SUMMARIES

A. Ledgeway, « From Latin to Romance : structure and configurationality »

Traditionally, the principal typological difference between Latin and Romance has been taken to involve a distinction between morphology and syntax: while Latin predominantly makes recourse to synthetic structures (with concomitant so-called free word order), the morphologically poorer Romance varieties make greater use of analytic structures (with concomitant fixed word order). According to one popular view, this difference involves a move from non-configurationality to full configurationality: whereas in Latin grammatical relations are encoded by the forms of words themselves through case and agreement morphology, in Romance grammatical relations are encoded through the syntactic context of individual words organized into distinct hierarchical phrase structure configurations. Despite the merits of this configurational view, an alternative approach to the changes in word order from Latin to Romance is developed which assumes the presence of configurational structure and functional structure already in Latin. On this view, the unmistakable differences between Latin and Romance, most notably observable in the replacement of an essentially pragmatically-determined word order with an increasingly grammatically-determined word order and the concomitant emergence of functional categories, can now be explained by formal changes in the directionality parameter and the differential role of functional structure in the two varieties.

M. Mancini, "Linguistic strata in the *Lex XII tabularum*"

This paper aims to identify the different historical-linguistic layers in the fragmentary texts of the ancient Roman *Law of the Twelve Tables*. We show that the language of the *Twelve Tables* – despite some philological questions about their transmission during the last centuries of the Roman Republic – displays chronological strata. A thorough analysis of the phonological and morphological features and of the archaisms preserved by the written tradition here allows us to show the presence of three distinct layers which can be ascribed to the three different linguistic periods of the 5th, 3rd and Ist centuries BC.

S. Van Laer, "*Hic* as an adverb of place in Latin : referential chain and 'indexical' reference"

This paper aims to establish a difference between the anaphoric use of the adverbs of place derived from *hic* and those derived from *is*. In existential sentences, the anaphoric reference is preferably expressed by *hic,* which is able to introduce a new Topic (§ 2). The stylistic parameter (which has been mentioned by previous studies) is relevant only to the other referential chains (§ 3) and it appears that all referential chains can be explained without recourse to stylistic factors, simply by using linguistic analysis. The use of *hic* is due to the 'indexical' reference it is able to make. This kind of reference, which is a consequence of the deictic value of *hic,* makes the anaphor stronger since it individuates the referent (§ 4).

Marie-Dominique Joffre, "How does Latin use the passive verb with an agentive complementation ?"

How does Latin use the verb in the passive voice complemented by an agent complement? And why does Latin display two different morphosyntactic constructions with apparently the same meaning and denotation? This "threefold" ("ternary" in the terminology of P. Flobert) passive verb seems to be more complex than the corresponding transitive active verb, from both a morphological and a syntactical point of view. Following on from our previous publications, we show that a passive verbal construction – whether the agent is expressed or not – provides a notional content that makes it different from the transitive active verb. The passive construction focuses on the subject-passive verb relationship, which is autonomous in itself. Its consequence is the opening of a whole range of possibilities to denotate the many factors responsible for a given state of affairs. Being syntactically expressed as a "circonstant" (Fr. *circonstant, vs actant),* the agent complementation differs from the grammatical subject of the transitive active verb in that it denotates always only one of the many factors that are at the origin of the process concerned.