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**PLENARY SESSIONS**

Pierluigi CUZZOLIN - Università di Bergamo

**Aspect of the expression of definiteness in Classical Latin**

Definiteness has been for a long time one of the most investigated topics in theoretical linguistics. Linguists, philosophers and logicians have tried to define it as clearly as possible in numerous contributions. The result is that the label of definiteness itself is to be considered a cluster of semantic (and possibly pragmatic) properties rather than a monolithic notion. There are different types of definitenes, and the one expressed by the definite article is probably the most spread type among the languages of the world, but is not the only one (on this point is useful Bauer 2009, although it does not encompass the breadth of the topic treated).

In this respect the book by Christopher Lyons (1999) still stands out as the most authoritative linguistic textbook. In that book, theory, typology and some diachronic aspects are thoroughly combined to deal with definiteness satisfactorily by providing a survey of most of the problems related to this issue.

However, there are still some aspects of definiteness that have not been adequately investigated, involving morphosyntactic domains that still need further research. After sketching an up-to-date survey on definiteness as a theoretical issue, the main aim of this paper is to deal with two problems:

1. To investigate the semantic relationship between the complement of manner and the corresponding adverb from the viewpoint of definiteness, i.e. (*cum*) *moderatione* vs *moderate*:
   1. Cic. 17, 37 *Ergo, hic, quisquis est qui* ***moderatione*** *et constantia quietus animo est sibique ipse placatus, ut nec tabescat molestiis nec frangatur timore nec sitienter quid expetens ardeat desiderio nec alacritate futili gestiens deliquescat, is est sapiens quem quaerimus …*
   2. Cic. *Verr*. II 3, 158 *non sensim atque* ***moderate*** *ad istius amicitiam adrepserat, sed brevi tempore totum hominem … possederat.*
2. To investigate to what extent definiteness can combine with impersonal verbs or sentences that are traditionally described as impersonal according to the traditional labels of “grammatical subject” and/or “logical subject”.

**References**
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Guglielmo INGLESE - Università di Torino

***Nisi paria non pugnant*: syntactic constructions of lexical reciprocal verbs in Latin**

The last decades have witnessed an increasing interest in the study of reciprocal constructions in Latin, partly in the wake of recent advances in the typological study of reciprocals across languages (see Nedjalkov et al. 2007, König & Gast 2008, Evans et al. 2011 among others).

While most of the research has focused on the morphosyntactic strategies that Latin employs for the encoding of reciprocity (e.g. polyptotic constructions with *alius/alter* ‘other’, the phrase *inter se*, prefixes such as *dis-* and *com*- and adverbs such as *mutuo* and *invicem*;see Fanelli 2009, Cuzzolin 2015, Revuelta 2015, 2017), less attention has been paid to lexical reciprocals. Lexical reciprocals can be broadly defined as verbs with inherently reciprocal meaning (Nedjalkov 2007: 14). These verbs fall within a few specific semantic classes, all connected with the notion of symmetry (Dimitriadis 2008). In Latin, lexical reciprocals may appear as either unmarked active verbs, e.g. *pugno* ‘fight’, or as deponents*,* e.g. *luctor* ‘fight’ (on the connection between reciprocals and the mediopassive voice see Kemmer 1993, Gianollo 2010). Several prefixed verbs also belong to this class, e.g. *disputo* ‘argue’ and *conversor* ‘discuss’.

An interesting albeit understudied property of lexical reciprocals is their possibility to occur in a variety of constructions with respect to the encoding of the reciprocants (see Nedjalkov 2007: 27-31 on *simple* vs. *discontinuous* constructions). Consider the verb *pugno* ‘fight’, which can occur with the two reciprocants encoded as a plural subject, as in (1), with one reciprocant encoded as subject and the other through a prepositional phrase with either *cum*, in (2), or *in*, in (3), or in an absolute construction with the second reciprocant omitted altogether, as in (4). This behavior of lexical reciprocals has already been noted for languages other than Latin, and scholars have argued that different factors may account for the choice of specific constructions in individual languages: the general discourse and information structure (Knjazev 2007: 120), the conceptualization of the event as more or less symmetric (Allan 2003: 52-53), the semantics of individual verbs (Dimitriadis 2008: 387-390), and individual verbs’ preferences (Inglese & Zanchi 2020).

In this talk, I offer an in-depth investigation of constructional alternations with lexical reciprocal verbs in Latin. I will take into account the three main semantic classes of lexical reciprocals (Knjazev 2007: 122): general relations of identity/difference (e.g. *congruo* ‘coincide’, *differo* ‘differ’), spatial relationship of proximity/remoteness (e.g. *congrego* ‘assemble’, *diffugio* ‘scatter’) and human relationship of rivalry/collaboration (e.g. *pugno* ‘fight’, *paciscor* ‘agree’). For each class, I will select a list of relevant verbs and extract a representative sample of their occurrences from the L.A.S.L.A databases of annotated Latin texts. The main goal is to describe the existing range of variation in the syntactic realization of lexical reciprocals and the frequency of different constructions in texts. In addition, I evaluate the extent to which existing general explanations for such constructional alternations also apply to the Latin data, in order to single out the specific factors that may account for the actual distribution of different constructions in Latin texts.

**Examples**

1. *duarum nobilissimarum bello gentium* ***exercitus*** *pari Marte* ***pugnabant***

‘The armies of the two nation most famed in war were fighting on even terms.’ (Curt. 6 7-8)

1. *et tu ne* ***pugna******cum******tali coniuge****, virgo*

‘And you maid, do not fight with such a partner’ (Catull. 62 v. 59)

1. *facile* ***in hostem******imparem*** *ex aequo* ***pugnabant***

‘They were fighting on even terms with an enemy who was no match for them.’ (Liv. 10 43)

1. *pro me* ***pugnabit*** *L. Philippus*

‘Lucius Philippus will fight for me.’ (Cic. *Quinct*. 22, 72)
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Antonio M. MARTÍN RODRÍGUEZ - Universidad de las Palmas de Gran Canaria

**Semántica y sintaxis de *dare.* consideraciones intralingüísticas e interlingüísticas**

Dar es un contenido verbal esencial en la mayoría de las lenguas, por su condición de lexema primario, no solo por su frecuencia, sino porque constituye la base de la vida social (Mauss 1985 [1923-24]; Caillé-Godbout 1992); su condición de archilexema del macrocampo de la transferencia, y su complejidad semántica, perceptible cuando comparamos sus estructuras sintácticas en las diversas lenguas o, en un análisis intralingüístico, por la diversificación de su invariante semántica en un *continuum* de materializaciones específicas, desde los usos plenos (*dar dinero a alguien*) hasta la debilitación de su contenido léxico para funcionar como soporte verbal de un nombre de acción (*dar un salto*), pasando por una serie de usos donde el sentido pleno se difumina según los términos no prototípicos seleccionados como sus actantes (primer actante desprovisto del rasgo /control/, *la oscuridad me da miedo*); segundo que designa realidades que, no teniéndose, solo pueden transferirse metafóricamente, *te daré un instructivo ejemplo*; o tercero que solo metafóricamente puede considerarse receptor o beneficiario, *darse a la bebida*).

La bibliografía sobre “dar” es extensa, pero destacan la monografía de orientación cognitivista de Newman (1996) y los volúmenes editados por Newman (1997) y Nolan, Rawoens y Diedrichsen (2015), sobre la causación, el permiso y la transferencia, con un enfoque funcional, cognitivo y construccional. En ellas tienen cabida numerosísimas lenguas de muy diferentes familias, pero no el latín, dada su orientación sincrónica.

En latín, los estudios recientes sobre Dar no son demasiado numerosos. Martín Rodríguez (1992: 71-308; 1999: 77-139) presenta un minucioso análisis estructural de la semántica y sintaxis de *dare* hasta la época de Augusto; Touratier (1994), combinando el método estructural y la teoría de la valencia, ofrece un fino análisis de *dare* y sus diferencias con otros verbos de su campo; Martín Rodríguez (1996; 2018) analiza sus empleos como soporte.

Nuestra finalidad es doble: actualizar el análisis semántico y sobre todo sintáctico de *dare* a la luz de los avances en este campo producidos en las tres últimas décadas, y colocarlo en una perspectiva interlingüística que permita paliar su ausencia en las monografías de referencia, mediante un *cross-linguistic approach*.
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Rodie RISSELADA - Universiteit van Amsterdam

**Asyndeton in discourse: pragmatic constraints, narrative mode, and discourse stylistic opportunities**

Traditionally, asyndeton, i.e. the juxtaposition of two units of equal rank without explicit connection, is analysed in terms of style and register, only. Thus, Kühner-Stegmann (II, 148) use terms such as *natürliches Asyndeton* and *rhetorisches Asyndeton*; asyndeton is often characterised in terms of ‘vividness’, ‘speed’, ‘energisch’, ‘lebendig, etc. ; and in historiography it is usually associated with stylistic features such as *brevitas* and ellipsis. If subcategorizations are made, they are usually based on the type of relation between the two units juxtaposed (additive, adversative, explicative, etc, cf. also Hofmann-Szantyr, 1965: 83-831).

A distinction is usually made between word group level, where asyndeton is contrasted with overt coordination and disjunction, and asyndeton in case of clauses, sentences and larger units of discourse, where it is contrasted with the use of sentence connectors and discourse markers. In my paper I will only deal with the second type, i.e. asyndeton of discourse units (single utterances and larger units). My aim is (i) to analyse asyndeton not as a purely stylistic choice, but in terms of pragmatic conditions and discourse related constraints, and (ii) to relate variation in the use of asyndeton to differences in narrative mode.

As regards (i):following e.g. Rosén (2002; 2009) and Pinkster (f.c.), I prefer to see asyndeton as an alternative for and partly collaborating with, partly ‘complementary’ to other connective devices. These latter devices not only involve sentence connectors (e.g. *nam*, *sed, et*, *autem*) and sequential expressions such as *(deinde, mox, postremo,* etc.), but also connection by means of anaphoric pronouns and adverbs, relative connection, ellipsis of (topical) constituents, etc, which all signal various forms of cohesion. Hence asyndeton can be seen as a complex and gradual phenomenon, depending on the absence *versus* presence and number of other connective devices and features, and its occurrence is, at least to some extent pragmatically constrained by them. A second type of pragmatic constraint derives from the hierarchical structure of narrative, where we find different types of units in various hierarchical relations, which may favour or disfavour the use of asyndeton.

*Ad* (ii): In addition to these and other discourse conditions and pragmatic constraints, there are, undeniably, stylistic factors involved. However, these stylistic factors do not merely concern the free choice of individual authors between equal alternatives (as style can be loosely paraphrased after Marouzeau 1935 and Leech & Short 20072), but also relate to narrative mode, as discussed by e.g. Allan 2007 in relation to Greek historiography, and Van Gils and Kroon for Latin (cf. already also Chausserie-Laprée; Pinkster 1998). In that respect, asyndeton has been associated with the use of historical present, brief sentences, visual details and lack of narratorial control. Both style and narrative mode will be taken into account as well in my detailed analysis of a corpus of historiographical narrative (Caesar; Sallust; Livy) and *narrationes* in Cicero’s speeches.
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Béla ADAMIK - Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest

**The dialectological situation of the Latin language in late imperial and early medieval Italy as evidenced in inscriptions: the phonological aspect**

This paper, based on one of the pioneering studies of József Herman (published in 2000) and using the capabilities and tools of the Computerized Historical Linguistic Database of Latin Inscriptions of the Imperial Age (http://lldb.elte.hu/), attempts to describe and analyse the linguistic and dialectological characteristics of Latin in late imperial and early medieval (4-7th century) Italy as evidenced in inscriptions.

Limited to the field of phonology, a consonantal and a vocalic phenomenon (the story of the word-final -*s* as well as the *e*-*i* and *o*-*u* mergers) is the subject of this paper which aims to find out whether the late Latin territorial distribution of these changes predicts or anticipates the characteristic territorial differences within the Italian dialects and between the Italian and Sardinian dialects?

The paper shows that the question posed can be answered in an essentially positive way and that the time of geographically determined occurrence (or non-occurrence) of both discussed phenomena can be given with relative certainty.

**References**
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Simon AERTS - Universiteit Gent

**The diachrony of Latin ingressivity: a ‘language ecology’ approach**

Although different views on ‘ingressivity’ exist (cf. Dahl 2006), the phenomenon is here taken as one potential *signifié* of grammatical ‘aspect’ (e.g. Haverling 2010, Aerts 2021): with certain ‘stative’ predicates (e.g. *taceo* ‘to be silent’), ‘ingressivity’ is defined as the functional potential of ‘perfective’ aspect, associated with the perfect tense, to profile the ‘entering into’ such a stateand therefore to markedly present it as an *event* (e.g. *tacuit* ‘he became silent’) rather than a *situation* (cf. Dik 1997, 221). Granted, such a distinction can also be expressed lexically, i.e. by prefixation (e.g. *conticuit* ‘he became silent’, where the choice for the perfect tense is unmarked); in Early and Classical Latin, this *conticuit* type of ingressivity is often described as default, while the *tacuit* type is said to occur in more poetic language (Haverling 2018, 241-243) as a nonproductive use of the perfect tense (Pinkster 2015, 446–50). However, later attestations suggest that the perfect tense had regained its ‘ingressivity’ function at some point in the development towards the Romance languages, where it can be observed (Haverling 2010, 479). Arguably, the gradual loss of lexical distinction between unprefixed and prefixed variants played some role there (Haverling 2018, 252-253), but the *tacuit* type also occurred with states for which there was no ingressive cognate of the *conticuit* type (e.g. *sileo, habeo*; cf. Haverling 2018, 262). In addition, from most of the examples Haverling cites elsewhere (2010; 2003), one could conclude that the influence of Greek must have been of some significance (Aerts 2021, 185).

In a larger project which also investigates the development of other form-function pairings in the Latin tense system, such language-external influences (i.e. from ‘outside’ the Latin language system) are considered together with language-internal influences as the ‘triggers’ that effected the changes that we can observe. This project aims to map the full extent of such triggers and reactions across dimensions of time, space and register. Evidence is gathered from a wide variety of texts extracted from online databases, including (but not limited to) *Opera Latina* at the L.A.S.L.A., the *PALAFRALAT-V2* database at the Portail BFM-TXM, and the *EDCS.*

Concerning ingressivity, I hypothesized that all tenses built on the *perfectum* stem have preserved the (residual) potential to express ingressivity after the merger of the PIE aorist and perfect stems (Aerts 2021, 185-186). In Early and Classical Latin, therefore, ingressivity is thought to occur especially with a relatively limited number of stative verbs that have no ingressive cognate of the *conticuit* type (e.g. *teneo* ‘to hold’, *haereo* ‘to stick’), and especially in high-register or poetic texts that would accommodate such archaisms. Under the influence of (biblical) Greek, ingressivity would then have regained its productivity. In sum, therefore, the current paper aims to complement previous studies such as Haverling’s with additional insights and to substantiate these claims with data gathered from a wide range of both literary and non-literary texts, from various regions and time periods.
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Olga ÁLVAREZ HUERTA - Universidad de Oviedo

**El acusativo adverbial en latín**

Se denomina acusativo adverbial a elementos que sólo parecen tener en común su morfología: el ser acusativos y aparecer en género neutro (Álvarez Huerta 2009). Desde el punto de vista de su origen morfológico pueden establecerse dos grupos: los de origen pronominal como *id* y los de origen adjetival, como *multum*. Algunos de los acusativos adverbiales pronominales han sido funcionalmente equiparados a los acusativos internos (Serbat 1996: 131), pues se documentan casos de alternancia entre una y otra construcción como muestran los textos de (1):

(1a) *Quom illo aduenio, solitudo ante ostium: iam* ***id*** *gaudeo* (“Cuando llego allí, soledad ante la puerta: ya estoy contento con eso”, Ter. *Andr.* 362)

(1b) *ut* ***suum gaudium*** *gauderemus* (“Para que gozáramos con su gozo”, Cic. *fam*. 8,2,1)

La función del acusativo de textos como (1b), y acaso también en (1a) está cercana a la argumental, como afirma Givón (1984: 105).

En cambio, el acusativo neutro adjetival de (2), como afirma Pinkster (2015: 335) no puede identificarse con el acusativo interno, pues el verbo ya tiene argumento. La función de este constituyente es la de adjunto (Cf. Pinkster 2015: 885-887):

(2) *Te* ***multum*** *amamus quod ea abs te diligenter paruoque curata sunt* (“te valoramos mucho porque lo conseguiste todo rápidamente y con poco gasto”, Cic. *Att.* 1,3,2,6)

El pronombre interrogativo o indefinido también se encuentra en contextos en los que tiene función adverbial, como en (3)

(3) ***Ecquid*** *amas nunc me?* (“¿Me quieres ahora algo?”, Plaut, *Cas*. 456)

En este trabajo, inspirados por los interesantes resultados de estudios sobre este tipo de acusativos en lenguas como el húngaro (Csirmaz 2008) o el japonés (Chizuro 2009), partiremos de datos lo más exhaustivos posible sobre la distribución de estos acusativos: analizaremos los contextos en que aparecen, y en especial, el tipo de predicados con que se combinan -si designan eventos estáticos o dinámicos, durativos o puntuales, etc. Partiremos de la hipótesis de que todos esos acusativos tienen una misma función, algo que se ha probado para lenguas como el húngaro (Csirmaz 2008: 188), donde parecen tener una función semántica como delimitadores de eventos atélicos. Se estudiará también su comportamiento sintáctico, esto es, si han de considerarse argumentos o adjuntos.
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**PULCHER ...FALX, FALCŌ: autour d’une famille de mots latins d’origine libyco-berbère**

Selon le DELL (543), “sans étymologie”, “pulc(h)er, -c(h)ra, - c(h)rum (ancien polc(h)er d'après Priscien; cf. CIL i2 640, Polc[er]. Ap. Pulcri. “ (...) L’introduction de l'h a été favorisée par l'étymologie qui rapprochait pulc(h)er de gr. πολύχρους. L'hypothèse d'une origine ou d'une influence étrusque reste sans preuve. (…) Il a dû d'abord signifier “ fort, puissant” aussi bien que “ beau” à l'origine (cf. de même fortis avec le sens de beau et la formation de bellus)”. C'est dans les langages techniques ruraux et (secondairement) religieux que PULCHER peut trouver une motivation en diachronie. Citons le DELL: “dans la langue rustique il s'emploie pour désigner un animal « corpulent, plein d'embonpoint” (*Fest* 274, 28) et dans la langue religieuse se dit d'un animal sans défaut réservé pour le sacrifice ; cf. Comment. In Lud. Saec. 1, 106. De là “ beau” au sens physique et moral appliqué aux dieux, aux hommes, aux choses...”. D’après De Vaan (2008), PULCHER n’a pas d’étymologie (“No etymology”). Lat. PULCHER est à rapprocher du mot *afulki* attesté pour le berbère médiéval dans le *Kitāb al- asmā* d’Ibn Tūmart (1145 ap. J.- C.) comme “beauté” - et adapté à la classe d'adjectifs en -er de lat. ᾹCER (“aigu, pointu”) par analogie. Si la racine berbère FLKY (auquel nous rattachons *afulky*) ne semble attestée que dans les dialectes méridionaux (chleuh et touareg) - *fulki* « être beau, gentil » (Chl): *falkay* « être généreux » *teffelkeya* « beauté, générosité » *aneffelkey*, pl. i*neffelkay* « généreux » (Tw et Y) - elle est sans doute à reconnaître sous les formes FK, KF, HKF, pan-berbères, véhiculant le sens de « donner, offrir »: *ekf* « donner » int.: *ibekk* ; *abekki* « action de donner » *sekf*, *sekfut* « faire donner » *uc* « donne ! (impératif) » (ghadamsi), efk « donner, accorder, gratifier, promettre la main d’une fille… » ssefk « promettre, annoncer, p. ext. falloir, convenir » nnefk « être donné, promis » tikci, pl. tikciwin « don, présent » tufkin, plssg « action de donner, don » (kabyle) uc « donner » (chaoui) » etc. *afulky* appartient à la même famille de berb. (chleuh, kabyle, rifain etc.) *afalku* « faucon », passé en latin en tant que FALCŌ (que le DELL apparente à FALX). Le faucon est le symbole de la beauté masculine dans des nombreuses expressions consacrées, dont ce proverbe kabyle: *yiwas i tkeḥḥel tyazit, ibbwi-t ufalku* « le jour où la pauvre poule a maquillé ses yeux, elle a été attrapée par le faucon (l'oiseau de proie) ».
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**A new Latin magical text from Aquincum, Pannonia**

At the very end of 2019, during a rescue excavation in the cemetery of the civil town of Aquincum, Pannonia, a new curse tablet was found. In the preceding years, three other pieces were discovered there and examined thoroughly (Barta 2019). The investigations demonstrated that these tablets not only have added new evidences to the Latin of Pannonia, but they present characteristics which were previously not known or were documented only from later texts in various parts of the Latin speaking territories. As regards the requirements of magic, they are in conformity with the conventions. The creative world of magic and rituals, and the innovative characteristics of Vulgar Latin are well matched.

The present paper deals with the new tablet, the fourth one. Similarly to the previous ones, this tablet can be dated to the 3rd century AD. Based on the concordance of the finding contexts and the lay-out as well, we expected a text of nearly the same structure and features as of the three others. Although the general bad condition of the tablet preclude the possibility of obtaining a full reading, the topic and the main characteristics are still clear. The findings suggest it was made as a judicial binding curse in order to inhibit two men from speaking before the court. The spelling mistakes and the lexical innovations indicate the same community as the three other tablets were ordered and made by. By identifying Vulgar Latin features in the text it became possible to comprehend a *simile*. The formula clearly refers to a cruel crucifixion which procedure was never mentioned before in any epigraphic evidence in Pannonia.
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**L’expression de la sottise, du Latin au langues romanes. Question d’héritage**

Pour le linguiste qui passe en revue le vocabulaire latin de la sottise, celui-ci s’avère un inventaire d’expressions métaphoriques qui ne se retrouvent dans les langues romanes qu’en tant que néologismes. Basée sur notre ancienne étude présente dans la bibliographie ci-jointe, complété par les données fournies par Ana-Cristina Halichias dans son livre dédié aux qualités intellectuelles en latin, nous avons dressé, autant que possible, l’inventaire des termes latins de la sottise et nous avons démontré que tout cet inventaire est un champ lexical strictement structuré en sous-champs précis. Car ses éléments constitutifs peuvent être groupés dans un nombre limité de catégories, en fonction de certaines caractéristiques bien évidentes (par exemple *lourdeur*, *taille exagérée*, ou, en revanche, *légèreté*, *taille réduite*, *caractère obtus*, *entêtement* etc.). C’est la radiographie de ce champ lexical qui nous intéresse. Et, dans le sillage de celle-ci, son héritage roman, inventaire et/ou schémas de pensé.
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**A cognitive-pragmatic description of evaluative suffixes in Latin non-literary texts**

Although Latin evaluative suffixes have received considerable attention (e.g. Petersen 1916-17; Strodach 1933; Hakamies 1951; Hanssen 1952; Fruyt 1989; Haverling 2011), a morphological-pragmatic diachronic analysis of their uses is still peripheral. Based on this observation, we aim at analyzing the behavior of the Latin suffix –*llus*, as it occurs at different stages of the history of the Latin language, within a theoretical framework that combines Dressler/Merlini Barbaresi’s (1994) morpho-pragmatic model and the cognitive perspective on the pragmatic polyfunctionality of diminutive suffixes (Jurafsky 1996; Prieto 2005).

The suffix -*llus* forms nouns (*asellus* vs. *asinus*) and adjectives (*misellus* vs. *miser*), never modifying the lexical category of the base and, therefore, never acting as a morphological head. This confirms what Scalise’s (1984) observed on the specificity of evaluative morphology compared to the general behavior of suffixes. As they do not convey any morphosyntactic information, evaluative suffixes are considered peripheral with respect to the core of both derivation and inflection (Grandi 2002).

At the semantic level, consistent with its etymology (Magni 1999, Haverling 2011 inter al.), -*llus* has a non-evaluative use expressing a relationship of similarity (*anguilla* vs. *anguis*) or belonging/contiguity (*armilla* vs. *armus*) between the derivative and the base. As an evaluative suffix, it is used with a proper diminutive function adding to the base the semantic component [small] (or [young] and [unimportant], see Merlini Barbaresi 2015).

In many cases, however, -*llus* (as the etymologically related -(*c*)*ulus*) refers to the complex system of relations between the speaker, the listener and the communicative situation, has scope on the entire speech-act and is used to express an articulated range of meanings related to the speech act and, hence, to the pragmatic modulation of the speaker/listener’s interaction (see Hofmann 1951; Szymanek 1988).

This is consistent with Dressler/Merlini Barbaresi (1994), according to whom evaluative morphology is primarily located in pragmatics and evaluative markers are typical instances of morpho-pragmatics, an area in which morphological rules interact directly with pragmatic conditions (cf. Grandi/Körtvélyessy 2015).

A preliminary survey carried out by Brucale and Mocciaro (2019) has highlighted the relevance of such an approach for the suffix -*llus* in Plautus’ corpus. In this contribution, the phenomenon will be investigated throughout the history of Latin, through surveys in different chronological phases (classical and postclassical Latin). The attention will be focused on non-literary texts (or, at least, with less prominent literary characteristics, such as letters, that is, texts not produced with explicit artistic aims), where we can more easily expect to find examples of “domestic language” and “language of emotions” (Ronconi 1940) and where, therefore, interactional meanings (attenuative, affective, illocutive) are often more salient than literal ones. The polysemic and pragmatically polyfunctional network of the evaluative suffix will be described as a radial structure, whose semantic core is the notion of 'related to', while other functions derive from metaphorical mapping and metonymical shifts. A semantic map will be proposed to represent the relationships among the various functions of the suffix-*llus.*
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**Expression of (non-)permanent qualities and coding of the Praedicativum in Latin**

Among the problems that affect the function of the Praedicativum (*P*), especially when it appears with stative verbs, is how to explain the combination of the expression of non-permanent qualities that is usually attributed to P and the co-occurrence of this with verbs that most commonly convey notions of (greater or lesser) permanence (Rapoport, 1993: 178; Shultze-Berndt & Himmelmann, 2004: 63; Cabrillana, 2019; Pinkster, 2021: 779, 787); on occasion —Pinkster (2021: 787)— it has been noted that some poets may show greater freedom here. This paper seeks to identify and quantify, using a corpus of prose texts, the density of occurrence of Subject (*S*)-oriented Praedicativa that express a quality of permanence, and, especially, to explore the conditions in which this density occurs. By applying a methodology which includes various analytical criteria, the study will reveal how the link that potentially exists between verbal semantics, the specific type of P, the encoding of the P itself (adjective, participle, or NP in agreement or not with the S), and the (extra-)linguistic context, is manifested. It will also be shown that the expression of permanent qualities is not restricted to P with meanings related to age or socio-economic position —semantic notions with almost inherently denote permanence— but can also occur when the P conveys other semantic notions, such as non-transitory physical states, or those of evaluative content.
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**Due nomi di mestiere di rara attestazione**

Il contributo ha come oggetto due nomi latini di mestiere, ovvero *perticarius* e *sarcitor*, attestati per via epigrafica, rispettivamente in *CIL* VI 9672 = 25081 (cfr. Barbera 1999) e *CIL* V 4509. Di *perticarius* *ThlL* 10,1, 1786, s. v. non registra alcun’altra occorrenza; più fortunata la situazione di *sarcitor*, giacché si rinviene in Prob. *app. gramm.* IV 202,29-30. Nuovi dati sono forniti da due lemmi presenti nella sez. 14, περὶ τεχνιτῶν, del glossario latino-greco dei cosiddetti *Hermeneumata Celtis* (*HC*), tramandato dal ms. Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek suppl. Gr. 43, ff. 18r-45v. Tale glossario, risalente all’età tardo-antica, è ancora in buona parte inedito (per un’introduzione all’argomento si vedano Ferri 2012, 753-757; Dickey 2015, 141-161; Ortoleva 2018, 229-230; Ortoleva et al. 2020). Le coppie che sono ivi attestate, assenti negli altri glossari del *CGL*, consentono di riconoscere l’esistenza di diversi possibili significati per *perticarius*, probabilmente perché la derivazione da *pertica* mediante l’aggiunta del suffisso *-arius* è avvenuta indipendentemente in ciascun caso; di *sarcitor*, invece, l’occorrenza di *HC gloss.* conferma il significato di ‘rammendatore’.
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**Frequency patterns and predictability in Latin inflectional morphology**

In the last two decades, the main thrust of research in morphological theory has shifted towards an interest in paradigmatic relations, and the construction of reliable and large electronic databases has made large-scale quantitative analysis more feasible. Of particular interest is the question of predictability, i.e. to what extent the form associated with a given paradigmatic cell can be calculated from the form associated with another paradigmatic cell. The present paper explores how these relations of predictability manifest themselves in Latin verbal morphology and how they relate to the frequency of individual forms as calculated from the Packard Humanities Institute database of Latin texts. The predictions we wish to look at in detail concern this relation: are more frequent paradigmatic forms stronger predictors, weaker predictors, or are the two properties unrelated? In addition, we explore how exactly the property of predictability relates to the specific forms of verbs that fill the individual paradigmatic cells. The general framework of the paper is based on ideas elaborated in Ackermann & Malouf (2016), Anderson (1992), Blevins (2006) and (2015), Blevins, Ackermann & Malouf (2016), Stump & Finkel (2013), Montermini & Bonami (2013); the analysis of Latin specifically draws to varying degrees on Matthews (1974) and Cser (2015), in its quantitative aspects on work by Matteo Pellegrini (Pellegrini & Passarotti 2018).
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**Repetition as a Means of Coordination**

In this paper, I want to draw attention to an important function of repetition in classical Latin texts. I argue that word repetition is – besides syndeton (employment of conjunction) and asyndeton (zero coordinator, ellipsis of conjunction[[2]](#footnote-2)) – a third means of syntactic coordination. There are some examples of this very frequent phenomenon (1) and (2):

(1) *Qui non est vir bonus,* potest *nihilominus medicus esse, potest gubernator, potest grammaticus.* (Sen. *fin.* 1,39)

(2) *Si* non *virtute, non industria, non innocentia, non pudore, non pudicitia,* at *sermone, at litteris, at humanitate eius delectamini.* (Cic. *Verr*. 2,3,8)

In example (1),there are three coordinated professions (*medicus*, *gubernator*, *grammaticus*), or maybe rather three situations (*esse medicus*, *esse gubernator*, *esse grammaticus*), which could have been coordinated by coordinators like *aut* (syndeton) orwithout any coordinator (asyndeton); but instead of that, Seneca, I argue, preferred to coordinate them by the repetition of *potest*. Example (2), especially the second sequence with *at*s is even more interesting, for the repetition of *at* prevents restoring of a hypothetically omitted conjunction (\**at sermone et at litteris et at humanitate eius*). Therefore, when the speaker/writer wants to coordinate two or more elements (X, Y) which are in contrast with some other element (Z), (s)he has three distinct possibilities of how to do so:

syndeton: X, *at* Y *et* Z

asyndeton: X, *at* Y, Z

repetition: X, *at* Y *at* Z

This is why I claim that word repetition is a third means of coordination: although syndeton and asyndeton seem to be complementary (what is not syndeton, seemingly, should *eo ipso* be asyndeton), instances with *at*. Moreover, if this phenomenon was just a matter of style with no grammaticalization behind it, it should be imitable in practically any language (which is not the case).

In my paper, therefore, I will in the first place present a new (above mentioned) concept of repetition as a means of coordination and I will support it with arguments (syntactic and others); I will also try to find as many clear instances as possible (since the cases with *at*s – especially if they are not frequent enough – could be theoretically dismissed as miscopied *et*s); there seems to be a lot of unquestionable instances with *ut*, and especially with *sed*. Then I will present statistics on the frequency of coordination through repetition. I will excerpt all instances of this word repetition in selected texts of Cicero (speeches, philosophical and rhetorical treatises and dialogues) and Seneca (*Epistles*, *Dialogues*), who seem to use it very frequently. I will try to show which words can be coordinated (it seems that almost any) to produce coordination; moreover, I will show the poets (Lucretius, Virgil, Ovid) employ repetition wherever coordinative conjunctions are metrically impossible.
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**L’introduction du Discours Direct dans la narration romanesque latine**

Si le roman latin n’a inventé ni la représentation du discours ni même le dialogue, il semble que l’intégration massive de la parole directement rapportée dans le fil narratif constitue néanmoins l’une des spécificités de ce genre littéraire. Un enjeu de taille, véritablement, compte tenu de la grande fréquence des emplois du Discours Direct (DD) dans le roman: avec 350 occurrences dans les *Métamorphoses* d’Apulée (soit 76,25% des discours rapportés) et 220 dans le *Satyricon* de Pétrone(78,86 %), la fréquence de ce mode de discours rapporté dans le cadre narratif est jusque-là inouïe.

L’insertion du DD et de l’oralité qu’il insère dans le récit sous des formes diverses innerve en effet le genre romanesque et constitue de fait une véritable gageure linguistique dans une langue écrite marquée par la *scriptio continua* et qui ne connait aucune des marques typographiques modernes.

Cette étude se propose de faire le point sur les modalités d’emploi du DD dans les deux romans latins. Il s’agira de mettre en évidence les différentes stratégies de son introduction, telles qu’elles sont mises en œuvre par les romanciers, et de mettre ainsi en évidence l’ensemble des verbes introducteurs, marqueurs d’oralité, motifs syntaxiques et autres structures annonciatrices spécifiques qui permettent le marquage et l’identification de la parole directement rapportée.

On pourra ainsi comparer les usages des deux romanciers sur ce point, et confronter, le cas échéant, leur(s) technique(s) aux pratiques des autres genres narratifs.
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**The choice between argument alternations in Latin**

The existence of systematic alternations in the complementation of many Latin verbs was highlighted for Latin by Lemaire (1983) and studies such as that by Levin (1993) proved its importance also for other languages. Lemaire identified regular series of alternations and listed and classified the verbs that presented each type. As a consequence, she showed that it is a regular aspect of grammar, not just a matter of the individual lexical items. Subsequently, there have been more detailed studies on some of these alternations (e.g. Martín Rodríguez 1996, Torrego forthcoming) and some contributions to the recognition of new alternations (e.g. Villa 2015).

Some of those studies have sought to go beyond the simple description of the alternations. Some authors have tried to identify the reasons that lead to the choice of one particular construction over another with the same verb. The proposals are diverse: Lemaire (1983: 290) mentions semantic reasons in certain cases, in the sense that there were some referential differences in the use of some constructions compared to others. Bolkestein (1985a, 1985b) identified reasons of discourse cohesion, basically associated to pragmatic factors. Martín Rodríguez (1996) identified for the verb *donare* reasons of a stylistic and historical character. The result is that, in this moment, we do not know well the specific weight of each of these factors in the processes of choosing an alternating construction or another for most verbs or groups of verbs.

In this paper I intend to present the results of a study carried out on verbs with different types of alternations. I have taken as basis for the study a relatively varied corpus of authors in terms chronology and the literary genre -Plautus, Virgil, Ovid, Livy, Seneca, Tacitus-. I have tried to determine the relative importance of the diverse factors that can lead in a certain context to the choice of one construction over another. My conclusion is that, in agreement with Bolkestein’s proposals, apart from historical evolutions, synchronically, in most cases, pragmatic factors can explain the choice of one variant over another.
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**Qualche esempio di usi linguistici sommersi nei grammatici latini**

Numerosi studi linguistici, anche recenti, hanno cercato di verificare se la presenza nel latino tardo di forme attestate da autori arcaici come Plauto e Terenzio, scomparse poi nelle testimonianze letterarie di epoca classica e imperiale, sia spiegabile con la persistenza di tali forme nel latino *substandard*, riemerse poi in epoca tardoantica come una sorta di ‘fiume carsico linguistico’, dando però risposte diverse a questo problema. La questione è infatti molto dibattuta, in quanto vari studiosi, a partire da Adams 2013, che dedica al problema un capitolo del suo lavoro nel quale procede con grande cautela, invitando a non considerare come scontato il fatto che forme ‘sommerse’ debbano essere necessariamente considerate ‘volgari’. D’altro canto non esiste un contributo complessivo (come quello aveva progettato, senza mai poterlo realizzare, Aldo Prosdocimi) che raccolga e sistematizzi le varie testimonianze, suddividendole nelle categorie fondamentali dei fatti fonetici, lessicali, morfologici e sintattici.

In questo ambito non è stata ancora effettuata una vera e propria ricerca del contributo che può essere dato alla questione delle attestazioni dei grammatici latini tardi, in particolare di quei testi come l’*Ars de barbarisimis et metaplasmis* di Consenzio, l’*Appendix Probi*, i trattati ortografici tardi, che, nel tentativo di fermare un progressivo allontanamento degli usi linguistici comuni della loro epoca dalle norme linguistiche codificate, ci offrono una preziosa serie di esempi di forme *substandard* (cui vengono contrapposte le forme corrette), che possono essere messe a confronto con testimonianze, soprattutto lessicali, del latino arcaico, scomparse poi nella lingua letteraria dei secoli successivi.

Il contributo intende quindi esaminare alcuni casi più significativi di forme *substandard*, attestate e condannate da questi testi grammaticali più tardi, che possono essere messe a confronto con forme lessicali attestate soprattutto, ma non solo, nel latino del teatro arcaico di Plauto e Terenzio, per fornire un primo *specimen* preliminare a una più ampia e complessiva raccolta di questi casi.
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**Expressing ‘pink’ *(ros-)* from Ancient to Early Modern Latin. A corpus-based study**

A great deal of research has been devoted to naming colours in Ancient Latin (e.g. André 1949, Kristol 1980, Baran 1983, Eco 1985, Lyons 1999, Kay 1999, Oniga 2007, Bradley 2009). Sets of Basic Colour Terms (BCT) have been proposed and associations of colour terms with real-life objects outlined. The investigations of the later periods are scarcer and focussed on cultural implications rather than on linguistic questions. Furthermore, they hardly separate discussions of Latin from those of other languages.

While in the modern world hue is generally accepted to be the central quality of distinguishing between colours, in the Classical Antiquity brightness was more prominent (Gage 1993: 24-28). The Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period brought about some crucial changes. At a global level, scientific, cultural and technological developments caused the BCTs to align along the hue distinction. Furthermore, they emancipated from their attachment to concrete objects, increasingly referring to abstract colour notions (Bradley 2009: 222-223). Latin, on the other hand, lost all its native speakers and began to be used by people with various linguistic backgrounds, who had a variety of colour terms in their respective mother tongues at their disposal.

Our main research question will be: how were the terms for the hue space of 'pink' (lexically derived from *rosa*) used in a large time span from the beginning of the Latin literature through the Early Modern Period. We will explore how their use fits into the universalistic theoretical model of Belin and Kay (1969), which predicts gradual establishment of basic colour terms, with pink coming at the stage VII (the last one, together with purple, orange, and grey; see also Oniga 2007). Additionally, we will observe whether the corpus data support the opposing relativistic view, according to which the change of cultural context has a crucial role in the development of the BCTs (e.g. Eco 1985, Lyons 1999: 65).

Departing from the existing lexicographical descriptions of the researched terms, the analysis will be performed on a custom 35 million word corpus of Latin texts from all periods, both literary and technical, containing almost the entire Ancient Latin literature (11.5 million words), with the addition of medieval (9 million words) and early modern (14.5 million words) texts. A systematic corpus inquiry of lexical associations will help us avoid a trap of forcing Latin colour terms into our modern categories. Both neologisms and semantic shifts will be taken into account.

The study will reveal whether and when *roseus* (along with its derivatives) started to occupy a BCT slot in Latin or to be specialised for a certain part of abstract colour spectre, which objects it used to describe, how prominent was its use for an abstract notion of 'pink', how frequently it was used chromatically or figuratively, what emotional and symbolical meanings were linked to it, and how it was distributed across the text types.
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**Glossing as a Rhetorical Strategy: Seneca the Younger’s Use of Greek Loan-Words in his Philosophical Works**

In contrast to Cicero before him, Seneca the Younger’s philosophical project was largely one devoid of Latin neologism, jargon or technicalism (Inwood 2007, xvii). His *Epistulae Morales* (*Ep.*) demonstrate a remarkable exercise in rhetorical and literary design, using the foil of the ‘addressee’, Lucilius, as his ersatz-Anonymous Reader. This paper examines Seneca’s use of Greek in the *Ep.* and in the *Naturales Quaestiones* (*N.Q.*). The methodology relies upon direct glosses of Greek found in these works to aid in understanding how Seneca interpreted them in Latin and the techniques he uses in doing so. This methodology will include the comparison of two linguistic techniques: lexical innovation (neologisms, morphological calques) and lexical augmentation (semantic calques, metaphorical usages). The results indicate that Seneca’s glosses of Greek loan-words serve as important rhetorical tools, deployed for specific reasons. On the one hand, to perpetuate the topos of the *patrii sermonis egestas* which allows him the freedom to innovate new meanings onto pre-existing Latin words (lexical augmentation); on the other, it provides a method of engaging with the particular philosophical and scientific concepts under discussion in a more didactic way, for the benefit of his reader. The analysis also touches on some linguistic-philosophical problems in Seneca’s corpus by analysing the issue of term-conflation. I use *Ep.* 58 as a case study of the terms *essentia*, *quod est*, οὐσία and τὸ ὄν. Term-conflation is rampant in Seneca’s discussion of Platonic ontology here but I suggest it is very much deliberate – *contra* some earlier scholars who have seen such conflation as either inadvertent carelessness through Stoic-Platonic confusion or simply word games (Bougery 1922, 121; Inwood 2007, 114-15; Long 2017, 220; although cf. Boys-Stones 2013). The term-conflation comes about due to Seneca’s use of Greek philosophical jargon as rhetorical foils for his own arguments in the letter, which aim to undermine the necessity of studying these kinds of metaphysical subjects. The results also indicate that, although neology is largely avoided in the translation of Greek philosophical and scientific terminology in both the *Ep.* and *N.Q.*, Seneca’s unique style allows him to interpret these expressions more closely, even occasionally critiquing Greek terms as incomplete conceptualisations of certain natural phenomena. In Seneca’s elaborate glossing process, appeals to authority, lexical augmentation, and rhetorical stratagems all play key rôles, and the combined force of these techniques, in my opinion, produces a closer understanding of the concept under discussion.
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**Possessive Strukturen im Lateinischen der Vulgata und ihre hebräischen Parallelen**

Verben des Besitzens, des Vorhandenseins sowie des Mangels weisen sprachübergreifend relativ häufig eine nicht-kanonische Markierung auf (cf. Oinishi 2001). Nicht-kanonische Strukturen für den Besitz können im Urindogermanischen rekonstruiert werden und sind in allen alten urindogermanischen Sprachen belegt. Dabei wird das Besessene mithilfe des Nominativs markiert, während der menschliche Besitzer mithilfe eines obliquen Nominals ausgedrückt wird (cf. Viti 2014). Das Lateinische bedient sich dazu der sogenannten *mihi est aliquid* Struktur, bei welcher der Besitzer mithilfe des Dativs markiert wird. Während diese Struktur im frühen und klassischen Lateinischen relativ häufig ist, kann ein diachroner Verfall dieser Struktur konstatiert werden, welche dabei meist durch eine auf *habeo* basierenden transitiven Struktur ersetzt wird. Auch in den semitischen Sprachen wird häufig eine nicht-kanonische Struktur zum Ausdruck des Besitzes verwendet. Im Hebräischen wird dabei der Besitzer meist in einer Präpositionalphrase mit -ל le angeschlossen. Die Prädikation erfolgt entweder durch eine von der Wurzel היה hayah »sein« abgeleiteten Verbalform oder durch die existenziellen Partikel יש yeš »es gibt« oder אין ʾên »es gibt nicht«. Der vorliegende Beitrag untersucht nun, wie diese hebräischen Strukturen ins Lateinische der Vulgata übertragen werden und welche Prinzipien dabei zum Tragen kommen. Dabei wird sich zeigen, dass weder der Ansatz *verbum ex verbo* befolgt wird, welcher die Verwendung der *mihi est aliquid* Struktur nahelegen würde, noch eine willkürliche Wahl der possessiven Struktur stattfindet, sondern dass diese vielmehr auf bestimmten Kriterien beruht, welche dieser Beitrag aufzeigen wird.
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**Linking the LASLA corpus to the LiLa Knowledge Base of Interoperable Resources for Latin**

Despite the increase in the quantity and coverage of linguistic resources for Latin, most of these are locked in data silos, which prevent users from honing both their individual and joint potential in interoperable ways. While resources tend to focus on providing annotation at one or more levels of linguistic analysis – be those lexical, morphological, syntactic, semantic or pragmatic – linking them to one another helps to draw the overall picture and to maximize their individual contribution.

A current approach to interlinking linguistic resources takes up Linked Data principles, so that «it is possible to follow links between existing resources to find other, related data and exploit network effects» (Chiarcos et al., 2013: iii).

The LiLa: Linking Latin project (<https://lila-erc.eu>) aims to build a Knowledge Base of linguistic resources for Latin based on the Linked Data paradigm, i.e. a collection of multifarious, interlinked data sets described with the same vocabulary of knowledge description (by using common data categories and ontologies), thus allowing users to run complex queries across linked and distributed resources.

The core of the LiLa Knowledge Base consists of a large collection of Latin lemmas (called Lemma Bank): interoperability is achieved by linking all those entries in lexical resources and tokens in corpora that point to the same lemma. Our contribution wants to present the process of linking the LASLA corpus of Latin texts to the LiLa Knowledge Base, by connecting all the textual occurrences of words (tokens) in the corpus to the corresponding lemma in the LiLa Lemma Bank.

The building of the LASLA corpus started in 1961 and continues still today. The corpus contains approximatively 2.500.000 lemmatized and morphosyntactically annotated tokens, each manually verified by a philologist.

Despite the very rich (meta)linguistic information provided by the LASLA annotation scheme, part of the potential of the LASLA corpus still remains underexploited because of a lack of (a) standardization among different Latin linguistic resources in the conventions used for encoding information and (b) interlinking with other textual, as well as lexical resources for Latin. The Lila Knowledge Base being set up for addressing such issues, we have linked the entirety of LASLA corpus to the Lemma Bank. In our contribution, we will shortly describe the steps undertaken during the process of linking the corpus to LiLa, the methodological choices and the main outcomes of the work. The steps include the automation of disambiguation of multiple linking (holding when a token can be connected to more than one lemma in the Lemma Bank), the manual verification of the remaining cases and the insertion of missing lemmas in the Lemma Bank. Methodological choices include the harmonization of different lemmatization and Part-of-Speech tagging choices, like for instance the distinction between nouns and proper nouns, as well as between adjectives and nouns (like in the case of nominal uses of adjectives).

To show the potential of the interoperability between linguistic resources, we will run a number of federated queries that search across the distributed corpora, lexica and dictionaries for Latin currently interlinked in the LiLa Knowledge Base.
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**El** **sincretismo léxico-gramatical de ciertos participios perfectos en secuencias aspectuales y diatéticas**

*Sistere* y *stare* (‘ponerse en pie’ y ‘estar de pie’) forman una secuencia de contenido; esto es, a una acción le sigue la otra con sentido de continuidad. Otro tanto puede decirse de la secuencia *iacere* y *iacēre* (‘echar’ y ‘estar echado’). ¿Qué diferencia hay entre una y otra secuencia? Aquella es aspectual y esta es diatética. En el plano paradigmático, aquella es intrasubjetiva (‘quien se pone en pie’ → ‘está de pie’) y esta es intersubjetiva, pues en ella el objeto del primer verbo pasa a ser sujeto del segundo (*aleam iacere .- alea iacet*).

Ambas secuencias tienen un solo participio perfecto para los dos verbos. Por ello, *status* y *iactus* son participios sincréticos. Pero en la secuencia aspectual *sistere → stare* (‘no resultativo’ → ‘resultativo’) el participio proviene del segundo verbo y en la secuencia diatética *iacere* .- *iacēre* (‘causativo’ .- ‘no causativo’) proviene del primer verbo.

El participio en *\*-to-*, según Benveniste (1975: 167-168), indica «l’accomplissement de la notion dans l’objet». Esta definición es adecuada en el caso de *datus*, como participio de un verbo transitivo, pues entonces el adjetivo verbal califica «celui en qui s’accomplit le donner». A lo que el autor añade que, si se trata de verbos intransitivos, «seule change la diathèse, non la valeur». Se entiende que entonces la noción verbal se cumple en el sujeto.

Ahora bien, tratándose de participios sincréticos, comunes a dos verbos, su valor varía de acuerdo con el aspecto o la diátesis. En la secuencia aspectual *sistere → stare*, el participio *status* varía del valor no resultativo ‘que se ha puesto en pie’ al resultativo ‘que ha estado de pie’.

El contraste de si la noción verbal se cumple en el objeto o en el sujeto se observa mejor en las secuencias diatéticas. Así, en la de *iacere* .- *iacēre* la noción de *iactus* se cumple en el objeto, cuando funciona como participio del verbo transitivo, y en el sujeto, si expresa el contenido del intransitivo. La misma variación se da en *doctus*, que es participio sincrético de la secuencia diatética *discipulum docet .- discipulus discit* (‘enseña al discípulo’ .- ‘el discípulo aprende’). En ella los dos verbos son transitivos; pero, como participio de *discit*, la noción verbal de *doctus* no se cumple en el objeto, sino en el sujeto.

La secuencia aspectual léxica (*sistere → stare*) es análoga a la gramatical ‘infectum’ → ‘perfectum’ de ambos verbos: *sisto → steti* (‘me pongo en pie’ → ‘me he puesto en pie’, consiguientemente ‘estoy de pie’), *sto → steti* (‘estoy de pie’ → ‘he estado de pie’, ya no ‘estoy de pie’). También la diatética léxica *iacere* .- *iacēre* es análoga a la gramatical de ‘activa’ .- ‘mediopasiva’: *aleam iacit .- alea iacitur*: ‘echa el dado’ .- ‘el dado es echado’. Este paralelismo léxico-gramatical y el sincretismo participial permiten entender que el aspecto léxico no es tan diferente del gramatical y asimismo la diátesis. Nos ocuparemos de varias secuencias con participio perfecto sincrético.
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**Derivational processes in -*tio* and -*tus*: comparison between frames of analysis**

This paper approaches some derivational processes in Latin involving the suffixes -*tio* and -*tus*. Examples of both formations can be seen in (1):

(1a) *obseruatio* ‘the action of observing’ < *obseruo* ‘to observe’

*pastio* ‘a pasturing; a pasture’ < *pasco* ‘to pasture, drive to pasture’

(1b) *aduentus* ‘an approach, arrival’ *< aduenio* ‘to come (to)’

*ploratus* ‘a wailing, weeping’ < *ploro* ‘to wail, lament’

(1c) *abortus* and *abortio* ‘an abortion, miscarriage’ < *aborior* ‘to abort, miscarry’

The main aim is to analyse both the references or interpretations of the derivative nouns and their verbal bases, using the event classifications proposed by Vendler (1957) and Pustejovsky (1995) as methodological frameworks. For this purpose, a corpus has been designed that includes about 500 nouns in -*tio* and -*tus* documented in archaic and classical Latin texts.

In this corpus, I will address two major points. First, I will examine these nouns and their respective base verbs in the light of the typology of states of affairs proposed by Vendler. In this regard, I am interested in determining if the features of Dynamism, Telicity, Duration (and Control) and, consequently, the categories of State, Activity, Accomplishment and Achievement suffice to explain the formation of nouns in -*tio* and -*tus*[[3]](#footnote-3). Second, I will apply to those nouns and verbs the so-called levels of representation proposed by Pustejovsky. These levels include *event structure*, according to which the events can be classified into at least three types (States, Processes and Transitions), and *argument structure*, in which four types of components can be distinguished (true arguments, default arguments, shadow arguments and true adjuncts).

By comparing the results obtained after the application of both models to the same corpus, I expect to demonstrate why Pustejovsky’s frame explains in a better way (i) the possible types of references or interpretations that the nouns in -*tio* and -*tus* can acquire, and (ii) the selection restrictions that operate in the formation of these nouns.

**References**

Comrie, B. & S. Thompson. (2007) [1985]. *Lexical Nominalization*. In T. Shopen (Ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Vol. III*: *Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon* (2nd edn., pp. 334-381). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,.

Dik, S. (1997) [1989]. *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part. 1: The Structure of the Clause* (2nd edn.).Dordrecht: Foris.

Garzón, E. (2020). Latin verbal nouns in -*tio*: Interpretations and selection restrictions. *Lingue Antiche e Moderne*, 9, 87-105.

Hopper, P. & S. Thompson. (1985). The iconicity of the universal categories ‘noun’ and ‘verb’. In J. Haiman (Ed.), *Iconicity in Syntax* (pp. 151-183). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Pustejovsky, J. (1995). *The Generative Lexicon*.Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Vendler, Z. (1957) Verbs and times, *The Philosophical Review*, 66(2), 143-160.

Theodor GEORGESCU - Universitatea din București

**Le micro-champ lexical des noms de pains en latin – une approche étymologique**

La présentation vise à identifier et à analyser, du point de vue étymologique, le micro-champ lexical des noms latins de pains depuis Plaute jusqu’ à la fin de l’Antiquité. Les noms de pains ont varié au cours des siècles et se sont substitués les uns aux autres suivant par exemple la teneur en farine, la catégorie sociale à laquelle ces produits étaient destinés, ou bien la région de provenance. Le nombre des noms de pains a augmenté au cours des siècles et parfois il y a eu de la confusion entre différents noms, utilisés pour le même produit. Les études jusqu'à présent ont visé surtout les aspects de civilisation et l’histoire de la cuisine (e.g. André 1981) et elles n’ont guère adopté une perspective linguistique.

Notre approche sera onomasiologique, visant, premièrement, la réalisation d’un inventaire par le dépouillement des sources lexicographiques et des textes (des traités de cuisine ou d’agriculture, des textes littéraires etc.). La seconde étape consiste en l’analyse étymologique de ces noms, envisageant leur catégorisation selon l’origine. Une attention spéciale recevront les formations internes, en vue de l’identification des possibles schémas morpho-lexicales récurrents dans la formation de ces noms.

On peut observer sans difficulté que la plupart des noms de pains se sont formés par ellipse, à partir d’un syntagme *panis* + adjectif – celui-ci normalement crée par dérivation. Le plus intéressant est le point de départ de ces adjectifs, puisqu’il est très instructif en ce qui concerne les *realia:* l’ingrédient principal (ex. *(panis) adipatus*, *furfureus*, *hordeaceus,* *siligineus* etc.), la manière de préparation (*depsticius* < *depsere « broyer, pétrir »*, *subcinericius* «cuit sous la cendre (*cinis*)», *focacius* < *focus*), la qualité du pain (*sordidus, mundus, rusticus* etc.), la couleur (*rubidus*, *candidus*), la région de provenance (*Parthicus, Picentinus*), ou bien la catégorie sociale à laquelle il était destiné (*militaris, nauticus, castrensis, plebeius*).

Certains noms de pains, comme c’est naturel à l’intérieur d’un langage technique ayant trait au vocabulaire culinaire, sont des emprunts au grec, soit anciens, datant de l’époque de Plaute (e.g. *collyra / collira*), soit plus récents, avec des traits phonétiques grecs (comme *artopticius, clibanicius* / *clibanites*), correspondant parfois à de simples translitérations (e.g. *azymus, acrozymus, autopyrus encryphias*). Il y a aussi des emprunts qui ont été faits exclusivement sur la base des traductions latines de la *Septante*, tel *collyris.*

Du point de vue de leur continuation dans les langues romanes, on peut voir qu’il y a un nombre très restreint de noms de pains qui ont été hérités (e.g. *collyra*), tandis que le nom générique *panis* est panroman.

L’analyse du micro-champ lexical des noms de pains pourrait mettre en relief, d’une part, les stratégies de dénomination employées par les locuteurs dans un domaine plutôt technique, révélant une remarquable productivité lexicale et, d’un point de vue plus général, la manière dont le langage nous dévoile les *realia* de la Rome Ancienne.
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**On problems in the description of the Early Latin verbal system**

The Early Latin verbal system differs from the one found in Classical Latin in several ways: there are, for instance, traces of the blurring of the Proto-Indo-European aorist and perfect and of the Proto-Indo-European optative and subjunctive (cf. e.g. de Melo 2007). There are also constructions with the perfect participle – e.g. with *uolo*, *do* and *curo* – which tend to become rare in later Latin (cf. e.g. Haverling 2016).

A few verbal suffixes deserve our attention from this point of view:

One point where we find a difference between earlier and later Latin is the progressive and atelic use of verbs with -*sc*- formed from already dynamic and intransitive verbs, such as *permanascere* ‘seep through gradually, penetrate’ (Plaut. *Trin*. 155) from *permanāre* ‘flow through, seep, percolate’. In later Latin such verbs tend to disappear or to be found mainly in references to Early Latin passages (cf. Haverling 2000).

Another point worth interest regards the use of the so-called iterative suffix, which in some cases seems to have a progressive or backgrounding function in certain Early Latin forms which do not continue in later Latin. One example is *occeptare* ‘begin / be beginning to’ occurring twice in Plautus (*Men*. 915 and 934) and not in later Latin (cf. Viti 2015).

A third point worth interest is the use of stative verbs like *callere* ‘be hard, callous’ or *anere* ‘be (an) old (woman)’ (Plaut. *Merc*. 755 *uerum hercle anet* ‘but she is by Hercules rather old’). This is, of course, a category that remains very much alive in Classical and in later Latin as well, but in Early Latin we find quite a few such verbs which do not seem to occur in the later periods (except in references to earlier texts). This seems to indicate that the category ceased to be productive rather early – which in turn paves the way for the change from *senet* to *senex* est ‘he is old’ met with in Late Latin (cf. e.g. Haverling 2010 and 2018).

In this paper I will focus on a few such kinds of verb formations which tend not to continue in later Latin and the implications for our interpretation of the Early Latin system on the one hand and the later development on the other.
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**Representación lingüística del estatus en el *Miles Gloriosus* de Plauto**

Si damos por bueno el aserto deLisa Maurice (2007) cuando califica el plautino *Miles Gloriosus* como “pieza de teatro particularmente metateatral”, es de suponer que esa ‘metateatralidad’ se refleje también por medio de signos lingüísticos en el sentido más amplio de la palabra. Mientras en la mayoría de los estudios el acercamiento a un texto teatral toma una senda literaria, por así decir, mi enfoque consiste en buscar pasajes textuales en los que se produce una discrepancia entre referencia y significación literal. La doble estructura de la que habla Lisa Maurice (2007) se pone de manifiesto por incompatibilidades semánticas entre el rol ‘real’ y el rol ‘ficticio’, aunque, por supuesto, las dos percepciones contribuyen a la representación teatral. La constatación de Keith Johnstone (2016) de que la definición del estatus es esencial para cualquier puesta en escena de obras teatrales, significa que no hay acciones que sean casuales o sin una razón subyacente. Este mecanismo se puede observar de manera meridiana en el *Miles Gloriosus*. Lo que no se ha hecho aún es describir los distintos medios lingüísticos que favorecen cada uno de los dos roles mencionados y que prueban el doble fondo del que habla Lisa Maurice (2007).

La idea dominante en mi análisis adapta una idea que apareció primero a finales de los años cincuenta del siglo pasado en la lingüística del texto, a saber, la idea de que referencia y significación textual se comprenden por medio de ‘historias’. Estas ‘historias’ se definen por el contexto que cualquier espectador necesita para entender lo que se le presenta en escena. Dicho contexto no se limita a cosas, cualidades o circunstancias, sino que se manifiesta también por medio de actos verbales y no verbales en un determinado sentido que conforman así el estatus de los personajes.

La teoría aquí empleada parte de la idea de que las ‘historias’ dan pie a analizar elementos siguiendo intereses selectivos y perspectivas pragmáticas. Las ‘historias’, por tanto, sirven para crear un marco en que las cosas, las cualidades y las circunstancias, por un lado, se reconozcan y, por otro, adquieran significación. En mi exposición aclararé este procedimiento y describiré a grandes rasgos los mecanismos que se activan en el momento de representar la pieza en el escenario.
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**On the zero anaphora of dative arguments in Livy**

It is a well-known fact that Classical Latin is a null subject-language in which pronominal subjects need not be explicitly expressed if they are known in the communicative or anaphoric context. Zero anaphoras of the accusative argument are no seldom phenomenon in Latin and have been studied in the nineteen nineties (Johnson 1991; Mulder 1991; van der Wurff 1994; Luraghi 1997). Less known is the fact that dative arguments can also occur not seldom as in (1)

(1) *Sexto ubi quid vellet parens quidve* ***Ø-Dat******praeciperet*** *tacitis ambagibus patuit, primores civitatis criminando alios apud populum, alios sua ipsos invidia opportunos interemit.*

“As soon as it was clear to Sextus what his father meant and what was the purport of his silent hints, he rid himself of the chief men of the state.” (Liv. 1.54.8)

(2) *Cui enim non apparere adfectare eum* [*sc. Tarquinium*] *imperium in Latinos? Quod* [*sc. imperium*] *si sui bene* ***Ø-Dat******crediderint*** *cives* [...], *credere et Latinos quamquam ne sic quidem alienigenae debere.*

“For who could fail to see that he was aiming at sovereignty over the Latins. If his own people had done well to intrust this **to him** […], then it was right that the Latins also should intrust it to him. (Liv. 1.50.4)

(3) *Illud haudquaquam discrepat maiore conatu atque impetu rem actam quam prioribus annis, quia* ***Ø-Dat******spem*** *posse vinci hostem dictator* ***praebuerat****.*

[“One thing is not disputed–that they proceeded with more energy and enthusiasm than in former years, because the dictator had given **them** ground for hoping that they would be able to defeat the enemy.” (Liv. 22.36.5]

In (1) *praecipere* needs a dative object which is coreferent with *Sexto* that belongs to *patuit*. (2) shows that also the ditransitive verb *credere*, needs a dative which is mentioned in the pronoun *eum* in the question before. In (3) *spem praebere* is a so-called support verb construction (OLS 1: 74-77) and has a causative meaning. To be complete, it needs a causee.

Since a zero-anaphora, which is a constituent that is “phonologically no realized, but semantically present” (Fries 2016, transl.), is nothing else than an ellipsis, i.e. an omission or non-appearance of an anaphoric pronoun, its usage can be easily found by starting from a translation into a language without zero dative anaphora like English or German. Aside from this, looking at every dative pronoun in the translation which has a dative in the Latin text to see whether there is a similar pronoun, an explicit noun or a gap after verbs with dative compliments in the Latin text also helps in identifying them. If we have seen that indeed a dative argument must be dependent of the Latin verb out of the information strategy, we can speak of a zero anaphora in the dative.

Having collected all such zero anaphoras in a well-defined corpus of Livy’s work, namely books 1 to 5 and 21 to 25, we can have a closer look at the context to say more about the syntax, semantics and pragmatics of dative anaphoras in Livy. We will probably see by this research how far the usage of zero anaphoras of dative arguments can be understood as a strategy of text cohesiveness in a greater narrative work like Livy’s “Ab urbe condita”.
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**Interrogative *nam* in classical and later Latin**

In an earlier paper (Holmes 2012) I looked at the early use of *nam* in combination with question words such as *quis* and *ubi*. Since, as earlier descriptions had found, *nam* questions often have a lively tone, showing irritation and emphasising the uncertainty in the question (much like ‘why on earth?’ in English), I suggested (developing an observation by Kroon 1995: 165-6) that a sarcastic use of explicative *nam* was the original use. Classical and later Latin shows some differences to the usage in the earliest writers. In particular indirect questions with interrogative *nam* are much more common than in early Latin (Holmes 2012: 216-7). How far did such indirect questions diverge from the use of *nam* that we find in Plautus and Terence? Three points in particular deserve research. (1) Does the colloquial character of the original use have any effect on the classical usage in indirect questions? Are representations of spoken Latin or a colloquial flavour more common in indirect questions with interrogative *nam* than without? (2) While most instances of *nam* in indirect questions retain the original aspect of uncertainty, there are exceptions in classical and later Latin. How rare are such exceptions, and do they have anything in common? (3) Were there other advantages to interrogative *nam* beyond its original characterising function that encouraged its use (cf. e. g. Bolkestein 1995: 62-3)? I plan to investigate these by looking at all instances of questions with *nam* from classical Latin to late antiquity. In addition, points 1 and 3 will be investigated using a sample of indirect questions without *nam* from classical Latin for comparison.
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**Latin denominative stative verbs with the suffix *-ē-***

This paper, developing the paper presented at ICLL19, concerning the behavioural patterns of the Latin stative verbs with the suffix *ē* in general, deals with a special subgroup of stative verbs, namely verbs derived from nouns denoting things as *flōrēre < flōs* and *frondēre < frons* as well as verbs derived from nouns denoting persons as *senēre* *< senex* and *anēre < anus* (cf. Leumann, 1977: 555).

The “core” of the group of Latin stative verbs with the suffix *ē* comprises root verbs belonging to the Caland system, which is manifested by the fact that they are generally derived from adjectival roots and feature a common derivational pattern of the *-or*, *-idus* and *-ēscere* type (e.g. *calēre, calor, calidus, calēscere*), some other typical verbs of this group being *frīgēre, madēre, languēre, liquēre, candēre, nitēre* etc.

Based on their stative, and consequently atelic character, the Latin stative verbs exhibit some common semantic features and at least partly appear in similar syntactic constructions, the best-known of them being that they are intransitive and do not essentially appear in the passive.

The objective of the underlying corpus-based study is to analyse, using the approach of frame semantics, which is incorporated in the tenets of Construction Grammar, the semantic frames the denominative stative verbs evoke as well as their associated syntactic constructions, focusing mainly on the argument structure, and to compare the results to those of similar analyses of the “core” Latin stative verbs. This comparison may elucidate the usage patterns of this unique group of verbs in the Classical and Late Latin periods as well as semantic shifts some of the verbs underwent.

For instance, a considerable number of the Latin stative verbs, especially those evoking the “visual experience” semantic frame, do not only appear in a purely intransitive, or single argument construction, but also in a two-argument construction with an ablative argument where the ablative-argument slot is occupied by the stimulus of the experience, as e.g. *(cubiculum) …* ***marmore******splendet*** (PLIN. *epist*. 5,6,38) “it is formed of glistening marble”.

It would seem that the verbs *flōrēre* and *frondēre* are not likely to appear in the ablative construction as they already have the stimulus (*flōs, frons*) “incorporated” in themselves, but in spite of this, they do appear in such constructions as e.g. *hinc laetas urbes* ***pueris******florere*** *videmus* (LUCR. 1, 254) “… hence we behold happy cities blooming with children”, especially in hyperbolical and metaphorical uses (cf. Dowty, 2000). This shows that the said argument alternation was quite a common feature among the stative verbs.

The paper will also deal with the development of these verbs in the Late Latin period and provide some statistical information.
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**When Lexicography met collocations: building a combinatory dictionary of classical Latin**

Collocations, as is well known, are preferential and restricted combinations of words which usually work as a semantic unit. An example of these structures is *uerba facere*, in which noun and verb maintain a close syntactic and semantic relation: both words act as a semantic unit — the expression as a whole means *to speak* — where the noun, which is the base of the collocation, is the semantic nucleus, whereas the verb, referred to as the collocative, serves as a support to express syntactically the substantive’s semantic participants.

One of the most noteworthy characteristic of these expressions is that they are distinctly idiosyncratic, in other words, they are specific to each language, as can be seen in the following examples, in which the verb of the collocation *to take a walk* varies among English, Spanish, French and Latin. This fact makes these linguistic structures unpredictable and difficult to learn.

* + - Cicero decided *to take a walk* through the Academy
    - Cicerón ha dedidido *dar un paseo* por la Academia [“to *give* a walk”]
    - Cicéron a decidé de *faire une promenade* dans l’Académie [“to *make* a walk”]
    - constituimus inter nos ut *ambulationem* postmeridianam *conficeremus* in Academia (Cic. fin. 5,1) [“to *make* a walk”]

In spite of the growing number of specific studies about collocations in Latin in the past years (Baños 2014, 2016; Bodelot & Spevak 2018; Pompei & Mereu 2019, etc.), the main dictionaries do not usually provide enough information about these linguistic structures. Rather, they present only some of them quite asystematically, without considering some important semantic and syntactic aspects (see Tur 2019: 131, 209 & 266 for the treatment of *odium*, *invidia*, *laetitia* and *gaudium* in the main bilingual dictionaries). The aim of this contribution is to propose, from a Functional perspective, some guidelines to build a combinatorial dictionary of classical Latin. Such a dictionary could prove very useful not only for Latin didactics, but also as a lexicographical reference for other purposes, such as translation and research on Latin linguistics.
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**Anaphore « zéro » ou *is* ? Réflexions sur l’impact de l’emploi de *is*, / *id* au nominatif sujet**

Cette communication s’inscrit dans une réflexion plus large consacrée à l’anaphorique *is.* On a repris l’idée de Serbat qu’à la différence des déictiques, cet outil syntaxique était un cadre sémantiquement vide. S’il va de soi que sa présence est indispensable pour marquer toute fonction syntaxique, il est légitime de se poser la question lorsqu’il s’ait de remplir la fonction de sujet grammatical. En effet, dans la plupart des anaphores simples (et, cela va de soi, intra-textuelle), pour éviter la reprise d’un substantif, les désinences personnelles du verbe, -*t* et -*nt*, remplissent parfaitement cet office.

*Amore captiuae uictor captus. Data dextra […] in regiam concedi****t****. Institi****t*** *deinde reputare secum ipse …*(Liu.30,12,18)

On note toutefois l’emploi sporadique de *is* ou de *id* (au singulier comme au pluriel)

*Ad Caesarem conferunt.* ***Is*** *eo temporer erat Ravennae* (Caes.*C*.1,5,5)

*Terruit animos hominum ignis in aede Vestae extinctus […]* ***Id*** *quanquam nihil […] neglegentia humana acciderat* … (Liu.28, 11,6-7)

Nous nous proposons donc ici de nous interroger sur les motivations qui conduisent à un tel emploi. Nécessité de clarté du propos, notamment lorsque qu’il y a discordance entre les fonctions syntaxiques de l’anaphorique et de son « antécédent », ce qui conduit à réfléchir sur l’homogénéité de la chaîne référentielle ? On note toutefois des cas où la discordance n’entraîne pas l’emploi de l’anaphorique:

*Elephanti plures ab ipsis rectoribus quam ab hoste interfecti. Fabrile scalprum cum malleo habeba****nt****. Id ubi saeuire beluae ac ruere in suos coeperant, magister […] ipso in articulo […] adigebat.* … (Liu.27,49,1)

Nature de l’interprétant sémantique ? Il semble en effet que l’emploi du neutre *id* soit obligatoire lorsqu’il subsume une séquence d’énoncé. Contraintes tactiques ? Nos relevés ne fournissent jusqu’à maintenant que des emplois comme premier mot de la phrase, quelques uns comme premier mot d’une subordonnée.

***Ea*** *dum a Corbulone tuendae Syriae parantur* (Tac.*An*.15,4,1)

*Deinde in haedo expertus, postquam* ***is*** *quinque horas protraxit*… (Suet..*Ner*.35,5)

Quel pourrait être alors l’impact prosodique sur l’anaphorique et sur l’attaque de la phrase ? Un tel agencement répond-il enfin à des préoccupations d’ordre thématique, argumentatif voire pragmatique ? On peut enfin se demander si, lorsqu’il occupe la fonction de sujet grammatical, *is* ne conserve pas encore une charge sémantique héritée de son statut primitif, probablement déictique.

A plus d’une année du colloque, nous ne pouvons qu’énumérer des questions. Peut-être d’autres surgiront-elles encore. Nous comptons bien évidemment y apporter des réponses en nous appuyant sur des faits relevés dans les parties purement narratives d’une épopée, *La Pharsale*, et de deux historiens, Tite-Live et Tacite (*Annales*).
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**Non-finite constructions in Latin, German and Turkish: A trilateral comparison**

In this paper, I would like to sketch a trilateral contrastive description of "non-finite subordinate constructions" in Latin, German and Turkish. In order to define such "non-finite subordinate constructions", I will take into account the insight of typological literature that both "(non-)finiteness" and "subordination" cannot be defined by a single criterion (such as presence or absence of forms indicating tense, aspect, mood and agreement), but have to be characterized by a cluster of morphological, syntactic and semantic parameters. Taken together, these parameters assign non-finite, subordinate constructions a position on a (set of) scale(s), with extreme poles and a continuum in between (cf. e.g. Bolkestein 1989, Lehmann 1989, Haspelmath 1995, Nikolaeva 2010).

One of these scales, namely, desententialization (cf. Lehmann 1989: 165), will be taken in order to describe in some detail the following contrasts between the three languages (cf. Kienpointner 2010: 281):

German subordinate constructions tend to focus on the sententiality pole (clause): German has a great variety of finite subordinate clauses and only a few types of non-finite subordinate constructions (infinitives, participles, verbal nouns)(cf. Helbig/Buscha 1991: 642ff.).

Turkish subordinate constructions tend to be situated closer to the nominality pole (verbal noun): Turkish strongly prefers non-finite subordinate constructions (infinitives, participles, a great variety of converbs ("a nonfinite verb form whose main function is to mark adverbial subordination"; Haspelmath 1995: 3), verbal nouns) and has only a few finite subordinate clauses (cf. Göksel/Kerslake 2005: 461).

Latin subordination is situated somewhere in between, with a strong role played both by finite subordinate clauses and by non-finite subordinate constructions (infinitives, participles, gerundives and gerunds, supines, verbal nouns)(cf. Lehmann 1989: 177; Pinkster 2015: 57ff.).

The detailed description of these contrasts should provide some insights for a more elaborate typological classification of the three languages and for language typology in general.
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**Degrés et manières d’élaboration textuelle chez quelques historiens romains**

La narration est une opération complexe, dont j’examinerai ici brièvement deux aspects chez quelques historiens romains (essentiellement César, Salluste, Velleius Paterculus et Eutrope). L’un des aspects en question se manifeste à la surface des textes, tandis que l’autre peut être découvert par une étude sémantique de la structure « profonde ». Dans le premier cas, il s’agit, d’une part, du soin que l’historien a apporté à la construction cohérente et en particulier à l’élaboration de la liaison interphrastique (renvois anaphoriques, conjonctions de coordination) ; d’autre part, l’alternance des « sommaires » et des « scènes » au cours de la présentation des faits fournit un critère de classement intéressant des textes, utilisable comme marque chronologique et comme indice du style individuel. Dans le second cas, c’est une étude rhétorique et narratologique qui s’impose pour déceler le projet textuel de l’auteur, son appartenance à une tradition et le degré de son originalité. La répartition des différents types de discours (séquences narratives proprement dites, description, argumentation, passages rédigés en « oratio obliqua »), la présence (ou l’absence) de commentaires psychologiques, moraux ou philosophiques caractérisent la manière d’écrire des historiens et déterminent le degré de complexité linguistique des ouvrages. Les interventions du narrateur – qu’il s’agisse des manifestations de sa subjectivité ou des remarques métalinguistiques renvoyant à la narration elle-même – seront considérées également lors de la comparaison des textes. L’articulation des événements et des processus parallèles a un rôle déterminant dans le mode de présentation propre à tel ou tel historien. En conclusion – provisoire –, je proposerai une grille des points de vue linguistiques qui permettra de vérifier objectivement nos impressions de lecture et de comparer également des périodes (en ce qui concerne par exemple le genre du « bréviaire », nouvelle mode développée à l’époque impériale). Mon travail consiste donc dans la comparaison d’« échantillons », avec une méthode qui, une fois expérimentée, pourra être appliquée à un corpus plus étendu.
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***Urbanitas* – conceptualisation of witticism and verbal duelling as a sophisticated play**

The paper will examine a specific use of the term *urbanitas* (= “sophistication”) for denoting witty comments or responses based mainly on a play with (potential) ambiguities. In classical Latin, *urbanitas* is one of the main terms used for denoting verbal duelling and witticism - linguistic and communicative behaviour quite popular in Roman society and widely attested in a broad range of communicative situations and literary genres (ranging from its roots in its original ritual apotropaic context over Roman comedy, private communication between members of Roman nobility, literary play among poets to public discourse, rhetorics and politics) which could be used for various socio-communicative purposes ranging from scathing sarcastic attacks over establishing solidarity and strengthening in-group feeling to positive self-presentation of the producer and even propaganda in favour of the target of the witticism.

It will be argued that the reason for the use of *urbanitas* as a term for this multifaceted and wide ranging communicative praxis is the fact that it conceptualises its unifying and at the same time most important feature which is sophistication consisting in the display of intellectual capability of the producer and of his proficiency in spotting potential ambiguities, in creative and surprising reinterpretation of them (often in form of wordplay) and finally, in using them for his communicative purposes.

To put it in communicative terms, it is this very display of his intellectual capability by means of which the producer tries to create rapport and common ground with the audience, namely by (i) impressing the audience and gaining thus their admiration, and (ii) leading audience to follow the path of his thoughts when making an intellectual “effort” to recognise the pun so that they may more easily accept the stance and opinions of the producer. The rapport with the audience and the common ground may in turn either (i) be used against the target of the witticism, be it the adressee or an external target, i.e. third party (aggravating so the attack, especially in combination with a display of intellectual superiority over the target) or (ii) include the target and be used for the target’s or/and the producer’s own benefit (such as e.g. creating a friendly atmosphere or presenting a possibly criticisable behaviour more favourably).

The analysed material will include first and foremost instances of verbal duelling and witticism explicitly termed *urbanitas* with special attention being payed to theoretical accounts of it (e.g. *Cicero, Quintilianus*), supplemented by instances without explicit label but displaying the constitutive features of *urbanitas* (i.e. intellectual play or showing-off), especially those including an evaluation of such communicative behaviour.

The analysis will be theoretically based on (i) the discursive approaches to impoliteness, in particular on Culpeper (2003, 2011), Bousfield (2008), genre approach to impoliteness (Garcés-Conejos Blitwich, 2010) and frame-based approach (Terkourafi 2005, 2008) as well as (ii) the concepts of intertextuality and recontextualisation (Fairclough, 2003 and *Blommaert, 2005).*
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**L’expression de la non-virilité par le féminin en latin**

Les lexèmes exprimant le manque ou l’absence de virilité sont nombreux en latin, que l’on songe aux substantifs empruntés au grec *cinaedus, eunuchus, gallus, pathicus, spado* ou encore à l’adjectif *mollis* et à ses dérivés, *molliter* ou *mollitia*. Ainsi, cette caractéristique est souvent associée à ce qui vient de l’étranger (de Grèce ou plus largement d’Orient) et/ou à un relâchement moral. Mais, à côté de ces expressions, nous trouvons aussi, pour dénoter l’absence de virilité, des lexèmes forgés sur les deux noms latins de la femme, *femina* et *mulier:* *femineus, effeminare, effeminatus, effeminatio, muliebris, muliebriter*. En outre, il existe au moins trois textes où la dévirilisation est traitée comme une féminisation: le poème 63 de Catulle consacré à Attis, le livre IX de l’*Enéide* où Numanus traite les Troyens de *Phrygiae*, et l’extrait des *Métamorphoses* d’Apulée (VIII, 26) où les prêtres émasculés de la déesse syrienne sont appelés *puellae*. C’est ce lien entre non-virilité et féminisation que nous souhaitons étudier dans cette communication, en analysant les emplois des dérivés de *femina* et *mulier*, dans leur relation parasynonymique avec la famille de *mollis* notamment, ainsi que d’autres marques, morphologiques et lexicales, de la féminisation d’individus masculins.
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**New Perspectives on Latin Phraseology: Phrasemes and Textual Motifs**

During the last two decades, two different fields of research have been converging through the definition of new linguistics items. On the one hand, phraseology has been extending its scope by taking into account units whose structures show a greater variability, as for instance the morpho-syntactic idioms of Fillmore, Kay and O’Connor (1988), the collocations as defined by Sinclair (1991) or the lexico-grammatical constructions of Gledhill and Frath (2007) (for a critical reviewing, see Longrée & Mellet 2013 or Bandinelli, 2017). On the other hand, according to a new textometry based on a topological approach, the text has no more be considered as a “bag of words” but as a ordered set in which recurrent patterns have been identified as, for instance, *segments répétés* (Salem, 1987), *motifs textuels* (Longree, Luong & Mellet, 2008), *routines discursives* (Née, Sitri &Veniar, 2014), *constructions lexico-syntaxiques* (Kraif, Novakova & Sorba, 2016). A main difference however between the units identified by phraseology and by textometry is that the last one have always, -even if they correspond also to phraseological units-, a textual function, mainly a characterising and/or a structuring one.

Regarding Latin, on the one hand, phraseological studies have also taken into account semi-frozen structures, as for instance the so-called light verb construction (see Bodelot & Spevak, 2018). On the other hand, several studies have shown the importance of the textual motifs in various type of texts, especially historical and poetical ones. As far as a “dead” language is concerned, it is often difficult to distinguish clearly phraseological units and textual motifs, especially as phraseological units could function as textual motifs. For instance, in the case of the Caesarean motif, *quibus rebus cognitis*, the variation possibilities are numerous (*his rebus cognitis*, *his cognitis rebus*, *qua re cognita*...) and the analysis as a phraseological unit should probably be excluded. On the contrary, the textual motif *Quae cum ita sint*, -which is characteristic of of Cicero’s speeches (see Longrée-Mellet, 2014)-, seems to be frozen in a larger extend (even if light variations of the pattern as *Quod cum ita sit* exist). Even if it is impossible to know if such a pattern is really an idiom or only a feature of Cicero’s idiolect, the analyse of this motif as an occurrence of one of the phraseological units mentioned above seems to be more probable.

Our paper will try to identify the criteria to take into account to decide if a motif should be considered as a phraseological unit. It will focus not only on the above-mentioned motifs but also on patterns such as *per mare per terras*, attested twice in the Ovidian *Heroides* (*Ep*. 7, 88 and 14, 101) and once in the works of Claudian (*DRP* III, 50). The research, relaying on previous studies on lexicalisation (see Lehmann, 1989; Prevost, 2006; Fruyt, 2008) and on a textometrical approach, will aim to precise if such a pattern should be analysed in the same way as *terra marique*, whose lexicalisation is evident, or if the Claudian occurrence is only a reminiscence of a Ovidian motif. In this way, we hope to contribute to refine the description of the phenomenon of lexicalisation and to enrich our knowledge of the writing techniques of Latin authors.
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**Interferencias colocacionales entre *facere*, *agere* y *gerere* en latín tardío**

El estudio de las colocaciones verbo-nominales en latín está siendo, en los últimos años, objeto de estudio desde perspectivas muy diversas: desde el análisis del radio colocacional de determinados sustantivos (Tur 2019) o verbos (Brunet 2008, Jiménez Martínez 2016), a la consideración de aspectos diatéticos como la expresión de la causatividad (Mendózar 2019), o la comparación con la lengua griega (Baños & Jiménez López 2018; López Martín 2019), entre otros. Sin embargo, son más escasos los estudios (Baños 2018) que examinan, desde un punto de vista diacrónico, la evolución de dichas colocaciones. Es esta perspectiva diacrónica la que vamos a adoptar en este trabajo, que aborda específicamente el estudio comparado de tres de los verbos soporte más productivos en latín: *facere*, *agere* y *gerere*. Y es que, para entender algunos aspectos (cuantitativos y cualitativos) de la evolución de *facere* como verbo soporte en latín tardío (Galdi 2018), es interesante llamar la atención sobre las interferencias de empleo con otros dos verbos soporte, *agere* y *gerere*, con los que *facere* presenta similitudes y confusiones que ya llamaron la atención de los propios autores latinos: *propter similitudinem* ***agendi*** *et* ***faciendi*** *et* ***gerendi*** *quidam error his qui putant esse unum* (Varr.*L.L*.6.77).

Para ello, hemos analizado, en primer lugar, los empleos fundamentales de *facere*, *agere* y *gerere* como verbos soporte en un amplio corpus de historiadores de época clásica y postclásica (Salustio, César, Nepote, Livio, Veleyo Patérculo, Valerio Máximo, Curcio Rufo, Suetonio y Tácito), porque es este el género literario en el que son más frecuentes las colocaciones verbo-nominales (Baños, forth.). A su vez, para mostrar su evolución diacrónica, con cambios importantes en el radio colocacional de *facere*, *agere* y *gerere*, compararemos los datos obtenidos con el análisis de obras e historiadores representativos del siglo IV: la *Historia Augusta*, Amiano Marcelino, Eutropio y Aurelio Víctor. Para ilustrar algunos de los cambios más significativos y de las interferencias entre estos tres verbos, nos detendremos sobre todo en el análisis de las colocaciones relativas a cuatro campos semánticos (la guerra, las magistraturas, los juegos y el tiempo), campos en los que se observan notables interferencias y confusiones: *iter facere* / *iter agere*, *consulatum gerere* / *consulatum agere*, *annos agere* / *annos gerere*, etc.
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***Puto, iudico, existimo* en el epistolario ciceroniano: una exploración en la sintaxis y el significado de la valoración intelectual**

Este trabajo constituye la fase inicial de una investigación, enmarcada en el estudio de la modalidad epistémica en latín, que se propone rastrear la distribución de los verbos de valoración intelectual *puto, iudico, existimo* en el corpus de las cartas de Cicerón.

Desde el punto de vista semántico, estos verbos guardan compatibilidad semántica con predicados subjetivos o “de gusto” (por ejemplo, *aterrador, encantador*, *cf.* Bouchard 2013), vinculados con un “juez” (el que asocia ese predicado a una entidad o situación) cuya referencia surge del contexto de emisión y que, sintácticamente, se realiza como sujeto de la predicación principal.

Esta presentación se propone, en primer lugar, evaluar alternancias sintácticas semejantes a las siguientes:

1. **(a)** et hercule **hominem** probo; nam **[hominem]** **et doctum et probum** *existimo*. (Cic. *Att.* 10.17.1)

Y por Hércules, me cae bien este hombre, pues lo considero culto y honrado.

1. **quam [sc. gravitatem] non imitari** **turpissimum** *existimo*. (Cic. *Fam.* 5.13.4)

Considero muy lamentable no imitar la solidez de tu carácter.

1. **turpe enim esse** *existimo* **me non ita ferre casum meum ut tu tali sapientia praeditus ferendum putas**. (Cic. *Fam*. 4.6.1)

En efecto, considero que es lamentable que no sobrellevar mi desgracia como tú, que estás dotado de tal sabiduría, piensas que debo sobrellevarla.

Casos como los de (1) reflejan ejemplos de predicación secundaria a la que la bibliografía asigna estructura de *cláusula mínima*: tomando como referencia 1(a), el predicado de esta cláusula es un adjetivo cuyo argumento es *hominem* (repuesto gráficamente en el texto a los fines de esta explicación). Así, no se sigue que Cicerón considera a un individuo (*hominem*), sino un estado de cosas (*hominem et doctum et probum*), *cf*. por ejemplo, Bosque & Gutiérrez Réxach 2009:424ss..

Si bien parte de esta bibliografía ha postulado que una estructura con verbo *ser*, como la de AcI que se ve en 2, es estructuralmente precedente a una cláusula mínima, en este trabajo no se indagará sobre la filiación entre ellas, a pesar de la relativa proximidad entre 1(b) y 2 (desde otra perspectiva, *cf.* Pinkster 2015:190 respecto de la duda que puede plantearse acerca de la posible omisión de *esse* en el análisis de casos puntuales, dada la frecuencia de la presencia de AcI con estos verbos). Examinará, en cambio, la hipótesis de que una y otra estructura expresan diferentes grados de compromiso del hablante, reflejando la de cláusula mínima un grado más alto de subjetividad (Aarts 1992: 70).

Ahora bien, una primera revisión del corpus epistolar ciceroniano enseña que el tipo de construcciones de 2. es mucho más frecuente que el tipo ejemplificado en 1.: es también una hipótesis de trabajo que un AcI cuya predicación sea *esse*+predicado subjetivo constituye una variante sintáctica de complementación para *puto, iudico, existimo* en tanto verbos de valoración, y no como verbos de opinión. En función de que parece preferible esta última construcción a la de cláusula mínima, la hipótesis final es que el AcI entraña una presuposición de verdad más próxima a la de la modalidad epistémica objetiva.
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**Etymology and Mythology: Latin God Name *Mercurius***

This paper intends to discuss the etymology for the Latin theonym, *Mercurius,* derived from *merx*, as well as its proposed Etruscan connections, and its religious motivation.

The name of the Roman god of trade, *Mercurius*, is most likely a derivation of the Latin root *merc-*, although there is a possibility that this stem was borrowed from Etruscan (De Vaan: 376), or that the name is derived from the name of an Etruscan gens (*\*Mercura,* WH II: 74). However, Lat. *merx, mercis* f. ‘commodity, goods, merchandise’ does not seem to be a loanword, but it has no PIE etymology so far. It has the shape of an archaic root-noun (cf. *nex, necis* ‘murder’ or *lēx, lēgis* ‘law’, both of which are easily derivable from PIE roots), but there is no PIE root *\*merk(‘)-* with a meaning from which *merx* could be derived. We will propose that *merx, mercis* can be derived from the root \*merg’- ‘divide’ (Hitt. *mārk-i* ‘divide, separate, distribute, cut up animals’ cf. Kloekhorst 558-9), from which we also have *margō, marginis* ‘border, limit’ (IEW 738). Latin, namely, has a number of words with unexpected voiceless stop which is due to devoicing before word-final *\*-s* (e.g. Lat. *pāx, pācis* ‘peace’, from PIE *\*peh2g’-* ‘fix’, where the regularly de-voiced *\*-k-* in the Nominative was extended to the whole paradigm; Matasović 2010). Thus *\*merg-s* was originally an abstract root noun meaning ‘a division, a sharing’. The semantic development was from ‘what is divided, a share’ to ‘goods, merchandise’. In archaic societies, before money was invented, trading was in fact a form of sharing, or dividing the goods.

In other Italic languages we find cognates of this word, such as Oscan *amirikum* (Acc. sg.) ‘commerce’, Osc. *amiricatud* ‘sold’ (perhaps a Latin loanword). If *merx* and the name of the god *Mercurius* are derived from the same root, then the Faliscan theonym *Mercui* (Dat. sg.) and Oscan *Mirikui* (Dat. sg.) are also related. The idea of Etruscan origin of *merx* and *Mercurius* will also be analysed by looking at the proposed etymologies of other two Latin god names, *Minerva* and *Iuno*, usually connected with Etruscan *Menrva* and *Uni*.

A semantic parallel to the etymology of *merx* is found in Slavic. PSl. *\*tъrgъ* ‘market’ (cf. Vasmer III: 123) can be derived from the root of *\*tъrgati* ‘tear’ (Derksen 502). If the original meaning ‘to tear’ developed from ‘cut into pieces’, we can assume the deverbal abstract noun built from this verb: *\*tъrgъ* ‘piece, share’, which could easily develop into ‘merchandise’ and (by metonymy) ‘market’, the attested meaning. If this is correct, then the etymologies of PSl. *\*tъrgъ* and Lat. *merx* support each other, as they exhibit similar semantic developments.
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**PIE \*h1op- ‘at, by, within the reach of’ in Latin**

PIE \*h1op- ‘on, at’ (Lith. *ap(i)-*  ‘around’, *apie͂* ‘about’) is reflected in Latin as *op-*, and, with the voicing of the final *-p* (as in *sub* ‘under’ < \*(s)up-, *ab* < \*h2ep-) as *ob* ‘towards, in front of, because of’. It is the Ablaut variant of \*h1ep(i) ‘on, at’ (Gr. *epí*, Arm. *ew*, Ved. *ápi* ‘also’, Av. *aipi,* Arm. *ew* ‘also, and’), the reflexes of which are unattested in Latin. The preposition *ob* became a very productive verbal prefix, e.g. in *officiō* ‘stand in the way’ < \*h1op-dhh1k-, *offerō* ‘offer’ < \*h1op-bher-, *objiciō, ōbiciō* ‘throw before’ < \*h1op-(H)ih1-k-, etc. It is also found in some nouns and adjectives that are not obviously derived from verbs, e.g. *obscaenus* ‘unpropitious’ < \*h1op-sk’eh2i-no-, *obscūrus* ‘gloomy, dark’ < \*h1op-sk’oh2i-ro-, *occipitium* ‘occiput, back part of the head’ < \*ob-kaput-, *oppidum* ‘fortified town, barriers’ < \*h1op-ped-o- (from the root of *pēs* ‘foot’), *operiō* ‘cover’ < \*h1op-h2wer-ye-*, oportet* ‘it is proper’ < \* h1op-h2wor-t-eh1- (from the root of *vertō* ‘turn’), perhaps also in *opīmus*  ‘rich’ (if from \*opi-piH-mo-, from the root of Ved. *pī̍van-* ‘fat’). In such words, the reflexes of the prefix \*h1op- are often not easily recognizable, as the word-final stop (usually preserved as unvoiced \*-p-) tends to be assimilated to the following consonant.

This paper will present the reflexes of the PIE adverb-turned-prefix \*h1op- in Latin and attempt to establish its original meaning and relation to the variant \*h1epi. We will offer a number of new etymologies of Latin words with that prefix, e.g. Lat. *offa* ‘morsel’ < PIE \*h1op-bhh1-eh2 ‘(snack) for baking’ (from the root of OHG *bāen* ‘bake’, LIV s.v. \*bheh1-, IEW 113), Lat. *opīnor* ‘think, believe, suppose’ < PIE \*h1op-weys-n- ‘be about to do’ (from the root of Skt. *viṣ-* ‘work, perform’, EWA II: 585-6), and *oblīviscor* ‘forget’ < \*h1op-leyH-w- ‘hide (from memory)’ (from the root of Ved. *ni-láyate* ‘hide oneself’, Hitt. *u-laezi* ‘hide oneself’, Kloekhorst 2008: 913). In the light of the fact that adpositions in IE often develop from petrified case-forms of nouns (cf., e.g., Lat. *ante* ‘before’ < PIE \*h2enti ‘on the face of’), we will propose to derive the PIE adposition \*h1op- from the Nom.-Acc. sg. of a neuter root-noun \*h1op ‘a reach’, from the verbal root \*h1ep- ‘seize’ (Lat. *apīscor* ‘seize’, *coēpī* ‘begin’, Htt. *epp-zi* ‘take, grab’, Skt. *ā̍pa* ‘has reached’, Alb. *jep* ‘give’). The Ablaut variant \* h1epi ‘at’ (< ‘within reach’) is the Loc. sg. of that root noun.
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**Datives of agent vs. Ablatives of agent: some remarks on their meaning and syntactic distribution**

We analyze the different syntactic distribution of so-called “datives of agent” and “ablatives of agent”. For example, besides appearing in typically verbal contexts like *Proelium ab equitibus commissum est*, ablatives of agent can also be found in non-verbal ones like (1):

(1) a. Commisso *ab equitibus* proelio, ... (Caes. *Civ*. 1.41)

b. post civitatem *a Lucio Bruto* liberatam (Cic. *Phil*. 5,17)

In contrast, “datives of agent” are not expected in non-verbal contexts: e.g., in an Ablative Absolute construction like *Hoc deliberato mihi*, the dative *mihi* could not be easily interpreted as an agent (cf. *Hoc deliberato a me*) but rather as a beneficiary. It is rather in a verbal context like *Mihi consilium captum iam diu* *est* (Cic. *Fam*. 5.19.2) where the dative can be understood as the one who has carried out the deliberation (hence the traditional label of "dative of agent").

This syntactic distribution is also found in passive non-verbal contexts that include a verbal adjective in -*ndus.* Contrary to what one could expect from Serbat’s (1996: 500) claim that the “dative of agent” is related to the morpheme *–nd*-, only by-phrases with ablative case are found in these passive non-verbal contexts: e.g., see (2), drawn from Audouin (1887), whose extensive corpus of Cicero’s works is the one we’ll mostly use in our present research. A “dative of agent” is not possible in non-verbal contexts like (2):

(2) a. De provinciis ab iis qui obtinerent retinendis… (Cic. *Fam*. 12, 22, 1).

b. De mercenariis testibus a suis civitatibus notandis… (Cic. *Fam.* 3, 11, 3)

As is well-known, some exceptions to the typical rule whereby the "agent" in passives with *esse* plus verbal adjectives in -*ndus* is expressed by a dative (e.g., *Caesari omnia erat agenda* (Caes. *Gall*. 2.20)) are typically explained (away) in Latin grammars by saying that the ablative of agent is possible to differentiate complements (e.g., *Quibus est a vobis consulendum* (Cic. *Man*. 6)) or to maintain a syntactic parallelism (e.g., *Nec, si a populo praeteritus est quem non oportuit, a iudicibus condemnandus est qui praeteritus non est* (Cic. *Plan*. 3, 8)). However, as evidenced by (2) and other examples found in Audouin (1887), this description is not accurate enough.

The theoretical framework we will use to express how the “ablative of agent” and “dative of agent” are introduced differently in the syntactic structure is the formal one used by Embick (2000) and Mateu (2017), i.a. Essentially, our proposal is that the agentivity expressed by ablative and nominative cases is syntactico-*semantic* (there is a specific syntactic head introducing this kind of agent: e.g., see Kratzer (1996)), whereas that of a “dative-of-agent” is only *conceptual*. Finally, our approach will also be shown to provide support for the (well-known) claim that the dative of agent is a special use of the dative of possession (e.g., Allen&Greenough (1903/2006: 233), i.a.), which typically requires the presence of the verb *esse*. See also Suárez-Martínez (2001) for interesting remarks relating the dative of agent and the *dativus iudicantis*.
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**Límites del discurso directo en la lengua latina**

La comunicación versará sobre las “zonas-límite” entre el discurso directo y otros tipos de discurso, y casos de la categorización ambigua. Como punto de partida me apoyaré en las características del discurso directo que surgieron de las investigaciones y discusiones mantenidas por numerosos lingüistas, entre ellos, por ejemplo, Sternberg (1982), Coulmas (1986), Noh (2000), Semino y Short (2004) Güldemann (2008), Vandelanotte (2009), y para el latín, Rosén (2013), Taous (2017) y Adema (2019). Después pasaré a los casos que 1) comparten con el DD solamente algunos rasgos (p. ej. la reproducción de palabras ajenas y características sintácticas), pero difieren en otros, o 2) no llevan una expresión introductora explícita y pueden, pero no tienen que, ser clasificados como el DD. El primer tipo incluye estructuras como citas puras, citas mixtas, formas verbales con la función del intensificador de la fuerza ilocutiva, y el uso performativo de los verbos. El segundo tipo abarca enunciados que o representan la voz polémica del oponente hipotético, o pueden ser interpretados como preguntas retóricas. Ejemplos de estos fenómenos, sacados de textos de autores latinos, muestran que los límites del DD son difusos y que el papel importante lo juegan el contexto y la situación comunicativa.
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**Origine ed evoluzione delle costruzioni participali assolute in latino**

La relazione intende proporre alcune linee di discussione sull’origine e sull’uso del participio assoluto in latino. In particolare, la questione viene affrontata in una prospettiva di linguistica storica, facendo riferimento alle possibili origini indoeuropee del costrutto e verificandone l’ampliamento e la diffusione nel corso della storia del latino. Particolare attenzione sarà rivolta all’individuazione e all’uso delle costruzioni participiali assolute nella lingua arcaica, sia in documentazioni epigrafiche sia in documentazioni letterarie.

1. Si è molto discusso se l’ablativo assoluto latino sia una costruzione sviluppatasi all’interno del latino o riprenda modelli preesistenti e risalenti all’epoca della comunità linguistica indoeuropea.

2. Poiché nell’ablativo latino confluiscono diversi casi indoeuropei (strumentale, ablativo, locativo) non è certo che l’origine dell’ablativo assoluto sia da individuare nell’antico ablativo (spiegazione di molti manuali fin da Brugmann) piuttosto che negli altri due antichi casi che si sono fusi con questo. La risposta alla domanda dipende anche anche dall’interpretazione del valore che si intende dare a costruzioni participiali che si trovano in testi arcaici, dal momento che, a mio parere, alcuni esempi di costruzioni participiali assolute segnalate in testi arcaici da precedenti studiosi non sono da considerare ablativi assoluti (p.es. *exibant capitibus opertis*, Nevio, difficilmente è da considerare costruzione participiale assoluta).

3. La questione dell’origine non può essere affrontata senza considerare l’esistenza di costruzioni participiali assolute in altre tradizioni linguistiche indoeuropee, e in particolare in antico indiano (locativo assoluto), in greco (genitivo assoluti) e (in misura più modesta) in area germanica (dativo assoluto in gotico e occasionalmente in altre lingue germaniche: i dativi assoluti del baltico e dello slavo fanno probabilmente storia a sé). L’analisi in tutte queste lingue mostra una stretta coerenza delle costruzioni participiali assolute coi casi indicanti valori di tempo (locativo in area indo-iranica; genitivo in greco – dove esistono altresì, benché raramente, testimonianze di dativi assoluti; dativo – erede tra l’altro dell’antico locativo – in gotico).

4. Questo porta a concludere che anche le costruzioni participiali assolute latine hanno la loro origine nel locativo, anche se la successiva fusione di questo caso con ablativo e strumentale ha portato all’insediarsi di valori diversi da quello temporale e più prossimi a valori strumentali (p.es. *invito domino* XII Tab.,)

4bis. Mi propongo di mostrare anche attraverso esempi desunti all’interno del latino come la trafila da seguire sia questa: originari valori temporali che apre successivamente a una gamma di usi molto più larga.

5. Se questa analisi è corretta, l’uso di ablativi assoluti in lingue dell’Italia antica che possiedono ancora un caso locativo deve essere interpretato come imitazione sintattica della costruzione latina. Del resto gli ablativi assoluti italici si trovano in documenti ufficiali che presentano stile elevato e sintassi curata. Pertanto l’ablativo assoluto latino è il modello e gli ablativi assoluti italici ne seguono l’esempio in una situazione di scambi e convergenze molto ampie. Questa interpretazione è interessante anche in chiave di lettura e di valutazione dei legami che intercorrono fra latino e osco-umbro.

6. In sostanza, le costruzioni latine sono da considerare come eredità indoeuropea, anche se probabilmente questa costruzione nella fase comune esisteva più come mera potenzialità che come realtà codificata. Il latino ha dato quindi sviluppo e a una costruzione antica, dandole una diffusione e conferendole molti valori che in precedenza non possedeva.
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**Linguistik der Emotionen: Glück und Freude bei Terenz und Cicero**

Die Linguistik der Emotionen ist ein Minenfeld aus vielerlei Gründen, deren zwei besonders schwer wiegen: Zum einen läßt sich der Begriff der Emotion kaum eingrenzen und sein Ausdruck in einem Text schwer differenzieren, da ein emotionsloses Sprechen gemäß Schulmeinung der Psychologie geradezu unmöglich ist. Zum anderen verwischt die Schriftlichkeit der Überlieferung antiker Texte mit ihren sowohl stofflichen Überarbeitungen als auch grammatikalischen Eingriffen in die Texttradition die direkte Zugewandtheit emotionalen Ausdrucks. Die theoretische Grundlegung der Textproduktion in Rhetorik und Poetik nennt im Rückgriff auf die Affektenlehre Erzeugung von Freude und Lust als ein Ziel der dichterischen Tätigkeit. Den Gegenstand der Untersuchung bilden die lateinische Komödie des Terenz und Plautus sowie Ciceros Briefe. Den Textcorpora ist gemeinsam, daß sie durch Thematik und Adressaten, also inhaltliche und soziale Kriterien, Ausdruck von Wertungen, von Nähe oder Distanz zeigen. Desweiteren liegen sie zeitlich in verschiedenen Phasen der Ausbildung der lateinischen Sprachnorm und gehören nach modernem Verständnis verschiedenen literarischen Gattungen an. Vor dem Hintergrund dieser Kriterien sozialer Differenzierung, diachroner Entwicklung und individueller Textmarkierung zeigt die Untersuchung den Wandel und die Stabilität emotiver Lexeme, Phraseologismen und syntaktischer Strukturen.
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**A New Approach to the Etymology of Latin *testa* ‘earthenware’ and *tesqua*/*tesca* ‘?’**

There is no doubt that the Latin word *testa* ‘earthenware (like a pot)’ was very important as daily vocabulary, as shown by and its inheritance into the Romance languages, e.g., Italian *testa* and French *tête* ‘head’ (with a well-known figurative semantic shift). Nevertheless, its etymology has long been disputed.

Given that it refers to earthenware objects, one might want to associate *testa* with *terra* ‘(surface of the) earth’ and claim that *testa* is a product of *torreō* ‘scorch’ (← PIE √\**ters*- ‘dry up’), i.e., \*‘a burnt thing’ — a nominalized, perfect passive participle. Under this morpho-semantic interpretation, the original form would include the verbal root in zero grade, i.e., \**tr̥s*-*to*-; however, its reflex is *tosto*- (via \**tors*-*to*-; see below for this consonant cluster reduction) with *o*-vocalism (see Walde – Hofmann II: 676). A mechanical reconstruction of the *e*-grade, as seen in Sihler (1995: 504), remains unmotivated. Thus, de Vaan (2008: 617) tentatively regards the form as a loanword (see also Schrijver 1991: 423), denying the derivation from \**tek̑-* ‘to build’ (though supported by Walde – Hofmann) for several reasons, too.

It is true that the names of tools often spread with the items they represent, but it is still too early to give up looking for the origin of our word from Latin and Indo-European perspectives. My paper aims to present a novel etymology by proposing a connection with the verb *terg(e)ō* ‘wipe clean/dry’. One of the features of the form, particularly notable for our purposes, is that the perfect passive participle *tersum* shows *e*-vocalism for some reason. The derivation from the stem *ters*- by -*to*- results in *testo*- with loss of -*r*- in the consonant cluster -*rst*- as with *testis* ‘witness’ (< \**tersti*-; see Weiss 2011: 180). Derivatives in -*tu*- also trigger the same phonological change; thus, words such as *testūdō* ‘(the shell of a) tortoise’ will join our discussion. My paper will demonstrate how these forms were morphologically derived by referring to other examples.

In terms of semantics, *testa* and *terg(e)ō* are well compatible with each other; in some cases, the former means ‘tile’ or ‘pavement’, and its water-resistant feature is in good agreement with the action indicated by *terg(e)ō*. Note that the semantic range of the verb is wider than this; based on several passages where it appears, keeping one thing away from another seems to be its basic concept. This nuance is extremely useful for examining the poorly attested word in Latin, *tesqua*/*tesca*, which has resisted firm interpretation; philological analyses suggest that this form is used to represent an area which is not normally accessible to the public (see Weiss 2010: 322). In this regard, my paper will etymologically link *tesqua*/*tesca* with *testa* and *terg(e)ō*.
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**The typology and theory of metaphor in 2nd c. CE Roman linguistic discourse**

This paper, based on the corpus-oriented approach, will explore the co-occurrence of the terms *metaphora/tra(ns)latio* and *imago* in the 2nd c. CE Latin passages on the cognitive and communicative force of language (Fest. *Verb. Sign.* 352.24, 364.40; Front. *Ad Caes. et Invic.* 4.3.3.11, 4.3.4.4, 4.3.7.11; 4.12.2.6, 4.12.2.10; *Eloq.* 5.3.3). The iconicity of the metaphor and the metaphorical mapping used in Ancient semiotic use of the cognitive images (*phantasmata* or *imagines*), is a particularly important contribution to the theoretical debates on memory. The conceptual nature of the image component can be roughly described as a bridge between what is said (*lexis*) and what is meant (*dianoia*). The term *imago*, a complex and ambiguous concept, should mean "cognitive image" in certain contexts. The image component should be considered as a semantic and a pragmatic phenomenon, it can be explained both in terms of metaphorical mapping and based on other semiotic phenomena. Building on the recent article by Luuk Huitink (2020) which explored Greek material, this paper will discuss bodily and experiential grasp brought by metaphor and the way and terms Latin grammarians discussed the grasp.

It is difficult to say which Greek term for 'image' exactly was translated into Latin. Various terms such as *eidolon, eikon, phantasma* and *phantasia* could mean "cognitive image", as it will be argued in the paper. Thus the anonymous author of Seneca's contemporary treatise "On the sublime" (the so-called Pseudo-Longinus) discusses the "production of images" (*eidolopoiia*) as a necessary component of text-making (*Subl.* 15, 1). The related manifestation of metaphor was first emphasized by Aristotle as "to put the thing in sight" (τὸ πρᾶγμα πρὸ ὀμμάτων ποιεῖν or its constant Latin variant *rem ante oculos ponere*), with its concern for the horizon of the expectations of the recipient (Arist. *Rhet.* 3, 2-11 1405b12-1411b25; [Dem.] *Eloc.* 81; *Rhet. Her.* 4, 45; Cic. *De orat.* 3, 160; Quint. *Inst.* 8, 6, 19). Greek and Latin theoretical passages on mental visuality and (conceptual) metaphor reveal the attention of Roman intellectuals to the communicative processes and interaction of language (speaking) and cognition (meaning). 'Longinus' and Plutarch provide an important background for understanding and interpreting the usage and meaning of certain terms and ideas. Being at the same place at the same time and sharing the same intellectual discourses, belonging to the same 'common ground' in other words, Greek grammarians in Rome were fundamental to the crystallisation of both Greek and Latin linguistic concepts.

Contemporary research permits us to interpret Roman 2nd century CE analysis from a new psycholinguistic perspective. Being natural and universal metaphors depend on multi-layered cultural, religious, political and social codes, in other words, on 'common ground'. Roman 2nd century CE evidence on the discourses on communicational process and the interaction of speaking and meaning can significantly enrich the present exploration of cognitive metaphor.
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**On the evolution of Latin motion verbs. A view from the Vindolanda tablets**

The aim of this paper is an interpretation of the diachronic development of Latin motion verbs based on data from a survey of the Vindolanda tablets and other non-literary texts. While previous analyses have shown how these documents display features of non-classical language (e.g., with reference to the use of cases and prepositions for the expression of goal; see Adams 1995:110; 2003:551; Mackay 1999; Halla-Aho 2009; see also Cabrillana 1997; Van Laer 2019), the focus of my survey is a comparison with the general picture of motion verbs in classical literary texts with respect to aspectual and deictic features (e.g. telic *venio* vs. non-telic *eo*; or a centripetal vs. centrifugal orientation; see Hofmann & Szantyr 1965:301-303; Ricca 1993; Nuti 2016).

At first sight, a peculiarity of the tablets is the overwhelmingly high frequency of *venio* compared to other motion verbs, whose occurrence is considerably limited. This phenomenon – which can be compared to a similar tendency in Cicero’s letters, where *venio* is the motion verb with the highest rate of occurrence (e.g., it is roughly ten times more frequent than *eo*) – does not seem to fully match later trends in Late Latin and Romance, where *venio* continues to be used complementarily alongside a number of other verbs (i.e., not only *eo*, but also *vado*, *ambulo*, etc.). I will therefore evaluate the impact of textual requirements specific to epistolary texts that might be relevant for explaining the use of motion verbs shown in the Vindolanda letters. At the same time, I will try to account for the state-of-affairs displayed in Vindolanda within a framework that includes also secondary typological developments apparently not foregrounded in typological descriptions and which, however, may be relevant factors in the diachronic drift of Latin motion verbs towards a configuration centered around a deictic principle (i.e. centrifugal or “itive” *eo* – centripetal or “ventive” *venio*; cf. *go* vs. *come*; see Wilkins & Hill 1995; Goddard 1997).
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**La ley de Lachmann y el alargamiento vocálico en latín**

Como bien se sabe, el vocalismo latino se ve afectado por diferentes procesos, tales como la abreviación, la elisión, el debilitamiento o el alargamiento de vocales en determinados contextos. Los dos primeros fenómenos están prosódicamente condicionados y obedecen a la conservación de la estructura rítmica, tanto en relación a la estructura básica del pie latino, el troqueo moraico, en el primer caso, como a evitar la proliferación de hiatos en el segundo (entre otros, Mester 1994; McCarthy, Pater & Pruitt 2016, Jacobs 2019). El tercer fenómeno, el debilitamiento o reducción vocálica, también conocido como Ablaut, consiste en la sustitución de las vocales breves no iniciales del latín por vocales menos perceptibles de acuerdo con la escala universal de sonicidad, según la cual, la *a*, vocal baja, es más perceptible que las vocales medias *e* y *o*, y estas, a su vez, más perceptibles que las vocales altas (entre otros, de Lacy 2004). Este proceso es menos regular y se debe a la relación entre la noción de perceptibilidad (Crosswhite 2004) y las posiciones de prominencia (Beckman 1998). Por último, las vocales también pueden alargarse, como el alargamiento por compensación y el proceso conocido como la ley de Lachmann, en la que se centrará esta presentación.

Formulada por el filólogo Karl Lachmann en su edición de *De rerum natura* de Lucrecio, en 1850, la mencionada ley consiste en el alargamiento de la vocal breve seguida de una oclusiva sonora final de una raíz verbal en el participio de pretérito y sus derivados (*ăgo>āctus, āctio*). Ello implica a la vez un condicionamiento fonético y otro morfológico.

La particularidad de este caso de alargamiento consiste en que el ensordecimiento de la consonante de la raíz en contacto con la consonante sorda del participio, por asimilación regresiva, ya se había producido en indoeuropeo -y por tanto es general a todas las lenguas indoeuropeas-, en cambio el alargamiento de la vocal es un proceso propio del latín (entre otros, Jasanoff 2004).

La propuesta de Kiparsky (1965) de una primera regla de alargamiento y una siguiente de asimilación regresiva, basada en criterios fonéticos, no especifica ningún contexto morfológico, y por tanto no explica la no aplicación de la regla, entre otros casos, en contextos no verbales (*grex grĕgis*). Kuryłowicz (1968) introduce el factor morfológico, aduciendo que se debe a la oposición entre formas activas y pasivas, y a las de infectum y perfectum. Sin embargo, este análisis encuentra problemas para explicar por qué en *strĭngo strĭctus*, entre otros casos en relación con nasales, no se produce el alargamiento. Es decir, el análisis no puede soslayar ni el aspecto morfológico ni el contexto fonético.

El objetivo de esta presentación es ofrecer un análisis de este fenómeno particular de alargamiento vocálico en el marco de la Teoría de la Optimidad (entre otros, Prince y Smolensky 1993), que con su jerarquía de restricciones de fidelidad, marcaje y alineación constituye un marco teórico apropiado para dar cuenta de esta multiplicidad de factores, tanto fonológicos como morfológicos.
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**The Interaction between Lability and Alignment in the History of Latin in a Diachronic-Typological Perspective**

The Latin language has three ways to express anticausative verbs, namely (1) the mediopassive voice (sometimes denoted as *-R* marked forms, based on the characteristic formant of the mediopassive), (2) a reflexive pronoun with the verb in the active voice and (3) labile constructions with the verb in the active voice (only possible with a certain number of verbs) (Cennamo 2001, Gianollo 2014, Cennamo, Eythórsson & Barðdal 2015, among others). Labile or lability refers to the valency alternation that verbs or verbal forms can undergo without a formal change in the verb and the phenomenon can be split up into a group of Agent-preserving lability and Patient-preserving lability (Kulikov and Lavidas 2014), the latter of which will be the focus of the present research. Alternative terms for (P-)labile verbs are ambitransitive verbs (of the type S=O) (Dixon 1994), unmarked anticausatives (Heidinger 2010) inchoative/causative verb alternations (Haspelmath 1993), ambivalent actives (Flobert 1975), intransitivizations (Feltenius 1977), etc. A frequently quoted example of a P-labile verb in Latin is aperire, which can be used transitively, as in Plautus’ (*Mostellaria,* 900) *ecquis has aperit foris?* “will someone open the door?”, and intransitively, as in Plautus’ (*Persa,* 300) *foris aperit.* “the door opens” with the maintenance of Patient in the intransitive alternant. The number of P-labile verbs in Latin started to heavily increase from the third century AD on (Feltenius 1977, Gianollo 2014). Apart from the increase of labile verbs, Latin also developed from the third century on a semantic active-stative alignment, in which intransitive verbs with an undergoer subject viz., unaccusative verbs, passives, intransitive P-labile verbs, among others, will take the accusative instead of the nominative (Ledgeway 2012). Dixon (1994) suggested that accusative alignment favours the use of A-labile verbs and, mutatis mutandis, ergative alignment P-labile verbs. Since Late Latin evolved to an active-stative alignment, which is sometimes considered as an intermediate step in the development from an accusative to an ergative alignment (Ledgeway 2012), one can investigate whether the development of alignment had any effect on the development of labile verbs in Late Latin. In the light of the development of an active-stative alignment, one could already observe that the accusative can be used for the subject of the intransitive alternant of a P-labile verb or for passives (Ledgeway 2012, Rovai 2012, 2014, Cennamo 2009, among others), but that does not seem to be the case for reflexive anticausative verbs after some preliminary research. Furthermore, it might be interesting to delve deeper into the anticausative alternation viz., the alternation between labile patterns, reflexive patterns and mediopassive patterns, in relation to changes in through corpus research in substandard Latin texts, which can be found in the databases *PaLaFraLat-V2*, *Epigraphik-Datenbank* and Brepols’ *LLT-A* and *LLT-B*. In the analysis of the results, the development of labile verbs in the history of Latin and Early Romance will be considered from a diachronic-typological perspective.
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**On some political terms in Latin from the Roman history of the late Republic era**

This paper is a preliminary part of a monography, which explores this topic. I want to deal with some lexical items such as *liberalitas, fortitudo, audacia, severitas* and *virtus* both by proposing a semantic interpretation established by exact philological analysis as well as by employing methods and heuristics of contemporary discourse theory. The textual basis of my study will be the Ciceronian private letters (*ad Atticum, ad familiares*) and his late speeches, some major and minor works of Sallust (*De coniuratione Catilinae, Epistulae ad Caesarem senem, Invectiva in Ciceronem*) and the evidence of Caesar’s monography *De bello civili*. I have already written and published some articles on related problems and selected lexical items, which I enumerate in the bibliography that follows.

**Bibliography**

Panagl, O. (2000). Otium honestum - Iabor improbus. Zum lateinischen Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk von Muß, Muße und Müßiggang. In: Ernst Sigot (Hg.), *Otium- Negotium. Beiträge des interdisziplinären Kolloquiums der SODALITAS zum* *Thema ZEIT* (pp. 66-81). Wien: Edition Praesens.

Panagl, O. (2004). Politische Semantik und lateinische Wortgeschichte. In H. Kopetz & J. Marko & K. Poier (Hgg.), *Soziokultureller Wandel im* *Verfassungsstaat. Festschrift für Wolfgang Mantl* (Bd. II, pp. 1495-1506)*.* Wien: Böhlau.

Panagl, O. (2005). Archaisierende Tendenzen in der lateinischen Sprachgeschichte. In S. Kiss & L. Mondin & G. Salvi (Eds), *Latin et langues romanes. Études de linguistique offertes à József Herman* (pp. 47-56)*.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Panagl, O. (2008), Zeitgeschichte, Politjargon und öffentliche Sprache. In F. Schausberger (Hg.), *Geschichte und Identität: Festschrift für Robert Kriechbaumer zum 60. Geburtstag* (pp. 51-68). Wien: Böhlau.

Panagl, O. (2014). Ein würdevolles Problem. Überlegungen zur politischen Semantik von lateinisch *dignitās*. In F. Lang & S. Traxler & E. M. Ruprechtsberger & W. Wohlmayr (Hgg.), *Ein kräftiges Halali aus der Römerzeit! Festschrift für Norbert Heger* (pp. 215 – 220). Salzburg: Eigenverlag Universität Salzburg.

Panagl, O. (2017). Wortbildung, Bedeutungswandel und öffentliche Sprache: lat. *factum* vs. *facinus*. In K. Schaaff & F. Gieseke-Golembowski (Hgg.), *„Wörter bilden“. Jenaer Mai-Kolloquium - zum 25. Todestag von Bernd Barschel* (pp. 49-54)*.* Hamburg: Baar.

Panagl, O. (2018). „Lateinisch *innocentia*. Eine Wortstudie im Schnittbereich von Rechtsprechung, ethischer Norm und Politjargon“. In K. Kazzazi & K. Luttermann & S. Wahl & T. A. Fritz (Hgg.), *Worte über Wörter: Festschrift zu Ehren von Elke Ronneberger-Sibold* (pp. 409-418). Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Angela PARKES - University of Birmingham, UK

**The language of early Christian Latin - an overview of the first generation c 150-250 AD**

I seek, in this paper, to present an overview of the spread of Christian beliefs through the medium of Latin, rather than Greek, during the latter part of the second and the first part of the third centuries AD. . Firstly, a brief outline of Latin usage towards the end of the second century will provide a background to the examination of the gradual development of Latin, with borrowings from Greek and new coinings, to express the tenets of the new Christian religion. Some of the earliest examples of written Latin about Christianity appear to be Latin translations of writings which originally appeared in Greek, such as the First Epistle of Clement, originally written in Greek about the end of the first century, of which a Latin translation is thought to be dated in the second and third centuries, suggesting that already at this period the use of Latin as a means of communication was becoming more widespread amongst Christian communities.

I shall compare and contrast examples from the first extant Christian writers in Latin, Tertullian and Cyprian. Both were native to Carthage, in North Africa, a region in which Latin formed the language of communication much earlier than in other parts of the Roman Empire, and discuss some of the main linguistic differences between these two writers, Tertullian, the theologian, who uses a robust and almost colloquial style of language to express forceful opinions and expositions of Christian doctrine, and Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, the patrician, whose treatises and pastoral correspondence, written in a traditional classical Latin style, present a picture of an administrator in an already established organisation. I submit that this early period of Latin Christian writing lays the foundation for the great Christian writers, Augustine, Jerome and Ambrose, who will emerge in the fourth century.

Finally, I shall consider in outline the only major examination of in recent times of early Christian Latin, that carried out by Monsignor Josef Schrijnen and his associate Christine Mohrmann at the Catholic University of Nijmegen during the first part of the 20th century using, for the first time, insights from the then new discipline of linguistics, even though the conclusions they came to are not, in the main, those which find a sympathetic hearing today. I shall then briefly survey later reactions to this research.
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**Exploiting the (Meta)Data. The LiLa Knowledge Base of Linguistic Resources for Latin Supporting Research in Latin Linguistics**

Despite the proliferation and the increasing coverage of linguistic resources for many modern and historical languages, the interoperability issues imposed by their different formats severely limit their potential for exploitation and use. To address this challenge, the *LiLa: Linking Latin* ERC-Consolidator project (2018-2023; <https://lila-erc.eu>) wants to connect the wealth of linguistic resources tools for Latin developed thus far, by building a Linked Data Knowledge Base of the currently available textual/lexical resources for Latin (e.g., corpora, lexica, ontologies, dictionaries, thesauri), i.e. a collection of several data sets described using the same vocabulary of knowledge description and linked together (Passarotti *et al.*, 2019). Linked Data is a paradigm according to which data in the Semantic Web (Berners-Lee *et al.*, 2001) are interlinked with other data via triple-like connections that can be interrogated via semantic queries. LiLa makes use of a set of Semantic Web and Linguistic Linked Open Data standards, including ontologies to describe linguistic annotation (OLiA: Chiarcos & Sukhareva (2015)), corpus annotation (NIF: Hellmann *et al.* (2013)) and lexical resources (Lemon: Buitelaar *et al.* (2011)).

The LiLa Knowledge Base is highly lexically-based, following the assumption that everything in LiLa deals with words. Textual resources are made of (occurrences of) words, lexical resources describe properties of words, and natural language processing tools process words. The core of the LiLa Knowledge Base is a large collection of Latin lemmas extracted from the lexical base provided by the Latin morphological analyzer *Lemlat* (Passarotti *et al*., 2017; <https://github.com/CIRCSE/LEMLAT3>), which results from the collation of three reference dictionaries for Classical Latin (Georges and Georges, 1913-1918; Glare, 1982; Gradenwitz, 1904), plus the entire *Onomasticon* from Forcellini’s (1940) *Lexicon Totius Latinitatis* (Budassi & Passarotti, 2016) and the Medieval Latin *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis* by Du Cange (1883-1887), for a total of more than 150,000 lemmas (Cecchini *et al.*, 2018). The Lemma is the key Class in the ontology LiLa is built upon. Interoperability is achieved by linking the entries in lexical resources and the corpus tokens pointing to the same lemma.

Our talk wants to introduce the LiLa Knowledge Base, particularly focusing on its use to support research in Latin linguistics. Our contribution will present:

1. the structure of the LiLa collection of lemmas, detailing how its organization of the lexical data helps to harmonize the different lemmatization criteria found in the available annotated corpora for Latin;
2. the process performed to include into LiLa a number of linguistic resources for Latin, among which are the *Index Thomisticus* Treebank (Passarotti, 2019), the PROIEL Treebank (Haug & Jøhndal, 2008), the *Computational Historical Semantics* corpus (<https://www.comphistsem.org/home.html>), the *Late Latin Charter Treebank* ([Korkiakangas](http://www.easychair.org/utils/wild.cgi?url=http://www.mv.helsinki.fi/home/timokork/index.html) & Passarotti, 2011), the corpus of the Latin works of Dante Alighieri (<http://perunaenciclopediadantescadigitale.eu:8080/dantesearch/>) and the *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages* by De Vaan (2008-2018);
3. a number of (types of) complex queries that can be run on the LiLa Knowledge Base, to extract information from the interlinked corpora and lexica, particularly showing the added value of making interact the (meta)data provided by different resources.
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**La lingua del *De errore profanarum religionum* di Firmico Materno**

Si presenta uno studio di carattere linguistico sul *De errore profanarum religionum* di Firmico Materno, un’opera che getta luce su alcuni aspetti fondamentali del processo di cristianizzazione della società occidentale del IV secolo d. C.

In tale trattato di polemica antipagana si rinvengono non poche particolarità lessicali, morfologiche e sintattiche. Alcune di esse sono riferibili precipuamente al linguaggio giuridico caratteristico dell’opera, altre sono spiegabili per influsso dei testi biblici citati dall’autore, altre ancora si inquadrano nel contesto del latino tardo. Nel corso della relazione saranno messe in evidenza tali peculiarità linguistiche, fornendo gli esempi più significativi e saranno messi a frutto i precedenti studi particolari sulla lingua firmiciana e quelli sul latino cristiano.
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**Light verbs, prefixed verbs, and *Aktionsart*. A case study**

The talk aims at reflecting on the aspectual value of light verb constructions, especially those with structure [V+N], having *facio* and *habeo* / *teneo* as light verbs and motion nouns like *iter* and *cursus* as predicative nouns.

In literature it has often been observed that the light verb constructions among their functions have an influence on the lexical aspect, or *Aktionsart*. As regards Latin, for example, Flobert (1996: 195-196) notes that *facio* is *ponctuel*, e.g. as opposed to the durative value of *ago*. Likewise Spevak (2014: 252) notes that *iter facio* "marks the accomplishment of *iter*". Moreover, Flobert (1996: 196) states that "*tenere* rend quelque viguer à *facere*" and that "les préfixes servent à redonner de la force" to these verbs.

On the other hand, in the same context of lexicological studies it has been often noted that prefixes can have an aspectual value (García-Hernandez 1989a, 1989b).

In this study we try to put together these two fields of study, in order to understand (1) to what extent *facio* can actually be considered as a punctual or telic light verb, (2) in which contexts *facio* and *habeo* might actually overlap, and (3) whether *teneo* can be considered to 'strengthen' *habeo*.

The study will deal with the period covered by the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, and take into account light verb constructions such as *iter facio*/*habeo* or *cursum facio*/*habeo* *et similia*.

The expected results are a revision of the actual aspectual values of the light verb constructions under examination.

It seems, in fact, that *facio* does not really always have a punctual value, if it can co-occur with a phasal verb like *coepi*, which can be used exclusively with the durative verbs:

1. *Nauitae haudquaquam dubitantes, quin perisset, cursum, quem facere coeperant, tenuerunt*. (Gell. 16.19.15)

Furthermore, *facio* does not result to be telic in a passage like the following, in which it co-occurs with the modifier 'for-x-time' (*dies circiter quindecim*), marking the atelicity:

1. Ita dies circiter quindecim iter fecerunt (Caes. *Gall*. 1.15.4)

On the othar hand, *facio* is telic when prefixed, e.g. with *cum*-, as shown by the co-occurrence with the modifier 'in-x-time' (year), that marks the telicity:

1. ea cursum anno conficit et latitudinem lustrans sig niferi orbis et longitudinem (Cic. *nat. deor*. 2.53)

Sometimes *conficio* plus motion nouns is not really telic, but it expresses a bounded activity, that is an activity limited in time, as happens also in modern languages, comparing the analytical verb with the synthetic one (e.g. It. *fare una passeggiata* ‘to take a walk’ vs. passeggiare ‘to walk’):

1. constituimus inter nos ut ambulationem postmeridianam conficeremus in Academia. (Cic. *fin*. 5. 1)

The same compatibility with nouns expressing bounded activities can be found with the not-prefixed verb, but in structures like the absolute ablative:

1. […] *Scaevolam duobus spatiis tribusve factis dixisse* […] (Cic. *de orat*. 1. 28)

On the other hand, the use of *habeo* with motion nouns like *iter* seems to be atelic, as well as that of *teneo* (1):

1. *Nuntiatur Afranio magnos commeatus, qui iter habebant ad Caesarem, ad flumen constitisse* (Caes. *Gall*. 1.51.1)
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**Comparison of Latin verbal adjectives**

Priscianus (*GL* II 84,21–22): *quando comparantur participia, transeunt in nominum significationem.*

Cledonius (*GL* V 37,32–34): *participia et nomina – quando significationes suas servant, participia sunt; quando comparationem recipiunt, nomina*.

As can be seen in various Latin grammars, some forms considered to be “participles”, and thus classified by a verbal system – in Latin, the forms in *-tus*/*-sus*, *-nt-*, *-turus*/*-surus* and, with some licence, gerundives in *-ndus* – may lose their verbal character and become standard adjectives. (From the diachronic point of view, the reverse process occurred, but this fact has no bearing on the problem we shall consider.) To determine when and under what circumstances it is reasonable to regard these forms as participles and when as adjectives is notoriously problematic, reflected in the fact that the very definition of a participle is somewhat vague. Even analysis of Latin texts containing examples of these forms is not always able to reveal unequivocally whether a particular form functions verbally as a participle or rather acts as an adjective.

One of the main indicators usually given for a participle form to act as an adjective – and, as we can see in the epigraph to this abstract, one mentioned already by late-ancient grammarians – is the ability to be graded. According to this rule, if a given form is attested as a comparative or superlative, then this represents conclusive evidence that in this particular instance it is an adjective and that under certain (not easily definable) circumstances this given form may act as an adjective normally would. But the inverse does not hold: if a given form has no attested comparative or superlative, it cannot be concluded that this form never acts as an adjective. Comparison may be a prominent characteristic of adjectives; however, it actually only applies to a core set of adjectives, which may – depending on the system of derivational morphology in the given language – be very limited in scope (for example, according to the Czech National Corpus, in the highly inflective language of Czech just 6% of adjectives have attested degree forms). In Latin, as was shown in several recently published studies (e.g. Pultrová 2018), degree forms are attested in around 14–15% of adjectives.

In this talk I will attempt to define which types of Latin forms in *-tus*/*-sus*, *-nt-*, *-turus*/*-surus* and *-ndus* have the ability to act as standard adjectives and to establish which of them are gradable and why. In order to do this I will use extensive excerpted Latin material featuring comparison along with theoretical considerations on scalarity, (im)perfectiveness, stativity, and other factors. In addition, I shall draw comparisons with material from the author’s modern native language (Czech).
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***Per-*, trans-, δια- and the expression of aspect: ‘spending time doing something’**

The purpose of this paper is to describe and analyse the use of preverbs in Latin and Greek for the expression of aspect. The paper builds on previous findings on preverbs in general (Zanchi) and particularly on *per*- (Brucale & Mocciaro, Cabrillana, García Hernández, van Laer), *trans*- (Bortolussi, Revuelta) and δια- (Revuelta).

The prefixes *per*-, *trans*- and δια- in combination with movement verbs generally convey the idea that a Trajector traverses a certain amount of spatial extension (usually codified as a noun in the accusative or a PP) as its moves. However, when that extension refers to time, they rather describe the consumption of time by some entity in a certain activity or position. In this case the compound verbs convey aspect and their meaning could be paraphrased as follows: ‘A (Agent) spends B (Time) doing C (Activity)/in C (Place)’.

In these constructions the agent (A) is usually a living being and occupies the subject position, whereas the time (B) and the activity/place (C) can display different forms and occupy different argument slots. The purpose of this paper is to provide a typology of those possibilities. The following are just some of them:

a) The activity (or mood of action) can be conveyed by the simple verb (*per-pōto* ‘to spend time drinking’), by a PP (*tempus alii per ostentationem et officiorum ambitum transigunt* ‘others spend time in advertisement and in courting attention’), by a gerundive (*utinam relicum tempus nec patiendo infanda nec faciendo traduci posset!* ‘would that the remaining time could be passed without either suffering or committing atrocities!’) or by a participle (τὸ μὲν πλεῖστον τῆς ἡμέρας ἐνταῦθα ἀκροβολιζόμενοι διῆγον ‘they spent most of the day there in fighting at long range’), among other means.

b) The time spent (aspectual time) can appear as a NP in the accusative (see previous examples) or a PP, or can be expressed lexically by the ‘simple’ verb (*per-noct-o*, δια-νυκτερ-εύω ‘to spend the night’).

The combination of the different alternatives of the two previous factors provides a grid of possible constructions. This algebra will be used in order to distinguish the behaviour of Latin and Greek in this area.

The use of preverbs for this purpose is usual outside the Classical languages and can be found in other satellite-framed languages (Mateu & Acedo-Matellán) like English or German (Dewell): «Ich hab die ganze Nacht durch-getanzt bis zum bitteren Ende!» (‘I have spent the whole night dancing till the end’)

From a theoretical point of view the paper has a Functional-constructionist approach (Dik, Goldberg) and includes a description of the predicate frames (quantitative and qualitative valency, selection restrictions). But it presents also a Cognitive approach (Talmy, Luraghi). It includes comparative-typological data, since the Latin data are compared mainly with those of Ancient Greek, but also with other from modern languages (mainly English and German).

The study is based on two main sources: (a) databases containing Latin and Greek texts (corpora) specifically designed by the author for this purpose; (b) databases containing Latin (Lewis & Short) and Greek (Liddell-Scott-Jones) dictionaries. Managing a large number of data with databases allows to find all kinds of regularities and collocations.
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***Sensus censendi*. On the expression of opinions in Latin**

The cognitive verbs have been deeply studied in several languages and in Latin, too. Among them, *sentio* stands out as a polyvalent, ‘multimodal’ lexical item (Jansegers, Enghels y Domínguez, 2016). Lexicologists have categorized it not only within the verbs of sense and the verbs of feeling, but also as belonging to the semantic range of knowing and thinking verbs (*puto*, *opinor*, *arbitror*, *existimo*, *cogito*,and others), used to express one’s own opinion.

The verb *censeo* takes also part in this semantic field and shares several lexical features and combination possibilities with *sentio*. For example, both are transitive and tend to take as direct object an interrogative pronoun (Cic. *nat. deor.* 1.16 *uelim scire quid* sentias | *epist*. 11.15.1 *scire uelim quid* censeas) or an infinitive clause (*Att*. 14.13.4 sentio *ualde esse utile* | *off.* 2.10 *id* *utile* *esse* consent; *epist*. 6.22.3 *parum posse* sentio| *Tusc*. 5.57 *omnia se posse* censebat). This infinitive clause may use a passive periphrastic infinitive, inviting a meaning of obligation (*fin.* 1.48 *quod* sentiant *non esse faciendum*, *Tusc*. 2.8 *minus id ita faciendum esse* sentimus), and this combination occurs much more often for *censeo*: *epist.* 10.1.3 *quid censeas mihi faciendum*; *epist.* 11.29.1 *mihi faciendum esse* censeres; *epist.* 12.23.4 (*cfr. off.* 1, 1) *idem tibi* censeo *faciendum*.

Furthermore, both *sentio* and *censeo* are frequently followed by prepositional phrases (*fin.* 3.11*de quibus* [= *Pyrrhone* *et* *Aristone*] *cupio* *scire* *quid* sentias | *ad Att.* 7.12.6 uelim mihi exponas etiam quid censeas *de Terentia et Tullia*) or adverbs (*Att.* 15.18.2 *sin tu aliter* sentis, *uelim ad me scribas* | *epist.* 10.1.2 nisi *si tu aliter* censes, *et hinc abero et illim*). More specifically, the adverbs *sic* and *ita* are two of the most preferred by both the studied verbs: *Att.* 8.8.1 *sic enim* sentio | *fin.* 3.61*, off.* 3.117 *sic enim* consent; *fin.* 1.10 ita sentio *et saepe disserui* | *Tusc.* 1.72 *ita* censebat *itaque disseruit*.

However, while their syntactic and semantic similarities are proven by common linguistic behaviour, as seen in the previous examples, I work on the assumption that two lexical units, for reasons of linguistic economy, must not be in any case absolute synonyms. In respect of *sentio* and *censeo*, this fact is clear, based on some of their particular meanings. As a starting point, I will take an interesting testimony of Cicero’s epistles *ad Atticum* (1.4.1), *nunc uero sentio*[[4]](#footnote-4)| *censeo*[[5]](#footnote-5)*, quod commodo* *tuo facere poteris, uenias ad id tempus, quod scribis*, which enables us to affirm not only the paradigmatic affinity of the verbs, but also the semantic nuances that oppose each other.

This paper aims to point out the common and specific syntactic and semantic features of *censeo* and *sentio*, providing usage examples or statistical data from a significant *corpus* of ten Archaic, Classical and post-Classical Latin authors. A *corpus* that will become our *sensus censendi*, our ‘sense to decide’ whether was *sentio* or *censeo* the verb that Cicero must have written in his letter addressed to Atticus.
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**The use of *suscipio* in support verb constructions: inchoativity and agentivity**

The aim of this paper is to analyse the verb *suscipio* as a support verb. Support verb constructions (from here on, SVC) have become a focus of interest in Latin linguistics leading to numerous publications in recent years (*cf*. among many others, Baños, 2018; Bodelot-Spevak, 2018; Pompei, 2016). Following Baños (in press), SVCs can be defined in a broad sense as ‘noun-verb collocations (i.e. lexically specified combinations) composed of an abstract noun (usually deverbal) and a verb that encodes the tense, mode, voice and/or number-person categories, allowing the noun to function as the nucleus of an analytic verbal predicate’. A primary distinction can be made between basic support verbs (e.g. *gerere* in *bellum gerere* ‘to wage war’) and extension support verbs, which codify more specific semantic properties such as aspectual or diathetical distinctions (Gross, 2004: 357; Baños, 2014). While diathetical extensions have already been studied (see Mendózar (2019) for causative extensions and Brunet (2008) and Hidalgo (forth.) for passive ones), the same cannot be said for aspectual extensions.

In particular,when combining with a predicative noun, *suscipio* specifies the inception phase of the event denoted by the noun, i.e. it has inchoative meaning (e.g. *bellum suscipere* ‘to undertake a war’, as opposed to *bellum gerere* ‘to wage war’ and *bellum deponere* ‘to end a war’, Cic, *leg*. 2,34; *cf*. also Baños, 2014). To do so, we will provide an analysis of the collocational possibilities of *suscipio* on the basis of a corpus from Plautus to Aulus Gellius (Packard Humanities Institute database edition), showing both how a wide range of predicative nouns combine with *suscipio* to express inchoativity, and how *suscipio* is used in contrast to other aspectual support verbs such as *depono*, which specifies the termination phase of an event.

In addition to inchoativity, there is another semantic feature which may be relevant regarding the election of *suscipio* as a support verb, namely agentivity. Many nouns combining with *suscipio* (*causam*, *laborem*, *negotium*, *curam*, etc.) are conceptualised as responsibilities which the subject (first argument of the SVC) willingly undertakes. Therefore, the change of state denoted by SVC(i.e. the inception of the event) is instigated by and under the control of a prototypically human agent (*cf*. Haverling, 2010: 291). Evidence of the agentive character of SVC with *suscipio* can be found, for example, in (i) manner adjuncts expressing the way in which the subject prompts the state change (e.g. *libenter causam eius suscepi*, Sen. *contr*. 1,4,3); (ii) imperative constructions (*suscipe hanc curam*, Plin. *epist*. 3,6,5), which implies that the state change itself is in control of the agent (Dik, 1991: 113); or (iii) in contexts where the volition of the agent is made explicit (*Quam causam suscipere iurati iudices noluerunt*, Cic. *leg. agr.* 1,12). Therefore, agentivity may play an important role inrestricting the range of *suscipio*’s combinatorial nouns (to controllable events) and in distinguishing *suscipio* from other inchoative extensions such as *ineo* or *ingredior*.

**References**

Baños, J. M. (2014). Construcciones con verbo soporte, extensiones y elecciones preferentes: *bellum parare, suscipere, trahere, conficere*. *Boletín de la Sociedad de Estudios Latinos*, 1, 5-11.

Baños, J. M. (2018). Las construcciones con verbo soporte en latín: una perspectiva diacrónica. In C. Bodelot, & O. Spevak (Eds.), *Les constructions à verbe support en latin* (pp. 21-51). Clermont-Ferrand: Presses Universitaires Blaise Pascal.

Baños, J. M. (in press). Support verb constructions in Plautus and Terence. In J. N. Adams & G. Pezzini, & A. Chaboud (Eds.), *Early Latin: Constructs, Diversity, Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bodelot, C. & Spevak, O. (Eds.). (2018). *Les constructions à verbe support en latin*. Clermont-Ferrand: Presses Universitaires Blaise Pascal.

Brunet, C. (2008). *Accipere*, le verbe support et élément du passif nominal chez Sénèque et Valère-Maxime. In G. Viré (Ed.), *Autour du lexique latin*, *Communications Faites Lors Du Xiiie Colloque International de Linguistique Latine, Bruxelles, 4 Au 9 Avril 2005* (pp. 167-177). Bruxelles: Éditions Latomus.

Dik, S. C. (1997) [1989]. *The Theory of Functional Grammar Part 1: The Structure of the Clause* (2nd edn.). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gross, G. (2004). Pour un Bescherelle des prédicats nominaux. *Lingvisticae Investigationes*,27(2), 343-359.

Haverling, G. V. M. (2010). Actionality, tense and viewpoint. In P. Baldi & P. Cuzzolin (Ed.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax. Volume 2: Constituent Syntax: Adverbial Phrases, Adverbs, Mood, Tense* (pp. 277-523)*.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

Hidalgo, J. I. (forth.). *La expresión léxica de la diátesis pasiva en latín: colocaciones verbo-nominales*. Madrid: Unpublished doctoral thesis. Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

Mendózar, J. (2019). *La expresión de la causatividad en latín: diátesis léxica y colocaciones*. Madrid: Unpublished doctoral thesis. Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

Pompei, A. (2016). Construction Grammar and Latin: the case of *habeo*. *Pallas*,102, 99-108.

Josine SCHRICKX - Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften

***Nescio an*: maybe or maybe not?**

The verb *nescio* with an indirect question introduced by *an* can be used in both a positive and a negative direction. In example 1 *nescio an* has a positive direction: Cicero thinks that what he is about to mention should have been the first thing. In example 2 it has a negative direction: the declaimer does not think that Cicero wants to go on living. Politeness could be a reason for using this indirect mode of speaking.

1. CIC. ad Q. fr. 2, 16 (15), 4 venio nunc ad id, quod nescio an primum esse debuerit.

„Now I come to what ought perhaps to have been put first.“[[6]](#footnote-6)

1. SEN. suas. 7, 1 nescio an hoc tempore vivere velis, Cicero.

„I do not know, Cicero, if you want to live at this time“

*Nescio an* also seems to have developed into an adverb, without a verb of its own. In that case it can mean, positively, ‘maybe’, ‘I rather think’ or, negatively, ‘maybe not’ or even ‘not’, as we can see in example 3 and 4 respectively.

1. LIV. 23, 16, 16 ingens eo die res ac nescio an maxima illo bello gesta est (sit *trad.*).

“a very great thing, I rather think the greatest in that war, was accomplished that day.“

1. QVINT. inst. 6, 3, 6varia hominum iudicia in eo quod non ratione aliqua sed motu animi quodam, nescio an enarrabili, iudicatur.

“that people’s judgements differ over a matter which is judged not on rational principles but by a feeling which cannot be put into words.“

The OLD has also recognized this phenomenon:

a (affirmatively) I am inclined to think that, perhaps, probably; (often w. ellipsis of vb.) b (negatively) I am not sure that, possibly not.

The following questions will be addressed in this paper:

- how can *nescio an* go in both a positive and a negative direction? and are there other comparable words?

- has *nescio an* developed into an adverb? and are there comparable words for this phenomenon?

The corpus used comprises all Latin text down to AD 600.
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**La alternancia léxica en el paradigma adverbial de ‘día’ | ‘noche’ en latín: *noctu*, *nocte*, *de nocte* y *sub noctem* y *diu*, *die*, *de die*, *sub diu* e *in diem***

La consideración de los adverbios ha tenido una trayectoria compleja tanto en su vertiente semántica como morfosintáctica. De manera apriorística los mecanismos de formación derivativa han sido bien descritos desde los estudios antiguos conservados hasta hoy. Sin embargo, las particularidades de algunas fosilizaciones, la recreación de sintagmas estandarizados y las alternancias léxicas que se establecen en los distintos campos de designación circunstancial no han conseguido una gran repercusión en los estudios lingüísticos.

Si bien los acusativos adverbiales (como furtim o statim) han suscitado interés por diversas razones, la constitución de sintagmas de significación similar merece mayor atención en su estudio sistemático y diacrónico de las distintas formas alternantes en sus entornos sintácticos.

La fosilización como fenómeno morfológico está indisolublemente unida a las posibles realizaciones casuales, como la tendencia a la adverbialización del acusativo y el ablativo. No obstante, el papel de la preposición como transpositor funcional es una marca fundamental en la estandarización léxica de unidades pluriverbales, ya sea a partir de sus constituyentes semánticos o como marca gramatical.

Precisamente las estructuras PS (adverbios constituidos por una preposición y sustantivo) son un buen ejemplo de la función hipercaracterizadora de las preposiciones en contacto con los casos con valor próximo al adverbial, como se deduce de la alternancia de nocte | de die o incluso en sub noctem, en donde los valores semánticos del primer elemento quedan total o parcialmente opacados en virtud de la función contextual del frasema.

Los principios de la lexemática implican que la oposición de elementos semánticos mínimos configura los campos de significación, lo que nos lleva a pensar que no es posible que la variación que se da entre los distintos elementos sea producto de la sinonimia o que se trate de variaciones propias de la creación literaria. De igual manera la composición semejante de los frasemas alternantes nos hace pensar que se trata de un fenómeno sistemático de naturaleza particular.

A partir del análisis detallado de la distribución de estos elementos tanto a nivel diacrónico como según su incidencia de aparición en los distintos géneros literarios, pretendemos ofrecer una visión más clara de las diferencias que presentan las unidades que estudiamos. Así, intentaremos reflejar las oposiciones que constituyen este pequeño sistema adverbial, tanto a nivel de variación interna como alternante, y cuáles son las repercusiones del empleo de las preposiciones en la combinatoria de las colocaciones y su funcionamiento como nexo entre frasemas antonímicos.
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**Les fonctions des noms verbaux dans le *De inventione* de Cicéron**

Dans la présente étude, je me propose d’examiner les noms verbaux en -*tio* et -*tus* dans le *De inventione* de Cicéron. Plusieurs études ont été consacrées aux noms verbaux, en particulier à la différence entre les noms en -*tio* et -*tus* (Fruyt 2002, Garzón 2018). Cependant, leurs fonctions dans les textes techniques ont été peu explorées (Espinilla 1995 ; cf. Rosén 1983). En comparaison avec les textes de caractère narratif (le *De divinatione*, par exemple), où les noms verbaux dénotent des activités et des événements, dans les textes techniques, les noms verbaux sont utilisés pour dénoter des concepts, des manières de faire ou des procédés. La présente étude est fondée sur un dépouillement du livre premier du *De inventione* et sur une analyse syntaxique et sémantique des occurrences réunies. Le livre premier présente 116 noms en -*tio*, dont certains sont utilisés plus d’une fois (685 occurrences au total). Ce chiffre contrastenettement avec 43 occurrences des noms en -*tus*, qui, à l’exception de *eventus*, n’interviennent pas dans les définitions. La fréquence et la variété des noms en -*tio* sont des indices de leur productivité dans le domaine des langues techniques (Panagl 1987: 131-133).

Je vais essayer de montrer que dans le *De inventione*, les noms verbaux en -*tio* sont presque majoritairement employés au nominatif (et à l’accusatif sujet): dans 46,6 % des cas. Ils fonctionnent comme des sujets ou des attributs du sujet dans les définitions pour nommer des concepts (sujet) ou pour présenter le contenu de ces concepts (attribut du sujet) de manière condensée. Ces nominalisations sont concurrencées par la proposition relative (telle *elocutio est per quam*) ou par la proposition en *cum* (telle *elocutio est cum*):

1. *Elocutio* est idoneorumverborum ad inventionem *accommodatio*. (Cic. *Inv.* 1.9)

« L’élocution est l’adaptation des mots appropriés à l’invention. »

Les noms verbaux en -*tio* sont des moyens de condensation d’un contenu propositionnel par excellence. La condensation souvent va de pair avec la complexité du syntagme nominal, complexité qui est relativement rare dans les textes de caractère narratif. Par exemple en (1), le nom trivalent *accommodatio* est accompagné d’un génitif objectif (*idoneorum verborum*) et du syntagme prépositionnel *ad inventionem* (argument),qui exprime le point d’application. En outre, dans les textes techniques comme ce traité de rhétorique, les noms verbaux en -*tio* sont des moyens de « dé-agentivisation » ou effacement de l’agent, qui est inconnu, non pertinent, ou laissé non-spécifié (Pinkster 2015: 253). L’agent de *elocutio* (1), ce qui est une partie de la rhétorique, peut être considéré comme absent parce que aucun agent spécifique ne se laisse déduire du contexte.
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**El genitivo en *-īus* de la flexión pronominal latina**

El genitivo de buena parte de los tradicionalmente llamados pronombres presenta la característica de una terminación de genitivo en *-īus* cuyo origen es oscuro. Los gramáticos suelen dividir estas formas en dos tipos, según vayan precedidas de vocal (*cuius, eius, huius*), representadas epigráficamente en escrituras como eiivs, o de consonante (*istius, illius, ipsius, unius, alius,* etc.). Se considera que la forma *cuius* ha influido en la extracción de la terminación *-ius* y en su extensión analógica a los demás genitivos pronominales.

M. Leumann alude a varias hipótesis que tratan de explicar su origen. Así, algunos recurren a la forma del a. i. *asya, kasya* para postular en indoeuropeo una terminación *\*e-syo, \*kwe/o-syo*, aunque ello implique aceptar el discutible cambio fonético *-sy* > *-ii-*, único en latín; a esta terminación se le habría añadido la *-s* de genitivo (*uid.* P. Monteil, G. Meiser o J. A. Beltrán). También hay quien considera *cuius* una forma procedente del adjetivo *cuius, -a, -um*, pero Leumann estima que debería ser más bien al revés, en vista de que no hay *\*\*huius, -a, -um*. Por su parte, A. Ernout, propone distinto origen para *eius* *(<\*ei-os*) que para *huius* *(\*hoiios > \*hoīius*); las demás formas serían analógicas.

Como explicación de las formas del segundo tipo Leumann recoge la idea de A. Tovar de que serían, como las otras, antiguas formas de genitivo en *-ī*, hipercaracterizadas con la desinencia de genitivo en *-os* (*ill* + *-ī* + *os*). Con todo, el propio Tovar considera que el punto débil de su teoría es no poder aplicarla bien a las primeras formas, pues no es capaz de “alegar ninguna prueba concluyente para explicar la conservación de la *-ī-* intervocálica”.

Por nuestra parte, consideramos que esta de Tovar es la interpretación más satisfactoria, pues permite entender, de acuerdo con la teoría sobre vocales largas de J. L. Moralejo, los dos tipos de la misma manera. Alegaremos, entonces, como “prueba concluyente para explicar la conservación de la *-ī-* intervocálica”, el idéntico comportamiento de esa *-ī-* intervocálica en otras palabras del latín que hasta ahora no se habían tenido en cuenta. Por último, examinaremos el diferente tratamiento métrico que dan los poetas a la *-ī-*, especialmente, en las formas del segundo tipo.
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**Analyse syntaxique et pragmatique des corrélations causales en latin**

Jusqu’à présent les études sur les subordonnées de cause en latin se sont concentrées majoritairement sur la valeur ou l’emploi des conjonctions (Mellet, 1994 ; Thomas, 2019), ou bien sur les rapports complexes qu’entretiennent les différents types de subordonnées entre elles, notamment avec le morphème *quod* (Serbat, 2003). La présente étude aura pour objet d’étudier les subordonnées causales en contexte de corrélation (Haudry, 1973 ; Panchón Cabañeros, 1982 ; Bodelot, 2004 ; Fruyt, 2004 ; Fruyt, 2005), c’est-à-dire lorsque les subordonnées se trouvent annoncées ou reprises par un déictique textuel. Nous porterons ainsi notre attention sur l’emploi du corrélatif, auquel la littérature grammaticale reconnaît généralement un effet d’emphase de la subordonnée.

La particularité des causales – partagée en partie avec les finales – réside en ce que l’élément corrélatif représente, en plus de formes incontestablement adverbiales (*ideo, propterea*), un élément (pro)nominal fléchi, de type *eo*, dont il est souvent difficile de savoir s’il est encore interprétable comme un déictique neutre à l’ablatif ou bien s’il s’agit d’un léxème adverbialisé. De même, les emplois de ce dernier au milieu d’un syntagme prépositionnel ne laissent pas toujours deviner le degré de lexicalisation du subordonnant (type *in eo quod*, ou français *par ce que >parce que*).

Ainsi, à l’aide d’un corpus de textes s’échelonnant de l’époque préclassique jusqu’à l’époque postclassique, on analysera les différents emplois des corrélatifs revêtant la forme de syntagmes prépositionnels ou d’adverbes, lorsqu’ils ont une subordonnée en *quod* ou en *quia* (Baños, 1991) comme explicitant sémantique: de fait, nous écarterons les causales en *quoniam* (Baños, 2014: 90 *sqq*) et en *quando* (Fatello, 2018). Nous procéderons à la comparaison des deux types de diptyques, dits normaux ou inverses, selon la position de la subordonnée par rapport à la principale dans la charpente phrastique, ainsi que le degré de proximité entre le corrélatif et la subordonnée.

Nous verrons que les différentes unités corrélatives peuvent trouver des justifications pragmatiques et syntaxiques, non seulement en ce qui concerne le type de prédicat ou de prédication dans lesquels s’insèrent ces subordonnées, mais aussi pour ce qui est l’insertion du subordonnant dans la macro-phrase, de sorte que ces structures peuvent être analysées dans le même champ linguistique que les phénomènes de dislocation, traditionnellement limités au domaine des complétives (Bodelot, 1996).
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***La séquence [*sola *+* VIR *en tête de vers]: un nouveau Motif Textuel dans l’élégie ovidienne ?***

Interpellé par un article de C. Bolton (1994) qui relève la proximité de *sola* et *uir* dans un vers des *Héroïdes*, nous avons entrepris d’étudier la séquence [*sola* + VIR en tête de vers] dans l’œuvre d’Ovide. Cette séquence illustre-t-elle d’une manière privilégiée chez Ovide les rapports amant-amante propres à l’élégie ? Pour répondre à cette question, nous analysons cette séquence par le biais des Motifs Textuels (MT), une notion linguistique récente visant à analyser le double phénomène de récurrence/cooccurrence au sein d’un corpus donné (Longrée *et al.* 2008 ; Longrée & Mellet 2008).

Nous livrons d’abord une définition des MT: patrons lexico-syntaxiques récurrents au service d’une fonction sémantique stable, mais admettant des variables lexicales, grammaticales et/ou fonctionnelles. Nous exposons ensuite nos outils et notre méthodologie. Pour relever chaque occurrence du MT, nous investiguons le corpus poétique lemmatisé et étiqueté figurant dans la base LASLA de l’ULiège via le programme Hyperbase créé à l’Université Nice-Antipolis. Pour les textes qui n’y sont pas encodés, nous investiguons les bases informatiques du PHI et de The Library of Latin Texts. Nous dégageons les constantes et les variables du MT d’abord dans l’ensemble de l’œuvre ovidienne, nous élargissons ensuite notre champ de recherche à tout le corpus poétique d’époque républicaine et augustéenne pour voir si le MT est propre à Ovide. Nous en donnons ensuite une définition finale.

Après avoir distingué les deux acceptions de *sola* (solitude ; unicité), nous avons relevé dans toute l’œuvre d’Ovide trois occurrences avec [*sola* (unicité) + VIR en tête de vers] (*H.* 3, 97 ; 15, 153 (Bornecque & Prévost 2018) ; *Am.* I, 10, 29 (Bornecque 2012)) et une seule occurrence de [*sola* (solitude) + VIR au second hémistiche du pentamètre] (*H.* 7, 84). Nous nous penchons ici sur les trois premières occurrences uniquement. En poésie [*sola* + VIR en tête de vers] apparaît d’abord chez Virgile (*En.* IV, 423 (Perret 2018)), ensuite chez Ovide, ce qui rend compte d’une possible influence du premier sur le second. Mais la séquence virgilienne ne répond pas à une stratégie littéraire qui puisse rendre compte de ce que nous appelons MT. En revanche, Ovide élabore une tournure toute personnelle pour dire les rapports homme/femme au sein du couple désuni.

Nous ne considérons comme MT que deux des trois occurrences ovidiennes: *H.* 3, 97 et *Am.* i, 10, 29. Elles répondent à la structure suivante: [*sola* épithète détachée (sens: unicité) en tête d’hexamètre + VIR contigu (sens: homme ou époux) + personnage féminin complémentaire contigu (femme ou épouse) + verbe se rapportant à une action dirigée vers VIR]. Ce MT a une fonction emphatique et discriminante: par la position de *sola* en début de vers, mise en exergue de la capacité exclusive d’une (catégorie de) personne(s) de sexe féminin à exercer une influence décisive sur l’être masculin défini dans sa complémentarité vis-à-vis d’elle. Le MT a aussi une fonction iconique: inclusion du référent masculin entre les deux éléments du référent féminin. Enfin, le MT a une fonction caractérisante car il ne se trouve pas chez les autres poètes antérieurs ou contemporains. Au sein du corpus ovidien, il n’apparaît que dans les élégies amoureuses (*Héroïdes* et *Amours*), ce que justifie pleinement le thème central de ces deux œuvres.

Toutefois, le nombre restreint de cooccurrences des lemmes SOLVS et VIR dans l’œuvre ovidienne au regard de leur fréquence respective (197 fois le lemme SOLVS dont 34 fois en tête de vers, 498 fois le lemme VIR) soulève la question du nombre minimal d’occurrences à envisager pour qu’il y ait MT et nous invite à ne pas perdre de vue que cette notion est avant tout un outil d’investigation moderne.
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**The expression of ‘substitution’ in Latin**

The notions of 'substitution' and 'preference' have been proposed by Kortmann (2000: 468) as forms of relation between constituents and sentences for many languages in Europe. Polo (2016) has also explored these expressions in Ancient Greek. As for Latin, whereas the notion of ‘preference’ has been described within comparative sentences (called pseudo-comparative, cf. Tarriño 2021: cap. 24 § 2.5), there has not been enough specific attention about ‘substitution’ –just a brief mention in Baños (2021: chap. 11 § 4.2) about *pro* + Abl; subordinate clauses introduced by *pro* *eo ut,* are considered by K-St (II 248) among consecutives, as by Pinkster (2021: chap. 16 § 84).

Nevertheless, there is evidence for the existence of specific and partially grammaticalized expressions for 'substitution' at least from Livy onwards. The most frequent marker is *pro* + Abl. (*ut*), including examples of both prepositional phrases (1) and subordinate clauses (2):

1. quod Sabini aureas armillas […] bracchio leuo […] habuerint, pepigisse eam quod in sinistris manibus haberent; eo scuta illi **pro aureis donis** congesta (“because the Sabines wore heavy Golden bracelets on their left arms […], she had stipulated for what they had on their left arms, and that they had therefore heaped their shields upon her, **instead of gifts of gold**” Liv. 1,11,9)
2. Galli, […], posqueam **pro eo ut** ipsi ex alieno agro raperent […], suas terras sedem belli esse […] uidere, (“the Gauls, […], after they saw that their own lands were the headquarters of war […], **instead of looting someone else's land** themselves …” Liv. 22,1,2)

The aim of this paper is to further investigate this kind of expressions taking as a departing point a series of particular uses of *pro* + Abl. that have been previously studied in Torrego (1995: 301-304). The questions I intend to answer are the following: 1) Which are the syntactic and semantic characteristics of the substitution expressions, mainly compared to other values of *pro* + Abl.? 2) Do they operate at the syntactic level of noun phrase, sentence or both? 3. Is there any evidence for the existence of a specific semantic function of Substitution in Latin? 4) Given the low number of instances of ‘substitution’ clauses like (2), are there other means in Latin to express this notion?

My research is based on a corpus of prose data from Livy onwards.
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**Latin translations of Greek ὅτι-clauses in the Vulgate and Vetus Latina**

This paper deals with Latin translations of Greek clauses introduced by ὅτι in both the Vulgate and Old Latin versions of the Bible. Greek ὅτι is primarily a completive complementizer but it also occurs in causal clauses, and in some cases it is not easy to distinguish between the two functions (cf. Rijksbaron 2002 [1984]: 85, fn. 2). In the Vulgate and the manuscripts of Old Latin Bible ὅτι-clauses are mainly translated by *quod*, *quia*, and *quoniam*. All of them are known to be causal complementizers in Classical Latin and to develop completive values (cf. Hofmann & Szantyr 1965: 572ff. (*quod*), 584ff. (*quia*), 626ff. (*quoniam*); Serbat 2003: 734ff.; Taylor 1951: 227-249; Woolsey 1953: 52-69; Baños Baños 1991: 79-108). The choice among the three Latin complementizers seems to be due to chance, according to Serbat (2003: 649). The aim of this study is to show that the choice of one complementizer instead of another correlates with some semantic and syntactic differences concerning the semantic class of the main verb and the modal values of the subordinate clause.

This study is corpus-based and provides both quantitative and qualitative analysis of the data (cf. Bejarano 1975: 89-90 for some quantitative data). It takes into account all occurrences of ὅτι-clauses in the Greek Gospels and their Latin translations in both the Vulgate and the manuscripts of Old Latin Bible (Jülicher, Matzkow, Aland 1972 [1938]). A pilot investigation into the Gospel of Mark shows that in the Vulgate *quod* is preferred when the verb of the subordinate clause is a subjunctive and the verb of the main clause is a non-assertive predicate, whereas *quoniam* occurs with indicatives and assertive predicates and *quia* is the unmarked choice, since it depends on both assertive and non-assertive predicates and takes both subjunctive and indicative verbs. Quantitative data confirms the unmarked value of *quia* as a completive complementizer with 49 occurrences instead of 18 occurrences of *quoniam* and 7 occurrences of *quod*. The data of both Afra and Itala manuscripts are very different from those of the Vulgate: in the Itala manuscripts *quod* (27 occurrences) is slightly preferred to both *quia* and *quoniam* (19 occurrences for each of them), whilst in the Afra there are 31 occurrences of *quia*, 11 of *quoniam* and no occurrence of *quod*.

As expected results of this research, we can foresee: (1) a systematic (quantitative and qualitative) description of the occurrences of *quod*, *quia*, and *quoniam* in the Latin translations of the Gospels; (2) a better knowledge of the different factors ruling the choice of completive complementizers: this can also be useful for further research in Latin-Romance diachrony (cf. Herman 1963, 1989; Cuzzolin 1991; Roca Alamá 2001; Greco 2012, 2014).
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**Elementi tematizzati, focalizzati e clitici nella periferia sinistra del latino**

Con periferia sinistra della frase si intende indicare l’organizzazione interna in termini di proiezioni ordinate in cui si pensa sia articolata la proiezione che precede il *Complementizer Phrase* (ipotesi *Split CP*), individuata a partire da Hale (1987) per le lingue indoeuropee antiche, e da Rizzi (1997) e Benincà (2001; 2006) per le lingue romanze, attraverso la quale è possibile mostrare come i costituenti tematizzati, focalizzati e altri connessi a funzioni di operatore si collochino secondo ordini non casuali nello spazio sintattico a sinistra della frase minima (questi studi sono ora compresi all’interno del più generale *Cartographic Project*). In questo lavoro verranno proposte alcune osservazioni sulla collocazione dei costituenti nella periferia sinistra della frase in latino e l’interazione che essi manifestano con la collocazione dei clitici, in comparazione con altre lingue indoeuropee antiche. Si cercherà di mostrare come alcuni fenomeni, talvolta considerati di origine prosodica (ad es. i *cola* di Fraenkel 1933 e la loro interazione con la collocazione dei clitici), possano essere analizzati all’interno di un quadro basato esclusivamente su categorie sintattiche, che prevede l’esistenza di ordini di base (testa/complemento) all’interno della frase e dei costituenti - e un’operazione di movimento, motivata da ragioni connesse con l’organizzazione informativa della frase. Questo approccio metodologico era già stato iniziato dagli studi pioneristici di sintassi dei linguisti neogrammatici, segnatamente da Delbrück (1878; 1900). Il quadro teorico in cui si iscrive questo lavoro si oppone quindi all’idea che il latino debba essere iscritto nel novero delle lingue non configurazionali (si veda ad es. la discussione in Ledgeway 2012), il che tuttavia comporterebbe, ad es. l’impossibilità di individuare un *Verbal Phrase*: le difficoltà principali che ostacolano l’individuazione di un ordine di base in latino probabilmente derivano dalla fase di transizione che esso rappresenta nel passaggio da un tipo indoeuropeo a testa finale a un tipo a testa iniziale e dall’uso estensivo dell’*hyperbaton* (cfr. ad es. Giusti&Oniga 2007), fenomeno che è comune ad altre lingue indoeuropee antiche e presente anche in alcune lingue indoeuropee moderne, ad es. in serbocroato (Bošković 2005). Il corpus preso qui in esame attinge principalmente ai repertori già ampiamente utilizzati per la ricerca e disponibili presso, ad es. <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/indexe.htm>, <http://www.intratext.com/LATINA/> e altri, oltre ai dati già individuati nelle fonti secondarie. Si deve tenere conto del fatto che, in uno studio di una lingua antica non basato su criteri quantitativi, la logica principale non è quella di considerare ciò che è più o meno numeroso, ma quella per cui ciò che è possibile è grammaticale, mentre permane la difficoltà di valutare ciò che non è attestato, che potrebbe essere solo casualmente assente, oppure impossibile. Necessariamente quindi deve essere preso in considerazione un arco temporale piuttosto ampio, pur tenendo conto che già in epoca abbastanza alta (ad es. Claudius Terentianus, cfr. Adams 1994) sono attestate condizioni che modificano il quadro precedente rispetto all’*hyperbaton* e alla collocazione dei pronomi clitici. I dati provenienti dai testi sottoposti al vincolo del metro non vengono esclusi, dal momento che anche in questi casi la lingua utilizzata può avere regole proprie, ma restrittive, considerando ad es. l’importanza che hanno avuto nell’ambito della ricerca sulla sintassi della periferia sinistra delle lingue romanze medievali e, in generale, delle altre lingue indoeuropee antiche.
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**Remarks on The Aspect of The Present Tense**

Recently, much attention has been paid to the Latin aspect and the aspectual value of Latin tenses (e.g., Aerts 2021, Adema 2019, Vaníková 2019, Haverling 2010, Oldsjö 2001). There are many differing views on the matter, with no consensus reached. It is often said that aspectual difference can only be seen when comparing imperfect and perfect tense. Conversely, the aspectual values of the present and future tenses have not been debated thoroughly. Some scholars consider the present to have an imperfective/durative value (e.g., Panhuis 2009: 42); others think the present tense can be either punctual or durative (e.g., Oniga 2014: 113; Menge 2000: 178). According to Pinkster (2015: 395), the present tense denotes simultaneity with the moment of speech. Serbat (1975: 216) considers the present tense an atemporal tense with no aspectual value of its own. Haverling (2010:347) points out that Latin (and Slavic languages) uses the present tense for “anterior continuing”, whereas English, for example, uses the present perfect tense. All the descriptions have two main issues: confusing the categories of aspect and telicity, and not distinguishing grammatical aspect as a verbal category and aspect as a universal category expressed by the whole predication and other constituents.

In summary, the present tense is either considered imperfective or indifferent regarding aspect. As for grammatical aspect, the present tense clearly does not have any aspectual opposition in the sense of the imperfect/perfect tenses. However, if we consider aspect a universal characteristic of a predication (cf. Vaníková 2019: 8), then even the predications with verbs in the present tense must have an aspectual value. But which constituents in such a predication add or change the aspectual value?

Many scholars have attempted to explain the role of prefixes in Latin. Slavic languages have the morphological means to combine any tense with either aspect – however aspect influences the value of the tense, i.e., telic verbs combined with present tense morphemes render the future, not some perfective present. Consequently, the present tense is inherently imperfective (and quite logically so, since the imperfective aspect does not denote limits, and something that is present cannot be depicted as a whole, or as completed).

The paper shows that the present tense is, indeed, by default imperfective, but there are features that change this default value, such as the situation type of the verb, esp. its telicity, arguments, and prefixes. It is crucial to identify the possible combinations of these features and the meanings rendered by different combinations. Thorough analysis of a corpus featuring all verbs with the *ex-* prefix from Plautus to Cicero reveals that the prefixed telic verbs generally do not function as the actual present. In 54% cases, these were historical present tenses denoting perfective past; in 33% cases, they denote iterativity; 5% instances are *praesens pro futuro*; only 4% actual present; 2% conative present.

It seems obvious that the aspect is a compositional category, and this paper attempts to demonstrate an approach, which may be used in further descriptions of the category.
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**The smallest of leaps: some parameters of prepositional hyperbaton**

Noun phrases split by a governing preposition of the type *summa cum laude* are sometimes used as the iconic example of hyperbaton in Latin. This said, some recent accounts of hyperbaton have disputed their status as hyperbaton altogether. Powell (2010) excludes them entirely from his study of the different types of hyperbaton in Ciceronian rhetoric, arguing that while there may be a minor shift in emphasis, these constructions are ‘routine’ in Classical Latin. Agbayani & Golston (2016), on the other hand, propose that all movement in Latin can be explained in terms of phonology, and that this kind of discontinuity is the consequence of marking a phonological word of the prepositional phrase (henceforth ‘PP’) as prosodically prominent. Yet another perspective is provided by Devine & Stephens (2006) who, working within a generative framework, conclude that the modifier (and in some rare cases the nominal head) is moved to a discourse projection local to the PP.

The aim of this paper is to investigate the parameters of this type of hyperbaton more closely, without referring itself to any specific theoretical framework. Instead, I will combine and compare insights into the nature of Latin word order gained within different frameworks, including Functional Grammar and discourse analysis (cf. among others Bolkestein 2001, Panhuis 1982, Spevak 2010), typology (Adams 1976), and generative syntax (Devine & Stephens 2006). In particular, I will be concerned with the kinds of modifiers involved, the prepositions involved, and distributional patterns including some discussion of the role played by discourse features. I will draw my data from the totality of the prepositional phrases with branching complements in a selection of texts, also including continuous PPs in order to provide a reliable basis for comparison of discourse features and well-grounded statistics on frequency.

I have collected the data from a range of Ciceronian speeches, 18 in total, covering the author’s entire career and different oratorical genres. All prepositional phrases in these texts were excerpted and tagged for a number of syntactic features, including the type of modifier involved, the order of the components making up the PP, the type of clause, the position and function of the PP within the clause, and whether or not the phrase is discontinuous. Cases where an additional intervener (such as a particle, a verb, or a weak pronoun) is inserted into the PP were also noted.

Preliminary results suggest that prepositional hyperbaton is particularly common with a group of modifiers largely covered by the so-called “preferential” words (quantifying adjectives, adjectives of size, superlatives, etc.), but not entirely. It also seems to be over-represented with certain prepositions, as occurs most frequently in prepositional phrases governed by *in* and *de*. Furthermore, initial results suggest that the distribution vis-à-vis continuous constructions is to some extent sensitive to pragmatic concerns.

**References**

Adams, J. (1976). A typological approach to Latin word order. *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 81, 70–100.

Agbayani, B & C. Golston. (2016). Phonological constituents and their movement in Latin. *Phonology*, 33, 1–42.

Bolkestein, M. (2001). Random scrambling? Constraints and discontinuity in Latin noun phrases. In C. Moussy (Ed.), *De lingua latina novae questiones* (pp. 245–258). Louvain: Peeters.

Devine, A. M. & L. D.Stephens. (2006). *Latin word order. Structured meaning and information*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Panhuis, D. (1982). *The Communicative Perspective in the Sentence. A Study of Latin Word Order*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Powell, J. G. F. (2010). Hyperbaton and register in Cicero. In E. Dickey & A. Chahoud (Eds.), *Colloquial and Literary Latin* (pp. 163–185). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spevak, O. (2010). *Constituent order in classical Latin prose*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

WORKSHOP “CONVERSATION AND DIALOGUE IN LATIN”

**Organizers:** Łukasz Berger, Rodie Risselada, Rodrigo Verano

Giulia BEGHINI - Università di Verona

***Age/agite*: la rielaborazione artistica di un polifunzionale «discourse marker» in Virgilio**

Tracce della viva conversazione sono presenti, con diversi gradi di mimesi, in letteratura. Anche l'epica virgiliana, pur non essendo marcatamente mimetica della comunicazione orale di carattere colloquiale, ne riporta interessanti casi di riutilizzo artistico. Uno di questi è costituito dal «discourse marker» *age/agite*, un'interiezione secondaria con un significato di base esortativo, ancora poco studiata, specialmente nella produzione virgiliana (Lepre 1985 e Barbini 1966). Lo studio vorrebbe continuare una ricerca prospettata in Beghini (2020) dedicata al latino colloquiale nell'*Eneide*. Il lavoro ha necessitato della messa a punto di un metodo in parte nuovo per gli studi sul «Colloquial Latin», capace di coniugare un approccio di tipo linguistico e stilistico a uno di tipo pragmatico e sociolinguistico. L'impianto metodologico sviluppato da Ricottilli (2003) sulla base di Hofmann (1951) e accolto anche da Dickey & Chahoud (2010), è stato arricchito dall'analisi sinergica di dati appartenenti all'asse testuale (lessico, sintassi, retorica, registri e metrica) ed extratestuale (ambientazione, situazione, «Stimmung», relazione tra i personaggi, prossemica, gestualità, pragmatica, eventuali strategie di «politeness»). Una fase di estrema importanza, che potrebbe essere sintetizzata nella formula "spiegare Virgilio con Virgilio", ha permesso di individuare dei corrispettivi linguistici e situazionali all'interno della produzione del Mantovano e di toccarne con mano la profonda sensibilità linguistica. Infine, nella consapevolezza che la «parole» di un poeta è inestricabilmente connessa con la «langue» del tempo, per quanto riguarda specifici «case studies» tale analisi è stata condotta sia sulle fonti letterarie sia su quelle non ufficiali e prive di intento artistico precedenti e coeve a Virgilio, nel tentativo di ricostruire, per quanto possibile, la "storia" di una parola, di un'espressione o di una costruzione.

Rifacendosi a tale metodologia, che può agevolmente comunicare con il metodo teorizzato da Kroon (1995), il presente lavoro si propone di esaminare le occorrenze dell'interiezione *age/agite* all'interno della poesia di Virgilio, con particolare attenzione ai dialoghi tra personaggi (rispetto a quelli attivati dal narratore in prima persona) e all'epica. Sembra, infatti, quanto mai stimolante vedere i modi in cui Virgilio rielabora artisticamente tale materiale linguistico polifunzionale e tipico dell'oralità in un genere le cui regole e la cui *gravitas* esigono un allontanamento dal quotidiano. L'obiettivo è quello di cogliere più aspetti possibili di tale elemento dalla natura sfuggente, a metà, come ha intuito Biville (2002), tra l'espressione linguistica e quella del corpo. Primaria sarà l'individuazione, quindi, dei diversificati valori e delle funzioni assunti da *age* e *agite* nei vari contesti. Particolarmente proficua si prospetta, inoltre, l'analisi dettagliata di due «case studies» costituiti dai nessi interiezionali *quin age/agite* e *nunc age/agite*. Chiaramente, si estenderà lo studio alle attestazioni letterarie e non letterarie precedenti e contemporanee a Virgilio, senza la pretesa di ricostruire lo sviluppo diacronico, bensì nel tentativo di stabilire se e in quale misura le interiezioni *age/agite* e i nessi interiezionali che esse vengono a creare siano stati attinti dal vivo uso parlato o, invece, abbiano subìto la stilizzazione poetica.
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**Doing interruptions in Terence and Menander**

Conversation Analysis (CA) is engaged with drawing a connection between the orderliness of the verbal interaction (the so-called micro-level) and the social organization (macro-level; see Schegloff 1987). Accordingly, the way the rules of speakership assignment operate, in a broader perspective, will systematically inform us who in a given community is preferably selected as the next speaker or, on the contrary, who tends to be exempt of the speakership rights or even deprived thereof with impunity.

This paper seeks to investigate one selected phenomenon of the Latin (literary) conversation in comparison with its Greek counterpart. By using the methods of CA, we will describe turn-management problems and turn-taking violations, with a specific focus on interruptions in the comedies by Terence compared to his most prominent Greek sources, the plays by Menander. The topic has been partially addressed in previous studies on verbal interaction both in Roman comedy (Müller [1997: 55-64], Barrios-Lech [2016: 157-162]) and in Menander (Osmun [1952: 78-95], Sorrentino [2012: 115-118]), but never in a contrastive, cross-linguistic perspective (e.g. Ulijn 1995, Li 2001).

Furthermore, our objective is to revise and broaden the methods of identifying interruptions in dramatic corpora. To this end, we will combine the formal criteria of (syntactic) non-completion of the utterance **(1)** with a more pragmatic, participant-oriented approach. Thus, our analysis will also include the cases of interruptions claimed or reported by the characters **(2)**, even if the turn-at-hand seems to be syntactically complete (see Bilmes 1997).

1. DE. Mitto rem: consuetudinem amborum—

MI. Mane.

scio, istuc ibam.

DE. Never mind about the money. It’s the way they both live—

MI. Hold on! I know. I was coming to that.’ (Ter. *Ad.* 820-821)

1. Σω μειράκιον, οὕτως εὐτυχοίης, βραχ[ύ τι μου

ἄκουσον–

Δα. εὖ γε, δέσποθ', οὕτω πολλά [σοι

ἀγαθὰ γένοιτο.

Σω. –καὶ σύ γ', ὁ λαλῶν πρ[όσεχε δή.

‘SO. Young man, *please* let me say *some*thing!

DA. Bravo master, [you] deserve a shower of blessings!

SO. And you listen too, you interrupter!’ (Men. *Dys.* 299-301)

The initial examination of the Latin and the Greek data suggests that most of the turn-system violations belong to male speakers, while high-power characters are rarely interrupted by their subordinates. Hopefully, our theoretical and contrastive approach will allow us to offer a more nuanced account of the phenomenon. We argue that a study of the dynamics of turn-taking in ancient comedy will ultimately provide data of the social behaviour of different communities (or type) of speakers, as represented in those plays.
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**La gestualità disfunzionale nelle tragedie di Seneca**

Seneca descrive con una certa frequenza la gestualità dei personaggi sia nelle opere in prosa che nelle tragedie. Particolarmente adeguato allo studio delle rappresentazioni gestuali si rivela il metodo della pragmatica della comunicazione così come applicato ai testi classici (Watzlawick, Helmick Beavin, Jackson 1967; Ricottilli 2009a). Uno dei paradigmi fondamentali della pragmatica della comunicazione, infatti, è la distinzione fra livello di contenuto e livello di relazione. Il livello di contenuto riguarda le semplici informazioni. Il livello di relazione fornisce informazioni sulle informazioni stesse, indicando come esse si rapportino alla relazione che intercorre fra i soggetti interagenti. Il livello di relazione è veicolato prevalentemente da forme di comunicazione non verbale, quali, appunto, la gestualità. Nella costruzione del dialogo sono dunque fondamentali, accanto agli aspetti della comunicazione verbale, quelli della comunicazione gestuale. Per quanto concerne la produzione senecana, lo studio pragmatico della gestualità è stato finora svolto con sistematicità solo nell’ambito dello scambio di *beneficia*, connotato da Seneca da forti implicazioni di tipo relazionale (Ricottilli 2009b). La preferenza accordata dal filosofo alle descrizioni gestuali è del resto collegata alla predilezione stoica per l’ostensione, considerata uno strumento di conoscenza (Berrettoni 1989; Moretti 1995; Ricottilli 2000; Ricottilli 2009b). Nel corso di un lavoro finalizzato all’indagine del rapporto tra relazione e identità nelle tragedie di Seneca (Calabrese 2017), inoltre, è emerso come la gestualità non veicoli soltanto il livello di relazione, ma sia utilizzata dal drammaturgo come potente mezzo per esprimere e rappresentare l’identità nella relazione.

Nell’analisi del dialogo così come riprodotto dai testi antichi, la presenza degli interlocutori rende necessario affiancare alla comunicazione verbale quella gestuale, la quale può rafforzare, integrare, smentire le parole. Proprio per la connessione tra aspetti verbali e gestuali, risulta importante non trascurare la gestualità, tanto più che essa risulta talvolta per i Romani più convincente delle espressioni linguistiche. Ci si propone ora di estendere il lavoro già intrapreso sulla gestualità all’intero *corpus* tragico senecano, con specifico riferimento ad una situazione ben precisa: quella in cui la gestualità appaia disfunzionale, o poiché incongrua rispetto alle parole, o poiché non in linea con le aspettative dell’interlocutore in rapporto all’interazione in atto, alla relazione che intercorre tra i soggetti interagenti, nonché allo status e al genere del parlante.

Si intende analizzare questa disfunzionalità con attenzione agli effetti che essa è in grado di provocare tanto a livello di enunciato, ovvero sui personaggi, quanto a livello di enunciazione, cioè sui lettori. L’analisi pragmatica, efficace nell’esegesi delle dinamiche comunicative che hanno luogo nei drammi senecani, verrà dunque condotta con riferimento costante alla specificità del codice antropologico e culturale romano, che appare fondamentale per ricostruire le aspettative dei personaggi e dei lettori in rapporto al gesto. I Romani infatti, come noto, hanno condotto una riflessione profonda sulla gestualità (Sittl 1890; Ricottilli 2000; Corbeill 2004; Fögen 2004; Cairns 2005; Aldrete 2017), e sono arrivati a dotarla anche in altre opere (Calabrese 2019) di una significativa funzione di carattere interpretativo, nonché di un altissimo valore artistico.
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**Elaborated Orality in Plautine and Terentian Comedy, from Latin to Romance**

This paper focuses on two discourse strategies often used as mechanisms of fictional orality in Latin comedy: several *formulae* at the beginning of the dialogical turn and various mechanisms of dialogical interruption. I will consider different plays by Plautus and Terence –whose language has been analyzed by Happ (1969), Hofmann (1978 [1926]) and Bagordo (2001), among others– with the aim of identifying some regularities at the beginning of the conversational turn characterizing the dialogical nature of a given literary text (cf. Del Rey 2016). At the same time, I will observe to what extent different mechanisms regarding interruption and co-construction of discourse (López Serena & Méndez García de Paredes 2009; López Serena y Sáez Rivera 2018) are frequent in these texts and to what extent they motivate the appearance of figures of syntax (Blanche-Benveniste 1998; López Serena 2007) that imitate discursive forms typical of conceptual orality (Koch & Oesterreicher 2011 [1990]). The description of this type of strategy, and the determination of its extension in Latin literature, which I will try to determine using the databases available for classical and humanistic Latin, is fundamental to understanding the construction of dialogical discourse in classical languages (cf. Verano 2017, 2018 for Greek and Berger 2017, 2019 for Latin). The theoretical-methodological assumptions on which this work is based come from the field of German variational linguistics. Specifically, I rely on Koch & Oesterreicher’s (2011 [1990]) model that understands the relationship between orality and scripturality as a non-dicotomic conceptual continuum. Based on this model, I propose that the mechanisms of fictional orality to be found in dialogic texts represent an *elaborated* orality that is not conceptually monolithic. In this sense, I assume that the consideration of phenomena typical of communicative distance that appear in literary dialogues should not be excluded from the analysis of orality in literary dialogue. The analysis of the Plautine and Terentian works that I will carry out will allow, as I hope, to recognize *discourse-traditional* strategies (cf. Koch 1987; Winter-Froemel *et al*. 2015) that characterize dialogue as such, strategies that are recovered in the humanistic dialogue fundamentally by Erasmus of Rotterdam and that, through the translational activity especially since European Humanism, will reach the Romance languages, where these mechanisms will also set the pattern of dialogical writing.
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**La structuration de l’interaction verbale dans les dialogues de Cicéron: La fonction discursive de *tum* introducteur de répliques dans le *Brutus***

L’extrême simplicité des formules d’insertion du discours direct dans les dialogues narratifs de Cicéron n’a guère invité les chercheurs à se pencher sur la manière dont l’Arpinate introduit les répliques de ses personnages. Celles-ci sont presque toujours accompagnées d’une incise comportant invariablement le verbe de dire *inquit*, et parfois précédées d’une formule introductrice consistant en un connecteur suivi d’un nom propre ou d’un pronom renvoyant au locuteur. Andrieu (1954) oppose leur « rigidité » à la souplesse des formules d’insertion des dialogues platoniciens. En dépit, ou peut-être plutôt du fait de leur relative monotonie, les formules introductrices de Cicéron présentent des variations qui, bien que minimes, peuvent s’avérer tout à fait significatives. À propos des dialogues narratifs de Platon, Rijksbaron (2019) a ainsi dégagé la valeur pragmatique de l’alternance en apparence anodine entre ἔφη/ἔφην et ἦ δ’ὅς/ἦν δ’ἐγώ, la première formule indiquant une continuité tandis que la seconde marque une rupture dans le déroulement du dialogue. Nous avons nous-même pu montrer ailleurs que l’alternance entre nom propre et pronom pour désigner le locuteur dans la formule introduisant sa réplique fournissait des indications sur l’allocation des tours de parole. C’est ici l’emploi récurrent du connecteur temporel *tum* pour introduire les répliques des personnages qui retiendra notre attention. Nous nous interrogerons sur ce qui motive la présence ou l’absence d’une formule d’introduction en *tum* ainsi que sur la fréquence de son emploi par rapport à celui d’autres connecteurs qui peuvent aussi apparaître dans ces formules. Nous nous attacherons à montrer, en nous inscrivant dans le cadre théorique de l’analyse conversationnelle (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974, Kerbrat-Orecchioni 1990, Schegloff 2007), que ces variations font système et nous livrent des informations sur la structuration de l’interaction. Nous utiliserons comme corpus pour cette étude le *Brutus* qui, par le nombre de répliques au discours direct qu’il présente (115), permet de prendre en compte la valeur conversationnelle de chacune d’elles tout en offrant suffisamment de cas pour que des conclusions significatives puissent en être tirées.

**Bibliographie**

Andrieu, J. (1954). *Le Dialogue antique. Structure et présentation*. Paris, Les Belles Lettres.

Fleck, F. (2020). Les marques frontalières du discours direct: l’attribution des répliques dans le *Brutus* de Cicéron. *Lalies*, 40, 43-59.

Hilton, J. (1999). The Role of Discourse and Lexical Meaning in the Grammaticalisation of Temporal Particles in Latin. *Glotta*, 74, 198-210.

Hilton, J. (1989). Temporal Connectors in the Narrative Discourse of Cicero. In M. Lavency & D. Longrée (Éds.), *Actes du Ve Colloque de Linguistique Latine* (pp. 173-184). Louvain-la-Neuve: Cahiers de l'institut de Linquistique de Louvain.

Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (1990). *Les Interactions verbales*. *Vol. 1*. Paris: Armand Colin.

Kroon, C. (2011). Latin Particles and the Grammar of Discourse. In J. Clackson (Ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language*. Malden, MA/Oxford/Chichester: Blackwell.

Rijksbaron, A. (2019). On the Syntax and Pragmatics of *inquit* Formulae in Plato’s Narrated Dialogues. In A. Rijksbaron, *Form and Function in Greek Grammar* (pp. 210-222). Amsterdam: Brill.

Rosén, H. (2009). Coherence, Sentence Modification and Sentence-part Modification: The Contribution of Particles. In Ph. Baldi & P. Cuzzolin (Eds.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*, vol. 1: *Syntax of the Sentence* (pp. 317-441). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.

Sacks H. & E. A. Schegloff & G. Jefferson. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language*, 50, 596-735.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Federica IURESCIA - Zürich Universität

**Conversational behaviour after quarrels: im/politeness in Latin dialogues**

The paper proposed intends to analyse conversational behaviour after a quarrel in Latin literary texts.

Taking the quarrels in Roman Comedy, Tragedy and Novel (Iurescia 2019a, Iurescia 2019b) as a corpus, it focuses on the consequence of these conflictual interactions: is it reconciliation or a disruption of the interpersonal relations? Does the quarrel shift in another kind of interaction, or is there a time break and a new interaction is set? Is the conversation’s structure (openings, closings, turn management) standard or marked? Which im/polite expressions play a role in the (portions of) interactions after a quarrel?

In tackling such research questions, Conversational Analysis (Sacks, Schegloff 1973, Levinson 1983, Schegloff 2007) and im/politeness theories (Brown, Levinson 1987 [1978], Watts 2003, Culpeper 2011) serve to appreciate the use and distribution of the occurring linguistic devices, such as speech acts (e. g. threats, insults, apologies, congratulations), terms of address, non-interpellation, change of interlocutor, interruptions. Much has been written on these themes within the realm of Historical Pragmatics in Latin (Hoffmann 1983, Roesch 2005, Roesch 2008, Berger 2016, Berger 2019, Iurescia, Martin 2019 on conversation’s structure; on im/politeness in Latin see the overview in Unceta Gómez 2014, Unceta Gómez 2018, together with Roesch 2019), but relatively scarce attention has been paid on these linguistic features in a specific kind of interaction, or rather in the developments of this interaction. This paper aims to be a first step in this direction.
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**Tempi comici e anomalie nel ritmo dell’interazione nelle commedie di Plauto**

La manipolazione del ritmo dell’interazione è una risorsa di cui Plauto si serve in modo ricorrente per ottenere potenti effetti comici nella gestione dei dialoghi: giochi di deliberata alterazione nei ritmi conversazionali appaiono in varie commedie, a volte ripresi con sistematicità e variati in complesse rielaborazioni creative. Il fenomeno emerge con forte evidenza ad esempio nel *Mercator*, oggetto di uno studio specifico (Raccanelli, 2019), in cui è stato messo a punto un metodo di analisi che integra la tradizionale indagine sui *clichés* comici attesi dagli spettatori plautini con un approccio ispirato alla pragmatica della comunicazione applicata ai testi letterari latini (Watzlawick, Helmick Beavin, Jackson,1967; Ricottilli, 2009 e 2010). In particolare, lo strumento pragmatico più rilevante ai fini di quest’analisi è la nozione di punteggiatura della sequenza interattiva, in relazione al concatenarsi dei messaggi in una logica di causalità circolare, attraverso la quale si (ri)definiscono i ruoli degli interagenti. Si può pensare, ad esempio, a scambi dialogici come quelli nelle scene di *altercatio*, configurati secondo gli schemi della *verbivelitatio* e del *par pari respondere*, in cui la dinamica ritmica dell’interazione può arrivare ad articolarsi in forme incalzanti di *stychomitía* o anche di *antilabé.* In casi come questi l’accelerazione dello scambio verbale può portare a giochi di alterazione del circuito comunicativo, come ad esempio l’accavallamento dei turni dialogici, l’inversione dell’ordine azione/reazione, il blocco del flusso comunicativo, *etc*. Lo studio sinora condotto ha mostrato come tali anomalie nel dialogo possano essere sfruttate da Plauto, a seconda dei contesti, per produrre effetti diversi, come ad esempio per infrangere deliberatamente le norme di cortesia nella conversazione, per capovolgere i ruoli dei personaggi nel corso dell’interazione, oppure per creare puri giochi di *nonsense*, in cui la meccanica ritmica risulta paradossalmente prevaricante rispetto ai contenuti della comunicazione. Essenziale, in questo tipo di analisi, è naturalmente tener conto di forme letterarie e modelli antropologici, ovvero delle convenzioni teatrali attivate nella mimesi della conversazione, come anche del contesto culturale condiviso dal commediografo con gli spettatori.

La ricerca pragmatica condotta sul campione del *Mercator*, insomma, ha aperto un campo di indagine nuovo, rispetto al quale sono in corso ulteriori studi e progetti di sviluppo. In particolare, in prospettiva di un ampliamento all’intero *corpus* plautino, ci si propone qui di estendere il lavoro così avviato almeno a una selezione particolarmente significativa delle commedie. In tale campione, si intende procedere nella rilevazione delle anomalie ritmiche emergenti dalle conversazioni fra i personaggi plautini e nell’analisi dei contesti in cui esse appaiono. Si potranno così ricavare dati interessanti da comparare con i risultati finora ottenuti, in rapporto alla frequenza dei fenomeni, alla loro densità nei testi, alle diverse tipologie emergenti, ai giochi di variazione modulare cui Plauto li sottopone, come anche rispetto ai diversi effetti che tali alterazioni sortiscono nella conversazione fra i personaggi, (ri)definendone i ruoli, infrangendo le regole dell’interazione, evidenziando in paradossi metacomunicativi gli ingranaggi della meccanica dialogica.
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**Non-Polar and Para-Polar Responses to Polar Initiating Turns in Latin Dialogue**

The comparative perspective informing many of the approaches to studying response mechanisms offers rewards as well as obstacles, which need to be navigated through re-examination of the sources, an integrative view of the approaches, and the examination of phenomena at the borders of the prototypical patterns involving polar affirmative and negative response tokens, often in binary patterns.

The responses to polar initiating turns in Latin are an interesting case linguistically and philologically due to a number of factors, including Latin being a dead language, the stylized and literary nature of the attestations and their Greek models, the evidence of Early and Later Latin as the tokens and patterns evolve into the daughter languages, and the analytical criteria and tools of Conversation Analysis and Cohesion increasingly applied to the philological study of classical languages.

In his work on ‘yes’ and ‘no’ in the Roman Comic authors, Thesleff has presented subtle *differentiae* involving levels of anaphora and other elements for assessing polar responses to statements, questions and commands in Greek, Latin and Romance languages, and has thrown the gauntlet to further pursue this. In her theoretical introduction to her work on directives in Latin, in the discussion on the nature of ‘exchange’, Risselada has opened up the complexity of non-binary exchanges and other breaches of the adjacency-pair models. Thesleff and Rosén in discussing *immo*, and Rosén in her work on epitaxis have opened up vistas which promote the reconsideration of the nature of corrective responses, which are most salient in the distinction of Modern French *si* vs. *oui*, and which are discussed also in the context of responses in English by Halliday and Hasan, and for Modern Greek *ne* and *oxi* by Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton. Furthermore, the reportability of Latin ‘yes’ and ‘no’ tokens has entered into the discussion following Rosén’s work non-direct discourse.

I will focus on a closer look at three patterns in the response mechanisms of polar initiating turns in Latin sources and Latin translations (a *dépouillement* from Plautus and Terence, and selected examples from Ovidian dialogue. Evidence will also be drawn from Latin translations of Plato’s *Meno*, *Parmenides* and *Phaedo* by the pre-humanist Aristippus, from the *Republic* by Manuel Crysoloras on the cusp of humanism, and from the *Crito* and *Gorgias* in the Latin of the early humanist Bruni). The discussion will be informed by my research on literary dialogue texts in Classical Greek with shared literary conventions, and later Greek exegetical intertexts:

1. Non-polar responses to polar initiating turns,

with special emphasis on the exchange pattern yes/no question:: WH question

1. Use of both ‘yes’ and ‘no’ tokens for confirming and correcting positive and negative initiating turns contoured as declaratives and interrogatives, with particular attention to the exchange patterns

NEG (± tags):: ‘yes’/ ‘no’ tokens to confirm, and NEG (±tags):: ‘yes’ and ‘no’ tokens to correct.

1. Tokens or patterns for polar response in non-direct discourse

These patterns will promote a discussion on the nature of the tokens in literary Latin, translations and their models, constraints and parameters of polarity, the relation between polarity and categorical viz. hedged response, and reportability and the *valeur* of expressions in the armory of polar response tokens in Latin, and beyond.
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**The pragmatic marker *age*: an overview of its pragmatic functions and an analysis from the perspective of im/politeness theories**

From its first occurrences, *age*, the imperative of the verb *agere*, appears as a fully pragmaticalized functional marker (on this category, see Ghezzi 2014). Along with other imperatives that underwent functional developments and with which the imperative of *ago* share some properties, such as *em* (Unceta Gómez 2017a) or particularly *abi* (Unceta Gómez 2017b), *age* (as well as the reinforced form *agedum*) fulfils various pragmatic functions (see Hofmann 2003[1926]: 149; Barbini 1966; and especially Fedriani and Ghezzi 2014). Among those functions, the most frequent and obvious one is that of strengthening the illocutive force of directive speech acts, as in example (1) —cf. Servius’ (*in Aen*. 2.707) account of this word as an *adverbium imperantis*—; but other seemingly contradictory functions, such as concession (2) or disagreement (3), are also apparent:

1. […] PAL. ***Age*** *igitur intro abite,*

*insistite hoc negotium sapienter*. […] (Plaut. *Mil*. 928-929)

1. ***Age****, quiescant auctoribus nobis? Quis incolumitatem præstat?* (Cic. *Att*. 15.10.1)
2. SA. *Credo istuc melius esse: uerum ego numquam adeo astutus fui,*

*quin quidquid possem mallem auferre potius in praesentia.*

*SY.* ***Age****, noui tuom animum: quasi tanti umquam tibi sint uiginti minae*

*dum huic obsequare*. […] (Ter. *Ad*. 221-224).

Building on Fedriani’s (2019: 81-83) proposal of categorization of the pragmatic functions of *age*, which takes into account the image schemas underneath those pragmatic expansions, in this paper I aim, on the one hand, at investigating the analysis of those functions in a broad corpus (from Plautus to Apuleius), taking into account sociolinguistic parameters and the situated uses of this marker (specially its combination with interjections or mitigators). At a second stage, I’ll discuss the implications of those pragmatic values from the perspective of im/politeness theories (Kádár and Haugh 2013) and the Latin politeness system (Unceta Gómez 2019), and will address the issue of whether or not this marker interferes with the politeness of a given utterance.
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**Conversational strategies in non-conversational texts: the communicative structure of Cicero’s 4th Catilinarian**

The absence of an addressee is not a reason to ignore him or her. On the contrary, hypothesized addressees are present in every text (e.g. Bell, 1984; van Gils & Kroon, 2019). In this paper, we discuss the possible traces of the addressee’s presence in Cicero’s speech *In* *Catilinam* *IV*, paying attention to communicative structure (i.e. sequences of acts and moves at the local and global levels of discourse) and intersubjective elements (e.g. particles, demonstratives, tenses).

The unresolved question of the audiences of Cicero’s Catilinarian speeches has recently been taken up again by Berry 2020 and Woodman 2021, who plead their contrastive views with rhetorical and historical arguments. We add a linguistic dimension to this discussion.

A very explicit example of the addressee’s presence in a letter of Cicero is the following:

*Tuus autem ille amicus (sci’n quem dicam? de quo tu ad me scripsisti, postea quam non auderet reprehendere laudare coepisse) nos, ut ostendit, admodum diligit, amplectitur, amat, aperte laudat, occulte, sed ita ut perspicuum sit, invidet.*

‘As to that friend of yours (you know whom I mean? The person of whom you write to me that he began to praise when he no longer dared to criticize), he professes the highest regard for me and makes a parade of warm affection, praising on the surface while below it ̶ but not so far below that it’s difficult to see ̶ he’s jealous.’ (Cic. *Att*. 1.13.4)

In this example, *autem* signals the start of a new communicative move (Kroon, 1995, on the basis of Sinclair & Coulthard 1975 and Roulet et al. 1985; see also Roulet et al.,2001). In the first act of this move (the unit *tuus autem ille amicus*) the possessive pronoun *tuus* and the recognitionally used demonstrative *ille* (Breunesse 2020) bring in the perspective of the addressee, both being typical ‘intersubjectivity devices’ (Verhagen 2005; Kroon 2021). On the level of the communicative structure, this unit functions as a preparatory act which conveys presupposed knowledge and as such orients the addressee to some upcoming, more central act or move (Hannay & Kroon 2005). The boundary after such a preparatory act is a typical place for a dialogical intervention (Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff, 2007); in this case, Cicero uses this boundary to interrupt the ongoing move and to insert a parenthesis which evokes a (fictive)embedded exchange in which the common ground status of the first act is problematized and the presupposed knowledge is subsequently made explicit (Bolkestein, 1998).

Such a parenthetical element is only one of the devices that are available for negotiating or (re)building common ground in non-conversational texts. In this paper we investigate a broad variety of intersubjective elements in terms of their contribution to the communicative structure of the text, and as markers of conversational strategies in the non-conversational genre of Latin oratory. Since markers of conversational strategies are often relatable to the specific addressee that is involved, we also aim, with this investigation, to contribute to the debate about the audiences of Cicero’s *In Catilinam IV*.
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**L’ordine dei costituenti in Latino cristiano alla luce di Greco e Semitico: un’indagine tipologica**

Il presente contributo intende fornire un’analisi di tipologia sull’ordine basico dei costituenti nei testi cristiani e su un eventuale suo mutamento.

La storia del Latino è sempre stata caratterizzata da contatti e interferenze con altre lingue: in particolare con l’avvento del Cristianesimo, il Latino entra in contatto con il Vicino Oriente antico e con le lingue semitiche. Il lavoro segue gli studi sull’interferenza linguistica tra Latino e lingue semitiche, con la mediazione del Greco: tra gli altri, ricordiamo Adams (2003); Goodman (1998); Rubio (2009); García de la Fuente (1981; 1998).

Come evidenziato da Fedriani & Ramat (2015, 70), «nel suo insieme, il latino può essere definito una lingua ad ordine OV non rigido, o meglio, come uno “split type” ove sia SOV che SVO potevano funzionare come ordini basici e non marcati […]». Per quanto riguarda le antiche lingue semitiche occidentali e il Greco si è riconosciuta, rispettivamente, la prevalenza degli ordini VSO e SVO/SOV.

L’obiettivo è fornire una comparazione sistematica tra l’ordine dei costituenti di Latino, Greco e Semitico, sulla base di un *corpus* di testi dell’*Antico Testamento* quali, per limitarci a un esempio, il Cantico dei cantici. I testi della Bibbia ebraica, della *LXX*,della *Vetus Latina* e della *Vulgata* verranno consultati nelle edizioni scientificamente più rilevanti e saranno sottoposti al vaglio dell’ordine dei costituenti nella frase dichiarativa assertiva e nei sintagmi adposizionale e nominale. Le traduzioni greche e latine della Bibbia tendono a riprodurre fedelmente l’ordine delle parole dell’originale ebraico: tuttavia, bisogna evidenziare con García de la Fuente (1983) che, mentre la *Vulgata* e la *LXX* rispettano questo principio, la *Vetus* si discosta dalla struttura originale nei casi in cui questo avviene anche nella *LXX*.

L’attenzione sarà rivolta al rilevamento del mutamento dell’ordine basico dei costituenti, al fine di evidenziare eventuali variazioni e incongruenze nella posizione dei complementi e dei modificatori della testa nei sintagmi verbale, adposizionale e nominale, con riferimento al principio organizzativo soggiacente.

La prima operazione consiste nella creazione e disamina del soprammenzionato *corpus*; quindi, si procederà all’individuazione di un campione rappresentativo del latino classico da un lato, e del latino volgare dall’altro; il lavoro conclusivo si incentra, invece, sulla creazione di una tabella riassuntiva dei risultati emersi dall’analisi contrastiva dei tre campioni. Pertanto, il fine ultimo risulta essere l’identificazione di variazione, *in primis* nel *corpus* da noi creato, quindi nel raffronto tra i tre campioni*.*

In merito ai risultati attesi, lo studio è volto a comprendere se esista o meno, tra i dati risultanti dall’analisi, un intervallo statisticamente significativo e, in seguito, a indagare le motivazioni alla base della sua presenza o assenza: nel primo caso, avremmo dei dati per stabilire quantitativamente il grado di variazione del criterio in esame; nel secondo caso, avremmo modo di indagare la continuità del Latino – sempre in merito all’ordine dei costituenti – nella sua storia e riconsiderare le conclusioni finora tratte riguardo all’influenza del Semitico – con il tramite del Greco – nel Latino biblico e cristiano.
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**Proto-Romance a result of imperfect group second language acquisition in 3rd century BC Italy**

This paper addresses the following question: *Why are all of the Romance languages more linguistically similar to each other than any of them are to Classical Latin?* This paper proposes that radical demographic expansion and rapid Roman colonization of the Italian peninsula in the 3rd century BC created a situation of language contact between prestigious speakers of Latin and native inhabitants. This situation is compared to the similar, though much more recent and well- documented contact situations which led to the creation of contact varieties between the 17th and 19th centuries, in particular the “semi-creoles” examined in Holm (2004). This work proposes that some of the major linguistic changes seen in Romance began at this early period as a result of contact effects. At the very least this research establishes that the situation of language contact in 3rd c. BC Italy must be addressed when examining the development from Latin to Romance.

There are many structural changes between Classical Latin and the first written stages of Romance, some of which are already partially visible in some of the more popular written Latin by authors such as Plautus. These include an increasing tendency toward analytic structures (perfect, future, etc.) and a reduction/loss of case distinctions (Goyette (2000), among many others). These tendencies are shared across all of Romance, a fact which strongly suggests they were developed and in use before the expansion and fragmentation of Latin outside Italy.

Over a period of about eighty years in the third century BC, Rome expanded its control from a very small region around the city of Rome to almost the entire Italian peninsula. Rome then colonized these areas. “The Romans established at least fifty-three colonies [(2,500 – 6,000 adult male settlers)] in Italy” (Boatwright, et al. 2004: 82). This equates to a population movement of about 130,000–320,000 adult male Romans who have now spread throughout Italy and have begun to engage in close contact with speakers of other languages and language families. This is a huge demographic shift, especially given that the population of the Italian peninsula in 200 BC is estimated at between 4 and 6 million people (Scheidel 2008).

Given the current body of knowledge in contact linguistics, the socio-demographics of 3rd century BC Italy could hardly have produced a more conducive environment for one or more contact varieties to emerge. In particular, a “simplified” version (Winford 2003) of Latin could have emerged wherein there would have been much less visible substrate input due to the “continuing access that learners had to the target”, and therefore “more akin to group SLA” (Winford 2003: 298). Adams (2003:525) also recognizes imperfect group learning of Latin. He notes, “there was a period when second-language learners mixed Latin and Italic features, thereby creating odd, but ephemeral, varieties of Latin in provincial parts of Italy” (2007:725).

By comparing early Roman Italy to better-understood cases of contact variety genesis, this paper proposes that the answer to the question of why the Romance languages are all more similar to each other than any are to Latin is because the main Proto-Romance structures emerged in a ‘simplified’ Latin resulting from imperfect group second language acquisition process in 3rd century BC Italy.
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**Substratal plant names and landscape terms in Latin and Romance**

In this brief contribution we shed a light on lexical materials in Latin, which seem to stem from ancient substrata in the Mediterranean, with a focus on plant names and landscape-related vocabulary. Both of these semantic fields, in general, are parts of the lexicon considered to be of very archaic coinage.

In order to show our line of reasoning we have chosen, e.g., words for "berries", "shrubbery, herbs and trees", and the like, as also for "rocky" and "swampy" terrains. After looking into potential cognates in attested languages in the Mediterranean, and to the geolinguistic distribution of the investigated words, we try to form conclusions on the involved strata and their chronological organization. At present we would identify two important strata, an older “Eurafrican” one, and a quite widely attested Euskaro-Caucasian layer, associated with the arrival of Neolithic farming.

Example: Latin *mōrum* ‘mulberry’ related somehow (but not as an Indo-European cognate) to Greek μόρον ‘black mulberry, blackberry’ and Armenian *mor* ‘blackberry’. However Basque has *\*maṙuhi ~ \*mahuṙi* “strawberry,

blackberry, mulberry” and East Caucasian has words such as Lak *mamari* ’blackberry’; Lezgi *mere* ‘blackberry’, Dargwa (dial.) *mimre* ‘raspberry’. Basque also has compounds such as (dial.) *marhüga* ‘mulberry, blackberry’, *marzusta, marzuza* id., in which the element -*zuza* resembles other East Caucasian words like Agul *ziwz*-ar ‘strawberry’, Dargwa (dial.) *ziza*- ‘blackberry’, etc. Many Romance words for ‘strawberry’, with shapes such as /madžusta/, /madzufo/, Lombardian *magiostra*, Friulian *majòstre*, etc. abound in French and northwestern Italian dialects, with no satisfactory explanation from Latin. (The initial element has secondarily become contaminated with Latin *Maius*, since the berries appear in the spring.) These substratal Romance words can only be analyzed with the help of Basque: *\*maṙ- + \*sus(a) + \*-ta* (diminutive or expressive suffix), all of which have North Caucasian cognates: *\*mer(ʔ)V* ‘a kind of berry’; *\*ʒimʒV* (= *\*dzimdzV*) ‘a kind of berry (or flower, blossom)’; *\*-t’a / \*t’o* [expressive suffix].
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**Changes in Late Latin verbal morphosyntax: Copying or convergence?**

This paper takes a fresh look at background for the development of innovative verbal categories in Late Latin from the perspective of Contact Linguistics (cf. Hickey (ed.) 2020a [2010] and Grant (ed.) 2020 for recent state-of-the-art overviews of this field). A characteristic difference between Archaic and Classical Latin, on one hand, and Late Latin, on the other, is that periphrastic verb categories consisting of the present participle and the verb *esse* (or some other stative verb as auxiliary) with markedly imperfective semantics appear more frequently in later stages of the language (cf. Pinkster 2015). According to one line of research, the increasing use of these categories in Late Latin is closely connected with the appearance of analogous constructions in Biblical Greek, especially New Testament Greek (cf. Amenta 2003). Thus, the question arises whether the Latin situation is the result of copying of morphosyntactic patterns originating in Biblical Greek or whether it reflects a convergence between internally motivated innovations and the external motivation provided by the New Testament source text (cf. the discussion in Hickey 2020b). Given that precursors of the Late Latin constructions sporadically appear in earlier stages of the language as well, there is good reason to hypothesize that their increased frequency in later stages of the language reflects the fact that they have become more firmly grammaticalized, a development possibly reinforced by influence from Greek. Under this hypothesis, this grammaticalization pattern would represent a bona fide case of a contact- induced change. Moreover, it is likely that the grammaticalization of new tense/aspect categories in Latin was a byproduct of other changes in the verbal system. Based on quantitative data Dahl (2019) claims that the imperfect shows a diachronic trend in Latin towards developing a more general aspectual semantics, thus furnishing an advantageous environment for the emergence of new grammatical categories with specific imperfective semantics. While it is likely that these and similar changes reflect the widespread bi- and plurilingualism characteristic of the imperial age (cf. Adams 2003), an important set of problems concerns whether and to what extent this and analogous instances of contact-induced grammaticalization in Late Latin result from what may be labeled translational preferences, which is here understood as the tendency to employ parallel constructions in the target language whenever available. Limiting the present focus to the Vulgate corpus, this paper closely examines how Hebrew and Greek tense/aspect constructions in the source texts are rendered in the Latin translation to establish the extent to which the productivity of the periphrastic categories reflects translational preferences or whether it mirrors the fact that they represented well integrated constructions within the tense/aspect system of postclassical Latin.
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**The bilingual *scholia* to Juvenal**

The P. Ant. s.n. is a leaf from a parchment codex written in the Constantinople of the early 6th century, containing on the two sides 50 verses of Juvenal (7.149–98).

What makes this papyrus interesting is not so much the text of Juvenal, which does not offer significant variation from the manuscript tradition, as the Graeco-Latin *scholia*, both interlinear and in the margins, which are independent from the tradition of *scholia* we find in the manuscripts. Nocchi Macedo (2016a & b) identifies three hands of scholiasts, different from the scribe of the text, each of whom writes both in Greek and Latin.

As for their function, some *scholia* are translations of the Latin into Greek, or gloss terms perceived as archaic or poetic with more usual Latin equivalents, but most of them are interpretative of the text. Those *scholia*, which give us precious information about Latin in the East under Justinian, deserve a closer look than has been given until now. For example, a fact that has eluded scholars is that at v. 183 we have a gloss which is itself bilingual (aedificatur ψυχροποιὸς̣ σ̣τ̣οά), but has been always misinterpreted as two separate glosse which would be incompatible with the underlying text.

Many of the annotations denote basic lack of comprehension,which led Cameron to conclude that “the ignorance and lack of understanding the scholia reveal are enough to prove that the papyrus was no scholar's copy.” (Cameron 2010: 454.). However, as Nocchi Macedo (2016b: 221f.) objects, the three scribes of the *scholia* are sophisticated enough to use the ὀβελὸς περιεστιγμένος to signal when a word is object of a marginal annotation. The fact that some interpretative notes denote correct usage of grammatical technical terms, which makes them seem to be dictated by a schoolteacher (as at 179 κατὰ ἔλλειψιν· παρὰ τῶν δού[λων “elliptically: by the slaves,” which integrates J.’s *gestetur dominus* “the master is brought” and at 189 ὡς ἀπὸ ἀντιθέσεως “like by antithesis” explains the imaginary interlocutor’s objection “but Quintilian owns valleys!” to the *persona loquens*’ statement, that the teacher of rich pupils live in misery) makes me think that we are handling a school copy, passed from father to son, on which three generations of students have put their notes, some dictated by professors, some originating by themselves.

In my contribution to the workshop I will to analyze the nature and function of the bilingual glosses, especially focusing on the interplay between the two languages.
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**The Latin vocabulary in the Jewish Aramaic sources from Roman Palestine: novel approaches and some recent findings**

Although Greek loanwords make up the largest group of non-native words in the totality of the Hebrew/Aramaic lexicon (in Mishnaic Hebrew, Jewish Palestinian Aramaic and Jewish Babylonian Aramaic), a high number of Latin or “Latinate” loanwords, which have been transmitted via Greek into these dialects, occur in the extensive Jewish Aramaic sources of Late Antiquity and the Early Byzantine times. Unfortunately, there exists no up-to-date dictionary of the Latin and Greek loanwords in the vast Rabbinic literary tradition: in many cases, one still relies on the monumental work by Krauss from the end of the 19th century. Only in the last decade, it has become possible to consult further important, pioneering publications and tools pertaining to the linguistic analysis of loanwords in Rabbinic texts. Nevertheless, a sufficient number of existing entries require supplementing, and many etymologies must be corrected in the light of more recent research and methodology.

The present study is mainly based on recent results from the *Digital* *Dictionary of Loanwords in the Midrash Genesis-Rabbah (GenR)* (funded by Austrian Science Fund (FWF) and hosted at the University of Salzburg/Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna, 2018-2021) concerning the Greek and Latin loanwords in a text from Judaism’s classical period, which is the earliest Rabbinic commentary on the Book of Genesis and was compiled during the 5th c. CE in Roman Palestine.

The paper will present some case studies of Latin loanwords in GenR (about 400 Graeco-Latin types in total), the study of which still remains a desideratum, and will compare the findings with the evidence stemming from other important Hebrew/Aramaic sources from Roman Palestine: the Mishnah, the Jerusalem Talmud and the targums. The investigation will focus on hapax legomena and problematic cases of (alleged) Latin loanwords, which examine each attestation of the respective lexeme in its context and offer an up-to-date linguistic analysis, concerning the origin, the morphophonology as well as detailed fine-grained semantics. Further, the investigation will pursue –where possible– comparisons with the Latin (and Latinate) loaned vocabulary in “epichoric” post-Classical Greek as well as in Syriac Aramaic and Coptic sources, in order to present the findings in their Eastern Mediterranean context.
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**Vowel reduction and deletion in Very Old Latin: contact-induced phenomena?**

This paper deals with the vowel reduction and deletion which occurred in Latin after the earliest documents between the 5th and the 3rd century BC. Specifically, it aims to examine the well-known hypothesis according to which these phenomena would be contact-induced, taking into account the most recent works on the phonology of Latin and neighbouring languages as well as on language contact.

Very Old Latin vowel reduction (for example, *cōnficiō* < \**cōnfaciō*) and deletion (for example, *auceps* < \**auicaps*) affect non-initial syllables and, thus, are commonly attributed to a first syllable stress, which would have been later replaced by the Penultimate Law. Such a stress would account also for vowel reduction and deletion in the Sabellic languages. However, the chronology of these phenomena in the Sabellic languages and, specifically, their presence in the earliest documents (late 7th-5th century BC) are rather controversial. In any case, although the correspondence between Latin and the Sabellic languages has led some scholars to the reconstruction of a first syllable stress for Proto-Italic, vowel reduction and deletion occurred separately in these languages, as evident by their chronology and different outcomes. Furthermore, there is no clear evidence of such phenomena in Faliscan.

Vowel reduction and deletion are also attested in Etruscan. In particular, a shift from a prehistoric penultimate syllable stress, responsible for apocope, to a first syllable stress, responsible for vowel reduction and then deletion in medial syllables (*avile* > *avale*/*avele*/*avule* > *avle*), can be reconstructed. Etruscan vowel deletion is usually dated to the beginning of the 5th century BC. Nevertheless, as I intend to show, evidence of this phenomenon can be traced back to the 7th century BC and, hence, contrary to some recent assumptions (see, for example, Nishimura 2012), it precedes the occurrence of similar phenomena in both Latin and the Sabellic languages.

The similarity of the phenomena concerned, the chronological and geographical proximity, the genetic unrelatedness between Etruscan, on the one hand, and Latin and Sabellic languages, on the other, as well as the occurrence of further language contact effects between these languages make it probable that we are dealing with a contact-induced phenomenon. Therefore, on the basis of an analysis of the available linguistic data and the comparison with similar phenomena occurred elsewhere, this paper aims to reconstruct the origin and development of such a phenomenon. In particular, it aims, on the one hand, to demonstrate that the borrowed feature is not (only) the stress position on the first syllable but (also) its phonetic implementation and, on the other, to confirm the linguistic and extra-linguistic reasons for assuming that it spread from Etruscan to the Sabellic languages and, probably later, to Latin.
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1. \* The content of the abstracts is the responsibility of the author(s). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Cf. a simple definition of asyndeton in Bussmann (1996: 102): “Omission of conjunctions between words, phrases or clauses.” [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. A partial study on this issue is provided in Garzón (2020). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Purser, 1903; Page, 1919; Constans, 1969. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Bentivoglio, 1826; Shackleton Bailey, 1965. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The translations are taken from the Loeb Classical Library. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)