# Quid est «qui»?

Relative clauses from Proto-Italic to Proto-Romance
La phrase relative du proto-italique au proto-roman

Vendredi, 1 juillet 2022

*Unil*

**UNIL** | Université de Lausanne
Faculté des lettres

# Programme

| | |
|---|---|
| 09.00– 09.10 | **Welcome \| Accueil** *Robin Meyer (UNIL)* |

**Panel 1 \| Séance 1**
Chair \| Présidence: Philomen Probert

Qui or is qui? On free and semi-free relative clauses in Latin
*Anna Pompei (Roma Tre)*

| | |
|---|---|
| 09.10–11.10 | Ubi est "qui"? Wh-movement in pre-Classical Latin relative clauses *Krishnan Ram-Prasad (Cambridge)* |

The contribution of Latin to the comparative study of QU-Exclamatives
*Michiel de Vaan (Basel & Geneva)*

| | |
|---|---|
| 11.10–11.40 | Coffee break \| Pause café |

**Panel 2 \| Séance 2**
Chair \| Présidence: Robin Meyer

Fragmentary texts and the frequency of linguistic features: the case of correlative sentences
*Philomen Probert (Oxford)*

| | |
|---|---|
| 11.40–13.00 | |

Les propositions relatives dans les vers saturniens latins
*Antoine Viredaz (Lausanne)*

| | |
|---|---|
| 13.00– 14.30 | Lunch \| Dîner |

|           |                                                                              |
|-----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|           | **Panel 3 \| Séance 3**<br>Chair \| Présidence: Antoine Viredaz              |
| 14.30–15.50 | Types of Relativization and Headedness in Sabellic<br>*Yasmim Drigo & Yexin Qu* (*Cornell*)<br><br>Relative Clauses in Oscan and Latin<br>*James Clackson* (*Cambridge*) |
| 15.50–16.20 | Coffee break \| Pause café                                                 |
|           | **Panel 4 \| Séance 4**<br>Chair \| Présidence: Anna Pompei                 |
| 16.20–<br>17.40 | Moods and tenses in Latin relative clauses: the Plautine situation<br>*Wolfgang de Melo* (*Oxford*)<br><br>Relatively late – relative clause syntax in Gregory of Tours'<br>*Historia Francorum*<br>*Robin Meyer* (*Lausanne*) |
| 17.40     | Final remarks \| Remarques finales                                          |

# Acknowledgements        Remerciements

*Qui* or *is qui*? **On free and semi-free relative clauses in Latin**
Anna Pompei (Roma Tre)

Headless relative clauses (henceforth HRCs) are relative clauses that do not have a lexical head. In Latin they can co-occur with a phoric element, i.e., a cataphor or an anaphor, or not. In the former case they can be classified as semi-free relative clauses; in the latter, as free relative clauses. The talk aims at investigating the relationship between free and semi-free relative clauses in Latin.

Three different types of headless relative clause will be identified, taking into consideration semantic features such as definiteness, specificity, genericness and referentiality. According to these three different kinds of HRC, the possible occurrence of phoric elements answers different linguistic needs:

|  | phoric elements |
| --- | --- |
| $1^{st}$ kind | pragmatic function |
| $2^{nd}$ kind | semantic function |
| $3^{rd}$ kind | syntactic function |

Phoric elements co-occur in the first type with no constraints and onlysatisfy pragmatic needs. Conversely, in the second kind, the obligatory occurrence of phoric elements answers a semantic function as a trigger of existential presupposition, namely, it avoids a non-definite reading which would be encouraged by the subjunctive. Finally, in the third kind the presence of phoric elements in the syntactic structure of HRCs does not seem to be foreseen. Indeed, in generative termsthey are CPs in non-argumental positions, e.g., in the "there be" construction, whereas in the argumental ones they are DPs. Nevertheless, the effective phonetical realization of phoric elements is very restricted.

Whereas the first two types are characterized by a maximalizing semantics and are referential (*realis*), the third is distinguished by a classifying semantics and is non-referential (*irrealis*).

**Ubi est "qui"?** *Wh*-movement in pre-Classical Latin relative clauses
Krishnan Ram-Prasad (Cambridge – Peterhouse)

Classical Latin shows *wh*-movement of the relative pronoun *qui* to the left periphery in relative clauses, as in the following example:

(1)  *nam si quis erit* [$_{RC}$ ***qui*** *hoc dicat*]...
     'For if there will be anyone [**who** says this]...' (Cic. *De Or.* 52)

According to SALVI (2005: 453), in Classical Latin prose 'relative *wh*-phrases are always the rst constituent in embedded clauses.' This is in contrast to pre-Classical Latin, in which the relative pronoun may follow other constituents within the relative clause:

(2)  *salvere iubeo, spectatores optumos,* [$_{RC}$ *Fidem* ***qui*** *facitis maxumi*...]
     'I welcome you, most excellent audience, [**who** esteem Faith most highly...]'
     (Plaut. *Cas.* 1)

Note further that in (2), *qui* occurs not only non-initially but directly preceding the verb. This is common in cases of non-initial *qui*, but is not a strict rule, as evidence by the following:

(3)  [$_{RC}$ *ex malis multis malum* ***quod*** *minimum'st*]*, id minim'est malum*
     '[**What** is least evil among the many evils], that is the least an evil'
     (Plaut. *Stich.* 64)

From a syntactic perspective, these relative clauses with non-initial *qui* could be analysed in various ways. In the rst place, it is possible to argue that *qui* undergoes *wh*-movement, but that another element raises to the left periphery above *qui*, by a pragmatically conditioned process of topicalisation/focalisation:

(4)  [$_{TopP}$ [$_{Spec}$ Fidem$_i$] Top° [$_{CP}$ [$_{Spec}$ **qui**$_j$] [C° ... [$_{VP}$ $t_j$ $t_i$ facitis maxumi] ] ]

In an alternative analysis, *qui* does not undergo *wh*-movement to the left periphery but remains *in situ*, in its base-generated position within the VP:

(5)   [… Fidem$_i$ [$_{VP}$ **qui** $t_i$ facitis maxumi ] ]

Both options seem to be paralleled elsewhere in Indo-European: in Vedic Sanskrit *wh*-movement combined with topicalisation/focalisation around the relative pronoun is quite common (RAM-PRASAD 2022), while Hittite has been argued to lack *wh*-movement altogether (HUGGARD 2015). Since this word order is ostensibly lost in later authors, the analysis of non-initial *qui* in pre-Classical texts provides a point of diachronic interest in Latin syntax.

In this paper, I examine evidence from pre-Classical Latin relative clauses to establish whether *wh*-movement can be meaningfully diagnosed for instances of non-initial *qui*. I argue that both possibilities—*wh*-movement and *wh-in-situ*—were available in pre-Classical Latin. I investigate the possibility of semantic and/or pragmatic conditions relevant to the differing strategies, and their relation to *wh*-movement in interrogatives. I also discuss evidence from Classical Latin verse which suggests a poetic survival of non-initial *qui*. On this basis, I offer some speculative pathways of change that may have led to the situation in Classical Latin, as well as locating the results within a comparative analysis of relative *wh*-movement elsewhere in Indo-European.

### References

ADAMS, J.N. (1994), "Wackernagel's law and the position of unstressed personal pronouns in Latin", *Transactions of the Philological Society* 92(2), 103–78.

DANCKAERT, L. (2012), *Latin Embedded Clauses: The left periphery*, Amsterdam.

DEVINE, A.M., and STEPHENS, L. D. (2006), *Latin Word Order: Structured meaning and information*, Oxford.

HORROCKS, G. (2011), "Latin syntax", in J. Clackson (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin language*, Chichester, 118–143.

HUGGARD, M. (2015), *Wh-words in Hittite: A Study in Syntax-Semantics and Syntax-Phonology Interfaces*, PhD thesis, UCLA.

POMPEI, A. (2011), "Relative Clauses", in P. Baldi and P. Cuzzolin (eds), *New Perspectives on Latin Historical Syntax. Vol. 4: Complex sentences*, Berlin, 427–547.

RAM-PRASAD, K. J. (2022), *The Syntax of Relative Clauses and Related Phenomena in Proto-Indo-European*, PhD thesis, University of Cambridge.

SALVI, G. (2005), "Some rm points on Latin word order: The left periphery", in K. E. Kiss (ed.), *Universal Grammar in the Reconstruction of Ancient Languages*, Berlin, 429–56.

**The contribution of Latin to the comparative study of QU-Exclamatives**
Michiel de Vaan (Basel / Geneva)

QU-exclamatives can be introduced by adnominal (*qui, qualis, quantus*) or adverbial (*quam*) QU-words, e.g., *quas ego hic turbas dabo*! vs. *quam dicit quod opust*! Whereas the synchronic interpretation of exclamatives in terms of semantics and syntax has received quite some attention in recent years, the diachrony of such constructions has not been researched exhaustively. My paper will compare the Latin QU-exclamatives with similar constructions in other ancient Indo-European languages, in order to arrive at a more general understanding of the diachronic development of these constructions.

## References

ASLANOV, C. (2009), "Comme/ Comment du latin au français: perspectives diachronique, comparatiste et typologique", *Travaux de linguistique* 58(1), 19–38.

BODELOT, C. (2005), "L'éxclamation indirecté introduite par un thème en *kʷ- du latin préclassique au latin tardif", *Revue de Philologie* 79(1), 35–57.

BODELOT, C. (2011), "QVAM: marqueur de degré interrogatif et / ou exclamatif ?", in *La quantification en latin, Juin 2006*, Paris, 335–351. https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00593406

HOFF, F. (1983), "Interrogation, interrogation rhétorique et exclamation en latin", in Harm. Pinkster (ed.), *Latin Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, 123–129.

MICHAELIS, L. (2001), "Exclamative constructions", in Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher, Wolfgang Raible (eds), *Language Typology and Language*, Berlin, 1038–1050.

PINKSTER, H. (1990), *Latin Syntax and semantics*, London/New York, Routledge.

ZEVAKINA, N. (2016), "The hypothesis of insubordination and three types of wh-exclamatives", *Studies in Language* 40, 765–814.

**Fragmentary texts and the frequency of linguistic features: the case of correlative sentences**

Philomen Probert (Oxford – Wolfson College)

In a study of Latin correlative sentences (PROBERT AND DICKEY 2011), Dickey and I suggested briefly that the process of anthologising affects the frequency of some linguistic features. Our main evidence was that correlative sentences appear more frequently in the Cicero passages in a modern anthology of Latin prose (RUSSELL 1990) than in complete works of Cicero. Our explanation appealed to a particular use of correlative sentences to express sententious generalisations, which might well be over-represented in particularly eloquent, 'anthologisable' passages.

If anthologising can affect the frequency of linguistic features, there are consequences for historical linguistics because our evidence for some linguistic stages comes from more fragmentary—more 'anthologised'—texts than our evidence for others.

At the colloquium I propose to pursue this question one step further, by comparing the incidence of correlative constructions the complete works of Cicero and in the fragments of Cicero that come down to us. If significant differences emerge, this will suggest that anthologising in antiquity (and not only in modern times) can indeed affect the frequency of linguistic features. The paper will conclude with some thoughts about other linguistic features that might be worth investigating in the same way.

**References**

PROBERT, P. and DICKEY, E. (2011), "Six notes on Latin correlatives". in J. Adams and N. Vincent (eds), *Early and late Latin: continuity or change?*, Cambridge, 390–419.

RUSSELL, D. A. (1990), *An anthology of Latin prose*, Oxford.

# Les propositions relatives dans les vers saturniens latins
Antoine Viredaz (Lausanne)

On appelle saturnien le mètre dans lequel ont été composés les deux premiers poèmes épiques latins ainsi qu'un certain nombre d'inscriptions versifiées latines datant principalement du 3ᵉ s. av. J.-C. Tant la délimitation exacte du corpus saturnien que le principe primaire de versification de ce mètre sont l'objet de débats parmi les spécialistes de littérature latine. On peut toutefois considérer aujourd'hui comme certainement saturniens un ensemble de huit inscriptions funéraires ou dédicatoires latines et environ 80 fragments épiques de Livius Andronicus et de Cn. Naevius, transmis par tradition indirecte. Dans la présente contribution, j'étudierai les occurrences de propositions relatives dans les saturniens épigraphiques et littéraires en mettant en évidence les différences existant entre ces deux sous-corpus dans la place du relatif. Je tenterai de déterminer si cette variation répond à des différences dans le type ou la fonction des relatives, ou s'il faut plutôt en chercher la raison dans des contraintes liées au genre littéraire ou à la métrique.

**Bibliographie**

CREISSELS, D. (2006), *Syntaxe générale : une introduction typologique. 2, La phrase*, Paris.

DEVINE, A. M. and STEPHENS, L. D. (2006) *Latin word order : structured meaning and information.* Oxford.

HORROCKS, G. (2011) " Latin Syntax", in James Clackson (ed.), *A companion to the Latin language* / Oxford, 118–143.

KRUSCHWITZ, P. (2002) *Carmina Saturnia epigraphica : Einleitung, Text und Kommentar zu den saturnischen Versinschriften*, Stuttgart.

DE MELO, W. D. C. (2014), "The Latin Saturnian revisited : a critical look at Mercado's *Italic verse*, followed by a fresh analysis of the metre", *Kratylos* 59, 53–81.

MERCADO, A. (2012) *Italic verse : a study of the poetic remains of Old Latin, Faliscan, and Sabellic*, Innsbruck.

PINKSTER, H. (2021) *The Oxford Latin syntax. 2, The complex sentence and discourse*, Oxford.

VIREDAZ, A. (2020) *Fragmenta Saturnia heroica : edition critique, traduction et commentaire des fragments de l'*Odyssée *latine de Livius Andronicus et de la* Guerre punique *de Cn. Naevius*, Basel.

## Types of Relativization and Headedness in Sabellic

Jasmim Drigo & Yexin Qu (Cornell)

Like other Indo-European languages, Sabellic has different types of relativization: post- nominal, right-extraposed, free relatives, and correlatives.[1] Some of these types have been widely discussed in the literature, e.g. HALE (1988) for Old Persian, BENUCCI (1996) and DUPRAZ (2009) for Sabellic, PROBERT (2015) for Ancient Greek, POMPEI (2012) and PINKSTER (2021) for Latin.

Although Sabellic free relatives have been examined in DUPRAZ (2009), their subtypes have not been fully analyzed, and the analysis of the free relative type prove to be informative for the discussion of correlatives. Correlatives have not been analyzed at all in Sabellic, and usually only superficially analyzed in other Indo-European branches.

Section I focuses on these least studied types, free relatives and correlatives, such as the correlative below:

(1)  [*piei.     ex.    comono.     pertemest.*]     *izic.     eizeic.*
     who.DAT   PREP   assembly.ACC  prohibit.3SG.FUT  he.NOM    that.LOC
     *zicelei    comono.      ne.    hipid.*
     day.LOC    assembly.ACC  NEG   hold.3SG.SUBJ.PF
     'For whomsoever*i* he shall thus prohibit an assembly, he*i* may not that day hold (any other) assembly.' (BANTIA 1,3)

Section II shows that relatives in Sabellic can be internally headed (the head is in the rel- ative clause), externally headed (the head is in the main clause) or headless. Case assignment is used to determine in which clause the head is.

---

[1] More types could be mentioned depending on the classification of the scholar, but here we will restrict ourselves to just this classification.

(2) *clauerniur.*    *dirsas.*    *herti.*  (...) *śesna/*    *homonus.*
Clavernii.NOM  give.3PL.SUBJ  must     dinner.ACC  men.DAT
*duir.*    [*puri.*       *far.*      *eiscurent.*  (...)
two.DAT  which.NOM.PL  spelt.ACC  collect.3PL.FUT
'The Clavernii must give (...) dinner to the two men, who will collect the spelt (...)' (Vb 8a–10)

Even though the types of relativization and headedness are independent, both are essential to understand relative clauses. (1) has a correlative structure, but as for the headedness, it is headless, while (2) is an externally headed relative clause.

Section III discusses the relationship between definiteness and word order. IVANOV (1979) suggested that relative pronouns in Italic languages, similar to Hittite, are indefinite in initial position and are definite in non-initial position. However, unlike Hittite, the definiteness distinction of Sabellic word order is actually restricted to relative clauses, as a result of headedness: externally headed relative clauses have the relative pronoun after the antecedent, while internally headed relative clauses have the internal head after the relative pronoun. (2) is externally headed, and hence definite; (3) is internally headed, and indefinite. Correlatives are always internally headed (cf. 1) and are always indefinite, as is similar to the quantificational reading of correlatives in other Indo-European languages such as Hindi, discussed by DAYAL (1995).

(3) *esuf.*    *in(im).*  *eituam.*    [*poizad.*  *ligud.*    *<i>usc.*
he.NOM    and    property.ACC  which.ABL  law.ABL  these.NOM
*censtur.*    *censaum.*    *angetuzet.*]
censors.NOM  censor.INF    pronounce.3PL.FUT
'(...) himself and in respect of his property, under whatever law those censors may have pronounced to the census.' (BANTIA 1,9)

Mainly, we will show how Sabellic relativization has similarities and differences to other branches of Indo-European languages.

## References

BENUCCI, F. (1996), *Studi di Sintassi Umbra: il verbo nelle Tavole Iguvine e nelle iscrizioni minori*, Padova.

DAYAL, V. (1995), "Quantification in correlatives", in: E. Bach (ed.), *Quantification in natural languages*, Dordrecht, 179–205.

DUPRAZ, E. (2009), "Stratégies de relativisation dans les langues sabelliques", *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 104(1), 215–259.

HALE, M. (1988), "Old Persian Word Order", *Indo-Iranian Journal* 31(1), 27–40.

IVANOV, V. (1979), "Syntactic Archaisms of Old Hittite", in E. Neu and W. Meid (eds), *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*, Innsbruck, 73–78.

PINKSTER, H. (2021), *The Oxford Latin Syntax. Volume 2, The Complex Sentence and Discourse*, Oxford.

POMPEI, A. (2011), "De la classification typologique des phrases relatives en latin classique", *Emerita* 79(1), 55–82.

PROBERT, P. (2015), *Early Greek Relative Clauses*, Oxford.

**Relative Clauses in Oscan and Latin**
James Clackson (Cambridge – Jesus College)

Perhaps the most celebrated relative clauses in Oscan features in the so-called Testament of Vibius Adiranus from Pompeii (Pompei 24 in *Imagines Italicae,* Po 3 in *Sabellische Texte*):

> **v(iíbis). aadirans. v(iíbieís). eítiuvam. paam**
> **vereiiaí. púmpaiianaí. trístaamentud.**
> **deded. eísak. eítiuvad**
> **v(iíbis). viínikiís. m(a)r(aheis). kvaísstur. púmpaiians.**
> **trííbúm. ekak. kúmbennieís.**
> **tanginud. úpsannam**
> **deded. ísídum. prúfatted**

This text can be translated word-for-word into Latin, as in the following version from VETTER (1953: 49-50):

> *V(ibius) Atranus V(ibi f.) pecuniam quam iuventuti Pompeianae testament dedit, ea pecunia V. Vinicius M(a)r(aei f.) quaestor Pompeianus domum hanc (de) conventus sententia faciendam dedit, idem probavit.*

The appearance of the antecedent **eítiuvam** (*pecuniam*) both in the preposed relative clause (with so-called *attractio inversa*) and in the following matrix clause, accompanied by the correlative pronoun **eísak** (*ea*), is a recognised pattern in early Indo-European languages; WATKINS (1995: 541) gave parallels from Vedic and early Latin, associating the repetition of the antecedent also with Hittite 'high style'. However, the second-century BCE date that Watkins ascribed to the inscription now seems too early, and the presence of other Latinisms in the text have led some to see this relative clause structure as a potential Oscan calque of a Latin legal formula (ADAMS 2003: 137, CLACKSON & HORROCKS 2007: 63, MCDONALD 2012: 51).

In this paper I shall address the question of Latin influence on Oscan relative clause syntax, using material both from the Oscan corpus and from other Sabellic languages. It is now possible to compare inscriptions composed in areas and at times when there is demonstrable Latin influence with those written at earlier periods. Although it will never be possible to prove that the relative syntax in the testament of Vibius Adiranus is not an archaism continued from Proto-Italic, a clearer account of the different structures found in Sabellic will help to clarify what is more likely to be a Latinism and what is an inherited feature.

## References

ADAMS, J.N. (2003) *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge.

CLACKSON, J., and HORROCKS, G. (2007) *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language*, Oxford.

MCDONALD, K. (2012) "The Testament of Vibius Adiranus", *Journal of Roman Studies* 102, 40–55.

VETTER, Emil (1953) *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte*, Heidelberg.

WATKINS, C. (1995) *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics,* Oxford.

**Moods and tenses in Latin relative clauses: the Plautine situation**
Wolfgang de Melo (Oxford – Wolfson College)

The larger descriptive grammars have quite straightforward rules for the usage of moods and tenses in the relative clauses of classical Latin: if the relative clause is defining, the indicative is the norm and the subjunctive is only used if the antecedent is indefinite, but specific ('consecutive' relative clauses, a major misnomer); if the relative clause is non-defining, the subjunctive is used to indicate that the listener should expect a further semantic connection between relative and main clause - the relative clause could be seen as causal or concessive. The rules for the sequence of tenses apply if the relative clause is in the subjunctive, but not otherwise.

My paper asks three questions. First, does this description work for early Latin (as exemplified by Plautus) as well? Second, given that the rules for moods and tenses are remarkably similar in classical *quom*-clauses, we need to ask whether the historical developments began with the *quom*-clauses or the relative clauses. And finally, I would like to find out to what extent early relative clauses are influenced by indirect questions and vice versa.

**References**

BENNETT, C.E. (1910), *Syntax of Early Latin*, Boston.
DE MELO, W.D.C. (2007), *The Early Latin Verb System: Archaic Forms in Plautus, Terence, and Beyond*, Oxford.
LINDSAY, W.M. (1907), *Syntax of Plautus*, Oxford.

## Relatively late – relative clause syntax in Gregory of Tours' *Historia Francorum*

Robin Meyer (Lausanne)

The syntax of relative clauses is highly complex, both from a typological and language-internal perspective, as many languages exhibit not only multiple means of relativisation—subordinate relative clauses introduced by relative pronouns and participle constructions for Latin—but in the case of clausal relativisation require that a host of factors be taken into account: absolute position of the clause (peripheral or embedded); its relative position (before, after, or incorporating its pivot); matters of agreement (or lack thereof); the occurrence of correlative or resumptive pronouns; etc. (LEHMANN 1984: esp. 49).

For Latin in particular, any enquiry into the syntax of such complex structures gains a further dimension: time depth. Owing to its long attestation, the diachronic development of relative clauses can be observed from the very beginning in Old Latin almost seamlessly up to the days of Late Latin and Proto-Romance. These developments are of particular interest given changes observable in later Romance languages and, particularly as regards pronominal relative clauses, the interactions of syntactic with morphophonemic changes.

This paper will exemplify these developments at the example of the *Historia Francorum*, a 10-volume Late Latin historical treatise composed by Gregory of Tours in the latter half of the 6th century CE. While a thorough treaty of his language exists (BONNET 1890: esp. 389–397), the syntax of relative clauses is not discussed therein beyond the 'errors' of agreement likely caused by changes in Late Latin phonology and the resulting homophony of grammatically (and orthographically distinct) forms. On the basis of a corpus study, the structural differences between relative clauses in Gregory's Latin and that of earlier varieties will be illustrated, all the while keeping an eye on potential foreshadowing of later developments in French and other

Romance languages. These may prove interesting since regional diversification is already detectable in earlier authors from Gaul (ADAMS 2007: 276–369) and with a view to establishing whether a tendency for dominantly right-branching structures and fixed word order are already evident in Gregory (cp. BAUER 1995: 159–167).

## References

ADAMS, J. N. (2007) *The Regional Diversification of Latin, 200 BC–AD 600*, Cambridge.

BAUER, B. L. M. (1995) *The Emergence and Development of SVO Patterning in Latin and French. Diachronic and Psycholinguistic Perspectives*, Oxford.

BONNET, M. (1890) *Le latin de Grégoire de Tours*, Paris.

LEHMANN, C. (1984) *Der Relativsatz. Typologie seiner Strukturen, Theorie seiner Funktionen, Kompendium seiner Grammatik*, Tübingen.

**Lunch | Dîner**

We shall have lunch in the Géopolis building, c. 700m (8 min.) from the Anthropole building; see the map below.

Pour dîner, nous irons au bâtiment Géopolis, qui se trouve à 700m (8 min.) de l'Anthropole ; vous trouverez une carte ci-dessous.

**Dinner | Souper (19h30)**

Brasserie « Les Trois Rois », Rue du Simplon 7, Lausanne, CH-1006 (Métro m2, arrêt | stop Grancy).

**Starter**
Fresh seasonal salad OR
Snails from Vallorbe with parsley and garlic dressing

**Main**
Beef steak, pommes frites and seasonal vegetables OR
Fresh sausage wheel with shallot sauce, tagliatelle & seasonal vegetables OR
Vegetable and tofu loaf with a potato rösti and tomato compote

**Desert**
"The Tower of Doom" (meringue, hot chocolate sauce, vanilla ice cream) OR
Vanilla panna cotta with a seasonal fruit coulis

*** 

**Entrées**
Salade fraîche de crudités OU
Escargots de Vallorbe en persillade

**Plats principaux**
Steak de bœuf, pommes frites maison et légumes frais du jour OU
Saucisse à rôtir de la boucherie de Cour, sauce aux échalotes, tagliatelles et légumes frais OU
Polpete de légumes et tofu, rösti maison et compoté de tomates (plat végétarien)

**Desserts**
La tour infernale (meringue, sauce chocolat chaud, glace vanille) OU
Pannacotta à la vanille et coulis de fruit de saison