

SUMMARIES

J.-Fr.Thomas « Sur la polysémie et la synonymie de *negare* »

Beyond the usual translations of *negare*, in a further analysis, we see a development in usage and construction that raises the question of how polysemy functions. This is closely bound up with the subject of synonymy, as not all the meanings of *negare* are found for the other verbs in the lexical field, or at least not with the same frequencies, and comparison between terms discloses, in addition to certain obvious semantic equivalences, some fairly clear shades of meaning.

M. Fruyt (1), « Le morphème négatif *in-* à l'initiale de mot en latin »

Among the initial negative morphemes, *in-* is the most commonly found form. Inherited in adjectives, it forms determinative compounds and possessive *bahuvrīhi* compounds and it appears in verbal impersonal forms. By a process of derivation involving word resegmentation, *in-* has also been extended to other grammatical categories such as nouns and verbs via the impersonal verbal forms.

M. Fruyt (2), « Grammaticalisation des éléments de relation marquant l'éloignement en morphèmes négatifs à l'initiale de mot en latin »

As shown in the previous article, *in-* is the most commonly found form of initial negative morpheme in Latin. But initial word negation also involves relational lexemes such as *dis-*, *ex-*, *dē-*, *ab-* and *uē-* denoting removal and which have been grammaticalized as negative morphemes. They mostly denote absence, but *dis-*, *dē-*, *uē-* are also found with a word-negation reversing function similar to *non*. They are mostly to be found in adjectives which are determinative compounds (*dis-similis*, *dē-honestus*, *uē-sanus*), but also in a few verbs (*dē-decet*) and in the noun *dē-decus*.

S. Van Laer « Peut-on parler de parasynthèse pour les adjectifs privatifs en *-bilis* »

The study of *-bilis* privative adjectives here is based on the *TLL*'s data. Some of these adjectives are only attested with the privative prefix. 'Parasynthesis' is not appropriate to describe the way they were created; 'possible word' ('*mot possible*') seems to be a better approach to the problem. It can thus be explained in a semantic perspective. *-bilis* privative adjectives express inability, so they define an entity as being singular. This is the reason why they are so frequent among Christian authors.

B. García-Hernández « La negación como modalidad alterna. El *in-*privativo con bases nominales y el origen de *inānis* e *ingens* »

Negation is the modal alternative of affirmation on any of its expressive levels. Our study focuses on the negative prefix *in-* with nominal bases. In particular, we propose new etymological explanations for *inānis* "empty" and *ingens* "immense". The first of these terms has its origins in the negation of the substantive *ānus* "surrounding ring", so that *inānis* has come to mean "empty", through metonymy from "without a ring". The second term consists of the negation of the term *egens* "lacking in", followed by vocalic apophony and syncope: **in-igens* > *ingens* "not lacking, without need". This adjective, used as litotes, has acquired the superlative value of "very large, immense".

R. Garnier « Sur les négations composées en latin : considérations étymologiques sur l'origine du lat. arch. *nec* « *nōn* »

The present paper deals with reanalysis in Latin, a pervasive but under-recognised notion for Latin etymology. Our aim here is to account for the puzzling interrogative stem *uter* "which of two?" from a negative compound *ne=cuter* "neither of the two" (epigraphically attested), reanalysed as *nec=uter* (whence a secondary doublet *ne=uter*). This form *ne=cuter* reflects Com. It. **né=k^wo-tero-* "neither of the two", and was associated with Old Lat. **quoter* "which of two?" (< Com. It. **k^wó-tero-*), viz. a clear cognate of Sabellic **potero-* "id." and Gr. *πότερος* "id." (< PIE **k^wó-tero-* "which of two?").

E. Magni, A. Orlandini, P. Poccetti, « *Haud* : usages et fonctions d'une négation perdue »

This paper deals with the negation *haud*, whose origins and functions present unresolved issues. After a thorough examination of the various etymological proposals, the discussion explores the relation between *haud* and the other Latin negations. According to the logical approach, *non* can be seen to be mostly a contradictory negation, whereas *haud* is a contrary negation. Pragmatic analysis clarifies the nature and functions of this form, which is a weak, gradable, and scalar negation conveying 'discordance', uncertainty and mitigation effects.

C. Bodelot, « Sur la valeur controversée du subjonctif nié par *non* dans les questions de protestation et de délibération en latin »

From a selection of examples from Plautus and Terence, we propose a contextual study of the so-called questions of protest and deliberation, in the broad meaning of these words. Using the "adjacency pair" analysis of Shegloff & Sacks (1973), we define the semantic and enunciative relationship that these questions have with the preceding or following utterance. In all of these questions, the subjunctive, congruent with the negative morpheme *non*, seems to convey a basic value of possibility, compatible with the emergence of various modal nuances which are often to be explained in relation to the presupposition of the adjacent utterance. Thus, even in old Latin, these questions are not mere copies of a Greek or Indo-European model of volitional meaning.

M.-A. Julia, « Positionnement initial de la négation dans la phrase en latin, grec et moyen-égyptien »

The aim of this article is to investigate negative statements in three languages, Greek, Latin and Middle Egyptian, in the archaic stage of each language. The "standard" and "prohibitive" negations are most often or always in the initial position. We attempt to relate their initial positioning to a speaker's enunciative choice between two basic modalities, affirmation and negation.