raschieri

University of Milan

My contribution focuses on some morphological and syntactical features of Valerius Maximus' prose. In particular, I analyse how he uses non-finite verb forms in his work, and some peculiar examples of his use of participles and infinitives. Scholars have recognised many linguistic innovations in morphology, syntax and semantics in Valerius Maximus' *Facta et dicta memorabilia* (see Brunet 2008, Canessa 1994, Sánchez Manzano 1986, Sinclair 1980, Taddei 1988). Moreover, the author himself showed an acute awareness of linguistics, for example in a famous passage (2.2.2) about the Roman magistrates who had to respond to foreign ambassadors only in Latin, whether in the Senate or outside Rome (see Rochette 2011, 550-552).

After a systematic survey of Valerius Maximus' work, I present specific, more interesting instances demonstrating [1] his non-anterior use of the perfect infinitive (see Pinkster 2015, 536-541), [2] the periphrastic forms with *habeo* (see Pinkster 2015, 478-481), and [3] his use of the future participle instead of a clause or in absolute ablative constructions. I also endeavour to explain the reasons for these constructions from a historical and linguistic point of view. Some relevant examples are:

- [1] (1.8.7) *nostrum sit inclitis litterarum monumentis consecrata perinde ac uera non refugisse* ("let it be my part not to shy away from items consecrated by famous literary memorials as though they were mere fiction");

- [2] (3.3 ext 4) *multorum aures illa lingua et in primis Alexandri regis admiratione sui adtonitas habuerat* (“that tongue had held the ears of many lost in admiration, above all king Alexander’s”); (8.7.1) *cumque eloquentia magnam gloriam partam haberet, id egit, ut iuris ciuilis quoque esset peritissimus* (“and although he had won great fame in eloquence, he made himself a past master of civil law as well”);
- [3] (9.3 ext. 3) *eo exercitum in Hispaniam traiecturo* (“when was about to transport an army into Spain”).

Bibliography

- Canessa, Maria Teresa, *Usi particolari dell'avverbio in Valerio Massimo*, "Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Siena", 15, 1994, 41-53.
- Rochette, Bruno, *Language Policies in the Roman Republic and Empire*, in James Clackson (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language*, Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2011, 549-563.
- Haverling, Gerd V. M., *Actionality, tense, and viewpoint*, in Philip Baldi, Pierluigi Cuzzolin (edd.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*, vol. 2, *Constituent Syntax: Adverbial Phrases, Adverbs, Mood, Tense*, Berlin-New York, de Gruyter, 2010, 277-523.
- Pinkster, Harm, *Latin Syntax and Semantics*, London-New York, Routledge, 1990.
- Pinkster, Harm, *The Oxford Latin Syntax*, vol. 1, *The Simple Clause*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Sánchez Manzano, María Asunción, *El empleo de las perífrasis de participio de perfecto con fuit, fuerat, fuerit, fuisset y foret en Valerio Massimo*, "Studia Zamorensia", 7, 1986, 371-378.
- Sinclair, Brent William, *Valerius Maximus and the evolution of silver Latin*, Cincinnati, University of Cincinnati, 1980.
- Taddei, Chiara, *Per uno studio sulla lingua di Valerio Massimo*, "Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Siena", 9, 1988, 241-245.

Funktionsverben/Light Verbs in Latin and Greek: a Comparison

Antonio R. Revuelta Puigdollers
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

In the last years many works (see Baños 2016 and López 2012) have studied the similarities and differences between light verbs (*suspicionem habeo/do*) and the verbs etymologically related to their object (*suspicio*):

- (1) *id est, quod **suspica**bar* (Plaut. Men. 5.2.24)
- (2) *habebat enim Meneclides **suspicionem** adulteri*. (Nep. vit. Ep. 5.5.5)
- (3) *nostra simultas antea stimulabat me ut caverem ne **cui suspicionem** fictae reconciliatae gratiae **darem*** (Cic. Fam. 3.12.4.8)

However, those abstract nouns like *suspicio* may appear not only as the object of light verbs, but can occupy other argument positions with many other functional verbs (*sum, venio, incido, adduco/ induco, habeo*, and so on) building frequent collocations, as happens in other languages with similar verbs (see the German *Funktionsverbgefüge* in Winhart 2002):

- (4) cum **in suspicionem venissent** suis civibus fanum expilasse Apollinis (Cic. Ver. 2.4.30.5)
- (5) **in suspicionem incidit** regni adpetendi (Quint.Inst. 5.11.12.10)
- (6) darentque operam consiliis clandestinis ut **Hannibalem in suspicionem regi adducerent**, tamquam ab ipsis corruptum (Nep. vit.Han. 2.2.3)
- (7) **suspicio est mihi** nunc vos suspicari, me idcirco haec tanta facinora promittere quo vos oblectem (Pl. Ps.562)

My purpose is twofold: first, I will try to show that these different collocations provide a different diathetical (and sometimes aspectual) perspective of the state of affairs and secondly I will compare their situation both in Latin and Ancient Greek.

Nouns like *suspicio* can take different arguments: (i) the entity that experiments the suspicion (A); (ii) the entity suspected (B) and (iii) the reason or object of the suspicion (C). Those three entities (and others like a causer D) can be syntactically projected in different argument positions according to the light verb selected, as the following table shows:

	Subject	Direct Object	Indirect Object	Direction	Noun Phrase Complement
	Nom.	Acc.	Dat.	In + Acc.	Gen./AcI
A (Nom.) suspico B (Ac.) (A suspects B)	A	B			
A (Nom.) adducit B (Ac.) in suspicionem C (Gen./AcI) (A suspects B of C)	A	B		in suspicionem	C
B (Nom.) venit/cadit/incidit in suspicionem C (Gen./AcI) A (dat.) (B comes under suspicion of C)	B		A	in suspicionem	C
B (Nom.) dat suspicionem C (Gen./AcI) A (dat.) (B give reasons to A for suspecting him of C)	B	suspicionem	A		C
B (Nom.) habet suspicionem C (Gen./AcI) A (dat.) (B is suspected of C)	B	suspicionem			C
D (Nom.) adducit B (Ac.) in suspicionem C (Gen./AcI) A (dat.) (D makes B suspected to A of C)	D	B	A	in suspicionem	C
Suspicio est A (Dat.) C (Gen./AcI/ut) (A suspects B)	suspicio		A		C

The Latin data will be compared with those of Ancient Greek, where this kind of collocation is extremely frequent with the following nouns among many others: ἄγνοια, ἀγωνία, ἄδεια, ἀδικία, ἄδοξία, ἄθυμία, αἴνη, αἰσχύνη, αἰτία, ἄκεσις, ἀκοή, ἀμνηστία, ἀμφισβασίη, ἀναβολή, ἀναισχυντία, ἀνία, ἀντιλογία, ἀξίωμα, ἀπέχθεια, ἀπιστία, ἀπορία, ἀσθένεια, ἀσφάλεια, ἀτιμία, βλάβη, βουλή, δέησις, δέϊμα, διαβολή, διάνοια, διάνοσις, δόξα, δύναμις, etc.

References

- Baños Baños, José Miguel (2016): “Las construcciones con verbo soporte en latín: sintaxis y semántica”. In E. Borrell-O. de la Cruz (eds.), *Omnia mutantur*, Vol. II, Barcelona, 2016, pp. 15-39.
- Butt, Miriam (2010): “The light verb jungle: still hacking away”. In Amberder Mengistu *et alii* (eds.) *Complex Predicates Cross-linguistic Perspectives on Event Structure*, 48-78.
- Hoffmann, Roland (1996): “Funktionsverbgefüge im Lateinischen”, in Alfred Bammesberger et Friedrich Heberlein (éds), *Akten des VIII. internationalen Kolloquiums zur lateinischen Linguistik*, Heidelberg, Winter, 200-212.
- López Jiménez, M^a Dolores (2012): “Construcciones con verbo soporte, verbo simple y nombre predicativo: un ejemplo en griego antiguo/Support Verb Constructions, Simple Verb and Predicative Noun: An Example in Ancient Greek”. *Minerva* 25, 83-105.
- Winhart, Heike (2002): *Funktionsverbgefüge im Deutschen. Zur Verbindung von Verben und Nominalisierungen*. Philosophische Dissertation angenommen von der Neuphilologischen Fakultät der Universität Tübingen.

Latin *dubenus* ‘dominus’: An Attempt at Etymology

Luca Rigobianco

Università Ca' Foscari Venezia

The aim of this paper is to propose an etymology of the Latin word *dubenus*. *dubenus* is attested only in Paulus Diaconus as an archaic word meaning ‘dominus’ («*dubenus apud antiquos dicebatur, qui nunc dominus*» 59 L). The difficulty to explain *dubenus* ‘dominus’ from a formal point of view has led some to consider it as a corrupted gloss. Specifically, the translation ‘dominus’ has been ascribed to a misunderstanding, which would also be recognisable in the *Glossae latinograecae et graecolatinae*, and, therefore, it has been corrected into ‘dubius’ («*dubenus apud antiquos dicebatur, qui nunc dubius*»). Despite the complexity of the tradition, I intend to show that such a misunderstanding is due to a secondary formal overlap and that *dubenus* ‘dominus’ is a genuine Latin word which can be explained as derived from the base *du-* ‘to give’ (< I.E. *dh(e)H₃^w-). A derivation with *-beno-* can be analysed in several ways: the most likely hypothesis is that *dubenus* is from **du-bhØ-ēno-*. In particular, **-bh(o)-* is a suffix for deriving abstract nouns (cp., e.g., lat. **sabo-*, whence *Sabus* ‘Sabus’ (name of a god), *sabīnus* ‘Sabine’, etc., < **s(w)Ø-bho-* ‘selfhood’ from the base **s(w)e-* ‘self’), and *-ēno-* is a derivational suffix indicating relationship (cp., e.g., lat. *Picēnus* ‘those of the woodpecker’ → ‘Picenes’ < **pikØ-ēno-* from the base **piko-* ‘woodpecker’). According to this analysis, the meaning ‘dominus’ would have evolved from an original meaning related to ‘the giving’ (approximately ‘that of the giving’). The semantic shift is comparable to that of *duenos* > *duonus* > *bonus* and *optimus* (both

also with a social sense), if they are respectively from *du-ěno- ‘provided with gifts’ (cp. Cic. Att. 8.1.3 bonorum id est lautorum et locupletium) < *du- ‘give’ and from *opi-timo- ‘richest’ < *opi- ‘wealth’. More generally, such a semantic shift could be considered as a linguistic relic of an Indo-European ideological system in which social status was determined by the exchange of gifts through a practice similar to the pot-latch.

Bibliography

Thesaurus Linguae Latinae

- F. BADER, Les Noms des Aryens : Ethniques et Expansion, in F. BADER (ed.), *Langues IndoEuropéennes*, Paris, 1994, pp. 65-38.
- E. BENVENISTE, Don et échange dans le vocabulaire indo-européen, in «*L'Année sociologique*» 3, 1948-1949, pp. 7-20.
- E. BENVENISTE, *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*, Paris, 1969.
- A. ERNOUT, A. MEILLET, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, Paris, 1959⁴.
- P. G. W. GLARE, *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford, 1996².
- G. GOETZ, G. GUNDERMANN (eds.), *Glossae latinograecae et graecolatinae*, Leipzig, 1888.
- M. LEUMANN, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*, München, 1977⁵.
- W. M. LINDSAY (ed.), *Sexti Pompei Festi De verborum significatione quae supersunt. Cum Pauli Epitome*, Leipzig, 1913.
- G. MEISER, *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*, Darmstadt, 1998.
- J. POKORNY, *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Tübingen-Basel, 2005³.
- A. L. PROSDOCIMI, *Latino (e) italico e altre varietà indeuropee*, Padova, 2008.
- A. L. PROSDOCIMI, Safini/Sabini, Samnium, Samnites, in *I Sanniti e Roma. Proceedings of the international conference* (Isernia, 7th-11th November 2005), in press.
- H. RIX, Picentes - Picenum, in «*Beiträge zur Namensforschung*» 2, 1951, pp. 237-247.
- H. RIX, Sabini, Sabelli, Samnium. Ein Beitrag zur Lautgeschichte der Sprachen Altitaliens, in «*Beiträge zur Namenforschung*» 8, 1957, pp. 127-143.
- H. RIX, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, Wiesbaden, 2001².
- J. J. SCALIGER (ed.), *Sex. Pompei Festi libros de verborum significatione Castigationes, Recognitae et auctae*, Paris, 1576.
- M. DE VAAN, *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*, Leiden-Boston, 2008.
- A. WALDE, J. B. HOFMANN, *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg, 1938-1954.
- M. WEISS, *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*, Ann Arbor-New York, 2009.

Structure and Expression: Politeness in the Formal Correspondence of Cicero and Pliny

Rodie Risselada

University of Amsterdam

Over the past 15 years, politeness phenomena in Latin letters have been subject of investigation from various angles. Roesch (2004) applied the widely acknowledged

politeness theory of Brown & Levinson (1987) to ritual and redressive politeness phenomena in Cicero's letters, while Hall (2009) developed a new approach to politeness, based on his observations that politeness need not always be compensation for 'face threatening' speech acts, but also serves to establish and maintain social relations between sender and addressee. From the perspective of linguistic expression, on the other hand, Halla-aho (2009; 2010) and Dickey in a series of papers (e.g. 2012; 2015) focused on the relative politeness of various linguistic expressions for directives in both documentary letters and higher register correspondence (as did e.g. Risselada 1993, Unceta 2009, and recently Barios-Lech 2016 for other types of texts, esp. Roman comedy).

My contribution to the politeness workshop will take a slightly different perspective. Building on the results of these and other studies, I will focus on politeness in the structure of letters more at large, and analyse the relationship between the position of expressions of, especially positive, politeness (compliments, expressions of empathy and endearment, congratulations, vocatives, etc) within these letters vis-à-vis face threatening acts and aspects. Usually, positive politeness expressions tend to be found at the beginning and end of letters, where the rapport between sender and addressee is thematised and expressed, but in certain cases such expressions are also found in the 'body' of letters, around and introducing potentially face threatening aspects of the letter which form its core and 'pointe'. My corpus will consist of more formal letters of Cicero and the correspondence of Pliny and Trajan (with occasional reference to documentary letters).

Bibliography

Brown, P. & S.C. Levinson

1987 *Politeness : some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dickey, E

2012 "How to say 'please' in Classical Latin". *Classical Quarterly* 62, 731 – 748.

2015 'How to say 'please' in post-Classical Latin: Fronto and the importance of archaism. *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 14:1, 17-31.

Hall, J.C.H.

2009 *Politeness and Politics in Cicero's letters*. Oxford University Press.

Halla-aho, H.

2009 *The non-literary Latin letters. A study of their syntax and pragmatics*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.

2010 "Requesting in a letter: context, syntax and the choice between complements in the letters of Cicero and Pliny the Younger". *Transactions of the Philological Society* 108, 232 – 247.

Molinelli, P.

2015 'Dialoghi a distanza e pragmatica: marcatori funzionali e lettere private in latino e in greco'. In M.G. Busà & S. Gesuato (eds), *Lingue e contesti. Studi in onore di Alberto. M. Mioni*. Padova: CLEUP, pp. 621-633.

Risselada, R

1993 *Imperatives and other directive expressions. A study in the pragmatics of a dead language*. Amsterdam : Gieben.

Roesch, S.

2004 "La politesse dans la *Correspondence* de Cicéron". In. L. Nadjo & E. Gavouille (eds), *Epistulae Antiquae* III. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters, pp. 139 – 152.

Unceta Gómez, L.

2009. *La petición verbal en latin: estudio léxico, semántico y pragmatic*. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas.
- 2016 'Congratulations in Latin Comedy: Types and functions'. *Journal of Politeness Research* 12:2, 267-290.

Cogitanti mihi: the Participle Construction of the *dativus iudicantis* from Syntax to Literature.

Stefano Rocchi

Thesaurus linguae Latinae & Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München

Paper in English.

Il contributo si prefigge innanzitutto di presentare una casistica testuale più ampia rispetto a quella su cui la struttura participiale del *dativus iudicantis* è stata sinora indagata; in secondo luogo, intende analizzare il *corpus* presentato da un punto di vista sia sincronico sia diacronico (tenendo in tal modo presente l'impiego della detta struttura anche presso i modelli greci, cui i prosatori latini si rifanno). Una tale analisi verificherà la tenuta dei dati sinora acquisiti in bibliografia e accerterà in che misura l'ampliamento del *corpus* testuale conduca a nuovi risultati e acquisizioni al livello linguistico o in campo letterario. In particolare, sul piano diacronico si cercherà di mostrare come la struttura participiale del *dativus iudicantis*, per quanto pienamente latina dal punto di vista della lingua e della sintassi, sia inizialmente uno stilema della storiografia e filosofia greca introdotto nella prosa latina – allo stato del *corpus* latino pervenutoci – da Cicerone. Esso è impiegato dai prosatori latini – filosofi e storiografi, in particolare, ma non solo – in passi particolarmente significativi delle loro opere, quali ad esempio gli *incipit*, per esporre o introdurre il proprio punto di vista su un determinato tema. Le molteplici riprese e varianti di tale struttura participiale nel corso dell'intera latinità mostrano come essa sia presto divenuta un *topos* retorico, un modo da parte degli autori di assumere una sorta di posa intellettuale da 'pensatore', che può financo divenire oggetto di parodia.

Bibliografia

- Ch. Hauser, *Der participiale Dativ des örtlichen und geistigen Standpunctes [...]*, Programm des K. K. Staats-Gymnasiums in Bozen, 1877-1878, 1-19.
- Gustaf Landgraf, 'Der *Dativus commodi* und der *Dativus finalis* mit ihren Abarten', *Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik* 8, 39-76.
- S. Rocchi, 'Floro, Vergilius orator an poeta: *un'ipotesi* [...]', *Revista d'Arqueologia de Ponent* 24, 2014, 52 e n. 5.
- H. Pinkster, *The Oxford Latin Syntax*, Oxford 2015, 927 and 1203.

Constitutus = καθεστώς : un hellénisme de la langue juridique ?

Bruno Rochette

Université de Liège – UR « Mondes anciens »

Le participe parfait *constitutus* (ainsi que *positus*) a été vu comme une sorte de substitut destiné à pallier l'absence en latin de participe présent du verbe être (**ens*, *entis*). Plusieurs auteurs ont considéré cet emploi comme un hellénisme propre à la langue juridique en soulignant que, dans les *Novellae* de Justinien, *constitutus* est une traduction du grec καθεστώς, qui a un sens actif. On en a déduit qu'il pourrait s'agir d'une particularité de la langue des juristes qui apparaît pour la première fois chez Julianus [4], Scaevola [6], Papinien [5] et Ulpien [8]. Cet emploi, qui ne semble pas antérieur à Sénèque [7], n'est toutefois pas spécifique aux juristes. On le rencontre dans le latin de l'Empire, spécialement chez des auteurs africains chrétiens et païens, comme Apulée [2] et Cyprien de Carthage [3], et surtout dans la langue tardive (Ammien Marcellin [1]). Cet usage pose la question de la spécificité de la langue des juristes et de l'influence éventuelle du grec sur cette langue technique. Une étude plus systématique des prétendus hellénismes chez le juriste Gaius, peut-être d'origine orientale, montre que l'influence du grec sur son latin, si elle a existé, est assez réduite. Un grand nombre de particularités qui ont été considérées comme des hellénismes sont en réalité des spécificités du latin tardif et connaissent des parallèles chez des auteurs comme Apulée, Tertullien, Augustin, Ammien Marcellin. J'étudie ici les emplois de *constitutus* comme prétendu substitut du participe présent de *esse* dans un corpus assez large de textes : Arnobe, Firmicus Maternus, Lactance, Hilaire, Lucifer, Ambroise, Jérôme, Sulpice Sévère, Cassien, Orose... jusqu'à Cassiodore. On trouve aussi cette tournure assez souvent dans la *Vulgate*. Pour expliquer cette spécificité, l'influence du grec n'est pas une donnée nécessaire. Il s'agit essentiellement, comme d'autres phénomènes, d'une évolution du latin, qui a sans doute éprouvé le besoin de combler la lacune de l'absence du participe présent du verbe « être », ce qui arrivera au Moyen Âge avec la création de **ens*, *entis*, déjà proposé par Jules César.

Exemples

- [1] Ammien Marcellin, XX, 3, 12 : *eodem adhuc constituto*
- [2] Apulée, *Mét.*, IV, 11 : *Tunc nos in ancipiti periculo constituti uel opprimendi nostri uel deserendi socii remedium e re nata ualidum eo uolente comminiscimus.*
- [3] Cyprien, *Ep.*, 1, 1 : *in clerico ministerio constituti*
- [4] Julianus Dig. 24, 2, 6 : *in captiuitate constitutus*
- [5] Papinien Dig. 35, 1, 77, 3 : *impubere filia constituta*
- [6] Scaevola Dig. 4, 4, 39, 1 : *curatoribus eius idoneis constitutis*
- [7] Sénèque, *NQ*, III, 10, 3 : *natura partes suas uelut in ponderibus constitutas exanimat*
- [8] Ulpien Dig. 3, 5, 19 : *apud hostes constitutus*

Bibliographie

- GARCEA A., *Caesar's De analogia. Edition, Translation, and Commentary*, Oxford, 2012.
- KALB W., *Das Juristenlatein. Versuch einer Charakteristik auf Grundlage der Digesten*, Nürnberg 1888 [Aalen 1961].
- , *Roms Juristen nach ihrer Sprache dargestellt*, Leipzig 1890 [Aalen 1975].
- LÖFSTEDT E., *Zur Frage der Gräzismen, dans Syntactica. Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins II*, Lund 1933, 406-457.
- NELSON H.L.W., *Überlieferung, Aufbau und Stil von Gai Institutiones* (Studia Gaiana, 6), Leiden 1981.
- ROSÉN H.-D. SHALEV, Quasi: Its Grecizing [?] syntactic patterns, *Colloque de Linguistique latine de Toulouse* (sous presse).
- SCHRIJNEN J.-CHR. MOHRMANN, *Studien zur Sprache der Briefe des hl. Cyprian*, 2 vol., Nijmegen 1934.

L'impolitesse dans les comédies de Plaute

Sophie Roesch

Université François Rabelais- France

La politesse est un phénomène dont les manifestations linguistiques ont été largement étudiées ces dernières années (voir Brown et Levinson 1987 ; Kerbrat Orecchioni 1998 et 2000 ; Watts 2003 ; Locher and Watts 2005 ; ou encore Leech 2014). Des travaux de Brown et Levinson, nous retenons la notion de face positive et négative, de politesse positive et négative, ainsi que celle de Face Threatening Act. Pour Brown et Levinson, un FTA est un acte agressif qui risque d'abîmer la relation entre les interlocuteurs, et la politesse est un processus qui vise à prévenir ou à réparer ce FTA, en compensant les dégâts causés à la face de l'interlocuteur.

A la suite de ces recherches sur la politesse, son pendant, l'impolitesse, a donné lieu à de nombreuses publications, notamment de la part de Bousfield (2008), Bousfield et Locher (2008), Culpeper (1996 et 2011), et bien d'autres encore (Kienpointner 1997, Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2010, Haugh 2015), qui tous posent les bases d'une réflexion théorique.

Le but de cette communication est d'étudier le fonctionnement de l'impolitesse dans un corpus latin et de voir si les catégories mises en lumière pour les sociétés occidentales contemporaines¹ sont opérantes en latin. De telles recherches ont déjà été effectuées pour le latin en ce qui concerne la politesse (cf. Hall 2009, Roesch 2002 et 2004 ; Dickey 2012 et 2016) ; elles montrent que les stratégies langagières polies utilisées dans la société romaine sont, très souvent, proches de celles que nous utilisons de nos jours. Mais les échanges impolis latins restent, nous semble-t-il, à être analysés en détail.

Nous définirons l'impolitesse comme un FTA volontairement assumé par le locuteur, que ce dernier n'essaie pas de réparer. Nous rejoignons ici Bousfield : "rather

¹ Nous n'aurons pas recours aux travaux effectués sur l'(im)politesse dans les sociétés asiatiques (Gu 1990 ; Matsumoto 1988), la société romaine étant bien plus proche sur ce point des normes culturelles des sociétés occidentales.

than seeking to mitigate face-threatening acts, impoliteness constitutes the communication of intentionally gratuitous and conflictive verbal face threatening acts which are purposefully delivered” (2008 : 71).

Notre objectif est d'étudier si les différentes manifestations de l'impolitesse dégagées par Bousfield (2008 : 99-134), - comme, par exemple, l'usage de termes offensifs, le mépris, le sarcasme ou la menace -, se retrouvent dans un corpus latin. Nous nous demanderons aussi ce qui suscite l'impolitesse entre deux locuteurs latins, et quelle est sa visée pragmatique.

Le corpus retenu est l'ensemble des comédies de Plaute, qui présente de nombreuses occurrences d'échanges impolis. En effet, les comédies archaïques comportent des dialogues visant à mimer l'oralité, certes de manière stylisée, mais tout en présentant des traits suffisamment représentatifs d'échanges réels pour que le public puisse les reconnaître. Ce niveau de langue peu soutenu est propice à la présence de manifestations impolies (pour preuve, l'une des comédies de Plaute s'intitule le *Rudens*). En outre, dans le cas particulier de la comédie, l'impolitesse entre personnages est fréquente car elle contribue au divertissement des spectateurs (cf. Culpeper 2005 : 45).

Éléments de bibliographie

- D. Bousfield, 2008, *Impoliteness in interaction*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- D. Bousfield and M.A. Locher (eds), 2008, *Impoliteness in Language, Studies on Its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- P. Brown and S. Levinson, 1987, *Politeness. Some universals in language use*, CUP, Cambridge.
- J. Culpeper, 1996, « Towards an anatomy of impoliteness », *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25, p. 349-367.
- J. Culpeper, 2005, « Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: The Weakest Link », *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1, p. 35-72.
- J. Culpeper, 2011, *Impoliteness. Using Language to Cause Offence*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- E. Dickey 2012, « The Rules of Politeness and Latin Request Formulae », in *Laws and Rules in Indo-European*, P. Probert and A. Willi (eds), Oxford University Press, Oxford, p. 3013-329.
- E. Dickey, 2016, « Politeness in ancient Rome: Can it help us evaluate modern politeness theories? », *Journal of Politeness Research*, 12, p. 197-220.
- Y. Gu : « Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese », *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, p. 237-257.
- J. Hall, 2009, *Politeness and Politics in Cicero's Letters*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- M. Haugh, 2015, « Impoliteness and taking offence in initial interactions », *Journal of Pragmatics*, 86, p. 36-42.
- C. Kerbrat Orecchioni, 1998, *Les interactions verbales*, t.1, Paris, Armand Colin, 2^{ème} éd.
- C. Kerbrat Orecchioni, 2000, « Est-il bon, est-il méchant : quelle représentation de l'homme-en-société dans les théories contemporaines de la politesse linguistique ? », in *Politesse et idéologie*, Peeters, Louvain.
- C. Kerbrat-Orecchioni, 2010, « L'impolitesse en interaction Aperçus théoriques et étude de cas », *Lexis HS 2, Theoretical Approaches to Linguistic (Im)politeness*, p. 35-60. (<https://lexis.revues.org/774>)
- M. Kienpointner, 1997, « Varieties of Rudeness : Types and Functions of Impolite Utterance », *Functions of Language*, 4:2, p. 251-287.
- G.N. Leech, 2014, *The pragmatics of politeness*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- M.A. Locher, and R.J. Watts, 2005, « Politeness theory and relational work », *Journal of Politeness Research* 1, p. 9-33.

- Y. Matsumoto, 1988, « Reexamination of the universality of face : Politeness phenomena in Japanese », *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12, p. 403-426.
- S. Roesch, 2002, « Les stratégies de clôture du dialogue dans les comédies de Plaute », in *Theory and description in Latin Linguistics, selected papers from the 11th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*, A.M. Bolkestein, C.H.M. Kroon, H. Pinkster, H. W. Remmelink, R. Risselada (eds), Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology, J.C. Gieben, Amsterdam, p. 317-332.
- S. Roesch, 2004, « La politesse dans la correspondance de Cicéron », in *Epistulae Antiquae III, actes du IIIème colloque « L'épistolaire antique et ses prolongements européens »* (Tours, 25-27 septembre 2002), L. Nadjo et E. Gavoille (eds), Peeters, Louvain, p.139-152.
- R.J. Watts, 2003, *Politeness*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Tra *ratio* e *usus*: costruzioni perifrastiche inusitate nell'insegnamento grammaticale tardoantico

Elena Spangenberg Yanes
Sapienza Università di Roma

Le *Artes grammaticae* tardoantiche (IV-VI sec. d. C.), nell'esposizione della morfologia del verbo, prescrivono alcune forme perifrastiche, che gli studi linguistici moderni indicano, invece, come molto rare o altrimenti ignote. Si tratta della costruzione del supino attivo con *ire* per esprimere l'infinito futuro attivo (*amatum ire* = *amaturum, -am, -um esse*), del participio perfetto di verbi transitivi con *sit/esto* per l'imperativo perfetto passivo (*amatus sit/esto*), del participio presente con *fui* per la diatesi attiva dei tempi derivati dal tema del perfetto (*amans fui* = *amavi*). Sulla circolazione di queste forme nel latino letterario si dispone solamente di studi antiquati (Brandt 1931; Lyster 1930) o che comunque non tengono in conto la testimonianza dei grammatici antichi (Eklund 1930; Hoffmann 1993; 1997) e di informazioni sintentiche nelle grammatiche di riferimento (Kühner-Stegmann, Hofmann-Szantyr) e in indagini sulla lingua di singoli autori (ad es. Galdi 2013). Non è stata ancora compiuta un'indagine sistematica della loro diffusione ai vari livelli diacronici e diastratici della documentazione conservata. Mancano poi del tutto osservazioni sulla menzione delle tre forme perifrastiche da parte dei grammatici antichi.

Si propone di indagare questo argomento in uno studio che prenda le mosse proprio dalla riflessione grammaticale tardoantica e si collochi pertanto nell'ambito della storia della linguistica.

Si compirà dapprima uno spoglio sistematico dell'esposizione delle forme sopra elencate presso tutti i grammatici latini tardoantichi; si verificherà quindi l'eventuale presenza di cenni a tali costrutti nella riflessione linguistica di età repubblicana e imperiale (ad es. Varrone, Gellio, frammenti dei grammatici romani) e nella produzione grammaticale conservata solo su papiro (vd. Scappaticcio 2015; Dickey 2016). Sarà così possibile tracciare un quadro complessivo di quali grammatici registrino ciascuna delle forme in esame e in quali termini: se cioè vengano confrontate con degli equivalenti greci, se siano collocate nel dominio dell'*usus* o della *ratio* (analogia), se siano illustrate con *loci* letterari o *exempla ficta*. Particolare attenzione verrà rivolta alle eventuali varianti diacroniche, diatopiche (ad es. tra grammatici attivi in Oriente e in Occidente) o diastratiche (ad es. tra gli scritti di Macrobio e Prisciano, destinati ad un

insegnamento di livello superiore, e le *Artes* di Donato o quelle papiracee, più vicine alla prassi scolastica elementare) nella trattazione delle tre costruzioni perifrastiche. Si tenterà infine di valutare il rapporto tra i precetti dei grammatici antichi e tardoantichi e l'uso linguistico reale, tramite uno spoglio delle occorrenze delle perifrasi in esame nei testi letterari conservati e nella documentazione epigrafica. I dati ricavati da questa analisi serviranno a stabilire se i grammatici tenessero presente la prassi linguistica anteriore e coeva, e in quale misura l'uso linguistico posteriore, almeno di livello colto, possa essere stato influenzato dal loro insegnamento (cfr. Rosellini 2008; 2009).

Il primo risultato atteso è una ricostruzione complessiva della presenza, sia nell'uso letterario ed epigrafico sia nella trattativa grammaticale, dei tre costrutti sopra elencati. L'analisi di questi tre casi particolari contribuirà in secondo luogo a chiarire la questione di maggiore portata del rapporto, nell'antichità e tarda antichità romana, tra speculazione grammaticale e uso vivo della lingua.

Riferimenti bibliografici

- Arias Abellán 1999 = C. Arias Abellán, *Innovaciones sintácticas en el latín cristiano: participio de presente en lugar de forma personal del verbo*, in H. Petersmann – R. Kettemann (edd.), *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif V*, Heidelberg 1999, 195-207
- Brandt 1931 = E. Brandt, *Zum lateinischen inf. fut. act. auf -um ire, -uire*, «Glotta» 19, 1931
- Dickey 2016 = E. Dickey, *Learning Latin the Ancient Way*, Cambridge 2016
- Dietrich 1973 = W. Dietrich, *Der periphrastische Verbalaspekt in den romanischen Sprachen*, Tübingen 1973
- Eklund 1970 = S. Eklund, *The Periphrastic, Completive and Finite Use of the Present Participle in Latin*, Uppsala 1970
- Galdi 2014 = G. Galdi, *Syntaktische Untersuchungen zu Jordanes*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 2013
- Hoffmann 1993 = R. Hoffmann, *„Periphrase“ (periphrastisch)*, «Glotta» 71, 1993, 223-242
- Hoffmann 1997 = R. Hoffmann, *Lateinische Verbalperiphrasen vom Typ amans sum und amatus fui*, Frankfurt am Main-Berlin-Bern-New York-Paris-Wien 1997
- Hofmann – Szantyr = J. B. Hofmann – A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik mit dem allgemeinen Teil der lateinischen Grammatik*, I-II, München 1972² [1965¹]
- Jeep 1893 = L. Jeep, *Zur Geschichte der Lehre von den Redetheilen bei den römischen Grammatikern*, Leipzig 1893
- Kühner – Stegmann = R. Kühner – C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Satzlehre*, I-II, Hannover 1912-1914
- Lyer 1930 = S. Lyer, *Le participe présent latin construit avec esse*, «REL» 8, 1930, 241-249
- Marouzeau 1910/11 = J. Marouzeau, *L'emploi due part. prés. latin à l'époque républicaine*, «MSL» 16, 1910/11, 133-216
- Paucker 1884 = C. Paucker, *Kleine Studien. Lexicalisches und syntaktisches*, Berlin 1884
- Richter 1856 = E. L. Richter, *De supinis*, Progr. Königsberg 1856, 1-36
- Rosellini 2008 = M. Rosellini, Varrone, *Palemone, Prisciano: effetti di un insegnamento grammaticale sulla pratica della lingua*, in R. Ferri (ed.), *Aspetti della scuola nel mondo romano. Atti del convegno (Pisa, 5-6 dicembre 2006)*, Amsterdam 2008, 189-198
- Rosellini 2009 = M. Rosellini, *Prisciano e il futuro del congiuntivo*, «Philologus» 153, 2009, 300-309
- Scappaticcio 2015 = M. C. Scappaticcio (ed.), *Artes Grammaticae in fragmentis*, Berlin-Boston 2015.

La valence nominale en latin

Olga Spevak

Université de Toulouse 2 JJ

Le concept de valence nominale est parallèle au concept de valence verbale. Il repose sur l'idée qu'un procès dénoté par un verbe implique, de part de son sémantisme, un certain nombre de participants ; par exemple, *obseruo* « observer » implique un agent et un patient ; *do* « donner » implique un agent, un patient et un récipient. Ces compléments, obligatoires, sont appelés « arguments » (actants), par opposition aux satellites (circonstants) qui sont facultatifs. La valence représente un concept moderne pour une description de la syntaxe et de la sémantique d'une langue (Pinkster 2015 : chap. 4 « Verb frames ») de même que de son lexique (dictionnaires valenciels, par exemple, *VALLEX* 3.0).

La valence nominale, à savoir l'aptitude de noms à appeler des compléments obligatoires, fait actuellement l'objet de nombreuses études concernant surtout des langues modernes. Pour la valence nominale en latin, l'étude de H. Rosén (1981) concernant le latin archaïque constitue un bon point de départ. Parmi les noms valenciels, le groupe le plus remarquable est représenté par les noms verbaux : les noms déverbaux (*obseruatio* « observation ») ou les noms sémantiquement associés à un verbe (tel *uerbum* « mot »). Le problème avec la description des noms verbaux consiste en ce qu'ils peuvent conserver des traits verbaux et avoir une valeur verbale (tel *adspersio* « action de répandre ») ou, au contraire, ils peuvent être dépourvus de valeur verbale et avoir une valeur résultative (tel *consilium* « conseil » en tant qu'institution) (voir Grimshaw 1990). Or, l'interprétation des noms verbaux pose des difficultés, aussi dans des langues modernes (Kolářová 2014 ; Flaux et Van de Velde 2000) ; parmi les critères qui permettent de distinguer entre la valeur verbale et la valeur résultative, on évoque la présence d'un complément d'agent, d'un adjectif exprimant l'itération ou la durée, d'un adjectif qui traduit la volonté de l'agent (« délibéré »). À ces critères, on peut ajouter la « collocation », à savoir la combinaison avec d'autres éléments, en particulier, avec le verbe : un verbe d'état ou d'événement est un indice d'une valeur verbale du nom tandis qu'un verbe d'action, télique, signale un nom à valeur résultative.

La distinction entre les noms à valeur verbale et à valeur résultative est essentielle pour l'étude de leur comportement syntaxique. Les noms verbaux qui expriment un procès sont effectivement valenciels, à la différence de noms de procès, et leurs compléments représentent des arguments (génitif objectif ou subjectif). En nous appuyant sur une étude du *De Diuinatione* (Spevak 2015) nous allons montrer que la différence entre les compléments des noms à valeur verbale (arguments) et des noms à valeur résultative (satellites) et non pas seulement qualitative mais aussi quantitative : les arguments des noms verbaux sont assez souvent explicitement exprimés (dans 30–39 % des cas), à la différence des satellites qui accompagnent des noms dépourvus de valeur verbale (6 %). Le concept de « valence nominale » se trouve alors pleinement justifié et permet de mieux comprendre le comportement des noms verbaux en latin.

Références bibliographiques

Flaux, Nelly et Van de Velde, Danièle, 2000, *Les noms en français : esquisse de classement*, Paris, Ophrys.

- Grimshaw, Jane, 1990, *Argument Structure*, Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press.
- Kolářová, Veronika, 2014, « Specific valency behaviour of Czech deverbal nouns », in Olga Spevak (éd.), *Noun Valency*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, p. 19-59.
- Pinkster, Harm, 2015, *The Oxford Latin Syntax*, Oxford, OUP.
- Rosén, Hannah, 1981, *Studies in the Syntax of the Verbal Noun in Early Latin*, Munich, Fink.
- Spevak, Olga, 2015, « Les noms verbaux en latin », *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique* 110, 289-321.
- VALLEX 3.0 : <http://ufal.mff.cuni.cz/vallex/3.0/>.

Coreferentiality in Absolute Constructions

Beata Spieralska-Kasprzyk

Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw

The general rule cited by most Latin handbooks is that there should be no coreference between any constituent of the main clause and any constituent of the ablative absolute construction embedded within it. However, some studies (as the one done by Hoff) show that there are quite numerous exceptions to this rule. Another problem arises, when we analyse the implicit agent of the passive ablative absolute constructions. In this case there is no clear consensus among scholars. While Ramat states that the passive absolute construction “has no necessary semantic connection with the subject of the main clause”, others (e.g. Touratier and Gayno) say that the implicit agent of the *ablativus absolutus* is often identical with the first argument of the predicate of the main clause. Let us consider the following examples:

- 1) *Hoc responso dato discessit* – Having given this answer (Caesar) left (Caes. BG 1, 14, 7)
- 2) *Ea re promissa diem concilio constituerunt* – When this thing have been promised (by Caesar), they appointed the day for the assembly (Caes. BG 1, 30, 5)

Although Gayno points out that the situation illustrated by the example 1) occurs more often (about 80% of cases), it seems difficult to outline any rule concerning the coreferentiality in the passive ablative absolute constructions. My purpose is, therefore, to re-examine this question, and to investigate, first, how often the implicit agent of the absolute construction in the passive voice is coreferential with the subject of the superordinate clause, and secondly, what are the possible factors, on which the coreferentiality is depending. I propose to perform the statistical analysis of data excerpted from Latin texts. For the purpose of this paper, I will follow the studies done by Hoff and by Gayno, and present my conclusions concerning the coreferentiality in the Caesar’s *Commentarii de bello Gallico*.

Bibliography

- Gayno, M. (2015), *Le participe en latin aux VIème et VIIème s. ap J.-C. Syntaxe et sémantique*, Paris.

- Hoff, F. (1989), *Les ablatifs absolus irréguliers : un nouvel examen du problème*, in: G. Calboli (ed.) *Subordination and Other Topics in Latin*, Amsterdam, pp. 401-423.
- Ramat, P. (1994), *On Latin Absolute Constructions*, in: J. Herman (ed.) *Linguistic Studies on Latin. Selected Papers from the 6th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*, Amsterdam, pp. 259-268.
- Remmelink, H. W. (2002), Inferring implicit first-argument participants of passive ablative absolutes in Ammianus Marcellinus. A discourse-processing account, in: A.M. Bolkestein et al. (2002), (ed.) *Theory and description in Latin Linguistics*. Amsterdam, pp. 301-316.

Le genre est-il, en latin, une vraie catégorie grammaticale du nom ?

Pedro Manuel Suárez-Martínez

Université d'Oviedo (Espagne)

On a traditionnellement défini le genre en latin comme « el accidente gramatical que sirve para indicar el sexo de las personas y animales y el que se atribuye a las cosas o bien para indicar la carencia de sexo » (Bassols, 1956 : 15). Cependant, un grand nombre d'anomalies résultent d'une telle conception du genre : noms masculins ou féminins désignant une réalité inanimée, comme *campus*, *petra* ; noms à forme masculine ou féminine, mais correspondant à des animés de l'autre sexe, comme *nurus*, *agricola* ; noms à forme neutre, mais désignant des réalités animées, comme *genus*, *animal* (Hofmann-Szantyr, 1972 : 5-12). C'est pour ça que les linguistes ont essayé d'autres définitions, comme celle fonctionnelle qui dit que le genre « es un sistema de clasificación de los nombres que sirve para asociar a ellos otras clases de palabra y mantener así la coherencia referencial de la lengua » (Ramos Guerreira, 2009: 86).

Mais, en ce qui concerne le nom, on voit bien que ce « système » est très peu systématique et qu'« il est difficile de prévoir a priori quel sera le genre d'un mot donné » (Ernout, 1953 : 1) et surtout s'il va être masculin ou féminin. On ne s'étonne dès lors pas de voir Ernout dire que « c'est l'adjectif qui seul indique d'une manière non ambiguë le genre masculin ou féminin du substantif » (Ernout, 1953 : 1). En fait, comme le remarque H. Pinkster (2015 : 39), « Whereas adjectives and other words are inflected for gender, the inflectional endings of nouns do not contain an element of gender ». Mais, ceci dit, il soutient, -comme on l'a toujours fait-, qu'il existe un « grammatical gender of nouns », que « The gender of nouns is an intrinsic property » (Pinkster, 2015 : *ibid.*) et, en parlant de la concordance, que « Nominal modifiers of all types agree with the head of the noun phrase to which they belong in number/ gender/case » (Pinkster, 2015 : 935).

Ce panorama, très confus à notre avis, permet de se demander, -à la lumière de ce que l'on entend par « catégorie grammaticale » (Suárez-Martínez, 2012 : 132) -, si, dans le nom, celle du genre est une véritable catégorie grammaticale et si, par conséquent, il est légitime d'envisager le phénomène de la concordance de la façon dont on le fait d'habitude.

Références

- Bassols, M., 1956, *Sintaxis latina I*, Madrid.

- Ernout, A., 1953, *Morphologie historique du latin*, Paris.
- Hofmann, M.-Szantyr, A., 1972, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, München.
- Pinkster, H., 2015, *The Oxford Latin Syntax I. The Simple Clause*, Oxford.
- Ramos Guerreira, A., 2009, « Las categorías de género, número y caso. La concordancia », dans J. M. Baños (coord.), *Sintaxis del latín clásico*, Madrid, 83-110.
- Suárez-Martínez, P. M. 2012, *Catégories grammaticales, systèmes grammaticaux et autres questions de linguistique latine*, Hildesheim.

Latin biblique et complétives en *quoniam*

Lyliane Sznajder

Université Paris Nanterre

Les complétives conjonctives ont pris leur essor dans la littérature chrétienne, mais c'est en latin biblique que leur développement est de loin le plus considérable et à ce titre mérite examen particulier. Après *quod* et *quia* et leur rapport spécifique aux langues sources (voir notamment publications sous presse 2017 a et b), je voudrais m'intéresser ici à un 3^{ème} concurrent, *quoniam*, nouveau venu totalement inconnu en emploi complétif avant la littérature biblique et chrétienne, et qui pourrait à première vue fonctionner en variante libre (Garcia de la Fuente 1981):

uidentes quod fugisset Syrus (1 par. 19, 15) / quia manducaret (Marc. 2, 16)/ quoniam corruissent (2 reg. 10, 15)
dicebant quoniam ...et quia ... (Marc. 3, 22)

On se propose donc de confronter les contextes syntaxiques, sémantiques, pragmatiques, dans lesquels ces 3 subordonnants sont de purs conjoncteurs complétifs et non des subordonnants à signifié causal, pour dégager les points communs et les spécificités de *quoniam* dans son cheminement, à travers des chevauchements partiels, de l'emploi causal à l'emploi complétif.

L'étude sera contrastive et quantitative, basée sur un corpus constitué du texte biblique de la Vulgate traduite par Jérôme (livres de l'Ancien Testament traduits de l'hébreu et Evangiles traduits du grec), du texte biblique Vieux Latin (VL) quand il est attesté, et d'un ensemble de lettres de Jérôme dont ont été écartées les citations bibliques. On s'appuiera également sur les relevés d'autres corpus, chrétiens et non chrétiens, d'époque similaire (Bejarano 1973, Roca Alama 2001).

L'enquête dégagera notamment des sélections dont il conviendra de discuter le caractère diatopique ou diastratique. Ainsi l'emploi de *quoniam* complétif est surtout caractéristique des VL, Jérôme tendant au contraire à l'éliminer de sa traduction. A titre d'exemple, *gen. 22, 12* :

Vulg. : *Nunc cognoui quod timeas Dominum*

VL : *Nunc...cognoui quoniam times deum/dominum (tuum)* (ap. Cypr. *Testim.* 2, 5 ; Aug. *Gen. litt.* 4,9 ; *Hept.* 1, 58 ; *Coll. Max.* PL 42 col. 717, l. 37)

Dans la Vulgate même, *quoniam* complétif est, comme *quia*, plus fréquent dans les Evangiles que dans l'AT (voir Sznajder 2017b).

Cette enquête éclairera ainsi les conditions de transfert fonctionnel d'une conjonction sémantiquement pleine en conjonction complétive dans le corpus biblique et alentour, que ce transfert soit réussi ou freiné, accéléré par l'influence latente des langues sources dans une perspective littéraliste, ou encore conditionné par le niveau de langue du texte cible auquel il sert en retour de révélateur. De façon plus générale, se trouve illustrée la place complexe mais centrale des deux traductions bibliques latines dans l'étude des mécanismes majeurs présidant aux changements syntaxiques en latin tardif.

Quelques références bibliographiques

- BAÑOS BAÑOS J.M., 2011, « Causal clauses », in : Ph. Baldi-P.L. Cuzzolin (eds), *New Perspectives on the Historical Latin Syntax*, vol. IV, Mouton de Gruyter, New York-Amsterdam, 195-234.
- BEJARANO, V., 1973, « Un aspecto del latín de San Jerónimo: el uso de las conjunciones, *quod, quia, quoniam* », *Boletín del Instituto de Estudios Helénicos*, 7(2), 19-26.
- 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*, 4, 3-14.
- ROCA ALAMÁ, M.J., 2001, *La subordinación completiva en latín tardío: la extensión de las subordinadas completivas (quod, quia, quoniam, eo quod)*, Tesis Doctoral (Universidad de La Laguna).
- SZNAJDER L., 2017a sous presse, « Autour des complétives en *quod* en latin biblique », in : P. Duarte, Fr. Fleck, P. Lecaudé et A. Morel eds, *Recueil d'hommages à Michèle Fruyt*.
- SZNAJDER L., 2017b sous presse, « Quelques réflexions autour des complétives en *quia* du latin biblique » « *Études de linguistique latine II* », *Pallas* 103.

The Expression of Knowledge in Latin: *cognosco, nosco, scio, nescio* and *ignoro*

Esperanza Torrego

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

The aim of this work is to study the syntax and semantics of a set of verbs expressing different kinds of positive and negative knowledge in Latin, mainly *cognosco, nosco, scio*, on the one hand, and *nescio* and *ignoro*, on the other.

The prototypical semantic characterization of these Latin verbs has been partially made in previous studies, mainly in what respects verbs of positive knowledge -f.i. Haverling (2000) –*nosco, cognosco* and, to a lower degree, *scio*- and Unceta (2013) –*cognosco*-; Segura Arias (1987). Additionally, general studies, like Lyons (1977) or studies about similar verbs in other languages offer interesting information about their content and semantic relationships (see Rivero 1976, Bosque 2000, Vatrican 2015 on Spanish verbs; Lerat 1972, Vet 1994, on French).

However, all these studies, independently of the language studied, offer a typical result of the analysis of a *corpus* of a certain amount of data: not all the data concerning one verb fit in the prototypical characterization of that verb and, as a consequence, all of those verbs seem, in particular cases, to be equivalent to each other. This is essentially the case of the Latin verbs I deal with. Some of the parameters that generate those

non prototypical uses are properly explained; a case in point is that of the verbal category of Aspect, which focuses on different internal phases of the event: the perfect stem of terminative verbs focuses on the post-terminal phase, yielding resultative state readings; the perfect stem of states focuses on the initial phase, yielding ingressive readings (Pinkster 2015: 446-449). Nevertheless, it is not clear enough whether the effect of these combinations always arises or not, and, if it is not systematic, what other factors are involved in the triggering of the alternative readings. On the other hand, we don't know how these different readings modify the syntactic and semantic characteristics of the complementation. These are the kind of parameters the present research considers by analyzing all the data in a representative *corpus* mainly of prose consisting of around 2000 examples.

The concrete questions I aim to answer are:

- 1) What are the differences between the analyzed verbs in particular grammatical conditions and how are they reflected in the characteristics of the verb's complementation patterns?
- 2) Are the readings conditioned by aspectual constellations systematic?
- 3) What is the effect of mood and verbal person on the syntactic and semantic interpretation of each verb?

As for negative verbs, two further questions will be discussed:

- 4) Which kind of knowledge *nescio* and *ignoro* deny? Are there differences between them?
- 5) Is there any difference between negation through verbs and negation through syntactic means?

In order to answer these questions, I will examine systematically the result of crossing verbal categories of Aspect, Voice, Mode, and Person with the syntactic and semantic characteristics of their complements. Then I will show how a comparison between them can give us an interesting picture of the expression of knowledge by means of this group of verbs.

References

- Bosque, Ignacio (2000), “¿Qué sabe el que sabe hacer algo? Saber entre los verbos modales”, en F. García Murga y K. Korta (eds.), *Palabras. Víctor Sánchez de Zavala in memoriam*, Vitoria, Universidad del País Vasco, 2000, pp. 303-323.
- Haverling, Gerd (2000), *On sco-verbs, prefixes and semantic functions. A study in the development of prefixed and unprefixed verbs from early to late Latin*, Gothenburg, Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Lerat, Pierre, 1972 : “Le champ linguistique des verbes *savoir* et *connaître*”, *Cahiers de Lexicologie* 20, 53-63.
- Lyons, John (1977), “Knowledge and truth: a localistic approach”, in Allerton D.J., Eduard (ed.), *Function and Context in Linguistic Analysis*, Cambridge, Cambridge UP, pp. 111-221.
- Pinkster, Harm, (2105) *The Oxford Latin Syntax*, Oxford, Oxford UP
- Rivero, M^a Luisa (1976), “*Saber*: toward a grammar of knowledge in Spanish”, in M. Luján and y F. Hensey (ed.), *Current Studies in Romance Linguistics*, Washington, Georgetown University Press, pp. 246-254.

- Segura, Bartolomé - Carmen Arias (1986), "El campo semántico verbal de 'visión' y 'conocimiento' en la Guerra de las Galias", *Habis* 16, pp. 128-162
- Vatrican, Axelle (2015), "La modalidad en la gramática: las construcciones *saber / poder* + Infinitivo", *RSEL* 45,2, pp. 115-141.
- Vet, Co (1994), "Savoir et croire", *Langue française* 102, 56-68.
- Unceta, Luis (2013): «*Cognoscere*», en *Dictionnaire Historique et Encyclopédie Linguistique du Latin* (Partie «Lexique Latin»):
<http://www.dhell.paris-sorbonne.fr/DICTIONNAIRE:COGNOSCEREPLAN>

La parenthèse existe-elle en latin ?

Hamida Trabelsi

Laboratoire Intersignes

Dans cette communication, nous mettrons à l'épreuve une définition de la parenthèse qui se fonde sur la nature des indices de son identification dans une langue flexionnelle synthétique telle que le latin, d'un côté, et sur l'objectif que se pose le locuteur, de l'autre.

À priori et dans la majorité des études consacrées à ce phénomène, la spécificité de la parenthèse tient «aux deux caractéristiques suivantes:

1. Premièrement, la parenthèse s'identifie par les marques graphiques qui l'entourent ;
2. Deuxièmement, la mise en parenthèses procède de la décision d'un locuteur scripteur qui choisit ces balises alors même qu'il dispose d'autres signes de ponctuation et d'autres moyens linguistiques ».¹

En conséquence, l'on considère une parenthèse tout segment encadré par les formes typographiques qui guident l'interprétation. Or, dans une langue où il n'est pas toujours évident de décider des frontières de la phrase et où les deux critères importants d'identification des parenthèses ne sont pas disponibles (intonation et ponctuation sont absents des textes latins), la question qui se pose comment identifier la parenthèse dans les textes latins. Autrement dit : la parenthèse existe-t-elle en latin ?

Les réponses apportées à cette question et les analyses qu'elles suscitent sont majoritairement formalisées en termes de rapport entre le segment mis entre parenthèses et la phrase-hôte qui l'héberge et en termes d'identification de ses bornes.

Par ailleurs, les marqueurs spécifiques de frontières ne s'appliquent pas de manière systématique à la description de la parenthèse dans la mesure où elle peut être indirectement délimitée sur ses bords gauche et droit : le changement de proposition marque son début, tandis que la reprise de la phrase hôte en montre sa fin.

On retient donc de ce survol qu'il est peu satisfaisant de concevoir la parenthèse comme un simple phénomène d'ordre typographique et syntaxique.

¹ RICHARD, E., 2008, « Pour une définition (très) stricte de la parenthèse à l'oral », *Verbum* XXX.

L'apport de cette communication est de se demander si la parenthèse en latin constitue un indice qui invite à prendre en compte un point de vue différent ; autrement dit un système d'alerte qui indique que le locuteur change de palier énonciatif.

Notre objectif s'articulera autour d'une double problématique : la première, de nature théorique, reviendra sur la caractérisation de la proposition parenthétique en latin et ses spécificités syntaxiques et pragmatiques tandis que la seconde, empirique, interrogera un corpus spécifique – en l'occurrence un échantillonnage de textes latins en vue de tester les hypothèses formulées à l'issue de la réflexion initiale.

Références bibliographiques

- BOLKESTEIN, A., 1995, « Modalizing one's Message in Latin : "Parenthetical" Verbal Sentendi. » In: Ch.-M. Ternes & D. Longrée. *Oratio soluta - oratio numerosa: les mécanismes linguistiques de cohésion et de rupture dans la prose latine*. Luxembourg: Centre Alexandre-Wiltheim. 22-33.
- CHARNAVEL, I., 2008, « Caractéristiques syntaxiques de la parenthèse en latin : linéarisation, délimitation et insertion » *Discours n° 3*.
- DELOMIER, D., 1986, « Caractéristiques intonatives et syntaxiques des Incises », *DRLAV : revue de linguistique* 34-35.

The Latin Imperative: Morphological Features and Diachronic Development

Elena Triantafillis
University of Padua

The present talk deals with the Imperative mood in Latin and focuses in particular on the so-called 'Future Imperative' (or '-tōd Imperative'; e.g. Latin *amato*, *amatote*). The paper mainly aims to examine the morphosemantic properties of the Latin Future Imperative and to reconstruct its diachronic development.

The features of the Latin 'future forms' have been traditionally explained by reconstructing an Indo-European category: according to the prevailing point of view, the Latin Future Imperative would be formed by Indo-European Injunctive forms with the addition of the deictic *tōd (Szemerényi; traces of such a system can also be found in other Indo-European languages). The original Indo-European source would have yielded Latin sets of forms through phonetic developments (for instance, 3rd person singular *feretod* would go back to Indo-European *bheret-tod). The Latin '-tōd Imperative' is usually interpreted as a future tense (Leumann). This reconstruction reveals some problems: firstly, it merely aims to link Latin Imperative to Indo-European (reconstructed) forms by hypothesizing a development drawn *ad hoc*; secondly, the interpretation of the Latin '-tōd Imperative' as a tense is in contrast with documental evidence: a deeper analysis of Latin texts shows that the 'tōd forms' have different properties. Starting on this basis:

- 1) I will discuss the problems posed from the 'traditional' approach.
- 2) I will try to suggest an alternative interpretation.

My analysis will pay special attention to Archaic Latin: data drawn from ancient Latin inscriptions (VI-IV BC) offer meaningful elements for the present research. As for the methodological framework, analysis will take advantage of an ‘internal reconstruction’; that is, I will focus on the Latin historical system with its specific features rather than on a comparison with (hypothetical) Indo-European structures.

In detail, following Prosdocimi and Lazzeroni, there are good bases for claiming that the Imperative category has a special *status*. The Latin present Imperative implies the simultaneous presence of speaker and addressee and the immediate execution of the order; *vice-versa*, the ‘-tōd Imperative’ implies the existence of a *distance* between speech act and order execution: the prescription is not linked to the immediate speech situation and commands can be addressed to a ‘*non-present person*’. The ‘-tod Imperative’ would have specific deictic properties: the prescription is executed ‘not here, not now, by a non-present person’ (e.g. laws and maxims).

- 3) Moreover, I hypothesize that at an early stage of Latin the ‘-tod Imperative’ had neither grammatical number oppositions nor grammatical person oppositions; this reconstruction is supported from archaic inscriptions (VI BC) attesting that the ‘-tod Imperative’ originally had only one form (meaning ‘non-present person’). I assume that the formal and functional development of the Latin ‘Imperative system’ has taken place subsequently and has yielded the ‘standard’ set of forms (morphologically re-setted on the analogy of other verbal categories).

References

- Lazzeroni R., *Deissi e tempo grammaticale. Il caso dell'imperativo indeuropeo*, AGI, 94.2, 2009
- Leumann M., Hofmann J.B., Szantyr A., *Lateinische Grammatik*, Munchen, 1977⁵.
- Prosdocimi, A., *Vetter 243 e l'imperativo latino*, La Civiltà dei Falisci, Firenze, 1990
- Szemerényi O., *The future imperative of Indo-European*, RBPh, 1953.

La expresión de la alegría como manifestación de cortesía positiva en la comedia latina

Luis Unceta Gómez

Universidad Autónoma De Madrid

Esta propuesta pretende ser una aportación al estudio de la cortesía lingüística en latín, disciplina con un nivel de desarrollo aún incipiente (véase en Unceta Gómez 2014 un estado de la cuestión). Partiendo de la premisa de que los actos lingüísticos ritualizados llevan aparejado cierto grado de emotividad (Kádár 2013 : 104-134), el objetivo concreto de este trabajo es explorar la posible contribución a la expresión de cortesía lingüística que poseen ciertas manifestaciones lingüísticas del sentimiento de la alegría, cuya contribución a la sociabilidad del individuo ha sido puesta de manifiesto por varios trabajos (Cunningham 1988; Andersen & Guerrero 1998; Pataki & Clark 2004 ; Li, Canziani & Barbieri 2016).

En las comedias de Plauto y Terencio, corpus de este estudio, son frecuentes las expresiones de alegría, tanto a través de su explicitación léxica (*laetari, gaudere* como por otros mecanismos más espontáneos, tales como las interjecciones (Unceta Gómez 2012). Los modos de vincular un enunciado concreto con la idea de 'alegría' son, por tanto, variados, como también son diferentes las funciones discursivas que pueden asumir esos enunciados: desde una mera expresión de empatía e interés (en ejemplos como Plaut., *Poen.* 1078 : *Pol istam rem uobis bene euenisse gaudeo*), hasta usos más complejos. Así, por ejemplo, en cierto tipo de bienvenidas es preceptiva la expresión *saluom te aduenire gaudeo* o cualquiera de sus variantes, formulación muy convencionalizada para la función comunicativa del saludo (Berger 2016). De manera semejante, la expresión de la alegría (especialmente a través de las interjecciones *euge, eugepae, eu*) está también muy especializada en la expresión de alabanzas, aprobación o felicitación, actos de habla expresivos susceptibles de expresar cortesía positiva (Unceta Gómez 2016a: 280-282). Del mismo modo, otras expresiones de alegría pueden asumir fuerza ilocutiva de agradecimiento o funcionar como respuesta a este acto de habla (Unceta Gómez 2010: 629 y 2016b: 233, respectivamente).

Tomando en cuenta sus posibles funciones comunicativas, este trabajo abordará de manera conjunta todas estas expresiones de alegría, para valorar su papel en la lengua de la comedia como mecanismo de expresión de la cortesía lingüística y, en concreto, de su vertiente positiva (Brown & Levinson 1987), afiliativa (Hall 2009) o valorizadora, y para tratar de determinar hasta qué punto esas distintas manifestaciones son susceptibles de ser consideradas un comportamiento realmente cortés o meramente político, de acuerdo con la distinción de Watts (2003).

Referencias

- ANDERSEN, P. A. & L. K. GUERRERO (1998): «The Bright Side of Relational Communication: Interpersonal Warmth as a Social Emotion», in Peter A. Andersen & Laura K. Guerrero (eds.), *Handbook of Communication and Emotion*, San Diego, Academic, pp. 303-329
- BERGER, L. (2016): «Escenas de bienvenida en las comedias de Plauto», *Scripta Classica* 13 (en prensa).
- BROWN, P. & S. C. LEVINSON (1987): *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- CUNNINGHAM, M. R. (1988): «Does Happiness Mean Friendliness? Induced Mood and Heterosexual Self-Disclosure», *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 14/2, pp. 283-297.
- HALL, J. (2009): *Politeness and politics in Cicero's letters*, Oxford/New York, Oxford University Press.
- KÁDÁR, D. Z. (2013): *Relational Rituals and Communication: Ritual Interaction in Groups*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- LI, J., B. F. CANAANI & C. BARBIERI (2016): «Emotional Labor in Hospitality: Positive Affective Displays in Service Encounters», *Tourism and Hospitality Research* 22. doi: 10.1177/1467358416637253.
- PATAKI, S.P. & M.S. CLARK (2004): «Self-presentations of Happiness: Sincere, Polite, or Cautious?», *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 30/7, pp. 905-914.
- UNCETA GÓMEZ, L. (2010) : expresión del agradecimiento en la comedia latina», en Peter Anreiter & Manfred Kienpointner (eds.), *Latin linguistics today. Akten des 15. internationalen Kolloquiums zur lateinischen Linguistik*, Innsbruck, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, pp. 625-637.
- UNCETA GÓMEZ, L. (2012): «Cuando los sentimientos irrumpen: valores expresivos de las interjecciones primarias en las comedias de Plauto», en Rosario López Gregoris (ed.),

- Estudios sobre teatro romano: el mundo de los sentimientos y su expresión*, Zaragoza, Pórtico, pp. 347–395.
- UNCETA GÓMEZ, L. (2014) : «La politesse linguistique en latin: Bilan d'une étude en cours», *Dictionnaire Historique et Encyclopédie Linguistique du Latin*, Paris-Sorbonne: http://www.dhell.paris-sorbonne.fr/encyclopedia_linguistique:notions_linguistiques:syntaxe:formules_de_politesse.
- UNCETA GÓMEZ, L. (2016a): (Congratulations in Latin Comedy: Forms and Functions», *Journal of Politeness Research* 12/2, pp. 267–290.
- UNCETA GÓMEZ, L. (2016b): «La respuesta al agradecimiento en la comedia de Plauto y Terencio», *Pallas* 102, pp. 229–236.
- Watts, R. J. (2003): *Politeness*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bemerkungen Zum Wortschatz Der Lateinischen Fluchtafeln

Daniela Urbanová

Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic

Die Sprache der lateinischen *tabellae defixionum* ist in hohem Maße formelhaft und artifiziell. Sie kann als Fachsprache charakterisiert werden, die zu bestimmten Zwecken eingesetzt wurde. Dabei zeichnet sie sich durch zahlreiche Besonderheiten aus, die die Textgattung von anderen literarischen und epigraphischen Zeugnissen unterscheidet. Die wichtige Zusammenstellung der lateinischen Fluchtafeln (Kropp 2008) ist in jüngster Zeit durch umfangreiche Funde aus dem Brunnen der Anna Perenna in Rom (Blänsdorf / Piranomonte 2012), dem Isis- und Magna Mater-Heiligtum in Mainz (Blänsdorf 2012) sowie durch eine Reihe von Einzelfunden u.a. aus Pannonien (Barta 2015, 2016) nochmals erheblich erweitert worden. Die Corpora und Editionen stellen die Grundlage für die Beobachtung der sprachlichen Spezifika der *defixiones* dar. Konkret handelt es sich um sonst in den Schriftquellen nicht oder nur selten bezeugte linguistische Neuerungen und semantische Abwandlungen, die teils durch die betreffende Inschriftengattung bedingt sind, bzw. die Sprachentwicklung in einzelnen Gebieten des Römischen Reiches widerspiegeln. Das skizzierte Phänomen wird u.a. anhand des Gebrauchs der Begriffe *nomen*, *homo*, *aversus* und *mitto* erläutert werden.

Bibliographie

- Barta, Andrea. 2015. *Ito pater, Eracura and the Messenger*. A preliminary Report on a new curse tablet from Aquincum. *Acta Classica Univ. Scient. Debrecen LI* (2015) 101–103.
- Barta, Andrea. 2016. A.: *New Remarks on the Latin Curse Tablet from Savaria*. *Hungarian Polis Studies* 22 (2016) 63–69 and the paper of the same author present in this volume: *A Letter to the Underworld a Research Report on the curse Tablet Aq-2*. (im Druck)
- Blänsdorf, Jürgen. 2012. *Die defixionum tabellae des Mainzer Isis- und Mater Magna-Heiligtums*, *Defixionum tabellae Mogontiacenses (DTM)*. Mainzer Archäologische Schriften Band 9. Mainz: Generaldirektion Kulturelles Erbe Rheinland-Pfalz, Direktion Landesarchäologie Mainz.
- Blänsdorf, Jürgen & Marina, Piranomonte. 2012. Schede di catalogo IX, 49.3–6, IX, 49.8–28. In Friggeri, Rosanna Granino Cecere, Maria Grazia, Gregori, Gian Luca (eds.), *Terme di Diocleziano. La collezione epigrafica*, 617–639. Milano: Mondadori Electa.

Kropp, Amina. 2008. *Defixiones - Ein aktuelles Corpus lateinischer Fluchtafeln*, Speyer 2008.
 Urbanová, Daniela & Juraj Franek. Il campo semantico di "nomen" nelle tavole defixionum.
 In *Latin Vulgaire - Latin Tardif, 11th International Conference on Late and Vulgar Latin*,
 Oviedo, 1.-5. 9. 2014. 2017 (im Druck).

Les verbes de déplacement en latin : typologie et rôle de la préverbation

Sophie Van Laer
Université de Nantes

Dans le domaine des relateurs (en particulier des prépositions), la question de la primauté de la valeur spatiale reste un sujet débattu (François *et al.* 2009 : 9-10). Si c'est l'hypothèse retenue par la Grammaire Cognitive qui nomme « proto-scène » cette valeur première (Luraghi, 2009 : 172), d'autres théories linguistiques envisagent une valeur fondamentale plus abstraite. Tel est le cas de la Théorie des Opérations Énonciatives qui pose une « forme schématique » (Franckel & Paillard, 2007 : 12) invariante, qui permet à chaque préposition de déterminer et de configurer son environnement. Le sens en discours s'explique alors par les interactions entre cet invariant et les éléments du co-texte. Tout en reconnaissant la prégnance de la valeur spatiale, liée à une appréhension intuitive (Franckel & Paillard, 2007 : 8), cette valeur n'est donc pas considérée comme première, l'identité d'une préposition ne se réduisant à aucune de ses valeurs en discours.

L'étude portera plus particulièrement sur les préverbes, qui peuvent également être analysés comme des relateurs (Pottier, 1962 : 274). Nous étudierons, dans la perspective théorique de la TOE, la valeur des différents préverbes du latin lorsqu'ils sont associés à un verbe de déplacement. Nous nous limiterons aux verbes dénotant le déplacement de l'argument sujet, pour lesquels nous proposerons une typologie s'appuyant sur les travaux Boons (1987). En vertu du critère de « l'orientation inhérente au procès » (Van Laer, 2010 : 32), nous distinguerons :

- verbes de déplacement proprement dits (*eo, uenio*)
- verbes de manière de déplacement (*curro, salio, uolo*)
- verbes de déplacement intrinsèque (*ambulo, erro*)

Ce critère sera croisé avec celui de la « polarité aspectuelle » (Boons, 1987 : 10) distinguant « lieu initial », « lieu final », « lieu médian » (qu'il conviendra de distinguer du « lieu du procès »).

Deux questions se posent :

- Tous les préverbes ont-ils une aptitude à prendre une valeur spatiale ? Sont-ils également compatibles avec les verbes de déplacement des différentes classes ?
- La présence du préverbe ouvre-t-elle une place de complément pour l'entité-repère (Lehmann, 1983) ? Quelle est la forme morpho-syntaxique prise par le complément ?

Cette étude, à l'interface entre sémantique et syntaxe se fera sur corpus (prose et poésie de l'époque républicaine et julio-claudienne) Elle vise à :

- mieux cerner le système préverbal latin dans son ensemble, à partir d'un domaine qui est pour la préverbation un domaine de prédilection.
- mesurer l'incidence syntaxique de la préverbation. Peut-on considérer, par exemple, que *adire ad* et *adire + ACC.* sont de simples variantes ?

Plus largement, nous nous demanderons si la distinction établie par Paillard et Franckel (2007 : 7-8) entre prépositions de « zonage » et prépositions de « discernement » peut être adaptée aux préverbes latins et si elle s'avère opératoire.

Références bibliographiques des auteurs cités dans l'abstract

- Boons J.-P. (1987), « La notion sémantique de déplacement dans une classification syntaxique des verbes de déplacement », *Langue française* 76, 5-40.
- Franckel J.-J. & Paillard D. (2007), *Grammaire des prépositions, tome 1*, Paris, Ophrys.
- François J. Gilbert E. *et al.* (éds) (2009), *Autour de la préposition*, Caen, Presses Universitaires de Caen.
- Lehmann C. (1983), « Latin Preverbs and Cases » in H. Pinkster (éd.), *Latin Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, J. Benjamins, 145-165.
- Luraghi S. (2009), « A model for representing polysemy : The Italian preposition *da* », in J. François, E. Gilbert *et al.* (éds), *Autour de la préposition*, Caen, Presses Universitaires de Caen, 171-182.
- Pottier B. (1962), *Systématique des éléments de relation*, Paris, Klincksieck.
- Van Laer S. (2010), *La préverbation en latin : étude des préverbes ad-, in-, ob- et per- dans la poésie républicaine et augustéenne*, Bruxelles, Latomus.

Compositional Aspect in Latin

Martina Vaníková

Charles University in Prague

Aspect is a universal semantic category that varies in the level and means of its grammaticalization. The bibliography regarding aspect in Latin is immense, yet no agreement on the matter has been reached so far. There are theories stating that nothing like aspect can be identified in Latin, theories viewing the opposition imperfectum versus perfectum as an aspectual one, theories working with preverbs and/or infixes like –sc– as aspectual markers etc. There are three main reasons why the discussion on the matter has never led to a conclusion:

1. The concept of markedness tends to be ignored.
2. The fact that in different languages, different members of the aspectual opposition are (un)marked.
3. All the above mentioned theories perceive the aspect purely as a verbal characteristic.

As the recent works in the field of aspectology convincingly show, the aspect is encoded in the whole sentence and its elements – in the subject/object and its (un)specified quantity, in adverbials, etc. There are other constituents of the sentence that have obvious influence on the aspect of the whole utterance, e.g. definite and indefinite articles of the subject or object or cases or and morphemes with originally locative or partitive meaning (as in Finnish or German). FILIP (1999: 62-69) isolated even more markers that cause the aspect shift, as for example adverbials, verbal mood, etc.

It is quite easy to test the influence of the various aspectual markers in English, German, and other languages that have native speakers. However, the theory of compositional aspect has never been tested for Latin. Latin is a highly flective language, and thus possesses a prime condition for developing the morphological aspect; there are also no (in)definite articles, which are important carriers of the aspect e.g. in Germanic languages. It follows that we might expect the morphological aspect in Latin. However, a structural analysis of the Latin verbal system does not show this to be the case and the category of aspect has never developed however, it obviously is not systematic in its whole verbal system – it has never developed in such a complex form. The present paper discusses the possible aspectual markers (preverbs, adverbials, (un)specified quantity of the subject or object, etc.) and identifies their mutual relationships in Latin.

In this paper, I point out the importance of viewing aspect in Latin from the compositional point of view in order to understand properly the manifestation of aspect in the Latin discourse.

Selected bibliography

- BERTINETTO, Pier Marco – DELFITTO, Denis, 2000. Aspect vs. Actionality: Why they should be kept apart. In: Dahl, Ö. (ed.), *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*, 189-226. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- COMRIE, Bernard, 1976. *Aspect. An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DOČEKAL, Mojmir, 2007. Mereologie českého aspektu a direkcionální předložky. *Linguistica Brunensia* 55, 219-233.
- DOWTY, David R., 1979. *The Semantics of Verbs and Times in Generative Semantics and in Montague's PTQ*. Dordrecht – Boston – London: D. reidel Publishing Company.
- FILIP, Hana, 1999. *Aspect, Eventuality Types and Noun Phrase Semantics*. New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- HÄVERLING, Gerd, 2000. *On -sco verbs, Prefixes and Semantic Functions*. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- HÄVERLING, Gerd, 2010. Actionality, tense, and viewpoint. In: Baldi, P. – Cuzzolin, P. (eds.), *New Perspectives of Historical Latin Syntax*, 277-523. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- JOHANSON, 2000. Viewpoint operators in European languages. In: DAHL, Ö. (ed.), *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*, 27-188. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- KRIFKA, Manfred, 2001. Quantifying into Question Acts. *Natural Language Semantics* 9, 1, 1-40.
- PINKSTER, Harm, 1983. Tempus, Aspect and Aktionsart in Latin. In: *ANRW* 29, I, 270-319.
- PINKSTER, Harm, 2015. *The Oxford Latin Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- VERKUYL, Henk J., 1993. *A theory of aspectuality: the interaction between tempoval and atemporal structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- VERKUYL, Henk J., 2005. Aspectual composition: Surveying the ingredients. In: Verkuyl, H. J. – de Swart, H. – van Hout, A. (eds.), *Perspectives on Aspect*, 19-39. Dordrecht: Springer.

Sub-rule vs. Analogy: On the Outcome of the Double Dental Cluster $*-d^h-$ + $*-t-$ in Latin

Lothar Willms

Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg

In Proto-Indo-European, a cluster of double dental stops resulted in T^sT and eventually became in Germanic and Latin ss or $-st-$ in particular cases. For the sake of consistency, I shall focus on the outcome of the particular cluster $-d^h-$ + $-t-$ in Latin. To explain the instances of $-st-$ scholars have had recourse to two neogrammarian concepts, namely analogy and the grasping of exceptions to phonetic rules by sub-rules (Leumann 168, Meiser 124, Hill 227–248), although often without coming to terms with the range and distribution of these phenomena (cf. Weiss 173–74). Three reasons make this question extremely complicated. Firstly, the evidence is quite limited, since we are dealing with a special combination of two sounds. Secondly, doubts about etymology sometimes prevent us from being sure that we are dealing with the cluster $-d^h-$ + $-t-$ (e.g. *custōs* ‘guard’, *russus* ‘red(haired)’). Third, since the t of the cluster is often part of one of the numerous suffixes in $-t-$ (e.g. $-to-$, $-tās$), the outcome $-st-$ might also be the result of a posterior restoration by analogy.

I shall develop the aforementioned methodology by incorporating into it aspects of semantics and phonetics. I argue that $-d^h-$ + $-t-$ had three different stages of outcome in Latin:

- 1) The regular outcome of $-d^h-$ + $-t-$ was $-ss-$ and hence identical with $T + T$ ($*g^{(h)}rd^{(h)}$ ‘step, walk’ + $-tos > gressus$, $*h_x\epsilon ud^h$ ‘to order’ $\rightarrow *h_x\epsilon ud^h-tos > iussus$, $*h_1rud^h-tos > russus$ ‘red(haired)’; $*bhe\dot{\epsilon}dh-$ ‘trust’ $\rightarrow *bhe\dot{\epsilon}dh-tos > \dagger f\acute{\imath}ssus > f\acute{\imath}sus$).
- 2) In two isolated words the etymology of which are highly controversial and was not evident to speakers of Latin (*custōs* ‘guard’ $< *kud^h-tó-sd-s$ ‘who sits near the treasure’, cf. Nowicki; *īnfestus* ‘hostile’ $< *(n-)g^u hedh-tos \leftarrow *g^u hedh-$ ‘ask for sth.’), the intermediary $*T^sT$ developed into $-st-$. The possible reason was that their accentuation differed from words which yield the regular outcome of $-d^h-$ + $-t-$.
- 3) All other instances of $*dh + *t > st$ can be explained by the re-addition, by analogy, of the original dental suffix to the regular outcome $-s(s)-$. One condition for this analogic restoration is that the original suffix was still productive and transparent at that stage (*aestus* ‘heat’, *aestās* ‘summer (heat)’ + $-tus / -tās$). Furthermore, a motive for the analogic restoration of the dental suffix is to avoid homophony with extant forms in $-s(s)-$ (*īnfestus* ‘hostile’ vs. $\dagger \dot{\imath}nfessus$ ‘untired, inexhaustible’). This motive would also explain the outcome $-st-$ in stems in simple $-d-$ (*fūstis* ‘stick, club’ vs. PPP *fūsus* $\leftarrow fundō$

‘to pour’, *caestus* ‘strip of leather, boxing-glove’ vs. PPP *caesus* ← *caedō* ‘to strike’).

References

- Hill, Eugen (2003). *Untersuchungen zum inneren Sandhi des Indogermanischen. Der Zusammenstoß von Dentalplosiven im Indoiranischen, Germanischen, Italischen und Keltischen*. Bremen.
- Leumann, Manu (1977). *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. Munich.
- Meiser, Gerhard (1998). *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*. Darmstadt.
- Nowicki, Helmut (1978). “Zur Stammbildung von lat. *custōs*.” *ZVS* 92, 184–194.
- Weiss, Michael (2009). *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor.

Il mitacismo nei grammatici latini

Anna Zago

University of Pisa

Il *mitacismo*, spesso citato come *vitium orationis* in testi grammaticali e retorici latini, si configura come fenomeno particolarmente problematico già dal nome stesso: di chiara impronta greca, esso è accostabile a formazioni come *iotacismus* e *labdacismus*, in analogia con termini come ἀπτικισμός e σολοικισμός.

Dopo un chiarimento preliminare proprio sulla questione della denominazione e della grafia (BICKEL 1937), questo lavoro si propone di analizzare lo statuto del fenomeno *mitacismo* all’interno della più vasta questione del trattamento di *-m* finale, su cui la bibliografia è ben nutrita, anche se spesso molto datata (si veda a questo proposito la ricca rassegna di PORZIO GERNIA 1974).

L’analisi delle numerose testimonianze sul fenomeno del *mitacismo* includerà necessariamente anche brani in cui non compare una menzione esplicita del *vitium*, ma vi sono considerazioni utili a comprendere il quadro dottrinale in cui collocare la questione; gli autori presi in considerazione si collocano in un arco temporale e geografico molto ampio, da Plinio e Quintiliano fino ad artigiani altomedievali come Sedulio Scoto e Murethach, passando per grammatici come Diomede, Prisciano e Pompeo.

Da una comparazione ragionata di queste testimonianze si tenterà di isolare i macro-contesti nei quali grammatici e retori inquadrano il fenomeno del *mitacismo*:

- esiti di *m* tra due vocali
- esiti di *m* davanti a vocale vs esiti di *m* davanti a consonante
- ripetizione eccessiva del suono [m].

I primi due contesti saranno analizzati partendo dalla definizione del TLL s.v. *moe-tacismus*, secondo cui il termine *in re grammatica* è impiegato *de obscuracione m litterae terminantis inter vocales*. Ci si focalizzerà dunque sul *mitacismo* “grammaticale”, affrontando innanzitutto la questione di “nasale debole” (avanzata tra i primi da SEELMANN 1885) vs “vocale nasalizzata” (SCHUCHARDT 1866, SAFAREWICZ 1934 e 1960). In seguito si cercherà di vagliare la validità di una soluzione che vede la

“nasale debole” o “vocale nasalizzata” come allofono di /m/ in posizione finale, partendo dall’interessante soluzione “tripartita” proposta da HOPPENBROUWERS 1960 (*liaison, réduction, exclusion*). La tesi che si cercherà di dimostrare è che il *mitacismo* consista in un’errata pronuncia della -m in fine di parola, tale da far sembrare che la consonante sia legata alla parola successiva.

In conclusione, si affronteranno due corollari piuttosto interessanti delle teorie sopra esposte: da una parte l’interazione fra la pronuncia di [m] e la sua resa grafica nei testi in esame, soprattutto per quanto concerne la rappresentazione del confine di parola; dall’altra la definizione stessa del *mitacismo* in quanto *vitium* e la conseguente necessità di classificarlo come *barbarismo* (errore in una singola parola) o come *solecismo* (errore in una sequenza di parole).

Bibliografia essenziale

- BICKEL 1937 = E. Bickel, *De moetacismo*, in *Mélanges Émile Boisacq*, Bruxelles 1937, vol. I pp. 69-76
- HOPPENBROUWERS 1960 = H. Hoppenbrouwers, *Fonction euphonique du m final chez quelques auteurs paléochrétiens*, in “*Vigiliae Christianae*” 14 (1960), pp. 15-46
- NIEDERMANN 1948 = M. Niedermann, *Iotacismus, Labdacismus, Mytacismus*, “*Revue de philologie*” 74 (1848), pp. 5-15
- PORZIO GERNIA 1974 = M.L. Porzio Gernia, *Contributi metodologici allo studio del latino arcaico. La sorte di M e D finali*, in “*Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Memorie. Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*” 17 (1974), pp. 111-337
- SAFAREWICZ 1934 = J. Safarewicz, *A propos de l'm final latin*, in “*Eos*” 35 (1934), pp. 133-138
- SAFAREWICZ 1935 = J. Safarewicz, *Les voyelles nasales en latin*, in *Atti del III Congresso Internazionale dei Linguisti* (Roma, 19-26 settembre 1933-XI), a cura di B. Migliorini e V. Pisani, Firenze 1935
- SAFAREWICZ 1960 = J. Safarewicz, *Notes de phonologie latine*, in “*Studii Clasice*” 2 (1960), pp. 85-93
- SCHUCHARDT 1866 = *Der Vokalismus des Vulgärlateins*, Leipzig 1866, vol. I, pp. 109-112.

Animacy in Latin: Explaining some Peripheral Phenomena

Elena Zheltova

St. Petersburg State University

Introduction. The category of animacy has its core and periphery. The core consists of the nouns which demonstrate the strict correlation between the biological (referential) and grammatical animacy as well as between the animacy and the grammatical gender. The nouns which do not demonstrate such a correlation belong to the periphery of this category. Thus, the words indicating animals or children proved to be neuter in spite of their referential animacy in a number of languages, e. g. in Ancient Greek (τὸ τέκνον n. ‘child’), Modern Greek το παιδί, n. ‘child’), German (das Tier, n. ‘animal, beast’), Russian (дѹмя, n. ‘child’). Such cases are attested in Latin, too (e. g. *animal*, n. ‘animal’). The peripheral phenomena of animacy in the world languages is a topical issue which has been vividly discussed in literature (Corbett 1991; Yamamoto 1999; Swart, Lamers, Lestrade 2008; Luraghi 2011; Rusakova 2013).

Aims. Since the reliable criteria to establish whether a noun is animate or not are lacking in the traditional Latin grammars, this study aims, first, at offering a method of diagnosing animacy/ inanimacy and, second, at explaining some peripheral phenomena.

Methodology. The method of diagnosing animacy/inanimacy is based on the different syntactic behaviour of animate/inanimate nouns in the passive constructions (*Abl. auctoris* vs. *Abl. instrumenti*). The study is conducted with the help of the electronic database PHI-5 and thus can be considered as a corpus-based study. The nouns presumably belonging to the peripheral zone of animacy were divided into five groups according to their meaning (human beings, animals, collective nouns, natural phenomena, abstract nouns) and subjected to the diagnostic test.

Results. The findings are represented in five tables containing the statistical data about the use of the nouns in *Abl. auctoris* (singular and plural) in comparison with the total number of their occurrences in *Abl. + a/ab*. The author draws on the comparative material from some other languages with a particular focus on Russian.

The analysis demonstrated that animacy is a gradient and dynamic category, as exemplified in (1) and (2):

- (1) ...*ne a multitudine* (*Abl. auctoris*) *equitum dextrum cornu circumveniretur* (Caes. civ. 3, 89, 4)
- (2) *L. Petrosidius aquilifer, cum magna multitudine* (*Abl. instrumenti*) *hostium premeretur, aquilam intra vallum proiecit...* (Caes. Gall. 5, 37, 5)

The conceptualization of the entities as animate/inanimate can be influenced by the grammatical number, the degree of individuation or agency, the speaker's empathy as well as other parameters pertaining to the anthropocentric nature of the language.

Quite a few nouns indicating inanimate objects are treated as grammatically animate in Latin; the lack of the strict correlation between the referential and grammatical animacy as well as between animacy and gender is explained by the need for expressing some features which may be much more significant for the language as a sign system, than such correlations.

References

- Corbett, G. G., 1991. *Gender*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Luraghi, S., 2011. The origin of the Proto-Indo-European gender system: Typological considerations. *Folia Linguistica* 45/2, 435-464.
- Rusakova, M.V., 2013. *Elementy antropocentricheskoy grammatiki russkogo yazyka [The anthropocentric elements of Russian grammar]*, Moscow, Yazyki slavyanskoj kul'tury Publ.
- Swart, P. de, Lamers, M., Lestrade, S. 2008. Animacy, argument structure, and argument encoding. *Lingua* 118, 131-140.
- Yamamoto, M., 1999. *Animacy and Reference: A Cognitive Approach to Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Workshop: Linguistics and Latin Learning

Organiser: Suzanne Adema

Universiteit van Amsterdam

Empirical research on the teaching and acquisition of Latin still seems scarce. Experimental research designs (e.g. pre- and post-tested intervention studies) and data-collection methods such as think-aloud tasks or eye tracking would provide us with insights in the acquisition of Latin and the reading process of Latin learners.

In this workshop, design research and experimental research on learning, reading and teaching Latin will be presented. The workshop is meant to explore the interest and experience of Latin linguists and other classical scholars in the acquisition of Latin as a research field.

Latin Reading Comprehension Strategies; Results from the Interactive-Processing Strategy Inventory (IPSI)

Rebecca Boyd

George Washington University

As a result of Latin and Ancient Greek educators' growing interest in applying modern foreign language theory and research to the instruction of classical languages, the use of reading comprehension strategies has attracted particular attention (Deagon, 2006; Gruber-Miller, 1998; Harrison, 2010; McCaffrey, 2006; Morrell, 2006; Rea, 2006; Van Houdt, 2008). Reading comprehension strategies are the reading-related "techniques, approaches or deliberate actions that students take in order to facilitate the learning and recall of both linguistic and content area information" (Chamot, 1987, p. 71). This paper will present the results of the first empirical study to examine Latin students' use of Latin reading comprehension strategies, and to investigate the relationships between Latin and native (L1) English reading comprehension strategy usage and reading comprehension ability. A survey instrument, the interactive processing strategy inventory (IPSI) was developed for the study, to examine students' use of a variety of reading comprehension strategies, including linguistic strategies (e.g. recognition of syntactic features and text structure markers, methods of approaching Latin word order that violates expected English language patterns), and global strategies (e.g. making inferences from the text, using background knowledge). Prior to the development of the IPSI, Latin educators lacked an explicit inventory of Latin reading strategies, which is not only useful as a data collection instrument for Latin pedagogical research studies, but is also beneficial as a reference for Latin students and teachers (National Capital Language Resource Center, 2004). For this reason, the focus of the presentation will be the Latin reading comprehension strategies on the IPSI, including a comparison of the strategy usage among high, middle, and low proficiency Latin readers.

Two research questions guided this study: (1) What reading strategies do high school Latin students report on the interactive processing strategy inventory (IPSI) for

English and Latin after reading an English text and a Latin text? (2) Are there any relationships between overall and specific reported reading strategy usage, English reading comprehension level (high, middle, low), and Latin reading comprehension level (high, middle, low)? The study's exploratory sequential mixed-methods design consisted of a qualitative phase followed by a quantitative phase. During the qualitative phase, twelve advanced high school students participated in a semistructured group interview about their Latin reading strategy usage. The data from the semistructured interviews were used to develop a survey instrument, the interactive processing strategy inventory (IPSI) for Latin. Afterwards, 143 advanced high school Latin students participated in the quantitative phase of the study, in which they completed four instruments: an English reading comprehension assessment, the interactive processing strategy inventory (IPSI) for English, a Latin reading comprehension assessment, and the interactive processing strategy inventory (IPSI) for Latin. Results showed significant differences between Latin and English strategy usage: (1) Latin students overall demonstrated a preference for linguistic rather than global strategies when reading Latin; (2) low Latin language proficiency shortcircuited L1 English strategy transfer; and (3) negative English syntactic transfer hindered Latin reading comprehension.

References

- Chamot, A. U. (1987). The learning strategies of ESL students. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 71-83). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Deagon, A. W. (2006). Cognitive style and learning strategies in Latin instruction. In J. Gruber-Miller (Ed.), *When dead tongues speak: Teaching beginning Greek and Latin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gruber-Miller, J. (1998). Toward Fluency and Accuracy: A Reading Approach to College Latin. In R. LaFleur (Ed.), *Latin for the 21st century: From concept to classroom*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman-Addison Wesley.
- Harrison, R. R. (2010). Exercises for developing prediction skills in reading Latin sentences. *Teaching Classical Languages*, Fall 2010. Retrieved from http://tcl.camws.org/sites/default/files/TCL_2.1_1-30_Harrison.pdf.
- McCaffrey, D. V. (2006). Reading Latin efficiently and the need for cognitive strategies. In J. Gruber-Miller (Ed.), *When dead tongues speak: Teaching beginning Greek and Latin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Morrell, K.S. (2006). Language acquisition and teaching Ancient Greek: Applying recent theories and technology. In J. Gruber-Miller (Ed.), *When dead tongues speak: Teaching beginning Greek and Latin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- National Capital Language Resource Center. (2004). Sailing the 5 Cs with language strategies: A resource guide for secondary foreign language educators. Washington, DC: Chamot, A.U., Meloni, C., Bartoshesky, A., & Keatley, C.
- Rea, J. (2006). Pre-reading strategies in action: A teacher's guide to a modern foreign language teaching technique. CPL Online, 3.1, 1-7. Retrieved December 1, 2008 from <https://camws.org/cpl/cplonline/files/Reacplonline.pdf>.
- Van Houdt, T. (2008). The strategic reading of Latin (and Greek) texts: a research-based approach. In B. Lister (Ed.), *Meeting the challenge; international perspectives on the teaching of Latin* (pp. 54-70). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

L2 Sentence Processing by Advanced German Learners of Latin: A Reaction Time Study on Argument Interpretation

Delaram Bextermöller & Anna Fiona Weiß

University of Marburg

The processing of L2 sentences is at the core of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research, but it has not been until very recently that the question as to how learners of classical languages read a sentence has been addressed by Latin linguists. However, a review of Latin teaching methodology in light of empirically driven data could enhance the learners' ability to read and understand Latin sentences. Following the Competition Model (MacWhinney et al. 1984), L2 sentence processing is said to rely on cues the learners already know from their L1. The present study thus serves as a first attempt to examine whether this also holds true for learners of Latin by using a methodology that is well established in SLA research. We conduct a reaction time experiment with a 2x2x3 design in which we manipulate argument structure, animacy and verb position. Advanced German learners of Latin have to decide on the plausibility of sentences with local subject-object ambiguity. Since both arguments are morphologically ambiguous, the role of subject and object is only determined by the number of the verb. Also, by using subject and object experiencer verbs, participants have to draw on lexical-semantic information in deciding upon the sentence's plausibility. It is therefore the aim of this study to investigate (1) to what extent German learners of Latin rely on case marking, (2) how they integrate lexical-semantic information and (3) whether they process sentences incrementally. In accordance to previous findings, the participants are likely to show a subject-first preference being an influence of their L1 (Bader et al. 2000). Due to the high cue validity of case marking in Latin, verb-initial sentences are expected to be processed faster – especially when coinciding with subject-first order – as the sentence is disambiguated by the number of the verb. This strong reliance on case marking might also lead to accepting implausible sentences where subject-verb agreement would override animacy cues.

References

- Bader, M., Meng, M., Bayer, J. and Jens-Max Hopf (2000) 'Syntaktische Funktions-Ambiguitäten im Deutschen: Ein Überblick.' *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 19.1, 34-102.
- MacWhinney, B., Bates, E. and Reinhold Kliegl (1984) 'Cue validity and sentence interpretation in English, German, and Italian.' *Journal of verbal learning and verbal behavior* 23.2, 127-150.

Rethinking the Teaching of Latin in the Inclusive School

Anna Cardinaletti, Giuliana Giusti

Università Ca'Foscari Venezia

Rossella Iovino

Università degli Studi di Roma Tre

In recent years, many works dedicated to the teaching of Latin have been published in different countries. Much literature focuses on the situation of the teaching of Latin in English-speaking countries, with an emphasis on different issues such as (among many others) the students' motivation to study Latin and the discussion on the advantages and disadvantages of different possible didactic approaches (cf. a.o. Morwood 2003, Lister 2008, Hunt 2016). Some works dedicated to the teaching of Latin have also appeared in Continental Europe (cf. Balbo 2007, Baños Baños 2009, Oniga / Iovino / Giusti 2011, Cardinaletti / Giusti / Iovino 2016, Giusti / Iovino 2014, in press, Iovino / Bellin in press). In this area, the teaching of Latin is mandatory in some high-school programs; furthermore, it goes beyond the mere linguistic and literary education, also concerning the students' awareness of their cultural roots (cf. for the Italian case www.indicazioninazionali.it).

This contribution is part of a research line that aims at renewing the teaching of Latin applying the advances of the contemporary comparative linguistic research (cf. Cardinaletti 2006, 2007-2009, 2008) to the production and experimentation of materials for the teaching of (classical) languages. In addition, it addresses a particular aspect to which the Italian school is currently more and more sensitive, namely the inclusion of students with dyslexia (Law 170/2010). Such an approach is aimed at promoting the linguistic reflection starting from a Latin text and the understanding of the linguistic phenomena facilitated by the animated visualization of them with the aid of ICT (Information and Communication Technologies). The desired result is the improvement of retention and recall of Latin structures also by minimizing the mnemonic effort with positive effect on the so-called lifelong-learning (according to European suggestions).

More in detail, this communication aims at illustrating the outcomes of a research project funded by the "Fondo Sociale Europeo nel Veneto" entitled "Didattica del latino per l'inclusione dei soggetti con DSA" that led to the publication of a book which represents a starting point for later expansions and discussions and offers an example of an inductive teaching method at the beginner and intermediate levels (Cardinaletti / Giusti / Iovino 2016). Such method aims to encourage students to formulate expectations on the contents of the Latin texts they read, by brainstorming activities, spotting keywords, and proposing collaborative hypotheses to the peer group. Furthermore, it proposes an inductive approach to the morphological analysis of the texts. Finally, it is very important to recognise the positive role of the cross-linguistic comparative approach to the texts, mostly (but not only) based on the reflection on the thematic structure of the verbs which is universal and only varies in its syntactic realization; on the recognition of phrases; on the graphic representation (first guided, then independent) of the syntactic structure of phrases and sentences.

References

- Balbo, A. (2007), *Insegnare latino. Sentieri di ricerca per una didattica ragionevole*. Torino UTET Università.
- Baños Baños, J.M. (2009), "Cómo analizar un texto en latín: consideraciones sobre la didáctica de la Gramática Latina", *RE(F)Class* 1.1: 50-68.
- Cardinaletti A. (2006) *Una proposta per l'insegnamento linguistico del latino e del greco antico: alcune considerazioni generali*, in U. Cardinale (ed.) *Essere e divenire del "Classico"*, Torino, UTET, 330-347.
- Cardinaletti A. (2007-2009) *L'approccio comparativo in linguistica e in didattica*, Quaderni Patavini di Linguistica, 2: 3-18.
- Cardinaletti A. (2008) *Le ragioni del comparare per insegnare le lingue*, in U. Cardinale (ed.) *Nuove chiavi per insegnare il classico*, Novara, UTET Università, 267-289.
- Cardinaletti A. / Giusti G. / Iovino R. (2016) *Il latino per studenti con DSA. Nuovi strumenti didattici per la scuola inclusiva*, Venezia, Cafoscarina.
- Giusti G. / Iovino R. (2014), "La didattica dei verbi in prospettiva comparativa: il caso dei verbi ditransitivi", talk presented at *Giornate di Linguistica e Didattica*, Padova 25-26 febbraio 2014.
- Giusti G. / Iovino R. (in press) "La didattica comparativa dei verbi psicologici all'interfaccia semantica/morfo-sintassi". In Corrà Loredana, (a cura di), *Sviluppo della competenza lessicale Acquisizione, apprendimento, insegnamento (atti del workshop di Salerno, settembre 2013)*, Roma, Aracne.
- Hunt, S. (2016) *Starting to teach Latin*. London, Bloomsbury.
- Iovino, R. / Bellin P. (in press). "Ripensare la didattica del latino nella scuola dell'inclusività: una proposta didattica". Atti del III Congresso della Società Italiana di Didattica delle Lingue e Linguistica Educativa (DILLE) *Lingua al plurale: la formazione degli insegnanti*, 8-10 ottobre 2015, Università della Calabria.
- Lister, B. (2008) *International Perspectives on the Teaching of Latin*. Cambridge, CUP.
- Morwood, J. (2003) *The teaching of Classics*. Cambridge, CUP.
- Oniga, R. / Iovino, R. / Giusti, G. 2011. *Formal Linguistics and the Teaching of Latin. Theoretical and Applied Perspective in Comparative Grammar*, Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholar Publishing.

Latin Curricula, Attitudes and Achievement: An Empirical Investigation

Dragana Dimitrijevic
University of Belgrade

It is generally accepted that there are positive correlations between foreign-language achievement and individual difference measures (attitudes and motivation, language anxiety, self-confidence etc.). However, there is still a lack of research on the relationship between foreign-language achievement and other parts of the teaching/learning process, such as curriculum. This study addresses the question whether a difference in Latin curriculum results in differences in students' attitudes and Latin achievement.

The study was based on a sample of 146 first grade students, aged from 14 to 15, of both sexes (males 58 & females 88), enrolled in the different school programs at a

gymnasium in Nish (Serbia). Four groups of Latin learners were selected for comparison: one group was defined as Foreign languages (F), the second Social studies (S), the third Mathematics (M), and the fourth Bilingual (B), concerning the differences in their school programs. The students were given a questionnaire which consists of three parts – the first records participants' marks (average mark and marks in Serbian, English and Latin), the second tests the sample with a short combined Latin test (vocabulary, understanding and producing sentences), the third examines students' attitudes towards learning Latin. I collected the information about the scope and content of Latin curriculum for all four groups of learners. It turned out that the F group has a significantly different curriculum in comparison with three other groups. Only this group has a four-year obligatory Latin course and its Latin curriculum is much more relaxed, with much less grammar than the three others.

Finally, the employment of quantitative and qualitative analyses gave an answer about the relationship between Latin curriculum, students' attitudes and achievement. An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) procedure showed significant differences between the F group and all three other groups favoring the F group on all testing measures. To conclude, this study shows a strong correlation between Latin curriculum, attitudes and achievement.

Bibliography

- Florian, L. (2013) 'Übersetzen und Verstehen im Lateinunterricht. Eine empirische Untersuchung', *Pegasus-Onlinezeitschrift* XIII.1-2, 1-15.
- Gardner, R. C., Tremblay, P. F. and A.-M. Masgoret, (1997) 'Towards a Full Model of Second Language Learning: An Empirical Investigation', *The Modern Language Journal* 81.3, 344-362.
- Hoath, H. (2016) 'How Do Different Types of Goals and Feedback Affect Student Motivation in Latin?', *Journal of Classics Teaching* 16.32, 1-13.
- Keip, M. und T. Doepner (Hrsg.), (2014) *Interaktive Fachdidaktik Latein*. Göttingen.
- Liebermann, B. (2014) 'Grammatik und Sprachkompetenz. Zur Relevanz der lateinischen Grammatik Christian Touratiers für den Lateinunterricht an Schulen', *Pegasus-Onlinezeitschrift* XIV.1, 151-166.
- Snow, R. E. and D. N. Jackson, (1997) *Individual Differences in Conation: Selected Constructs and Measures*. Los Angeles.
- Sparks, R. L., L. Ganschow, K. Fluharty and S. White, (1995-1996) 'An Exploratory Study on the Effects of Latin on the Native Language Skills and Foreign Language Aptitude of Students with and without Learning Disabilities', *The Classical Journal* 91.2, 165-184.

Reading Seeing and Understanding Latin

Kristien Hulstaert

Charlemagne University College, Antwerp

This paper will address

- the application of recent Latin linguistic research and linguistic digital tools in the teaching of Latin, more specifically word order and text structuring devices;
- empirical research on the teaching and acquisition of Latin.

Reading Latin. Easy as it sounds, Latin teachers, whether in high schools or at universities, know it is not. Students are able to *read* – in modern languages – and they know *Latin* – we teach them. Yet they are unable to combine both into *reading Latin* as a process of direct communication – without translating – by which the Latin words are converted into images in the mind.

Among the range of recent research on Latin word order, the challenging approach of professor Wim Verbaal (Ghent University) may be the most useful to tackle this problem. Verbaal detected a fixed pattern of semantical ‘positions’ that lies underneath every Latin expression.

An Applied Research Project was set up to find an answer to the following research question:

How can linguistic knowledge of Latin word order contribute to the development of a reading method in which the very patterns of Latin word order form the basis of a systematic way of reading?

The theoretical basis of the reading method is twofold. The first is knowledge of word order (Bauer, Devine & Stephens, Spevak) and the ‘positional pattern’ (Verbaal). The second is the ancient practice of colometry: writing out a sentence *per cola et commata* (Habinek, Hoyos, Johnson).

The research approach was that of educational design research. To get a clear view on all aspects of the problem and to select the criteria for design, a needs and context analysis was conducted by means of interviews with teachers and focus groups with pupils. For the next one and a half year the method was developed by iterative phases of testing, evaluating and refining. This took place in 10 different classes from 1st to 6th year of secondary school.

Based upon knowledge of word order and colometry and designed according to the criteria emerging from the context analysis, a reading method was developed focusing on the way the story is directed by the Roman author. The essence of the method can be summarized thus:

- the text (beforehand) is arranged in *cola*
- the text is read *colon* after *colon* (mostly by means of a ppt-presentation)
- each *colon* is (initially) discussed on 4 levels (morphology – position – content – expectation)
- there is no formal translation

A sentence becomes a scene and word order is extremely important in the correct description of that scene. Who do you see first? What is being zoomed into? Why has the author directed the scene thus? The visual support of the colometric arrangement helps to add to and adjust the image as the sentence is unfolding.

In the final evaluative discussions with both pupils and teachers almost all participants were highly positive about the reading method. Pupils proudly testified that they were able to understand the Latin *as they were reading* in all its fullness and complexity. They experienced the difference between reading, seeing and understanding a Latin text and reading a translation.

The reading method is described in the teacher’s manual *Latijn: lezen zien begrijpen. De positionele methode in de klas*. The actual didactic materials can be downloaded from www.kdg.be/latijn-lezen.

Bibliography

- Bauer, B. (1995). *The Emergence and Development of SVO Patterning in Latin and French*. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press.
- Devine, A.M. & Stephens, L.D. (2006). *Latin Word Order*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Distler, P. (2000). *Teach the Latin, I pray you*. Nashville: Wimbledon Publishing Company.
- Habinek, T.N. (1985). *The Colometry of Latin Prose*. Classical Studies Volume 25. Berkeley-Los Angeles-London: University of California Press.
- Hoyos, B.D. (1997). *Latin: How to Read it Fluently: A Practical Manual*. CANEPRESS.
- Hulstaert, K. (2016). *Latijn: lezen zien begrijpen. De positionele methode in de klas*. Gent: Skribis.
- Johnson, W.A. (2000). Towards a Sociology of Reading in Classical Antiquity. In *The American Journal of Philology*, 121, nr. 4, p. 593-627.
- Johnson, W.A. (2004). *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Plomp, T. & Nieveen N. (eds). *An introduction to Educational Design research*. Proceedings of the seminar conducted at the East China Normal University, Shanghai, November 23-26, 2007. Enschede: SLO.
- Spevak, O. (2010). *Constituent Order in Classical Latin Prose*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Van der Plaat, A. (2015). *Mythoi en Logoi: sprookjes en feiten aangaande het leesonderwijs Grieks*. In *Didactica Classica Gandensia*, nr. 51, p. 39-60.
- Verbaal, W. (2015). *Leren lezen als Romeinen: niet enkel een kwestie van syntaxis!* In *Didactica Classica Gandensia* nr. 51, p. 7-38.

Multiple Semantic Priming and Latin Sequential Collocations: when Text Linguistics and Language Learning meet Cognitive Psychology

Frédéric Lavigne

UMR 7032 « Bases, corpus et langage », CNRS – Université de Nice Sophia-Antipolis

Dominique Longrée

LASLA, Université de Liège / SeSLa, Université Saint-Louis Bruxelles

Sylvie Mellet

UMR 7032 « Bases, corpus et langage », CNRS – Université de Nice Sophia-Antipolis

This paper will describe an experiment made with Master Degree students in Classical Philology and points out the interest of its results to understand the way students memorize Latin sentence and text structure.

The experiment aimed to study the way word associations are coded in long term memory. According to the psychologists, word associations are related to a semantic processing, called semantic activation. This processing is described as developing in semantic networks formed of multiple associations between pairs of words (see, e.g. Brunel & Lavigne, 2009; Lavigne et al., 2011). However, the statistical analysis of

texts by linguists has pointed out the above chance occurrence, not only of pairs of words, but also of ordered and regular sequences of more than two words (repeated sequences; Salem, 1986; motifs; Longrée, Mellet & Luong, 2008; Mellet & Longrée, 2012; Longrée & Mellet, 2013), which function as integrated textual units. The minimal pattern not reducible to pairs of words corresponds to a triplet of co-occurrent words, such as for example ‘*Quibus rebus cognitis*’. Such pattern is described by three pair-associations (‘*quibus / rebus*’, ‘*quibus / cognitis*’ and ‘*rebus / cognitis*’) plus a higher-level representation of the triplet itself (‘*Quibus rebus cognitis*’) relying on the idiomatic principle (Sinclair, 1991). A consequence is that the processing of a pattern requires knowledge of the triplet *in addition to* knowledge of the pairs, whereas the processing of other triplets not in a pattern (e.g. ‘*omnis*’, ‘*ciuitas*’ and ‘*Heluetia*’) would involve solely pair associations (e.g. ‘*omnis / ciuitas*’, ‘*omnis / Heluetia*’ and ‘*ciuitas / Heluetia*’). The possibility for higher-level knowledge of triplet of words points to the question of their on-line processing and of their learning in cortical network models.

In order to investigate this question, 30 Master Degree students in ancient Latin language of the Universities of Liège and Brussels, who had extensively learned standard Latin texts, have been taking part in an experiment consisting in a lexical decision task. 20 practice trials were presented, followed by the experimental block of 144 trials. For each trial, after having seen a two words sequence on a computer screen, the students were asked to indicate, as quickly and as accurately as possible, if a third letters string appearing on a second screen was a Latin word: this string could be a true Latin word or a pseudo-word. True Latin words could be related or not to each preceding word in pairs, and could be related (cooccurrent) either in a rare triplet or in a frequent pattern to the preceding words. All response times have been measured. As the experimental material was constituted of triplets selected from the Classical Latin corpus of the LASLA (Laboratoire d’Analyse Statistique des Langues Anciennes, ULg), these response times could be compared to quantitative data on expected or unexpected lexico-grammatical collocations (rare or frequent triplets), in order to evaluate correlations between shorter response time and higher frequency of the triplets in the corpus.

We will here firstly describe the experiment as well as its results, secondly investigate the question of different cognitive status for “textual motifs” and phraseological units, and thirdly point out the interest of the experiment for Latin learning methods.

References

- Brunel, N., & Lavigne, F. (2009). Semantic Priming in a Cortical Network Model. *J Cogn Neurosci*, 21-12 (in press).
- Lavigne, F., Dumercy, L. & Darmon, N. (2011). Determinants of Multiple Semantic Priming: A Meta-Analysis and Spike Frequency Adaptive Model of a Cortical Network. *The Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, Vol. 23, No. 6: 1447–1474.
- Longrée, D., Luong, X. & Mellet, S. (2008). Les motifs : un outil pour la caractérisation topologique des textes. In *JADT 2008*, Actes des 9èmes Journées internationales d’Analyse statistique des Données Textuelles. Lyon: Presses de l’ENS, vol. 2, 733-744. [see Lexicometrica web-site: <http://lexicometrica.univ-paris3.fr/jadt/jadt2008/pdf/longree-luong-mellet.pdf>].
- Longrée, D., & Mellet, S. (2013). Le motif : une unité phraséologique englobante? Etendre le champ de la phraséologie de la langue au discours. *Langages*, 189: 65-79.

- Mellet, S., & Longrée, D. (2012). Légitimité d'une unité textométrique: le motif. *In JADT 2012*, 11èmes Journées internationales d'Analyse statistique des Données Textuelles, [see Lexicometrica web-site: <http://lexicometrica.univ-paris3.fr/jadt/jadt2012/tocJADT2012.htm>].
- Salem, A. (1986). Segments répétés et analyse statistique des données textuelles. *Histoire et mesure*, 1(2), 5-28.
- Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Staying the Distance: Transforming Open University Latin Pedagogy

Mair Lloyd & James Robson
The Open University, UK

The Open University has been at the forefront of research and practice in distance learning since its inception, and has the largest number of Latin students of any United Kingdom university (over 200 per year). It offers the opportunity for *ab initio* Latin study to UK and international students, and admission to the course requires no specific previous qualifications or experience. In past years, although many students have enrolled on the *ab initio* module, and many of those who completed the course attained high grades, a significant proportion of students have withdrawn from study or failed the module. In September 2015, the original grammar-translation based introductory Latin module was replaced with a completely new course that incorporated entirely new pedagogy and technology. This paper compares evidence from each of the two modules to answer the research question:

How successful was the Open University in improving Latin students' learning experience and success rates by transforming its ab initio Latin pedagogy?

The paper begins by explaining and demonstrating some of the innovations introduced in the new module, grounding them in theories drawn from the field of modern foreign languages (MFL). New pedagogical approaches and technology included:

- an increased emphasis on processing of spoken Latin, supported by audio-recordings of Latin passages alongside text versions, and vocabulary learning materials that promoted the direct association of Latin sound with images
- support for the pleasurable reading of continuous Latin passages, carefully graded in difficulty and presented via an online 'story explorer' that provides hyperlinked access to lexical and morphological information through a very clear and user-friendly interface
- integration of language learning with Latin literature and cultural content to enhance understanding of and engagement with Latin texts

Modern language theories drawn upon to inspire and justify these changes include the Simple View of reading (Hoover & Gough, 1990, pp. 127-128; Verhoeven & van Leeuwe, 2012, p. 1806), schema theory (Ellis, 1999, p. 1; Nuttall, 2005, pp. 4-7), and Krashen's input hypothesis (Krashen, 1991, pp. 13-31). The concept of integration of technology and pedagogy and issues of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation will also be touched upon briefly.

A mixed methods approach is used to answer the research question. This includes making quantitative comparisons of student retention and success rates and student satisfaction statistics collected for the old and new modules. To explore reasons behind changes in these figures, they are supplemented with student comments (gathered in surveys and interviews) that have been analysed thematically. Finally, an assessment of the success of the new module is presented along with lessons learned and plans for future research and enhancement.

Bibliography

- Ellis, R. (1999). *Learning a second language through interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hoover, W. A., & Gough, P. B. (1990). The Simple View of Reading. *Reading and Writing*, 2 (2), pp. 127-160.
- Krashen, S. D. (1991). The input hypothesis: An update. *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics: Language pedagogy: The state of the art*, pp. 409-431.
- Nuttall, C. (2005). *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language* (2nd ed.). London: Heinemann Educational.
- Verhoeven, L., & van Leeuwe, J. (2012). The Simple View of Second Language Reading throughout the Primary Grades. *Reading and Writing*, 25 (8), pp. 1805-1818.

How do Dutch Adolescents Translate Latin Into Coherent Dutch? A Journey into the Unknown

Suzanne Luger

University of Amsterdam

Translating Latin into Dutch is considered to be one of the cornerstones of Latin education in the Netherlands (Kroon and Sluiter, 2010). However, the cornerstone has become more of a stumbling block, given the poor quality of the target texts Dutch students produce. The equivalence of source text and target text is usually inadequate and the target text in itself is often incomprehensible and incoherent (Kroon & Sluiter, 2010; Luger, 2015). Nevertheless, some Dutch students do seem to be able to produce coherent target texts, and it might be interesting to investigate how exactly they manage to do so. It is to be expected that knowledge of Latin is an important factor to read and understand Latin. However, previous research shows that translating a source text into a coherent target text requires some other competences as well (Göpferich, 2008; Nord, 1997).

My contribution concerns a study of the translation process of 18 students¹ that generally produce coherent target texts. In this study a coherent target text is defined as a target text that is comprehensible to the reader without prior knowledge of the source text and that conveys the main message of the source text.

Method:

The participants performed two tasks on a computer that was connected to an eye-tracker (TOBII tx300). One task consisted of translating a short fable by Phaedrus into

¹ 15-18 years old and 3,5-5,5 years of Latin education

Dutch. The Latin source text was extensively annotated to stimulate focus on the 6 translation problems that were identified beforehand. These problems were intentionally left out of the annotations, in order to analyse how these problems were tackled by the participants. The other task consisted of rewriting a literal Dutch translation of another fable into a more coherent Dutch text. During the tasks, the participants could consult an online Latin-Dutch dictionary. Immediately after the completion of both tasks, the participants viewed the eye-tracking film and were invited to comment on their translating activities in a retrospective interview.

Data:

The reading behaviour was filmed and measured by the eye-tracker (TOBII tx300). The interview was audio- and video-recorded. Data from the interview were qualitatively coded using open coding via Nvivo. Solutions of the presented translation problems in the target texts were afterwards scored as successful or not successful for each participant.

Results:

The first results suggest that the importance of the knowledge of the target language (Dutch) is not to be underestimated.

Successful strategies that were applied by the participants of this project will form the basis of an intervention-study, that intends to teach less successful students how to produce more coherent target texts.

References

- Göpferich, S. (2008). *Translationsprozessforschung: Stand-Methoden-Perspektiven*. Tübingen: Narr
- Kroon, C.H.M., & I. Sluiter (2010) *Het geheim van de blauwe broer. Eindrapport van de Verkenningcommissie Klassieke Talen* [*The Secret of the Blue Brother. Final Report by the Classical Languages Exploratory Committee*]. Leiden/Enschede: SLO
- Luger, S. (2015) Latijn vertalen in de bovenbouw: een mission impossible? [*Translating Latin in Upper Secondary Education: a Mission Impossible?*]. *Lampas*, 48, 212-225.
- Nord, C. (1997) *Translating as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained*, Manchester.

List of Participants

Name	Surname	Affiliation	Email
Bela	Adamik	Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest	adamik.bela@btk.elte.hu
Suzanne	Adema	Universiteit van Amsterdam	S.M.Adema@uva.nl
Simon	Aerts	Universiteit Gent	simon.aerts@ugent.be
Tommi	Alho	Åbo Akademi University / University of Turku	talho@abo.fi
Olga	Álvarez Huerta	Universidad de Oviedo	davolga@uniovi.es
Maria Carmen	Arias Abellán	Universidad de Sevilla	carmenarias@us.es
Łukasz	Berger	Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznan / Universidad Autónoma de Madrid	lberger@amu.edu.pl
Wim	Berkelmans	University of Amsterdam	wim.berkelmans@uva.nl
Davide	Bertocci	University of Padua	davide.bertocci@unipd.it
Delaram	Bextermöller	Philipps-Universität Marburg	d.bextermoeller@hotmail.com
Bernard	Bortolussi	Univ. Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense	bortolus@u-paris10.fr
Rebecca	Boyd	George Washington University	rebeccaboyd323@gmail.com
Merlijn	Breunese	FSU Jena/KU Leuven University	merlijn.breunese@uni-jena.de
Marco	Budassi	University of Pavia	marcobudassi@hotmail.it
Concepción	Cabrillana	Universidad de Santiago de Compostela	concepcion.cabrillana@usc.es
Emilia	Calaresu	University of Modena and Reggio Emilia	emiliacalaresu@tiscali.it
Matilde	Conde Salazar	Universidad Complutense de Madrid	matilde.conde@cchs.csic.es
Cécile	Conduché	Fondation Thiers	cecile.conduche@univ-paris-diderot.fr
Leonardo	Costantini	University of Leeds	cllc@leeds.ac.uk
Francesca	Cotugno	University of Pisa	francesca.cotugno@for.unipi.it
Michal	Ctibor	Charles University, Prague	Ctibor.Michal@seznam.cz
Pierluigi	Cuzzolin	Università degli Studi di Bergamo	pierluigi.cuzzolin@unibg.it

Name	Surname	Affiliation	Email
Joseph	Dalbera	Université de Corse	jdalbera@univ-corse.fr
Lieven	Danckaert	Université de Lille 3/CNRS	Lieven.Danckaert@UGent.be
Irene	De Felice	University of Pisa	irene_def@yahoo.it
Jesús	de la Villa	Universidad Autónoma de Madrid	jesus.delavilla@uam.es
Wolfgang	De Melo	University of Oxford, UK	wolfgang.demelo@gmail.com
Šime	Demo	University of Zagreb	sdemo@hrstud.hr
Marina	Díaz Marcos	University of Salamanca	marina.diaz@usal.es
Eleanor	Dickey	University of Reading	E.Dickey@reading.ac.uk
Dragana	Dimitrijević	University of Belgrade	dragana_dim77@hotmail.com
Pedro	Duarte	Aix Marseille Univ.	pedro.duarte@univ-amu.fr
Vera	Dürschnabel	University of Bern	vera.duerrschnabel@hotmail.com
Margherita	Fantoli	Université de Liège	mfantoli@ulg.ac.be
Fabienne	Fatello	Université Blaise Pascal Clermont- Ferrand	fabienne.fatello@education.lu
Chiara	Fedriani	University of Genoa	chiara.fedriani@unibg.it
Rolando	Ferri	Università di Pisa	rolando.ferri@unipi.it
Panagiotis	Filos	University of Ioannina, Greece	panagiotis.filos@gmail.com
Manfred	Flieger	Thesaurus linguae Latinae	m.flieger@thesaurus.badw.de
Michèle	Fruyt	Université de Paris- Sorbonne	michele.fruyt@gmail.com
Giovanbat- tista	Galdi	University of Ghent	giovanbattista.galdi@ugent.be
Benjamín	García- Hernández	Universidad Au- tónoma de Madrid	benjamin.garciahernandez@uam.es
Romain	Garnier	Université de Limoges	garromain@gmail.com
Laurent	Gavoille	Université Bordeaux- Montaigne	laurentgavoille@wanadoo.fr
Simona	Georgescu	University of Bucharest	simona_rodina@yahoo.com
Theodor	Georgescu	University of Bucharest	theogeorgescu@yahoo.com
Chiara	Gianollo	Università de Bologna	chiara.gianollo@unibo.it
Anna	Ginestí Rosell	KU Eichstätt- Ingolstadt	anna.ginesti@ku.de

Name	Surname	Affiliation	Email
Francesco	Giura	Università di Pisa	francesco.giura@for.unipi.it
Alexandra	Grigorieva	Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies	alexandra.grigorieva@helsinki.fi
Caterina	Guarda- magna	University of Liverpool	C.Guardamagna@liverpool.ac.uk
Hilla	Halla-Aho	University of Helsinki	hilla.halla-aho@helsinki.fi
Gerd	Haverling	University of Uppsala	gerd.haverling@lingfil.uu.se
Friedrich	Heberlein	KU Eichstätt- Ingolstadt	sla019@ku.de
Michael	Hillen	Thesaurus linguae Latinae	M.HILLEN@thesaurus.badw.de
Satoko	Hisatsugi	Friechrich-Schiller- Universität Jena	satoko.hisatsugi@uni-jena.de
Roland	Hoffmann	Mainz	rohoffi@web.de
Stefan	Höfler	Universität Wien	hoefles6@univie.ac.at
Sophie- Christin	Holland	Humboldt-Universität Berlin	sophie.holland@outlook.de
Nigel	Holmes	Thesaurus linguae Latinae	nigel.holmes@thesaurus.badw.de
Kristien	Hulstaert	Charlemagne Univer- sity College, Antwerp	Kristien.Hulstaert@KdG.be
Rosella	Iovino	University of Rome Tre /University Ca'Foscari Venice	rossella.iovino@unive.it
Federica	Iurescia	Universität Zürich	federica.iurescia@sglp.uzh.ch
Marie-Do- minique	Joffre	Université de Poitiers	madojoffre@orange.fr
Andreas	Keränen	University of Gothenburg	andreas.keranen@sprak.gu.se
Sándor	Kiss	Université de Debrecen	kiss.sandor@arts.unideb.hu
Timo	Korkiakangas	University of Oslo	timo.korkiakangas@ifikk.uio.no
Caroline	Kroon	Universiteit van Amsterdam	c.h.m.kroon@uva.nl
Herbert	Lange	University of Gothenburg	herbert.lange@cse.gu.se
Éloïse	Lemay	University of Califor- nia, Los Angeles	eloise@ucla.edu
Ville	Leppänen	Ludwig-Maximilians- Universität München	ville.leppaenen@campus.lmu.de
Bianca	Liebermann	Humboldt-Universität Berlin	bianca.liebermann@staff.hu-berlin.de

Name	Surname	Affiliation	Email
Eleonara	Litta Modignani Picozzi	Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore	EleonoraMaria.Litta@unicatt.it
Mair Elizabeth	Lloyd	Open University, UK	mair.houlker@gmail.com
Felicia	Logozzo	Università per stranieri di Siena	logozzo@lettere.uniroma2.it
Dominique	Longrée	Université de Liège et Université Saint-Louis Bruxelles	dominique.longree@ulg.ac.be
Suzanne	Luger	Universiteit van Amsterdam	s.luger@uva.nl
Elisabetta	Magni	Università di Bologna	elisabetta.magni@unibo.it
Aleksi	Mäkilähde	University of Turku	ahpmak@utu.fi
Robert	Maltby	University of Leeds	R.Maltby@leeds.ac.uk
Adriana	Manfredini	Universidad de Buenos Aires	adrianammanfredini@gmail.com
Tommaso	Mari	Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg	tommaso.mari88@gmail.com
Emanuela	Marini	Liceo Scientifico Statale N. Rodolico-Firenze	emanuela.marini@hotmail.com
Giovanna	Marotta	University of Pisa	giovanna.marotta@unipi.it
Cristina	Martín Puente	Universidad Complutense de Madrid	cmartin@filol.ucm.es
Antonio María	Martín-Rodríguez	Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria	antonio.martin@ulpgc.es
Jaume	Mateu-Fontanals	Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona	Jaume.Mateu@uab.cat
Michael	Mazzola	Northern Illinois University	mlm115@hotmail.com
Francesca	Mencacci	Università degli Studi di Siena	mencacci@unisi.it
Erica	Meszaros	University of Chicago	elmeszaros@uchicago.edu
Egle	Mocciaro	Università di Palermo /University of Texas at San Antonio	egle.mocciaro@gmail.com
Piera	Molinelli	University of Bergamo	piera.molinelli@unibg.it
Laurent	Moonens	EHESS / Université de Toulouse 2	moonens.laurent@gmail.com
Roman	Müller	Universität Heidelberg	Roman.Mueller@uni-heidelberg.de
Maria	Napoli	Università del	maria.napoli@uniupo.it

Name	Surname	Affiliation	Email
		Piemonte Orientale	
Kanehiro	Nishimura	Kobe City University for Foreign Studies	kanehiro.nishimura@gmail.com
Anna	Novokhatko	Universität Freiburg	anna.novokhatko@altphil.uni-freiburg.de
Krzysztof	Nowak	Polish Academy of Sciences	krzysztof.nowak@ijp-pan.krakow.pl
Andrea	Nuti	Università di Pisa	andrea.nuti@unipi.it
Andreas	Opfermann	Ludwig-Maximilians- Universität München	andreas.opfermann@gmx.de
Anna	Orlandini	Università di Bologna	orlandinianna@libero.it
Sebastian	Ortner	Ludwig-Maximilians- Universität München	sebastian.ortner@uni-tuebingen.de
Marijke	Ottink	Thesaurus linguae Latinae	marijke.ottink@thesaurus.badw.de
Oswald	Panagl	Universität Salzburg	oswald.panagl@sbg.ac.at
Alessandro	Papini	La Sapienza Università di Roma	ale.papini1@gmail.com
Angela	Parkes	University of Birmingham	angelamparkes@yahoo.co.uk
Marco	Passarotti	Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore	marco.passarotti@unicatt.it
Silvia	Pieroni	Università per stranieri di Siena	silvia.pieroni@unistrasi.it
Harm	Pinkster	Universiteit van Amsterdam	h.pinkster@uva.nl
Francesco	Pinzin	Università Ca' Foscari di Venezia	pinzinfrancesco@gmail.com
Paolo	Poccetti	Università di Roma 2 'Tor Vergata'	paolopoccetti@tiscali.it
Jesús	Polo	Universidad San Damaso	jesuspoloarrondo@gmail.com
Anna	Pompei	Roma Tre University	pompei@uniroma3.it
Lucie	Pultrová	Charles University Prague	Lucie.Pultrova@ff.cuni.cz
Danica	Pušić	John Cabot Univer- sity, Rome / Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa	dpusic@johncabot.edu
Amedeo A.	Raschieri	University of Milan	amedeo.raschieri@gmail.com
Elisabeth	Reichle	Universität Tübingen	elisabeth.reichle@uni-tuebingen.de
Antonio	Revuelta	Universidad Au- tónoma de Madrid	antonio.revuelta@uam.es
Luca	Rigobianco	Università Ca' Foscari di Venezia	luca.rigobianco@gmail.com

Name	Surname	Affiliation	Email
Rodie	Risselada	Universiteit van Amsterdam	R.Risselada@uva.nl
James	Robson	Open University, UK	james.robson@open.ac.uk
Stefano	Rocchi	Thesaurus linguae Latinae /LMU München	stefanorocchi@yahoo.com
Bruno	Rochette	Université de Liège	bruno.rochette@ulg.ac.be
Sophie	Roesch	Université François Rabelais, Tours	soph.roesch@gmail.com
Hannah	Rosén	Hebrew University, Jerusalem	hanrosen@mail.huji.ac.il
Nadia	Rosso	Università del Piemonte Orientale	nadia.rosso.uni@gmail.com
Josine	Schrickx	Thesaurus linguae Latinae	j.schrickx@thesaurus.badw.de
Annemarie	Schunke	Humboldt-Universität Berlin	schunke.annemarie@gmail.com
Maria	Selig	Universität Regensburg /BAW	Maria.Selig@sprachlit.uni-regensburg.de
Franciska	Skutta	Université de Debrecen	skutta.franciska@arts.unideb.hu
Elena	Spangenberg Yanes	Sapienza Università di Roma	e.spangenberg@virgilio.it
Olga	Spevak	Université de Toulouse 2 Jean Jaurès	spevak@univ-tlse2.fr
Beata	Spieralska	Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw	beata.spieralska@gmail.com
Pedro Manuel	Suárez-Martínez	Universidad de Oviedo	pmsuarez@uniovi.es
Lyliane	Sznajder	Université Paris Ouest Nanterre	sznajder@worldonline.fr
Lucia	Tamponi	Università di Pisa	lucia.tamponi@fileli.unipi.it
Nathalie	Tassotti	Wien	ntassotti@hotmail.com
Marcel	Thunert	Humboldt-Universität Berlin	mthunert@posteo.de
Esperanza	Torrego	Universidad Autónoma de Madrid	esperanza.torrego@uam.es
Hamida	Trabelsi	Laboratoire Intersignes	hamida_trabelsi@yahoo.fr
Elena	Triantafillis	University of Padua	trianta@libero.it
Luis	Unceta Gómez	Universidad Autónoma de Madrid	luis.unceta@uam.es

Name	Surname	Affiliation	Email
Daniela	Urbanová	Masaryk University, Brno	urbanova@phil.muni.cz
Cecilia	Valentini	Università degli Studi di Firenze	cecilia.valentini@unifi.it
Lidewij	Van Gils	Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam	l.w.van.gils@vu.nl
Sophie	Van Laer	Université de Nantes	sophie.vanlaer@laposte.net
Jasper	Vangaeve	Université Lille 3 /Ghent University	jasper.vangaeve@univ-lille3.fr
Martina	Vaníková	Charles University in Prague	martina.vanikova@gmail.com
Wim	Verbaal	Universiteit Gent	Wim.Verbaal@Ugent.be
Barbara	Wehr	Johannes Gutenberg Universität Mainz	wehr@uni-mainz.de
Alfons	Weische	Universität Münster	eckert.guenter@freenet.de
Lothar	Willms	Uni Heidelberg	lothar.willms@skph.uni-heidelberg.de
Koen	Wylin	Universität Gent, Belgien	koen.wylin@ugent.be
Anna	Zago	Università di Pisa	annazago86@gmail.com
Elena	Zheltova	St.Petersburg State University	elena.zheltova@mail.ru

©Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften
Alfons-Goppelstr. 11
80539 München
Umschlagentwurf: Gabriele Sieber
Foto Umschlag: Stefan Obermeier
Satz: Josine Schrickx
Druck: Inprint GmbH Erlangen