

SUMMARIES

J.Vangaever, "The gerundium and the present participle in Classical Latin: a typological approach"

This paper shows that the traditional view of the Latin gerund as a verbal noun and of the present participle as a verbal adjective does not apply in all the instances where the gerund and the present participle are attested in Latin (they apply in less than 60% and 45% respectively). Adopting a typological perspective based on the syntactic functions of the gerund and of the present participle, we analyse the gerund as a non-finite verb form displaying verbal, nominal and adverbial properties and the present participle as displaying verbal, adjectival and adverbial properties. The analysis proposed here offers new perspectives for the analysis of non-finite verbal forms in both synchrony and diachrony.

Felicia Logozzo & Edoardo Middei, "The 'appositivus' and 'definitivus' genitive; an unstable category. Part one: an update and evaluation factors"

Our aim here is to look again at the often quite vague definitions and categories that we see in modern Latin grammars used for the definition of the "genitivus appositivus". Our detailed analysis of the occurrences shows that the function of the genitive "appositivus" is not totally appropriate for the syntagms in which it is generally attested. Strictly speaking, the function of the genitive "appositivus" used as an alternative to apposition depends on the onomastic category concerned and on the nature of the specific *designatum* of proper nouns. Our paper is divided into two parts; the first is presented here and gives a critical overview of the *status questionis* along with an evaluation of the criteria on which the choice between the use of the genitive or of apposition is based. Proper nouns show a fundamental distinction between anthroponyms and toponyms, depending on the distinction between animate (human) and inanimate entities. Within toponyms, we find another distinction, this time between places that are characterised by the presence of human beings and those that are characterised by their absence. We will look at this in the second part of our paper.

Felicia Logozzo & Edoardo Middei, "The 'appositivus' and 'definitivus' genitive; an unstable category. Part two: the onomastic factor"

This is the second part of our paper on the "genitivus appositivus", a term that is widely used in modern works on Latin syntax. In it we look at the onomastic categories that are most often used as examples of this type of genitive. An analysis of the individual occurrences shows that, among toponyms, there is a fundamental difference between the names of the locations that are inhabited (mainly *urbs*, *oppidum*) and the names of geo-morphic entities (primarily *flumen*, *fons*, *amnis*, *lacus*, *mons*, *collis*). The term "genitivus appositivus" is appropriate only for names of inhabited places, as seen in the canonical example *urbs Roma* vs. *urbs Romae*. It is only in this situation that the name in the genitive is identical to its *designatum*, thus with the same meaning as *Roma est urbs*.

Louise Brouard, Juliette Delalande, Guillaume Djian, Cécile Euler, Lucas Haensler, Rosemarie Mearns, Nina Roux, Marie de Toledo, "Verbal contests; politeness and impoliteness in dialogue opening (Hor. Sat. I, 9, 1-8)"

In *Sat.* 1, 9, Horace depicts himself in an unfortunate encounter with a bore who is trying to introduce himself into Maecenas' circle, in what appears as a true verbal contest. The first lines of the poem (1-8), in which both characters meet each other for the first time, are analysed here using linguistic theories on politeness. These allow us to show that the strategic course of the exchange is that of a failed dialogue opening, and to renew our understanding of this famous satire by highlighting the ambiguity of Horace's own role in it.