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ABSTRACT

A theory-based perspective is essential to a full understanding of infinitive clauses in early Latin. Some previous work focusing on syntactic theory has failed to include appropriate Latin data or has not explained it adequately. More recent theoretical perspectives have taken the approach of Functional Grammar, dismissing much of the variation in word order and embedded clause types as driven merely by pragmatics.

This study examines the syntax of early Latin from a Government and Binding viewpoint, with the aim of fully marrying the theory with the data to account for the infinitival variations. A corpus was created from the complete extant works of Accius, Caecilius, Cato, Ennius, Livius Andronicus, Lucilius, Naevius, Pacuvius, and the anonymous Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus as well as five selected plays from Plautus and three from Terence (comprising a total of over 200,000 words with 3,828 infinitives).

One of the main findings is that certain structures such as passivization are a strategy to avoid the syntactic ambiguity that would otherwise result from the confluence of multiple accusative-case assignments. The results show that infinitival complements with more than one overt accusative noun phrase are relatively rare (occurring in only 14% of contexts), while structures that avoid ambiguity, such as finite clause variants, passivization, and null noun phrases, are more frequent (occurring in about one fourth of possible contexts). The study also provides a baseline for examining grammaticalization and other language changes in the history of Latin.
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

The last half century has witnessed an explosion in linguistic theory, much of it in the area of syntax. Chomsky’s *Syntactic Structures* (1957) focused theoretical attention on transformational generative grammar. As transformational generative theory eventually developed into Government and Binding and later the Minimalist Program, much of the original focus was on English. Later work has expanded to include other languages – even the Romance languages – but generally not dead languages such as Latin.

The result is a third-fold irony. First, Chomsky himself had written a descriptive analysis of modern Hebrew, so that early on English was not the dominant language of research interest for many researchers. Second, a stated goal of the Minimalist Program is to identify linguistic universals. While the general approach is theoretical rather than empirical, universal principals can be derived only through the systematic study of a wide range of languages. Third, one particular language long associated with rationalism in the Western tradition – Latin – has been generally neglected by linguistic theorists. Dismissed as “elitist” by many in the twentieth century, analyses of Latin have remained mostly hidden from the syntactic microscope. Where Latin is still regularly studied, such investigations are typically philological rather than theoretical.

One early exception is Lakoff’s *Abstract Syntax and Latin Complementation* (1968), but this work has been rightly criticized for errors in its application of syntactic theory (Amacker, 1972) as well errors in the actual facts about Latin (Pinkster, 1971; Householder, 1969). Moreover, Lakoff deals primarily with Classical Latin, and when attempting to show diachronic change makes unwarranted assumptions about the underlying nature of the grammar. While Lakoff’s work is seminal, it ultimately leaves many more questions than it has answered. That
vacuum has begun to be filled. In the past two decades some areas of Latin syntax have been examined from a theoretical standpoint, for instance Exceptional Case Marking. Theoretical research has also explored specific areas of the grammar, such as the distribution of various types of NP and discourse markers.

The result of these recent analyses has finally focused long-needed attention on Latin, combining the best of descriptive analysis with a chosen theoretical framework. However, with the exception of Pinkster’s *Latin Syntax and Semantics* (a 1990 English translation of his 1984 work), most recent linguistic attention on Latin has been on particular topics. Pinkster synthesizes many aspects of Latin grammar into a larger outline, but overall the work is descriptive and promotes a Functional Grammar perspective. For instance, in analyzing embedded infinitival complements, he makes no theoretical distinction between Exceptional Case Marking and control structures. So far, other work that is theory-based has not yet drawn a complete picture of Latin grammar. Bolkestein has examined various issues of Latin syntax and discourse (e.g. 2000; 1992; 1990; 1989; 1985; 1980; 1979; Bolkestein & van de Grift, 1994), but so far without integrating the various pieces into a composite description of the grammar, and much of her theory is, like Pinskter’s, within Functional Grammar. Thus, the current state of a theoretical approach to Latin grammar is still skewed: The theory-driven studies are applied only to localized aspects of syntax, and the synthesizing studies are not driven by a syntactic approach such as Government and Binding or Minimalism. There remains a void in our understanding of how Latin grammar actually works as interpreted by the “mainstream” apparatus of syntactic theory.

Even when syntactic theory has been applied to Latin, it has dealt either exclusively or primarily with the classical period of the language. Earlier stages of the language have received
little systematic attention, apart from work by nineteenth- and twentieth-century philologists (e.g. Bennett, 1984:2001, 1910; Buck, 1976; Kieckers, 1930; Leumann & Hofmann, 1928; Gildersleeve & Lodge, 1895:1997; Draeger, 1878). Understanding the pre-classical period of Latin is important for a complete understanding of Latin as a diachronous, multi-register language. Even when syntactic attention focuses on the early period, textual citations are typically framed as anomalies compared with the better-known classical period, or as mere corroboration of patterns found from later. No modern theoretical study has yet examined the early Latin period in itself.

The classical period has its theoretical study in Pinkster’s framework of Functional Grammar, but early Latin has not yet had a recent theoretical account applied to it. Given the lack of a theoretical approach to the syntax of early Latin, this gap invites a thorough-going examination of actual data to meet up with a theoretical approach to syntax. This study attempts to fill in the syntactic gap by examining the nature of infinitival complements in early Latin. The data for the study come directly from extant texts of the early period, which are analyzed within the framework of Government and Binding and the Minimalist Program. Using a corpus-based approach, this study takes a small step in a much longer path toward understanding early Latin with a syntax-centered theoretical apparatus.
CHAPTER 2. THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO INFINITIVAL COMPLEMENTS

The obvious difference between an infinitive and a finite verb are the settings of the [finite] and [tense] features. While significant, these differences obscure the many similarities that finite and non-finite verbs share. For instance, both verb forms can take an external argument (i.e. the subject) if semantically endowed with an appropriate thematic role. Both can also subcategorize for one or more internal arguments, again according to their semantic structure. Where an infinitive most differs from its finite counterpart is in the type of NP it takes for its subject and in the type of structures in which it can occur. Generally, the subject of a finite verb (in English, at least) is an overt NP, and that NP receives its case marking from the finite verb. A non-overt subject can occur with an infinitive in a construction such as control. In Exceptional Case Marking, the infinitive allows an overt NP as subject, but the NP receives its case assignment from the main verb, not the infinitive. In these various ways, non-finite verbs are noticeably different from finite verbs. In addition, infinitivals play important roles in passivization and raising.

2.1 CASE ASSIGNMENT

Under Case theory, each lexical thematic NP must receive case. According to the Case Filter, each overt thematic NP argument must receive a case assignment, either overt or abstract (Chomsky, 1995, p. 111). One implication of the Case Filter is that all languages are presumed to have abstract case. However, parameter settings and relative morphological richness account for differences in whether abstract case is overtly expressed in any particular language. In languages like English with little overt morphology on NPs, most nouns can overtly show plurality or possession, but only pronouns overtly mark the difference between nominative and accusative case (e.g. she vs. her). Determiners, adjectives, and nouns are also overtly case-
marked in more morphologically rich languages like German and Latin. An account of Latin inflectional morphology is presented in detail beginning in section 3.2 below, but for now examples (1-2) show how overt case marking distinguishes nominative (pueri) and accusative (pueros) in Latin. (In citations throughout this work, verbs are in present tense, indicative mood, and active voice unless otherwise noted. Gloss abbreviations are listed on page ix, and full names of authors and their works are in Appendix A.)

(1) Mercator quidem fuit Syracusis senex, ei sunt nati filii gemini duo, ita forma simili pueri


‘There was a certain old merchant in Syracuse who had twin sons, boys so alike in appearance …’ (Pl. Men. 17-19)

(2) ut quidem ille dixit mihi, qui pueros viderat

as INDEF-M-S-NOM that-M-S-NOM say-3-S-PERF I-S-DAT REL-M-PL-NOM boy-M-PL-ACC see-3-S-PLUP

‘as a certain man who had seen the boys told me’ (Pl. Men. 22)

As the glosses show, all Latin NPs including pronouns and adjectives are inflected for case.

Case may be assigned either inherently or structurally. Inherent case derives from the semantic properties of the verb and the NP’s relationship to that verb. For example, the dative case is for an indirect object, as it relates that NP as a beneficiary or goal of the verb. Inherent case may also stem from the relationship between another lexical head and an NP, such as a preposition combining with an NP to yield a PP or a genitive NP expressing the relationship of possession or source. Case assigners in English include verbs and prepositions, but not nouns or adjectives. Since inherent case comes from a “natural” relationship between constituents, its form in a given type of thematic role does not vary except in so-called quirky case. Thus, for example, all indirect objects should be assigned dative case unless overridden by some other
principle of the grammar. Under the θ-Criterion, each thematic role for a given verb must be mapped onto one (and only one) NP argument. In a nominative-accusative type language such as English or Latin, the typical active verb licenses an agent role for the doer of the action, and that agent is often (but necessarily) the subject. The θ-role of agent is based on the verb’s semantics and its nominative case assignment is inherent. If transitive, the verb also selects a θ-role like patient or theme for the direct object. In the corresponding passivized sentence, the θ-role of the agent still exists (although it may be phonetically null), but the NP with the role of patient/theme becomes the subject.

In contrast to inherent case, structural case reflects merely a grammatical relationship between the verb and its arguments. The nature of that relationship can change according to the clause structure. Nominative (for the subject) and accusative (for the direct object) are structural case assignments because they are not mapped to specific thematic roles. The subject of an English sentence is often the NP with the θ-role of agent, but NPs with other thematic roles can also be the subject, including the expletives it and there, which have no θ-role at all. Regardless of its thematic role, the subject of a finite clause structurally gets a nominative case assignment, and the direct object gets accusative case. Exactly how those structural case assignments are made is explained differently in different syntactic theories.

In Government and Binding (GB) theory, the grammar is modular and the main relationship between the modules is government. Both θ-roles and structural case are assigned under government. For example, a finite transitive verb assigns accusative case to its direct object internally from within the VP, regardless of which θ-role the NP bears. Under the relation of government, I(nfl) also assigns nominative case to the subject externally as the specifier of the
I head, which carries Agreement. These case assignments are shown in simplified structure in Figure 1, ignoring any movement of the subject from within the VP.

![Figure 1: Case Assignment in GB.](image)

In GB, phrases have specifiers, heads, and complements, and they set up relationships between specifier-head or head-complement, defined by different forms of government. Nominative case is assigned from the Spec-Head relationship between the agreement feature in the I node and the NP in its specifier. Accusative case is assigned by V to the NP in its complement. This results in an asymmetric assignment of structural case.

Besides government, another crucial component of GB is the principle of Move-α. Move-α is the obligatory movement of constituents, limited only by specific parameter settings or other features of the grammar such as binding rules. If after an instance of movement the resulting derivation violates no grammatical principle or parametric setting, the string is grammatical; otherwise, it either crashes or is subject to another cycle of Move-α. One example of Move-α is when an overt NP has no case assignment. Since that condition violates the Case Filter, Move-α derives a new structure in which the NP is at a position where it can receive a case assignment. For example, accusative case assignment is absorbed in passivization, leaving the underlying direct-object NP without case. Lacking a case assignment even though it has
phonetic content, the NP is forced to move. In passivization the only available slot is the subject position, previously vacated by the underlying NP with the $\theta$-role of agent. Once the promoted NP moves into the position where it can receive case, the Case Filter is satisfied and the resulting structure is valid.

Minimalist syntax also assumes the Case Filter requirements are fulfilled through syntactic relationships. One crucial difference is that in the Minimalist Program (MP) the main force behind syntactic relations is a generalized concept of agreement, the relationship between a head and its specifier or between two heads under head movement. That is, movement is not triggered per se under a universal principle of grammar, but rather movement is a consequence of the need to check features under the structural relation of agreement. Whenever movement occurs, it does so over the shortest possible route. The MP includes Checking Theory, under which NPs have agreement features that must be checked. Rather than being assigned structurally through syntactic relations, case is the checking of features between the NP and its functional head. Checking takes place in sequential Spec-Head derivations, wherein constituents move from a base position to one or more secondary positions. Whenever an agreement feature is at a position where it cannot be checked, the structure crashes. It can be recovered only by movement to a position where feature checking is possible. Where the Case Filter denies grammatical support for an overt NP without case, Checking Theory requires an overt NP to be in an agreement relationship in order to receive case. An NP without case crashes not because it violates the Case Filter per se, but the lack of case reveals that the NP’s agreement features have not been properly checked.

Projections result from the merger of heads for checking purposes. This means that in the MP there are more projection levels to account for the various agreement features that must be
checked. Subject agreement (AgrS) is one feature to be checked, as are tense (T) and object agreement (AgrO). AgrO is supported by V. Nominative case marking on the subject occurs through Spec-Head agreement with AgrS, and accusative case under Spec-Head agreement with AgrO. Thus, checking theory posits the assignments shown in Figure 2, a simplified version with T and AgrS together; some versions of the theory separate them out.

![Diagram of Checking Theory in the MP](image)

Figure 2: Checking Theory in the MP.

Under Minimalist theory, it is essential that the subject originates as the specifier of VP. Since the VP-internal subject cannot checks its AgrS feature where it is generated, it must move to the specifier of AgrS. Similarly, the direct object moves to the specifier of AgrO in order to check case. The verb moves twice, each time motivated by feature checking: first to AgrO to check object agreement features with the direct object and then to AgrS to check subject agreement features with the subject. The object checks accusative case in Spec-AgrO, and the subject checks nominative case in Spec-AgrS after T merges with AgrS. In GB, case assignment is asymmetrical, but in the MP case checking is consistently made through Spec-Head agreement relations.
For the sake of consistency and to avoid unnecessary repetition, throughout this work syntax and related issues such as case assignment and movement will be referred to in the terms of GB rather than the MP. The interested reader can adapt such terms and concepts into those of Minimalism. Rather than case being assigned, in the MP features are checked for agreement properties. For GB’s I node, substitute AgrS and for VP in relation to accusative case, substitute AgrO. Other terminological translations between the two theories will be mentioned below.

2.2 BINDING AND TYPES OF NPS

One GB module is binding theory, which encompasses how the relationships between NPs are interpreted. Binding theory includes the distribution of referring expressions, pronouns, reflexives, and empty categories. The definition of binding is in (3), and the principles of Binding Theory are in (4).

(3) \( \alpha \) binds \( \beta \) iff

(a) \( \alpha \) c-commands \( \beta \) and

(b) \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are co-indexed. (Chomsky, p. 93)

(4) Binding theory

(a) Principle A: An anaphor must be bound in its governing category.

(b) Principle B: A pronoun must be free in its governing category.

(c) Principle C: An R-expression must be free everywhere.

NPs are categorized according to how they express two binary features, [anaphora] and [pronoun]. The four possible combinations of these two features for overt NPs are in Table 1. Anaphoric NPs require an antecedent, and pronouns may or may not have an antecedent. Personal pronouns are [- anaphor, + pronoun], because while they do not require an antecedent, they can have one. Reflexive pronouns are [+ anaphor, - pronoun] because they require an
antecedent. Referring (or R-) expressions require no antecedent; they are ‘unbound’ and independently recoverable and therefore [- anaphor, - pronoun].

Table 1: Types of Overt NPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt NP</th>
<th>[anaphor]</th>
<th>[pronoun]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal pronoun</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive pronoun</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referring expression</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The feature combination [+ anaphor, + pronoun] is not possible for an overt NP because of government. The two binding conditions of Principle A and Principle B shown in (4) place a mutually incompatible set of restrictions on an overt NP that is [+ anaphor, + pronoun] with a governing category. The only way to resolve the contradictory requirements of the [+ anaphor, + pronoun] features is for the NP to have no governing category. But in order to receive case, the subject of a finite verb must be governed, and if that subject has no case it violates the Case Filter. Therefore, this set of features cannot apply to an overt NP.

However, the PRO theorem allows an empty category of NP, known as PRO, that does simultaneously fulfill the two conditions. PRO serves as an infinitival subject, a domain considered as ungoverned. As a result, overt NPs and PRO are in (near) complementary distribution; indeed, the binding conditions of GB appear to be formulated precisely to explain why such a distribution occurs. In addition to PRO, the other three combinations of the [anaphor] and [pronoun] features also have counterparts that are empty categories. These are shown in Table 2.
Table 2: Types of Empty Categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empty Category</th>
<th>[anaphor]</th>
<th>[pronoun]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pro</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP-trace</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wh-trace</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The empty category with the features [- anaphor, + pronoun] is pro. In languages such as Spanish and Italian that parametrically license it, pro is a phonetically null pronoun. Most commonly, pro is a subject pronoun but some languages also have object pro. The two types of traces both have the [- pronoun] feature, which results from the fact that in GB traces remain in situ from the D-structure following all movement derivations, in accordance with the Empty Category Condition that all traces must be governed.

Since a basic tenet of the MP is movement for checking purposes, the binding conditions of GB are unnecessary. Where patterns in overt vs. empty NP distribution exist, these result as a consequence of the grammar – without having to formulate special rules to create them. Anaphora, for instance, results from movement, and the three categories of NPs that have the feature [+ anaphor] – reflexive pronouns, NP traces, and PRO – are merely what result when checking conditions are satisfied. Even more generally, the [pronoun] feature is a lexical option that does not depend on any notion of domain or government for its realization.

2.3 CONTROL

Case theory accounts for the occurrence of case on overt NPs, specifying that lexical thematic NPs must have a case assignment. The theory also accounts for conditions in which an overt NP is prohibited but a covert one (i.e. PRO) is allowed. Infinitives like those in (5-7)
cannot support overt NPs as subjects except with the for complementizer, but instead require PRO. (Infinitival clauses are indicated in square brackets.)

(5)  
   a.  the plan [PRO to sneak into Troy]  
   b.  *the plan [the Greeks to sneak into Troy]

(6)  
   a.  [PRO to design the horse] was clever  
   b.  *[Odysseus to design the horse] was clever

(7)  
   a.  Cassandra promised [PRO to warn the Trojans]  
   b.  *Cassandra promised [she to warn the Trojans]

The ungrammatical (b) sentences result from a violation of the Case Filter. The I node contains tense and subject agreement, but the infinitive’s [- finite] tense cannot support a case (suitable for an overt NP) for the subject. The infinitival subject cannot be assigned case, which by the Case Filter prohibits an overt NP in that position. As long as the subject is the non-overt PRO, as in the (a) sentences, the string is acceptable. This type of structure is control, in which one of the thematic arguments of the higher verb is obligatorily co-indexed with PRO in the infinitival complement.

Recall that PRO, with the binding features [+ anaphor, + pronoun], is interpretable as either anaphor or pronoun, as in (8-10), where anaphoric co-indexing is indicated by matching subscripts.

(8)  Caesar, decided/tried [PRO\textsubscript{i} to cross the Rubicon]  
(9)  Caesar, ordered the soldiers\textsubscript{j} [PRO\textsubscript{j} to cross the Rubicon]  
(10) Caesar, told the soldiers\textsubscript{j} [it was healthy [PRO\textsubscript{jk} to eat apples]]

PRO is anaphoric in (8-9), co-indexed with Caesar in (8) but with the soldiers in (9). Both are examples of so-called obligatory control, in which PRO is co-indexed with a particular NP
argument in the main clause. In (8) control extends from the main-clause subject Caesar to the
PRO subject of the embedded verb, thus creating subject control; in (9) the link between the
matrix object the soldiers and embedded subject PRO results in object control. In (10) PRO can
be co-indexed with the soldiers, but there is also another reading in which it is not co-indexed
with either overt NP. Rather, the co-indexing is with a distinct but covert controller, creating so-
called arbitrary control. Arbitrary PRO appears mostly in infinitival complements of intransitive
adjectives like healthy in (10) but not with transitive predicates. In obligatory control, the
[+ anaphor] element of PRO is stronger since it links back to a particular NP, while in arbitrary
control the [+ pronoun] element predominates.

Control predicates have a θ-role assigned to their specifier, which is the NP Caesar in
examples (11-13).

(11)  a. Caesari decided [PROi to cross the Rubicon]
    b. *Caesari decided [Caesar/he/him to cross the Rubicon]

(12)  a. Caesari ordered the soldiersj [PROj to cross the Rubicon]
    b. *Caesari ordered the soldiersj [the soldiers/they/them to cross the Rubicon]

(13)  a. Caesari told the soldiersj [it was better [PROk to eat apples]]
    b. *Caesari told the soldiersj [it was better [peoplek to eat apples]]

The θ-role of these subjects is usually agent, which fits semantically with the notion of ‘control’.\(^{1}\)
The semantic field of control predicates includes those above and various verbs meaning tell,
show, want, and try. Adjectival control predicates include psychological states such as anxious
and desperate. In addition, control includes modal constructions with root or deontic modals,

\(^{1}\) By metaphorical extension, non-agentive entities can also serve as controllers: That dessert tempted me
to break my diet. The cat persuaded her to let it outside.
which also assign the subject a θ-role (Roberts, 1985, p. 49). The requirement for a thematic role rules out an expletive subject, as in (14-16).

(14) *It/There; decided [PRO/Caesar; to cross the Rubicon]

(15) *It/There; ordered the soldiersj [PROj to cross the Rubicon]

(16) *It/There; told the soldiersj [it was better [PROk to eat apples]]

In the MP, control is considered not a module of the grammar, but rather a natural by-product of feature checking. The features [+ tense, - finite] on infinitives check null case, and the combination [- tense, - finite] does not check any case (Martin, 2001, p. 147). Since an overt NP must have a real case assignment – not merely null – only PRO is permitted as the infinitival subject.

2.4 EXCEPTIONAL CASE MARKING

PRO occurs as the specifier of a non-finite verb, while an overt NP is required with a finite verb. Overt subjects in a finite clause are allowed by the Case Filter because the subject receives a case assignment. Overt subjects are also possible in infinitival clauses headed by the complementizer for, as in (17-19).

(17) the plan [for the Greeks/them/*PRO to sneak into Troy]

(18) [for Odysseus/him/*PRO to design the horse] was clever

(19) Cassandraj expected [(for) Zeusj/(for) himj/*PROj to warn the Trojans]

In (17-19) it appears that the complementizer for assigns accusative case to the infinitival subjects, much as the preposition for assigns an oblique case to an ordinary NP complement (e.g. This book is for him/*he). Yet in (19) the overt NP Zeus and its pronominal equivalent him are the infinitival subject and they carry accusative case (as overtly shown on him), but these accusative forms are equally possible without for. This fact suggests that the assignment of
accusative case in (19) comes from outside the clause, specifically from the higher verb across the clause boundary. Because case assignment in GB ordinarily occurs within a local domain, the assignment of structural case across clauses is known as Exceptional Case Marking (ECM).

In ECM, the infinitival subject receives accusative case from the matrix verb. Examples are in (20-22).

(20) Caesar believed [Pompeia/her to remain above suspicion]
(21) Caesar found [Marius/him to be a good role model]
(22) Caesar understood [the soldiers/them to have destroyed Alesia]

Thematicall, Pompeia/her in (20) is the subject of the lower clause, receiving its θ-role of experiencer from the embedded VP remain. If inherent and structural case assignments matched directly, Pompeia/her could not be accusative since it is the subject of a verb. Similarly, the accusative NPs Marius/him and the soldiers/them are assigned from the higher verb, not the infinitive itself. The difference between these examples and the control structures in (23-24), repeated from (12-13), is the absence of an argument position within the main clause.

(23) Caesar ordered the soldiers [PRO to cross the Rubicon]
(24) Caesar allowed the soldiers [PRO to eat apples]

Control structures like (23-24) with an overt NP have an internal argument in the higher clause. For example, order in (23) has an argument slot for who is ordered, the soldiers, and allow has an argument for who is allowed, the soldiers. These θ-roles rank high in the verbs’ argument structure, and in English they occur as overt NPs. In contrast, ECM verbs such as believe, find, and understand in (20-22) take an internal argument that has the θ-role of theme. That theme argument occurs as an infinitival complement, not as a mere NP. On the surface, the
two structures sound similar, but their actual structural difference is shown in (25-26), where example (25) is control and (26) is ECM.

(25) Caesar, persuaded Pompeia, [PROj to accept the divorce]
(26) Caesar, expected [Pompeia, to accept the divorce]

Some predicates, such as expect, can take either a control or an ECM complement. An example is in (27).

(27) a. Caesar, expected [PROi to accept the divorce]
    b. Caesar, expected [Pompeia, to accept the divorce]

Within the set of ECM predicates, clauses with verbs of saying, believing, and sensory perception are traditionally called accusativus cum infinitivo, ‘accusative with infinitive’ (AcI). Since these predicates form a natural class of bridge verbs, it is useful to maintain the distinction between AcI and non-AcI ECM. In this study, bridge verb complements are called AcI, and all other embedded accusatives are referred to as ECM. That is, AcI is a specific subset of ECM. Additional examples of AcI predicates are in (28).

(28) a. Marius, considered [Sulla/himj to be the enemy]
    b. Sulla, thought [the Roman citizens/themj to be the enemy]
    c. Caesar, believed [Julia/herj to be a wonderful daughter]

Note that for some AcI predicates the embedded verb is restricted to the copula; compare the (a) and (b) examples in (29-31).

(29) a. Marius assumed [the soldiers/them to be eager for battle]
    b. *Marius assumed [the soldiers/them to fight]
    c. Marius expected [the soldiers to fight]
(30)  
a. Clodius believed [himself to be invincible]  
b. *Clodius believed [himself to prevail]  
c. Clodius needed [himself to prevail]  
(31)  
a. Marcia considered [Cicero to be a good orator]  
b. ?Marcia considered [Cicero to speak well]  
c. Marcia desired [Cicero to speak well]  

While the (b) examples are either outright ungrammatical as in (29-30) or of mixed acceptability as in (31), the (c) sentences all work. These examples show that a non-copula embedded verb is readily acceptable in non-Acl ECM complements.

GB explains ECM as the assignment of accusative case across the clausal boundary. SVO word order is canonical in English. Given these two facts, it is reasonable to expect adjacency of matrix verb – embedded accusative in ECM. Some examples are in (32).

(32)  
a. We truly believe [him to paint frescoes]  
b. *We believe truly [him to paint frescoes]  
c. We believe [him to paint frescoes beautifully]  
d. *We believe [beautifully him to paint frescoes]  

When the main-clause adjunct truly is positioned post-verbally, it blocks the ECM predicate. Similarly, when the lower-clause adjunct beautifully is positioned clause-initially, the infinitival complement also fails. In both instances the ECM structures fail because the accusative-assigned infinitival subject does not occur immediately after the main verb.

Another feature of ECM is that the distribution of overt NPs and PRO differs from what occurs in control. Earlier we saw that overt NPs are obligatory as subjects in finite clauses while

2 But cf. the grammaticality of Clodius believed [himself to have prevailed] and Clodius believed [himself to be prevailing]. Here the acceptable complements are not copulas but periphrastic (i.e. aspectual) forms.
PRO is prohibited, and PRO is required in non-finite clauses but overt NPs are not permitted at all. In ECM, the converse is true: An overt NP is required for the subject of the non-finite clause, as the examples in (33-35) illustrate.

(33) *Caesar, wanted [PRO\textsubscript{j} to accept the divorce]
(34) *Caesar, found [PRO\textsubscript{j} to be a good role model]
(35) *Caesar, understood [PRO\textsubscript{j} to have destroyed Alesia]

In GB, the assignment of accusative case from beyond the local domain is exceptional, but in the MP an ECM structure is merely a derivation made for the purpose of feature checking. Since the NP infinitival subject cannot check its case feature with the infinitive, it is forced to raise to a higher landing site, the AgrO projection in the main clause. This is illustrated in Figure 3. At the AgrO projection the embedded subject NP can successfully check its case and the structure is saved from crashing. Thus, in the MP so-called exceptional case marking is not exceptional at all. It is not merely ordinary, but absolutely predictable under the requirement for feature checking.

Based on the examples above, it can be seen that English ECM involves five main characteristics: (a) the matrix verb is transitive but takes a clausal complement rather than an NP object; (b) the infinitive lacks an [agreement] feature and therefore its subject cannot be assigned nominative case; (c) the subject is obligatorily overt; (d) because an overt NP must have a case assignment and the infinitive cannot assign case, the infinitival subject receives case from the higher verb; and (e) the ECM subject is adjacent to the matrix verb. All five criteria are necessary for ECM to occur.
2.5 RAISING

Some predicates lack an external argument (i.e. subject) and have only one internal argument, a clausal complement. The argument structure for these predicates is a theme argument. Examples are the verb seem in (36) and the adjective likely in (37).

(36)  a.  *the soldier seemed
       b.  *seemed [the soldier was angry]
       c.  *seemed [the soldier to be angry]

(37)  a.  *the father was likely
       b.  *(was) likely [the father would disinherit the son]
       c.  *(was) likely [the father to disinherit the son]
The invalid (a) sentences have a single argument, an overt NP rather than a clause. In the (b-c) examples, even the presence of a clausal complement does not rescue the sentences, and the finiteness of that clause does not affect the grammaticality of these failed sentences.\(^3\) The (b) sentences fail because English requires an overt subject for tensed predicates under the Extended Projection Principle. Since *seem* and *likely* have no external \(\theta\)-role, the only possible subject to insert is an expletive, such as *it* in (38-39).

(38) It seemed [the soldier was angry]
(39) It was likely [the father would disinherit the son]

The (36-37c) examples can also be saved, but not by inserting an expletive subject. What they require is a movement derivation, promoting the NP clausal subject to the main subject position and leaving behind a trace (indicated by t) in the lower clause. Examples are shown in (40-41).

(40) The soldier, seemed [t₁ to be angry]
(41) The father, was likely [t₁ to disinherit the son]

Because such verbs and adjectives must raise their embedded subjects with a non-finite complement, they are called raising predicates. This class of predicates also includes epistemic modals, which assign no \(\theta\)-role to the subject (Roberts, p. 50). Raising is necessary because otherwise the infinitival subject would get no case assignment or, in the MP, be able to check its case feature.

Since raising involves movement, it contrasts with ECM, as in (42-43).

(42) The soldier, seemed [t₁ to be angry]
(43) He believed [the soldier to be angry]

\(^3\) We leave aside the question of exactly how the tense-inflected modal *would* is selected as the finite counterpart of the infinitive in (37b) since that is not at issue here.
In both examples a structural case assignment is made to the infinitival subject, but with raising as in (42) that subject is assigned nominative case after it is promoted to SpecIP; in ECM in (43), the subject is assigned accusative from the main verb. Raising in (44) also contrasts with control in example (45), where the control predicate obligatorily assigns an external θ-role (i.e. agent).

(44) a. Caesar seemed [it to be in charge]
    b. It seemed [Caesar was in charge]

(45) a. Caesar tried [PROi to win]
    b. *It tried [Caesar to win]

The inability of expletive it to act as subject in (45b) shows that try subcategorizes a θ-role for its subject, while the acceptability of it in (44b) reveals the lack of a subject θ-role in the matrix clause.

2.6 PASSIVIZATION

Passives have several properties that distinguish them from actives. In passivization the active subject is demoted, even to the point that it may be unexpressed; if overt, it is the object of a by-phrase in English and the equivalent in other languages (e.g. Latin a/ab(s) + ablative case, German von + dative case). The verb itself undergoes a morphological change, acquiring a passive participle; in English, the passive morphology is periphrastic: be + {en}. The passive morphology is said to absorb the verb’s ability to assign case. As a result of passivization, the subject position empties and the underlying internal argument (i.e. object) no longer receives case assignment, so it moves up to occupy subject position. The underlying agent and theme argument retain their thematic roles in the passivized sentence, but they fulfill different grammatical relations. What was the subject with nominative case is demoted and only optionally expressed, and what was the direct object with accusative case is promoted to the
subject (i.e. with nominative case) of the passive verb. These behaviors of passives presuppose a verb which, in the active voice, selects the \( \theta \)-role of agent, experiencer, or theme (i.e. whichever is the highest-ranking thematic argument of the verb) for the external argument and an action-receiving role such as patient or theme for the internal argument; such verbs are traditionally called transitives. By definition, then, verbs like exist and seem cannot passivize because they lack one or more of the required \( \theta \)-roles.

In more formal terms of GB, the underlying object moves to SpecIP. That SpecIP was previously empty shows that the passive verb cannot have had an external argument. Rather, it is the internal argument that moves to SpecIP. This means that the passive verb does not assign any external \( \theta \)-role.

Rather than being completely erased, the external \( \theta \)-role in passivization is absorbed by (= remains with) the passive morpheme itself. Otherwise, the verb would have no internal \( \theta \)-role to complete its argument structure. Under passivization, the promoted NP leaves behind a trace in VP, but the verb does not structurally assign a case to the NP trace since non-overt NPs do not require a case assignment. The promoted NP receives cases from its new subject position, which can happen only if it did not already have a case assignment in its base position.

As with raising, passivization is a movement derivation. Its requirement for a transitive verb excludes raising predicates from passivization on the ground that they have no external \( \theta \)-role available for demotion. However, control predicates as well as Acl and ECM predicates can be passivized, with the effects shown in (46-48), respectively.

(46) a. The dictator \(_1\) had promised [\( \text{PRO}_i \) to cancel all debts\(_j\)]

b. *Debts\(_j\) had been promised [\( \text{PRO}_i \) to cancel t\(_j\)]

b. It had been promised [\( \text{PRO}_i \) to cancel all debts\(_j\)]
When passivized, ECM verbs, including AcI, become raising verbs since the infinitival subject gets no case from its verb. Instead, it leaves an NP trace in the lower clause when it is promoted to the higher subject position. When the embedded clause is passivized, the derivational options are different for control structures as in (49b) than from those with raising as in (50b) and ECM as in (51b).

(49) a. Caesar hoped [PROi to kill Pompeyj]
    b. *Caesar hoped [ej PROi to be killed tj by Caesari]

(50) a. Caesar seems [ti to have killed Pompeyj]
    b. Pompey seems [ti to have been killed tj by Caesari]

(51) a. Caesar expected [the Senatej to pass the billk]
    b. Caesar expected [the billk to be passed tk by the Senatej]

Raising and passives form a natural class of predicates based on subcategorization.

Verbs without an external argument do not assign (accusative) case to the internal argument, and vice versa. Known as Burzio’s Generalization (1986), this observation captures the idea that accusative is assigned only in a dependent relation, when another argument links it with the verb. Burzio predicts three types of verb categories: transitives (external + internal argument), intransitives (external argument only), and unaccusatives (internal argument only). Of these,
only intransitives have no selection for accusative. Passives and raising predicates behave like unaccusatives in that they have no external argument subcategorization.
CHAPTER 3. CORPUS OF EARLY LATIN

3.1 “EARLY LATIN” DEFINED

To examine the various infinitival structures in Latin, the extant texts from the early Latin period were analyzed, electronically edited, and tagged to form an electronic corpus. Early Latin is defined here as the post-archaic stage of the language up to 102/101 BC, the date of the satirist Lucilius’ death (Bieler, 1980, p. 99).

Exactly what to call the stage of Latin before 100 BC is a matter of some debate. The main difficulty lies in the fact that the extant language is represented in two distinct stages. The archaic stage ends by 240 BC, when Greek literary influence began. Many archaic texts are barely understandable as “Latin” when compared with classical data or even with the other texts analyzed in this study. What survives from the archaic period is typically incomplete, such as a piece of a tombstone or a manuscript fragment of verse. Moreover, the texts themselves are often merely formulaic repetitions of religious chants, for example fertility rituals (Williams, 1982, pp. 53-57) or a one-line verse to cure gout, to be repeated the magical number of 27 times (Lockwood, 1962, p. 6). The syntax of archaic Latin offers little of interest to the study of infinitival complements because of its semantic context. The most common remains are inscriptions such as on tombstones or markers set up in public areas. Even when such documents go beyond a formulaic “here lies X,” the syntactic structure is generally parataxis (parallel) rather than hypotaxis (embedded). Overall, then, the surviving archaic texts are unhelpful because either unintelligible or, where understood, uninteresting from the syntactic viewpoint.

A noticeably different stage of the language begins in 240 BC, when Livius Andronicus adapted both a Greek comedy and a Greek tragedy into Latin, and both plays were publicly
performed that year (Conte, 1994, p. 13). Based on Livius’ success, others also adapted works from Greek into Latin, including the playwrights Plautus and Terence, whose works are represented in this study. The Romans themselves credited Appius Claudius Caecus ‘the Blind’ with writing the first literary prose in Latin (Gratwick, 1982, p. 138), but his work does not now survive. The first surviving Latin author whose work is not modeled directly on Greek sources is Ennius, born in 239 BC (Conte, p. 75). Although he adapted earlier Greek literary works into Latin, Ennius also created works original to Latin, including his epic poem the *Annales*.

Beginning around 100 BC, surviving texts contain Latin that is qualitatively different from earlier. By 20 B.C., the poet Horace notes that contemporary schoolboys have great difficulty understanding Livius Andronicus’ archaic language (*Ep. 2.1.69ff.*). Scholars generally agree that the so-called classical period of Latin begins around 100 BC (e.g. Palmer, 1954; Conte, 1984; Courtney, 1999). Regarding what to call the language before 100 BC, there is less agreement. Because the earlier period includes archaic language, some scholars categorize the entire pre-classical period as “archaic Latin” (e.g. Courtney), while others designate it all as “old Latin” (e.g. Warmington, 1940; Gratwick, 1982). To call the entire pre-classical stage of Latin “archaic” is misleading since the period can be separated into the two stages noted above, and the latter stage is not qualitatively different enough from classical Latin to merit the label “archaic.” Rather, “archaic” is more descriptive of the earlier stage, up to about 240 BC. Since the archaic texts are excluded here, “early Latin” is a better description of what it is actually included rather than “archaic” or “old” Latin: It is not the oldest (i.e. archaic) stage of the language, but rather the intermediate period before the classical period.

Accordingly, the corpus developed here begins around 240 BC with the first known extant literary works – those of Livius Andronicus – and continues until Lucilius’ death by 101
BC. One change between early and later Latin is a rising tendency toward hypotaxis (Hammond, Mack & Moskalew, 1963). A heavy reliance on syntactic subordination, often with multiple embedded clauses, can be considered a hallmark of the classical period as exemplified by renowned speaker/writers such as Caesar and Cicero. Two other main linguistic criteria also distinguish the early period from the later classical stage. The first difference is seen most obviously in phonetics and morphology, such as the reduction of certain diphthongs to a single vowel in classical Latin (Kieckers, 1930, p. 28ff.) and the intervocalic rhotacism of Indo-European /s/ (pp. 114-115) as in *quaesendum* in Ennius (*Trag.* 126, ca. 190 BC) for classical *quaerendum*. Many of the early-Latin texts included in this study have /o/ for later /u/, for example nominative singular *servos* ‘slave’ and accusative singular *servom* for classical *servus/servum*. In morphology, one changed noted by the Roman grammarian Varro around 46 BC is that the perfect tense of *solere* ‘to be accustomed’ has changed from *solui* in the time of Cato and Ennius to the periphrastic form *solitus sum* (Varro, 1938, p. 2:524).

### 3.2 CORPUS CONTENTS

To construct the electronic corpus used in this study, all sources in the relevant period were considered and reviewed. However, the data in this study generally exclude epitaphs, official inscriptions, and most laws. These public documents are problematic in several ways. First, their remains are scanty. Classical authors such as the historian Livy refer to many laws and other public documents from the early period of Latin which have since become lost; sometimes we know the general content of such documents but rarely more than a few words of the actual text. Second, even when a document is apparently complete (e.g. all the writing on a tombstone can be deciphered unambiguously and the monument itself remains in one piece), the

---

4 Non-rhotacized *quaesendum* may be intentionally archaizing (i.e. rhotacization could have been complete in the language by then), but Ennius does sometimes use deliberate archaisms.
discourse topic typically does not include a verb that licenses an infinitival complement. Third, the one document that is most representative of prose in the archaic period is the Laws of the Twelve Tables (originally codified ca. 490-450 BC). The Laws contain numerous examples of infinitival complements, but the text we have includes the interpolations of later classical writers (Courtney, p. 13), often including even the presumed matrix verb. The infinitival phrases are generally considered the earlier (i.e. not the interpolated) text, but even that part of the text may well postdate when(ever) the laws were actually first written down (Warmington, 1940, p. IV:xxx). The result is that we cannot rely on the purported antiquity of the Laws as valid evidence of early Latin. Thus, however tempting to include a body of text considerably older than the other corpus data, it is clearly dangerous to rely on the Laws’ syntax except as corroboration for constructions found elsewhere. For these reasons, the Laws are omitted from this study.

One brief exception to the lack of reliable texts from monuments is the well-known epitaph of L. Cornelius Scipio (consul in 259 BC). This inscription contains an instance of AcI, shown in (52); the actual inscription is in (52a) and the later, classical equivalent is given in (52b).

(52) a. Hunc oino ploorume cosentiont R[omai] duonoro
  optumo fuise viro Luciom Scipione. (Warmington, p. IV:4)

b. Hunc unum plurimi consentiunt R[omae] bonorum
  optimum fuisse virum Lucium Scipionem. (Lockwood, p. 8)

‘Most agree this man, Lucius Scipio, was one of the best men at Rome.’

The main verb is consentire ‘to agree’, realized as cosentiont in (52a) and as the classical form consentiunt in (52b), reflecting phonological changes between the early and classical period.
The subordinate clause is the infinitive *fuis(s)e* ‘to have been’ headed by the NP subject *hunc oino ~ hunc unum*. The basic structure of (52) is shown in (53), where it is assumed that *hunc oino* is moved up through topicalization since ‘this one’, Scipio, is the subject of the epitaph itself.

(53) *ploirume cosentiont [hunc oino fuise optumo]*  
most agree [this one to have been best]

This early example with *cosentiont* represents the most frequent type of AcI found in the early Latin period and thus confirms that such a construction developed early in the language. A few other inscriptions provide corroborating evidence for the same structure, with the result that we do not expect different syntax for verbs that elsewhere in early Latin take AcI complements. No such examples from monuments are included in the corpus data or numerical results cited herein.

While not nearly as old as the original Laws of the Twelve Tables, the *Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus* ‘Senate Decree on the Rites of Bacchus’ dates definitively from 186 BC. Its language is deliberately archaizing rather than contemporary (Ernout, 1947, pp. 60-68), which provides important diachronic evidence. Moreover, although the complete text is less than 350 words, it contains 19 infinitival complements and is therefore critical to the present study as corroboration of the various infinitival structures.

Of the remaining texts from early Latin, the corpus comprises all that survives of the poets Ennius⁵, Accius, Lucilius, Caecilius Statius, Livius Andronicus, Pacuvius, and Naevius; the prose agricultural treatise and fragmentary orations of Cato⁶; and five of the 20 extant plays of Plautus plus three of Terence’s six plays. All told, these works comprise a corpus of over

---

⁵ The prose *Euhemerus* is attributed to Ennius (Courtney, p. 27), but brief as it is the text we have appears to be modernized by later writers (Warmington, pp. 1:414-416).

⁶ The so-called *Monosticha* and *Disticha Catonis* actually date from several hundred years later (Bieler, 1980, p. 77), while unfortunately the genuine (prose) *Origines* on Rome’s earliest history survives only in tiny fragments.
200,000 words, including over 3,800 instances of infinitival complements of various types. A summary of the corpus contents is in Table 3. Of these, 52 (1%) of the corpus infinitives lack sufficient context for proper classification of the complement type (see chapter 6). In addition to the 3,828 infinitival complements, the corpus also contains 129 instances of finite complements in contexts where the infinitive more often occurs. Such variants are discussed in further detail in chapters 6 and 7.

Table 3: Corpus Contents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Approx. No. of Words</th>
<th>No. of Infinitives</th>
<th>Rate of Infinitives</th>
<th>% of Total Words</th>
<th>% of Total Infinitives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accius</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacch.</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caecilius</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cato</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ennius</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livius</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucilius</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naevius</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacuvius</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plautus</td>
<td>126,600</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence</td>
<td>42,700</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL  219,250  3,828  .017

The complete list of authors, their works, and abbreviations for those works appears in Appendix A. Given this set of texts, the extant early Latin data provide a reasonable mixture of poetry and prose, as well as a sampling of discourse registers: Cato’s treatise on managing a farm, excerpts from his forensic speeches, the exuberant dialog in the various comic plays, the high-blown style in tragic dialog, the epic poetry of Ennius and others, and the witty satirical verse of Lucilius. Thanks to the prolific and relatively well-preserved playwrights, the corpus
data also offer the closest glimpse we have of ordinary conversation from the early Latin period.\(^7\)

For instance, despite being conveyed in metered verse, examples (54-55) feature topics and wording uniquely associated with the register of conversation.

(54) \(\text{Poti -n a me abeas, nisi me vis vomere?}\)

\(\text{able-M-S-NOM -Y/N from I-S-AVL go away-2-S-SUBJ unless I-S-ACC wish-2-S vomit-INFIN}\)

‘Can’t you go away from me – unless you want me to throw up?’ (Pl. Cas. 731)

(55) \(\text{Filium unicum adulescentulum habeo – ah, quid dixi? –}\)

\(\text{son-M-S-ACC sole-M-S-ACC youth-M-S-ACC have-1-S ah INTERROG-N-S-ACC say-1-S-PERF}\)

\(\text{habere I-S-ACC, immo habui.}\)

‘I have one son, a teenager. Ah, what did I say – that I have a son? Actually, I had one.’ (Ter. Hea. 94-95)

Note from Table 3 that the rate of infinitival complements varies considerably by author.

The lowest rate is .006 for Livius, but the mere 700 words of surviving text from him make this infinitival rate statistically invalid since a larger sample could well yield a different value.\(^8\) On the other hand, the five sampled works of Plautus account for 58% of the total words in the corpus but only 37% of the infinitives; his rate of .011 infinitives is significantly lower than the other authors’ except that of the poorly represented Livius. In contrast, Terence is represented by only one third as many words as Plautus, but he uses infinitival complements at more than twice the other playwright’s rate. Ennius and Lucilius each have approximately the same number of words surviving, but Ennius’ infinitival rate of .022 is similar to that of Terence – even though he provides only about one fifth as many words. Lucilius employs infinitives at an even higher rate (.036), approximately 1.5 times that of Ennius and Terence, or 3.5 times that of

---

\(^7\) Gratwick (1982, p.154) asserts that Cato’s style in *De Agri Cultura* has “the same speech patterns as we hear in Terence’s narrative and dialogue.” Put another way, Cato approaches the tone of ordinary conversation: It is direct in its hypotaxis rather than being stylized for literary purposes. Such simplicity also happens to fit neatly into Cato’s purpose, which is essentially to glorify the unpretentious values attributed to the earliest Romans.

\(^8\) As archaeological and philological work continues on deciphering the remains from Piso’s library at the Villa of the Papyri near Pompeii (Casson, 2001, pp. 74-75), it is always possible that additional works from the early Latin period may come to light.
Plautus. Interestingly, the shortest text (*Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus*) yields the highest rate of infinitival complements (0.059). These variations help balance out the corpus, compensating for the fact that the surviving texts are inherently unequal in terms of the number of words they contain.

The differences in infinitival rate also show that within a particular genre, the individual variations are probably due more to personal style than to register. For instance, Terence has always had the reputation of being more highbrow (and thus less commercially successful) than Plautus (Conte, 1994, pp. 99-102). His higher rate of infinitival usage suggests overall greater use of subordination, and hypotaxis is certainly one element of a more elevated style. On the other hand, the two texts of Cato’s prose yield significantly different infinitival rates. In the treatise, infinitives occur at the rate of .024, while the speeches feature nearly doubt that rate (.045). Yet this difference is tempered by the qualitative distinction in the two texts: *De Agri Cultura* is complete except for a few apparently brief lacunae, while the speeches are only fragments collected from quotations in later authors, and many known speeches have no surviving text at all. The complete set of speeches might yield an infinitival rate more similar to that in the farming manual – or else the remaining difference would be due to register rather than authorial style.

While the findings described in this study are based on the corpus data, sometimes it was necessary to delve further into the complete extant set of the works of Plautus and Terence to examine low-frequency syntactic patterns. All numerical results presented here are based only on the selected works summarized in Table 3, but some descriptive analysis is necessarily presented with the inclusion of examples from beyond those works.
Significantly, the 160-year period of early Latin chosen for the corpus is internally consistent with respect to infinitival complements. That is, no one construction is found one way in a particular author but not in any others; when a construction occurs at all, it is generally found in several, or even all, of the surveyed authors. This cross-author, cross-style consistency also provides evidence that “early Latin” is a single – albeit variable – dialect, not the diglossic distinction sometimes claimed between a highly stylized formal register (i.e. the canonical or literary language) and the vernacular. The same types of infinitival clauses occur in the didactic prose of Cato, the high-blown poetry of Ennius and Accius, the comic verse of Lucilius, the lively dialog of the playwrights, and the sober language of a law banning certain religious rituals. Across registers, then, early Latin is stable with respect to infinitival syntax, even as it shows some variations (noted in the following chapters). Moreover, where variants occur they are generally not constrained to a single author. We can thus feel confident that the variant forms are options freely available in the grammar, not merely authorial idiosyncrasy.

This is ultimately a significant point since one of the authors in the corpus is definitively known not to be a native speaker of Latin: *P. Terentius Afer* ‘the African’ (went to Rome in childhood or early youth as a slave), probably = ‘Berber’ (Bieler, p. 66) or ‘Libyan’ (Norwood, 1923, p. 132). Two others (Livius and Caecilius) were Roman war prisoners when they were young adults, so they too were possibly not native speakers. (Born near Milan, Caecilius may have previously known some Latin or even grown up bilingual, and Livius’s linguistic background is even less clear.) The sociolinguistic perspective on Latin literature, both synchronically and diachronically, has been little explored, although for early Latin too little is known for serious study.
3.3 METHODOLOGY

Clauses with infinitival complements from the selected works were entered electronically into the Systematic Analysis of Language Transcripts (SALT) software, research version 6.1 (Miller & Chapman, 2000), based on the texts of the standard Loeb series of print editions of classical works. Although the Loeb works feature a side-by-side Latin text with English translation, the translations shown here in citations are original to this study. The aim was for verbatim translations in order to preserve the original meaning as much as possible, although when otherwise too stilted the translations are rendered in more idiomatic language. Whenever possible, instances of ambiguity were resolved by consulting multiple printed English translations. Deviations from standard translations are noted where they occur.

The general methodology of corpus linguistics was used in accordance with the principles outlined by Biber (2000) as a way to examine patterns of language in use. Biber models language based on empirical findings in various corpora comprising multiple sociolinguistic registers. This study aimed to corroborate syntactic theory on infinitival complements with data from the early Latin period. For that purpose, 863 different tags were added to the electronic texts to track the various syntactic issues of interest in this study. The total number of tagged syntactic items was 12,755, equivalent to approximately one tag for every 17 words in the corpus. A printout of the tagged corpus in SALT format is in Appendix B.

---

9 For the fragments of Cato’s orations Loeb has no edition, so Malcovati’s edition (1955) was used instead. Only direct quotations from Cato were counted, not the (Greek) citations compiled from Plutarch’s biography of Cato or the Latin allusions or indirect quotes made by later authors.
CHAPTER 4. THE INFINITIVE, THE COPULA, AND WORD ORDER IN EARLY LATIN

4.1 THE INFINITIVE

The infinitive differs from a finite verb in lacking the inflection feature [+ finite] tense. Since the infinitive is unrealized, it indicates a “possible future” (Stowell, 1982, p. 562) but is not contrary-to-fact (i.e. irrealis) like the subjunctive. The infinitive’s features are [+ tense, - finite], where the [tense] setting is infinitival rather than temporal. For English, this feature matrix is straightforward since infinitives do not have any temporal marking. In contrast, Latin explicitly marks infinitives for three temporal tenses: present, past, and future. Voice (active or passive) as well as gender and number features are also morphologically marked on some infinitives, as discussed below. A simple paradigm for the six infinitives of the verb *amare* ‘to love’ appears in Table 4. For simplicity, macrons for long vowels are shown to indicate phonemic distinctions among forms in the tables but not in the textual citations.

Table 4: Overview of Infinitive Forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td><em>amāvisse</em></td>
<td><em>amātus esse</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td><em>amāre</em></td>
<td><em>amāri</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td><em>amāturus esse</em></td>
<td><em>amātum iri</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1 Origin and Development

The Latin infinitive apparently originated as a deverbal noun that could take two cases: dative and locative (Palmer, 1954, p. 278). Evidence for a nominal infinitive also exists in other Indo-European languages that are roughly contemporary with early Latin (Coleman, 1985a, pp. 308-309). In the classical period, the present tense forms of the infinitive are –*re* for active voice and –*ri* for passive. The –*re* form reflects the earlier locative case, while the –(r)i form is dative.
Evidence from archaic Latin shows the classical –re form as –se and the later –ri form as –sai (Kieckers, pp. 2:233-234). After intervocalic rhotacism developed, the /s/ changed to /t/ in both infinitival forms. Similarly, the long diphthong /ai/ became the long vowel /ī/ (e.g. earlier amase/amasai > amare/amarī). Note that a few verbs have a different infinitival, including esse ‘to be’ and velle ‘to wish’.

That the deverbal noun took dative and locative cases illustrates how abstract case relates to case assignment. Both the dative and the locative encode the semantic concept of movement towards. The dative is typically the case for the thematic role of goal (i.e. the end point of movement), and the locative is where something is after it has perhaps moved to that location, so that movement is implied or presupposed. From the locative concept, Bennett argues (p. 366) it was a natural development to an infinitive of purpose as a metaphorical movement towards a goal. Similarly, control verbs (“infinitive as object of auxiliary verbs”) reflect the notion of psychological movement toward a goal, in that the higher clause controls the action of the lower clause (i.e. the main verb ‘moves toward’ the action in the lower verb). At some time predating the corpus texts, the infinitive’s nominal sense with morphological and semantic distinction of dative/locative case marking was lost. That is, the earlier infinitive form was [+ N, + V], which then developed into [– N, + V]. While the basic formal distinction (from earlier case) between –re and –ri remained, those forms were reanalyzed as full verbs that could take appropriate thematic arguments (e.g. a patient or theme role marked as accusative case) like any full-fledged verb.

10 While Bennett does not claim the analogy, a locative inflection with –re would correlate with ablative forms for nouns and adjectives in the so-called third declension, where the case ending is –e (e.g. canis/nom/cane/abl ‘dog’). From Proto Indo-European the distinct locative case is generally merged in Latin with the ablative, with only a few exceptions remaining distinct (e.g. names of towns and cities). For the infinitive in –ri, the relationship to the third-declension dative is also clear, as without exception all dative singular forms take the ending –i (see Appendix C).
The distinction between an earlier deverbal noun and a true verb can be shown by comparison with the Latin supines, gerunds, and gerundives, which are also non-finite. All three of these deverbal forms are inflected for case. However, only gerundives can occur in any case; gerunds have no nominative form\(^\text{11}\) and supines have only accusative and ablative. Likewise, only gerundives have a plural form and they alone also inflect differently for the three genders (see section 5.2). These restrictions show that supines, gerunds, and gerundives are not full-fledged nominals. Their [+V] nature is revealed in the fact that they can assign accusative case to a direct object, for example with the supine *emptum* ‘to buy’ and its internal object *ancillulam* ‘little maid servant’ in example (56). Disjoint embedded constituents are indicated by ellipsis (...).

\[(56)\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{Ego} & \text{me} & \text{ire} & \text{senibus} & \text{...Sunium...} & \text{dicam} & \text{...ad} & \text{mercatum}, \\
\text{I-S-NOM} & \text{I-S-ACC} & \text{go-INFN} & \text{old-M-PL-DAT} & \text{Sunium-N-S-ACC} & \text{say-1-S-FUT} & \text{to} & \text{market-M-S-ACC}, \\
\text{ancillulam emptum}] & \text{dudum quam dixit Geta}. \\
\text{maid-DIMIN-F-S-ACC} & \text{buy-SUPINE-N-S-ACC} & \text{just now} & \text{REL-F-S-ACC} & \text{say-3-S-PERF} & \text{Geta-M-S-NOM} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I’ll tell the old men I’m going to Sunium to the market to buy the little maid servant that Geta promised just now.’ (Ter. Phor. 837-838)

Supines occur mainly with verbs of motion to express purpose (i.e. figurative movement toward a purpose), while the ablative of the supine is typically used with adjectives analogous to the English construction *John is easy to please*. An example is the adjective ‘laughable’ in *ridicula auditu, iteratu* ‘laughable to hear, to repeat’ (Pl. Cas. 880).

A gerund taking an internal direct object is shown in (57) with the gerund *eludendi* ‘of eluding’ and its object *senes* ‘old men’.

\(^{11}\) Traditionally, the gerund (equivalent to –*ing* in English *Exercising is good for your health*) is said to be the inflected form of the infinitive since it has no nominative form and the (historical-era) infinitive has no overt oblique cases (Gildersleeve and Lodge, 1895:1997, p. 278). Such a description is misleading, though, because infinitives and gerunds differ most significantly in whether they inflect for temporal tense. Still, what the traditionalists capture is a real generalization about infinitives as nouns, e.g. as the object of a verb in a control structure (*volo audire si est quem exopto* ‘I want to hear if he’s the one I’m expecting’, Acc. Trag. 140-1).
Now I have the best opportunity to elude the old men and take away from Phaedriae any monetary worry. ’ (Ter. Phor. 885-886)

Note that the gerund clause is coordinated through et ‘and’ with the more usual infinitival clause,

*Phaedriae curam adimere argentariam.* For the passive voice, the gerundive is used. The gerundive is formed as a present passive participle in {–ndus} + ‘be’, as with *praebendam* in example (58).

*I came home at the right time to offer water [lit. ‘to water to be offered’].’ (Pl. Amph. 669-670)

### 4.1.2 Tenses

What distinguishes the infinitive from supines, gerunds, and gerundives is its unique ability to mark temporal tense. The infinitive also developed a separate form for active and passive voice. While infinitives do carry tense and thus are [+V], the available tenses for infinitives – present, future, and perfect – represent only half of those available for finite verbs: traditionally named (a) present, (b) imperfect, (c) future, (d) perfect, (e) pluperfect, and (f) future perfect. A useful way to categorize the six-tense system is to recognize the fundamental distinction between complete (“perfect”) and incomplete actions. Within that main classification, each type has additional parameters marking [± past] and [± future]. Following Jensen (1983, p. 10), the tense features of finite verbs can be categorized as in Table 5, using their traditional names.

It is interesting to note that the binary semantic distinction between [- perfect] and [+ perfect] has morphological correlates, as Varro (1938, p. 2:570) accurately observes just about
two generations following the end of the early-Latin period. Within the [- perfect] system, the
three tenses are formed morphologically from the stem of the present infinitive (i.e. the base
lexeme + vowel stem – infinitival morpheme {–re}). For example, the present infinitive hab-ē-
re ‘to have’ has finite counterparts including present-tense hab-e-o ‘I have’, imperfect hab-e-
bam ‘I used to have’, and future hab-e-bo ‘I will have’. The three tenses in the [+ perfect]
system are morphologically based on the stem of the indicative perfect tense. Habēre’s perfect-
tense analog is hab-u-isse, and the perfective finite forms include perfect hab-u-i ‘I (have) had’,
pluperfect hab-u-eram ‘I had had’, and future perfect hab-u-ero ‘I will have had’. In short,
morphology mirrors meaning in tense marking.

Table 5: Finite Tenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>[- perfect]</th>
<th>[+ perfect]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[- past, -future]</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[+ past, -future]</td>
<td>imperfect</td>
<td>pluperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[- past, + future]</td>
<td>future</td>
<td>future perfect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike finite verbs, the infinitive has only present, future, and perfect tenses, as shown in
Table 6. While morphologically limited, these three tenses are sufficient to locate the infinitive’s
action in relative sequence with the matrix verb, and a conventional sequence of tenses correlates
event times of the main verb and infinitive. Thus, the present infinitive encodes an event that is
incomplete or [- perfect] and is [- past, - future] (i.e. occurs neither in the past nor in the future);
it is therefore co-temporal with the main verb, as dormire in (59).

(59)  Credo [edepol¹² quidem dormire solem].
       believe-1-S indeed indeed sleep-INFIN sun-M-S-ACC

‘Yes, indeed, I certainly believe the sun is sleeping.’ (Pl. Amph. 282)

¹² Edepol is a mild oath derived from the name of the god Pollux.
Table 6: Non-Finite Tenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>[- perfect]</th>
<th>[+ perfect]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[- past, -future]</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[+ past, -future]</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[- past, + future]</td>
<td>future</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A future infinitive is also [- perfect, - past] but as [+ future] occurs after the main verb’s action, as *venturum* in (60).

(60)  

\[\text{Censet eo venturum obviam Poenum}.\]  

‘He believes the Phoenician [i.e. Hannibal] will come there to meet him.’ (Naev. *Bell.* 40)

A perfect infinitive is [+ perfect] and thus represents completed action, and like the present infinitive is set in neither the past nor the future. Rather, like a (finite) pluperfect it indicates that the infinitive’s action precedes that of the main verb, as *obdormivisse* in (61).

(61)  

\[\text{Credo ego hac noctu Nocturnum obdormivisse}.\]  

‘I believe Night (has) gone to sleep tonight.’ (Pl. *Amph.* 272)

The present-tense infinitive is morphologically the base lexeme + vowel stem + voice morpheme. Verbs are traditionally classified into four paradigmatic groups (the so-called first, second, third, and fourth conjugations) according to the thematic vowel (and other morphological criteria). For the active voice, the morpheme is {-re}, and for the passive it is {-ri}, with the common early-Latin variant {-ier}. In the passive infinitive, third-conjugation verbs drop the stem vowel and have only {-i} as the termination (e.g. the i-stem *capio* > *capere* has the passive infinitive *capi*, and *rego* > *regere* has passive *regi*). The present-tense infinitive forms for the four conjugation classes based on vowel stems are in Table 7. Phonemically long vowels, indicated by macrons, are shown here only where significant to conjugation groups.
While the present infinitive forms from the present-tense stem and distinguishes voice by the final vowel, the perfect infinitive is formed from two different stems according to voice (active or passive). The active voice of the perfect infinitive is formed inflectionally from the perfect active stem of the indicative + {-isse}, with counterparts for the four vowel-terminating conjugations shown in Table 8.

Table 8: Perfect Active Infinitive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowel Stem</th>
<th>Indicative</th>
<th>Infinitive</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ā</td>
<td>amāvi ‘I (have) loved’</td>
<td>amāvisse</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to have loved’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ē</td>
<td>tenui ‘I (have) kept’</td>
<td>tenuisse</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to have held’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>rex ‘I (have) ruled’</td>
<td>rexisse</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to have ruled’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-i</td>
<td>cepi ‘I (have) taken’</td>
<td>cepisse</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to have taken’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ı</td>
<td>audīvi ‘I (have) heard’</td>
<td>audīvisse</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to have heard’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some verbs terminate in consonantal /v/ in the perfect-tense stem, so that their infinitive ends in –visse (e.g. complēvi ‘I have filled in’ > complēvisse ‘to have filled in’). Verbs with -visse for the perfect infinitive frequently syncopate the /vi/ syllable (e.g. amāvisse > amāsse, complēvisse > complēsse, audīvisse > audīsse). In addition, a few verbs ending in a consonantal stem with two
segments including an /s/ may elide the –iss– part of the perfect infinitival morpheme, apparently through haplology. For example, the /ks/ sequence (spelled <x>) triggers elision in dixisse > dixe, /ps/ in sumpissee > sumpse, and /ss/ in iussisse > iusse.

4.1.3 Periphrastic Tenses

The perfect passive infinitive comes from a different verb stem than the perfect active and is formed periphrastically, not through inflection. It includes the perfect passive participle (PPP) + present-tense infinitive of the copula (esse). Examples are in Table 9.

Table 9: Perfect Passive Infinitive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowel Stem</th>
<th>Participle</th>
<th>Infinitive</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ā</td>
<td>amātus ‘having been loved’</td>
<td>amātus esse</td>
<td>‘to have been loved’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ē</td>
<td>tentus ‘having been kept’</td>
<td>tentus esse</td>
<td>‘to have been held’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>rectus ‘having been ruled’</td>
<td>rectus esse</td>
<td>‘to have been ruled’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-i</td>
<td>captus ‘having been taken’</td>
<td>captus esse</td>
<td>‘to have been taken’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ī</td>
<td>audītus ‘having been heard’</td>
<td>audītus esse</td>
<td>‘to have been heard’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the copula is frequently omitted especially in its present tense (see section 4.2), the perfect passive infinitive (formed with the present tense of the copula) is often realized as the bare participial form such as amātus, tentus, rectus, captus, or audītus.

Some verbs, called deponents, have passive morphology but an active or middle meaning; the so-called semi-deponents have passive morphology only in the [+ perfect] system. For these verbs, the form like the PPP actually has an active rather than passive meaning. An example of a deponent with past participle is conor ‘I try’ > conatus ‘having tried’ (i.e. *‘having been tried’), and a common semi-deponent is audeo ‘I dare’ > ausus ‘having dared’ (i.e. *
‘having been dared’. As with PPPs, these [+ perfect] participles take the copular infinitive, and only their meaning with respect to [voice] is different from the PPP.\(^{13}\)

In addition to the features of [tense] and [- finite], the PPP also includes two nominal agreement features, [gender] and [number]. That is, the PPP actually consists of four morphemes: stem + perfect passive morpheme + [gender] + [number]. For example, in Table 9 the form *captus* is analyzable as *cap-* ‘take’ + perfect passive {-t-} + {-us}. The morpheme {-us} is itself a fusional inflection, expressing (a) masculine gender, (b) singular number, and (c) nominative case inseparably. Given the possible combinations of three grammatical genders (masculine, feminine, and neuter) and two numbers (singular and plural), the PPP represents six possible meanings. In the nominative case it has five overtly distinct forms, shown in Table 10. The form *capta* in is syncretized for feminine singular and neuter plural. Other agreement features (such as [number] on a finite verb) or context are needed to disambiguate between the two potential meanings.

Table 10: Nominative PPPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td><em>captus</em></td>
<td><em>capti</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td><em>capta</em></td>
<td><em>captae</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuter</td>
<td><em>captum</em></td>
<td><em>capta</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to present- and perfect-tense forms, the Latin infinitive also marks [+ future] tense. For this tense, both the active and passive voices are morphologically formed from the PPP stem + {-ur-}, an inchoative morpheme generally translated as ‘about to’, + [gender] +

\(^{13}\) There is also a small set of verbs one could call reverse deponents, verbs whose meaning is passive or middle but which take active morphology only. One of the most frequently occurring of these is *vapulare* ‘to be beaten’. The verb *cluere* ‘to be called’ is discussed below in section 7.1.
As with the examples in Table 10, the resulting form actually represents three possible genders × two grammatical numbers. The future active infinitive consists of the inchoative participle + present-tense infinitive of the copula (esse), with forms appearing in Table 11.

Table 11: Future Active Infinitive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowel</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Participle</th>
<th>Infinitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ā</td>
<td>amātus ‘having been loved’</td>
<td>amāturus esse ‘to be about to love’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ē</td>
<td>tentus ‘having been kept’</td>
<td>tenturus esse ‘to be about to hold’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>rectus ‘having been ruled’</td>
<td>recturus esse ‘to be about to rule’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-i</td>
<td>captus ‘having been taken’</td>
<td>capturus esse ‘to be about to take’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ī</td>
<td>audītus ‘having been heard’</td>
<td>audīturus esse ‘to be about to hear’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The early-Latin corpus contains 11 instances of an inflectionally formed future active infinitive in {-ssere}, for example impetassere in (62).

(62) Credo [te facile impetassere].

‘I believe you’ll easily obtain [it].’ (Pl. Mil. 1128)

This inflectional future active infinitive is not lexical, since the more usual periphrastic form capturum occurs in (63).

(63) Credo [ad summos bellatores acrem fugitorem fore] et [capturum spolia ibi illum qui meo adversus venerit.]

14 This is ironic, playing upon the expected collocation of a fierce bellator ‘warrior’ rather than a fierce fugitor ‘fleer’.
‘I believe that one who will come up against my master will be a fierce deserter among the greatest warriors.’ (Pl. *Tri.* 723-724)

When infinitives occur with overt NP subjects, the synthetic forms for perfect passive (shown in Table 10) and future active (in Table 11) mark agreement with their accusative subject. That is, the nominative forms shown in Tables 9-11 inflect for accusative case, with the appropriate ending for [gender] as well as [number]. For example, the accusative counterparts for *captus esse* of Table 10 are shown in Table 12.

Table 12: Accusative PPPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td><em>captum</em></td>
<td><em>captos</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td><em>captam</em></td>
<td><em>captas</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuter</td>
<td><em>captum</em></td>
<td><em>capta</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with the nominative forms in Table 10, five overt forms represent six grammatical possibilities. However, the syncretization is not with the feminine singular and neuter plural as in the nominative case, but with masculine singular and neuter singular, both ending in -*um*. Thus, the perfect passive and future active infinitives are more like finite verbs than the three morphological infinitives because they show overt [number] agreement with their grammatical subject. Unlike finite verbs they also mark agreement for [gender], but they do not show agreement for [person]. This means the perfect passive and future active infinitives have similar same agreement features to pronouns – which also do not mark person agreement – plus [gender] and the verbal feature of temporal tense.

---

15 A thorough treatment of the periphrastic infinities and implications for agreement features is in Embick (2000).
The future passive infinitive is formed from the PPP + *iri*. Morphologically, *iri* is the present passive infinitive of *ire* ‘to go’, but since this verb is nontransitive\(^\text{16}\) the form *iri* does not take literal meaning. Instead, it serves as the morphological marker of passive voice for the future infinitive. This periphrastic form developed diachronically from a structure with direct object\(_\text{acc}\) + *ire* + supine\(_\text{acc}\). Since the supine is neutral as to voice (i.e. both transitive active and deponent verbs take a supine form), the only way to grammaticalize into an unambiguous marker of passivity was as direct object\(_\text{acc}\) + supine\(_\text{acc}\) + *iri* (Coleman, 1985b, p. 212). The construction with *iri*, illustrated in Table 13.

The form of the future passive infinitive undergoes grammaticalization just after the early Latin period. Out of 4 instances found in the corpus, all 4 (100%) agree in [number] with their accusative infinitival subject. One example, in (64), also shows [gender] agreement between the embedded subject and the periphrastic infinitive.

Table 13: Future Passive Infinitive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowel Stem</th>
<th>Supine</th>
<th>Infinitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ā</td>
<td><em>amātus</em> ‘to love/loving’</td>
<td><em>amātum iri</em> ‘to be about to be loved’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ē</td>
<td><em>tentus</em> ‘to keep/keeping’</td>
<td><em>tentum iri</em> ‘to be about to be held’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td><em>rectus</em> ‘to rule/ruling’</td>
<td><em>rectum iri</em> ‘to be about to be ruled’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-i</td>
<td><em>captus</em> ‘to take/taking’</td>
<td><em>captum iri</em> ‘to be about to be taken’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ī</td>
<td><em>audītus</em> ‘to hear/hearing’</td>
<td><em>audītum iri</em> ‘to be about to be heard’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(64) *Quid* ego cum illo dissertem amplius, [quem...]

\(^{\text{16}}\) It does nonetheless occasionally occur in the passive, e.g. *Quidnam est, obsecor te, adiri abnutas?* ‘Why, I beg you, do you refuse to be approached?’ lit. ‘to be come toward’ (Ennius *Trag.* 361). Perhaps the least transitive verb in Latin (Pieri, 2000, p. 300), *ire* is thus available without ambiguity for this special use in the periphrastic infinitive.

47
ego denique credo [...in pompa vectitatum iri
I-S-NOM finally believe-1-S in parade-F-S-ABL carry-SUPINE-M-S-ACC go-INFIN-PASS

ludis pro citeria], atque [cum spectatoribus sermocinaturum]?
game-M-PL-ABL in front of effigy-F-S-ABL and with spectator-M-PL-ABL discuss-PART-FUT-M-S-ACC

‘Why should I discuss any more with him, since I believe he’ll be carried in a parade with the games, in front of his effigy, and he’ll discuss [it] with the spectators?’ (Cato Or. 116)

In (64) the AcI subject is quem, the relative pronoun marked for [+ masculine, + singular] in agreement with vectitatum iri.

However, in (65-67) the infinitival subjects are [+ feminine], yet the future passive infinitive has the same {-um} ending as for [+ masculine] in (64).

(65) Qui postquam audierat [non datum iri filio
REL-M-S-NOM after hear-3- S-PLUPERF not give-SUPINE-M-S-ACC go-INFIN-PASS son-M-S-DAT
uxorem suo], numquam quoiquam nostrum verbum fecit
wife-F-S-ACC own-M-S-DAT never INDEFIN-M-S-DAT I-PL-GEN word-N-S-ACC make-3-S-PERF
neque id aegre tuit.
nor ANA-N-S-ACC sickly carry-3-S-PERF

‘Ever since he’d heard a wife wouldn’t be given to his son, he never said a word to any of us and he didn’t take it badly.’ (Ter. And. 177-178)

(66) Negat [ponere alio modo ullo profecto], nisi
deny-3-S place-INFIN other-M-S-ABL manner-M-S-ABL INDEFIN-M-S-ABL absolutely unless
[se...] sciat [...vilico non datum iri].
ANA-ACC know-3-S-SUBJ bailiff-M-S-DAT not give-SUPINE-M-S-ACC go-INFIN-PASS

‘She absolutely refuses to put [the swords] down unless she knows she won’t be handed over to the bailiff.’ (Pl. Cas. 698-699).

(67) Hanc fidem sibi me obsecravit [qui se...]
this-F-S-ACC faith-F-S-ACC ANA-DAT I-S-ACC plead-3-S-PERF REL-S-ABL ANA-ACC
sciret [...non desertum iri] ut darem.
know-3-S-IMPERF-SUBJ not desert-SUPINE-M-S-ACC go-INFIN-PASS COMP give-1-S-IMPERF-SUBJ

‘She begged me to give her this pledge, so that she’d know she won’t be deserted.’ (Ter. And. 401-402)

In (65) the infinitival subject is uxorrem ‘wife’, which has both natural and grammatical gender of [+ feminine]. In (66-67) the infinitival subject is the anaphor se, and in both examples the antecedent (not overtly shown here) is unambiguously a woman.
The fact that (most) future infinitives and the perfect passive infinitive are morphologically analytical rather than synthetic suggests that they were later to develop, being supplied as speakers felt a need to express such notions. Indeed, diachronic evidence shows that the [+ present] infinitive has a [+ future] sense in many complements (Leumann & Hofmann, 1928, 586-587). Specifically, with both ‘promise’ and AcI verbs, the present-tense infinitive was the first to develop (Iordache, 1995, p. 120). Example (68) with sperare ‘to hope’ also has a morphologically [+ present] infinitive with a [+ future] meaning.

(68) Et qui [se...] sperat [...Romae regnare Quadratae]
and how ANA-ACC hope-3- S Rome- F-S-GEN rule-INFIN square-F-S-GEN

‘And how does he hope to rule Square Rome?’ (Enn. Ann. 123)

This evidence from Ennius is revealing because his contemporary Plautus does use a [+ future] infinitive with sperare, as in (69-70).

(69) Speravi ego [istam tibi parituram filium].
hope-1-S-PERF I-S-NOM that-F-S-ACC you-S-DAT give birth-F-S-ACC-PART-FUT son- M-S-ACC

‘I hoped she would bear you a son.’ (Pl. Amph. 718)

(70) Et ego [idem...] spero [...fore].
and I-S-NOM same-N-S-ACC hope-1- S be-INFIN-FUT

‘And I hope the same thing will occur.’ (Pl. Men. 1094)

Moreover, even Naevius, who was probably even older (exact dates are uncertain), use a [+ future] infinitive with sperare, as illustrated in (71).

(71) quae sperat [se nupturam viridulo adolescentulo]
REL-F-S-NOM hope-3- S ANA-ACC marry-F-S-ACC-PART-FUT green-M-S-DAT youth-M-S-DAT

‘who hopes she will marry a green young lad’ (Naev. Inc. 7-8)

This tense variation in the infinitive with sperare could indicate synchronic change as the [+ future] infinitive developed, or merely that Ennius prefers archaic forms in his vast epic on the earliest Roman history. How the other early-Latin authors use sperare with infinitives is discussed below in section 6.5.1.2.
4.2 THE COPULA

The copula is a stative predicate representing a durative condition, and – in common with many other languages – Latin does not require it to be overt (Leumann & Hofmann, pp. 624-625). An adjective or other marker of stativity suffices, as shown in (72-74).

(72) *Cum -que hic tam formosus homo ac te dignus puellus* since -and this-M-S-NOM so shapely-M-S-NOM human-M-S-NOM and you-S-ABL worthy-M-S-NOM little boy-M-S-NOM

‘and since he [is] such a shapely person and a boy worthy of you’ (Luc. *Sat.* 166)

(73) *virago, cui par imber et ignis spiritus* female warrior-F-S-NOM REL-S-DAT equal-S-NOM rain-M-S-NOM and fire-M-S-NOM breath-M-S-NOM

et gravis terra and heavy-S-NOM earth-F-S-NOM

‘a female warrior, to whom rain and fire and breath and heavy earth [are] equal’ (Enn. *Ann.* 260-261)

(74) *Sed ego stolidus; gratulatum med oportebat prius.* but I- S-NOM stupid-M-S-NOM congratulate-SUPINE -M-S-ACC I-S-ACC behoove-3- S-IMPERF before

‘But I [am] stupid; I should have congratulated [you] earlier.’ (Caec. *Fab.* 8)

Although not required, the copula does often occur, as in examples (75-78).

(75) *Acontizomenos fabula est prime bona.* javelin’d play-F-S-NOM be-3-s first(ly) good-F-S-NOM

‘Javelined is a first-rate play.’ (Naev. *Fab.* 1)

(76) *Est ibi sub eo saxo penitus strata harena* be-3-s there under that-N-S-ABL rock-N-S-ABL deep strew-PPP-F-S-ABL sand-F-S-ABL

...
‘Under that rock is a huge cave with a stretch of sand deep within.’ (Pac. Trag. 87)

(77) Servorum est festus dies hic quem plane
slave-M-PL-GEN be-3- holiday-M-S-NOM day-M-S-NOM this-M-S-NOM REL-M-S-ACC plainly
hexametro versu non dicere possis.
hexameter-M-S-ABL verse-M-S-ABL not say-INFIN be able-2-S-SUBJ

‘This is a slaves’ holiday which you simply couldn’t say in a hexameter verse.’ (Luc. Sat. 252-253)

(78) Deicerent [necessus ese [Bacanal habere]].
decide-3-PL-IMPERF-SUBJ necessary-N-S-ACC be-INFIN Bacchic rite-N-S-ACC have-INFIN

‘They should it was necessary to have a Bacchic rite.’ (Bac. 4-5)

Since generally not required, the copula is also optional in the periphrastic infinitive constructions of the future and perfect tenses. This optional rule of copula omission with infinitives contrasts with English, where the ability to omit the copula infinitive in a small clause appears to be a lexical feature.19 For example, while understand and believe in (79-80) are both bridge verbs that can take ECM with an infinitival complement, copula omission (i.e. a small clause) is not allowed with understand in (79b) but is acceptable with believe in (80b).

(79) a. I understand [him to be a student of German]

b. *I understand [him ____ a student of German]

(80) a. I believe [him to be a student of German]

b. I believe [him ____ a student of German]

18 Specus, -ūs appears in all three genders in different citations (Simpson, 1968, p. 565), so the exact interpretation in this example is ambiguous. I classify specus as an inherently masculine noun simply because the vast majority of nouns with genitive in –ūs are masculine; the rest are neuter. By this interpretation, strata can agree only with harena and is therefore ablative, so that the phrase strata harena ‘strewn sand’ is a condition (because it is in the ablative case, i.e. a so-called ablative of material or respect) applicable to the subject specus. However, since specus does sometimes occur as a feminine noun (e.g. in Enn. Ann. 427, although Ennius elsewhere has it as masculine), strata may possibly mean the cave itself is strewn with sand (see Warmington, 1940, p. 4:197). Either way, the copula is present and unambiguously agrees grammatically in [number] with specus.

19 Rytting (1999) claims to find semantic and pragmatic differences between small clauses and full complements (i.e. with an overt copula) in infinitival clauses in classical Latin, but the claimed distinctions do not hold at all for early Latin.
In early Latin, similar constructions with semantically equivalent verbs may omit the copula and still produce a grammatical sentence. Thus, we find *intellegere* ‘to understand’ and *credere* ‘to believe’ both with and without the copula in the lower clause, resulting in no apparent difference in meaning. Sentences (81a-b) have *intellegere* and (82a-b) have *credere*; the (b) sentences have no overt copula.

(81) a. *Quanto* magis [te isti modi esse] intellego, quanto, *Antigona*, magis [me... par est]... tibi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quanto</th>
<th>magis</th>
<th>[te isti modi esse] intellego,</th>
<th>quanto, <em>Antigona</em>, magis [me... par est]... tibi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>how much-N-S-ABL</td>
<td>more</td>
<td>you-S-ACC</td>
<td>that-S-GEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Antigona</em>-F-S-VOC</td>
<td>more</td>
<td>I-S-ACC</td>
<td>equal-N-S-NOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>consulere</em> et <em>parcere</em>]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘The more I understand you to be in this mood, so much more, Antigone, it’s right for me to counsel you and spare you.’ (Acc. Trag. 88-89)

b. *quia* [temeti nihil allatum] intellego.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>quia</th>
<th>[temeti nihil allatum] intellego.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>because</td>
<td>wine-N-S-GEN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘because I understand no wine has been brought in’ (Pl. Aul. 355)

(82) a. *Credidi* [silicernium eius me esse esurum].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credidi</th>
<th>[silicernium eius me esse esurum]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>believe-1-S-PERF</td>
<td>funeral feast-N-S-ACC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘I believed I was going to eat his funeral feast.’ (Cae. Fab. 120)

b. *[Deum -que de consilio hoc itiner...] credo... conatum modo].20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Deum -que de consilio hoc itiner...] credo... conatum modo].</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>god-M-PL-GEN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘I think [you] recently attempted this journey because of the gods’ advice.’ (Enn. Trag. 344)

The corpus contains one instance of an embedded clause that appears to be a true small clause, since it is coordinated with a deverbal noun. This example is shown in (83).

(83) *Ille* [navem salvam nuntiat aut [irati adventum]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ille</th>
<th>[navem salvam nuntiat aut [irati adventum]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>that-M-S-NOM</td>
<td>ship-F-S-ACC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the context of this line within the play, it is clear that the speaker Agamemnon is addressing Telephus, the understood Acl subject (= te if overt).
'He announces the safe ship or the angry old man’s arrival.' (Pl. Amph. 988)

The first embedded clause could be AcI with a non-overt copula *esse*, meaning ‘he announces the ship is safe’, but then it would not coordinate properly with the other part, *irati adventum senis*.

The copula has several compounds formed from a preposition + copula, which together account for 25 (6%) of 431 overt instances of the copula not in a periphrastic construction (see Table 14). These copular compounds include *adesse* ‘to be near’, *abesse* ‘to be away from’, *prodesse* ‘to be of benefit for’, *inesse* ‘to be in, on’, *conesse* ‘to be with’, *interesse* ‘to be between’, and *obesse* ‘to be in the way of’. The most frequently occurring is *adesse*, represented in 13 corpus examples with infinitival complements. Some examples of the copular compounds are shown in (84-89).

(84)  
\[Nunc fores pultabo, [adesse...]] ut [...me] sciat.\]  
\[now door-F-PL-ACC knock-1- S-FUT be near-INFIN COMP I-S-ACC know-3-S-SUBJ\]  
‘Now I’ll knock on the door so he’ll know I’m here.’ (Pl. Men. 987)

(85)  
\[Neve inter ibei virei plous duobus, mulieribus plous [tribus [arfuis] velent.\]  
\[nor among there man-M-PL-NOM more two-M-PL-ABL woman-F-PL-ABL more three-F-PL-ABL be near-INFIN-PERF wish-3-PL-IMPERF-SUBJ\]  
‘Nor should more than two men [or] more than three women want to be present at the same time.’ (Bac. 20-21)

(86)  
\[Atque [haud longe abesse] oportet, verum longe hinc afuit.\]  
\[and not long be away-INFIN be fitting-3-S but long from here be away-3-S-PERF\]  
‘And it shouldn’t be far away, but it was far away from here.’ (Pl. Amph. 322)

(87)  
\[Hoc dolet, [med obesse], [illos prodesse], [me obstare], [illos obsequi].\]  
\[this-N-S-NOM pain-3-S I-S-ACC be in the way-INFIN that-M-PL-ACC be of benefit-INFIN I-S-ACC stand in the way-INFIN that-M-PL-ACC follow after-INFIN-DEPON\]  
‘This is painful, that I am in the way and they are useful, that I stand in the way and they follow after.’ (Enn. Trag. 64-65)
As young boys believe all bronze images are alive and are human, so those people think the stuff of dreams is real, they believe a heart exists in bronze images.’ (Luc. Sat. 526-528)

‘There should be one finger’s width between the wheel and the mill column.’ (Cato Agr. 22)

Note that although *posse* ‘to be able’ is a transparent compound from the adjective *potis* ‘powerful, able’ + *esse*, it is not considered as a copula here since it licenses subject control (see section 6.4.1) and is thus distinct from all other *esse* compounds.

In the corpus, whether or not the copula is overt varies according to tense and the type of infinitive. A summary of the copula’s occurrence by tense and form is in Table 14.

Table 14: Occurrences of Infinitival Copula.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitival Form</th>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Non-Overt</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copula – Present Tense</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copula – Perfect Tense</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copula – Future Tense</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>456</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periphrastic – Perfect Passive</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periphrastic – Perfect Deponent</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periphrastic – Future Active</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First, for the infinitival copula itself (i.e. not the copula as part of a periphrastic infinitive of another verb), 403 (72%) of 562 contexts are overt in the present tense as \( \text{esse} \). The perfect-tense form \( \text{fuisse} \) is overt in 17 (100%) of 17 contexts, and the future forms \( \text{futurum esse} \) or \( \text{fore} \) occurs in 36 (100%) of 36 contexts. Overall, the bare infinitival in the corpus is overt in 456 (74%) of 615 contexts, with a complementary distribution in overtness between [+ present] and [- present] tenses.

Second, the other group of copular infinitives consists of the two periphrastic infinitival tenses that include a form of the copula. The perfect passive infinitive, which is formed from the perfect passive participle + copula, has an overt \( \text{esse} \) in 77 (42%) of 183 contexts. The perfect deponent, formed from the perfect (morphologically passive form but active/middle meaning) participle + \( \text{esse} \), has the overt copula in 24 (52%) of 46 contexts. The future active infinitive, formed from the future active participle + copula, includes overt \( \text{esse} \) in 15 (17%) of 86 contexts. In the periphrastic forms combined, the copula is overt in 116 (37%) of 315 instances. Unlike the bare copula, the periphrastic copula does not occur in complementary distribution with respect to tense. However, nearly two thirds of all instances occur with non-overt \( \text{esse} \), and this trend is the opposite of what happens with the bare copula. The periphrastic contexts reveal that the copula itself is less essential than when the context is copula alone. This results from the overt agreement features of [gender] and [number] that the periphrastic forms overtly mark on the participles.

Overall, the infinitival copula is overt in 572 (62%) of 930 total contexts, or in about two out of every three times expected. There are no significant differences in the copula’s overtness according to type of infinitival complement.

---

\( \text{fore} \) is the actual future infinitive of the copula, but the periphrastic form \( \text{futurum} \) (the future active participle) + \( \text{esse} \) also occurs; the two forms are treated together here.
4.3 WORD ORDER

In general, Latin allows relatively free order of words (Del Vecchio, 1989), although overall patterns are SOV and SVO diachronically up to Late Latin (Panhuis, 1984). Given Latin’s rich inflectional morphosyntax, strict word order is not required since syntactic relationships are generally marked morphologically. This contrasts sharply with English syntax, where for instance NP → (Det) (Adj) N, as in the new governor but *governor the new. Even more critical is the difference in meaning between Dog bites man and Man bites dog, where the order of subject and object NPs makes a significant difference in English (but would not in Latin). While there are occasional exceptions to NP constituent order in English, such as the postposed adjective in French-influenced phrases like attorney(s) general, English overwhelmingly conforms to a fixed linear order of constituents. Latin, however, permits considerably looser word order which is nonetheless syntactically constrained (Elerick, 1989, pp. 569-570), and scrambling is common.

Unfixed word order often results in disjoint constituents. In (90) the NP eo exemplo is separated by the NP ego, and in (91) the verb possum separates the two constituents of the NP nullo remedio.

(90) Eo ego exemplo servio, [tergo...] ut [...in rem esse] arbitror.

be-INFIN think-1- S-DEPON

‘I serve by this guideline: however I think [something] is useful for my hide.’ (Pl. Men. 985)

(91) Ego nullo possum remedio [me evolvere ex his turbis].

be able-1- S roll out-INFIN out of this-F-PL-ABL

‘I cannot extricate myself from these troubles in any way.’ (Ter. Phor. 825)
Even greater scrambling occurs in (92) with the NP *hunc metum*, which is separated by the NP goal *mi* as well as the verb *expeditat*.

(92) *Nil satis firmi video quam ob rem [accipere hunc... mi expediat [...metum]].*  

‘I don’t see any strong enough reason why it should benefit me to take on this fear.’ (Ter. *Heau*. 337)

Even a proper name is subject to having its constituents separated, as with *Decimus Sura* in (93).

(93) *Sit [me scire... volo [...Decimus mihi conscius Sura] ne damnum faciam.*  

‘I want Decimus Sura to be aware with me that I know [this], so I won’t do anything wrong.’ (Luc. *Sat*. 1142-1143)

The genitival NP object *litigi* is also separated from its head NP *aliquid* in (94).

(94) *Nam ego [aliquid contrahere...] cupio [...litigi inter eos duos].*  

‘For I want to cause a quarrel between those two.’ (Pl. *Cas*. 561)

In (95) the PP *cum uno viro* is disjoint, with most of the main and subordinate elements intervening before the noun *viro*.

(95) *vobis cum uno semel ubi aetatem agere decretum.*  

‘when once you have decided to live out your live with one man’ (Ter. *Heau*. 392)

Similarly, the noun *deos* of the PP *per omnis deos* is separated by the NP goal *tibi* and the matrix verb *adiuro* in (96).

(96) *Per omnis tibi adiuro deos [numquam eam me].*
deserturum].

desert-PART-FUT-M-S-ACC

‘I swear to you by all the gods that I will never desert her.’ (Ter. And. 694)

Example (97) is particularly interesting because both the NP *quo pacto* and the NP *urbem Romanam* are separated, and their individual constituents even overlap each other.

(97) *quo* [populum atque urbem... pacto] [...servare...]

*potisset* [...amplius Romanam]

‘by what means he might be better able to save the [Roman] people and the Roman city.’ (Luc. Sat. 6-7)

The fact that scrambling and other word-order variation occurs in early Latin means adjacency is not required in ECM structures. Sometimes adjacency does occur, as in (98-100).

(98) *Donicum videbis* [me carpento vehentem en domum]

*venisse*]

come-INFIN-PERF

‘when you see I’ve come home riding in a carriage’ (Liv. Ody. 20-21)

(99) *Hic tu apte credis* [quemquam latrina petisse]?

‘Do you really believe someone here has gone to the latrines?’ (Luc. Sat. 283)

(100) *Adsimulabo_1* [me_1 esse ebrium_1].

‘I’ll pretend I’m drunk [lit. ’pretend myself to be drunk’].’ (Pl. Amph. 999)

However, unfixed word order frequently occurs with infinitival clauses. The result is that an overt infinitival subject is separated from its infinitive and the clause itself may also be disjoint. Some examples are in (101-108).

4.3.1 Adjacency

One important issue in ECM structures in Latin is adjacency. Although required in English, adjacency is merely optional in Latin. In fact, word-order variation frequently occurs...
with infinitival clauses, with the result that an overt infinitival subject is separated from its
infinitive and the clause itself may be disjoint. Some examples are in (101-108).

(101) \([\textit{Quem nam te esse} \textit{dicam?}]\)
    \(\text{INTERROG-M-S-ACC} -n\text{-nam} \text{ you-S-ACC} -\text{be-INFIN} -\text{say-1-S-FUT}\)
    ‘Then who will I say you are?’ (Enn. Trag. 355)

(102) \([\textit{Alcumenam ante aedis stare saturam} \textit{intellego.}]\)
    \(\text{Alcmena-F-S-ACC} \text{ before} \text{ wall-F-PL-ACC} -\text{stand-INFIN} -\text{full-F-S-ACC} -\text{understand-1-S}\)
    ‘I understand the pregnant Alcmena is standing in front of the house.’ (Pl. Amph. 667)

(103) \([\textit{Omnes cinaedos esse} \textit{censes quia tu es?}]\)
    \(\text{all-M-PL-ACC} \text{ lecher-ACC-M-PL} -\text{be-INFIN} -\text{believe-2-S} -\text{because you-S-NOM be-2-S}\)
    ‘Do you believe everyone is a lecher because you are?’ (Pl. Men. 513)

(104) \([\textit{Ne [tibi me esse ob eam rem obnoxium]} \textit{reare.}]\)
    \(\text{not you-S-DAT I-S-ACC} -\text{be-INFIN} -\text{because of} -\text{ANA-F-S-ACC} \text{ thing-F-S-ACC} \text{ subject-M-S-ACC}\)
    reare.
    \(\text{think-2-S-SUBJ}\)
    ‘Don’t think I’m under your control for that reason.’ (Caec. Com. 20-21)

(105) \([\textit{At vereor cum [te esse Alcmeonis fratrem]} \textit{factis dedicat.}]\)
    \(\text{but fear-1-S} \text{ since you-S-ACC} -\text{be-INFIN} -\text{Alcmeon- M-S-GEN brother-M-S-ACC} \text{ deed-N-PL-ABL}\)
    dedicat.
    \(\text{give out-3-S}\)
    ‘But I’m afraid, since he claims with facts that you’re Alcmeon’s brother.’ (Acc. Trag. 43)

(106) \([\textit{Pariter te esse erga illum video ut [illum ted]} \textit{erga scio.}]\)
    \(\text{equally you-S-ACC} -\text{be-INFIN} -\text{towards that-M-S-ACC} -\text{see-1-S} -\text{as that-M-S-ACC} \text{ you-S-ACC}\)
    erga]
    \(\text{towards know-1-S}\)
    ‘I see you feel the same about him as I know he feels about you.’ (Pac. Trag. 270)

(107) \([\textit{Eam nunc esse inventam probris compotem]} \textit{scis.}]\)
    \(\text{ANA-F-S-ACC} \text{ now be-INFIN} -\text{found-PPP} -\text{S-F-ACC} \text{ bad deed-N-PL-ABL} \text{ sharing in-F-S-ACC} \text{ know-2-S}\)

---

Ted is an allomorph of \textit{te}, frequently occurring before a vowel or /h/. However, unlike English \textit{an}, it is not mandatory before a word beginning with a vowel, as shown by the sequence \textit{te esse} in the first clause in (106). Here the two variants can probably be attributed to poetic meter. (With a /d/, \textit{te esse} would not elide into /tesse/, and without the /d/ \textit{ted erga} would elide; those forms would not fit properly into the verse.) Possibly, Pacuvius chooses the two allomorphs to formally represent the different grammatical roles played by \textit{te} in the sentence. Notably, \textit{ted} appears often in early Latin but disappears by the classical period.
'You know she has been found participating in bad behavior.' (Naev. Trag. 10-11)

(108) Scito [pro ratione fructum esse].

‘Realize that the result is in accordance with what you find.’23 (Cato Agr. I)

No matter whether SVO or SOV is the presumed underlying word order, some movement has occurred in each of these examples in (101-108). In (101), the AcI subject is quemnam, but since interrogative words are typically extracted clause-initially, quemnam’s initial position still does not address the issue of adjacency requirements.

By contrast, in sentences (102-108) the infinitive is positioned between the AcI subject and the matrix verb, regardless of the main verb’s location in the sentence. For example, in (105) the adjunct factis occurs after the appositive Alcmeonis fratrem, which has agreement features [singular, masculine/feminine, accusative] with and semantically refers to the AcI subject te. If we assume the copula’s underlying structure is literal (i.e. it occurs between the two elements that it links), then the word order of the infinitival clauses in (100), (105), and (107) is basic, while in (103) the element linked by the copula has moved up from the default position at the right of the infinitive. The result is a greater distance between the AcI subject or appositive and the matrix verb, showing that adjacency is not required. The basic copula word order assumed can also account for the greater distance in (106), where the AcI subjects te in the first IP clause and illum in the second are necessarily separated from an SOV matrix verb because of the copula and what it links to (the erga-phrases).

However, for (107) no such explanation can account for the distance between the main verb and the AcI subject fructum. Topicalization may play a role – for instance, by postponing the new information until late in the clause Cato emphasizes it. Yet what follows the AcI subject

23 Cato here advises the prospective owner to inspect the quantity of produce and wine jars on a farm before purchasing it; according to the volume of stored goods, one can judge how profitable the farm will likely be.
is weak because as a mere copula it is optional, especially in the early period of Latin (Draeger, p. 1:195). To follow the pragmatically significant information with the weakest constituent in the sentence – especially one that is optional anyway – appears to contradict the notion of topicalization. Whatever pragmatic considerations may affect the word order in these sentences, it is clear that adjacency is not required in the assignment of accusative case to Acl subjects in Latin.

4.3.2 Syntactic Ambiguity

Not only does word-order variation remove an adjacency requirement for ECM, but it also may result in syntactic ambiguity. For example, in (109) the NP *haec* could be either the matrix subject as [+ feminine, + singular] in agreement with *ait* or the embedded object of *novisse* (with *te* and *me* the embedded subjects). Only the discourse context can disambiguate the two possible meanings.

(109) Nam [nec te neque me novisse] ait haec.

‘For this woman says she knows neither you nor me.’ (Pl. *Mil*. 430)

Word-order variation can also result in garden-path sentences. In (110) the position of the NP *statum* ‘standing’ after the PP *in med* yields a garden-path interpretation of a coordinated PP because of *et* ‘and’. However, the meaning is clearly a coordinated (but variant-order) NP *formam et statum* instead.

(110) Et enim vero quoniam pro formam cepi huius in med et statum24, facta decet [et mores -que huius]

   habere me similis item].

24 Although the cognate ‘stature’ seems an appropriate translation here, *status* does not develop that meaning until the Augustan age, or nearly two centuries afterward (Andrews, p. 1456).
'And truly, since I took upon myself his shape and standing, it’s likewise right for me to have his actions and behaviors.’ (Pl. Amph. 266-267)

Not only does syntactic ambiguity result from unfixed word order, but in ECM clauses the effect is stronger since both embedded subject and object are marked for accusative case.

For example, in (111) both te and Romanos are unambiguously accusative.

\[(111) \quad Aio \, [te \, Aiacida \, Romanos \, vincere \, posse].\]

'I say you, son of Aeacus, can conquer the Romans’ / ‘I say the Romans can conquer you, son of Aeacus’ (Enn. Ann. 174)

The infinitival subject is AcI and the direct object of the subordinate verb vincere ‘to conquer’ is also accusative. The sentence contains two NPs marked as accusative, te Aiacida and Romanos.

The result is that either accusative NP can be interpreted as the subject of the infinitive. In (112), only one accusative form is overt even though the infinitive does take an (at least implied) object; given Latin’s parametric availability of both null subjects and null objects (see section 5.4), syntactic ambiguity also results.

\[(112) \quad Edico \, [vicisse \, Oresten].^{25}\]

'I announce Orestes has conquered [it/him]’ / ‘I announce [it/he] has conquered Orestes’ (Enn. Trag. 155)

The syntactic ambiguity that is possible from these structures was actually attributed to the ancient oracles as a linguistic strategy. Both sentences in (111-112) are cited in the classical period as examples of syntactic ambiguity to illustrate how readily the oracles could be

---

^{25} Again, context supplies the missing subject of the infinitive. The goddess Minerva expresses her judgment of Orestes’s moral guilt or innocence in killing his mother. Minerva replies either that he vicisse ‘has prevailed’ or that ‘something’ (a non-overt NP = the case, the event, the fact) has prevailed over him (i.e. he is guilty). Since the play is modeled on a Greek original and the content itself is thus well known, Ennius intends Oresten as the AcI subject of vicisse, but without such background knowledge the accusative is syntactically ambiguous.
interpreted according to one’s wishes (Warmington, p. 1:67). An early-Latin comment on the oracles’ ambiguity is shown in (113).

(113) \[
\text{Flexa non falsa autumare} \text{ dictio Delphis solet.}
\]

be accustomed-3-S

‘The oracle at Delphi is accustomed to saying contorted [but] not false words.’ (Pac. \textit{Trag.} 334)

Note that one reasonable interpretation of \textit{flexa} is ‘non-linear’.

Given the availability of word-order variation, linear order does not necessarily correlate with two accusatives’ structural assignment: the first one is not always the embedded subject. An oracular edict as in (111) can be intentionally ambiguous, but in other contexts there is usually just one intended meaning. In (111) the linear order of the accusative NPs is first \textit{te} then \textit{Romanos}, so the “natural” interpretation is that \textit{te} is the ECM subject of the infinitive \textit{vincere}.

However, what appears natural unambiguously fails in some sentences, where the second accusative must be interpreted as the infinitival subject. One such example is in (114).

(114) \[
\text{Philocomasium ...[quam in proxumo vidisse...]} \text{ aiebas [...te osculantem atque amplexantem cum altero].}
\]

kiss-PART-S-ACC and embrace-PART-S-ACC with another-M-S-ABL

‘Philocomasium … whom you said you saw next door kissing and embracing some man’ (Pl. \textit{Mil.} 319-320)

The relative pronoun \textit{quam} is clause-initial but the play’s plot clearly excludes it as the subject of the infinitive \textit{vidisse}; rather, \textit{te} is AcI and \textit{quam} is \textit{vidisse}’s direct object in the accusative. In example (115) the second accusative is merely in apposition, not a separate thematic argument, so that caution must be applied in attempting to link NP order with structural relation.

(115) \[
\text{Porro [eunuchum...]} \text{ dixti [...velle te].}
\]

‘Then you said you wanted a eunuch.’ (Ter. \textit{Eun.} 167)
The meaning of (115) would be quite different if eunuchum were the intended subject of the infinitive velle. Although the irony in such meaning is exactly the lynchpin of the play’s plot, immediate context makes it clear that te is actually the subject of its clause. Plautus exploits the syntactic ambiguity to underscore the irony of what really happened compared with the behavior (not) expected from a (real) eunuch. This is superb comedy in the hands of a highly skilled author, one who manipulates the syntactic ambiguities for their dramatic possibilities.

Incredulous emphasis apparently causes men to occur first in (116) even though it is clearly the object, not the subject, of the AcI clause. The sentence that follows resolves the syntactic ambiguity.

(116) \[
\text{Me-}n\text{ hodie usquam convenisse te…], audax, audes […dicere],}
\text{postquam advorsum mi imperavi [ut huc venires]?
}\]

‘Do you dare say you meet me some time today, after I ordered you to come here to meet me?’ (Pl. Men. 1050-1051)

In Miles Gloriosus, a play about a self-deluded soldier, Plautus clues us in to how he subverts the linear order for comic effect in (117).

(117) \[
\text{Ill’ est miles meus erus, qui hinc ad forum abiit, gloriosus, impudens, stercoreus, plenus periuri atque adulteri. Ait [sese ultro omnis mulieres sectarier], is deridiculo ’st quaqua incedit omnibus.}
\]

‘That soldier is my master, who went from here to the forum, a boastful, shameless, foul man, full of lies and adultery. He even says all the women follow him around. He’s an object of ridicule to all wherever he goes.’ (Pl. Mil. 88-92)

The lead-in line openly declares the title character a liar and a braggart, so that when he is indirectly quoted in the following line we are forced to take the second accusative as the
infinitival subject (otherwise there would be no boast in his statement). At the same time, through the linear word order\textsuperscript{26} Plautus subtly suggests what is actually true – that Pyrgopolynices himself follows all the women but in his deluded self-image believes he is the object, not the subject, of that following.

In some examples, varied word order is iconic. For instance, in (118) the disjoint NPs imitate the act of fleeing.

\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Nullo}  \quad -n  \quad \text{ego}  \quad \text{Chremetis}  \quad \text{pacto}  \quad \text{adfinitatem}  \\
\text{no-N-S-ABL}  \quad -Y/N  \quad \text{I-S-NOM}  \quad \text{Chremes-M-S-GEN}  \quad \text{means-N-S-ABL}  \quad \text{relationship by marriage-F-S-ACC}  \\
\end{array}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{effugere}  \quad \text{potero?}  \\
\text{flee from-INFIN}  \quad \text{be able-1-S-FUT}  \\
\end{array}
\end{equation}

‘Will I be unable to flee a relationship by marriage with Chremes by any means at all?’

(Ter. And. 245)

In (119) the preposition \textit{clam} ‘unknown to, in secret from’ is disjoint from its NP \textit{aleros}, which mimics the idea that ‘others’ will not know about it.

\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Nam}  \quad \text{ea}  \quad \text{oblectat}  \quad \text{spes}  \quad \text{aerumnosum}  \quad \text{hospitem}  \quad \text{dum}  \\
\text{for}  \quad \text{please-3-S}  \quad \text{hope-F-S-NOM}  \quad \text{full of hardship-M-S-ACC}  \quad \text{stranger-M-S-ACC}  \quad \text{while}  \\
\end{array}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[illud...]}  \quad \text{quod}  \quad \text{miser}  \quad \text{est}  \quad [...\text{clam}  \quad \text{esse}  \quad \text{aleros}]  \\
\text{that-N-S-ACC}  \quad \text{REL-N-S-ACC}  \quad \text{wretched-M-S-NOM}  \quad \text{be-3-S}  \quad \text{in secret}  \quad \text{be-INFIN}  \quad \text{other-M-PL-ACC}  \\
\end{array}
\end{equation}

censet.

\text{believe-3s}

‘For this hope pleases the stranger beset with hardship while he believes that for which he is wretched is unknown to others.’  (Acc. Trag. 338-339)

The rhetorical figure of chiasmus (i.e. word structure representing the Greek letter X, \textit{chi}) also accounts for some instances of non-linear word order, for example in (120) where the two infinitives \textit{trahere} and \textit{immittere} form the outer part of the X and the direct objects \textit{classis} and \textit{vela} form the inner part.

\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{trahere}  \quad \text{in}  \quad \text{salum}  \quad \text{classis}  \quad \text{et}  \quad \text{vela}  \quad \text{ventorum}  \quad \text{animae}  \\
pull-INFIN  \quad \text{into}  \quad \text{sea-N-S-ACC}  \quad \text{fleet-F-PL-ACC}  \quad \text{and}  \quad \text{sail-N-PL-ACC}  \quad \text{wind-M-PL-GEN}  \quad \text{spirit-F-S-DAT}  \\
\end{array}
\end{equation}

\textsuperscript{26} The form of the infinitive \textit{sectarier} may also contribute to the irony: The deponent verb (i.e. active/middle in meaning but passive in morphology) literally encodes an ambiguity of meaning as well.
immittere
send in-INFIN

‘to pull the fleets into the sea and send the sails into the rush of the winds’ (Acc. Trag. 463-464)

Finally, topicalization is evident in some instances where linear order does not render the intended meaning. In (121) Sceledrus insists he saw Philocomasium kissing someone, not that she saw him – as linear order would suggest. The effect of having the object before the subject (me) is the same as an it-cleft in English.

(121) Per. Et ibi [osculantem meum hospitem cum ista hospita] vidisti?
Per. And there kiss-PART-S-ACC my-M-S-ACC guest-M-S-ACC with that-F-S-ABL guest-F-S-ABL

Scel. Vidi (cur negem quod viderim?), sed [Philocomasium me vidisse] censui
Scel. see-1-S-PERF why deny-1-S-SUBJ REL-N-S-ACC see-1-S-PERF-SUBJ but Philocomasium-N-S-ACC I-S-ACC see-INFIN-PERF believe-1-S-PERF

‘Per. And there you saw my male guest kissing that female guest?

Scel. I saw it (why should I deny what I saw?), but I believed it was Philocomasium that I saw.’ (Pl. Mil. 555-557)

Altogether, the corpus contains 442 instances of two distinct overt NPs marked for accusative case. A summary of their order within the sentence (i.e. in processing order) appears in Table 15. The relative word order of two overt accusative NPs within a particular embedded clause is discussed in chapter 8.

Table 15: Linear Order in Embedded Clauses with Two Accusative NPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First NP</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the infinitival clauses with two overt accusative NPs, 190 (41%) occur in the order object – subject, and two additional instances are ambiguous. This means that linear order does not correctly predict grammatical function in well over one third of instances. The issue of linear order in relation to syntactic ambiguity is discussed further below in chapter 8.

In the instances of non-linear order, the most common reason (30 of the 190 cases) is the fronting of the anaphor *is* as a direct object. *Is* commonly links back an entity or proposition just mentioned (see section 5.3.3.1), so this effect is not surprising in embedded clauses with two accusative NPs. The next most common reason for fronting is a relative pronoun, which typically occurs clause-initially. Demonstratives are also a frequent cause of non-linear word order (24 occurrences), as a form of textual deixis (see section 5.3.1). Examples of these three types of non-linear word order are in (122-124).

(122) *Atque [id me dedisse] intellego.*

> but ANA-N-S-ACC I- S-ACC give-INFIN-PERF understand-1-s

‘But I understand I gave that.’ (Pl. Amph. 497)

(123) *Nil equidem, nisi [quod illum...] audivi [...dicere].*

> nothing-N-S-NOM indeed except REL-N-S-ACC that-M-S-ACC here-1-S-PERF say-INFIN

‘[That’s] nothing indeed, except what I heard him say.’ (Ter. And. 858)

(124) *[Haec me curaturum] dico.*

> this-N-PL-ACC I-S-ACC take care of-PART-FUT-M-S-ACC say-2-S-IMPERAT-FUT

‘Say I’ll take care of these things.’ (Pl. Men. 548)

Note also in (125a-b) that the demonstrative *hanc* is non-linear, but the other constituents are ordered differently in the two sentences, apparently in a desire for variety.

(125) a. *[Hanc mane esse...] oportet [...ieiunum].*

> this-F-S-ACC morning eat-INFIN be fitting-3-s fasting-M-S-ACC

‘The fasting person should eat this [cabbage] in the morning.’ (Cato Agr. 157)

b. *[Hanc...] oportet [...mane ieiunum esse].*

> this-F-S-ACC be fitting-3-s morning fasting-M-S-ACC eat-INFIN

‘The fasting person should eat this [cabbage] in the morning.’ (Cato Agr. 157)
While these three types of NP are the most common stimuli for non-linear word order, their occurrence does not usually cause non-linear order. Out of 52 instances of linear order with one of the accusatives as a demonstrative, 41 (79%) have the demonstrative as the second embedded element. This linear order for demonstratives is nearly twice the rate as in non-linear clauses. (The number of cases with *is* or the relative pronoun is only 15 total, too few to claim any pattern.) An example of a demonstrative as the second NP element in linear order is shown in (126).

(126) \[ \text{clanculum} \text{ te } \text{istaec flagitia facere} ... \text{censebat} \]

\[
\text{in secret you-S-ACC that-N-PL-ACC disgrace-N-PL-ACC do-INFIN believe-2-S-IMPERF} \\
\text{...potis} \\
\text{able-S-ACC}
\]

‘Did you believe you could do those wrong deeds of yours in secret?’ (Pl. *Men*. 605)

Note that while the demonstrative *istaec* does not get promoted to non-linear order, it does remain adjacent to the personal pronoun *te*, to which it is semantically linked. The combination of the overt *te* pronoun and the medio-distal demonstrative *istaec* reinforces the speaker’s emotional stance of distancing himself from the *flagitia*.

4.4 SUMMARY

Three syntactic characteristics of early Latin affect infinitival complements. These characteristics are the formal structure of infinitives, the copula, and word order. Infinitives occur in three tenses: present, perfect, and future. All [+ present] infinitives are formed morphologically (i.e. with an inflectional ending), while only some of the [+ perfect] and [+ future] tense forms are morphological. The [+ perfect] passive and [+ future] are always formed periphrastically with a participle + copula. The [+ future] active infinitive can be formed either morphologically or periphrastically, although the periphrastic form occurs more often and with a much wider range of lexemes. The significance of the periphrastic forms is that the
participial component of the infinitive conveys enough grammatical information for [gender] and [number] features so that no overt NP subject is required in an infinitival phrase. That is, the form of the infinitive itself includes an inflectional syncretized morpheme that overtly encodes both [gender] and [number], and those features can be matched with some entity in the discourse.

Another characteristic of early Latin grammar is the copula. The copula itself, any form of the linking verb esse ‘to be’, is optional in the [+ present] tense, and this optionality carries over to the infinitive form as well. In the other infinitival tenses, the standalone copula is always overt. The copula is also one component of the periphrastic infinitive forms (i.e. perfect passive, future passive, and some future-active tense forms). When used periphrastically, the copula tends to be non-overt in approximately two thirds of contexts, regardless of the infinitival tense. Thus, the copula patterns differently according to whether it is the standalone (i.e. inherent) copula or a periphrastic component. As part of a periphrastic infinitive, the copula always occurs as the present-tense infinitival form esse. Because the [+ present] infinitive is optionally null, in the periphrastic forms it is not needed because the participial part of the two-part infinitival form (e.g. paratus ‘having been readied’ in the perfect-passive infinitive paratus esse) overtly conveys the grammatical features needed for coreferencing. As a result, even in the tenses other than [+ present], the copula itself is frequently omitted, and an embedded infinitival clause can consist of just the PPP – with no overt NP and no overt infinitive of the copula.

The third important characteristic of early Latin syntax is word order. Because of rich overt morphological marking, Latin does not rely on word order to convey meaning. Instead, word order is relatively free. Word order is variable with respect to subject, verb, and object, so that all six possible combinations are possible. In addition, phrase constituents need not be adjacent; for example, a noun could occur at the beginning of a sentence that includes several
embedded clauses and the noun’s modifying adjective or a demonstrative could be sentence-final. Given this flexibility, early Latin allows great variation in the order of clause constituents. As a result, it is not possible to predict which NP within a given clause is the subject and which is the object. There is a slight tendency for subjects to occur before objects in infinitival clauses, but that trend is relatively weak at only 58%. Scrambling of definite entities such as demonstratives accounts for some, but not most, of the word-order variation.

The combined effect of these three characteristics of Latin syntax is a relatively high processing load on the listener/reader. The listener must check off the NP entities against the possible subject and object of an infinitive. If the infinitival form is periphrastic, the inflectional ending overtly distinguishes [gender] and [number], which can select possible discourse NPs as referents for the infinitive’s subject or object. However, if the most accessible entities share the same [gender] and [number] features, syntactic ambiguity is a potential result.
CHAPTER 5. BINDING AND TYPES OF NPs
IN EARLY LATIN

Within the category of overt NPs, early Latin has referring expressions and reflexive pronouns, but true (i.e. non-anaphoric) personal pronouns only for first and second person. Referring expressions can be full NPs or any NP constituent by itself or in combination with other NP constituents. For example, adjectives and demonstratives can function both adnominally (i.e. with other NP constituents) and pronominally (i.e. as the sole NP constituent). They can also co-occur and thereby constitute a valid NP (e.g. *haec pulchra* ‘this pretty’ [+ feminine] = ‘this pretty woman’). All these varieties are possible because nouns, adjectives, and determiners explicitly mark the grammatical features of [case], [number], and [gender]; pronouns lack marking for [gender], and anaphor-only forms lack [number].

5.1 GENDER

Gender is grammatical rather than natural, although it generally coincides with sex of animate nouns as in *vir* ‘man (masculine) and *puella* ‘girl’ (feminine). Exceptions are in the names of certain animals, where either [+ masculine] or [+ feminine] is canonically assigned (e.g. *canis* ‘dog’ is always masculine, regardless of natural gender of a particular referent). Natural gender also applies towards those inanimate entities that are gender-marked as neuter (< *neuter* ‘neither’), as in *crus* ‘leg’ (neuter) and *bellum* ‘war’ (neuter). However, both masculine and feminine gender forms also include many entities that are not animate, for example *res* ‘affair, thing’ (feminine) and *portus, -ūs* ‘harbor’ (masculine).

27 The inflectional suffix (indicated by the terminal morpheme) represents the genitive case ending. Since nouns, adjectives, and all pronoun-like words are morphologically classified according to their nominative/genitive suffixes, this ending is significant. Macrons are shown here where vowels are phonemically distinctive.
One traditional Latin grammarian describes the relationship between natural gender and grammatical form as follows: “For the names of animate beings, the gender is determined by the signification [i.e. sex]; for things and qualities, by the termination” (Gildersleeve & Lodge, 1895:1997, p. 10). While this generalization correctly predicts the grammatical gender of many nouns, it does not always work in reverse: Morphological termination is ambiguous. Different inflectional paradigms may appear similar in certain forms, for instance *amicus*, -i ‘friend’ (masculine), *corpus*, -oris ‘body’ (neuter), and *manus*, -ūs ‘hand’ (feminine). These all end in {-us} in the nominative singular, but they represent three different genders (and indeed three distinct inflectional paradigms).28

An example of natural rather than grammatical [gender] agreement is in (127), where the NP *Glycerium* (< Gk. ‘sweet one’) is [+ neuter] and used as a proper name. The corresponding adjective *Atticam* is [+ feminine] because the referent is a woman.

(127) *Quid ait tandem,*

[interrog-N-S-ACC]  [say-3-S]  [at length]  [Glycerium-N-S-ACC]  [ANA-ACC]  [know-INFIN]  [citizen-F-S-ACC]

*esse*  *Atticam*]

be-INFIN  Athenian-F-S-ACC

‘What does he say then, that Glycerium knows she’s an Athenian citizen.’ (Ter. *And.* 859)

5.2 CASE

Case marking is another significant feature on nouns and other nominal forms. Traditionally, nouns and adjectives are classified into five sets of paradigms, called declensions, according to their inflectional morphology (suffixes); these five declensions are shown in Appendix C. Case assignments generally correspond to particular thematic roles. For example,

28 The grammarian Varro, writing just after the early-Latin period, provides (pp. 2:424-428) lists of various nouns with identical endings in the nominative singular but with different morphological paradigms and/or grammatical genders. Varro’s point is to resolve the conflict between morphological analogy and the inconsistent, seemingly illogical reality of what one finds in (any) language.
the grammatical subject of a verb inflects for the nominative case, which corresponds to the role of agent or experiencer with an active verb. What the nominative form *puer* ‘boy’ represents in *Puer Marcum spectat* ‘the boy is looking at Marcus’ is the role of agent, but *puer* is experiencer in *Puer Marcum videt* ‘the boy sees Marcus’. In both sentences, the nominative case is the used for the structural assignment to the subject of a finite verb.

Less-central thematic roles like goal and instrument prototypically receive an inherent case other than nominative or accusative. For example, the θ-role of goal is assigned dative case inherently, and instrument is assigned the ablative case (with some variation, e.g. according to whether the entity is animate or inanimate). These lower-ranking thematic roles are illustrated in examples (128-131).

(128) *Iovi dapali culignam vini quantam vis polluceto.*

Jupiter- M-S-DAT of the feast-M-S-DAT cup-F-S-ACC wine-N-S-GEN how much-F-S-ACC wish-2-S

.offer-2-S-IMPERAT-FUT

‘To Jupiter of the feast offer a cup of wine of any size you wish.’ (Cato Agr. 143)

(129) *Ait [sese [Athenas fugere] cupere].*

say-3-S ANA-ACC Athens-F-PL-ACC flee-INFIN wish-INF

‘He says he wants to flee to Athens.’ (Pl. Mil. 126)

(130) *sacra quae [Cronia esse] iterantur {ab illis}\textsuperscript{1}.*

sacrifice-N-PL-ACC REL-N-PL-NOM Cronia-N-PL-NOM be-INFIN repeat-3-PL-PASS by

that-PL-ABL

‘sacrifices that are said by them to be the Cronia [i.e. for Cronus]’ (Acc. Ann. 3)

(131) *Illum dicis cum armis aureis, cuius tu legiones difflavisti spiritu.*

that-M-S-ACC say-2-S with weapon-N-PL-ABL golden-N-PL-ABL REL-S-GEN you-S-NOM legion-F-PL-ACC

blow away-2-S-PERF breath-M-S-ABL

‘You mean that one with golden weapons, whose legions you blew away with a breath’ (Pl. Mil. 16-17)
In (128) the dative goal ‘Jupiter’ is animate as an anthropomorphic deity, while in (97) the end point of the movement of fugere ‘to flee’ is the inanimate Athenas in the accusative case. Similarly, in a passive clause an agent (i.e. a human semantically analogous to the θ-role of instrument) is realized in the ablative case with the obligatory preposition a(b)²⁹ lit. ‘(away) from’, as with ab illis in (130). An inanimate NP in the instrument role takes ablative case, obligatorily without any preposition as with bare spiritu in (131).³⁰ While the goal role in (129) is expressed in the accusative case, Athenas is clearly not the direct object of a verb (fugere ‘to flee’ is semantically incapable of taking an object³¹) even though Athenas is unambiguously marked as accusative. Because the meaning of the thematic arguments is clear and certain morphological cases are associated with particular thematic roles, no confusion results from the accusative case syncretism of goal in (129) and the more typical use of accusative case for the direct object, as with culignam in (128). The use of the accusative case for both structures also shows the difference between inherent case assignment in (129) and structural assignment in (128).

The genitive case is prototypically assigned for possession or source, but it also marks the NP object of another NP (i.e. a so-called objective genitive), as in (132).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(132)</th>
<th>Non</th>
<th>ego</th>
<th>[illam mi dotem...]</th>
<th>duco</th>
<th>[...esse...]</th>
<th>quae</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not</td>
<td>I-S-NOM</td>
<td>that-F-S-ACC</td>
<td>I-S-DAT</td>
<td>dowry-F-S-ACC</td>
<td>lead-1-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dos</td>
<td>dicitur</td>
<td>[...sed pudicitiam et pudorem et]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dowry-F-S-NOM</td>
<td>say-3-S-PASS</td>
<td>but chastity-F-S-ACC</td>
<td>and modesty-M-S-ACC</td>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁹ The variation between a and ab(s) for this preposition is phonologically conditioned similarly to English a ~ an, with the addition that the allomorph abs can occur epenthetically before an alveolar (e.g. abs te ‘from you’ in Pl. Mil. 974 and Ter. And. 489, abs tergo ‘from the back’ in Acc. Trag. 610).

³⁰ The ablative as found from early Latin on includes the literal sense of ‘separation’ (< ablatum ‘carried away from’) as well as syncretism from several cases that were earlier distinct in PIE including the locative and the instrumental (Draeger, 1878, p. 1:495). Note that in example (131) the preposition cum in the PP cum armis aureis cannot mean ‘with’ as an instrument; rather, it means ‘together with, accompanied by’.

³¹ English flee can express a source with or without a preposition (e.g. They fled (from) the hurricane); without the preposition, such a thematic role occurs in the same position as a direct object since it typically follows the verb. But Latin expresses the source in the ablative or genitive, never in the accusative.
sedatum cupidinem, deum metum, parentum amorem et
calm-PPP-M-ACC desire-M-S-ACC god-M-PL-GEN fear-M-S-ACC parent-M-PL-GEN love-M-S-ACC and
cognatum concordiam.
relative-M-PL-GEN harmony-F-S-ACC

’I don’t believe my dowry is that which is said [to be] a dowry, but rather chastity, modesty, calm desire, fear of the gods, love of one’s parents and harmony among one’s relatives.’ (Pl. Amph. 839-842)

The three objective genitives are deum, parentum, and cognatum, each the direct object of a head NP.

Notably, the vocative case has no role in syntax since it is used only for direct address. However, the vocative form is a unique morpheme for second-declension masculine singular nouns and adjectives. For all other nouns and adjectives, the vocative is morphologically identical with the nominative. In addition, a distinct locative case exists for a few nouns such as city names (e.g. Athenis ‘in/at Athens’, Romae ‘in/at Rome’), domi ‘at home’, and ruri ‘in the countryside’.

The general correspondence between morphological form and semantic function was apparent to native speakers of Latin. Describing this form-function relationship, the Roman grammarian Varro writes what is excerpted in (133) about two generations following the early Latin period.

(133) Propter eorum qui dicunt usum declinati casus, uti is qui de altero diceret, distinguere posset, cum vocaret, cum daret, cum accusaret, sic alia eiudem discrimina, quae nos et Graecos ad declinandum duxerunt. . . Nos vero sex [casus] habemus, Graeci quinque: qui vocetur, ut Hercules; quemadmodum vocetur, ut Hercule; quo vocetur, ut ad Herculem; a quo vocetur, ut ab Hercule; cui vocetur, ut Herculi; cuius vocetur, ut Herculis.

32 In translating his Greek sources, Varro inadvertently renders Greek αἰτιατική = aitiatikē ‘effective, causative’ as accusativus instead of the semantically correct causativus. (The two words are related in the legal sense of a ‘cause’.) In the 6th century AD the Roman grammarian Priscianus corrected the terminology, but by then Varro’s had long become fixed in the grammatical lexicon. The original meaning is significant, as it refers to structural rather than inherent case assignment. In mistranslating the word, Varro changes the description to include only inherent case meanings.
‘The cases were derived for the use of those who speak, so that whoever spoke of another could distinguish when he was calling, when he was giving, when he was accusing, and similarly other distinctions of the same kind, which led us as well as the Greeks to the notion of declension. . . Anyway, we have six cases, the Greeks five: whoever is called, as Hercules [nominative]; how he is called, as Hercule [vocative]; to where he is called, as to Herculem [accusative]; by whom he is called, as by Hercule [ablative]; to [or, for] whom he is called, as Herculi [dative]; of whom [or, of what] he is called, Herculis [genitive].’ (Varro 8.6.16)

Even without using the now-familiar traditional case names, Varro clearly distinguishes between the thematic roles of the different cases. It is interesting to note that he mentions the inherent cases as well as the nominative for the subject (in his example, with a passive verb) but not the accusative as the structural assignment for a direct object.

Finally, it is important to note that accusative case is inherently or structurally assigned to a further range of meanings. Structurally, certain verbs take a so-called double accusative, assigning accusative case to both the person and thing affected. These include specific verbs meaning ‘ask’, ‘teach’, ‘warn’, and ‘hide’. Inherently, accusative case is also assigned to express extent, time, and distance (Bennett, 1894:2001, pp. 125-129).

5.3 OVERT NPs

Overt NPs include the three types shown in Table 1: personal pronouns, reflexive pronouns, and referring expressions. The discussion below focuses on how NPs in early Latin differ from English.

5.3.1 Demonstratives

A pronominal demonstrative is a determiner in that it specifies the particular entity intended by the referent of the noun in its NP. For example, in This dog doesn’t bark much, the demonstrative this signifies a – perhaps the only – dog near the speaker. When used pronominally, a demonstrative is an obviative (i.e. deictic) pronoun, as recognized by Varro in excerpt (134).
Demonstratives, or ‘articles’ when used adnominally, are thus classified as markers of definiteness. Demonstratives are separate from the system of personal pronouns because they represent an entity absent from the dialog, in effect a “third person” that is neither the speaker (i.e. first person) nor the second-person addressee (Carvalho, 1991, p. 225).

One of the main distinctions in demonstratives is the separation between near and far – an egocentric representation of the distinction between speaker and the rest of the world. For instance, English has two demonstratives, the proximal form this and the distal form that. Both can function in obviative and proximate (i.e. anaphoric) roles, as in (135-136), respectively.

(135) (Salesperson, pointing.) Thisi/Thati is our latest model, available in a wide range of sizes and colors.

(136) Uh oh. {It’s storming and the lights just went out}i. Thisi/Thati is spooky.

The obviative forms this and that in (135) refer to some particular entity in the real world such as an appliance or a vehicle; they are deictics. The choice of demonstrative form often depends subtly on the context including such factors as spatial distance between speaker and/or listener and the object being pointed out. Spatial indexicality may also occur metaphorically as social deixis. For example, the distal form that could represent greater social distance between speaker and addressee than would the proximal form this, or could be used as a subtle way to suggest that...
the customer might find the product too expensive, too ‘remote’ from an economic or budgetary standpoint.

When the demonstrative is logophoric as in (136), the choice of form reveals something about the speaker’s attitude. Since it refers back to the entire proposition of the previous sentence, the demonstrative represents an emotional stance toward that event or situation. The use of the distal form that signals that the speaker perceives the events as external to him- or herself, that he/she is affected by them but not materially altered by them. In contrast, the proximal this reveals the speaker’s perception of the events as nearby in both time and space: a clear and present danger. The difference between the two distance references – proximal and distal – is analogous to what distinguishes the thematic roles of theme and patient.

The Latin proximal demonstrative is hic, and the distal form is ille. For both words, the etymology is uncertain because Italic is the only branch of Indo-European with anything like these words for demonstratives. In general, Proto Indo-European (PIE) demonstratives are thought to have descended from two main forms. One of those is the anaphoric pronoun (see section 5.3.3). The other source is the stem *so-/*sa-, which has a general deictic meaning; in some reflexes, it means ‘this’, in others ‘that’ (Beekes, 1995, p. 202). A variant form apparently from the same stem has a homorganic onset with an alveolar stop instead of the fricative, in the form *to-/*tā- and with the same meaning. The PIE daughter languages roughly contemporary with early Latin all have demonstratives deriving from these forms, including Sanskrit, various dialects of Greek, and Old Church Slavonic (Szemerényi, 1996, pp. 203-206).

In contrast, the Latin form hic appears to follow a regular derivation from presumed PIE *gho- (Watkins, 2000, p. 31), for example just as *ghosti- ‘stranger, guest’ becomes hostis ‘guest, enemy’ in Latin. The unusual ending of hic in –c (i.e. /k/) is an epideictic particle from
PIE *ko- ‘here’. Thus, the complete form hic represents two historical morphemes (cf. modern French celui-ci, comprised of ce ‘this’ + lui ‘it, one’ + ci ‘here’ = ‘this one here’ vs. celui-là ‘that one there’). The declension of hic, shown in Table 16, includes the final /k/ in most singular forms and in the plural, uniquely in the neuter nominative and accusative.

Though the –c ending is unusual (note from Appendix C that is does not occur with any nouns or adjectives), regular phonology is observed. For instance, where all noun and adjective masculine and feminine accusative singular forms end in –m, nasal assimilation with hic always results in forms such as hunc (instead of *humc) and hanc (instead of *hamc).

Examples of the proximal demonstrative with the features [+ pronoun, - anaphor] are in (137-138). Multiple-word NPs are shown together in curly braces. For consistency and ease of interpretation, matrix subjects are indexed with subscript i and lower-ranking arguments, including embedded ones, are indexed sequentially thereafter.

Table 16: Proximal Demonstrative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>hic</td>
<td>haec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>huius</td>
<td>hōrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>huic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>hunc</td>
<td>hanc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>hōc</td>
<td>hāc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(137) Haec urbs est Thebae. In illis -ce habitat aedibus Amphitruo.

‘This city is Thebes. In those walls over there lives Amphitryon.’ (Pl. Amph. 97-98)
Here resides a woman whose name is Phronesium; this one has the habits of this generation. (Pl. Tru. 12-13)

Example (136) includes three different types of deixis: (a) locative in hic ‘here’, (b) personal in haec ‘this (feminine)’ = ‘she’, and (c) temporal in huius saecli ‘of this generation’. Similarly, sentences (139-140) have multiple types of deixis indicated by various forms of the proximal demonstrative including the allative adverb huc ‘to here’ and its elative counterpart, hinc ‘from here’.

And I’ll never allow this man to come here to this house today.’ (Pl. Amph. 264)

In that way this woman was able to go across from here to here.’ (Pl. Mil. 418)

The three sequential demonstrative forms haec, hinc, and huc in (139) are obviously used as deixis on the stage. Note how in (139) the proximal demonstrative is overtly linked with the first-person pronoun me.

In (141) the same lexeme, hic, is indexed to distinct entities.

Yes, I certainly know this man: he is my master. In fact, I am his slave, but I believe I was this man’s. I used to believe this one was you; I even carried out business for this man.’ (Pl. Men. 1070-1072)
Here, even though the two referents of *hic* are identical twins, the two men can be distinguished deictically, most likely through pointing on the stage. The use of the same lexeme to refer to the two entities forms a linguistic parallel to the confusion caused by their identical appearance and name, and only through physical context is it possible to distinguish them.

An intensifying form of *hoc* reduplicates the suffix –ce, with a result akin to non-standard English *this here* (man). In the plural, this intensive form terminates in –c or –ce, which distinguishes it from simple *hoc*. Some examples are in (142-144).

(142)  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Quid}_i & \quad \text{illuc}_i \quad \text{est} \quad \text{quod}_i \quad [\text{med}_k \ldots] \quad \{\text{hisce} \quad \text{homines}\}_j \\
& \quad \text{INTERROG-N-S-NOM} \quad \text{that-N-S-NOM} \quad \text{be-3-S} \quad \text{REL-N-S-ACC} \quad \text{I-S-ACC} \quad \text{this-M-PL-NOM} \quad \text{human-M-PL-NOM} \\
& \quad [... \text{insanire}] \quad \text{praedican}\text{t}_j? \\
& \quad \text{be insane-INFIN} \quad \text{say before-3-PL-SUBJ}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Why is that, that these men here claim I’m insane?’ (Pl. *Men*. 958)

(143)  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Iam} & \quad [\text{hos}_j \quad -\text{ce} \quad \text{absolutos}\}_i] \quad \text{censeas}_i \\
& \quad \text{now} \quad \text{that-M-PL-ACC} \quad \text{-INTENSIF} \quad \text{loose from-PPP-M-PL-ACC} \quad \text{believe-2-S-SUBJ}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Now you’d think those were paid for.’ (Pl. *Aul*. 517)

(144)  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sperabit}_i & \quad [\text{sumptum}_i \quad \text{sibi}_i \ldots] \quad \text{senex}_i \quad [... \text{levatum}_j \quad \text{esse} \\
& \quad \text{hope-3-S-FUT} \quad \text{expense-M-S-ACC} \quad \text{ANA-DAT} \quad \text{old-M-S-NOM} \quad \text{lighten-PPP-M-S-ACC} \quad \text{be-INFIN}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{harum}_k & \quad -\text{c} \quad \text{abitu]}. \\
& \quad \text{this-F-PL-GEN} \quad \text{-INTENSIF} \quad \text{departure-M-S-ABL}
\end{align*}
\]

‘The old man will hope the expense will be lessened for him [lit. ‘for himself’ by the departure of these women here.’ (Ter. *Heau*. 746)

In (145) *hic* is [+ anaphor], referring back to a ‘proximate’ entity in the text.

(145)  

\[
\begin{align*}
\{\text{Omnium} \quad \text{primum} \quad \text{iste} \quad \text{qui} \quad \text{sit} \quad \text{Sosia}\}_i \quad [\text{hoc}_i \\
& \quad \text{all-N-PL-GEN} \quad \text{first-N-S-ACC} \quad \text{that-M-S-NOM} \quad \text{INTERROG-M-S-NOM} \quad \text{be-3-S-SUBJ} \quad \text{Sosia-M-S-NOM} \quad \text{this-N-S-ACC}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dici]} \quad \text{volo}. \\
& \quad \text{say-INFIN-PASS} \quad \text{want-1-S}
\end{align*}
\]

‘First of all, what I want explained is who that Sosia is.’ (Pl. *Amph*. 609)

The neuter form *hoc* in (145) refers back to the indirect question expressed in the first clause. It is proximal because the antecedent occurs immediately before it, and it also conveys an
emotional stance of urgency, something very important to the speaker. In (146) the proximate

demonstrative occurs as *hunc*, referring back to *Megadorus*.

(146) *Sed* {Megadorus meus affinis}_i, eccum incedit, a

but Megadorus-M-S-NOM my-M-S-NOM related by marriage-M-S-NOM behold go in-3-s from

*foro*. lam hunc\_i non ausim\_j praterire, quin consistam\_j

now this-M-S-ACC non dare-1-S-SUBJ go past-INFIN but that stand still-1-S-SUBJ

*et* conloquar\_j.

and speak with-1-S-SUBJ-DEPON

‘But my son-in-law is coming in from the forum. Now I wouldn’t dare pass him

without stopping and speaking with him.’ (Pl. *Aul.* 471-472)

Note that *hunc* not anaphorically refer back to the nearest NP entity (*foro*), but rather to the

highest ranking nearby entity. In (147) *hunc* skips over the nearest entity, the indefinite *nemo*

and the relative pronoun *quem* referring to it, to refer back to the definite NP *Davom*.

(147) Davom\_j video, Nemo\_k 'st\_k quem\_k mallem\_i omnium

Davus-M-S-ACC see-1-S no one-M-S-NOM be-3-S REL-M-S-ACC prefer-1-S-IMPERF-SUBJ all-M-PL-GEN

nam [hunc\_i...] scio\_i [mea solide solum\_j gavisurum\_j

for this-M-S-ACC know-1-S my-N-PL-ACC solidly alone-M-S-ACC rejoice-PART-FUT-M-S-ACC

*gaudia*].

joy-N-PL-ACC

‘I see Davus. There’s no one out of them all that I’d rather [see], for I know he alone will

completely rejoice at my joys.’ (Ter. *And.* 963-964)

Finally, in (148) *haec* is cataphoric.

(148) *Haec* erunt vilici officia. Disciplina bona utatur.

this-N-PL-NOM be-3-PL-FUT overseer-M-S-GEN duty-N-PL-NOM discipline-F-S-ABL good-F-S-ABL use-3-S-SUBJ-DEPON

Feriae servantur... .

holiday-F-PL-NOM guard-3-PL-PASS-SUBJ

‘These will be the overseer’s duties. He should use good discipline. The holy days

should be observed.’ (Cato *Agr.* V)

For the distal demonstrative *ille*, the probable PIE stem is *al-/ol-* ‘beyond’, also found

in the Latin reflex *ultra* (Buck, 1976, p. 225). Cognates includes English *else* and *eldritch*, as

well as Latin *alius* ‘(an)other’ and Greek ἄλλος = *allo* ‘other’, but apparently no other PIE
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daughter language (including other members of the Italic branch) used the same stem to develop a demonstrative form (Watkins, pp. 2-3). The Latin forms are in Table 17.

In (149) the demonstratives *illaec* and the locative *illic* point to entities distant from the speaker.

(149) *Nimis* demiror, *Sosia*, *qui* *illaec* *me* 

too much wonder at-1-S-DEPON Sosia-M-S-VOC how F-S-NOM there I-S-ACC 

*donatum esse aurea patera* 
give-PPP-M-S-ACC be-INFIN golden-F-S-ABL bowl-F-S-ABL 

*sciat nisi tu dudum* 
know-3-S-SUBJ unless you-S-NOM just now 

*hanc convenisti et narravisti haec omnia.* 
this-F-S-ACC meet-2-S-PERF and tell-2-S-PERF this-N-PL-ACC all-N-PL-ACC 

‘I really wonder, Sosia, how she should know I was given the golden bowl there, unless you met her just now and tell her all these things.’ (Pl. Amph. 765-767).

Table 17: Distal Demonstrative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>ille</td>
<td>illa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>illīus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>illī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>illum</td>
<td>illam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>illō</td>
<td>illā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In (150) the distal demonstratives *illaec* and *illum* linguistically encode the speaker’s distancing stance from the propositions indexed by *illaec*, a stance emphasized by the intensified first-person pronoun *egomet*.

(150) *Ego* *met mihi* *non credo* *quom [illaec] autumare illum* 

I-S-NOM INTENSIF I-S-DAT not believe-1-S when that-N-PL-ACC say-INFIN that-M-S-ACC 

*audio* 

hear-1-S 

‘I don’t trust myself when I hear that one say those things.’ (Pl. Amph. 416)
In example (151) *ille* also serves to distance from the explicit first-person pronouns *ego*, *mihi*, and *me*, and in the final clause that distancing is intended to become literal.

(151)  
Quid *mihi*₂₉ melius *'st quam, quando illi*₂₉ [me]₃  
INTERROG-N-S-NOM I-S-DAT better-N-S-NOM be-3-s than when that-M-PL-NOM I-S-ACC  
insanire] [praedicanť, *ego*₃ [med]₉ [adsimulem]₉ [...insanire], ut  
be insane-INFIN say before-3-PL-SUBJ I-S-NOM I-S-ACC pretend-1-S-SUBJ be insane-INFIN COMP  
illos, a *me*₃ absterream?  
that-M-PL-ACC from I-S-ABL frighten away-1-S-SUBJ  

‘What’s better for me than, when they claim I’m insane, I pretend I’m insane in order to frighten them away from me?’ (Pl. *Men*. 831-832)

Sentence (152) shows how *illud* can be used for social deixis, distinguishing the speaker from the common crowd.

(152)  
Aut *illud*₁ falsum, *'st [quod, volgo...] audio₁  
or that-N-S-NOM deceive-PPP-N-S-NOM be-3-s REL-N-S-ACC crowd-M-S-ABL hear-1-S  
[...dicĭ], [diem adimere aegritudinem hominibus],  
say-INFIN-PASS day-F-S-ACC take away-INFIN sickness-F-S-ACC human-M-PL-DAT  

‘Or that which I hear said among the common masses is false, that time takes away pain from men.’ (Ter. *Heau*. 421-422)

As with the proximal demonstrative, *ille* can also function anaphorically. In (153) *illi* in the last clause has as its antecedent the most distant NP, *Cliniam*. This long-distance linking is the literal function of the distal demonstrative when used anaphorically.

(153)  
*Cliniam*₉ orat₁ sibi₁ uti id₉ nunc det₁, [illam₁  
Cliniam-M-S-ACC beg-3-S ANA-DAT COMP ANA-N-S-ACC now give-3-S-SUBJ that-F-S-ACC  
illi₉ tamen post daturam].  
that-M-S-DAT however afterward give-PART-FUT-F-S-SUBJ  

‘She begs Cliniam that he give it to her, however [she says] [she] will then give him the girl.’ (Ter. *Heau*. 605-606)

In (154) there are two distinct referents of a distal demonstrative, *illa* and *illum*.

(154)  
Quae *illi ad legionem facta sunt memorat pater  
REL-N-PL-NOM there to legion-F-S-ACC do-PPP-N-PL-NOM be-3-pl tell-3-s father-M-S-NOM  
meus₈ Alcumenaes, *illa* [illum₉ ...virum suom esse],  
my-M-S-NOM Alcmena-F-S-DAT that-F-S-NOM that-M-S-ACC believe-3-s man-M-S-ACC own-M-S-ACC be-INFIN
‘My father is telling Alcmena what happened to the troops there. She believes he is her husband, when in fact she’s with an adulterer.’ (Pl. Amph. 133-135)

In the first sentence of (154), the last two NPs are the masculine NP *pater meus* ‘my father’ and the feminine NP *Alcumenae* ‘to Alcmena’. When referred to anaphorically in the second sentence, each NP takes the appropriately gendered form of *ille*. Because [gender] is encoded distinctly in the feminine nominative form *illa* and masculine accusative *illum*, no ambiguity results about their respective antecedents.

In (155) anaphoric *illam* has a clear third-person (i.e. distancing) meaning, which encodes the speaker’s stance toward the woman and is reinforced by the fact that he intends to throw her out.

(155) \[ Nisi \, tu_i \, properas_i \, [mulierem_j \, abducere], \, ego_k \, illam_j \]

\[ eiciam_k. \]

‘Unless you hasten to lead the woman away, I’ll throw her out.’ (Ter. Phor. 436-437)

The intensifying suffix –*c* is also used with *ille*, as in the form *illisce* in (156).

(156) \[ Tu \, -n, \, senex, \, ais \, [habitare \, med \, in \, illis \, -ce \, aedibus]? \]

‘Old man, are you saying I live in that house there?’ (Pl. Men. 820)

In (157) the intensive form *illanc*, plus the interrogative morpheme –*n* (with an epenthetic vowel) which is often used in interjections. These layers of intensification linguistically reinforce the idea of how preposterous the suggestion is.

(157) \[ Illan \, -c \, -in \, mulierem \, alere \, cum \, illa \, familia! \]

‘The very idea of supporting that woman with that family of hers!’ (Ter. Heau. 751)
Similarly, in (158) *illoc* encodes the speaker’s stance toward the manner of joking.

(158) *Solet iocari saepe me -cum illoc modo.*

be accustomed-3-S joke-INFN-DEPON often I-S-ABL -with that-M-S-ABL manner-M-S-ABL

‘He’s used to joking with me often in that manner of his.’ (Pl. *Men*. 317)

In summary, *hic* is lexically mapped onto the first-person pronouns, and *ille* to third-person forms. Thus, *hic* means ‘this one’ because it is closest to the speaker, while *ille* means ‘that one’ which is further from the speaker and thus closer to another (i.e. third) entity that is not the addressee. By metaphorical extension, *hic* can also refer to an entity accessible in the shared knowledge of speaker and addressee. Similarly, *ille* sometimes also refers to well-known entities such as famous persons in history (Bolkestein, 2000, p. 116). An example of *ille* in reference to the same Cato included in the present corpus is in (159).

(159) *Num*\(^{33}\) \{*vetus ille Cato*\} \[*lacessisse*\] conscius non

N old-M-S-NOM that-M-S-NOM Cato-M-S-NOM provoke-INFN-PERF aware-M-S-NOM not

erat ipse sibi?

be-3-S-IMPERF INTENSIF-M-S-NOM ANA-DAT

‘sSurely that famous old Cato wasn’t himself unaware that he provoked [people], was he?’ (Luc. *Sat*. 487-488)

The contrast between proximal and distal demonstratives in deixis shown in (160).

(160) *Hinc ego et huc et illuc potero quid agant*

from here I-S-NOM and to here and to there be able-1-S-FUT INTERROG-N-S-ACC do-3-PL-SURJ

*arbitrarier.*

think-INFN-DEPON

‘From here I’ll able to think about what they’re going from both here and there.’ (Pl. *Aul*. 607)

In (161) *illum* refers back to the man last mentioned six clauses earlier, while *hunc anulum* is apparently accompanied with a stage gesture showing the ring.

(161) *Ego ad forum illum conveniam atque illi hunc*

I-S-NOM to forum-N-S-ACC that-M-S-ACC meet-1-S-FUT and that-M-S-DAT this-M-S-ACC

\(^{33}\) *Num* is an interrogative that presupposes the answer ‘no’.
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‘And I’ll give this ring to him and say it was given to me by your wife and she’s dying [with love] for him.’ (Pl. Mil. 931-932)

In addition to *hic* and *ille*, the Latin demonstrative system includes an intermediate-distance form, *iste*. The medio-distal form *iste* likely derives from the combination of two morphemes: PIE *i*-, a pronominal stem (Watkins, p.35), and the standard PIE demonstrative form *so/-sa*- or perhaps from its variant form *to/-ta* (Buck, p. 226). The inflectional paradigm of this demonstrative is in Table 18.34

Table 18: Medio-Distal Demonstrative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>iste</td>
<td>ista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>istīus</td>
<td>istōrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>istī</td>
<td>istīs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>istum</td>
<td>istam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>istō</td>
<td>istā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 18 shows, the declension of *iste* follows that of *ille*, shown in Table 17 above.

In (162) the medio-distal *istam* is overtly linked with the second-person pronoun *tibi*.

---

34 Latin’s ternary demonstrative system survives in modern Spanish, where the forms *éste*, *ése*, and *aquél* maintain the same deictic relationships as, respectively, *hic*, *iste*, and *ille*. Note that formally, *éste* ‘this (near the speaker)’ derives from Latin *iste*, the medio-distal demonstrative, while *ése* ‘that (near the addressee)’ and *aquél* ‘that (distal, near neither speaker nor addressee)’ are not transparently derived from any part of the Latin demonstrative system. Rather than surviving in their original formal structure, the Spanish forms merely encode the same three-way distinction as their earlier counterparts in Latin. No other Romance language has a ternary demonstrative system.
When Amphitryon asks what Alcmena is pregnant with, Sosia replies, “with insanity!” The disdainful effect of *iste* is also seen in (163), where *isti* refers to the wife’s *parasitus* ‘parasite’ (< Gk. παρα ‘alongside’ + ἁίτος ‘food’, one who dines alongside at the other’s expense).

A pejorative connotation of *iste* is common (Gildersleeve & Lodge, p. 192), perhaps most (in)famous in Cicero’s Catilinarian speeches, where it is downright sneering. Such a distancing emotional stance is iconically represented by the fact that the second-person form is morphologically similar to the distal (not the proximal) demonstrative. The effect of *iste* is often a metaphorical moue of distaste, expressed with *istos* in (164) and *istam* in (165).

‘Indeed I’ll rip out those eyes of yours, you wicked woman, so you can’t observe what I’m doing.’ (Pl. *Aul*. 53-54)
35 Hercle ‘by Hercules’ is a common mild oath, but its use in this play about the god Jupiter’s fathering Hercules is humorously ironic since only a god or demi-god would have an oath named after him. If Hercules’ father were the mortal Amphitryon, there would be no such oath. Thus, when Amphitryon – his supposed mortal father – speaks this, line the audience must be laughing at the irony of situation.
Although the Latin demonstrative system is ternary, not all three forms are equally available for use. First, one frequent usage of the demonstrative as [+ anaphor] is a two-way distinction between something recently mentioned and something else more remote in the discourse. For this kind of referential contrast, the two forms are always *hic* and *ille*, never *iste* (Gildersleeve & Lodge, p. 194). In that sense, *iste* is not available as a proximate anaphor. Next, the distribution of the three demonstratives is markedly unequal. In the classical period, *hic* occurs much more frequently than *ille* (Pennell Ross, 1996, p. 516). Overall, *iste* occurs even less than *ille* (Carvalho, p. 228), which is not surprising given its unavailability as an anaphor. Finally, it has been claimed that *hic* serves as anaphor only when an overt noun occurs in the immediately preceding context (Orlandini, 1989, p. 471), which suggests that *hic*’s anaphoric function is merely a metaphorical extension of deictic proximity, not a true functional specialization. In this function *hic* is at or near the beginning of a clause. According to Bolkestein (2000, p. 118), this initial position results in part from the fact that is contrasts – at least implicitly – with *ille*, while *iste* has no such counterpart.

However, true spatial deixis appears to override anaphoric function in (154), repeated here as (170). *Illa* refers to *Alcumenae*, the NP immediately before it.

(170) \[ Quae \quad illi \quad ad \quad legionem \quad facta \quad sunt \quad memorat \quad pater \]

\[ meus \quad Alcumenae, \quad Illa \quad [illum,...] \quad censet \quad [...virum \quad suom \quad esse], \]

\[ quae \quad cum \quad moecho \quad est. \]

‘My father is telling Alcmena what happened to the troops there. She believes he is her husband, when in fact she’s with an adulterer.’ (Pl. *Amph.* 133-135)

If *hic* is the preferred anaphor in such contexts, as Orlandini argues, then we should expect the form *haec* instead of *illa*. Rather, what seems to be meant is a deictic reference to the character of Alcmena on stage as ‘that woman over there’ – all in the context of Mercury’s explanatory
prologue to the audience. It may also be the case that preference for *hic* as anaphor may have increased after the period of early Latin.

Overall, the demonstrative systems of Latin and English are similar. Both have near and far forms, but Latin also has an intermediary form. Both languages use the demonstratives as deictics as well as anaphors, with the one exception of the medio-distal *iste* not being used anaphorically. A comparison summary of the two systems of demonstratives is in Table 19.

Table 19: Comparison of Demonstratives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>hic</em></td>
<td><em>this</em></td>
<td>proximal / anaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>iste</em></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>intermediate, deictic only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ille</em></td>
<td><em>that</em></td>
<td>distal / anaphor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.2 Pronouns

Personal pronouns in Latin differ from English in two main ways. First, overt pronouns occur less in Latin since both null subjects and null objects are licensed (see section 5.4). Second, Latin has first- and second- but no third-person forms of the pronoun. The first- and second-person pronouns function as deictics in the “obviative” form. That is, with the binding features [- anaphor, - pronoun] their co-indexing must be inferred pragmatically (Chomsky, 1981, p. 186).

The inflectional paradigms of first- and second-person pronouns are in Tables 20-21.

The variant forms in the genitive plural depend on the function. The *{–um}* ending is for a partitive sense, and *{–i}* is for possession (although possessive adjectives morphologically formed from these pronouns are much more usual). The accusative singular forms with
allomorphic ending \{-d\} usually (but not obligatorily) occur before a word beginning with a vowel or /h/.

Table 20: First-Person Pronoun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>ego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>meī</td>
<td>nostrum / nostrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>mihi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>mē(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>mē</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: Second-Person Pronoun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>tū</td>
<td>illī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>tuī</td>
<td>illōrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>tibi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>tē(d)</td>
<td>illōs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>illō</td>
<td>illā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When they occur, overt subject pronouns indicate emphasis or serve to disambiguate.

For example, in (171) the first-person pronoun ego plus the NP pater clarify who is meant by the first-person plural ending on meruimus ‘we have deserved’.

(171) *Meruimus et ego et pater de vobis et re publica.*

‘We – my father and I – have earned [something] from you and from the republic.’ (Pl. *Amph.* 39-40)
Another function of overt personal pronouns is for contrast. In (172) contrast is made between 

*nemo horum familiarium* and *vos* ‘you’, the audience.

(172)  

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{Ea} & \text{signa} & \text{nemo} & \text{horum} & \text{familiarium} & \text{videre} \\
\text{ana-\text{-}N-PL-ACC} & \text{sign-\text{-}N-PL-ACC} & \text{no \text{-} one-\text{-}\text{-}S-NOM} & \text{this-\text{-}M-PL-GEN} & \text{household member-\text{-}M-PL-GEN} & \text{see-\text{-}INFIN} \\
poterit: & verum & vos & videbitis.
\end{array}
\]

‘Those marks no one in the household will be able to see, but you will see [them].’ (Pl. *Amph.* 146-147)

Most typically, overt personal pronouns indicate emphasis, as in examples (173-174).

(173)  

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllllll}
\text{Atque} & \text{ego} & \text{quoque} & \text{etiam,} & \text{qui} & \text{Iovis} & \text{sum} & \text{filius,} & \text{contagione} \\
\text{but} & \text{I-\text{-}NOM} & \text{and} & \text{also} & \text{REL-\text{-}M-\text{-}S\text{-}NOM} & \text{Jupiter-\text{-}M-\text{-}S-GEN} & \text{be-1-\text{-}S} & \text{son-\text{-}M-\text{-}S\text{-}NOM} & \text{contact-\text{-}F-\text{-}S\text{-}ABL} \\
\text{mei} & \text{patris} & \text{metuo} & \text{malum.} & \text{my-\text{-}M\text{-}S\text{-}GEN} & \text{father-\text{-}M\text{-}S\text{-}GEN} & \text{fear-1-\text{-}S} & \text{bad-\text{-}N\text{-}S\text{-}ACC} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘But even I too, who am the son of Jupiter, fear something bad from contact with my father.’ (Pl. *Amph.* 30-31)

(174)  

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{Age} & \text{i} & \text{tu} & \text{secundum.} \\
de\text{rive-2-\text{-}S\text{-}IMPERAT} & \text{go-2-\text{-}S\text{-}IMPERAT} & \text{you-\text{-}S-NOM} & \text{following} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Go on, you go behind.’ (Pl. *Amph.* 551)

In both (175) and (176) two overt forms of the first-person pronoun help fulfill the felicity conditions for making a confession and are thereby pragmatically satisfying. Note that in (175) the confession is of a crime, and thus it is appropriate to provide the details that are stated; it has the effect of an apology.

(175)  

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllllll}
\text{Ego}_{i} & \text{[me}_{i} & \text{iniuriam}_{j} & \text{fecisse} & \text{filiae}_{k}\text{...]} & \text{fateor}_{i} & \text{[...tuae}_{k} & \text{Cereis} & \text{vigiliis} & \text{per} & \text{vinum} & \text{atque} & \text{impulsu} & \text{adulescentiae}.} \\
\text{I-\text{-}S-NOM} & \text{I-\text{-}S\text{-ACC}} & \text{wrong-F\text{-}S\text{-ACC}} & \text{do\text{-}INFIN\text{-}PERF} & \text{daughter-F\text{-}S\text{-DAT}} & \text{confess-1-\text{-}S\text{-DEPON}} & \text{your-F\text{-}S\text{-DAT}} & \text{of Ceres-F-PL\text{-}ABL} & \text{watch-F-PL\text{-}ABL} & \text{through} & \text{wine-N\text{-}S\text{-ACC}} & \text{and} & \text{impulse-M\text{-}S\text{-ABL}} & \text{youth\text{-}F\text{-}S\text{-GEN}} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I confess I did wrong to your daughter during the festival of Ceres, [led] by wine and the impulse of youthfulness.’ (Pl. *Aul.* 794-795)

(176)  

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllllll}
\text{Ego}_{i} & \text{[me}_{i} & \text{amare} & \text{han}_{j} & \text{fateor}_{i}. \\
\text{I-\text{-}S-NOM} & \text{I-\text{-}S\text{-ACC}} & \text{love-INFIN} & \text{this-F\text{-}S\text{-ACC}} & \text{confess-1-\text{-}S\text{-DEPON} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I confess I love her.’ (Ter. *And.* 896)

An emphatic effect also occurs with the second-person pronouns *tu* and *te* in (177).
‘And you would desire yourself to be calm towards us here.’ (Pac. Trag. 34-35)

In (178) the *ego me* sequence encodes strong moral indignation at the charge of wrong.

‘I’ll clearly show I didn’t do wrong, or I’ll undergo punishment.’ (Acc. Trag. 462)

A similar indignation is coded in (179). The fact that the speaker is the god Mercury in the guise of the real Sosia makes the indignation ironic, even as it is all the more emphatic.

‘Do you dare say you are Sosia, when I’m the one who’s Sosia?’ (Pl. Amph. 373-374)

Example (180) shows even stronger emphasis through the addition of the reduplicative intensifying suffix –*met* on *ego*.

‘Then meanwhile I began to think about [it] [lit. ‘with myself’].’ (Pl. Aul. 379-380)

A similar emphasis occurs in (181) with the reduplicated *tute* and the bare *tu*.

‘You yourself know I want done what you want, and I’m confident I’ll obtain that from my brother.’ (Pl. Aul. 686-687)

In (182) two overt forms of the second-person pronoun are used along with *unum* ‘the one’ as an ironic homage to the egotistical Pyrgopolynes.
'Why should I tell you what all mortals know, that you, Pyrgopolynices, live on earth as the one with excellence, handsomeness, and the most unconquered feats?' (Pl. Mil. 55-57)

Note how the illogical superlative *invictissumis* ‘the most unconquered’ adds to the comic effect with its mock bombast.

The null subject parameter (see section 5.4.1) means an overt subject pronoun is disfavored except under the conditions outlined above. Within that framework, multiple overt pronouns are unusual. When the expected rarity is flouted in (183), it is mocked. The wife (*Matrona* ‘matron’) of the Epidamnian Menaechmus twin responds emphatically with overt pronouns, and the parasite (*Peniculus* ‘hanger-on’) ridicules her response.

(183) Mat. *Tu, tu istic, inquam.*

Pen. *Vi -n [*adferri noctuam*, quae tu tu usque dicat tibi?]*

'Mat. You, you there, I say.'

Pen. 'Do you want an owl to be brought here that could say “tu tu” to you?’ (Pl. Men. 653-654)

5.3.3 Anaphors

In addition to the demonstrative and pronoun-only forms discussed above, certain third-person forms in Latin have specialized [+ anaphor, - pronoun] meaning. That is, the anaphor-only forms refer text-internally to an entity available in the discourse, not externally to a real-world entity (Bertocchi, 1989, pp. 443-445). Thus, anaphor-only forms are not available as antecedents, but only for subsequent (or cataphoric) mention of an entity. In that way, anaphor-
only forms differ from pronouns, which are free to occur with external obviative reference and therefore may encode the first mention of a topic. Nonetheless, anaphor-only forms also resemble deictic pronouns in that they point to something available in the context. With anaphor-only forms, the only context available for inferring the referent is the co-text of the discourse itself. The anaphor-only lexemes vary in form depending on the syntax of the anaphor, whether bound or unbound. Latin has two anaphor-only forms, *is* and *se*, and the latter also has a related adjectival form *suus*.

### 5.3.3.1 Unbound Anaphor

In English, the unbound anaphor is homophonous with the third-person pronoun forms *he, she, and it* and their epicene plural counterpart *they*. Some examples are in (184-185).

(184) Plautus, was a prolific playwright. He, wrote comedies adapted from Greek models but set in contemporary Roman culture.

(185) We bought {two pizzas} and ate them for dinner last night during the game.

The anaphors *he* in (184) and *them* in (185) are interpreted as co-indexed with the NPs *Plautus* and *two pizzas*, respectively. However, given two pronominal forms within the same clause, the second form may – depending on context – take a disjoint reference from the first, as in (186).

(186) Plautus, was a prolific playwright, but Terence wrote only about six plays. Some people prefer him but others find his works funnier.

Because there are two possible antecedents of *him* and *his*, other linguistic clues must be used for disambiguation. Perhaps the most natural reading of *him* is co-indexing with *Terence*, which because it is nearer is more readily available within the co-text. If *him* is co-indexed with *Terence*, the disjunctive *but* forces an interpretation of *his* with the other discourse entity, *Plautus*. Conversely, if *him* is interpreted as co-referential with *Plautus*, then *his* must refer to
Terence. The ambiguities are possible precisely because English has no specialized anaphor-only form that differs from the pronoun.

The inflections of *is* and its counterparts *ea* (feminine) and *id* (neuter) are shown in Table 22.

**Table 22: Unbound Anaphor.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th></th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Plural</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td><em>is</em></td>
<td><em>ea</em></td>
<td><em>id</em></td>
<td><em>eī</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td><em>eius</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>eōrum</em></td>
<td><em>eārum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td><em>eī</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>eīs</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td><em>eum</em></td>
<td><em>eam</em></td>
<td><em>id</em></td>
<td><em>eōs</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td><em>eō</em></td>
<td><em>eā</em></td>
<td><em>eō</em></td>
<td><em>eīs</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alone in the early-Latin corpus, Ennius sometimes has the unbound anaphor with initial /s/ rather than /e/, for example with *sam* for *eam* in (187).

\[(187)\] Nec quisquam comes sapientia quae perhibetur in somnis vidit prius quam [sam] discere coepit.

‘Nor in dreams has anyone seen wisdom, which knowledge is considered [to be], before he has begun to learn it.’ (Enn. *Ann.* 229-230)

*Is* can be either pronominal or adnominal. In (188) *is* refers back to the NP *Iovem* and is pronominal.

\[(188)\] Etiam, histriones anno cum in proscaenio hic Iovem, invocarunt, venit, auxilio is fuit.

‘Yes, last year when the actors on the stage here called on Jupiter, [he] came, he was helpful.’ (Pl. *Amph.* 91-92)
In (189) is is also pronominal, referring back to the indefinite entity defined in the previous clause.

(189) \[Qui_is, eorum non ita iuraverit, quod is legerit omne pro eo argentum nemo dabit\]
\[neque debetur.\]

‘Whoever of them has not so sworn, no one will pay or be owed silver for anything he has gathered.’ (Cato Agr. 144)

Adnominal is appears in (190) in the PP de iis rebus, where iis is a variant of the more usual ablative plural form eis.

(190) \{Donicum pecuniamigerit aut satisfecerit aut deligarit,\}
\[pecus et familia, quae illic erit, pigneri sunt\]i.
\[Siquid de iis rebus controversiae erit, Romae iudicium fiat.\]

‘Until someone has paid money or security or has assigned the debt, the herds and servants, whatever is there, will be held as pledge. If any part of these matters is controversial, let there be judgment in Rome.’ (Cato Agr. 149)

The antecedent of iis is the legal procedures just mentioned rather than a particular lexical NP.

This use as a propositional anaphor is common. In other examples, is refers to an entity construed through a proposition such as a relative clause, either definite or indefinite. Examples of the latter function are in (191-193).

(191) \[Ibi ex oraclo voce divina edidit Apollo puerum…\]i k\[primus Priamo qui foret post-illa\]

98
'Then with his divine voice Apollo gave forth that Priam should forebear to take up the first boy who would be born to him afterward, that he would be a tragedy for Troy, a pest for Pergamum.' (Enn. Trag. 46-49)

(192) *Proin videi ne [quemj,...] tu...i*...i deutesi

...aeque ac pecus],...i sapientia...i munitum...i

*egregie geratj, te-que regno expellat.*

'Then take care lest the one you consider to be as dull as a cow, that one should bear a heart fortified with knowledge and drive you out of the kingdom.' (Acc. Fab. 32-34)

(193) *Quii in his agris praedia vendiderint, [eosij,...] pigeat [...vendidisse].*

*Those who have sold farms in this region, it should cause them regret to have sold [them] / [them] to have sold them.’ (Cato Agr. 1)

Although *eos* in (193) could morphologically refer back to *agris*, given the frequent use of *is* in collocation with a relative pronoun it is more likely to refer to the *qui* defined in the preceding clause.

In (194), expanded from (172), both *id signum* and *ea signa* refer back to the *torulus.*

(194) *Tum meo patri autem {torulus}i inerit {aureus sub*}

---

36 The literal meaning of this verb refers to the custom of a Roman *paterfamilias* ‘taking up’ a newborn as his own. (Supposedly the child was placed on the ground in front of the doorway to the house, and it was the *paterfamilias*’s prerogative to accept the child as his own or not.) In this way the child was literally ‘raised’ by the father.

37 This is a pun on *pecus* ‘cattle’ and *grex* ‘herd, flock’. *Egregius* is something literally ‘out of the flock’, i.e. extraordinary in a good sense, based on the (patrician) Roman concept that the ‘crowd’ is inferior to the (aristocratic) individual.

38 Although *ea signa* is plural, it clearly refers back to *torulus aureus*, as does the singular *id signum*. The failure of agreement in *ea signa* may be interpreted on the one hand as colloquial exaggeration and on the other as stylistic variation.
‘But then my father will have a golden knot under his hat. Amphitrion will not have that sign. No one of those in the household will be able to see those signs.’ (Pl. Amph. 144-147)

A common use of the unbound anaphor is to recall the closest NP entity, for example

mulier in (195).

In (196) adnominal eam is maximally disjoint from the noun sollicitudinem, but it immediately follows a series of four propositions to which it refers; several of those clauses also contains a form of is. The dialog picks up with Pleusicles’ response after the old man Periplectomenus has asked the younger Pleusicles what is bothering him.

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{obicere},
&\text{neque}
&\text{te decora neque}
&\text{tuis}
&\text{virtutibus},
&\text{[eam\ldots]} \\
&\text{te expetere ex opibus}
&\text{summis}
&\text{mei}
&\text{[ea\ldots]} \\
&\text{honoris gratia}
&\text{mihi -que amanti}
&\text{ire}
&\text{opitulatum]} \\
&\text{fugere}
&\text{facere facinora],
&\text{quae}
&\text{istaec\ldots} \\
&\text{pudet} \\
&\text{...me tibi in senecta obicere sollicitudinem].}
\end{align*}
\]
‘For me to throw onto you at this time of your life childish actions, ones not worthy of you or your excellence; for [me] to ask you to go help me when I’m in love and for the sake of my honor, all with your best effort; and for you to do those deeds which [a man your] age is accustomed to flee from rather than pursue, it shames me to throw that anxiety to you in your old age.’  (Pl. Mil. 618-623)

Like the final *eam* in (196), *id* in (197) refers to the previous proposition.

(197)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Mitto}_i & \quad \text{i}am \quad \text{[osculari atque amplexari]}_i, \quad [\text{id}_j \quad \text{nil}] \\
\text{pass-1-S} & \quad \text{now} \quad \text{kiss- INFIN-DEPON} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{embrace- INFIN-DEPON} \quad \text{ANA-N-S-ACC} \quad \text{nothing-N-S-ACC}
\end{align*}
\]

\text{puto}_i.  

‘Now I don’t mention kissing and embracing, I think it [to be] nothing.’  (Ter. Heau. 900-901)

As with the demonstratives, *is* can also be co-indexed with multiple entities in the same sentence. An example is in (198).

(198)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\{\text{Flagitium hominis}\}_{i} & \quad \text{qui}_{i} \quad \text{dixit}_{i} \quad \text{mihi} \quad [\{\text{suam uxorem}\}_{j}] \\
\text{disgrace-N-S-NOM} & \quad \text{human-M-S-GEN} \quad \text{REL-M-S-NOM} \quad \text{say-3-S-PERF} \quad \text{I-S-DAT} \quad \text{own-F-S-ACC} \quad \text{wife-F-S-ACC}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hanc}_k & \quad \text{arcessituram}_j \quad \text{esse}, \quad [\text{se}_j \quad \text{eamk}...] \quad \text{negat}_j \\
\text{this-F-S-ACC} & \quad \text{summon-PART-FUT-F-S-ACC} \quad \text{be- INFIN} \quad \text{ANA-F-S-NOM} \quad \text{ANA-ACC} \quad \text{ANA-F-S-ACC} \quad \text{deny-3-S}
\end{align*}
\]

\text{[...morarier].}  

‘[He’s a] disgrace of a man who told me his wife would invite her; she denies she wants her.’  (Pl. Cas. 553)

Note in (198) that *ea* refers to the closest nominal form, *arcessituram*, which is a participle inflected for [+ feminine] in agreement with the earlier NP *suam uxorem*.

### 5.3.3.2 Bound Anaphor

The syntactically bound anaphor is *se*. Having the properties [+ anaphor, - pronoun], *se* is reflexive. It has no nominative case form. The paradigm is in Table 23. The lack of a nominative form for *se* is easily explained with respect to infinitival complements. Since ECM means the infinitival subject is assigned accusative case, no nominative form of *se* would be expected in ECM. With control structures, the empty category PRO serves as infinitival subject.
The few contexts in which nominative case is assigned to an infinitival subject are discussed below in sections 6.4 and 7.2, but no texts at all from early Latin have a nominative form of *se*.

Table 23: Bound Anaphor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td><em>suī</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td><em>sibi</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td><em>sē(sē)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td><em>sē(sē)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contrast between the anaphors *is* and *se* can be seen in example (199).

(199) *Ait*$_{i}$ *[hanc]$_{k}$ dedisse me$_{j}$ sibi$_{i}$ atque [eam]$_{k}$ {meae} uxori$_{1}$ surrupisse*.

‘He says I gave this woman to him [lit. ‘himself’] and stole her from my wife.’ (Pl. *Men.* 480-481)

The null matrix subject is third-person singular, as indicated by the inflection on the verb *ait*.

Co-indexed with the matrix subject is the bound anaphor *sibi*, which is assigned dative case as the goal of the embedded infinitive *dedisse* ‘to have given’. Note that the main (pro) and embedded subjects (*me*, overt in the first embedded clause and null through coordination in the second) are disjoint. *Eam* in the second embedded clause refers back to *hanc* in the previous clause and, like *hanc*, is the direct object of its infinitive.

---

$^{39}$ The reduplicated form *sese* occurs in 29 (31%) of 95 embedded contexts in the corpus.
In (200) both the bound anaphor *sese* and the unbound anaphor *is* refer to same entity, the persons described by the relative clause. The bound form *sese* occurs when those persons direct the verbal action of *volunt* toward themselves, while *is* is used when a separate entity (the referent of *ego*) directs the action of *do* toward them.

(200) *Qui [sese adfines esse ad causandum] volunt de virtute, is ego cernundi do postestatem omnibus.*

‘Those who want [lit. ‘themselves’] to be together in pleading the cause of virtue, to all them I give the power of determining [the outcome].’ (Pac. *Trag.* 39-40)

Example (201) shows two distinct referents of the unbound anaphor, with one of those referents co-indexed to the bound form *sibi*. The referent of *id* is not literally to *nil* ‘nothing’, but the implied entity of ‘something’ that be might deserved.

(201) *Ego, Charine, [neutiquam officium] liberis esse hominis*.

‘Charinus, I think it to be by no means the duty of a free man, when he deserves nothing, to demand that it be given to him [lit. ‘himself’] as a favor.’ (Ter. *And.* 330-331)

An example of the bound anaphor as a partitive genitive is in (202), where *sui* is the object of the adjective *memor* ‘mindful, remembering’.

(202) *Unum hoc scio, [hanc meritam esse] ut memor esses sui.*

‘I know this one thing, that this woman has deserved that you should be mindful of her [lit. ‘of herself’].’ (Ter. *And.* 281)
Because of null pronoun settings (see section 5.4), the accusative form *se* has the option of being either overt or non-overt in ECM clauses. In (203) *se* is overt, agreeing with the matrix subject *Iuppiter*.

(203)  

\[
\text{Donec cum tonitru voce missa ex aethere [adulterum, se]} \]

\[\text{se, Iuppiter, confessus, est.}\]

‘Then with a voice sent with the thunder from the upper air, Jupiter has confessed he is an adulterer.’ (Pl. *Amph.* 9-10)

Example (204) has the infinitival subject co-indexed with the main subject, but *se* is not occur in the embedded clause.

(204)  

\[
\text{Ait [pro, tibi uxorem dare hodie].}\]

‘He says [he] is giving you a wife today.’ (Ter. *And.* 353-354)

The issue of the optionality of *se* in ECM clauses is discussed further under section 6.5.5.

Since the *se* anaphor is bound within its domain, the antecedent must be clear (although not necessarily overt, because of pro) and thus there is no need for an overt [number] or [gender] distinction. In (205) *se* is co-indexed with the [+ masculine, + singular] NP *Chremes*.

(205)  

\[
\text{Chremes, qui [denegarat, [se, commissurum, mihi, \{gnatam suam\}, uxorem, \{id, mutavit, quom, [me]\}, immutatum, videt,?]]}.\]

‘Did Chremes, who had denied he would entrust his daughter to me as a wife, change that when he saw I [was] unchanged?’ (Ter. *And.* 241-242).

Examples (206-207) also have overt NPs that are [+ masculine, + singular] co-indexed with the bound anaphor.

(206)  

\[
\text{Verum hercle opinor, [fuisse Phaniam, hoc, certo scio].}\]

104
‘But indeed I think it was Phania, I know this for certain, he said he was Rhamnusian.’ (Ter. And. 929-930)

(207) \(\text{Conspicit}_{i} \quad \text{inde} \quad [\text{sibi}_{i} \quad \text{data}_{i}] \quad \text{Romulus}_{i} \quad [\ldots \text{esse} \quad \text{propritim}]\)

perceive-3-S-PERF then ANA-DAT give-PPP-N-PL-ACC Romulus-M-S-NOM be-INFIN favorably

\(\text{auspicio} \quad \text{regni} \quad \text{stabilita}_{i} \quad \text{scamma}_{i} \quad \text{solum}_{i} \quad \text{que}\).

divination by birds-N-S-ABL kingdom-N-S-GEN make firm-PPP-N-PL-ACC bench-N-PL-ACC soil-N-S-ACC -and

‘Then Romulus perceived by the auspice that the throne and territory of the kingdom had been favorably given to him [lit. ‘to himself’].’ (Enn. Ann. 99-100)

Examples (208-209) have a [+ feminine, + singular] referent co-indexed with \(\text{se}\).

(208) \(\text{Male} \quad \text{mi}_{i} \ldots \quad \text{uxor}_{i} \quad [\ldots \text{sesi}_{i} \quad \text{fecisse}] \quad \text{censet}_{i}\).

badly I-S-DAT wife-F-S-NOM ANA-ACC do-INFIN-PERF believe-3-S

‘My wife thinks she behaved badly to me.’ (Pl. Men. 668)

(209) \(\text{iam} \quad \text{prius} \quad \text{haec}_{i} \quad [\text{se}_{i} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{Pamphilo}_{i} \quad \text{gravidam}_{i} \ldots] \quad \text{dixit}_{i}\).

now before this-F-S-NOM ANA-ACC from Pamphilus-M-S-NOM heavy-F-S-ACC say-3-S-PERF

[\ldots \text{esse}].

be-INFIN

‘Already before this woman said she was pregnant by Pamphilus.’ (Ter. And. 512-513)

Examples (210-212) have \(\text{se} \)'s antecedent as [+ masculine, + plural].

(210) \(\text{Clientes}_{i} \quad \text{sibi}_{i} \ldots \quad \text{omnes}_{i} \quad \text{volunt}_{i} \quad [\ldots \text{esse} \quad \text{multos}_{i}]\).

client-M-PL-NOM REL-M-PL-NOM all-M-PL-NOM want-3-PL be-INFIN many-M-PL-NOM

‘Everyone wants many clients for himself.’ (Pl. Men. 574-575)

(211) \(\text{ut} \quad \text{adulescentuli}_{i} \quad [\text{vobis}_{i} \quad \text{placere}_{i} \ldots] \quad \text{studeant}_{i} \quad [\ldots \text{potius}]\).

as youth-DIMINUT-M-PL-NOM you-PL-DAT please-INFIN be eager for-3-PL-SUBJ rather

\(\text{quam} \quad \text{sibi}_{i}\).

than ANA-DAT

‘as the young would aim to please you rather than themselves.’ (Ter. Heau. 51-52)

(212) \(\text{Factores}_{i} \quad \text{qui}_{i} \quad \text{oleum}_{i} \quad \text{fecerint}_{i} \quad \text{omnes}_{i} \quad \text{iuranto}_{i} \quad [\text{sesi}_{i} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{fundo}]\).

maker-M-PL-NOM REL-M-PL-NOM olive oil-N-S-ACC make-3-PL-FUTPERF all-M-PL-NOM swear-3-PL-IMPERAT-FUT

\(\text{aut} \quad \text{ad} \quad \text{dominium} \quad \text{aut} \quad \text{ad} \quad \text{custodem} \quad [\text{sesi}_{i} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{fundo}]\).

or to master-M-S-ACC or to guardian-M-S-ACC ANA-ACC from farm-N-S-ABL
‘All the producers who have made olive oil shall swear either to the master or to the guardian that they have not, nor has anyone else, stolen through any stratagem of their own any olive oil or olives from the farm of Lucius Manlius.’ (Cato Agr. 145)

Given the bound anaphor’s lack of overt feature marking for [gender] and [number], the antecedent of *se* is potentially ambiguous. For example, in (213) *sibi* could refer back to either *eundem* ([+ masculine, + singular]) or the [+ masculine, + plural] pro subject of the main verb. Since this citation is the entire fragment of a larger part, no co-text is available to disambiguate. Nonetheless, Calypso figures in the *Odyssey*, so *eundem* must be Odysseus himself, and the epic tale resolves the intended meaning of *sibi*: it is co-indexed with *eundem*.

(213) \[Eundem_sibi_k procreasse per Calypsonem]_autumant_.

‘They say that same man procreated sons for himself with Calypso.’ (Pac. Frag. 11-12)

In examples like (212) *sese*’s antecedent is the subject of the main verb, so the anaphor is bound across the clausal boundary. Since the embedded clause is ECM, the so-called exceptionality that assigns accusative case to the embedded subject could also assign co-indexing. But example (214) shows that co-indexing is made even without ECM in the embedded clause.

(214) \[prok_proj \text{[orare prok]}_iussit, [si } se_k \text{amesk}]_era_k_.

‘He ordered [me] to beg [you], lady, if you love him to come to him right away.’ (Ter. And. 687)

---

40 The name L(ucius) Manlius is used here as the generic farm owner, equivalent to John Doe in a legal formulary such as this. Roman first names including Lucius are conventionally abbreviated, even on legal documents and monuments.
The anaphor is bound in two dependent clauses, first in the conditional headed by *si* ‘*if*’ and then in the indirect command headed by *ut* ‘*that*’. Similarly in (215), *se* occurs across different clauses in an object-control structure.

(215) \( I_i \) \( s' \) ‘\( is_{i_1} \) \( iube_{i_2} \) \( pro_{j} \) \( [transire \ huc \ [quantum \ possessit_{i_3}]], \) \( [se_{j} \ ut \ videant_{k} \ domi \ familiare_{s_k}]. \)

‘Please go, order [her] to cross over to here as soon as she can so that the people in the household will see her at home.’ (Pl. *Mil*. 182-184)

Example (216) illustrates how the anaphor remains bound even across embedded clauses with disjoint subjects.

(216) \( \{Hanc \ fidem\} \ sibi_{i_1} \ldots \) \( me_{j} \ obsecravit_{i} \ [qui \ se_{i_1} \ sciret_{i} \ [pro_{j} \ obj \ non \ deserturum_{i_1}] \ [\ldots ut \ darem_{j}]. \)

‘[She] begged me to give her this pledge, so that she’d know I won’t desert her.’ (Ter. *And*. 401-402)

It is interesting to note the relative closeness of *sibi* to the first word with an overt binding feature, *obsecravit* in (216). In contrast, *sibi* in (217) is more distant from the clause boundary.

(217) \( pro_{i} \ dixit_{i} \ [a \ decem-viris \ parum \ bene \ sibi_{i} \ cibaria_{i_1}] \ [curata_{j} \ esse]. \)

‘He said the food supplies hadn’t been taken care of by the commissioners very well for him [lit. ‘*for himself*’].’ (Cat. *Or*. 58)

Sentence (218) provides another example of long-distance anaphora. Preceding *secum* there are two potential antecedents, both [+ masculine, + singular]: the pro subject of *provocavit* and the overt *quis*. The null subject yields the more felicitous reading.

(218) \( Primores_{i_1} \ procerum \ provocavit_{i} \ nomine \ si \ esset_{k} \)

\( quis_{k} \ qui_{k} \ [se_{i} \ \cum\ldots] \ vellet_{k} \ [\ldots cernere]. \)
‘He called forth the leading men of the chiefs by name [to see] if there were anyone who’d want to fight with him.’  (Acc. Trag. 310-311)

In (219) the pro subject of *volt* is the antecedent of *se* in a doubly embedded clause, skipping across the *te scire* clause with a disjoint subject.

(219)  

`Non volt you-S-ACC [te you-S-ACC scire know-INFIN [sei ANA-ACC redisse return-INFIN-PERF] etiam even et et tuom your-M-S-ACC]

conspectum sight-M-S-ACC fugitati. flee-INFIN`

‘He doesn’t want you to know he’s returned and he even flees from your sight.’  (Ter. Heau. 433-434)

A summary of overt *se*’s clausal binding is in Table 24; the clause types are discussed in detail in chapter 6.

Table 24: Overt Local and Non-Local Se by Clause Type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Clause</th>
<th>Bound Anaphor Se</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Distant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interjection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Control</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Control</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal Control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentential Control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject Control ~ ECM</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal ECM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic ECM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcI</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the table shows, the clause domain for *se* is different across the two main clause types, control and ECM. In control clauses, 15 (43%) of 35 instances of *se* bind within the local domain, while overt *se* in ECM clauses is locally bound in 152 (76%) of 200 cases. Because of the much greater incidence of *se* in ECM than in control clauses, overall *se* occurs locally in 170 (71%) of 238 instances. Note that while *se* occurs most often in control subjects with long-distance binding, for subject-control clauses 12 (86%) of 14 instances have local control. Within ECM clauses, the greatest frequency of local binding for *se* is with Acl structures, with 125 (78%) of 160 instances.

Other languages not directly related to Latin that license an anaphor whose antecedent crosses the clausal boundary include Japanese, Icelandic, and Norwegian. In these languages, the antecedent must be the subject of its clause, but diachronic evidence from Latin shows no such restriction (Bertocchi, p. 444). The sole early-Latin example presented by Bertocchi has no infinitival complement and is thus excluded from the present study’s corpus. Of the 187 occurrences of *se* in infinitival complements in the corpus, only 2 (1%) have a non-subject antecedent. These unusual examples are shown in (220-221).

(220) *Ibi* ego *audivi* ex *illo* [ses*ese* esse *Atticum*].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IBI</th>
<th>EGO</th>
<th>AUDIVI</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>ILO</th>
<th>SES<em>ESE</em></th>
<th>ESE</th>
<th>ATTICUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>there</td>
<td>I-N-S</td>
<td>hear-I-S-PERF</td>
<td>out of</td>
<td>that-M-S-ABL</td>
<td>ANA-ACC</td>
<td>be-INFIN</td>
<td>Athenian-M-S-ACC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘There I heard from the man himself he’s an Athenian.’ (Ter. And. 927)

(221) *Quando* imago *est* huius *in* me, certum *est* [pro*prok* hocinem*hominem* eludere].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUANDO</th>
<th>IMAGO</th>
<th>EST</th>
<th>HUIUS</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>CERTUM</th>
<th>EST</th>
<th>PRO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>when</td>
<td>appearance-F-S-NOM</td>
<td>be-3-S</td>
<td>this-M-S-GEN</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>I-S-ABL</td>
<td>decide-PPP-N-S-NOM</td>
<td>be-3-S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human-M-S-ACC</td>
<td>trick-INFIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘When I look like him [lit. ‘his appearance is on me’], I’m sure to trick him.’ (Pl. Amph. 265)

In Bertocchi’s early-Latin example (from a text excluded from this corpus), the antecedent of the long-distance anaphor is a dative possessor. In (220) the antecedent *illo* is a source. The antecedent *me* in (221) is location. Both of these θ-roles are low on the thematic hierarchy, and
it has been shown that higher-ranking thematic roles function enough like subjects that they too can serve as antecedents in long-distance anaphora (Giorgi, 1983, p. 315). This means the early-Latin examples shown here are atypical. Benedicto (1991, pp. 180-181) also adduces examples from classical Latin in which the antecedent is actually a lower-ranking thematic role. Those examples are analyzed as being in the Topic position of the sentence, but no analogous citations are found in the corpus of early Latin.

5.4 EMPTY CATEGORIES

Latin has four categories of non-overt nominals: NP-traces, wh-traces, PRO, and pro. The two types of traces are not the focus here and will not be discussed further. Instead, the discussion focuses on the binary opposites pro and PRO.

First, it is important to note that shared constituents of any kind are typically omitted. In example (222) the shared NP herbae is non-overt (i.e. in accusative form herbas) as the object of eximito.

(222) Simul herbae, inceperint, [nasci], eximito, pro,

‘As soon as the weeds have begun to grow, take [them] out.’ (Cato Agr. 48)

In (223) the direct object of amittere in the final clause is omitted through coordination with the NP ei, the goal of dare ‘to give’.

(223) Ita -n tandem, quaeso, item ut meretricem, ubi abusus,
sis, pro, mercedem, dare lex, iubet, ei, atque
amittere pro?

‘So is it true, I ask [you], when you’ve abused her like a prostitute, the law orders [you] to give restitution to her and send [her] away?’ (Ter. Phor. 413-414?)
In (224) both the direct object me and the infinitive novisse are omitted in the second embedded clause through coordination.

(224) proi negas\textsubscript{i} [proi novisse me], negas\textsubscript{i} [proi patrem meum]?  

‘Do you deny [you] know me, do you deny [you know] my father?’ (Pl. Men. 750)

Example (225) has a similar omission of an NP (the direct object haec) and an infinitive (legere).

(225) [{\textit{Manium} Manilium\textsubscript{j}} Persium\textsubscript{k} -ve haec\textsubscript{i} legere] nolo\textsubscript{i},  

[{	extit{Junium} Congus\textsubscript{m} pro]} volo\textsubscript{i}.

‘I don’t want Manius Manilius or Persius to read these things, I want Junius Congus [to read them].’ (Luc. Sat. 633-634)

In (226) three coordinated items are omitted: the NPS illum and hanc and the infinitive habere in the object-control clause.

(226) Tibi\textsubscript{i} pro\textsubscript{i} sine\textsubscript{i} igitur, si pro\textsubscript{i} [tuom\textsubscript{m}] negas\textsubscript{i} [...me\textsubscript{i}]  

nor illum\textsubscript{m} hanc\textsubscript{m} perpetuo habere neque [me\textsubscript{k} permiti][pro\textsubscript{k}]

‘This seems so to you, but I think neither that he’ll be able to keep her forever nor that I’ll be able to allow [him to keep her].’ (Ter. And. 563-564)

Even when the clause structures are different, a coordinated constituent may still be null, as with the controllee illum in (226). Another example is in (227).

(227) Sic pro\textsubscript{i} sine\textsubscript{i} igitur, si pro\textsubscript{i} [tuom\textsubscript{m}] negas\textsubscript{i} [...me\textsubscript{i}] esse], [PRO\textsubscript{i} abire liberum\textsubscript{i}].

‘So therefore, if you deny I’m yours, allow me to go away free.’ (Pl. Men. 1028)

Overt me is the AcI subject in the negas clause, and its non-overt form is the controllee in the abire clause. In (228) the bound anaphor se is not overt as the subject of the second and third AcI clauses, nor is there any overt NP for austellos as a later embedded subject.

111
‘That famous king Cotys used to say he knew just these two winds, the south and the north [wind], very well, [he] didn’t know those gentle south winds [formed] out of the rain cloud, nor did [he] think [they] existed.’  (Luc. Sat. 544-546)

Finally, example (229) shows how the anaphor se, intended as both subject and object in the first embedded clause and subject in the second one, is overt only once.

‘But Granius [says] he doesn’t despise himself and [he] hates arrogant kings.’  (Luc. Sat. 609-610)

Note that se as AcI object of the contemnere clause is necessary. Otherwise, the direct object would be null through coordination with reges superbos, which would be both contradictory and pragmatically odd with the coordinating conjunction et ‘and’.

5.4.1 Null Subject (pro)

For continuous subjects, more usual than an overt pronoun is the null form pro (Vincent, 2000, pp. 38-40; Bolkestein & van de Grift, 1994, p. 293; Maraldi, 1985, p. 44). Also known as zero anaphora, pro is interpreted by default as being co-indexed with the closest antecedent topic in grammatical agreement with respect to [case], [number], and [gender] or deictically with first- or second-person (i.e. discourse participants).
Compared with some other pro-drop languages, Latin has relatively loose constraints on pro. For instance, pro occurs frequently in coordinated sentences that share the same grammatical subject, as in (230).

(230) *Quippe* \{illi iniqui\}_i ius, ignorant neque pro\_subj pro\_obj tenent.

‘Indeed, those evil [people] don’t know the law, nor do [they] uphold [it].’  (Pl. *Amph.* 37)

Since the two verbs *ignorant* and *tenent* are inflected for third-person plural, they agree grammatically with the nominative plural NP *illi iniqui* ‘those evil (people)’.

In (231), the interaction between participants A and B\(^{41}\) sounds like the banter between stand-up comedians, where the joke here relates to A’s wife – and ultimately the joke is on him.

The wife is first mentioned overtly as *tu*a *uxor* and subsequently only with subject pro.

(231) B: \textit{Sed} \{tua morosa\}_i -ne uxor, quaeso est?

A: \textit{Va!} Rogas?

B: \textit{Qui tandem}?

A: \textit{Taedet mentionis quae} mihi ubi domum adveni, adsedi, extemplo savium dat ieiuna anima.

B: \textit{Pro} nil peccat i de savio; ut devomas pro\_subj

Vult quod foris potaveris.

‘B: But I ask you, is your wife moody?

A: Ha, you ask?

B: Well, and?

---

\(^{41}\) The speakers in this dialog are identified as only A and B; the citation here picks up with a line spoken by B.
A: It’s tedious to talk about her; whenever I’ve come home and sat down beside her, right away she kisses me with a hungry breath.

B: She makes no mistake with that kiss; she wants you to vomit up what you’ve drunk away from home.’ (Caec. Fab. 151-155)

In example (232) there are three distinct entities that co-index with subject pro in later clauses.

(232) Mercatum \{asotum filium\}i, extrudit pater\_i, Is\_i peregre
missus\_i redimit ancillam\_k hospitis amore captus\_i, pro\_k-obj
advehit\_i, pro\_i-subj nave exilit\_i, pater\_j advolat\_j, vix
pro\_j-subj {visam ancillam\_k deperit\_j, Cuius pro\_k-subj sit\_k
pro\_j-subj percontatur\_j.

‘A father sends his dissolute son off to trade. Sent abroad, he buys his host’s maid after falling in love and takes her home. He leaves the ship, his father hurries toward him and falls madly in love with her after barely seeing her. He inquires who she belongs to.’ (Pl. Mer. Pro.)

Since the referents of pro switch throughout the passage, the listener/reader has a heavy processing burden and ambiguity is certainly possible.

Although pro is the preferred form for continuous subjects, it is not obligatory. In embedded clauses, pro is especially favored with coordinated subjects. Out of 200 cases of coordinated embedded subjects in the corpus, only 10 (5%) are overt. Examples of the typical coordinated pro form are shown below. In (233-236) the embedded subjects are disjoint from the main subject.

(233) Atque [huius uxorem...] volo\_i [...te\_] [pro\_j esse] adsimulare].

‘And I want you to pretend [you] are his wife.’ (Pl. Mil. 908)

(234) Nunc [\{equos iunctos\}_k...] iubes\_i [...PRO\_j capere...] me\_j
now horse-M-PL-ACC yoke-PPP-M-PL-ACC order-2-S take- INFIN I- S-ACC
untamed-M-PL-ACC and into carriage-M-S-ACC climb in-INFIN

‘Now you order me take yoked untamed, wild horses and [me] to climb into the carriage.’ (Pl. Men. 862-864)

(235) **Nam** si sensorit te timidum... pateri [...] esse],
for if sense-3-S-FUTPERF you-S-ACC fearful-M-S-ACC father-M-S-NOM be-INFIN

think-3-S-FUT-DEPON deserve-INFIN-PERF blame-F-S-ACC

‘For if your father senses you are afraid, he’ll think [you] have deserved reproach.’ (Ter. Phor. 205-206)

(236) **Sed** virum vera virtute vivere animatum addecet...que
but man-M-S-ACC true-F-S-ABL excellence-F-S-ABL live-INFIN animate-PPP-M-S-ACC be fitting-3-S-bravely -and harmless-M-S-ACC against enemy-M-PL-ACC

‘But it is right for a man to live animated by true excellence and [for him] to bravely stand innocent against his enemies.’ (Enn. Trag. 308-309)

Note that coordinated subjects are null in embedded clauses of different types. Example (233) has pro in either an ECM clause with *volo* or (as shown) in an AcI clause, depending on the clause boundaries that one interprets. In (234) pro is in an object-control subjects, in (235) in AcI, and in (236) in an ECM deontic clause with an impersonal verb. Thus, the type of embedded clause does not appear to have any effect on whether coordinated subjects are pro or overt.

Even when the embedded coordinated subjects are co-indexed with the main subject, pro is common, as shown in examples (237-240).

(237) **Nam** [mei perbitere], [proi illis] opitularier {quovis exitio}]
for I-S-ACC perish-INFIN that-M-PL-DAT aid-INFIN-DEPON INDEFIN-N-S-ABL death-N-S-ABL
cupioi, dum prosimi,
desire-I-S while be useful-I-S-SUBJ

‘For I want [lit. ‘me’] to perish, [me] to aid them by any sort of death, so long as I may be of use.’ (Pac. Trag. 308-309)

(238) {Erus meus}i ita {magnus moechus}i mulierum esti, ut
master-M-S-NOM my-M-S-NOM thus great-M-S-NOM adulterer-M-S-NOM woman-F-PL-GEN be-3-S as
‘My master is as greater an adulterer with women as I believe no one has ever been or [no one] will ever be.’ (Pl. Mil. 774-776).

(239) [Babus] [pabulum] hoc modo parari [pro] [dari-que] oportet.  
'It is fitting for fodder to be prepared in this manner and [for fodder] to be given to the cattle.' (Cato Agr. 54)

Again, note the different clause types in which coordinated pro subjects occur: ECM with cupio in (237), AcI in (238), deontic ECM with an impersonal verb in (239), and object control in (240).

Examples (241-242) have both pro and overt coordinated subjects in the embedded clauses.

(241) Dic me hic oppido esse invitam atque adservari], verum [aliquo pacto verba me his daturam esse] et [pro venturam].  
‘Say I’m here in town unwillingly and [I] oppose [it], but some way or another I’ll send word to them and [I] will come.’ (Ter. Heau. 734-735)

(242) [Fortunam] [insanam] esse et caecam et brutam] perhibent; philosopi, [saxo -que pro instare in globoso... praedicant; [...volubilei], quia quo id saxum]m inpulerit fors,  

116
The philosophers maintain that Fortune is insane and blind and insensible and they claim that [it] stands on a round rolling stone, because wherever chance has pushed that stone they say Fortune falls there.’ (Pac. Frag. 37-39)

For comparison, some of the rare overt coordinated embedded subjects are in shown in (243-244). In (243) the embedded subjects are med and me, which are co-indexed with the matrix subject as well.

(243) Per Iovem iuro, [med, esse] neque [me, falsum dicere].

‘I swear by Jupiter that I’m [Sosia] and that I’m not lying.’ (Pl. Amph. 435)

In (244) the coordinated embedded subjects, two overt examples of me, are disjoint from the main subject.

(244) Et quom [tej gravidam] et quom [tej pulchre plenam]

‘And I rejoice since I see you [are] pregnant and you [are] beautifully swollen.’ (Pl. Amph. 681)

A summary of overt and null subjects by clause type (discussed in chapter 6) is in Table 25. These data show that the overall rate for subject pro is 33%, or a null subject in one third of all infinitival contexts. The rate is much higher in impersonal control (63%) and sentential control (91%) complements, and much lower in subject control ~ ECM clauses (15%).

Coordinated subjects in embedded clauses are summarized in Table 26. Subject-control complements are zero since the PRO infinitival subject is, by definition, null and coordinated in all instances. There is a small difference in overtness of coordinated subjects between control and ECM clauses. Control complements with a coordinate subject are null in 41 (98%) of 42 instances, while 177 (95%) of the 187 ECM coordinated subjects are null. Overall, 95% of
coordinated subjects occur as null rather than overt. While there is a strong tendency for a coordinated subject to be null, that tendency is not an absolute rule.

Table 25: Subjects by Clause Type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Clause</th>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Null</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interjection</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Clause</th>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Null</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Control</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal Control</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic Control</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentential Control</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Clause</th>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Null</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Control ~ ECM</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal ECM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic ECM</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcI</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>1,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>1,922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL                | 1,630 | 806   | 2,436 |

Out of 2,436 expected subjects in infinitival clauses excluding subject control, 806 are null. Of these, 229 (28%) are null through coordination, and another 16 (2%) are null with a relative clause.

One possible effect of pro subjects is garden-path sentences. In (245) the reader construes one meaning for the sentence up through the word *dicas*, but the addition of *dicere* in (246) requires a new reading. Without *dicere*, the sentence’s meaning is different.

(245) *At iam pro faciam ut [pro verum...] dicas...*

‘But now I’ll make it so you’ll say [something is] true.’
Table 26: Coordinated Subjects by Clause Type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Clause</th>
<th>Coordinated Subject</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overt</td>
<td>Null</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interjection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal Control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentential Control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Control ~ ECM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal ECM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic ECM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcI</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(246) *At iam pro faciam ut [pro verum... dicas [...dicere].*

‘But now I’ll make it so you’ll say [I] speak the truth.’ (Pl. *Amph.* 345)

One implication of pro-drop is that there is no expletive subject requirement. In fact, there are no Latin equivalents to expletive *it* and *there*.\(^{42}\) Consequently, early Latin also has no motivation for raising except under passivization. The few possible instances of raising found in the corpus are discussed in section 7.1.

\(^{42}\) Within the corpus, the closest to an expletive is a demonstrative subject with an impersonal verb, e.g. *Hoc dolet* ‘This [situation] hurts.’ (Enn. *Trag.* 64).
5.4.2 Null Object (pro)

When the referent is highly salient such as when referring to a participant in a conversation, even the oblique case forms of an NP may be omitted. That is, object pro is also common. One frequent example of such ellipsis is the VP, pro obj amabo lit. ‘I will love’, for ‘please’, where an understood ‘you’ is the direct object; the pronoun does not need to be specified because it is highly predictable to the addressee. Examples are in (247-249).

(247) iam, pro obj amabo, desiste, [ludos facere] atque i, now love-1-S-FUT stop-2-S-IMPERAT game-M-PL-ACC do-INFIN and go-2-S-IMPERAT

hac me -cum semul.
this-F-S-ABL 1-S-ABL -with right away

‘Now please stop playing games and come this way with me right away.’ (Pl. Men. 405)

(248) An, pro obj amabo, meretrix illa est quae illam sustulit?
but love-1-S-FUT prostitute-F-S-NOM that-F-S-NOM be-3-S REL-F-S-NOM that-F-S-ACC

‘But please, is that the prostitute who kidnapped her?’ (Pl. Cis. 564)

(249) Phaedrome mi, ne plora, pro obj amabo. Tu, me curato, ne sitiam, ego tibi, quod amas, iam huc
Phaedromus-M-S-VOC my-M-S-VOC not cry-2-S-IMPERAT love-1-S-FUT you-S-NOM I-S-ACC
care-2-S-FUT-IMPERAT lest thirst-1-S-SUBJ I-S-NOM you-S-DAT REL-N-S-ACC love-2-S now to here

adducam.
carry to-1-S-FUT

‘My Phaedromus, please don’t cry. You take care of me so I’m not thirsty, now I’ll bring here for you what you like.’ (Pl. Cur. 138-139)

These examples rely on the deictic availability of the addressee for the referent of object pro to be recovered. In other instances the referent of object pro must be found within the text itself, as in examples (250-251), repeated here from (136-137).

(250) Meruimus et ego et pater pro obj de vobis et re
earn-1-PL-PERF and I-S-NOM and father-M-S-NOM from you-PL-ABL and affair-F-S-ABL

publica.
public-F-S-ABL
‘We – my father and I – have earned [something] from you and from the republic.’ (Pl. Amph. 39-40)

(251) \{\textit{ Ea signa\}_i \ nemo horum familiarium videre \}
\begin{tabular}{cccccc}
    & \textit{ANA-N-PL-ACC} & \textit{sign-N-PL-ACC} & \textit{no one-M-S-NOM} & \textit{this-M-PL-GEN} & \textit{household member-M-PL-GEN} & \textit{see-INFIN} \\
poterit: & be able-3-S-FUT & but & you-PL-NOM & pro\_obj & videbitis. & see-2-PL-FUT \\
\end{tabular}

‘Those marks no one in the household will be able to see, but you will see [them].’ (Pl. Amph. 146-167)

In (250) the referent of pro is an indefinite that can be inferred from the fact that \textit{meruimus} ‘we have deserved’ subcategorizes for a direct object. Pro in (251) is linked to the overt NP \textit{ea signa}.

A summary of object pro by complement type is in Table 27. As the table shows, the rate for null objects in control clauses (24\%) is comparable to that in ECM complements (22\%), with the overall rate at 23\% for object pro. This rate is lower than the overall rate of 33\% for subject pro, shown in Table 25.

Direct objects obey constraints similar to those of subjects. According to Lurgahi (1997, p. 242), a direct object shared in a coordinated sentence is obligatorily omitted, as with \textit{me} in example (252).

(252) \textit{Alii\_i negant\_i \ [me\_j...]} \ [...eum\_j esse] \ [qui\_j sum\_j atque]
\begin{tabular}{cccccccc}
    & \textit{other-M-PL-NOM} & \textit{I-S-ACC} & \textit{deny-3-PL} & \textit{ANA-M-S-ACC} & \textit{be-INFIN} & \textit{REL-M-S-NOM} & \textit{be-1-S} & \textit{and} \\
excludunt\_i & close out-3-PL & pro\_j & foras. & outdoors \\
\end{tabular}

‘Some deny I’m the man who I am and they force [me] outdoors.’ (Pl. Men. 1040-1041).

Other examples of a pro object in coordinated clauses are in (253-258).

(253) \textit{ne quom hic non videant\_i me\_j \ [pro\_j conficere...]} \ [credant\_i]
\begin{tabular}{ccccccccc}
    & \textit{lest when here not see-3-PL-SUBJ} & \textit{I-S-ACC} & \textit{finish-INFIN} & \textit{believe-3-5-PL-SUBJ} \\
[...{argentum suom\}_k] & \textit{silver-N-S-ACC} & \textit{own-N-S-ACC} \\
\end{tabular}

‘lest, when they don’t see me here, they believe [I] am using up their money’ (Ter. Phor. 839)
## Table 27: Objects by Clause Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Clause</th>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Null</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Control</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Control ~ ECM</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal ECM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic Control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic ECM</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcI</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcI</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interjection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(254) Quem\textsubscript{j} metuunt\textsubscript{i} pro\textsubscript{j} oderunt\textsubscript{i}, quem\textsubscript{i} quisque\textsubscript{k} odis\textsubscript{k} \[pro\textsubscript{i}\]

periisse expetit\textsubscript{k}.

‘They hate [the one] whom they fear they hate, whom each person hates he seeks [him] to perish [lit. ‘to have perished’]’. (Enn. Frag. 410)

(255) In adulterio {uxorem tuam\textsubscript{i}}\textsubscript{j} si prehendisses\textsubscript{i}, sine iudicio

in adultery-N-S-ABL wife-F-S-ACC your-F-S-ACC if catch-2-S-PLUPERF-SUBJ without trial-N-S-ABL

inpoene pro\textsubscript{j} necares\textsubscript{i}, illa\textsubscript{j} te\textsubscript{i} si adulterares\textsubscript{i}

not punished kill-2-S-IMPERF-SUBJ that-F-S-NOM you-S-ACC if commit adultery-2-S-IMPERF-SUBJ

si-ve tu\textsubscript{i} adulterarere\textsubscript{i} [digi-...\textsubscript{i}] non auderet\textsubscript{j}

if -or you-S-NOM commit adultery-2-S-IMPERF-SUBJ-PASS finger-M-S-ABL NOT dare-3-S-IMPERF-SUBJ

[...contingere], neque ius est.

[...touch-INFIN not law-N-S-NOM be-3-S]

‘If you caught your wife in adultery you would kill [her] without a trial with impunity, [but] if she, if you committed adultery or were committed adultery against, would not dare to lay a finger on you, nor is that the law. (Cato Or. 222)

(256) Edepol te\textsubscript{i}, {mea Antiphila\textsubscript{j}}, laudo\textsubscript{i} et \[pro\textsubscript{j}\] fortunatam\textsubscript{j}

indeed you-S-ACC my-F-S-VOC Antiphila-F-S-VOC praise-1-S and [pro\textsubscript{j}] make fortunate-PPP-F-S-ACC
'I praise you indeed, my Antiphila, and I deem [you] fortunate.' (Ter. Heau. 381)

In Amphitruonis into Amphitryon-M-S-GEN turn-3-S ANA-ACC likeness-F-S-ACC all-M-PL-NOM -and ANA-M-S-ACC

essee proj censentEk servik quiK proK videntK.

‘He turns himself into Amphitryon’s shape, and all the servants who see [him] believe him to be [Amphitryon].’ (Pl. Amph. 121-122)

Respondent respond-3-PL war-N-S-ABL ANA-ACC and own-M-PL-ACC look after-INFIN-DEPON able-INFIN

‘They respond that in war, they can look after [themselves] and their own people.’ (Pl. Amph. 214)

Sentence (259) provides a rare example of overt coordinated objects, mustum. Note that the pro NP in the last clause possibly also refers to that same entity, although more logically it is co-indexed with the amphoram that holds the mustum.

[Mustum1...] si voles1 [...totum annum habere], in

amphoramk mustum1 indito1 et corticem1 oppicato1,

demititto1 projk in piscinam.

‘If you should want to keep new wine for the whole year, put the new wine into a jar and cover the cork with pitch, let [it] down into the pond.’ (Cato Agr. 120)

Examples like (259) provide counter-evidence to Luraghi’s claim that a coordinated shared object is obligatorily null. The early-Latin data show that the claim must be weakened somewhat: overt coordinated objects are rare but not outright obligatory.

When a direct object represents a continuous topic but is not in a coordinated clause, object pro is typical. Still, as with subjects, it is not required (Mulder, 1991, p. 18). An example of such a continuous object is in (260).
‘But this man’s grandfather, pleading, entrusted a treasure trove of gold to me, unbeknownst to everyone: he buried it in the middle of the hearth, begging me to guard [it] for him.’ (Pl. Aul. 6-8)

The NP *thensaurum* ‘treasure’, in the accusative case, is the grammatical direct object of both *concredidit* ‘he entrusted’ and *defodit* ‘he buried’. As the topic continues in the clause with *defodit*, it is omitted as *pro* *obj*. The anaphor *id* in the third clause is also a direct object of *servarem* ‘I should guard’. However, with the agreement feature [+ neuter] *id* cannot co-index with [+ masculine] *thensaurum*. Instead, *id* must refer back either to [+ neuter] *aurum* ‘the gold’ or to the proposition of the secret disclosed by the speaker. Clauses are assigned [+ neuter] gender, a feature that is discussed below in section 7.2.2 along with its implications for infinitival complements.

Example (261) also illustrates the omission of a second direct object encoding a continuous topic.

(261) *Salictum* *pro* *alligato.*

‘Cut the willow at its proper time, peel [it] and tightly bind [it] together.’ (Cato Agr. 33)

Here, *salictum* represents an indefinite or generic entity rather than a specific referent.

Omission of indefinite direct objects is typical, while definite objects tend to take overt anaphors (Luraghi, p. 255). However, the opposite is also claimed: [+ definite] shared direct

---

43 *Mi* is a syncopated form of the more usual dative *mihi*; the vowel is compensatorily long, making the form a useful variant for metrical purposes.
objects are frequently omitted (Mulder, p. 19). Further, Schøsler (2001, p. 288) claims that ellipsis of the direct object – whether or not coordinated – is lexically determined by the verb. Two examples cited by Mulder are from Plautus and therefore directly relevant to the issue of ellipsis in early Latin. Since Luraghi and Mulder make different claims, it is important to attempt to identify what kinds of shared direct objects are more typically omitted. Wherever possible, direct objects in the corpus were coded for [definiteness]. When not possible to distinguish, such direct objects were marked as [+ definite], so that the results conservatively err in assuming specific entities are intended unless overt markers of [- definite] status or other contextual clues indicate otherwise. No overt continuous objects representing continuous objects were found in the corpus.

A summary of null continuous-topic objects in embedded clauses is in Table 28. For counting purposes, a direct object was assumed to exist for all transitive verbs, including those like *bibere* ‘to drink’ that may omit the direct object when used generically. Since the only native speakers we have access to are the very authors contained in the present corpus, their use of an overt direct object with a particular verb was considered as evidence of that verb’s underlying subcategorization for a NP argument, even if only one such overt NP occurs in the corpus. Thus, the counts of null objects may be somewhat higher than a native speaker would consider pragmatically necessary, but nonetheless the counts do reflect native-speaker evidence.

These data show that the claims of both Luraghi and Mulder are correct: Both [+ definite] and [- definite] continuous objects are null. In fact, it is not the case that these claims are mutually exclusive. Rather, they both contain a partial truth. The majority of such objects appear to be [+ definite] entities, with only four cases from subject-control and AcI complement
clauses having a [- definite] continuous topic. In (262), the indefinite quicquam ‘anything’ is continued as a topic in the vellem clause, where it is null.

Table 28: Null Continuous-Topic Objects by Clause Type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Clause</th>
<th>Continuous Object</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definite</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>1 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interjection</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>3 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Control</td>
<td>43 98%</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Control</td>
<td>8 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal Control</td>
<td>4 80%</td>
<td>1 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic Control</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentential Control</td>
<td>4 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59 97%</td>
<td>2 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Control ~ ECM</td>
<td>10 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal ECM</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic ECM</td>
<td>14 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aci</td>
<td>24 92%</td>
<td>2 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48 96%</td>
<td>2 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>111 97%</td>
<td>4 3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(262) Diₐ meᵢ perdantᵩ si egoᵦ tuiᵦ quicquamᵦ abstuliᵦ

ni -ve [adeoᵦ abstulisse proᵦ] vellemᵦ.

‘May the gods destroy me if I have stolen anything from you or even if I should want to have stolen [anything].’ (Pl. Aul. 645-646)

In (263) the [- definite] entity identified as aliquid is the object of all three infinitives. The speaker is curious about why Menedemus is always busy doing ‘something’.

(263) Numquam tam mane egrediorᵩ neque tam vespere domum

revortorᵩ quin [teᵦ in fundo...] conspicerᵩ [fodore proᵦ aut]
‘Never do I walk outside in the morning or return home in the evening without noticing that on the farm you dig something or plow [it] or carry [it].’ (Ter. Heau. 67-69)

Not only do coordinated and continuous-topic objects tend to be null, but standalone objects are also frequently null when co-indexed with a relative pronoun. An example is in sentence (264), where the neuter relative pronoun *quod* eliminates the need for an overt object of *efficere*, similar to *what* in English (see translation). Earlier we saw that a common overt NP in such a situation is the unbound anaphor *is*.

\[(264) \text{Utinam} [\text{efficere} \ \text{pro}_j] \ \text{quod}_j \ \text{pollicitus}_i \ \text{possies}_i.\]

‘Would that you were able to carry out what you promised.’ (Pl. Men. 1103).

In (265-266) the relative clause has the verb *velle* ‘to wish’. Note that the coordinated infinitives are also null.

\[(265) [\text{Illum}_j \ \text{mi}_{k\ldots}] \ \text{aequius}_i \ \text{‘st}_j [\ldots\text{quam} \ \text{me}_k \ \text{illi}_j \ \text{pro}_j\ldots] \]

\[\text{quae}_l \ \text{volo}_k [\ldots\text{concedere}].\]

‘It’s more fair for him to yield to me than for me to [yield] to him what I want.’ (Pl. Cas. 265)

\[(266) \text{Si} [\text{mihi}_{j\ldots}] \ \text{perget}_i [\ldots\text{pro}_k\ldots] \ \text{quae}_k \ \text{volt}_i [\ldots\text{dicere}], \ \text{ea}_l \]

\[\text{quae}_l \ \text{non} \ \text{voll}_j \ \text{audiet}_j.\]

‘If he continues to say to me what he likes, he’ll hears those things that he doesn’t like.’ (Ter. And. 920)

Note that the unbound anaphor *ea* is overt in the clause with *audiet* in (266). In (267) the pro object occurs with the verb *expedire*.

\[(267) \text{Nam} [\text{quod}_l\ldots] \ \text{conabar}_i, \ \text{cum} \ \text{interventum} \ \text{est}, [\ldots\text{dicere}] \]

\[\text{nunc} \ \text{pro}_j \ \text{expedibo}_i.\]

now disentangle-1-S-FUT
‘For now I’ll reveal what I was trying to say when I was interrupted.’ (Pac. Trag. 62-63)

Example (268) has a null object with conficere.

(268)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Roget}_i & \quad \{\text{quid operis}_j\} \quad \text{siet}_j \quad \text{factum}_j \quad \text{quid}_k \\
\text{restet}_k & \quad \text{satis}_l -\text{ne} \quad \text{temperi} \quad \text{opera}_l \quad \text{sient}_l \quad \text{confecta}_l \\
\text{possit}_m & \quad -\text{ne} \quad \text{quae}_n \quad \text{reliqua}_n \quad \text{sient}_n \quad [\text{pro}_n \text{ conficere}] \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘He should ask what work has been done, what remains, whether enough of the projects have been completed on time, whether he could be able to complete what is remaining.’ (Cato Agr. 2)

Out of 1,750 expected direct objects in infinitival clauses, 399 (23%) are null (see Table 27). Of these, 109 (27%) are null through coordination (Table 28), and an additional 29 (7%) are null with a relative clause. The overall rate of object pro is comparable to the 25% occurrence of subject pro. Similarly, compared with null subjects through coordination (30%), the rate for null objects through coordination is comparable at 27%.

Finally, one notable use of object pro is when the same morphological case is assigned to antecedent and anaphor, but their syntactic functions differ. For instance, in (269-270) the co-indexed entities are both in the accusative case but for different structural reasons.

(269)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Contraxistis} & \quad \text{frontem, quia} \quad \text{tragoediam}_i \quad \text{dixit} \quad \text{futuram}_i \quad \text{hanc}_i? \\
\text{Deus} & \quad \text{sum, pro} \quad \text{commutavero.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘Are you frowning because he said this would be a tragedy? I’m a god; I’ll change [it].’ (Pl. Amph. 52-53)

(270)  
\[
\begin{align*}
[\{\text{Trapetos bonos privos}_i\} \quad \text{inpares}_i \quad \text{esse}] \quad \text{oportet, si} \\
\text{orbes}_j \quad \text{contriti}_j \quad \text{sient}_j \quad \text{ut} \quad [\text{pro}_j \text{ commutare}] \quad \text{possis}_k. \\
\end{align*}
\]

44 *Contrahere frontem* ‘to draw the brow together’ is ‘to frown’. The verb is marked for [+ perfect] tense hear because the action occurred before this sentence, although its effect still remains: the audience is frowning.
‘The oil presses should all be good and of unequal sizes, so that you can exchange [them] if the wheels are worn out.’ (Cato Agr. III)

In (269) the NP *tragoediam* ‘tragedy’ is an Acl subject of the complement governed by *dixi* ‘I said’. Thus, it is assigned accusative case structurally through ECM. In the final clause pro is co-indexed with that same NP, but this time as the direct object of its verb. Similarly, in (270) *trapatos bonos privos* ‘all good oil-presses’ is in the accusative as the ECM subject of the impersonal verb *oportet* ‘it is fitting’. The same NP recurs as pro for the accusative direct object of *commutare* ‘to exchange’. The pro objects in both these sentences reveal that once a case assignment is made to an NP, that NP obeys the duplication restraints regardless of how it got its case assignment.

5.4.3 PRO

Within a GB framework, the empty category PRO must occur in control structures. PRO with control is discussed in chapter 6, including the case assignment it receives and the infinitival tenses it licenses.

5.5 SUMMARY

Early Latin overtly marks case assignment through inflectional endings that distinguish between [gender], [number], and [case]. Overt NPs include nouns, demonstratives, and pronouns. The demonstrative system is three-way, with an intermediate space marked between ‘near’ and ‘far’ from the speaker’s viewpoint. The proximal and distal demonstratives can function not only as markers of deixis, but also as unbound anaphors; the medio-distal demonstratives serve only for deixis. The pronoun system includes first- and second-person forms that can be either deictic or anaphoric. For third-person forms, however, there is no true pronominal form. Instead, anaphors are used. The third-person anaphors occur as either unbound or bound. The formal distinction between the two anaphor types has to do with overt
feature marking for [case], [number], and [gender]. The unbound anaphor overtly marks all three features, while the bound anaphor marks only [case] and it crosses the clausal boundary in nearly one third of instances. As a result, in infinitival complements the bound anaphor may cause syntactic ambiguity because its antecedent cannot be resolved through matching any overt features of [number] or [gender].

In addition to the forms of overt NPs available, early Latin also has pro-drop for both subjects and objects. Subject pro occurs in one third of infinitival complements overall, and in 95% of coordinated contexts within infinitive clauses. Object pro is found in about one fourth of infinitival complements with transitive verbs. Thus, there are four possibilities for expressing subject and object in transitive infinitival clauses: overt subject + overt object, overt subject + pro object, pro subject + overt object, and pro subject + pro object. Given these possibilities, syntactic ambiguity is frequent because in three out of four types one or more entities is not overtly marked.
CHAPTER 6. INFINITIVAL COMPLEMENTS
IN EARLY LATIN, PART 1

A summary of how the corpus infinitives are classified is in Table 29. These basic categories are discussed in chapters 6 and 7.

Table 29: Infinitives by Category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interjection</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECM</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,828</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table shows, 52 (1%) of the infinitives could not be classified because of insufficient context. The classifications of the remaining 3,776 infinitives that could be determined are discussed below.

6.1 NOMINAL INFINITIVE

In three instances the infinitive is used a noun in a metalinguistic explanation. These examples are in (271-273).

(271) Subplantare aiunt Graeci.
trip the heels-INFIN say-3-PL Greek-M-PL-NOM

‘The Greeks say “trip the heels.”’ (Luc. Sat. 859)

(272) Abbibere, hic non multum est d siet an b.
drink-FROM-INFIN here non much-N-S-NOM be-3-s be-3-S-SUBJ or b

‘It doesn’t much matter whether there’s a <d> or <b> in abbibere [‘to drink from’ vs. adbiber ‘to drink to’; i.e. either way there is a lot of drinking involved].’ (Luc. Sat. 393)

(273) Atque adcurrere scribas d ne an c non est quod quaeras
and run to-INFIN write-2-S-SUBJ d Y/N or c not be-3-S REL-N-S-ACC ask-2-S-SUBJ
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atque labores.\textsuperscript{45}

‘And whether you should write “run to” with a $<$d$>$ or $<$c$>$ is not what you should ask about or get [yourself] worked up about.’ (Luc. Sat. 394-395)

That all three examples come from Lucilius is not surprising since Saturae ‘Satires’ are a Roman invention combining piercing observation of society with witty verse, often mocking people’s affections, including how they speak.

6.2 HISTORICAL INFINITIVE

Historical infinitives account for 47 (1\%) of the total found in the corpus. The historical infinitive occurs with a nominative (not accusative) subject, and its tense is always [+ present]. A finite verb with [+ present] tense is also common to represent past events in a more vivid way (Draeger, 1878, p. 1:230). The historical infinitive is apparently an extension of that same structure (Leumann & Hofmann, 1928, p. 591).

Example (274) is particularly revealing because it combines three finite verbs overtly marked for [+ perfect] tense, followed by finite conlocat with [+ present] tense and then the [+ present] infinitive rapere. As the action proceeds in the narrative, the tense switches from true past to historical present, and then at the critical moment the historical infinitive represents the most exciting details of the action.

\begin{equation}
\text{(274)} \quad \text{pro}\_i \quad \text{constitit}_i, \quad \text{cognovit}_i, \quad \text{sensit}_i, \quad \text{conlocat}_i, \quad \text{sesei}_i, \quad \text{in}
\end{equation}

\begin{align*}
&\text{pro}\_i \quad \text{constitit}_i, \quad \text{cognovit}_i, \quad \text{sensit}_i, \quad \text{conlocat}_i, \quad \text{sesei}_i, \quad \text{in} \\
&\text{loce}_{\text{m-S-ACC}}, \quad \text{celsum}_{\text{lofty-M-S-ACC}}, \quad \text{hinc}_{\text{from here}}, \quad \text{manibus}_{\text{hand-F-PL-ABL}}, \quad \text{rapere}_{\text{seize-INFIN}}, \quad \text{raudus}_{\text{mass-N-S-ACC}}, \quad \text{saxeum}_{\text{rocky-N-S-ACC}} \\
&\text{gran}e_{\text{large-N-S-ACC}}, \quad \text{et}_{\text{and}}, \quad \text{gr}a\text{ve}_{\text{heavy-N-S-ACC}}
\end{align*}

‘He stood still, looked around, sensed, he sets himself onto a lofty place, from here he seizes with his hands a huge and heavy rocky heap.’ (Acc. Trag. 424-425)

\textsuperscript{45} This verse provides an insight into the probable pronunciation of adcurrere in Lucilius’ time. The fact that someone would question whether to write $<$d$>$ or $<$c$>$ (i.e. /k/) suggests that prefix assimilation has taken place in the pronunciation, even if not always conventionally in the spelling.
Example (275) also provides an explicit past-tense context along with the use of the historical [+ present] indicative *venit*. The historical infinitive *negare* marks the speaker’s strong indignation at the very idea of what had been alleged – an emotional stance made more vivid by the infinitive.

(275) *Venit*<sup>46</sup> *Chremes*<sub>i</sub> *postridie ad me*<sub>j</sub> *clamitans, [indignum*<sub>k</sub> *facinus*<sub>k</sub>, *comperisse Pamphilum pro uxore habere hanc*<sub>k</sub>.

‘Chremes comes to me the next day, shouting, a terrible thing, [he] has discovered Pamphilus has this foreign woman as his wife.’ (Ter. *And*. 146-147)

From the larger context around (276), it is clear that the slave Sosia is recounting to Mercury the war in which the real Amphitryon distinguished himself – a series of past events made more dramatic by the historical infinitives.

(276) *Imperator utrimque, hinc et illinc, Iovi vota suscipere, utrimque hortari exercitum.*

‘The commander on each side, from this side and that side, offers up vows to Jupiter, from each side [the command] encourages his army.’ (Pl. *Amph*. 229-230)

Other clear-cut examples of the historical infinitive are in (277-278).

(277) *Legio*<sub>i</sub> *aggreditur*<sub>i</sub> *Romana*<sub>i</sub> *ruinas*<sub>j</sub> *mox auferre domos*<sub>k</sub>.

‘The Roman legion approaches the ruins, soon [it] takes away the houses, with the shout of the people behind [it].’ (Enn. *Ann*. 242-243)

---

<sup>46</sup> *Venit* is potentially ambiguous as to [+ present] or [+ perfect] tense since both forms are spelled the same; the difference is the length of the first vowel. The meter of this line suggests a short vowel, meaning the form is intended as [+ present] (Shipp, 1960, p. 132)
‘But when [they] came to the boundary in the place where by chance he was awaiting, and the burdened priest Orestes stood up with his sword brandished.’ (Acc. Trag. 321-322)

When the nominative is a second-person pronoun or otherwise refers to the addressee, the ‘historical’ infinitive may have the illocutionary effect of an imperative. Examples are shown in (279-282).

(279) Tu_i hic ante aedis interim speculare, ut, ubi illaec prodeat, me provoces_i.

‘Meanwhile you watch here in front of the house so that when she comes out you can call me forth.’ (Pl. Mil. 1121-1122).

(280) Tu_i, Mysis_i dum exeo, parumper opperire hic.

‘You, Mysis, wait here a little while until I come out.’ (Ter. And. 714)

(281) At tu_i ut oculos_j emungare ex capite_k per nasum_i

‘But wipe your eyes out of your head through your nose.’ (Pl. Cas. 390).

(282) Sorba_i in sapa_j condere vel pro_i siccare, arida_i

‘Put the service-berries in boiled down wine or dry [them], you should make [them] dry.’ (Cato Agr. 7)
Note how the scrambling of *tuos* in (281) is iconic in juxtaposition to *nasum*. In (282) the infinitives cannot be to express purpose, which is the effect of the clause *arida facias*; rather, they appear to be commands in order to accomplish that effect.

### 6.3 INTERJECTION

Interjections represent 34 (1%) of the corpus infinitives, and 26 (76%) of those are found in the works of Terence. An interjection is formed with an optional vocative + accusative NP subject + infinitive. Some examples are in (283-285).

(283) *O Iuppiter, [tantam\(_i\) esse in animo\(_j\) inscitiam\(_j\)]!*  
\(o\) Jupiter-M-S-VOC such-F-S-ACC be-INFIN in mind-M-S-ABL lack of knowledge-F-S-ACC

‘O Jupiter, for there to be such ignorance in [someone’s] mind!’ (Ter. And. 244)

(284) \[\{Tantum bellum\(_j\) suscitare\ldots\} conari adversarios\(_i\) \[\ldots contra\] \{bellosum genus\(_k\)\]!  
such-N-S-ACC war-N-S-ACC stir up-INFIN try-INFIN-DEPON enemy-M-PL-ACC against  
warlike-N-S-ACC race-N-S-ACC

‘For the enemy to try to stir up such a war against a warlike race!’ (Caec. Fab. 277-278)

(285) \[Nos\(_i\) esse arquatos\(_j\)]!  
I-PL-ACC be-INFIN bow-PPP-M-PL-ACC

‘For us to be bowed!’ (Luc. Sat. 1007)

In (286) the interjection is preceded by a commentary on the interjection’s proposition, especially interesting from the ex-slave Terence.

(286) \*Quam \{indignum facinus\(_i\), [ancillam\(_j\) aere\(_k\) emptam\(_j\)]!*  
how unworthy-N-S-NOM deed-N-S-NOM maid servant-F-S-ACC bronze-N-S-ABL buy-PPP-F-S-ACC

\(suo\(_k\)\]!  
own-N-S-ABL

‘How unworthy a deed, for a maid servant to be purchased by her own money!’ (Ter. Phor. 511)

The interrogative particle –\(n(e)\) is often encliticized to the interjection’s subject, as in examples (287-289).

(287) \{Homo audacissime\(_i\)\(_b\), [cum ista\(_j\) -ci -n te\(_i\) oratione\(_j\)\]!  
human-M-S-VOC daring-SUPER-M-S-VOC with that-F-S-ABL -INTENSIF -Y/N you-S-ACC speech-F-S-ABL
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'Most outrageous man, for you to have dared come here to me with that speech of yours!'  (Pl. Aul. 745-746)

(288) $[Te_i$ $-ne$ $istuc_j$ $loqui!]$
\hspace{1cm}
you-S-ACC -Y/N that-N-S-ACC say-INFIN-DEPON

'For you to say that!'  (Ter. Heau. 921)

(289) $[Me_i$ $-n$ $servasse$ $pro_j$ $ut$ $qui_j$ $me_i$ $perderent!]$  
\hspace{1cm}I-S-ACC -Y/N save-INFIN-PERF  COMP REL-M-PL-NOM  I-S-ACC  ruin-3-PL-IMPERF-SUBJ

'For me to have saved [them] so that they might ruin me!'  (Pac. Trag. 45)

In (290) the disjoint subjects $me$ and the [+ feminine] $illam$ show the hierarchy for assigning gender to adjectives like $miseros$ that co-index with different genders: masculine $>$ feminine, even when the [+ feminine] NP is closer to the adjective.

(290) $[Sici$ $-ne$ $me_i$ $atque$ $illam_j$ $\{opera$ $tua\}_i$ $nunc$ $miseros_{i+j}$ $sollicitari!]$
\hspace{1cm}thus - Y/N I-S-ACC and that-F-S-ACC work-F-S-ABL your-F-S-ABL now wretched-M-PL-ACC agitate-INFIN-PASS

'For me and her to now be made so miserable by your doing!'  (Ter. And. 689)

In (291) the interrogative particle is attached to $servo$ ‘slave’ because that is the surprising part of the proposition. The outrage is emphasized by the displacement of the modifier $futtili$ at the end of the clause.

(291) $[Servo_k$ $-n$ $\{fortunas$ $meas\}_i$ $me_i$ $comisisse$ $futtili_k!]$
\hspace{1cm}slave-M-S-DAT -Y/N fortune-F-PL-ACC my-F-PL-ACC I-S-ACC commit-INFIN-PERF useless-M-S-DAT

'For me to have entrusted my fortune to a worthless slave!'  (Ter. And. 609)

Example (292) has the interrogative particle on $adeo$, an anaphoric (here, cataphoric) adverb that foreshadows the result clause headed by the complementizer $ut$.

(292) $[Adeo_j$ $-n$ $ingenio_k$ $esse$ $duro_k$ $te_i$ $atque$ $inexorabilis_k]$ $[ut$
\hspace{1cm}to ANA-N-S-LOC - Y/N nature-N-S-ABL be-INFIN hard-N-S-ABL you-S-ACC and implacable-N-S-ABL COMP
\hspace{1cm}neque$ $misericordia$ $neque$ $precibus$ $molli$ $queas]$ $[i]$ $!$
\hspace{1cm}nor mercy-F-S-ABL nor prayer-F-PL-ABL soften-INFIN-PASS be able-2-S-SUBJ
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‘For you to be of such hard and implacable nature that you can’t be softened by either mercy or pleas!’ (Ter. *Phor.* 497-498)

The corpus contains just one example of coordinated interjections, shown in (293). The coordinated subject *te* is overt in the first clause but null in the second.

(293) *Enim vero, Antipho, multi-modis cum {istoc animo}i et es i vituperandus*
*{ita-ne tei hinc abisse} et {proi vitam tuam}k tutandumk aliis1 dedisse!*

‘For indeed, Antipho, in many ways you should be blamed for those feelings of yours, for you to have thus left from here and given over your life to be protected by others!’ (Ter. *Phor.* 465-466)

One interjection, shown in (294), has a null subject but overt object, possibly leading to a garden-path interpretation because of the object’s position high in the clause and the encliticization of the interrogative particle on it.

(294) *Ah, [tantamj -ne remj tam neclegenter proi agere]!*

‘Ah, to do such a thing so negligently!’ (Ter. *And.* 252)

### 6.4 CONTROL

Both subject and object control structures occur in early Latin. In addition, various forms of oblique control, discussed below, also occur. A summary is shown in Table 30.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentential</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4.1 Subject Control

Subject control occurs with 89 different lexemes, for a total of 956 predicates. (This count is different from what is shown for subject control in Table 29, where all infinitives within a subject-control clause are counted, not just the triggering predicate.) A summary of subject-control predicates appears in Table 31.

The most frequently occurring subject-control predicates mean ‘able’, accounting for 351 (37%) of the total cases. The main lexeme is the adjective potis ‘able’ and the related verb posse, a compound from potis + the copula esse and including its present participle, potens. Together, forms of potis and potesse account for 301 instances of subject-control complements. Some examples of subject-control complements with these lexemes are in (295-297).

Table 31: Subject-Control Predicates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Lexemes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumul. Freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘able’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘want’</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘begin’</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘accustomed’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘dare’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘stop’</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘continue’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘hurry’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘try’</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘know how’</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
<td><strong>956</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(295) Qui potis\textsubscript{i} est\textsubscript{i} [PRO\textsubscript{i} refelli] quisquam\textsubscript{i} ubi nullus\textsubscript{j} how able-3-S be-3-S [PRO- INFIN-PASS INDEFIN-OM when no-3-S-NOM

’t causandi\textsubscript{k} locus\textsubscript{j} be-3-S plead-GERUND-N-S-GEN place-3-S-NOM

‘How can anyone be refuted when there’s no opportunity for pleading one’s cause?’ (Acc. Trag. 403).
‘Something can’t be either salty or sweet if love isn’t mixed with [it].’  (Pl. Cas. 222)

‘Then he led about eight thousand well-marked soldiers, chosen [men] and able to bear war.’  (Enn. Ann. 337-338)

The other ‘able’ lexeme is *quere* and its negative, *nequere*, together representing 50 occurrences.

Examples are in (298-299).

‘I have never been able to understand that [plan] of yours.’  (Ter. And. 589)

‘When I couldn’t carry my share of the burden, I, the donkey, would lie down in the mud.’  (Pl. Aul. 230)

The second-most frequent meaning of subject-control predicates is ‘want’, represented by 20 different lexemes in a total of 275 instances.  The most frequently occurring ‘want’ verbs are *volle* ‘to wish’ (177 instances) and its compounds *nolle* ‘not to wish, to be unwilling’ (31 instances) and *malle* ‘to wish more, prefer’ (8 instances).  Some examples are in (300-303).

47 Note that both *delectos* and *potentes* are [+ masculine], while *insignita* is [+ neuter] in agreement with the indeclinable [+ neuter] *milia*, which takes a partitive genitive.  The masculine adjectives agree by attraction to *militum* ‘of the soldiers’ rather than grammatically with *milia*.
‘Capital crimes are occurring in the city, for a prostitute doesn’t want to take money from a lover.’ (Caec. Fab. 203-204)

(301) Si pro1 [rotas...] volesi1 [PRO1 facere], tardi1s ducetur, if wheel-F-ACC-PL wish-2-S do-INFIN slowly-COMPAR lead-3-S-FUT-PASS

sed minore labore.
but less-M-S-ABL work-M-S-ABL

‘If you want to use wheels [the block] will move more slowly but with less effort.’ (Cato Agr. II)

(302) pro1 [PRO1 alere...] nolunt, [...{hominem edacam}]1 et pro1 sapiunt1 {mea sententia}1k, pro1 [PRO1 pro maleficio...], pro2 [PRO2 alere...] nolunti1 [...reddere].
nourish-INFIN not wish-3-PL human-M-S-ACC and be wise-3-PL my-F-S-ABL opinion-F-S-ABL on behalf of evil deed-N-S-ABL if

good deed-N-S-ACC highest-N-S-ACC not wish-3-PL return-INFIN

‘They don’t want to feed a gluttonous person and they’re wise, in my opinion, if they don’t want to repay a bad deed with an extremely good deed.’ (Ter. Phor. 335-336)

(303) Nam pro1 [PRO1 ter sub armis...] malim1 cernere, quam [PRO1 semel modo parere].
for three times under weapon-N-PL-ABL prefer-1-S-IMPERF-SUBJ life-F-S-ACC decide-INFIN than once only give birth-INFIN

‘For I’d rather fight for my life with weapons three times than give birth just once.’
(Enn. Trag. 269-270)

Other common ‘want’ verbs include cupere ‘to desire’ (22 occurrences) and studere ‘to be eager for’ (9 occurrences). Examples are in (304-305).

(304) Magna est res [quam...] egoi1 [...te -cum...] cupio.
great-F-S-NOM be-3-S thing-F-S-NOM REL-F-S-ACC I-S-NOM you-S-ABL -with desire-1-S

[...PRO1 loqui].
speak-INFIN-DEPON

‘There’s an important matter that I want to speak with you about.’ (Pl. Aul. 771)

(305) Quom vinum1i, coctum1i erit1, et quom pro1 legetur3, pro1 facitoj.
when wine-N-S-NOM cook-PPP-N-S-NOM be-3-S-FUT and when choose-3-S-FUT-PASS

uti pro1 servetur1 familiae1k, primum1i suis1 -que, do-2-S-IMPERAT-FUT COMP save-3-S-SUBJ-PASS family-F-S-DAT first-N-S-NOM own-M-PL-DAT -and

pro1 facitoj -que pro1 studeasj [PRO1 pro1 bene]
do-2-S-IMPERAT-FUT -and be eager-2-S-SUBJ well
‘When the grapes are ripe and gathered, see to it that the first is kept for the household and their [needs], and see to it that you’re eager to gather only the well-ripened and dry [grapes], lest the wine lose its reputation.’ (Cato Agr. 25)

Examples of various other subject-control predicates are in (306-309).

(306) pro_i properato_i apsente me [PRO_i comesse prandium].
  hurry-2-s-IMPERAT-FUT be away-3-ABL-PART I- S-ABL eat-INFIN-PERF lunch-N-S-ACC

‘Hurry and eat lunch while I’m gone.’ (Pl. Men. 628)

(307) Casinam_i... ego_i [...uxorem_i...] promisi_i [PRO_i vilico nostro dare].
  Casina-F-S-ACC I- S-NOM wife-F-S-ACC promise-1- S-PERF overseer-M-S-DAT our-M-S-DAT give-INFIN

‘I promised to give Casina as wife to our overseer.’ (Pl. Cas. 288)

(308) Tu_i tamen idem [has nuptias...] perge_i [...PRO_i facere]
  you-S-NOM however same this-F-PL-ACC marriage-F-PL-ACC continue-2-s-IMPERAT do-INFIN

‘But you go on with the marriage just as you’re doing.’ (Ter. And. 521-2)

(309) Numquam pro_i destitit_i [PRO_i instare] ut dicerem [me ducturum patri].
  never not wish-2-s-PERF insist-INFIN COMP say-1-s-IMPERF-SUBJ I-S-ACC lead-PART-FUT-M-S-ACC father-M-S-DAT

‘He never stopped insisting that I tell my father I would marry.’ (Ter. And. 660-661)

6.4.1.1 Negative Commands

One idiomatic subject-control structure is a negative command with nolle ‘to be unwilling’. Examples of the negative command with nolle as a control verb are in (310-312).

(310) pro_i noli_i [PRO_i mintari], pro_j scio_j [crucem_k futuram_k mihi_i sepulchrum].
  not wish-2-s-IMPERAT threaten-INFIN-DEPON know-1-s cross-F-S-ACC be-PART-FUT-F-S-ACC I-S-DAT grave-N-S-ACC

‘Don’t threaten [me], I know a cross will be my grave.’ (Pl. Mil. 372)

(311) Nolite_i hospites_i [PRO_i ad me adire].
  not wish-2-PL-IMPERAT stranger-M-PL-NOM to I-S-ACC come to-INFIN
‘Strangers, don’t come near me.’ (Enn. Trag. 358)

(312) \( \text{pro}_i \ nolito_i \not \text{ wish-2-S-IMPERAT-FUT} \) \[ \text{[tibi}_i \ \text{me} \ \text{male} \ \text{dicere} \ \text{posse}] \] \( \text{PRO}_i \ \text{putare} \)

‘Don’t think I can speak badly about you.’ (Luc. Sat. 1069)

Table 32 provides a comparison summary of the three ways to form a negative command in early Latin.

Table 32: Negative Commands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( nolle ) + infinitive</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ne ) + imperative</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ne ) + subjunctive</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>161</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the subject-control structure with \( nolle \) + infinitive is one form of a negative command, it is the least frequent (7%) of the three possibilities found. This early infrequent use of the negative control command changes diachronically, and the \( ne \) + subjunctive form is later used only for a negative purpose clause, not for commands. Thus, the frequencies found in the corpus reveal a distinct pattern from later stages of the language, a genuine hallmark of early Latin.

6.4.1.2 Infinitival Tense

The infinitival tenses that occur with subject-control predicates are summarized in Table 33. As the table shows, 1,013 (98%) of 1,038 infinitival complements in subject control have [+ present] tense. The [+ present] tense marks an unrealized potential action – the kind of action that most subject-control predicates embed. The embedded action, if it actually occurs at all, is [+ future] with respect to the matrix verb event. According to Martin (2001, pp. 146-147), it is precisely this [+ tense] feature on control infinitivals that distinguishes them from ECM (“raising”) infinitivals, which have [- tense].
Table 33: Infinitival Tense on Subject Control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitival Tense</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,038</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, if control infinitives are future-oriented in general and Latin infinitives in particular can morphologically mark [+ future], then it is surprising that only 2 (<1%) of control infinitivals in the corpus are marked for [+ future] tense. These examples are in (313-314).

(313) *Possum*<sub>i</sub> *ego*<sub>i</sub> [PRO<sub>i</sub> *istam*<sub>j</sub> *capite* *cladem*<sub>j</sub> *averruncassere*].

'I can advert that disaster from you [lit. ‘from (your) head’].’ (Pac. *Trag.* 248)

(314) *Nunc* *pro*<sub>i</sub> *pergam*<sub>i</sub> [PRO<sub>i</sub> *eri* *imperium*<sub>j</sub> *exequi*] *et*

[PRO<sub>i</sub> *me*<sub>i</sub> *domum* *capessere*].

‘Now I’ll continue to follow out my master’s order and take myself home.’ (Pl. *Amph.* 262)

Note that both of these future infinitives have the inflectional form ending in {-ssere} rather than the periphrastic form with the future participle + copula. Example (314) is particularly interesting because its two embedded clauses are coordinated without any obvious reason for their difference in tense. This fact suggests that the [+ present] tense is interpreted with the inherent unrealized potentiality that it has, regardless of whether it is overtly marked as such or not.

Further evidence that the [+ present] infinitive has a clear [+ future] meaning comes from matrix predicates such as ‘promise’. One can only ‘promise’ an event that is [+ future] with respect to the time of making the promise. Of the five corpus examples, all 5 (100%) have the
embedded infinitive with [+ present] tense; two of these examples with different verbs are in (315-316).

(315) \( \text{proi} \text{Casinam} \text{ego} \text{promisi} \text{nostro} \)

\[ \text{Casina-} \text{F-S-ACC \ I-S-NOM \ promise-1-S-PERF \ overseer-M-S-DAT \ our-M-S-DAT} \]

dare].

give-INFIN

‘I promised to give Casina as wife to our overseer.’ (Pl. Cas. 288)

(316) \( \text{Satis pol proterve me Syrii promissa huc induxerunt} \)

\[ \text{enough \ indeed \ boldly \ I-S-ACC \ Syrus-M-S-GEN \ promise-PPP-N-PL-NOM \ to here \ lead in-3-PL-PERF} \]

\( \{ \text{decem minas}\_1 [\text{quas} \text{mihi dare}] \text{pollicitus} \_1 \}

\[ \text{ten \ mina-} \text{F-PL-ACC \ REL-F-PL-ACC \ I-S-DAT \ give-INFIN \ promise-PPP-DEPON-M-S-NOM \ be-3-S} \]

‘Indeed Syrus’s promises have boldly lead me here, the ten minae [i.e. Greek coins] that he promised to give me.’ (Ter. Heau. 723-724)

This use of a [+ present] infinitival complement with ‘promise’ is even more notable when compared with the same verb used in ECM, where in 5 (83%) of 6 instances the infinitive is [+ future]. Some ECM examples are in (317-318).

(317) \( \text{proi promitte hoc fore} \)

\[ \text{promise-2-S-IMPERAT \ this-N-S-ACC \ be-INFIN-FUT} \]

‘Promise this will be.’ (Pl. Aul. 219)

(318) \( \text{Qui te diligat aetatis facie -que tuae se} \)

\[ \text{REL-M-S-NOM \ you-S-ACC \ esteem-3-S-SUBJ \ age-F-S-GEN \ appearance-F-S-GEN \ and \ your-F-S-GEN \ ANA-ACC} \]

\( \text{fautorem ostendat amicum polliceatur} \)

\[ \text{favorer-M-S-ACC \ show-3-S-SUBJ \ be-INFIN-FUT \ friend-M-S-ACC \ promise-3-S-SUBJ-DEPON} \]

‘The one who esteems you, [who] shows himself [to be] an admirer of your youthfulness and appearance, should promise he will be your friend.’ (Luc. Sat. 292-295)

While these examples show that the [+ present] infinitive has a [+ future] meaning for subject-control complements, 23 (2%) of the corpus examples are marked for [+ perfect] tense. Indeed, [+ perfect] tense on the infinitival complement of a subject-control predicate appears semantically odd because an action that occurs at a point in time X cannot have any effect over the ‘controlled’ action which has already occurred (i.e. is marked as [+ perfect]). Yet the archaicizing Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus, brief as it is, contains 11 examples of an
unambiguously [+ perfect] infinitive with the subject-control predicate *velle* ‘to wish’. An example with 5 perfect-tense complements of *velle* is in (319).

(319) Ne -ve proi post hac [PROi inter sedi coniurase] 
ne -ve [PROi convovise] ne -ve [PROi conspondise] ne -ve 
ne -ve [PROi compromisise] veleti ne -ve quisquami [PRO fidemj 
inter sedi dedise] veleti. 

‘After this no one [of the Bacchanals] should be willing to have sworn together among themselves nor to have vowed together nor to have pledged together nor to have promised together, nor should anyone [of the Bacchanals] be willing to have given a pledge among themselves.’ (Bac. 13-14)

Other examples of [+ perfect] infinitives with *velle* are in (320-323), showing that the construction is not constrained to a single text or author.

(320) Di me perdant si ego tui quicquam apstuli, 
ni -ve [PRO adeo apstulisse] vellem. 

‘May the gods destroy me if I stole anything from you, nor would I wish to have stolen anything.’ (Pl. *Aul.* 645-646)

(321) Vah, proi [PROi rogasse] vellem, 

‘Ah, I would want to have asked.’ (Ter. *Heau.* 978)

(322) [PRO ne -quid emisse …] velit [… insciiente domino], 
neu [PRO quid dominum celavisse] velit. 

‘He should not wish to have sold anything without the master’s knowledge, nor should he wish to have hidden anything from the master.’ (Cato *Agr.* V)

(323) Domi cum auspicamus, proi [honorem mei dium 
immortalium…] velim, […]habuisse. 

145
'When we take auspices at home, I’d want [lit. ‘me’] to have had honor for the immortal gods’. (Cato Or. 73)

Several other matrix verbs also take a perfect-tense infinitive. In (324) the controlling verb is *posse* ‘to be able’.

(324) pro\textsubscript{i} non potes\textsubscript{i} [PRO\textsubscript{i} probasse nugas\textsubscript{f}].

‘You can’t pass off nonsense as right.’ (Pl. Aul. 828)

A similar verb occurs in (325) with a form of *quere* ‘to be able’.

(325) pro\textsubscript{i} [PRO\textsubscript{i} meminisse\textsuperscript{48}] nequeunt\textsubscript{i}.

‘They can’t remember.’

In example (326) the [+ perfect] infinitival complement occurs with *incipere*.

(326) Ubi pro\textsubscript{i} iam [PRO\textsubscript{i} coctum\textsubscript{f}... ] incipit\textsubscript{i} [...] esse, eo\textsubscript{i} 

‘When it [i.e. the ham hock] is already beginning to cook [lit. ‘begins to have been cooked’], to it add two cabbage leaves, two beet leaves with the root, …’ (Cato Agr. 158).

Since *incipere* in (326) means ‘to begin’, the PPP *coctum esse* is semantically odd. A present passive infinitive would be more natural to represent simultaneous action, as occurs in 123 instances with subject control. The corpus contains just one other instance of *incipere* with any passive infinitive, shown in (327).

(327) si pro\textsubscript{i} forte [PRO\textsubscript{i} liber\textsubscript{i} fieri ] occiperim\textsubscript{i}.

‘if by chance I should have begun to become [lit. ‘to be made’] free’ (Pl. Mil. 1362)

\textsuperscript{48} The verb *meminisci* is inchoative (‘to begin to recall’), so that the perfect-tense form here means the action is completed = ‘to remember’. The present-tense system is deponent (i.e. has passive morphology but middle meaning), while the perfect-tense system is morphologically active.
Also note that Cato himself uses the present passive infinitive with a similar subject-control verb, shown in (328).\(^{49}\)

(328) \[ \textit{Ubi \ vuæae}_i \ [\text{PRO}_i \ \textit{variae}_i \ldots] \textit{coeperint}_i \ [\ldots\textit{fieri}_i], \]

\[ \textit{bubus}_j \ \textit{pro}_i \ \textit{medicamentum}_i \ \textit{dato}_i \ \textit{quotanis}, \ \textit{uti}_i \ \textit{pro}_j \]

\[ \textit{valeant}_j. \]

be strong-3-PL-SUBJ

‘When the grapes have begun to change [lit. ‘have begun to be made different’], give [them] to the cattle as medicine every year so that they’ll be well.’ (Cato \textit{Agr. 73})

These uses of a subject-control predicate other than \textit{velle} + passive infinitive show that the [+ perfect] tense of \textit{coctum esse} in (326) is unusual.

6.4.1.3 Infinitive as Gerund

There are five occurrences of the infinitive where English requires a gerund. Since early Latin also has a distinct gerund form, these are notable. The first two examples are shown in (329-330).

(329) \[ \textit{Ne \ pro}_i \ \textit{operam}_i \ \textit{perdas}_i \ [\text{PRO}_i \ \textit{poscere}]. \]

\[ \text{lest \ effort-F-S-ACC \ lose-2-S-SUBJ \ demand-INFIN} \]

‘Don’t waste effort in demanding [it].’ (Pl. \textit{Aul. 341})

(330) \[ \textit{Sed \ pro}_i \ \textit{cesso}_i \ \textit{quam \ prius \ quam \ prorsus \ perii}_i \ [\text{PRO}_i \ \textit{currere}]. \]

\[ \text{but \ stop-1-S \ before \ than \ completely \ die-1-S-PERF \ run-INFIN} \]

‘But do I stop before I’m completely dead from running?’ (Pl. \textit{Aul. 396})

The other examples have as the matrix predicate an adjective, the perfect participle \textit{defessi} in sentence (331) and the ordinary adjective \textit{lentus} in (332).

(331) \[ \textit{Postquam \ pro}_i \ \textit{defessi}_i \ \textit{sunt}_i \ [\text{PRO}_i \ \textit{stare}] \ \textit{atque} \ [\text{PRO}_i \ \textit{concurrunt}_i]. \]

\[ \textit{spargere \ sese}_i \ \{\textit{hastis \ ansatis}\}_i \ \textit{pro}_i \ \textit{concurrent}_i \]

\[ \text{sprinkle-INFIN \ ANA-ACC \ spear-F-PL-ABL \ fit with a handle-PPP-F-PL-ABL \ run together-3-PL} \]

\(^{49}\) Although \textit{occipere} ‘to begin’ appears to be a compound from \textit{coepere} ‘to begin’, it actually derives from \textit{ob} ‘in the way of’ + \textit{capere} ‘to take’, while \textit{coepere} is from \textit{co-} ‘together’ + obsolete \textit{*apere} ‘to fit’. The two verbs were routinely conflated (Simpson, p. 113), so it is no stretch to claim this example is directly analogous to (326).
‘After they were tired out from standing and showering each other with handle-fitted spears, they ran [lit. ‘run’] together from each side with their weapons.’ (Enn. Ann. 160-161)

6.4.1.4 Modal

Debere ‘to owe’ has a literal meaning when used without an infinitive, and with an infinitival complement it acts as a modal meaning ‘ought’. In one corpus example, shown in (333), even with an infinitival complement debere is not a modal. Rather, the subordinate clause is in apposition to the demonstrative hoc, further explaining what ‘this’ is which the speaker ‘owes’.

Pamphile, I owe you this from servitude, to try with hands and feet, both night and day, to meet lethal danger [i.e. instead of you].’ (Ter. And. 675-677)

In examples (334-335) debere does act as a modal with an infinitival complement.

---

50 Warmington (p. 3:139) interprets Paceni as vocative singular for a separate entity Pacenius, but the juxtaposition of two genitive singular masculine NPs makes the reading shown here at least as plausible. He also takes crassi to be ‘fat’ (its basic meaning is ‘thick’), but there appears to be a contrast set up between the sharp-witted father and the son, so ‘dull’ (a common metaphorical extension) seems more appropriate. Regardless of the exact interpretation of these two NPs, the adjective lentus clearly embeds an infinitive.
You ought to want what we want.’ (Pl. Amph. 39)

‘As you would want the one whom you didn’t want to visit when you should have to die.’ (Luc. Sat. 189-191)

Note that the infinitive visere in (335) is omitted with debueris through coordination with nolueris.

6.4.1.5 Finite Variant

There are three corpus examples containing the matrix verb posse ‘to be able’ + finite subjunctive clause instead of the usual infinitival complement. In (336) the complementizer quin ‘but that’ normally takes a subjunctive complement (i.e. regardless of the matrix predicate).

‘Then it can’t [be done] kindly unless I give the [clothes-] folder a monetary reward.’ (Pl. Mil. 695)

However, the subjunctive clauses with posse in (337-338) must be seen as a minor variant of the usual infinitive clause.

‘Can you hold your hand away [i.e. from hitting]?” (Pl. Amph. 903)

‘Can you go away from me?’ (Pl. Cas. 731)

Note that the finite complement in (337) has the complementizer ut ‘in order that’, while (338) has no overt complementizer. The structure of the two sentences is similar since they have the
same matrix predicate and the main and embedded subjects are also co-indexed. Thus, it appears
that the complementizer is optional with the subjunctive complement. Classical Latin is
traditionally said to require an overt complementizer with a subjunctive clause (Gildersleeve &
Lodge, p. 344), and if true that shows another way in which early Latin differs from later stages
of the language.

6.4.1.6 Object pro

Recall that the overall rate for object pro across all types of infinitival clauses is 23%.

For objects in subject-control complements, the omission rate is 24% for unbound NPs and 5% for bound ones, as shown in Table 34.

Table 34: Objects in Subject Control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Null Indef.</th>
<th>Null Coord.</th>
<th>Null Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNBOUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequency of object pro in subject control is thus similar overall in unbound NPs to
that in all types of infinitival clauses combined, but in first-person unbound NPs the rate is only
14%. That is, 86% of the time an unbound first-person object entity is overt in a subject-control
complement, whereas second- and third-person bound entities are nearly twice as likely to be
null (25%). When objects in subject-control complements are bound, they are rarely null. First-
and third-person bound object entities are overt in 100% of instances, and second-person bound objects are null in only 14% of cases, with an overall rate for bound objects at 5%.

6.4.2 Object Control

An object-control complement occurs with 314 verbs, representing 41 distinct lexemes.

A summary of object-control predicates appears in Table 35.

Table 35: Object-Control Predicates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Lexemes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘order’</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘allow’</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘beg’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘prohibit’</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘make’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘force’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 41 314

The most frequently occurring object-control verbs mean ‘order’. Of six ‘order’ lexemes, *iubere* ‘to order, command, bid’ occurs 113 times and *postulare* ‘to demand, request’ occurs 22 times; the other four lexemes together represent the remaining nine instances. Some examples of object-control complements with *iubere* are in (339-341).

(339) *Cocta sunt, iube i pro j-obj [PRO j ire accubitum].*

‘The food’s cooked, command [them] to go lie down [i.e. to eat].’ (Pl. *Men*. 225)

(340) *proi-subj proj-obj [PRO j prandere] iubet i horitur i -que.*

‘He orders and encourages [them] to have lunch.’ (Enn. *Ann*. 418)

(341) *Tum -que pro i-subj pro j-obj [PRO j remos...] iussit [...religare struppis].*

‘And then he ordered [them] to bind the oars with straps.’ (Liv. *Ody*. 12)
Examples (342-343) have the matrix verb *imperare*, and (344) has *postulare*.

(342) \[ \text{pro}_i \text{-subj} \text{ pro}_j \text{-obj} \] \[ \text{[PRO}_j \text{ animo} \text{nunc} \text{-iam} \text{otioso} \text{esse}] \text{ impero}_i. \]

‘I’m telling [you] to calm down right now.’ (Ter. And. 842)

(343) \[ \text{pro}_i \text{-subj} \text{ pro}_j \text{-obj} \] \[ \text{[PRO}_j \text{ signa} \text{extemplo} \text{canere} \text{ac}] \text{ imperat}_j. \]

‘He orders [them] to sound the signals and hurl the weapons against the walls right away.’ (Acc. Trag. 377)

(344) \[ \text{pro}_i \text{-subj} \text{ pro}_j \text{-obj} \] \[ \text{[PRO}_j \text{ tuum nefarium facinus} \text{facinore operire}] \text{ postulas}_i. \]

‘You’re ordering [someone] to cover up your evil deed with a worse deed.’ (Cato Or. 59)

The next most frequent object-control type is verbs meaning ‘allow’, accounting for 74 (24%) of object-control matrix predicates. Of these, *sinere* ‘to set down, leave alone, allow’ is the most frequent with 51 instances; some examples are in (345-346).

(345) \[ \text{pro}_i \] \[ \text{[PRO}_j \text{ abire} \text{non} \text{sinam}_i \text{te}_j. \]

‘I won’t let you leave.’ (Pl. Mil. 444)

(346) \[ \text{Servov hominem}_j \] \[ \text{[PRO}_j \text{causam orare} \text{leges}_i \text{non} \text{sinunt}_i,} \]

‘The laws don’t allow a slave to plead a lawsuit, nor is there any taking of his testimony.’ (Ter. Phor. 292-293)

An example with *pati* ‘to suffer (for oneself), endure, allow’, representing 17 instances in the corpus, appears in (347).

(347) \[ \text{Ego}_i \text{-ne} \text{huius memoriam}_i \text{patiar}_i \text{[PRO}_j \text{meae voluptati obstare]}. \]

stand in way-INFIN
‘Should I let his [lack of] memory stand in the way of my pleasure?’  (Ter. *And.* 943-944)

Other object-control examples are in (348-349).

(348) \[ \text{pro}_i \text{ non te}_j \text{ [PRO}_j \text{ porro procedere] porcent}_e. \]

‘They don’t prevent you from moving forward.’  (Luc. *Sat.* 260)

(349) \[ \text{Multa}_i \text{ me}_j \text{ dehortata} \text{ [PRO}_j \text{ huc prodire], \{anni, aetas, vox, vires, senectus}\}_i. \]

‘Many things have urged me to come forward here [i.e. as a lawyer in a trial]: years, age, voice, strength, old age.’  (Cato *Or.* 196)

In object-control structures, the main verb subcategorizes for two internal arguments.

One is the controllee, and the other is the clausal theme. The controllee is assigned accusative case structurally as a direct object of the matrix verb. The question then arises about the θ-role of the controllee. It can be considered either a theme (because somewhat affected by the action) or a goal (because receiving the action). The morphological evidence in Latin – accusative rather than dative case – suggests the controllee is conceptualized as a theme. Some command verbs (e.g. *imperare*) do subcategorize the dative case (i.e. θ-role of goal) for the person commanded, but then they do not behave as control predicates; see section 6.4.2.4.

Overall, control verbs behave in early Latin much as in English. However, one significant difference results from Latin’s pro-drop setting on objects. This means that the theme direct object, linked to the PRO infinitive subject, may be non-overt even when it refers to a separate entity from the subject of the main verb and is not otherwise mentioned in the sentence, as in (350).

(350) \[ \text{Si } \text{pro}_i\text{-subj resto}_i \text{ proj-subj pergit ut } \text{pro}_i\text{-subj eam, si [PRO}_i \text{ ire] } \text{pro}_i\text{-subj conor, pro}_j\text{-subj pro}_i\text{-obj prohibit [PRO}_i \text{ baetere].} \]
‘If I stand back he tells me to go; if I try to go he keeps [me] from going.’ (Pac. Trag. 240)

Since PRO is necessarily covert, this elliptical structure requires the listener/reader to infer the entity from discourse. In a situation like (347), the intended referent is clear enough from the [person] agreement (first-person singular) on the verbs eam and conor, but in the other examples the referent is available only from context beyond the immediate sentence.

6.4.2.1 Greetings

One idiomatic use of object-control complements is with iubere ‘to order’ + salvere ‘to be well’, occurring in three corpus examples. An instance is shown in (351).

(351) pro\textsubscript{i} [PRO\textsubscript{j} salvere] iubeo\textsubscript{i} {spectatores optumos}\textsubscript{j}.

‘Greetings to the most excellent spectators [lit. ‘I order the very good spectators to be well’].’ (Pl. Cas. 1)

There appears to be a pragmatic conflict between the notion of ‘order’ and the controlled action of ‘being well’: the controllee has no control over it. However, the vocative amator in (352) suggests that this object-control structure is a conventional greeting – its meaning is not literal control, but just a form of salutation.

(352) pro\textsubscript{i} iubeo\textsubscript{i} te\textsubscript{j} [PRO\textsubscript{j} salvere], amator\textsubscript{j}.

‘Hello, love [lit. ‘I order you to be well, lover’].’ (Pl. Cas. 969)

In (353), the imperative salve ‘be well’ also shows how salvere forms part of a conventional greeting. The AcI clause expands on the greeting theme.

(353) Ere\textsubscript{i} salve\textsubscript{i} pro\textsubscript{j} [salvom\textsubscript{i} te\textsubscript{j} advenisse] gaudeo\textsubscript{i}.

‘Hello, master, I’m glad you have arrived safe.’ (Ter. Phor. 286)
Finally, the other example of the *iubere* + *salvere* construction in (354) offers a direct insight in the structure’s meaning.

(354) \[ \text{[PRO}_i \text{salvere} \text{pro}_j \text{[PRO}_j \text{iubere} \text{[PRO}_i \text{salutem}_{k...} \text{est} \text{...mittere} \text{amico}_{j,l}] \text{].} \]

‘To order [someone] to be well is to send greetings [lit. ‘safety’] to a friend.’ (Luc. *Sat.* 261)

6.4.2.2 Controllees

Given the availability of object pro, many direct objects in object-control structures are non-overt. This means that both the controllee and the infinitival subject PRO are null. The principle of transparency predicts that when the controllee is disjoint from the matrix subject, it should be overt, while a co-indexed controllee should not need to be overt. A summary of the form of the 215 controllees in object-control complements is in Table 36. These data show that the prediction of transparency is essentially confirmed, but at weaker levels than a straightforward prediction. In contexts where the controllee is disjoint from the matrix subject (i.e. unbound), it is overt in 197 (78%) of 281 contexts, or in three of four expected contexts. In the opposite context, where the controllee is co-indexed with the main subject (i.e. bound), it is overt in 18 (75%) of 24 contexts, a rate higher than strictly necessary for recovery of the NP.

Table 36 also reveals a notable feature of some object-control complements. In 18 instances, the matrix and embedded (i.e. PRO) subjects are co-indexed, meaning the control goes from the subject referent to itself. Some examples of this construction are in (355-356).

(355) \[ \text{Sed ego}_i \text{inscitus}_i \text{qui}_i \text{[domino me}_{i...}] \text{postulem}_i \text{...moderarier].} \]

‘But I’m naïve if I expect [lit. ‘demand’] myself to control the master.’ (Pl. *Men.* 443)
Table 36: Controllees with Object Control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Null</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOUND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>9 69%</td>
<td>4 31%</td>
<td>13 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>8 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>8 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>1 33%</td>
<td>2 67%</td>
<td>3 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNBOUND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>42 71%</td>
<td>19 31%</td>
<td>61 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>26 65%</td>
<td>14 35%</td>
<td>40 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>129 71%</td>
<td>53 29%</td>
<td>182 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>215 70%</td>
<td>92 30%</td>
<td>307 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(356) *Nam quod pro i de argento sperem i aut [PRO i posse…]*

*postulem i […]me i fallere nil est.*

‘For what I may hope about the money or expect [lit. ‘demand’] myself to be able to deceive [him in] – that’s nothing.’ (Ter. *Hea*. 671-672)

A different type of controllee occurs with impersonal verbs that license object-control complements. There are three such lexemes, together accounting for seven instances in the corpus. The most frequently occurring is *pudere* ‘to shame’, which takes object control of the person shamed51; an example with an overt controllee is in (357), repeated here from (167).

(357) *Non te i pudet i [PRO i prodir i in conspectum meum...],*

{*flagitium hominis*}, *[…cum istoc ornatu]?

‘Aren’t you ashamed, you disgrace of a man, to come into my sight with that clothing?’ (Pl. *Men*. 708-709)

51 Calboli (1990, p. 119) claims that impersonals take an accusative object (i.e. bearing the patient role) co-indexed with the speaker of the sentence. However, this is easy to refute with data from early Latin. Just in Cato’s agricultural text, numerous counter-examples occur: The speaker throughout is Cato but the intended referent of all such impersonal verbs is a hypothetical landowner who is not Cato. Wherever sufficient context is available to make a determination, no examples in the corpus appear to fit Calboli’s claim.
In (358) the intended controllee *me* is not overt.

(358) *Pudet*<sub>1</sub> *pro*<sub>1</sub> [**PRO*<sub>1</sub> *dicere* *hac*<sub>1</sub> *praesente*<sub>1</sub> {**verbum** *turpe*}<sub>k</sub>].

shame-3-S say-INFIN this-F-S-ABL be present-PART-F-S-ABL word-N-S-ACC base-N-S-ACC

‘It shames [me] to say an ugly word when she is present.’ (Ter. *Heau*. 1042).

Generally, *pudet* has no overt NP subject, although in (359) an expletive demonstrative does occur.

(359) *Nil*<sup>52</sup> -ne *te*<sub>1</sub> *pudet*, *sceleste*, [**PRO*<sub>1</sub> *populi* *in* conspectum *ingredi*]<sub>r</sub>?

nothing-N-S-ACC -Y/N you-S-ACC shame-3-S shameful-M-S-VOC sight-M-S-ACC walk in-INFIN-DEPON

‘Doesn’t it shame you at all, you scum, to walk into public view?’ (Pls. *Amph*. 1034)

The other impersonal verbs with object control are *pigere* ‘to be annoying, disgusting’ *dolere* ‘to pain’, *(dis)taedere* ‘to fatigue’, and *pigovere* ‘to be sluggish, reluctant’, a verb which in later stages of the language occurs with a personal subject and can be inflected for all three persons (Simpson, 1968, p. 149). Examples of these control predicates are in (360-362).

(360) *pro*<sub>1</sub> *quaeso*<sub>1</sub>, *quod*<sub>1</sub> *pro*<sub>1</sub> *te*<sub>k</sub> *percontabor*<sub>1</sub>, *ne* [*id*<sub>j</sub>…]

ask-1-S REL-N-S-ACC you-S-ACC investigate-1-S-IMPERF-DEPON lest ANA-N-S-ACC

*te*<sub>k</sub> *pigeat*<sub>1</sub> [**PRO*<sub>k</sub> *proloqui*].

you-S-ACC annoy-3-S-SUBJ speak out-INFIN-DEPON

‘I ask [you] what I was investigating you about – don’t let it annoy you to speak about it.’ (Pl. *Aul*. 210)

(361) *Dolet*<sub>i</sub> *pigeti* -que *magis* *magis* -que *me*<sub>j</sub> [**PRO*<sub>j</sub> *conatum*<sub>i</sub>]

pain-3-S annoy-3-S -and more more -and I-S-ACC try-PPP-DEPON-M-S-ACC

*hoc*<sub>k</sub> *nequiquam* *itiner*<sub>k</sub>.

this-N-S-ACC in vain journey-N-S-ACC

‘It pains and annoys me more and more to have attempted this journey in vain.’ (Pac. *Trag*. 54)

(362) *Post* *aetate* *pigret*<sub>i</sub> *pro*<sub>j</sub> [**PRO*<sub>j</sub> *suberre* *laborem*<sub>k</sub>].

after age-F-S-ABL be reluctant-3-S take up-INFIN labor-M-S-ACC

‘In old age it makes [one] reluctant to take up work.’ (Enn. *Ann*. 391)

---

52 Although as a neuter NP *nil* ‘nothing’ could be either nominative or accusative, it is likely to be an accusative of extent or respect here rather than the nominative subject of *pudet*.
Note that without an overt accusative NP in (362), the matrix verb *pigret* may not be impersonal, but rather refers to an unspecified person. However, the line was cited by a later Roman author as an example of early Latin’s use of this verb as an impersonal (Warmington, p. 1:147), so we will let native-speaker judgment prevail here by interpreting this as impersonal *pigrere*.

### 6.4.2.3 Infinitival Tense

The infinitival tenses that occur with object-control predicates are summarized in Table 37.

**Table 37: Infinitival Tense on Object Control.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitival Tense</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>275</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table shows, 260 (95%) of 275 infinitival complements in object control have [+ present] tense. This rate of present-tense infinitivals is slightly lower than the 98% found for subject-control complements.

The 15 instances of [+ perfect] infinitives in object-control complements are divided among seven lexemes. The most frequently occurring is *pati* ‘to allow’ and its compound *perpeti*, together accounting for four instances. The related verb *sinere* ‘to allow’ accounts for one additional instance of a perfect-tense infinitival complement in object control. Some examples are in (363-365).

(363) *Neque* *pro*$_i$ *me*$_i$ *quidem* *patur*$_i$ [PRO$_i$ *probi*$_j$ falsa] *impune* *insulatam*$_i$.

*without punishment* *accuse-PPP-P-S-ACC*
‘Nor indeed will I allow myself to be [lit. ‘to have been’] falsely accused of wrong.’ (Pl. Mil. 395)

(364) Quid id ad me, tu te \[PRO\] nuptam possis, [\[PRO\] perpeti], an proj sis abitura

INTERROG-N-S-NOM ANA-N-S-NOM to F-S-ACC tu S-NOM te S-ACC [\[PRO\] nuptam]

possis \[\[PRO\] perpeti\], an proj sis abitura

be able-2-S-IMPERF-SUBJ allow-INFIN-DEPON or be-2-S-SUBJ go away-PART-FUT-F-S-NOM

a {\{tuo viro\}}k,?

from your- M-S-ABL man- M-S-ABL

‘What [is] that to me, whether you could allow yourself to be married [lit. ‘to have been veiled’] or are going to leave your husband?’ (Pl. Mil. 722-723)

(365) proi proj \[PRO\] biennium in sole... sinito ...

be-INFIN

proi proj \[\[PRO\] biennium\] in sole... sinito...

be an exile-INFIN allow-2-PL allow-2-PL-PERF

pelli, proi proj \[\[PRO\] pulsum\] \[\[PRO\] patimini\],

push-INFIN-PASS allow-PPP-M-S-ACC allow-2-PL-DEPON

‘Allow [him] to be an exile, you allowed [him] to be pushed out, you allow [him] to have been pushed out.’ (Acc. Trag. 359)

Three of the [+ perfect] infinitivals with object control have the matrix predicate facere ‘to make’, shown in (367-369).

(367) proi nosi \[\[PRO\] missos\] facei.

I-PL-ACC send-PPP-M-PL-ACC make-2-S-IMPERAT

‘Send us away [lit. ‘make us having been sent’].’ (Ter. And. 833)

(368) proi \[\[PRO\] ademptum, tibi\] iam faxo \{\{omnem\}

take away-PPP-M-S-ACC you-S-DAT now make-1-S-FUTPERF all-M-S-ACC

metum\}.

fear-M-S-ACC

159
'I’ll remove all your fear [lit. ‘I’ll have made all fear having been taken away from you’].’ (Ter. Heau. 341)

(369) \text{pro}_i \text{ hoc}_j \text{ [PRO}_j \text{ missum}_j \text{ facies}_i \text{ pro}_i \text{ illo}_j \text{ me}_k \\
\text{utere}_i \text{ libente}_k.

(370) \text{pro}_i \text{ boves}_j \text{ [PRO}_j \text{ maxima diligentia}_k \text{ curatos}_j \\
habetao_i.

(371) \text{Qui}_i \text{ in his agris praedia}_j \text{ vendiderint, [eos}_i\text{j...} \\
pigeat [...vendidisse].

(372) \text{Dolet}_i \text{ piget}_i -que magis magis -que \text{ me}_j \text{ [PRO}_j \text{ conatum}_j \\
hoc_k \text{ nequiquam itiner}_k].

Example (370) is interesting not only because of the [+ perfect] infinitival complement with habere ‘to have’, but also because it shows an early instance of habere + PPP in a sense that clearly anticipates the much later development of the Romance perfect participles, grammaticalization from the structure here into a periphrastic form.

Three instances of [+ perfect] tense complements with object-control predicates occur with impersonal object verbs (see section 6.4.2.2). Two of these are with pigere ‘to annoy, disgust’, shown in (371-372), and the other is with dolere ‘to pain’, shown in coordination with pigere in (372). Example (371) is repeated from (193), and (372) from (361).
‘It pains and annoys me more and more to have attempted this journey in vain.’ (Pac. Trag. 54)

Finally, the remaining three infinitival complements have [+ perfect] tense with the matrix verb *iubere* ‘to order’. These are shown in (373-374); note that all come from Cato, although they represent his two distinct texts (the treatise and the orations).

(373) pro_i pro_j [PRO_j incenatum_j... iubeto_i [...esse].

‘Order [him] not to dine [lit. ‘not to have dined’].’ (Cato Agr. 127)

(374) pro_i pro_j [PRO_j prorsum quodcumque_k... iubebat_i [...fecisse]

neque [PRO_j quemquam_l observavisse].

‘He ordered [someone] not to do [lit. ‘to have done’] anything whatsoever nor to observe [lit. ‘to have observed’] anyone.’ (Cato Or. 101)

These occurrences of various matrix verbs with the [+ perfect] infinitive are unusual since they happen in only 5% of the corpus contexts. Comparing the same matrix predicates with their infinitival complements in all object-control clauses, the [+ perfect] tense for the complement is indeed infrequent. The highest rate of a perfect-tense infinitive occurs at 50% with *pigere*, which has only 6 total contexts in the corpus. With *pati* and *perpeti*, the rate of [+ perfect] tense is 22% out of 18 instances. Of the object-control predicates that take [+ perfect] infinitivals, *iubere* is by far the most frequent lexeme. Tellingly, the perfect-tense infinitive occurs with *iubere* in only 2% of 121 contexts. Moreover, the three instances of [+ perfect] tense occur in Cato, but overall Cato uses [+ present] tense for an infinitive with *iubere* in 10 (77%) of 13 total contexts; even for Cato, the [+ perfect] infinitival is not the norm. While unusual, the [+ perfect] infinitivals with these object-control verbs are a variant available to multiple authors, not merely one person’s individual style or aim for variety.
6.4.2.4 Finite Variant

While the general pattern for object-control verbs is an infinitival complement, in 51 instances such predicates take a finite variant. In the variant structure, the embedded verb is subjunctive rather than infinitive. Note that this change from infinitive to finite complement clause results in the embedded subject as pro rather than PRO. Typically, the control clause is headed by the complementizer *ut*([i]) ‘in order that’, with the negative counterpart *ne* ‘lest’; in 14 (26%) instances, the (positive) complementizer is not overt. Some examples with the overt complementizer *ut* are in (375-377).

(375) *Si ea_1i domi 'st_1s si pro_j facio_j [ut eam_1i exire hinc] pro_k videas_k*, dignu_k' -n es_k {verberibus multis} _1i?

‘If she’s at home, if I make it so you see her come out of here, do you deserve a good whipping? [i.e. because the addressee had claimed she wasn’t there]?’ (Pl. *Mil. *341)

(376) *pro_i [id_k...] oro_i te_j [...in commune ut pro_j consulas_j].

‘I beg you to consider it mutually.’ (Ter. *And. *548)

(377) *Ego_i enim an perficiam_i [ut pro_k [PRO_k me_i amare] expediat_i]?*

‘Will I ever bring it about so that it’s worthwhile [to her] to love me?’ (Luc. *Sat. *741)

In (378-380) the positive complementizer is null.

(378) *Tu_i servos_j iube_i [pro_j hunc_k ad me_i ferant_j].

‘Command the slaves to bring him to me.’ (Pl. *Men. *955-956)

(379) *pro_i sine_i [pro_j te_i hoc_k exorem_j].

‘Allow me to beg this from you [lit. ‘allow I beg this from you’].’ (Ter. *And. *902)

(380) *pro_i [pro_j rem_k cognoscas_j simul et [pro_j dictis_m say-PPP-N-PL-DAT] at same time and...*
An example of the object-control finite variant with the negative complementizer is in (381).

(381) pro\textsubscript{i} sine\textsubscript{i} me\textsubscript{j} [\{vocivom tempus\}_k ne quod\textsubscript{k} dem\textsubscript{j}]

mihi\textsubscript{i} laboris\textsubscript{j].

I-S-DAT work-M-S-GEN

‘Let me not have any free time from work [lit. ‘Allow me not to give any free time from work to myself’].’ (Ter. Heau. 90-91)

Note the overt controllee me.

Table 38 shows the matrix predicates that take the finite variant for object control. Note that two verbs (pergere and monere) occur in the corpus only with the finite variant. The ‘order’ verbs represent the largest semantic group, and they are overwhelmingly more likely (92%) to occur with an infinitival rather than a finite complement. The data in the table suggest that no general semantic grouping explains the use of the finite variant, but rather the option appears to be lexical.

In (382) the subjunctive dicant appears to be simply a variant of the more usual infinitival clause controlled by iubere in 95% of the corpus instances.

(382) pro\textsubscript{i} Telobois\textsubscript{j} iubet\textsubscript{i} [pro\textsubscript{j} sententiam ut dicant\textsubscript{j} suam\textsubscript{j}].

Teloboian-M-PL-DAT order-3-S opinion-F-S-ACC COMP say-3-PL-SUBJ own-F-S-ACC

‘He orders the Teloboians to speak his opinion.’ (Pl. Amph. 205)

Similarly, imperat in (383) takes the finite subjunctive deducerem.

(383) pro\textsubscript{i} mihi\textsubscript{i} [classem\textsubscript{k}... imperat\textsubscript{i} [...Thessalum\textsubscript{i} nostram\textsubscript{k}-que in]

altum\textsubscript{m} ut pro\textsubscript{j} properiter deducerem\textsubscript{j}.

high-N-S-ACC COMP rapidly lead down-1-S-IMPERF-SUBJ

‘He orders me to rapidly lead the Thessalians’ and our own fleet into the deep.’ (Pac. Trag. 350-351)
Table 38: Complement Types with Object Control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrix Verb</th>
<th>Complement</th>
<th>Non-Finite</th>
<th>Finite</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOW – sinere</td>
<td></td>
<td>43 84%</td>
<td>8 16%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all others</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66 89%</td>
<td>8 11%</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEG – obsecrare</td>
<td>orare</td>
<td>2 67%</td>
<td>1 33%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all others</td>
<td>4 24%</td>
<td>13 76%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 33%</td>
<td>14 67%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORCE – cogere</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 83%</td>
<td>1 17%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all others</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68 89%</td>
<td>1 11%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAKE – facere</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 33%</td>
<td>12 67%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all others</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 37%</td>
<td>12 63%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORDER – iubere</td>
<td>postulare</td>
<td>107 95%</td>
<td>6 5%</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imperare</td>
<td>18 82%</td>
<td>4 18%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all others</td>
<td>4 67%</td>
<td>2 33%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>132 92%</td>
<td>12 8%</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROHIBIT – pergere</td>
<td>all others</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 95%</td>
<td>1 5%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URGE – hortari</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 33%</td>
<td>2 67%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARN – monere</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL OTHERS</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 100%</td>
<td>0 9%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>261 84%</td>
<td>51 16%</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, in (384-385) the command verb orare ‘to beg’ is itself embedded by iussit, and it may be that double structure with similar verbs that promotes the finite verb in the last clause (i.e. to disambiguate).

(384) pro₁ proᵣᵣ [PROᵣᵣ orare] iussitᵣᵣᵣᵣ [PROᵣᵣ] [iaam] [ut] [ad] [sesᵣᵣ] [veniaᵣᵣᵣᵣ].

‘My mistress ordered [me] to beg [you], if you love her, to come to her right now.’ (Ter. And. 687)


‘Now Jupiter has ordered me to beg this of you, that the inspectors go into all of the seats for spectators throughout the auditorium.’ (Pl. Amph. 64-66)

Another example of the finite subjunctive with multiple embedding is in (386).

(386) proᵣᵣ proᵣᵣᵣᵣ [PROᵣᵣ prohibere] ad cenam [ne proᵣᵣ proᵣᵣᵣᵣ promittatᵣᵣᵣᵣ].

‘Would you demand that he promise to prevent anyone [from coming] to dinner or that he not meet with anyone else at home?’ (Pl. Men. 794-795)

Imperare in (387) has a similar meaning to both iubere and orare, but even without multiple embedding it takes the subjunctive finite clause like iubere in (382).

(387) [postquam advorsum mi...] proᵣᵣᵣᵣ imperavi [...ut huc veniresᵣᵣᵣᵣ].

‘after I ordered [you] to come here to me’ (Pl. Men. 1050-1051)

In (388) monere ‘to remind’ is a weaker kind of ‘command’ but it too has a finite variant in the complementary clause.

(388) Tempus 'st [monere me] [hunc vicinum Phaniam ad]
cenam ut veniat].
dinner-F-S-ACC COMP come-3-S-SUBJ

‘It’s time for me to remind this neighbor Phania to come to dinner.’ (Ter. Heau. 169-170)

Example (389) has pergere ‘to continue, allow’, and this too takes the finite variant. This example is particularly interesting since the more usual infinitival control structure also occurs in the last clause. The parallel structure of the two parts of (389) supports the idea that the finite variant is semantically equivalent to the more typical infinitival structure.

(389) Si resto i pergit [ut eam i]; si ire conor i pro i-obj
if stand back-1-S continue-3-S COMP go-1-S-SUBJ if go-INFIN attempt-1-S-DEPON
prohibit baetere.
prohibit-2-S go-INFIN

‘If I stand back he tells me to go; if I try to go he keeps [me] from going.’ (Pac. Trag. 240)

The dative NP Telobois in (382) and mihi in (383) show that at least imperare has a θ-role for goal. Maybe a better way to translate (382) is ‘He commands [it] to the Teloboians that …’, where ‘it’ is a pro object in apposition to the ut-clause. However, there is no such overt dative NP in the other examples, and in (385) the controllee is a pronoun unambiguously marked accusative, not dative. Therefore, thematic roles alone do not account for the finite variant with control verbs.

Nor does the variant appear to be merely stylistic, since it occurs in all but three of the corpus authors. Moreover, the examples in (382-389) range from tragic poetry to comedy, and two additional examples not cited here are from Cato’s prose.

For sinere ‘to allow’, the finite subjunctive variant typically occurs with an imperative, as in (379) and (381). However, in (390) the two sinere clauses are different, since the first one has a null complementizer with finite subjunctive but the second one has the more use accusative
controllee + infinitive. Therefore, the finite variant is not uniquely identifiable with the imperative of *sinere*.

\[
\text{(390)} \quad \text{pro}_i \quad \text{sine}_i \quad \text{allow-2-S-IMPERAT} \quad \text{[proj]} \quad \{\text{tuos} \quad \text{ocellos}\}_k \quad \text{deosculer}_i, \quad \{\text{voluptas} \quad \text{mea}_i, \quad \text{pro}_i \quad \text{sine}_i, \quad \text{pro}_j \quad \text{amabo}_j, \quad \text{ted}_i \quad \text{[PRO}_i \quad \text{love-1-S-FUT} \quad \text{you-S-ACC} \text{amari}].
\]

‘Let me kiss [lit. ‘allow that I kiss’] your little eyes, my love, please allow yourself to be loved.’ (Pl. Cas. 136-137)

Finally, note that the finite variant appears in (386) with a negative command. If the more typical *nolle* + infinitival structure occurred, ambiguity would result from the multiple infinitives and scrambled word order. In this example, at least, the subjunctive variant for control appears to prevent syntactic ambiguity.

Together, these examples show that there are different reasons for the finite subjunctive variant to occur with verbs that otherwise take an accusative controllee and an infinitival complement. Sometimes the variant appears to prevent syntactic ambiguity, while in other instances it may occur simply for variety’s sake but is constrained to a small set of object-control lexemes.

### 6.4.2.5 Object pro: Controllee vs. Embedded

Given the pro-drop setting allowing null objects, there are three possibilities for null objects in object-control clauses: (a) a null controllee, (b) a null embedded direct object, and (c) both null controllee and null embedded direct object. Option (a) with a null controllee occurs in 88 (29%) of 303 contexts. (The total number of contexts, 303, is higher than the 274 shown in Table 29 because some examples contain more than one controllee NP entity.) Option (b) with a null embedded direct object occurs in 27 (20%) of 134 contexts with a transitive infinitive.
Option (c) with both null controller and null embedded object occurs in only 15 (12%) of 134 instances. The least transparent examples are those in which both objects are null but are not coordinated with an overt NP elsewhere in the immediate context, thus making recovery of the referent relatively difficult. An example is in (391).

(391) *Sic* pro\(_i\) sine\(_i\) pro\(_j\) [PRO\(_j\) *habere* pro\(_k\)].

‘So allow [her] to have [the sword].’ (Pl. *Cas*. 750)

In some examples, the pro objects may be null through coordination with an NP in the immediate environment, such as in (392), repeated here from (240).

(392) *Ecce*, Apollo\(_i\), denuo me\(_j\) iubes\(_i\) [PRO\(_j\) *facere* impetum\(_k\) in eum\(_i\)*]

behold Apollo- M-S-VOC anew I- S-ACC order-2- S make-INFIN attack-M-S-ACC into

qui\(_i\) stat\(_i\) atque [PRO\(_j\) *occidere* pro\(_j\)].

‘Behold, Apollo, once again you order me to make an attack against that man who is standing and to kill [him].’ (Pl. *Men*. 868-869)

Other examples exhibit a combination of a simple null object and a coordinated null object, as in sentence (393).

(393) pro\(_i\) iube\(_i\) pro\(_j\) [PRO\(_j\) nunc adtemptare pro\(_k\)], pro\(_i\)

iube\(_i\) pro\(_j\) [PRO\(_j\) nunc animo\(_i\) ruspari Phrygas\(_k\)].

‘Order [someone] now to attack [the Phrygians], order [someone] now to heartily search out the Phrygians.’ (Acc. *Trag*. 489)

In summary, the overall rate for object pro across all types of clauses is 23% (see Table 26). In object-control complements, the rate for null direct objects is similar to the overall rate at 20%. However, for main-clause controller objects, the omission rate of 29% is somewhat less than for both overall and embedded direct objects. An even lower rate of 12% occurs with combined null objects, the simultaneous omission of both the controller object and the embedded direct object. The general trend of these combined data is a preference for object NPs with a
higher-ranking thematic role to be overt rather than null. For instance, the controllee NP is co-indexed with the PRO infinitival subject and thus indirectly expresses the θ-role of agent in most control complements. In contrast, an embedded direct object typically bears the patient or theme role, which ranks lower on the thematic hierarchy. There is thus a tendency to overtly express the higher-ranking NP, and this tendency is supported by the relatively low rate (12%) of sentences in which both the controllee and embedded object are null.

### 6.4.3 Impersonal Control

As indicated in Table 29, 93 (6%) of infinitival clauses in the corpus are complements to an impersonal control verb. Unlike the object-control impersonal verbs such as *pudere* and *pigere*, these impersonal predicates take an internal argument NP with the thematic role of goal (i.e. marked for dative case). The dative NP controls the infinitival complement, with its subject as PRO. The most frequently occurring impersonal control verb is *licere* ‘to be allowed’, which occurs 54 times. Some examples are in (394–397).

(394)  

\[\text{(394) } \text{Nec [causam}_k\ldots\text{] liceat}_t \text{ [\ldotsPRO}_j \text{ dicere] mihi}_j.\]

‘Nor should I be allowed to plead a cause [lit. ‘nor should it be allowed to me to plead a cause’].’ (Pl. *Amph.* 158).

(395)  

\[\text{(395) } \text{Nimis vile 'st vinum atque amor, si ebrio}_j \text{ atque amanti}_j \text{ [PRO}_j \text{ impune facere pro}_k [quod}_k \text{luteat].}\]

‘Wine and love are too cheap, if a drunken lover is allowed [lit. ‘if it is allowed for a drunk and a lover’] to do what he pleases [lit. ‘what pleases [him]’].’ (Pl. *Aul.* 751).

(396)  

\[\text{(396) } \text{[PRO}_j \text{ ire] igitur tibi}_j \text{ licet}_t \text{ Nausistrata}_t.}\]

‘So you’re allowed [lit. ‘it is allowed to you’] to go, Nausistrata.’ (Ter. *Phor.* 813)

(397)  

\[\text{(397) } \text{Licet}_t \text{ [PRO}_j \text{ lacrumare] plebi}_j \text{ regi}_k \text{ [PRO}_k \text{].}\]

169
honeste] non licet._
honorably not be allowed-3-S

‘The common people are allowed to weep, but a king it is not honorable’ [lit. ‘it is allowed to the common people to weep, to the king it is not allowed honorably [to weep]’].’ (Enn. Trag. 235-236)

While the examples in (394-397) all have an overt controllee marked for dative case, sometimes the controllee remains covert as pro. Some examples are in (398-402).

(398) Nam hic nunc licet_i [PRO_j dicere].
for here now be allowed-3-S say-INFIN

‘For one may speak here now [lit. ‘for here it is now allowed to speak’].’ (Pl. Cas. 195)

(399) [PRO_j te -cum aetatem_k exigere] ut liceat._
you-S-ABL -with age-F-S-ACC live out-INFIN COMP be allowed-3-S-SUBJ

‘[I request] that [I] be allowed [lit. ‘that it be allowed [to me]’] to live out my life with you.’ (Pl. Mil. 1039)

(400) si pro_j liceat_i [PRO_j facere] et [PRO_j iam hoc_k versibus
if be allowed-3-S-SUBJ do-INFIN and now this-N-S-ACC verse-M-PL-ABL
rededere pro_j quod_m do_m.
render-INFIN REL-N-S-ACC give-1-S

‘if [I] be allowed [lit. ‘it should be allowed [to me]’] to do this and render it in verse as I’m doing’ (Luc. Sat. 1066).

(401) [[Naumachiam...] pro_j liceat_i […]haec…], inquam, […]alveolum -que…]_j
sea fight-F-S-ACC be permitted-3-S […] this-N-PL-ACC say-1-S board-N-S-ACC -and
[PRO_j putare]_k [...et calces]_i.
think-INFIN and stone-F-PL-ACC

‘It is permissible [for someone] to think these things are a sea fight or a board and counters [i.e. a game].’ (Luc. Sat. 489)

(402) [Quanto peiorem civem...]_k existimavint […]feneratorem quam
how much-N-S-ABL worse-M-ACC citizen-M-S-ACC consider-3-PL-PLUPERF-SUBJ usurer-M-S-ACC than
furem]_k, hinc pro_j liceat_i [PRO_j existimare].
thief-M-S-ACC from here be allowed-3-S consider-INFIN

‘How much worse they considered a usurer than a thief, [one] may judge from this.’ (Cato Agr. Intro.)

When the controllee is null, its referent is sometimes recoverable from a coordinated clause, as in example (403).
‘I beseech you that [I] be allowed to speak to you calmly and not get beaten.’ (Pl. Amph. 388).

In (404) a cultural schema provides the necessary information for recovery of the null controllee. Only a husband can be said to ducere ‘lead’ a wife (i.e. formally and legally ‘lead’ her into his household); a father gives away (dare) his daughter, and the bride veils herself (nubere) for the marriage ceremony. Thus, the unexpressed subject of the ducere clause must be the potential husband, co-indexed with the referent of meas (i.e. the speaker). Without the cultural context, it would be grammatically possible to interpret the speaker as providing the dowry to the bride (i.e. so she could marry someone else) but not actually marrying her himself.

(404) Proper {divitias meaus} pro3 licuiti [PRO3 {uxorem}]
because of riches-F-PL-ACC my-F-PL-ACC be allowed-3-S-PERF wife-F-S-ACC
dotatam}k {genere summo} ducere].
endow-PPP-F-S-ACC origin-N-S-ABL highest-N-S-ABL lead-INFIN

‘Because of my wealth [I] was allowed to marry a bride with a dowry and of the highest rank.’ (Pl. Mil. 679-680).

The second most frequent impersonal control verb is lubere ‘to please’ with 14 instances.

Examples are in (405-406).

(405) Qui lubitum est illi [PROJ condormiscere]?
how please-PPP-DEPON-N-S-NOM be-3-S that-M-S-DAT go to sleep-INFIN

‘How has he thought fit [lit. ‘was it pleasing to him’] to go to sleep?’ (Pl. Mil. 826)

(406) [quaex...] meo3 quomque3 animo3 lubitum be-3-S

[...PROJ facere]
do-INFIN

‘whatever I wanted to do [lit. ‘whatever it pleased my mind to do’]’ (Ter. And. 96-97)

53 Ne is a negative complementizer; a discussion of complementizer doubling is beyond the scope of this study.
Out of the 93 instances of impersonal control complements, all 93 (100%) have the infinitive with [+ present] tense. There are no finite variants.

6.4.4 Deontic Control

Of the 1,479 control complements, 32 (2%) are deontic control. As with impersonal control verbs, deontic control predicates also have an implicit NP serving as the goal, and control passes from that dative NP to the infinitival complement. The difference is that deontic control predicates have a deontic force, meaning something is ‘good’ (Goble, 1990, p. 169), ‘necessary’ and the like, or their opposites. Most deontic predicates are nouns or [+ neuter, + singular] adjectives (i.e. they share some agreement features with impersonal control predicates but belong to a different semantic field of meaning).

Examples (407-412) all have a deontic predicate meaning something ‘good’ or ‘necessary’ or their opposites.

(407) [PROj palam muttire] plebeioj piaculumi estj.

‘It is a crime for the commoner to grumble openly.’ (Enn. Trag. 340)

(408) Mihi necessei esti [PROj eloqui], nam scioj [Amyclasj eloqui].

‘I must speak out [lit. ‘it is necessary for me to speak out’], for I know Amyclae perished by keeping silent.’ (Luc. Sat. 696-697)

(409) uti tibi1 iusi esti [PROj porcoi piaculoi facere

‘as it is right for you to make a sacrifice with a pig’ (Cato Agr. 139)

(410) Virtusi [PROj scire] [homin i rectum utile quid sit honestum, quae bona, quae mala

likewise INTERROG-N-PL-NOM base-N-3-S-NOM dishonest-N-3-S-NOM
‘Excellence is knowing what is right and what is honorable for a man, what things are good and likewise what things are bad, what is useless, base, [or] dishonorable.’ (Luc. 
Sat. 1199-1200)

(Melius[i] \text{[PRO]} sanam[i] \text{[...mentem]} sumere[i].)
\begin{itemize}
\item better-N-S-NOM
\item sound-F-S-ACC
\item be-3-S
\item woman-F-S-VOC
\item mind-F-S-ACC
\item take-INFIN
\end{itemize}

‘Woman, it’s better to have a sound mind.’ (Pl. Men. 802)

(pro[i] \text{[PRO[k]} tacere[i]][\text{...}] \text{opinor[i]} \text{[...esse optimum[i]]}.)
\begin{itemize}
\item be silent-INFIN
\item think-1-S
\item be-INFIN
\item best-N-S-ACC
\end{itemize}

‘I think it best to be silent.’ (Enn. Trag. 147)

The examples in (413-414) have a deontic meaning of convenience or near-necessity.

(pro[i] \text{[PRO[i]} commodius \text{esse...]} \text{opinor[i]} \text{[...[PRO[k} duplici spe].}
\begin{itemize}
\item convenient-N-S-COMPAR
\item be-INFIN
\item think-1-S-DEPON
\item twofold-F-S-ABL
\item hope-F-S-ABL
\end{itemize}

‘I think it’s more convenient to enjoy a two-way hope.’ (Ter. Phor. 603)

(pro[i] nil \text{[PRO[i]} satis \text{firmi video[i]} \text{quam ob}.}
\begin{itemize}
\item nothing-N-S-ACC
\item enough-N-S-ACC
\item firm-N-S-GEN
\item see-1-S
\item INTERROG-F-S-ACC
\item because of
\item affair-F-S-ACC
\item take-INFIN
\item this-M-S-ACC
\item I-S-DAT
\item be fitting-3-S-SUBJ
\item fear-M-S-ACC
\end{itemize}

‘I don’t see any firm reason why I should take on [lit. ‘why it should be fitting for me to take on’] this fear.’ (Ter. Hea. 337)

In (415) the PPP \textit{decretum} is from the verb \textit{decernere} ‘to decide (what is right)’, and so as a stative adjective \textit{decretum} means ‘that which has been deemed (morally) right’.

(Nolo[i] hercle, nam mihi[i] \text{[PRO[i} bibere...]} \text{decretum[i]} est[i].)
\begin{itemize}
\item not wish-1-S
\item indeed for
\item 1-S-DAT
\item drink-INFIN
\item decide-PPP-N-S-NOM
\item be-3-S
\item water-F-S-ACC
\end{itemize}

‘Indeed I don’t want [to drink wine], for I’m supposed [lit. ‘it has been decided for me’] to drink water.’ (Pl. Aul. 572)

Out of 32 deontic control complements, all 32 (100%) have an infinitive marked for [+ present] tense. No finite clauses variants occur. In both respects, deontic control complements pattern exactly like impersonal control.
6.4.5 Sentential Control

Sentential control occurs with 44 (3%) of control complements. In the sentential-control construction, the infinitival clause is treated as an NP with [+ neuter, + singular] agreement features. For example, in (416) the infinitival complement is the bare infinitive *mentiri* ‘to lie’, and the neuter singular adjective *meum* ‘mine’ modifies it.

(416) \( \text{Non est}_i [\text{PRO}_j \text{mentiri}_i \text{meum}_i] \)  
\( \text{not be-3-s lie-INF-INFINON my-N-S-NOM} \)  
‘It is not my [habit, duty, …] to lie.’ (Ter. *Heau*. 549)

Grammatically, the PRO infinitival subject is arbitrary, although it is pragmatically constrained to refer to the speaker. It is the same construction as in English *ours is not to wonder why*. A similar construction with the same modifying adjective is in (417).

(417) \([\{\text{Homi}_i \text{amico} \text{et} \text{familiari}\}_k \ldots] \text{non est}_i [\ldots \text{PRO}_j \text{mentiri}_i \text{meum}_i] \)  
\( \text{human-M-S-DAT friend-M-S-DAT and family member-M-S-DAT not be-3-s lie-INF-INFINON my-N-S-NOM} \)  
‘It is not my [habit, duty, …] to lie to a friend and family member [or, ‘friend and acquaintance’].’ (Luc. *Sat*. 695)

In (418) the modifying adjective is the [+ neuter, + singular] *nostrum*, and in (419) it is *aliud*, which has the same agree features as *nostrum*.

(418) \( \text{Sed nostrum}_i \text{est}_i [\text{PRO}_j \text{intelleger}_i \text{utquomque} \text{atque} \text{ubi} \text{quomcum}_k] \)  
\( \text{but our-N-S-NOM be-3-s understand-INFIN INDEFIN-N-S-ACC and where INDEFIN-N-S-NOM} \)  
\( \text{opus}_k \text{sit}_5^{\text{4}} [\text{PRO}_j \text{obsequi}_i \text{pro}_k] \)  
\( \text{work-N-S-NOM be-3-S-SUBJ [PRO-J obey-INFIN other-N-S-NOM hasten-INFIN hasten-INFIN]} \)  
‘But our part is to understand whatever and wherever a need may be, to fulfill [it].’ (Ter. *Heau*. 578)

(419) \( \text{Aliud}_i \text{est}_i [\text{PRO}_j \text{properare}_i \text{aliud}_k] \)  
\( \text{other-N-S-NOM be-3-s hasten-INFIN other-N-S-NOM} \)  
\( \text{festinare}_5^{\text{5}} \)  
\( \text{hasten-INFIN} \)  
\( \text{54 In collocation with the copula, \text{opus} ‘work’ idiomatically means ‘need, opportunity.’} \)
\( \text{55 The semantic difference between these two verbs is probably in transitivity: \text{Properare} can be either transitive or intransitive, while \text{festinare} is only intransitive.} \)
‘It is one thing to hasten [something], another thing to hasten.’ (Cato Or. 131)

In (420) the infinitives colere, arare, and stercorare are in apposition to the neuter singular forms quid, secundum, and tertium.

(420) Quid est agrum bene colere? Bene arare.


Note especially that in the first question, the predicate includes the internal argument of the infinitive colere, the NP agrum. All three of these infinitives have arbitrary subjects, which are naturally left non-overt. The main verb is the copula, which is overt only in the first question.

For some sentential infinitives, there is no modifying adjective. Instead, the copula links the infinitival clause with another infinitival clause or a noun. Example (421) has two infinitival clauses linked by the copula. Note that the second infinitival clause has the overt NP subject te, a construction discussed in section 6.5.2.

(421) [PROj prodigere...] esti [...]cum proj nihilk habeasij tej

inriderier],

laugh at-INFIN-PASS

‘To be wasteful when you have nothing is to make yourself a laughing-stock.’ (Caec. Fab. 67)

Syntactically, the PRO subject of prodigere is arbitrary, but the sentence as a whole constrains it to be co-indexed with the referent of te. In (422), repeated here from (354), two infinitives are also linked by the copula.

(422) [PROj salvere prok iubere]i [PROj salutem1...] esti

[...mittere amicoj[m]i].

send-INFIN friend-M-S-DAT
‘To order [someone] to be well is to send greetings [lit. ‘safety’] to a friend.’ (Luc. Sat. 261)

In (423) there is no overt noun in apposition to the infinitival phrase, but the genitive NP *praetorum* implies a noun such as *officium* ‘duty’.

(423) *Ergo proi praetorum*56 *est* [PRO ante et praieire].

(Luc. Sat. 1215)

Examples like (416-419) explicitly show the infinitive in apposition to an NP marked as [+ neuter, + singular]. This grammatical agreement feature has implications for passivization in certain types of AcI clauses (see section 7.2.4).

Of the 44 sentential-control complements, all 44 (100%) have a present-tense infinitive and there are no finite variants.

### 6.4.6 Case Assignment for PRO

A significant issue regarding PRO in early Latin is which, if any, case assignment it receives. According to the PRO Theorem, PRO cannot receive a full-fledged case assignment since it would have to have a governing category. Because PRO fulfills a *θ*-role in relation to the infinitive, there is only an invisible case marking on it. Chomsky and Lasnik (1993) argue that the case assigned to PRO is null case.

However, evidence from early Latin suggests a case assignment somewhat more robust than mere null. PRO assumes the case assigned with the clause type – it takes on whatever case an overt NP would have in the same position. Such a case assignment is not null, but default. In most control complements, there is no overt evidence of any case assignment to PRO. However,

56 This is an agentive noun derived from *praeire*; a *praetor* is literally ‘one who goes before’ = ‘a leader’. As a technical political term, it had probably lost its derivational transparency by Lucilius’ time (in the same way that *senator* < *senex* ‘old (man)’ was probably not understood literally but rather just as the denotation of a particular political rank), so that this statement is likely meant as descriptive rather than tautological.
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certain constructions provide the necessary conditions to examine PRO’s case. For example, in an obligatory subject-control clause with a copula, any adjective or other nominal in agreement with the subject is marked with nominative case. Since the copula always links nominative-to-nominative NPs (Leumann & Hofmann, pp. 624-626), it follows that PRO linked by a copula must be nominative. Since [+ neuter] nominals have the same morphology in the nominative and accusative cases, only [- neuter] NPs can unambiguously demonstrate the case marking on PRO with a copula.

Two corpus examples include the matrix predicate *nolle* ‘not to wish’. In example (424) PRO has the features [+ feminine, + singular] in agreement with *molestā*, while PRO in (425) is [+ masculine, + singular] in agreement with (the human male) *Sosia*. Both instances of PRO are apparently nominative.

(424) \[\text{pro}_i [\text{pro}_i \text{molest}_i \text{e}_i \text{es}_i \text{nolo}_i].\]

\[
\text{bothersome-F-S-NOM ANA-S-DAT be-INFIN not wish-1-S}\\
\]

‘I don’t want to be bothersome to him.’ (Pl. Cas. 545)

(425) \[\text{ubi e}_g_o_i [\text{pro}_i \text{Sosia ...} \text{nolim}_i [...es}_s_i, \text{tu}_i \text{esto}_i].\]

\[
\text{where I-S-NOM Sosia-M-S-NOM not wish-1-S-SUBJ be-INFIN you-S-NOM be-2-S-IMPERAT}\\
\]

‘When I don’t want to be Sosia, you be Sosia.’ (Pl. Amph. 439)

Example (426) has the adjective *tardus* with overt features of [+ masculine, + singular] in agreement with PRO with the subject-control verb *coepere*.

(426) \[\text{pro}_i [\text{pro}_i \text{tard}_u_i \text{es}_s_i \text{ilico} \text{coep}_i].\]

\[
\text{slow-M-S-NOM be-INFIN there begin-1-S-PERF}\\
\]

‘Then I began to go [lit. ‘be’] slow.’ (Pl. Cas. 884)

In (427) the [+ masculine, + singular] NP *bonus vates* in linked with PRO under *posse*.

(427) \[\text{pro}_i [\text{pro}_i \{\text{bonus vates}\}_i ... \text{pot}e_r_a_s_i [...es}_s_i, \text{nam} \text{pro}_i].\]

\[
\text{good-M-S-NOM prophet-M-S-NOM be able-2-S-PLUPERF be-INFIN for}\\
\]
‘You could have been a good prophet, for you say what is going to be.’ (Pl. Mil. 911)

Example (428) also has a [+ masculine, + singular] adjective linked to PRO.

\( \text{pro} \, j \quad \text{[quae]_{1} \, sunt_{1} \, futura_{1}} \quad \text{dicis_{1}} \)

REL-N-PL-ACC be-3-PL be-PART-FUT-N-PL-NOM say-2-S

‘I much preferred to serve you [i.e. as a slave] than to be another man’s freedman.’ (Pl. Mil. 1355-1356).

Three corpus examples involve raising to subject position with a control complement (discussed further in section 7.2.1). In sentence (429) PRO has [+ feminine, + singular] agreement with \textit{subacta} (referring to Alcumena).

\( \text{Tu} \, i_{1} \quad \text{cum \{Alcumena} \, uxore\}_{j} \quad \text{antiquam \, in \, gratiam} \)

you-S-NOM with Alcmena-F-S-ABL wife-F-S-ABL former-F-S-ACC into agreeableness-F-S-ACC

redi_{i}; \quad \text{haud \, pro}_{j} \quad \text{promeruit}_{j} \quad \text{quam \, ob \, rem} \)

go back-2-S-IMPERAT not PRO_s-3-S-PERF INTERROG-F-S-ACC on account of affair-F-S-ACC

\( \text{pro}_{i} \quad \text{pro}_{j} \quad \text{vitio}_{k} \quad \text{vorteres}_{i}; \quad \text{\{mea} \, \text{vi}_{1}\text{\}}_{j} \quad \text{pro}_{m} \)

wrongdoing-N-S-ABL turn-2-S-IMPERF-SUBJ my-F-S-ABL force-F-S-ABL do-INFIN

\( \text{subacta}_{j} \quad \text{\textquotesingle st}_{j} \quad \text{[PRO}_{j} \quad \text{facere} \quad \text{pro}_{m}] \)

compel-PPP-F-S-NOM be-3-S be-3-INFIN

‘Return to your former agreeable relationship with your wife Alcmena: she has not done anything wrong to deserve that you should turn away [from her]; she was forced by me to do [it].’ (Pl. Amph. 1140-1142)

A similar raised nominative [+ feminine, + singular] PPP in (430-431) also link to PRO.

\( \text{Era}_{i} \quad \text{atque \, haec}_{j} \quad \text{dolum}_{k} \quad \text{ex \, proxumo} \quad \text{hunc}_{k} \)

mistress-F-S-NOM and this-F-S-NOM trick-M-S-ACC out of nearest-M-S-ABL this-M-S-ACC

\( \text{protulerunt}_{j+1}; \quad \text{ego}_{1} \quad \text{[PRO}_{i} \quad \text{hunc}_{m} \ldots \text{]} \quad \text{missa}_{i} \quad \text{sum \, \text{[\ldots ludere].}} \)

carry forth-3-PL-PERF I-S-NOM this-M-S-ACC send-PPP-F-S-NOM be-1-S play-INFIN

‘The mistress and this woman from next door have carried out this trick; I was sent to fool him.’ (Pl. Cas. 687-688)
‘Or, so that a citizen might take on no shame on account of her poverty, has she been ordered to be given to her nearest male [relative]?’ (Ter. Phor. 415-416)

In all these examples the appositive adjective or noun linked to PRO\(^{57}\) is nominative. Therefore, PRO is assigned nominative case by default through its linking to an overt nominative NP. The next question is whether PRO is assigned accusative case when linked to an overt accusative NP in a control complement. Already we have seen several examples of control complements with a [+ perfect] tense passive infinitive, in which the form of the infinitive is the PPP + (overt or non-overt) copula. In these examples the overt morphology on the PPP is unambiguously accusative for [- neuter] NPs. Sentence (432), repeated from (363), has the PPP insulatam linked by a null copula to PRO.

(432) *Neque* pro\(_i\) me\(_i\) quidem patiar\(_i\) [PRO\(_i\) probri\(_j\) falsa]*

impune without punishment insulatam\(_i\)]. accus-PPP-F-S-ACC

‘Nor indeed will I allow myself to be falsely accused of wrong.’ (Pl. Mil. 395)

In (433), repeated from (367), the PPP missos is [+ masculine, + plural].

(433) pro\(_i\) nos\(_j\) [PRO\(_j\) missos\(_j\)] face\(_i\). send-PPP-M-PL-ACC make-2-S-IMPERAT

‘Send us away [lit. ‘make us having been sent’].’ (Ter. And. 833)

Example (434), repeated from (373), has the PPP incenatum with the object-control predicate iubere.

(434) pro\(_i\) pro\(_j\) [PRO\(_i\) incenatum\(_j\)...] iubeto\(_i\) [...esse].

not dine-PPP-DEPON-M-S-ACC order-2-S-IMPERAT-FUT be-INF

‘Order [him] not to dine [lit. ‘not to have dined’].’ (Cato Agr. 127)

---

\(^{57}\) Alternatively, it can be argued that these examples do not have PRO since they have some NP constituent overt. However, since the copula’s function is to link and one of the two linked elements is non-overt, PRO is a valid label here.
In addition to these examples with a PPP, sentence (435) has the ordinary [+ feminine, + plural] adjective *bonas* linked with the overt copula *esse* to PRO.

(435) *Nam expediti, [PROj bonasj esse] vobis; nos1 quibus1 -cum estm resm non prok sinunkt1k.*

‘For it’s useful for you women to be good; they don’t allow us, whose business it is, [to be good].’ (Ter. *Heau*. 388)

The combined evidence shows that PRO gets either nominative or accusative case assignment, depending on the case assignment of the NP in apposition to it. This is not a null case, but rather a default structural assignment.

### 6.5 ECM

Out of the 3,828 infinitival complements in the corpus, 2,210 (58%) are ECM. These can be classified into four main types, discussed below. A summary of the classifications is in Table 39.

Table 39: ECM Complements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECM Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Control ~ ECM</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcI</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,210</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that AcI complements alone are so numerous as to represent 39% of all the infinitives in the corpus.

What is called ‘exceptional’ in ECM is the embedded NP argument being assigned accusative case by the matrix verb even though that verb does not subcategorize such an argument. Example (436) is particularly interesting in this regard, since the matrix verb *habeo* ‘I
have’ is not an ECM verb in itself. But with its internal argument gratiam the meaning becomes lit. ‘I have thankfulness’, or ‘I am grateful’. What the speaker is grateful for is expressed in an ECM clause. Since habere can normally take only one accusative NP (here, gratiam), the infinitival subject id is clearly not an actual argument of the matrix verb.

\[
\text{Id gratum fuisse avorsum te} \]

\[habeo gratiam.\]

‘I’m pleased it was pleasing to you.’ (Ter. And. 41-42)

Other verbs that are not inherently AcI but which become so with an internal argument are dare ‘to give’ + fidem ‘faith’ in (437) and inducere ‘to lead in’ + animum ‘mind’ in (438). As part of the synopsis at the beginning of the play, example (437) summarizes what Pamphilus does and what he believes will happen.

\[
\text{Sororem falsa creditam meretriculae, genere Andriae,}
\]

\[Glycerium vitiat Pamphilus gravida -que facta}

\[dat Glycerium uxorem fore hanc.\]

‘Pamphilus debauches Glycerium, [who is] falsely believed [to be] the sister of the little prostitute from Andria and when she’s pregnant he believes [lit. ‘he gives faith’] she will become his wife.’ (Ter. And. Arg.)

\[
\text{pro quanto -que \{suam vitam\}_k superiorem}_{k-1}
\]

\[atque ampliorem_k\]

\[animum inducent_i [\ldots esse quam innoxiorem_k].\]

‘They will believe [lit. ‘lead the mind into’] their own life is so much more superior and greater and more preferable than more harmless.’ (Cato Or. 178)

Altogether the corpus contains seven instances of compound AcI predicates of this kind.

Bolkestein (1979, pp. 20-21) makes a similar argument with dicere ‘to say’ and other AcI matrix verbs, showing that a NP referring to a person cannot by itself be the direct object of the verb,
but must instead be an argument of the infinitive. That claim is not completely right, because
dicere does actually take a true internal direct object in a context like (439).

(439)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pyth.</th>
<th>Sed</th>
<th>uter</th>
<th>vestrorum</th>
<th>est</th>
<th>celerior?</th>
<th>pro</th>
<th>memora</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>but</td>
<td>which-M-S-NOM</td>
<td>you-PL-GEN</td>
<td>be-3-S</td>
<td>swift-COMP-M-S-NOM</td>
<td>tell-2-S-IMPERAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pro</th>
<th>mihi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-S-DAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anthr.</th>
<th>Ego,</th>
<th>et</th>
<th>multo</th>
<th>melior.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-S-NOM</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>much</td>
<td>better-M-S-NOM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pyth.</th>
<th>Cocum</th>
<th>ego,</th>
<th>non</th>
<th>furem</th>
<th>rogo.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cook-M-S-ACC</td>
<td>I-S-NOM</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>thief-M-S-ACC</td>
<td>ask-1-S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anthr.</th>
<th>Cocum</th>
<th>ergo</th>
<th>dico.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cook-M-S-ACC</td>
<td>therefore</td>
<td>say-1-S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Pyth. But which of you is the faster? Tell me.

Anthr. I am, and much better too.

Pyth. I’m asking about a cook, not a thief.

Anthr. So I say a cook.’ (Pl. Aul. 321-323)

Here the NP cocum in the last line of the citation clearly undergoes the action of saying.

Generally, though, dicere and the many other ECM verbs have no direct semantic relationship to the NP marked as accusative.

In addition, impersonal predicates such as placere ‘to please’ have only one argument, which is realized as an ECM theme complement. Since that argument has no inherent thematic role for an NP (only for a clause), the accusative-marked NP necessarily comes from the infinitival complement and not the matrix verb itself. An example is in (440).

(440)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quom</th>
<th>id_{i}</th>
<th>mihi_{j}</th>
<th>placebat_{i}</th>
<th>[tum]</th>
<th>{uno}</th>
<th>ore</th>
<th>omnes_{k}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>when</td>
<td>ANA-N-S-NOM</td>
<td>I-S-DAT</td>
<td>please-3-S-IMPERF</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>one-N-S-ABL</td>
<td>mouth-N-S-ABL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>{omnia}</th>
<th>bona}_{l}</th>
<th>dicere</th>
<th>et</th>
<th>[pro_{k}</th>
<th>laudare</th>
<th>{fortunas}</th>
<th>meas}_{m}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all-N-PL-ACC</td>
<td>good-N-PL-ACC</td>
<td>say-INF</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>praise</td>
<td>fortune-F-PL-ACC</td>
<td>my-F-PL-ACC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Then that was pleasing to me, that everyone with one voice said all good things and praised my good luck.’ (Ter. And. 96-97)
Similarly, deontic ECM predicates have no internal argument for the infinitival subject, which
must therefore come from outside the matrix clause. Some examples are in (441-442).

(441) \[ Ut \text{ [filium}_j \text{ bonum}_j \text{ patri}_k \text{ esse} \text{ oportet}_i \text{ itidem}_j \text{ ego}_l \text{ sum}_l \]  
\[ \text{as} \text{ son-M-S-ACC good-M-S-ACC father-M-S-DAT be-INFIN be fitting-3-s same I-S-NOM be-I-s} \]

\[ patri_k \text{ father-M-S-DAT} \]

‘As a son should be good to his father, so am I good to my father.’ (Pl. Amph. 992)

(442) \[ Nos_i \text{ quiescere} \text{ aequum}_i \text{ est}_l \]  
\[ I-PL-ACC become quiet-INFIN fair-N-S-NOM be-3-s \]

‘Is it right for us to become quiet?’ (Enn. Trag. 166)

Finally, a trace in 12 (1%) of ECM contexts shows that the infinitival clause itself is
embedded by the matrix predicate. That is, the clause is in apposition to the trace, which is
either a demonstrative or a form of the unbound anaphor is. An example of a trace with the
ECM verb velle ‘to wish’ is in (443), where the anaphoric pronoun id refers to the proposition in
the ECM clause.

(443) \[ pro_i \text{ id}_j \text{ voluit}_i \text{ sic} \text{ necopinantis}_k \text{ duci} \]  
\[ ANA-N-S-ACC wish-3-s-PERF thus unaware-PART-M-PL-ACC lead-INFIN-PASS \]
\[ \{falso \text{ gaudio}_l \text{ sperantis}_k \text{ iam,} \text{ amoto}_m \text{ metu}_u \} ]_l \]
\[ FALSE-N-S-ABL joy-N-S-ABL hope-PART-M-PL-ACC now remove-PPP-M-S-ABL fear-M-S-ABL \]
\[ \text{interoscitantis}_k \text{ opprimi}_u \] \[ \text{be agape-PART-M-PL-ACC oppress-INFIN-PASS} \]
\[ \text{ne} \text{ esset} \text{ spatium}_u \text{ cogitandi} \] \[ \text{lest be-5-s-IMPERF-SUBJ space-N-S-NOM think-GERUND-N-S-GEN} \]
\[ ad \text{ disturbandas} \text{ nuptias;} \text{ astute.} \] \[ \text{to disturb-GERUNDIVE-F-PL-ACC marriage-F-PL-ACC cunningly} \]

‘He wanted this, for us to be lead unaware by false hope, now hoping, with fear removed,
[for us] while we were gaping to be taken by surprise, so that there wouldn’t be any time
for devising how to ruin the wedding; [he did it] cunningly.’ (Ter. And. 180-183)

In (444) the same anaphor id is also used with an AcI clause.

(444) \[ Scelestissume_i \text{ audes}_i \text{ mihi}_j \text{ praedicare id}_k \text{ domi te}_l \]  
\[ scoundrel-SUPER-M-S-VOC dare-2-s I-S-DAT proclaim-INFIN ANA-N-S-ACC home-F-S-LOC you-S-ACC \]
\[ esse nunc]_k \text{ qui}_i \text{ hic} \text{ ades}_l \] \[ be-INFIN now REL-M-S-NOM here be near-2-s \]

‘Utter scoundrel, do you dare proclaim this to me, that you’re at home now when you’re
right here?’ (Pl. Amph. 561-562)
Examples (445-446) have the demonstrative *hoc* as the trace to an AcI complement.

(445) \[\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{pro}_i & \{\text{unum} & \text{hoc}\}_j & \text{scio}_{\text{a}} & [\text{hanc}_k & \text{meritam}_k & \text{esse}]_j & \text{ut} \\
& \text{one-N-S-ACC} & \text{this-N-S-ACC} & \text{know-1-} & \text{this-F-S-ACC} & \text{earn-PPP-DEPON-F-S-ACC} & \text{be-INFIN} & \text{COMP} \\
& \text{pro}_i & \text{memor}_j & \text{esses}_j & \text{sui}_k, \\
& \text{mindful-M-S-NOM} & \text{be-2-S-IMPERF-SUBj} & \text{ANA-S-GEN} \\
\end{array}\]

‘This one thing I know, that she has deserved that you should remember her.’ (Ter. And. 281)

(446) \[\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{pro}_i & \text{credo}_{\text{i}} & \text{tibi} & \text{hoc}_j & \text{nunc,} & [\text{peperisse} & \text{hanc}_k & \text{e} \\
& \text{believe-1-S} & \text{-Y/N} & \text{you-S-DAT} & \text{this-N-S-ACC} & \text{now} & \text{give birth-INFIN-PERF} & \text{this-F-S-ACC} & \text{out of} \\
& \text{Pamphilo}_j? \\
& \text{Pamphilus-M-S-ABL} \\
\end{array}\]

‘Do I now believe you in this, that she bore Pamphilus [a son]?’ (Ter. And. 497)

The clausal appositives show that the entire infinitival complement – not the ECM subject – is treated as a direct object of the matrix verb.

6.5.1 Subject-Control ~ ECM

As in English, one type of ECM is the contrast between verbs that can take either a control or an ECM structure. Example (447) is adapted here from (27).

(447) a. Caesar, wanted [\text{PRO}_i to accept the divorce] 

b. Caesar, wanted [(for) Pompeia\text{}j to accept the divorce]

The essential difference between these two sentences is the type of NP in the embedded subject: PRO for control and an overt NP for ECM. In this example, there is also a difference in co-indexing: the control sentence has co-indexed subjects, while the ECM sentence does not.

(English does allow some reflexive subjects in ECM to be co-indexed depending on the lexeme, so co-indexing of subjects alone does not distinguish between the two complement types.)

The corpus predicates that take either a subject-control or ECM embedded clause pattern into four semantic groups totaling 266 predicates. The largest semantic group contains verbs meaning ‘want’: *cupere* ‘to wish, desire’, *optare* ‘to choose, wish’, *studere* ‘to be eager for,'
desire’, \textit{velle} ‘to wish’, \textit{malle} ‘to prefer’ (lit. ‘to wish more’), and \textit{nolle} ‘not to wish’. Together these lexemes account for 211 (79\%) of the 266 subject-control ~ ECM predicates. An example with \textit{cupere} is in (448), where the (a) sentence is a control structure and the (b) sentence is ECM. Note that the underlying difference between the two is whether the embedded subject is co-indexed or disjoint.

(448) a. \[\text{pro}_i \left[ \text{PRO}_i \text{ domum ire} \right] \text{cupio}_i, \]

\[\text{home-F-S-ACC go-INFIN wish-1-S} \]

‘I want to go home.’ (Pl. \textit{Men}. 963)

b. \[\text{pro}_i \left[ \text{ei} \text{us…} \right] \text{cupio}_i \left[ \left\{ \text{filiam virginem} \right\}_j \text{mi}_i \text{desponderi} \right]. \]

\[\text{ANA-M-S-GEN wish-1-S daughter-F-S-ACC maiden-F-S-ACC I-S-DAT promise-INFIN-PASS} \]

‘I wish (for) his maiden daughter to be promised to me [i.e. in marriage]’. (Pl. \textit{Aul}. 172-173)

A similar distinction between co-indexed and disjoint infinitival subjects occurs in (449-450) with \textit{velle}.

(449) a. \[\text{Numquam pro}_i \left[ \text{PRO}_i \text{ indicare id filio}_j\ldots \right] \text{voluit}_i \]

\[\text{never show-INFIN ANA-N-S-ACC son-M-S-DAT wish-3-S-PERF} \]

\[\ldots \text{suoj}_j, \left[ \text{PRO}_i \text{ inopem}_j\ldots \right] \text{optavit}_i \left[ \ldots \text{potius eum}_j \right. \]

\[\text{own-M-S-DAT without means-M-S-ACC -and choose-3-S-PERF rather leave-INFIN} \]

\[\text{quam eum thensaurum commostraret}_i \text{filio}_j]. \]

\[\text{than ANA-M-S-ACC treasure-M-S-ACC show-3-S-IMPERF-SUBJ son-M-S-DAT} \]

‘[He] never wanted to show it to his son; he chose to leave him without means rather than show that treasure to his son.’ (Pl. \textit{Aul}. 9-12)

b. \{\text{Omnes mortales} \}_i \left[ \text{seselaudarier} \right] \text{optant}_i\ldots \]

\[\text{all-M-PL-NOM mortal-M-PL-NOM ANA-ACC praise-INFIN-PASS choose-3-PL} \]

‘All mortals want (for) themselves to be praised.’ (Enn. \textit{Ann}. 549)

(450) a. \{\text{Quis pater aut cognatus} \}_i \left[ \text{volet}_i \right. \]

\[\text{Q-M-S-NOM father-M-S-NOM or relative-M-S-NOM wish-3-S-FUT} \]

\[\text{contra tueri}? \]

\[\text{opposite look-INFIN-DEPON} \]

‘What father or relative will want to look at you?’ (Enn. \textit{Ann}. 462)
b.  
\[ \mathbf{Vos}_j \ - \mathbf{ne} \ - \ \mathbf{velit}_i \ \mathbf{... \ an \ me}_k \ \mathbf{regnare} \ \mathbf{era}_i \ ? \]  
\text{you-PL-ACC} -Y/N \ \text{wish-3-S-SUBJ or I-S-ACC rule-INFIN master-F-S-NOM}  

‘Would the mistress wish (for) you or (for) me to rule?’ (Enn. Ann. 189)

Similarly, examples (451-452) show the two embedded complement types with \textit{nolle}, and (453) has \textit{malle}.

\begin{enumerate}
\item (451) a.  
\[ \mathbf{pro}_i \ \mathbf{[in \ coloniam\ldots, \ mercules, \ \mathbf{[\ldots \mathbf{PRO}_i \ \mathbf{scribere\ldots]} \ \mathbf{nolim}_i]} \]  
\text{into colony-F-S-ACC my Hercules write-INFIN wish-1-S-SUBJ}  
\[ \mathbf{si} \ \mathbf{trium} \ \mathbf{virum} \ \mathbf{sim}_i, \ \mathbf{[\ldots \mathbf{spatiatorem}_j \ \mathbf{atque} \ \mathbf{nolim}_i]} \]  
\text{if three-M-PL-GEN man-M-PL-GEN be-1-S-SUBJ walker-M-S-ACC and}  
\[ \mathbf{\{\mathbf{regem} \ \mathbf{Persem}_j \}}_1 \ \mathbf{vinci} \ \mathbf{t}_i \]  
\text{king-M-S-ACC Persis-M-S-ACC conquer-INFIN-PASS}  

‘Really, I wouldn’t want to send a walker and a Fescennian into the colony if I were one of the triumvirs.’ (Cato. Or. 113)

b.  
\[ \mathbf{Atque} \ \mathbf{ego}_i \ \mathbf{quidem} \ \mathbf{arbitror}_i \ \mathbf{[\mathbf{Rodienses}_j \ \mathbf{noluisse}]} \]  
\text{and I-S-NOM indeed think-1-S-DEPON from Rhodes-M-PL-ACC not wish-INFIN-PERF}  
\[ \mathbf{[\mathbf{nos}_i \ \mathbf{ita} \ \mathbf{depugnare}, \ \mathbf{uti} \ \mathbf{depugnatum} \ \mathbf{est}, \ \mathbf{neque} \ \mathbf{[\mathbf{pro}_k \ \mathbf{I-PL-ACC \ \mathbf{thus} \ \mathbf{fight \ out-INFIN} \ \mathbf{as} \ \mathbf{fight \ out-PPP-N-S-NOM} \ \mathbf{be-3-S \ nor}]} \mathbf{\{\mathbf{regem} \ \mathbf{Persem}_j \}}_1 \ \mathbf{vinci} \ \mathbf{t}_i \]  
\text{I-PL-ACC thus fight out-INFIN as fight out-PPP-N-S-NOM be-3-S nor}  

‘And indeed I think the Rhodians didn’t want to fight it out with us the way it was fought out, nor did they want (for) king Persis to be conquered.’ (Cato Or. 164)

\item (452) a.  
\[ \mathbf{Nolo}_i \ \mathbf{ego}_i \ \mathbf{[\mathbf{PRO}_i \ \mathbf{hanc}_j \ \mathbf{adeo} \ \mathbf{efflictim} \ \mathbf{amare}]} \]  
\text{not wish-1-S I-S-NOM this-F-S-ACC to there destruction-F-S-ACC love-INFIN}  

‘I don’t want to love her to death.’ (Naev. Fab. 37-38)

b.  
\[ \mathbf{pro}_i \ \mathbf{[\mathbf{mirari \ldots}] \ \mathbf{nolim}_i \ \mathbf{[\ldots \mathbf{vos}_j \ \mathbf{[\mathbf{quapropter} \ \mathbf{Iuppiter}}]} \]  
\text{wonder-INFIN-DEPON not wish-1-S-SUBJ you-PL-ACC why Jupiter-M-S-NOM}  
\[ \mathbf{\{\mathbf{nunc} \ \mathbf{histriones} \ \mathbf{curet}\}}_1 \]  
\text{now actor-M-PL-ACC care about-3-S-SUBJ}  

‘I wouldn’t want (for) you to wonder why Jupiter now cares about the actors.’ (Pl. Amph. 86-87)

\item (453) a.  
\[ \mathbf{pro}_i \ \mathbf{malis}_i \ - \mathbf{ne} \ \mathbf{[\mathbf{PRO}_i \ \mathbf{esse}]} \ ? \]  
\text{prefer-2-S -Y/N eat-INFIN}  

‘Do you prefer to eat?’ (Luc. Sat. 663)

b.  
\[ \mathbf{pro}_i \ \mathbf{[\mathbf{regnum}_j \ \mathbf{tibi}_k \ \mathbf{permitti}]} \ \mathbf{malunt}_i \]  
\text{kingdom-N-S-ACC you-S-DAT grant-INFIN-PASS prefer-3-PL}  

\end{enumerate}
'They prefer (for) the kingdom to be granted to you.' (Acc. Trag. 468)

In (454) the same contrast between subject control and ECM occurs with *studere*.

(454) a. \[ Sed \ ita \ pro_i [PRO_i \ Achilli \ armis \ inclutis \ studet_i \ studere \ vesce_i \ cuncta \ opima \ levia \ iam \ ut \ praec \ illis] \ putet_i. \] 

‘But he is so eager to feed upon Achilles’ famous weapons that he now thinks the rest of the spoils are trivial compared with them.’ (Acc. Trag. 96-97)

b. \[ Faciundum \ est \ mi_i \ illud \ fieri \ quod \ illaec \ postulat \ si \ [me_i \ amantem \ ad \ sese_i \ ... \ studeam_i \ recipere] \] do-GERUNDIVE-N-S-NOM be-3-S that- F-S-NOM do-INFIN-PASS REL-N-S-ACC that-F-S-NOM demand-3-S if I-S-ACC that-F-S-ACC love-PART-F-S-ACC to ANA-ACC be eager-I-S-SUBJ take back-INFIN

‘I must do what she demands to be done if I want (for) her to lovingly take me back to her [lit. ‘to herself’].’ (Pl. Amph. 891-892)

Another group of control/ECM verbs includes two verbs meaning ‘promise’: *polliceri* ‘to offer, proffer, promise’ and *promittere* ‘to promise’, together representing 22 (1%) of the control ~ ECM verbs. Examples of these verbs in the two structure types are in (455-456), again with the (a) sentences as control and (b) as ECM.

(455) a. \[ pro_i \ negabo_i \ -n \ [velle \ me_i \ ], \ modo \ qui_i \ sum \ pollicitus_i \ [PRO_i \ ducere]\] deny-1-S-FUT-V/N wish-INFIN I-S-ACC just now REL-M-S-NOM be-1-S promise-PPP-DEPON-M-S-NOM lead-INFIN

‘Am I going to deny I want to, when just now I promised I would [i.e. marry her]?’ (Ter. And. 612-613)

b. \[ pro_i \ [[puerum_i \ ... \ autem \ ne \ resciscat_i \ [...mi_k \ esse \ ex \ ilia] \ cautio \ 'st, \ nam \ pro_k \ pollicitus_k \ sum_k \] boy-M-S-ACC however lest find out-3-S-SUBJ I-S-DAT be-INFIN out of caution-I-S-NOM be-3-S for promise-PPP-DEPON-M-S-NOM be-1-S
‘I must be careful that [he] doesn’t find out I have a boy with her, for I have promised [I] will raise [him] up.’ (Ter. And. 400-401)

(456) a. 
\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{Casina-F-S-ACC} & \text{ego} & \text{wife-F-S-ACC} & \text{promise-I-S-PERF} & \text{overseer-M-S-DAT} & \text{our-M-S-DAT} \\
\text{promisi} & \text{uxorem} & \text{vilico nostro} \\
\text{dare}. \\
give-\text{INFIN}
\end{array}
\]

‘I promised to give Casina as wife to our overseer.’ (Pl. Cas. 288)

b. 
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{promise-2-S-IMPERAT} & \text{this-N-S-ACC} & \text{be-\text{INFIN-FUT}} \\
\text{promitte} & \text{fore} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Promise this will be.’ (Pl. Aul. 219)

In the following sections, certain predicates are classified as ECM or control based on their syntactic patterns.

6.5.1.1 ‘Hope’

In English, ‘hope’ is distinctly a control verb (e.g. I hope to win), and it lacks an ECM counterpart for either reflexive (e.g. *I hope myself to win) or disjoint subjects (e.g. *I hope him to win). When the matrix subject is not co-indexed with the ‘hope’ subject in English, the embedded clause must be finite (e.g. I hope he will win). However, in Latin, sperare ‘to hope’ and the related noun spes ‘hope’ behave as ECM rather than control, as shown from two patterns of distribution.

First, the embedded subject with sperare is typically an overt NP. In (457) with the noun spes as the matrix predicate, having the lower subject overt makes its meaning easier to interpret than otherwise since the matrix noun does not mark [person] for who does the hoping as the verb sperare would.

58 See footnote 36. The meaning is somewhat ironic here, since the speaker – although an adult – is still under his father’s legal responsibility and therefore cannot legally ‘raise’ the child. The plot of the play hinges on the felicity condition of the speaker’s promise.
My hope is [he] will discover you [are] two twin brothers born of one mother and one father on the same day.’ (Pl. Men. 1101-1102)

However, even when the matrix predicate is the verb sperare and the main and embedded subjects are co-indexed, the lower subject is also typically overt, as in the selections in (458-462) from a wide variety of authors.

‘And how does he hopes [lit. ‘himself’] to rule at Square Rome?’ (Enn. Ann. 123)

‘who hopes to marry [lit. ‘herself to (fut.) marry’] a green young man’ (Naev. Frag. 7-8)

‘hoping I’ll be able to offer [lit. ‘myself to be able to offer] these same things for a lifetime and to give [lit. ‘(fut.) to give’] something chewed up from the mouth.’ (Luc. Sat. 1059-1060).

‘which I hope I’ll show’ (Cato Or. 209)

‘He hopes he’s found [lit. ‘himself to have found’] a plea by which he discards you.’ (Ter. And. 407-408)

---

59 As Warmington (pp. 3:343) notes, the meaning is uncertain but it appears to refer to a parent and child, perhaps on the metaphor of birds.
To maintain transparency in communication, an overt subject would also be expected for an embedded subject that is disjoint from the main subject. That is what occurs in examples (463-465), again from a range of writers.

(463) Amphitruo, speraviₐ egoₐ [istamₐ tibiₐ parituramₐ filiumₐ].

‘Amphitryon, I hoped she would bear you a son.’ (Pl. Amph. 718)

(464) Hem, proi [tibiₐ -ne haecₐ diitus licere…] sperasₐ […] meₐ

‘Well, do you hope it’s allowed for me to do these things any longer for you while your father is alive, that you have a girlfriend in the place of a wife?’ (Ter. Heaut. 103-105)

(465) proi [nupturum₆₀ teₐ nuptaₐ negasₐ quod proi [vivere

‘Already married, you deny you’ll [ever] marry, because you believe Ulysses is alive.’ (Luc. Sat. 565-566)

A summary of how infinitival subjects occur with sperare is in Table 40. The infinitival subject with ‘hope’ is more likely to be overt whether or not it is co-indexed with the matrix subject, occurring as an overt NP in nearly three fourths (71%) of the 24 instances. This is not the pattern expected from a subject-control predicate.

The second pattern with ‘hope’ is its range of tense marking on the infinitival, summarized in Table 41.

---

₆₀ Here the future-active participle nupturum does not agree in [gender] with the [+ feminine] subject nupta, apparently an allusion to Ulysses’ wife Penelope.
Table 40: Subjects with ‘Hope’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Null</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Indexed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disjoint</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 41: Infinitival Tenses on ‘Hope’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitival Tense</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The infinitive is future tense in 12 (50%) and perfect tense in 2 (8%) of the 24 clauses embedded by sperare or the NP spes. While the [+ present] tense infinitive occurs almost as frequently as the [+ future], the 42% rate is misleading because 4 (40%) of the 10 instances are embedded by a single matrix verb, shown in (466).

(466) \[\text{pro}_i \ [\text{pro}_i \ \text{de} \ \text{oclassere} \ \text{aliqua...}] \ \text{sperans}_i \ [\ldots \text{me}_j \ \text{ac} \ \text{pro}_i \ \text{deargentassere,} \ \text{pro}_i \ \text{decalauticare,} \ \text{pro}_i \ \text{eburno} \ \text{speculo} \ \text{despeculassere}]\].

‘eagerly hoping somehow to ungoblet me, to unsilver and unshawl me, to unmirror me from my ivory mirror.’ (Luc. Sat. 640-641)
The unusualness of these present-tense infinitives is emphasized by the satirical humor, not only of the sentence’s meaning but also because all four verbs are neologisms (see Andrews, pp. 414-415).61

Future infinitives are shown above in examples (457,459-461,463,465). One of the two corpus examples of ‘hope’ with a perfect infinitive is in (462). The other example is in (467); both are from Terence.

(467) *Sperabit* 
\[\text{hope-3-S-FUT} \quad \text{[sumptum]\_1 \quad sibi\ldots]} \quad \text{senex}\_1 \quad [...levatum]\_1 \quad \text{esse}
\]
\[\text{harunc}\_1 \quad \text{abitu\ldots]}
\]

‘The old man will hope the expense has been lessened for him [lit. ‘himself’] by their departure.’ (Ter. *Heau.* 746)

As mentioned in section 3.2.3, evidence from Ennius (one of the earliest authors represented in the corpus and, significantly, the one who most prefers older forms) suggests that [+ present] was the original form of the infinitival, and the other two tenses developed diachronically. Whatever the historical development of tense on *sperare* complements, by the time of the works in the corpus this verb is freely able to take a [- present] infinitival complement.

Finally, the 7 (29%) of 24 examples with ‘hope’ and a null infinitival subject do not behave as subject-control complements. Two of those examples are shown above in (457) and (466); the remaining occurrences are in (468-472).

(468) *prō* \[\text{pro}\_1 \quad \text{spero}\_1 \quad [\text{pro}\_j \quad \text{ita} \quad \text{futurum}\_j].}
\]

‘I hope [it] will be that way.’ (Pl. *Mil.* 1231)

61 Andrews, otherwise faithful to the label “copious” in the dictionary’s subtitle, does not mention this instance of *depoclassare* and *despeculassere* in Lucilius or anywhere else (p. 447). Although three of these verbs have an ending in -ssere, they do not appear to be [+ future] since they syntactically parallel the unambiguously [+ present] form *decalauticare*. Each verb is transparently derived from a noun (e.g. *speculum* ‘mirror’ > *despeculassere*). Cf. *capessere* ‘to take eagerly’, an intensive form of *capere* ‘to take’; the meaning of the verbs here in –ssere is apparently ‘to X eagerly’, where X with de- has the sense of privation.
If it turns out the way I wish, so that Pamphilus makes no delay, there remains only Chremes for me to convince, and [I] hope [it] will happen.' (Ter. And. 165-166)

‘[Their quarrels were] so great that [I]’d hope [she] could be plucked away [from him].’ (Ter. And. 553)

‘Well, are you hoping it’s allowed to you that I do these things any longer while your father is alive, that you should have your girlfriend now in the place of a wife?’ (Ter. Heaut. 103-105)

‘not to ruin the state in eagerly hoping’ / ‘not in eagerly hoping to ruin the state’ (Enn. Ann. 408)

In all but example (472) the lower subject is disjoint from the main one, so that subject control is not possible. However, in (472) it is syntactically possible to interpret the infinitive prodere as the complement of sperando, but the presumed context makes the first interpretation shown more plausible (Warmington, p. 1:153).

The combined evidence, then, is that ‘hope’ is not a subject-control predicate. Compared with the infinitival tenses typical for unambiguous control verbs, sperare and spes behave like an
ECM rather than control predicate since the preferred tense is [+ future] rather than [+ present]. The 7 (29%) of 24 cases with a null infinitival subject shown in Table 40 are thus better treated not as PRO in subject control but as pro with ECM – however paradoxical the resulting terminology is.

6.5.1.2 ‘Pretend’

As with sperare ‘to hope’, simulare lit. ‘to make like’ = ‘to pretend’ and fingere ‘to fashion, pretend’ occur in Latin as ECM rather than subject control. The corpus contains 28 instances of these verbs meaning ‘pretend’. The most frequently occurring form is adsimulare, which occurs in 16 instances. Some examples are in (473), repeated here from (151), and (474).

(473) Quid melius quam, quando illi insanire praedicant, ego adsimulem insanire, ut illos absterream?

‘What’s better for me than, when they claim I’m insane, I pretend I’m insane in order to frighten them away from me?’ (Pl. Men. 831-832)

(474) Quo pro adsimularam, non pro eo.

‘Though I’d pretend I was going to the market, I’m not going.’ (Ter. Phor. 127-128)

A summary of infinitival subjects with ‘pretend’ verbs is in Table 42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Null</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Indexed</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disjoint</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As with ‘hope’, the infinitival subject with ‘pretend’ verbs is more likely to be overt whether or not it is co-indexed with the matrix subject. An overt NP occurs in 85% of all instances, which patterns more like ECM than subject control. Examples of co-indexed subjects with ‘pretend’ are in (475-476).

(475) *Nempe* ut proi adsimulemi [mei amorei istiusk]
   carry away-INFIN-PASS
differri].
   ‘Certainly, [the plan is] that I should pretend I’m carried away with love for him.’ (Pl. *Mil.* 1163)

(476) proi adsimulet -que [sei esse uxorem].
   ‘And [she] should pretend she’s [your] wife.’ (Pl. *Mil.* 792-793)

The infinitival tenses with ‘pretend’ are summarized in Table 43. The tenses pattern less like ECM than subject control, but ‘pretend’ prototypically involves an event (i.e. the pretense) occurring at the same time as the main event. In other words, [+ present] is the default tense from the meaning of ‘pretend’, and so these infinitival tenses are to be expected; they differ from the overall ECM pattern in a predicable way.

Table 43: Infinitival Tenses on ‘Pretend’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitival Tense</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6.5.1.3 ‘Promise’

The corpus contains two distinct predicates meaning ‘promise’, promittere and the semi-deponent polliceri. Both occur with subject-control and ECM complements. Examples of these two verbs with a subject-control clause are in (477-478).

(477) si pro i me i consultas i {nummum illum} k [quem i mihi,...]
    if I-S-ACC consult-2-S-SUBJ coin-M-S-ACC that-M-S-ACC REL-M-S-ACC I-S-DAT
    just now pro i pollicitu’ i ’s i [...PRO dare]
    promise-PPP-DEPON-M-S-NOM be-2-S give-INFIN

‘if you consult me, [I’d tell you to take] that coin which you just now promised to give me’ (Pl. Men. 310-311)

(478) [Casinam j...] ego i [...uxorem j...] promisi i [...{vilico nostro} k
    Casina-F-S-ACC I-S-NOM wife-F-S-ACC promise-1-S-PERF overseer-M-S-DAT our-M-S-DAT
    PRO dare].
    give-INFIN

‘I promised to give Casina as wife to our overseer.’ (Pl. Clas. 288)

Although both of these examples are from Plautus, Terence also has ‘promise’ verbs with subject-control complements. An example is in (479).

(479) {decem minas}62 [quas mihi PRO dare] pro
    ten mina-F-PL-ACC REL-F-PL-ACC I-S-DAT give-INFIN
    promiclitus ’t
    promise-PPP-DEPON-M-S-NOM BE-3-S

‘ten minas which he promised to give me’ (Ter. Heau. 724)

While the examples in (477-479) are clearly subject-control complements, 6 (55%) of the 11 corpus examples with a ‘promise’ verb take ECM complements instead. Even though the overall frequency is low, these examples range across four separate authors, showing that the ECM complement is not mere authorial preference but rather a more widely distributed phenomenon. The four examples with promittere are in (480-483).

---

62 The mina is a Greek silver coin worth 100 drachmas.
Example (484), from Terence, is particularly interesting because the matrix and embedded subjects are co-indexed – exactly the situation in subject-control complements. Here, however, the embedded clause is ECM.

(484) \[ pro_k \ \text{sanum}_k \ \text{futurum}_k \ \text{mea}_i \ \text{ego}_i \ \text{id}_i \ \text{promitto}_i \]

\[ fidei. \]

faith-F-S-ABL

‘[He] will be fine, on my honor I promise that.’ (Pl. Men. 894)

(481) \[ pro_i \ \text{promitte}_i \ \text{[hoc}_j \ \text{fore}. \]

promise-2-2-S-IMPERAT this-N-S-ACC be-INFIN

‘Promise this will be.’ (Pl. Aul. 219)

(482) \[ pro_i \ \text{[tuo}_k \ \text{istuc}_j:\text{...], Sceledre}_l \ \text{promitto}_l \ \text{[...fore}. \]

your-N-S-DAT that-INTENS-N-S-ACC Sceledrus-M-S-VOC promise-1-S be-INFIN-FUT

‘Sceledrus, I promise that fate will be upon your [head].’ (Pl. Mil. 326)

(483) \[ Recte \ \text{haec}_j \ \text{dari fieri} \ -que \ \text{satis} \ -que \ \text{dari}\]

rightly this-N-PL-ACC give-INFIN-PASS do-INFIN-PASS -and enough -and give-INFIN-PASS

\[ domino_k\text{...}], \ \text{aut pro}_k \ \text{cui}_l \ \text{iussserit}_k \ \text{pro}_i \ \text{promittito}_i \]

master-M-S-DAT or INDEFIN-M-S-DAT order-3-S-FUTPERF promise-2-PL-IMPERAT

\[ [...satis-que \ \{dato arbitratu\}_m \ \text{domini}_k]. \]

enough -and give-PPP-M-S-ABL judgment-M-S-ABL master-M-S-GEN

‘Promise that these things [will] be correctly given and done and satisfactorily given to the master or whomever he orders, and with the master’s judgment satisfactorily given [i.e. so that the master is satisfied with the result].’ (Cato Agr. 146)

‘We must be careful lest he find out the boy from her is mine, for I’ve promised [I] will raise [him] up.’ (Ter. And. 400-401)
Similarly, in example (485) from Lucilius the two subjects are co-indexed and the embedded structure is not subject control but ECM.

(485) *Qui te diligit, pro [aetatis facie] -que tuae se i [autorem] ostendet, pro fore amicum.*

‘He who likes you, [who] shows himself [to be] an admirer of your youth and appearance, promises [he] will be your friend.’ (Luc. Sat. 294-295)

Although the evidence here is scanty, it nonetheless appears that ‘promise’ verbs have an ECM variant even with a co-indexed infinitival subject. A summary is in Table 44.

Table 44: Subjects with ‘Promise’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Null</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Indexed</td>
<td>5 71%</td>
<td>2 29%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disjoint</td>
<td>12 71%</td>
<td>5 29%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>17 71%</td>
<td>7 29%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of the infinitival tenses with ‘promise’ verbs is in Table 45. The relative frequency of [+ future] infinitivals with ‘promise’ verbs in ECM contrasts with what occurs with the same verbs and subject-control complements. While the number of corpus examples is low, the trend shows a distinction between the subject-control and ECM complements with ‘promise’ verbs. It appears that such verbs can take either embedded clause type when the subjects are co-indexed, and if the ECM clause is selected it is freely able to pattern like other ECM complements.

---

63 Although this form appears to be ablative case, it is cited by the ancient commentator Gellius as an early dative form (Warmington, pp. 3:90-91), and this is confirmed elsewhere in Lucilius with *fautor* (cf. Andrews, p. 604).
Table 45: Infinitival Tenses on ‘Promise’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitival Tense</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRESENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Control</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERFECT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5.1.4 ‘Wish’ and Compounds

One other sets of verbs alternates between subject-control and ECM complements, *velle* ‘to wish’ and its compounds *nolle* ‘not to wish’ and *malle* ‘to wish more, prefer’. By far the most frequently occurring of these is *velle*. The first issue to consider is how likely infinitival subjects with *velle* are to be overt. As with ‘promise’ verbs, the *velle* predicates vary between subject-control and ECM complements when the subjects are co-indexed. Some examples with *velle* with subject control are in (486-487).

(486) \[D_{i} \text{me}_{j} \text{perdant}_{i} \text{si}_{i} \text{ego}_{j} \text{tui}_{i} \text{quicquam}_{i} \text{apstuli}_{j} \text{ni}_{i} \text{pro}_{j} \text{[PRO}_{j} \text{adeo}_{i} \text{apstulisse} \text{vellem}_{i}] \text{ae}

‘May the gods destroy me if I stole anything from you, nor would [I] wish to have stolen anything.’ (Pl. *Aul.* 645-646)

(487) \[\text{pro}_{i} \text{[PRO}_{i} \text{ne-} \text{emis} \text{si} \text{velit}_{i} \text{[...} \text{insci} \text{ente} \text{not-} \text{INDEFIN-N-S-ACC} \text{buy-INFIN-PERF} \text{wish-3-S-SUBJ} \text{not know-PART-M-S-ABL.}
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‘[He] should not wish to have sold anything without the master’s knowledge, nor should [he] wish to have hidden anything from the master.’ (Cato Agr. V)

In (488-489) *velle* occurs with an overt co-indexed infinitival subject as ECM, from the same two authors as above.

(488)  
\[
\text{Nunc } \text{pro} \_i \text{ volo} \_i \text{ me} \_i \text{ emitti manu} \_j. \\
\text{now wish-1- S I- S-ACC send out-INFIN-PASS hand- F-S-ABL}
\]

‘Now I want [lit. ‘myself’] to be manumitted.’ (Pl. Aul. 823)

(489)  
\[
\text{pro} \_i \text{ domi cum auspicamus} \_i, \text{ pro} \_j \text{ honorem} \_k \text{ me} \_j \{dium immortalium}\_1... \text{ velim} \_l \{...habuisse\}. \\
\text{home- F-S-LOC when take auspices-1- PL honor- M-S-ACC I- S-ACC god- M-PL-GEN}
\]

‘When we take auspices at home, I’d want [lit. ‘me’] to have had honor for the immortal gods’. (Cato Or. 73)

Note that ECM necessarily occurs when the complement has two subjects, one of which is co-indexed with the matrix subject; an example is in (490).

(490)  
\[
\text{Sed utrum nunc tu} \_i \text{ caelibem} \_i \text{ te} \_j \text{ esse... mavis} \_l. \\
\text{but whether now you- S-NOM unmarried-M-S-ACC you- S-ACC be-INFIN prefer-2- S}
\]

\[
\{...liberum\}_1 \text{ an pro maritum} \_i \text{ servom} \_i \text{ aetatem degere et} \\
\text{free-M-S-ACC or married-M-S-ACC slave-M-S-ACC age-F-S-ACC live out-INFIN and}
\]

\[
\{gnatos tuos\}_1? \\
\text{offspring-M-PL-ACC your-M-PL-ACC}
\]

‘But now would you prefer [lit. ‘yourself’] to be single and free or to live out your life married and a slave, you and your children?’ (Pl. Cas. 290-291)

Here the two embedded subjects are *te* ‘you’, co-indexed with *tu* as the main subject, and *gnatos tuos* ‘your children’. In addition, ECM sometimes appear to occur for emphasis, as in (491).

(491)  
\[
\text{Ego} \_i \text{ me... nunc volo} \_i \text{ ius pontificium} \_j \text{ optime scire}. \\
\text{I-S-NOM I-S-ACC now wish-1- S law-N-S-ACC of high priest-N-S-ACC best know-INFIN}
\]

‘I now wish [lit. ‘me’] to know the priestly law very well.’ (Cato Or. 197)
The temporal adverb *nunc* suggests urgency (or perhaps contrast from an unexpressed earlier mental state) in the desire expressed in this statement.

A summary of subjects with *velle* and its compounds is in Table 46. Note that the overall rate for an overt infinitival subject is similar for co-indexed (88%) and disjoint (89%) subjects. However, there are individual differences among the three verbs in this group. *Velle* and *malle* have similar rates for overt subjects, but *nolle* has a greater tendency to mark a co-indexed subject as null (22% overall, or twice the rate of the other two verbs). *Nolle* also shows a greater distinction in overtness between co-indexed and disjoint subjects, although the total count is too low for any statistical significance.

Table 46: Subjects with ‘Wish’ and Compounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Null</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-INDEXED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velle</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nolle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISJOINT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velle</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nolle</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malle</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velle</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nolle</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malle</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some examples of ECM with *nolle* are in (492-494), and with *malle* in (495-497).

(492) \[ \text{pro}_i [\text{mirari}...] \quad \text{nolim}_i [\text{vos}_j \text{...} \quad \text{quapropter} \quad \text{Iuppiter}_k] \]

\[ \text{nunc} \quad \text{histriones}_1 \quad \text{curet}_3, \]

now actor-M-PL-ACC care about-3-S-SUBJ
‘I wouldn’t want you to wonder why Jupiter now cares about actors.’ (Pl. Amph. 86-87)

(493) proi id,... noluerinti...evenire.  
ANA-N-S-ACC not wish-3-PL-SUBJ happen-INFIN

‘They wouldn’t have wanted that to occur.’ (Cato Or. 164)

(494) proi adiureti...insuper...nolle...esse...dicta].  
swear to-3-S-SUBJ on top not wish-INFIN be-INFIN say-PPP-N-PL-ACC

quaei proi in mek insontemk protulitk.  
REL-N-PL-ACC into I-S-ACC innocent-S-ACC bring forward-3-S-PERF

‘On top of that [he] should vouch [he] wishes unsaid those things he brought to bear on innocent me.’ (Pl. Amph. 887-890)

(495) proi eosj reduci quam relinqui, proj  
ANA-M-PL-ACC lead back-INFIN-PASS than leave behind-INFIN-PASS

devehi quam deseri] maluii.  
drag away-INFIN-PASS than desert-INFIN-PASS prefer-1-S-PERF

‘I preferred for them to be lead back rather than left behind, carried away rather than deserted.’ (Enn. Trag. 392-393)

(496) nisi quidem qui,...maliti,...pugnitus pessum64  
unless indeed REL-M-S-NOM ANA-ACC prefer-3-S with fists downward

dari].  
give-INFIN-PASS

‘indeed, unless one who prefers to be beaten in a fight’65

(497) proi sesei...-que i...perire... mavolunti...ibidem quam cum  
ANA-ACC -and then die-INFIN prefer-3-PL same place than with

stupro redire ad suos...popular].  
shame-N-S-ABL return-INFIN to own-M-PL-ACC fellow countryman-M-PL-ACC

‘They prefer themselves to die then and there than to return with shame to their own countrymen.’ (Naev. Bell. 59-60)

The other issue regarding the classification of velle and its compounds is the tense on infinitivals. Recall from Table 33 that subject-control complements take an infinitive marked for

---

64 Pessum dare, lit. ‘to give downward’, is idiomatic for ‘ruin’ (Simpson, 1968, p. 445).
65 Warmington (p. 1:487) renders this as ‘unless one who prefers a knock-out to perdition,’ but there is no direct comparison made with quam, the usual word with a form of malle. Instead, the dispreferred option is not mentioned, and pugnitus appears to describe the particular ‘ruin’ the subject would prefer over an unspecified alternative.
[- present] in only 3% of instances, and that most of the 23 instances with [+ perfect] infinitives are with *velle*. The findings for infinitival tense with *velle* and its compounds are shown in Table 47. According to these data, the main tense difference between the *velle* verbs in subject control and ECM is a greater frequency of [+ perfect] with ECM complements.

Table 47: Infinitival Tenses on ‘Wish’ and Compounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Subject Control</th>
<th>ECM</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRESENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>velle</em></td>
<td>176 91%</td>
<td>121 82%</td>
<td>297 87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nolle</em></td>
<td>30 100%</td>
<td>12 86%</td>
<td>42 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>malle</em></td>
<td>12 100%</td>
<td>18 95%</td>
<td>30 97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>218 92%</td>
<td>151 84%</td>
<td>369 89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERFECT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>velle</em></td>
<td>18 9%</td>
<td>26 18%</td>
<td>44 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nolle</em></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>2 14%</td>
<td>2 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>malle</em></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 5%</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>18 8%</td>
<td>29 16%</td>
<td>47 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>velle</em></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nolle</em></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>malle</em></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One issue regarding these three verbs is a special construction involving an embedded form based on the PPP stem. The question is whether the form is actually a supine (which has an active meaning) or a PPP. An example is in (498).

(498) \[ Di_i \ [me_j \ servatum_j/O] volun_t_i. \]

god-M-PL-NOM I-S-ACC save-PPP-M-S-ACC/save-SUPINE-N-S-ACC want-3-pl

‘The gods want me kept safe / The gods want to keep me safe.’ (Pl. *Men*. 1120)
If *servatum* is a supine, then the literal meaning is ‘the gods want to keep me safe’, while *servatum* as the [+ masculine, + singular, + accusative] form of the PPP means ‘the gods want me kept safe’. The basic meaning is the same, but supine vs. PPP makes a difference in terms of pragmatic focus. With the supine, the focus is on the matrix subject, here *di* ‘gods’, but with the PPP focus shifts to the ECM subject, here *me*.

In (499) the same ambiguity occurs again with *servatum*, but here it is syntactically coordinated with a regular adjective, *salvom* ‘safe’. The resulting structure is similar to English *safe and sound*, and the coordination itself shows that the structure is a PPP rather than a supine (i.e. the PPP is an adjective but the supine is not).

(499) *Euge, euge, di*[^1] [mej salvomj et servatumj] voluntj.

> ‘Great, the gods want me [to be] safe and sound.’ (Pl. Aul. 677)

The embedded passive structure with ECM is discussed in section 7.2.4.

Finally, note that *malle* ‘wish more, prefer’ usually connects the two alternatives with *quam* ‘than’. The preferred choice is expressed in an infinitival complement, while the less preferred option often occurs as subjunctive (i.e. contrary-to-fact), which is thus iconic. An example is in (500).

(500) *[Emortuom...]* egoi [...mei...] mavelim [...leto malo] quam

> ‘I’d prefer [lit. ‘me’] to be dead by some horrible death than not lay a trap for that old man today.’ (Pl. Aul. 661-662)

### 6.5.1.5 Finite Variant

The ECM verbs discussed above take a finite subjunctive variant in 20 instances. No finite variants occur with *sperare* ‘to hope’ or *promittere/polliceri* ‘to promise’. The three
examples with ‘pretend’ all occur within the same play of Plautus, shown in (501-503). Note that all these finite variants have the overt complementizer *quasi* ‘as if’.

(501) *Quasi* _pro_ ꞌ _militi_ ꞌ _animum_ ꞌ _adieceris_ ꞌ _simulare._

as if soldier-M-S-DAT mind-M-S-ACC throw to-2-PERF-SUBJ pretend-INFIN

‘Pretend as if you’d fallen for [lit. ‘given your mind toward’] the soldier.’ (Pl. Mil. 909)

(502) *Sed* _ubi_ _ille_ _exierit_ _intus_ _pro_ ꞌ _istinc te._

but when that-M-S-NOM go out-3-FUTPERF (from) inside from there you-S-ACC

*procul* _ita...* volo* [_...adsimulare*], _praef_ _illius* _formae_.

from a distance thus wish-1-S pretend-INFIN before that-M-S-GEN appearance-F-S-ABL

*quasi* _pro_ ꞌ _spernas* _tuam*.

as if scorn-2-S-ABL your-F-S-ACC

‘But when he’s gone outside, I want you from over there at a distance to pretend as if you scorned your own beauty compared with his.’ (Pl. Mil. 1169-1170)

(503) _pro_ ꞌ _adsimulato* _quasi* _pro_ ꞌ _gubernator* _sies*_.

pretend-2-S-IMPERAT-FUT as if pilot-M-S-NOM be-2-S-SUBJ

‘Pretend as if you were the ship’s pilot.’ (Pl. Mil. 1181)

In (502) the finite complement of *adsimulare* may be to avoid ambiguity, since *adsimulare* itself is already an embedded infinitive.

A finite subjunctive variant also occurs 14 times with *velle* ‘to wish’ and three times with *nolle* ‘to not wish’; no finite complements occur with *malle* ‘to prefer’. Some examples of the finite variant with these verbs are in (504-506). Note that the complementizer *ut* ‘in order that’ may or may not be overt; in (504) *ut* heads a purpose clause.

(504) _[Diu* _pro_ ꞌ _vivat*]_ _pro_ ꞌ _volo* _[ut* _pro_ ꞌ _mihi*]

long time wish-1-S wish-1-S COMP I-S-DAT

*prodesse* _possit*[_].

be profitable-INFIN be able-3-S-SUBJ

‘I want [her] to live for a long time so that [she] can be profitable to me.’ (Naev. Fab. 38-39)

(505) _pro_ ꞌ _[me*...* nolo*_ _[...in* _tempore* _hoc* _videat* _senex*].

1-S-ACC not wish-1-S in time-N-S-ABL this-N-S-ABL see-3-S-SUBJ old-M-S-NOM

‘I don’t want the old man to see me at this time.’ (Ter. And. 819)
6.5.2 Impersonal ECM

As shown in Table 39, impersonal ECM complements occur in 17 (1%) of the 2,210 ECM infinitivals in the corpus. With control impersonals, the embedded action is made available to the NP assigned dative case (i.e. as the beneficiary), while ECM impersonals overtly express the subject of the embedded action. For example, with licere ‘to be allowed’ in (507), in the (a) sentence control passes from the dative beneficiary mi to the PRO infinitival subject, while in (b) no beneficiary is expressed but hominem is the experiencer of the embedded verb esse.

(507) a. \[ Nunc licet_i mi_j [PRO_j libere quidvis loqui]. \]

‘Now I’m allowed to freely speak anything at all.’ (Pl. Amph. 393)

b. \[ Non licet_i [hominem_j esse] saepe ita ut pro_j volt_j. \]

‘Often one is not allowed to be as one wishes, if circumstances don’t allow [one/it].’ (Ter. Heau. 666)

Other impersonal ECM predicates include placere ‘to please’, shown in (508), and referre ‘to make a difference, concern’ in (509).

(508) \[ Apage, non placet_i me_j hoc noctis esse; pro_j cenavi_j. \]

‘Go away, I don’t want to eat at this time of night; I ate just recently.’ (Pl. Amph. 310)
ac dicaculus?  

‘What good does it do for me to be in love unless I’m learned or articulate?’  (Pl. Cas. 529) 

No control impersonals have an overt (accusative) infinitival subject, and no ECM impersonals have a dative NP co-indexed with an overt accusative subject. When the beneficiary role is overt in impersonal ECM complements, it is not co-indexed with the ECM subject. An example is in (510), repeated from (440). 

Then that was pleasing to me, that everyone with one voice said all good things [or, ‘said all things [were] good’] and praised my good luck.’  (Ter. And. 96-97) 

All 17 (100%) of the impersonal ECM infinitivals have [+ present] tense, and there are no finite (subjunctive) variants. 

### 6.5.3 Deontic ECM 

Deontic ECM complements account for 434 (20%) of the ECM structures. Recall that deontic control structures are like impersonal control in that control goes from an implicit dative NP to the infinitival complement. With deontic ECM, the controllee is an accusative NP. The contrast between deontic control and deontic ECM can be seen in (511), where the dative NP praegnanti is the goal of dari ‘to be given’ rather than the subject of the deontic clause, which is the overt NPs malum ‘bad’ and malum ‘apple’ (i.e. a pun).
si [...male esse] occeperit.
if badly be-INFIN begin-3-S-PERF-SUBJ

‘For truly it’s right for both pain [i.e. of childbirth] and an apple to be given to be given to a pregnant woman so there’ll be something she can gnaw at if she’s begun to feel badly.’ (Pl. Amph. 723-724)

The pun on the two forms of malum (‘bad’ has a short vowel, while ‘apple’ has a long one) is continued with the final clause in the citation: the adverb male straightforwardly means ‘badly’ and esse is the copular infinitive, but the phrase could also be an adverbial from mālum ‘apple’ and esse ‘to eat’. The general idea seems to be similar to that contained in the proverbial English expression an apple a day.

Among the deontic predicates, the three most frequently occurring lexemes are oportere ‘it is fitting, it behooves’ with 165 tokens, aequum ‘equal, right, fitting’ with 33, and decere ‘it is proper’ with 31. Together, these account for 53% of the ECM deontic constructions in the corpus. Some examples are in (512-519).

(512) satiusi [mej queri {illo modo}{] 
enough-COMPAR-N-S-NOM I-S-ACC complain-INFIN-DEPON that-M-S-ABL manner-M-S-ABL

servitutem].
slavery-F-S-ACC

‘It [would be] better for me to complain that way about being a slave.’ (Pl. Amph. 176)

(513) Decetj [tej equidem verakj proloqui].
be fitting-3-S you-S-ACC indeed true-N-PL-ACC speak out-INFIN-DEPON

‘Indeed it’s right for you to speak the truth.’ (Pl. Aul. 138)

(514) {Ridiculum caput}i, quasi necessus66 sitij si pro[k pro[ 
laughable-N-S-VOC head-N-S-VOC as if necessary-N-S-NOM be-3-S-SUBJ if

huicm non datkj [teni illamuxoremducere].
this-M-S-DAT not give-3-S you-S-ACC that-F-S-ACC wife-F-S-ACC lead-INFIN

66 Although the –us ending appears to be [+ masculine], it clearly refers to a proposition, not any gendered NP entity. The expected [+ neuter] form occurs, e.g. Necessum est vorsis depugnarian ‘it needs to be fought [by us] to fight with drawn [swords]’ (Pl. Cas. 344) and Necesse’st, Clitipho, consilia consequat consimilia ‘it is necessary, Clitipho, to follow very similar plans’ (Ter. Heau. 209). The –us ending here may be an early-Latin variant or simply a manuscript error.
‘Silly man, as if it were necessary, if [he] doesn’t give [her] to him [in marriage], for you to take her as your wife.’ (Ter. And. 371-372)

(515) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{studere} & \quad \text{oproet}i. \\
\text{be eager for-INFN} & \quad \text{befit-3-S}
\end{align*}
\]

‘It is fitting for the head of the household to seek from earliest youth to manage a farm.’ (Cato Agro. III)

(516) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sed} & \quad \text{deceat}i. \\
\text{but} & \quad \text{be proper-3-S-SUBJ}
\end{align*}
\]

‘But in what way and with what verbs it’s proper for me to tell the story, first I want to consider by myself.’ (Pl. Amph. 201-202)

(517) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{tempu}i' & \quad \text{'st}_i \\
\text{time-N-S-NOM} & \quad \text{be-3-S}
\end{align*}
\]

‘It’s time for me to remind this neighbor Phania.’ (Ter. Hea. 169)

(518) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ergo} & \quad \text{istaec} \quad \text{quom} \quad \text{ita} \quad \text{sint}, \quad \text{Antipho}_i \quad \text{tanto} \quad \text{magis} \quad \text{te}_i \\
\text{therefore} & \quad \text{when} \quad \text{thus} \quad \text{be-3-PL-SUBJ} \quad \text{Antipho-M-S-VOC} \quad \text{so much} \quad \text{more} \quad \text{you-S-ACC}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Since these things are this way now, Antipho, so much is it right for you to be on your guard.’ (Ter. Phor. 203)

(519) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{meliu}i & \quad \text{'st}_i \\
\text{good-N-S-COMPAR} & \quad \text{be-3-S}
\end{align*}
\]

‘It’s better for us to go there and question him.’ (Pl. Men. 1091)

In each instance the infinitival subject is assigned accusative case.

67 If from consero, consere, conserui, consortum this means ‘to sow’ but it could also be from consero, consere, conserui, consortum ‘to connect’. The first sense is the more straightforward in an agricultural treatise. However, since the topic is the farm owner’s duties as a Roman citizen to ‘bind together’ his household with that of the republic, the second meaning is not only possible but always implied within the cultural context. Here one must suspect the famously dour Cato of a (perhaps unintended) pun.

68 As in English, the allomorph of the comparative of ‘good’ is lexical; in Latin it is melius (superlative optimum).
In example (520) there is an overt dative NP, *mihi*, but it is the goal of *dari* rather than the subject of the ECM predicate *aequom*. Instead, the multiple overt ECM subjects spell out the speaker’s wish list.

(520) *Enim* [mihi_i... quidem aequom_i 'st_i [...]purpuram_i atque aurum_k
for I-S-DAT indeed fair-N-S-NOM be-3-S purple-F-S-ACC and gold-N-S-ACC
dari,
give-INFIN-PASS ancillas_m, maid-F-PL-ACC mules_m
mule-M-PL-ACC muliones_p, mule driver-M-PL-ACC pedisequous_o,
{salutigerulos pueros}_p, vehicle-N-PL-ACC qui pro_r vehar_r,
well wisher-M-PL-ACC boy-M-PL-ACC vehicle-N-PL-ACC how carry-1-S-SUBJ-PASS

‘For indeed I should be given purple and gold [i.e. expensive clothing and jewelry], handmaids, mules, coachmen, footmen, pages, and vehicles to ride in.’ (Pl. *Aul.* 500-502)

Example (521) has ambiguity with the inherent dative. *Tibi* could be the subject of the infinitive, but the next clause resolves the ambiguity, such that *tibi* is the goal of *credere* and the subject of *certum* is not overt but easily recoverable.

(521) [pro_j tibi_k credere] certum_k est nam pro_j [pro_k esse
you-S-DAT believe-INFIN decide-PPP-N-S-NOM be-3-S for be-INFIN
bonum_j ex voltu_m cognosco_j,
good-M-S-ACC out of face-M-S-ABL recognize-1-S

‘It’s okay [for me] to believe you, for I recognize from your appearance that you’re good.’ (Pl. *Aul.* 717)

In example (522), *fieri* is passive, so the NP *quod* must be the infinitival subject, not the object, and that bars the dative NP *tibi* from being the infinitival subject (i.e. as a deontic control structure).

(522) *Atque* is si denegat [pro facta] [quae...] tu
and ANA-M-S-NOM if deny-3-S do-PPP-N-PL-ACC REL-N-PL-ACC you-S-NOM
[...facta] dicis, [quod tibi...] aequom est [...fieri]?
do-PPP-N-PL-ACC say-2-S INTERROG-N-S-ACC you-S-DAT right-N-S-NOM be-3-S do-INFIN-PASS

‘And if he denies those things are done that you say are done, what should be done to you?’ (Pl. *Amph.* 850-851)
6.5.3.1 Infinitival Tense

Infinitivals tenses with ECM deontic complements can be analyzed in two different ways.

First is a summary of all infinitival tenses with ECM predicates, shown in Table 48.

Table 48: Infinitival Tenses on ECM Deontics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitival Tense</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>433</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overwhelming preference is for [+ present] tense.

Next, there is a greater tendency for [+ perfect] than for [+ present] matrix predicates to take a [+ perfect] infinitive. The data are summarized in Table 49. It appears that the high rate of [+ perfect] infinitives with [+ perfect] matrix verbs is by attraction rather than as a true pluperfect reference frame. Some examples are in (523-525).

(523) *Primum* [proj cavisse] opportuiti, [ne proj diceres],

First you should have taken care not to speak [lit. ‘first it was necessary for [you] to have taken care not to speak’]. (Pl. Amph. 944)

(524) {proi uxorem,...} decretati, [...dare sesei mi[

‘He had decided to give me a wife today; shouldn’t I have know about it beforehand, shouldn’t it have been communicated in advance?’ (Ter. And. 238-239)

(525) *Sed, mulier, postquam proi experrectai, enk tei

but woman-f-s-voc after rise up-PPP-depon-f-s-nom be-2-s you-s-acc

{prodigiali Iovi}k aut {mola salsa}1 hodie aut

portentous-M-s-dat Jupiter-M-s-dat or meal-f-s-abl salt-PPP-f-s-abl today or
ture\textsubscript{m} comprectam\textsubscript{i} \quad opportuit\textsubscript{i}.

incense-F-S-ABL pray to-PPP-DEPON-F-S-ACC be fitting-3-s-PERF

‘But, woman, after you arose today, you should have prayed to wonder-working Jupiter either with salted meal or incense.’ (Pl. Amph. 739-740)

Table 49: Matrix vs. Infinitival Tense on ECM Deontics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrix Tense</th>
<th>Infinitival Tense</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>330</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>&lt;1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>364</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5.3.2 Finite Variant

The corpus contains four examples of a finite subjunctive variant for ECM deontics.

These are shown in (526-529).

(526) \[
\text{[pro}_{i}\ loricam}_{k} \quad \text{induam}_{i} \quad \text{mi}_{i} \quad \text{optumum}_{j} \quad \text{esse}] \quad \text{pro}_{i} \quad \text{arbitror}_{i}.
\]

cuirass-F-S-ACC put on-1-s-subj I-3-DAT best-N-S-ACC be-INFIN think-DEPON-1-s

‘I think it’s best for me that I put on my armor.’ (Pl. Cas. 695)

(527) \[
\text{Videtur}_{i} \quad \text{tempus}_{i} \quad \text{esse} \quad \text{ut} \quad \text{pro}_{j} \quad \text{eamus}_{j} \quad \text{ad} \quad \text{forum}_{k}].
\]

see-3-s-Pass time-N-S-Nom be-INFIN COMP go-1-pl to forum-N-S-ACC

‘It seems to be time that we go to the forum.’ (Pl. Mil. 72)

(528) \[
\text{pro}_{i} \quad \text{dicas}_{i} \quad \text{-que} \quad \text{tempus}_{j} \quad \text{maxume} \quad \text{esse} \quad \text{ut} \quad \text{pro}_{k} \quad \text{eat}_{k}
\]

say-2-s-subj and time-N-S-ACC mostly be-INFIN COMP go-3-s-subj

domum\textsubscript{i}].

home-F-S-ACC

‘And you should say it’s high time she should go home.’ (Pl. Mil. 1101)

(529) \[
\text{Villam} \quad \text{aedificandam}_{i} \quad \text{si} \quad \text{pro}_{i} \quad \text{locabis}_{i} \quad \text{novam}_{j} \quad \text{ab}
\]

farmhouse-F-S-ACC build-gerundive-F-S-ACC if contract-2-s-FUT new-F-S-ACC from

solo\textsubscript{k}, \quad \text{faber}_{m} \quad \text{haec}_{i} \quad \text{faciat}_{a} \quad \text{opertet}_{i}.

soil-N-S-ABL builder-N-S-NOM this-N-PL-ACC do-3-s-subj be fitting-3-s

‘If you contract for a new farmhouse to be built from the ground up, it’s fitting that a builder do these things.’ (Cato Agr. 14)

212
6.5.4 AcI

As in English, AcI occurs in early Latin. The critical differences are in quantity and quality. First, ACI occurs in Latin with far more ECM lexemes than in English. Second, the finite-clause variant is extremely rare in Latin (see section 6.5.4.2), which makes for a qualitative difference from English. Examples of various AcI verbs across different authors are in (530-537), repeated here from (101-108).

(530) [Quem -nam te esse] dicam?
INTERROG-M-S-ACC -for you-S-ACC be-INF say-1-S-FUT

‘Then who will I say you are?’ (Enn. Trag. 355)

(531) [Alcumenam ante aedis stare saturam] intellego.
Alcmena-F-S-ACC before wall-F-PL-ACC stand-INF full-F-S-ACC understand-1-S

‘I understand the pregnant Alcmena is standing in front of the house.’ (Pl. Amph. 667)

(532) [Omnes cinaedos esse] censes quia tu es?
all-M-PL-ACC lecher-ACC-M-PL be-INF believe-2-S because you-S-NOM be-2-S

‘Do you believe everyone is a lecher because you are?’ (Pl. Men. 513)

(533) Ne [tibi me esse ob eam rem obnoxium] reare.
not you-S-DAT I-S-ACC be-INF because of ANA-F-S-ACC thing-F-S-ACC subject-M-S-ACC think-2-S-SUBJ

‘Don’t think I’m under your control for that reason.’ (Caec. Com. 20-21)

(534) At vereor cum [te esse Alcmeonis fratrem] factis
but fear-1-S since you-S-ACC be-INF Alcmeon-M-S-GEN brother-M-S-ACC deed-N-PL-ABL
dedicat.
give out-3-S

‘But I’m afraid, since he claims with facts that you’re Alcmeon’s brother.’ (Acc. Trag. 43)

(535) [Pariter te esse erga illum video ut illum ted
equally you-S-ACC be-INF towards that-M-S-ACC see-1-S as that-M-S-ACC you-S-ACC
erga] scio.
towards know-1-S

‘I see you feel the same about him as I know he feels about you.’ (Pac. Trag. 270)

(536) [Eam nunc esse inventam probris conpotem] scis.
ANA-F-S-ACC now be-INF found-PPP -S-F-ACC bad deed-N-PL-ABL sharing in-F-S-ACC know-2-S
‘You know she has been found participating in bad behavior.’ (Naev. Trag. 10-11)

\[\text{Scito} \quad \text{[pro rationale fructum esse].}\]

‘Realize that the result is in accordance with what you find.’ \(^{69}\) (Cato Agr. 1)

In addition to the verbs shown above, certain other predicates also license AcI complements. These include the NP *argumentum* ‘argument’, as in (538).

\[\text{Vinco} \quad \text{-n proj argumentis [te\_j non esse Sosiam]?}\]

‘Am I convincing [you] with my arguments that you’re not Sosia?’ (Pl. Amph. 433)

Note that although *vinco* ‘I conquer, win’ has the English derivative *convince*, it is only in collocation with *argumentis* that *vincere* can have such a meaning in Latin. That is, the matrix verb means ‘conquer’ and cannot in itself take an AcI complement. Similarly, a form of *esse* ‘to be’ in (539) cannot by itself take an AcI complement, but in collocation with the adverb *palam* ‘openly, publicly’ it has the effect of ‘to be open about, to be obvious’ and is thus AcI.

\[\text{Idi quidem palam esti [eam non esse. ut pro\_k dicis\_k].}\]

‘Indeed, it’s obvious that she is the one [you saw], just as you say.’ (Pl. Mil. 475)

NPs can also serve as the matrix predicate for AcI. An example is *rumor* in (540).

\[\text{[\{Meum gnatum\}_i...]} \quad \text{rumor\_i esti [...amare].}\]

‘The rumor is that my son’s in love.’ (Ter. And. 185)

In (541) the matrix predicate is the NP *dictu*, which bears a low-ranking thematic role in its clause.

\[\text{Sed ita dictu\_i opus\_i esti, si pro\_k [me\_i...]} \quad \text{vis\_k}\]

\[\{...salvom\_i esse et rem\_m et filium\_m], [me\_i {mea omnia}\text{safe-M-S-ACC be-INFIN and affair-F-S-ACC and son-M-S-ACC I-S-ACC my-N-PL-ACC all-N-PL-ACC}\}

\(^{69}\) Cato here advises the prospective owner to inspect the quantity of produce and wine jars on a farm before purchasing it; according to the volume of stored goods, one can judge how profitable the farm will likely be.
‘But there’s a need of speaking thus, if [you] wish me and my status and my son to be safe, that I have pledged all my good as a dowry for her.’ (Ter. Heau. 941-942)

In (542) the only matrix verb is *iubere* ‘to order’, which takes both an object-control and an AcI complement. Apparently the AcI clause is possible through the implied ‘speaking’ that inherently occurs with a spoken command, and this is the only such instance in the corpus.

(542) \( \text{pro}_i \text{ hominem}_j \) [\( \text{PRO}_j \text{ ad forum}_k \ldots \) \( \text{iussi}_l \) \[\ldots \text{opperiri}_m \] \( \text{eo}_n \)]

\( \text{me}_i \text{ esse adducturum}_i \text{ senem}_i \).

‘I ordered the man to wait at the forum, [I said] I would bring the old man.’ (Ter. Phor. 597-599)

The AcI predicates in the corpus fall into several semantic clusters, summarized in Table 50. The total frequency of 1,302 matrix predicates here is less than the 1,493 total AcI infinitives shown in Table 39 because some matrix verbs embed more than one infinitive.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Lexemes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘say’</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>413 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘see’</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>212 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘believe’</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>203 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘know’</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>190 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘think’</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>144 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘hear’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>38 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘sense’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>27 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotion</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>54 4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 120 1,302
The largest single AcI cluster is the predicates meaning ‘say’. Of these, the most frequently occurring lexeme is *dicere* ‘to say’ with 173 tokens, and *aio* ‘say yes, affirm’\(^{70}\) has 81 tokens. The next most frequent verb in this cluster is *negare* ‘to say no, deny’, with 38 tokens. The remaining 121 ‘say’ tokens are distributed among 42 lexemes.

The cluster of predicates meaning ‘see’ forms an interesting contrast to those of ‘say’. Predicates meaning ‘see’ consist of only 6 distinct lexemes, but together they account for 212 (16%) of all AcI predicates. This means that, on average, a ‘see’ predicates occurs about four times as frequently as a ‘say’ predicate. Nonetheless, the most frequently occurring ‘see’ verb is *videre* ‘to see’, represented by 194 instances in the corpus – more than the tokens for *dicere*, the most common ‘say’ predicate. Put another way, for an AcI construction a speaker is more likely to use a verb meaning ‘say’, but among lexemes the verb *videre* is the most prevalent.

In the ‘believe’ group, 83 tokens come from *credere* ‘to give faith to, believe’, and 64 are from *censere* ‘to estimate, believe’; 12 other lexemes account for the other 56 ‘believe’ tokens. The ‘think’ cluster is comprised of two main lexemes. *Putare* ‘to trim, reason, think’ has 55 examples, and the semi-deponent (i.e. middle-voice) *arbitrari* ‘to adjudge, think (for oneself)’ accounts for 40 tokens; the remaining 40 tokens are from six other verbs. Finally, the cluster of verbs meaning ‘know’ comes primarily from the 140 tokens of *scire* ‘to know’. The remaining 50 tokens are divided among 11 other lexemes.

It is important to note the cumulative frequencies of these semantic clusters. The top five groups account for 89% of all tokens, and this is qualitatively different from the semantic clusters in both subject- and object-control complements. In subject control, only two semantic

\(^{70}\) Only finite forms of this verb are ever attested in extant data from any stage of the Latin language. Note also that the literal meaning of this verb appears to be a causative from *ai* ‘yes’ (cf. *negare* ‘to deny’ < neg- ‘not’), although interestingly Latin has no word that exactly means ‘yes’ (Morris, 1989); common circumlocutions are *ita* and *sic*, both meaning ‘thus’. 
groups are larger, and together they account for 66% of the tokens (see Table 30). Among
object-control predicates, just one group is relatively large and it equals 46% of the instances
(Table 34). Thus, the data in Table 50 show that AcI is a widespread phenomenon in early Latin:
Not only is the number of AcI predicates larger than any type studied here, but the tokens for
both individual predicates and semantic clusters of predicates are also higher. AcI occurs often,
and it occurs with a variety of predicates having a variety of meanings.

In addition to bridge verb complements, non-bridge complements are also supported by
AcI. One such cluster is the predicates of emotion, such as gaudere ‘to rejoice’ and laetari ‘to be
happy’ plus the related adjective laetus. As shown in Table 50, these predicates account for only
2% of the AcI instances. Examples are in (543-545).

(543) [Quem,...] hercle ego,... [...itemk adeo perdidisse] gaudeo.

‘Indeed, I’m glad he lost the case.’ (Pl. Cas. 568)

(544) proi crucior,... [bolum71 tantum}j mi, ereptumj... tam

desubito e faucibusk].

‘I’m in torture that such a tasty morsel was so suddenly snatched out of my throat.’ (Ter.
Heau. 673)

(545) proi laetus, sumi [laudari mei...], paterj,

by ...{laudato viroj}.

‘I’m happy I’m praised by you, father, by a man who has been praised himself.’ (Naev.
Trag. 17)

71 Bolus is borrowed from Greek βόλυς, a deverbal noun meaning ‘throw’. Here it appears to allude to a
‘throw’ of the dice (a common Roman leisurely pursuit), so that the intent is ‘a stroke of luck, good fortune, gain’,
metaphorically extended to mean a ‘morsel’ (and that is the meaning of the English borrowing bolus).
6.5.4.1 Subject pro

An embedded subject that occurs as non-overt is common in AcI, as shown in Table 51.

Table 51: Subjects with AcI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Null</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Indexed</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disjoint</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall 30% rate of null infinitival subjects in AcI is nearly the same rate of pro-drop as for all infinitival complements (see Table 25), because the majority of infinitival clauses in the corpus as AcI. However, the AcI rate shown here is slightly lower than the combined rate of 33% subject pro in embedded clauses. For AcI complements, it does not appear to matter much whether the embedded subject is co-indexed with the matrix (25% null) or not (32% null).

6.5.4.2 Object pro

A summary of how objects in AcI clauses occur is in Table 52.

Table 52: Objects with AcI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Null</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Indexed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disjoint</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall rate of 23% for object pro is somewhat lower than for subject pro in AcI. What is particularly interesting is the distinction between co-indexed and disjoint embedded objects. While disjoint objects are less recoverable from the co-text, they are nearly twice as likely (23%) to be omitted than co-indexed objects (13%). Put another way, co-indexed objects occur as an
overt NP in 87% of possible contexts – even though they are more readily recoverable than disjoint NPs (77%). These patterns do not follow a straightforward prediction of transparency.

6.5.4.3 Infinitival Tense

Compared with all other infinitival complements in this study, AcI clauses are distributed more evenly among the three possible tenses. A summary is in Table 53. This range of infinitival tense distribution is to be expected since AcI complements are mostly with bridge verbs, which may need to express an action occurring either past, present, or future with respect to the speech time. That is, there is no inherent link between speech time and the time of the embedded event.

Table 53: Infinitival Tenses on AcI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitival Tense</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,493</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5.4.4 Finite Variant

A finite subjunctive variant occurs 43 times with a matrix predicate that otherwise takes an AcI complement. Unlike the finite variants for control predicates and the other types of ECM, the subjunctive clauses with AcI follow a clear pattern. With an indirect question, a finite subjunctive clause is standard; some examples are in (546-548).

(546) \[ \text{pro}_{i} \text{ ut [alis]}_{j} \text{ in tragoed}_{k} \text{ see-1-s-perf Neptunum,} \text{ as other-M-PL-ACC in tragedy-F-PL-ABL see-1-s-perf Neptune-M-S-ACC} \]
Virtutem, Victoriæ, Martem, Bellonam\textsuperscript{72} commemorare

\[
\{\text{quae bona}\}_1 \text{ pro}_j \text{ volis}_m \text{ fecissent}_j] \text{ pro}_j \text{ vo-3-PL-PLUPERF-SUBJ}
\]

‘as I have seen others – Neptune, Goodness, Victory, Mars, and Bellona – recount what good things they have done for you.’ (Pl. *Amph.* 41-44)

(547) \text{pro}_i \{\text{hominem}_j \text{ conmonstrarier mi}_i \text{ istum}_j\} \text{ volo}_i \text{ aut } \text{ ubi}_i \text{ live-3-PL-SUBJ show distinctly-PASS I-DAT that-M-S ACC wish-1-S or where }

‘I want that man shown to me, or else where he lives to be pointed out.’ (Ter. *Phor.* 305-306)

(548) \{\text{quae re alia}\}_j \text{ PRO}_i \text{ ex crimine}_k \text{ inimicorum}_1 \text{ effugere}\} \text{ PRO}_i \text{ delica}_t \text{ in unfriendly-M-PL-GEN flee out-INFIN be able-2-PL-IMPERF-SUBJ clear up-2-S-IMPERAT }

‘In what other way you could escape from the reproach of the unfriendly, explain.’ (Acc. *Trag.* 2)

In contrast, when the question is about the literal content of the embedded proposition, the clause is AcI rather than finite. Some examples are in (549-550).

(549) \text{pro}_i \{\text{quid}_k \text{ tam intus fuisse te}_j\} \text{ dicam}_t \text{ [PRO}_i \text{ diu]}? \text{ PRO}_i \text{ say-1-S-FUT for a long time so inside be-INFIN-PERF you-S-ACC for a long time }

‘For what reason will I say you were inside for such a long time?’ (Pl. *Mil.* 1201)

(550) \text{pro}_i \{\text{quibus}_k \text{ -nam te}_j\} \text{ aibant}_t \text{ [PRO}_i \text{ exortum}_j\} \text{ PRO}_i \text{ arise-PPP-DEPON-M-S-ACC place-M-PL-ABL }

‘From what place [lit. ‘places’] were they saying you came?’ (Acc. *Trag.* 379)

\textsuperscript{72} Bellona is the unimaginatively named goddess of war (bellum), the sister of Mars. Her name as a transparent derivation from what she represents parallels the patrician Roman practice of naming daughters after the father’s clan name (e.g. Marcus Tullius Cicero > Tullia, Gaius Julius Caesar > Julia), i.e. providing no inherent individuation (a second daughter would gain the tag Secunda, a third, Tertia, etc.). Perhaps because of her status as a (minor) deity, Bellona as a name does contain a derivational affix – one step more toward individuation than a Roman girl would have.
Note from (549) that the interrogative *quid* has the same potential clause-level ambiguity as the English translation shown.

### 6.5.4.5 Present-Participle Variant

Although this study focuses on infinitival complements, it is important to note that some embedded complements have a participle rather than infinitive. That is, the variant form is also non-finite. The corpus contains 24 instances of a present participle in place of the more usual infinitive. Of those, all 24 (100%) are in AcI constructions. The present participle occurs only in the active (or with deponents, middle) voice. Because it has [+ present] tense, this participle’s action is simultaneous with that of the main verb. Some examples of a present participle in an infinitival complement are in (551-553). Note that (552) also has the present participle *manens* co-indexed with the pro subject of the main verb.

(551) *Video* | *ego* | *Getam*<sub>j</sub> *currentem*<sub>j</sub> | *huc* | *advenire*<sup>2</sup>
---|---|---|---|---
see-1-S | I-S-NOM | Geta-M-S-ACC | run-PART-S-ACC | come to-INFIN

‘Do I see Geta running here?’ (Ter. Phor. 177)

(552) *pro*<sub>i</sub> | *ibi* | *manens*<sub>i</sub> | *sedeto*<sub>i</sub> | *donicum* | *videbis*<sub>i</sub> | *[me]_<sub>j</sub>
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
there | remain-PART-S-NOM | sit-2-S-IMPERAT-FUT | until | see-2-S-FUT | I-S-ACC

*carpento* | *vehentem*<sub>i</sub> | *en* | *domum* | *venisse*.
---|---|---|---|---
carriage-N-S-ABL | ride-PART-S-ACC | indeed | home-M-S-ACC | come-INFIN-PERF

‘Remain seated there until you see I’ve come home riding in a cart.’ (Liv. Ody. 20-21)

(553) *nam* | *pro*<sub>i</sub> | *ut* | *[pro*<sub>j</sub> *ludere* | *laetantes*<sub>j</sub> | *inter* | *se*<sub>j</sub>... | *vidimus*<sub>i</sub>
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
for | as | play-INFIN | be happy-PART-PL-ACC | between | ANA-ACC | see-1-PL-PERF

*praeter* | *amnem* | *cretarris* | *sumere* | *aquam* | *ex* | *fonce*.
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
before | stream-M-S-ACC | mixing bowl-F-PL-ABL | take up-INFIN | water-F-S-ACC | out of | fountain-M-S-ABL

‘for as we saw them happily playing there among themselves, taking up water from the fountain in front of the stream’ (Naev. Trag. 41-42)

In (551-553) the present participle expresses the manner in which the action is performed.

In (551) Geta is seen to arrive by ‘running’, and in (552) the unnamed addressee is supposed to

---

<sup>73</sup> Since there is no morphological participle for the present-tense passive voice (the closest circumlocution is the gerundive), active/middle is the only possibility in the [+ present] tense.
sit there ‘remaining’. Note that the finite verb and participle are expressed in Latin opposite from English (which would be ‘remain seated’ rather than literally ‘sit remaining’). In the embedded clause, the speaker will have come home in the manner of ‘riding’ in a carriage. Similarly, the persons observed in (553) were playing in a manner of ‘being happy’.

Example (554), repeated from (443), reinforces the idea of the participle as an expression of manner, since it co-occurs with the infinitive in the embedded clause.

\[(554)\] pro i id i vo l u i t i o n i [nos k] sic nec pin ant is k d u c i

\{f a l s o g a u d i o j\}_1, speran ti s k i a m, \{am o t o m e t u j\}_m, [pro k

interoscitantis k opprimi j], ne esset n spati um n cogitandi

ad disturb and as nupti as; astute.

to disturb-GERUNDIVE-F-PL-ACC marriage-F-PL-ACC cunningly

‘He wanted this, for us to be lead unaware by false hope, now hoping, with fear removed, [for us] while we were gaping to be taken by surprise, so that there wouldn’t be any time for devising how to ruin the wedding; [he did it] cunningly.’ (Ter. And. 180-183)

For some corpus examples, a manner interpretation is not so clear. Rather, the meaning of the two non-finite forms (infinitive and participle) appears to be identical. Some examples are shown in (555-560). Note that in each instance the matrix verb is one associated with AcI, and most are verbs of perception. The effect is apparently the same as the English variants I see you run and I see you running.

\[(555)\] pro i vidi i [te j, Ulix es j, saxo sternentem j, Hectora k, vidi i [pro j tegentem j clipeo {classem Doricam j}]

‘I saw you, Ulysses, lay Hector flat with a rock, I saw you protecting the Dorian fleet with your shield. (Acc. Trag. 115-116)

\[(556)\] pro i memini i [ibi \{candelabrum ligneum\}_j ardentem j]

‘I remember a wooden candelabrum burning there.’ (Caec. Fab. 107)
‘But I see [my] father’s brother standing nearby with [my] father.’ (Ter. Phor. 607)

‘Meanwhile not one of us heard your wife either sighing or weeping.’ (Pl. Amph. 1098-1099)

‘He saw her kissing [someone], at least I heard him say so.’ (Pl. Mil. 275)

‘But I’m looking at Philocomasium kissing some other young man over there.’ (Pl. Mil. 288-289)

In (561-566) the participle occurs in a double-embedded clause.

‘So if my fellow servant should allege to the soldier he saw her kiss someone else, I’ll argue to the contrary my fellow servant saw her at your place embracing and kissing her lover.’ (Pl. Mil. 242-245)

74 The tense is so-called historical present because the speaker is vividly relating what he witnessed some time ago.
Nam ill’i non potuit\textsubscript{i} quin sermone suo\textsubscript{i} for that-M-S-NOM not be able-3-S-PERF but that speech-M-S-ABL own-M-S-ABL

aliquem familiarium participaverit\textsubscript{i} de amicaj INDEF-M-S-ACC member of household-M-PL-GEN make share-3-S-PERF-SUBJ about friend-F-S-ABL

eri, [sese\textsubscript{i} vidisse [eam\textsubscript{j} hic in proxumo INDEF-M-S-ACC member of household-M-PL-GEN make share-3-S-PERF-SUBJ about friend-F-S-ABL

osculantem\textsubscript{i} cum alieno adulescentulo\textsubscript{i}]. kiss-PART-S-ACC with another-M-S-ABL youth-M-S-ABL

‘For he couldn’t help but inform someone in the household of the master’s girlfriend he saw her kissing some you here next door.’ (Pl. Mil. 262-264)

pro\textsubscript{i} {Philocomasium eccam\textsubscript{75} j domi, [[quam\textsubscript{j} in proxumo...]} Philocomasium-N-S-ACC that-F-S-ACC home-F-S-LOC REL-F-S-ACC in near-SUPER-M-S-ABL

[...vidisse] aiebas\textsubscript{i} [...tei] [...osculantem\textsubscript{j} atque amplexantem\textsubscript{i} cum see-INFIN-PERF say-2-S-IMPERF you-S-ACC kiss-PART-S-ACC and embrace-PART-S-ACC with

altero\textsubscript{j}]. another-M-S-ABL

‘Here’s Philocomasium at home – the one you said you saw kissing and embracing someone else.’ (Pl. Mil. 319-320)

Atque pro\textsubscript{i} arguo\textsubscript{i} [[eam\textsubscript{j}...] me\textsubscript{i} vidisse [...osculantem\textsubscript{j} hic but argue-1-S ANA-F-S-ACC I-S-ACC see-INFIN-PERF kiss-PART-S-ACC here

intus cum alieno viro\textsubscript{j}]. inside with another-M-S-ABL man-M-S-ABL

‘But I insist I saw her kissing some other man here inside.’ (Pl. Mil. 337-338)

Tu\textsubscript{i} -n [pro\textsubscript{i} [me\textsubscript{j}...] vidisse [...] in proxumo hic...], you-S-NOM -Y/N I-S-ACC see-INFIN-PERF in near-SUPER-M-S-ABL here

sceleste\textsubscript{i}, ais\textsubscript{i} [...osculantem\textsubscript{j}]? scoundrel-M-S-VOC say-2-S kiss-PART-S-ACC

‘Do you claim you saw me kissing [her] here next door, you scoundrel?’ (Pl. Mil. 366)

ut tu\textsubscript{i} suspicatus\textsubscript{i} es\textsubscript{i} [pro\textsubscript{i} [eam\textsubscript{j}...] vidisse as you-S-NOM suspect-PPP-DEPOM-M-S-NOM be-2-S ANA-F-S-ACC see-INFIN-PERF

[...osculantem\textsubscript{j}] kiss-PART-S-ACC

‘as you suspected [you] saw her kissing [someone]’ (Pl. Mil. 399-401)

---

\textsuperscript{75} It is interesting to note that the determiner eccam is marked [+ feminine] in agreement with natural gender, even though the name Philocomasium has [+ neuter] grammatical gender. This kind of natural gender agreement is typical for Latin (cf. German, where grammatical gender is the norm).
In these examples, the first embedded AcI clause has the infinitive (as is usual), but the clause embedded inside of that has the participle. However, such a strategy for disambiguation does not explain the participles in the previous examples.

Nor does a double-embedded clause always have a present participle instead of a present infinitive, as for example osculari in (561) above and again with habere in (567).

(567) Venit\textsubscript{i}, Chremesi, postridie \textit{ad me} clamitans\textsubscript{i}, \{indignum facinus\}\textsubscript{j}, [pro\textsubscript{i} comperisses \[Pamphilum\textsubscript{k} pro uxore habere\]

\textit{hanc peregrinam}].

‘Chremes came to me the next day shouting – a terrible experience – he had discovered Pamphilus treated this foreigner as his wife.’ (Ter. And. 144-146)

Another example with a present-tense infinitive in a double-embedded AcI clause is in (568).

(568) \textit{Aliquot} me adierunt, \[ex te auditum…\] qui\textsubscript{i} aibant \[…[hodie nubere meam filiam tuo gnato]\].

‘Some came to me and said they heard from you [lit. ‘[it] was heard out of you’] my daughter is marrying your son today.’ (Ter. And. 534-535)

From most of the corpus examples, what governs the participial clause is typically a verb of perception such as \textit{videre} ‘to see’ or \textit{audire} ‘to hear’. However, verbs of perception take an infinitival complement in 258 (93%) of 278 contexts, or a participle in only 7% of instances. This distinction holds even when it is clear that the meaning of the matrix verb is literal (i.e. not merely figurative) perception, as in (569-575).

(569) pro\textsubscript{i} \[mare\textsubscript{j} velis florere\] \textit{videres}\textsubscript{i}.  

‘You would see the sea flower(ing) with sails.’ (Cato Or. 29)

(570) \textit{Vide}\textsubscript{i} -n \textit{tu} [illic oculos\textsubscript{j} virere]\?

‘Don’t you see his eyes are green?’ (Pl. Men. 828)
‘And I see the city of the Greeks burn(ing) up.’ (Enn. Trag. 343)

‘When he sees oats or darnelweed grow(ing) among the wheat, he culls it, separates it out, and carries it away.’ (Enn. Prae. 1-2)

‘I don’t trust myself when I hear him say(ing) those things.’ (Pl. Amph. 416)

‘I hear the doors (being) opened.’ (Pl. Cas. 435)

‘And there I felt the royal doors sound(ing).’ (Acc. Trag. 470)

Embedded participles in place of the infinitives are traditionally ascribed to Greek influence (Draeger, p. 2:775). While it is true that many verbs of perception in Greek regularly take an embedded complement with a participle, not an infinitive (Hansen & Quinn, 1992, pp. 465-470), it is not immediately clear why the participial variant occurs only sporadically in Latin. In fact, it is difficult to correlate the embedded participle specifically to the influence of Greek (although general Greek influence on Latin is well-known because of regular cultural contact). Many of the works of the early Latin poets, for example Livius Andronicus’ *Odissia* and Naevius’ *Iphigenia*, are modeled on known Greek sources. The plays of Plautus and Terence are Latinized versions of Greek originals (Hunter, 1985, pp. 1-23). Yet in most of these works, the Roman authors have altered the original Greek ideas into social customs and
philosophical ideas more relevant to a Roman audience. They are, in short, not at all mechanical translations, but rather cultural transformations. Many of the details and even subplots are distinctly changed or invented by their Latin authors; in many instances, parts of distinct Greek plays become transmogrified into a single Latin play which nonetheless recalls the original works and the spirit and style of their author(s). Allusions abound to famous Greek quotes and situations that any ordinary Roman would recognize, and part of the humor lies in what is always a Greek cast of characters in a Greek setting – but presented in the Latin tongue and fitting a specifically Roman cultural schema, such as the allusion to political conferences in Plautus’ *Menaechmi* 453ff. In all of these changes, the language itself is modified according to the style or taste of a particular author. Plautus features frequent word play, and where the Greek model is extent for comparison, it can be seen that he departs from the original even while preserving its general spirit. Thus, what is meant by the “Greek influence” on the participial construction is not a literal rending from the original texts, but rather the Roman authors’ general knowledge of Greek and thus the construction with the participle.

On the one hand, 23 (96%) of the 24 instances of an embedded participle occur in plays definitively known to be modeled on Greek originals. In contrast, the construction does not occur in either Ennius, Cato, or *Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus*. It is certain that Ennius knew Greek, based not only on his rendering of various Greek original texts but also from his birthplace in southern Italy, in the thriving sphere of Greek culture; later generations actually referred to him as “Greek” (Warmington, p. 1:xvii). Yet the bulk of his extant works presents a new literary Rome – yes, modeled on the glory that was Greece but especially in the epic *Annales* presenting the grandeur that has been – and, by Vergilian-like implication, will be – Rome. In contrast, Cato grew up in solidly Roman territory. In many ways, his cultural and
political differences with the Scipionic circle make him take an extreme rhetorical view that the old-fashioned Roman virtues are to be prized above everything Greek (although, ironically, he is also praised by Cicero for his oratory on the model of the best Greek style). For the anonymous decree of Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus, there is certainly no inherent reason to expect Greek influence, and thus it is no surprise that the embedded participle does not occur in that text either.

If Greek influence cannot be directly related to the occurrence of the embedded participle, then we must look for other reasons. One fact is especially important to note. Of the 24 instances of the construction, 17 (71%) occur just in Plautus’ Miles Gloriosus. Moreover, it is the same two participles, osculantem ‘kissing’ and amplexantem ‘embracing’, that occur in all but one of those instances. The repetition stems from one of the play’s two main plots, in which Sceledrus sees Philocomasium kissing Pleusicles but is told that the woman is actually her twin sister, not Philocomasium herself. He, however, insists that he saw what he saw, and the clever slave Palaestrio must try to convince him otherwise. Thus, the same proposition of what Sceledrus sees is repeated multiple times as the plot thickens. Without that element of the plot and the resulting repetition, the number of instances of the embedded participle in the corpus would be significantly less.

Finally, example (576) contains a participle that prevents ambiguity. Since both postulare ‘to demand’ and prohibere ‘to prohibit’ normally take an infinitival complement as object control, the participle advenientem actually provides a different meaning to the clause embedded by prohibere. If it were instead the infinite advenire, the meaning would be ‘... prevent him from arriving’.

(576) Tu -n [domo prohibere peregre me advenientem] postulas?
‘Do you demand that I prevent him from coming home when he is arriving?’ (Pl. *Amph.* 361)

One explanation for the present-participle variant lies in the fact that it occurs only with AcI complements. In such complements, the finite subjunctive is reserved for indirect questions (see section 6.5.4.4). As a result, when an author wishes a stylistic variant – whether to avoid syntactic ambiguity because of multiple embedded clauses or just for the sake of variety – the subjunctive option is blocked in AcI. What remains is this participial construction. It may well have occurred originally in Latin because of Greek influence, but the motivation for borrowing such a construction appears to stem directly from the rules of Latin syntax. That is, the special usage for the finite subjunctive prevents such a clause – which is the ordinary variant form in all other infinitival clause types besides AcI – and thus another variant must be chosen. The present-participle construction fulfills such a purpose.

**6.5.4.6 Internal Argument**

Syntactic theory treats the AcI subject as inherently part of the embedded clause (see section 2.4), not directly subcategorized by the matrix verb. Nonetheless, some evidence from early Latin suggests that speakers parsed the AcI subject NP as belonging to the main clause. For example, in (577) the NP *Chalinum* is unambiguously marked for accusative case, but it is subcategorized by *scire* ‘to know’ with an indirect statement in the subjunctive. In other words, *Chalinum* ought to be as *Chalinus* (i.e. [+ nominative]). This suggests that it is actually treated as a direct object of *scire*. *Scire* means to ‘know’ a fact, not a person (for which *nosci* > *novisse* is used).76  The joke here is that the male Chalinus is disguised as the woman Casina in order to

76 Another possibility is that the traditional grammar books and dictionaries are wrong about the actual meaning of *scire* vs. that of *nosci, novisse*. Further corpus study would be needed to evaluate such a possibility.
marry the master’s son, and one of the other slaves in on the scheme makes the comment shown
in (577).

(577) \[ L ub e t , \quad p r o _ j \quad [ P R O _ j \quad C h a l i n u m _ k \quad [ q u i d _ 1 \quad p r o _ k \quad a g a t _ k ] ] \quad s c i r e \]
please-3-s Chalinus-M-S-ACC INTERROG-N-S-ACC do-3-S-SUBJ know-INFIN

\[ [... \{ n o v o m \quad n u p t u m \}_k \quad c u m \quad \{ n o v o \quad m a r i t o \}_m ] \].
new-M-S-ACC veil-PPP-M-S-ACC with new-M-S-ABL husband-M-S-ABL

‘I’d like [lit. ‘it pleases’] to know Chalinus, what the new male bride is doing with the
new bridegroom.’ (Pl. Cas. 859)

Similarly, the NP \textit{patrem} in (578) appears to be interpreted as the direct object of \textit{scire}.

(578) \[ P h o r . \quad [ H a n c _ j \ldots ] \quad D e m i p h o _ i \quad n e g a t _ i \quad [... e s s e \quad c o g n a t a m _ i ] ? \]
this-F-S-ACC Demipho-M-S-NOM deny-3-S be-INFIN relative-F-S-ACC

\[ G e t a \quad p r o _ i \quad n e g a t _ i . \]
deny-3-S

\[ P h o r . \quad N e q u e \quad [ e i u s _ j \quad p a t r e m _ k \quad s e _ i \quad s c i r e \quad [ q u i _ k \quad f u e r i t _ k ] ] ? \]
nor ANA-F-S-GEN father-M-S-ACC ANA-ACC know-INFIN INTERROG-M-S-NOM
be-3-S-PERF-SUBJ

‘Phor. Does Demipho deny she is his relative?

Geta He does.

Phor. And [he says] that he doesn’t know her father, who he was?’ (Ter. Phor. 353-354)

6.5.5 Optionality of Co-Indexed ECM Subjects

Lakoff claims (1968, p. 84) that an ECM subject co-indexed with the matrix subject must
be overt. She offers the hypothetical examples in (579a-b) as a minimal pair to illustrate the
requirement for the shared subject to be overt. (The bracketing of the embedded clauses and
labeling of pro are added here for clarity.)

(579) a. \[ p r o _ i \quad v o l o _ i \quad [ m e _ i \quad e s s e \quad b o n u m _ i ] . \]
wish-1-S I-S-ACC be-INFIN good-M-S-ACC

b. \[ * p r o _ i \quad v o l o _ i \quad [ p r o _ i \quad e s s e \quad b o n u m _ i ] . \]
wish-1-S be-INFIN good-M-S-ACC

‘I want to be good’.
Example (579b) is claimed to be ungrammatical because the non-overt pro (= *me*) as subject of the infinitive *esse* is co-indexed with the pro subject of the main verb *volo*. Since ‘wish’ verbs + copula occur with a nominative complement (see section 6.4.7), hypothetical example (579b) does seem blocked. Serving as model for what actually occurs in early Latin is the authentic example (580), repeated from (424).

(580) pro\textsubscript{i} [PRO\textsubscript{i} molest\textsubscript{a}\textsubscript{i} ei\textsubscript{j} esse] nolo\textsubscript{i}.

‘I don’t want to be bothersome to him.’ (Pl. Cas. 545)

That is, if PRO occurs any appositives must also be nominative. The contrast shown in (581) can therefore be proposed, where the overtness of the matrix subject and the lower-ranking thematic role (i.e. the dative NP *ei*) are immaterial.

(581) a. [PRO\textsubscript{i} molest\textsubscript{a}\textsubscript{i} esse] nolo\textsubscript{i}.

b. *[pro\textsubscript{i} molestam\textsubscript{i} esse] nolo\textsubscript{i}.

The difference lies partly in whether the empty category in the embedded clause is pro or PRO (terminology not available to Lakoff’s argumentation in 1968). Yet there is also the fact that accusative case is clearly assigned to the complement of a ‘wish’ verb when the infinitival subject is completely overt (i.e. with a noun or pronoun). Some examples with an embedded copula are in (582-584).

(582) Nam pro\textsubscript{i} [med\textsubscript{i} aetatem viduam esse] mavelim\textsubscript{i} quam [pro\textsubscript{i}

{ista\textsubscript{e}c flagit\textsubscript{a} tua\textsubscript{j} pati} quae tu\textsubscript{k} facis\textsubscript{k}.

‘For I’d rather [lit. ‘me’] be a widow for the rest of my life than endure those crimes of yours which you do.’ (Pl. Men. 720-721)

(583) Sed utrum nunc tu\textsubscript{i} [caelibem\textsubscript{i} te\textsubscript{i} esse...] mavis\textsubscript{i}

{...liberum\textsubscript{i}} an [pro\textsubscript{i} maritum\textsubscript{i} servom\textsubscript{i} aetatem degere et

free-M-S-ACC or married-M-S-ACC slave-M-S-ACC age-F-S-ACC live out-INFIN and
'But now would you prefer [lit. ‘yourself’] to be single and free or to live out your life married and a slave, you and your children?' (Pl. Cas. 290-291)

(584) [Emortuom,...] ego_i [...me_i,...] mavelim_i [...leto malo] quam
[non ego_i illi dem_i hodie insidas senti].

die off-PPP-DEPON-M-S-ACC I-S-NOM I-s-ACC prefer-I-S-SUBJ death-N-S-ABL bad-N-S-ABL than
not I-S-NOM that-M-S-DAT give-I-S-SUBJ today trap-F-PL-ACC old-M-S-DAT

'I’d prefer [lit. ‘me’] to be dead by some horrible death than not lay a trap for that old man today.' (Pl. Aul. 661-662)

Note that in (583) the first embedded clause has a non-overt copula, and the second embedded clause is finite with subjunctive rather than with the infinitive.

Regardless of whether the embedded verb is the copula or not, data from the corpus reveal a split between overt and non-overt co-indexed infinitival subjects with all ECM verbs. The results are summarized in Table 54.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Non-Overt</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While non-overt co-indexed infinitival subjects occur in all three [person] inflections, they occur most often in second-person contexts, and just once in third-person. This means that Lakoff’s claim is too strong, at least for early Latin, since overall 8% of contexts have the co-indexed NP as null rather than overt. Still, it must be noted that first-person contexts – those analogous to her proposed rule – do favor an overt co-indexed infinitival subject (89% of instances).

An example of omitted co-indexing for a first-person subject is in sentence (585), for second-person in (586), and for third-person in (587).
Nam pro\(_i\) i pollicitus\(_i\) sum\(_i\) [pro\(_i\) susceptrum\(_i\) pro\(_j\)]

‘For I have promised [I] will raise [him] up.’ (Ter. And. 400-401)

Tu\(_i\) i suspicatus\(_i\) e\(_i\) [pro\(_i\) eam\(_i\) vidisse osculantem\(_i\)].

‘You suspected [you] saw her kissing.’ (Pl. Mil. 401)

pro\(_i\) [pro\(_i\) depeclassere aliqua… sperans\(_i\) […]me\(_j\) ac pro\(_i\)

deargentassere, pro\(_i\) decalauticare, pro\(_i\) eburno speculo

despeculassere].

‘hoping somewhat to ungoblet me, to unsilver and unshawl me, to unmirror me from my ivory mirror.’ (Luc. Sat. 640-641)

When just the ECM ‘wish’ verbs are examined, the results are what appears in Table 55.

Table 55: Co-Indexed Infinitival Subjects (ECM ‘Wish’ only).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Non-Overt</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With just the ‘wish’ ECM verbs considered, the results are similar are for all ECM predicates combined. Overall, then, Lakoff’s claim does not hold as stated. Co-indexed embedded subjects do not obligatorily occur as overt, and indeed the overtness rate is slightly lower in the specific context made in the claim.

6.5.6 Binding and Empty Categories

In English, having an overt NP in the subject position of the embedded infinitival clause necessarily means having an ECM structure. However, Latin’s pro-drop setting allows the option of expressing an infinitival subject as either an overt NP or as pro. Therefore, the form of
the embedded subject – null or overt – does not distinguish between subject-control and ECM complements with the same matrix predicate. Even when the matrix and embedded subject are co-indexed, one or both NPs may be null. In example (588) the ECM subject NP *me* is co-indexed with *pro* as the subject of the matrix verb.

(588) \[ pro_i \ [\text{experiri} \ istuc...] \ mavellem_i \ [...me_i] \ quam \ [pro_j \ mi_i]^\footnote{This pair of elliptical questions results in a sequence of six iambs (Gratwick, 1993, p. 207) and iconically replicates the speaker’s surprise at the propositions expressed.} \]

\[ \text{memorarier].} \]
mention-INFIN-PASS

‘I would rather experience that than have it told to me.’ (lit. ‘would prefer myself to experience that’) (Pl. Amph. 512)

Since an overt pronoun would not be required in the main clause but its referent is still recoverable, in the embedded clause the same “invisible” indexing is also possible. Note that in examples (589-590), the overt accusative pronoun is not the ECM subject.

(589) \[ Negas_i \ [pro_i \ novisse \ me_i]? \ Negas_i \ [pro_i-ECMsubj \ \{patrem \ meum\}_i]^\footnote{This pair of elliptical questions results in a sequence of six iambs (Gratwick, 1993, p. 207) and iconically replicates the speaker’s surprise at the propositions expressed.} \]

\[ \text{deny-2-S get to know-INFIN-PERF I-S-ACC deny-2- S father-M-S-ACC my-M-S-ACC} \]

‘Do you deny [you] know me? Do you deny [you] [know] my father?’ (Pl. Men. 750)

(590) \[ Tu_i \ [-n \ [pro_i \ me_j \ vidisse \ in \ proxumo \ hic], \ scelleste_i, \]

\[ \text{you -Y/N I-S-ACC SEE-INFIN-PERF in close-SUPER-M-S-ABL here scoundrel-M-S-VOC} \]

\[ ais_i \ osculantem?; \]
say-2-S kiss-PART-S-ACC

‘Are you saying [you] saw me kissing [someone] in the next house here, you scoundrel?’ (Pl. Mil. 366)

With third-person referents as ECM subjects, there are even more variations possible.

The most straightforward variety is an overt NP in the main clause, with co-indexing through the anaphor *se* in the embedded clause. Examples are in (591-592).

(591) \[ [Uxorem...] \ decrerat_i \ [dare \ sese_i \ mi \ hodie]. \]

\[ \text{wife-F-S-ACC decide-3-S-PLUPERF give-INFIN ANA-ACC I-S-DAT today} \]
‘He had decided to give me a wife today’ (lit. ‘decided himself to give me a wife’) (Ter. And. 238)

(592) \{Omnes mortales\}_i [sese laudarier] optant.

All mortals want to be praised’ (lit. ‘want themselves to be praised’) (Enn. Ann. 549)

The embedded passive in (592) is discussed in section 7.2.2.

Note that subject-control predicates sometimes take an overt ECM subject that is co-indexed with the main subject. An example with the first-person pronoun co-indexed between the two clauses is in (593).

Example (594) has co-indexing in the second person.

In (595) the co-indexing is a bound third-person entity.

The overt co-indexed embedded subjects show that these forms of *velle* ‘to wish’ have the option of subject-control or ECM complements.
The examples in (593-595) all have an overt NP as the co-indexed infinitival subject. In (596-597) there is also co-indexing of main and embedded subjects, but the lower NP is non-overt.

(596) *Ille* atque *adiuret* insuper, [proi *nolle esse dicta*].

‘And on top of that he should swear [he]’s sorry for what he said’ (lit. ‘swear himself to not want things to have been said’).\(^{78}\) (Pl. *Amph*. 889-890)

(597) *Menaechme*_j, proi [proi *amare*...] *ait* [...*te*] multum Erotium_i.  

‘Menaechmus, Erotium asks ‘please’ [lit. ‘says [she] loves you a lot’].’\(^{79}\) (Pl. *Men*. 524)

Examples (598-601) exploit pro-drop even further by leaving both subjects as null.

(598) *Dum* proi *censent* [proi *terrere* proj minis], proi

hortantur i bi sos\(^{80}\).

‘While they believe [they] frighten them with threats, instead they encourage them.’ (Enn. *Ann*. 244)

(599) proi [proi vestimentis frigus atque horrorem] exacturum_i.

putet_i.

‘He may think [he] will drive out the cold and shivering with clothes.’ (Luc. *Sat*. 686)

(600) proi *ait* [proi tibiuxorem dare hodie*].

‘[He] says [he] is giving you a wife today.’ (Ter. *And*. 353-354)

(601) proi [proi altero te occissurum... ait, [...altero vilicum]

\(^{78}\) *Nollem dictum* ‘I would not want said’ is a standard formula of apology (Sedgwick, 1967, p. 119).

\(^{79}\) See Gratwick (p. 189) for the meaning of this sentence.

\(^{80}\) *Sos* is an archaic form of *eos*, a form of the unbound anaphor *is*. In the corpus, *s*- forms of *is* occur only in Ennius.

\(^{81}\) This is an instance of non-agreement on [gender] with a future active participle: The subject NP *Casina* (unambiguously recoverable from the co-text) is [+ feminine], but the form *occisurum* is elsewhere only [+ masculine] or [+ neuter].
Since the infinitival subject is non-overt in these examples, they are similar to control structures. What distinguishes them from control is the lack of an internal argument necessary for ‘control’. Instead, they all feature a matrix bridge verb or, as in (596), an ECM form of ‘wish’.

With third-person entities in ECM, pro in the main clause can link to an embedded se (i.e. bound) anaphor. Some examples are in (602-604).

(602) \[ \text{pro}_i [\text{rabere se}_i] \text{ait}_i. \]
\quad be insane-INFIN ANA-ACC say-3-S

‘He says he’s insane.’ (Caec. Plays 77)

(603) \[ \text{ne pro}_i [\text{plus}_k... \text{censeat}_i [\text{...sapere se}_i \text{ quam dominum}_i]. \]
\quad lest more-N-S-ACC believe-3-S-SUBJ know-INFIN ANA-ACC than master-M-S-ACC

‘lest he believe he knows more than the master’ (Cato Agr. V)

(604) \[ \text{pro}_i \text{ deierat}_i [\text{se}_i \text{ non scripsisse pro}_j \text{ et [pro}_i \text{ post non scripturum}_i \text{ pro}_j]. \]
\quad swear-3-S ANA-ACC not write-INFIN-PERF and after not write-INFIN-FUT-M-S-ACC

‘[He] swears he didn’t write [it] and won’t write [it] later.’ (Luc. Sat. 890)

Also note the omission of se in the second (conjoined) embedded clause of (604) for the object of the writing.

Binding rules mean that the anaphor se can also be the direct object in an ECM clause even when a separate entity is the embedded subject. That is, the binding crosses the clausal boundary. Some examples are in (605-607).

(605) \[ \text{pro}_i \text{ narrabit}_i [\text{servom}_j \text{ hinc sese}_i a \text{ foribus Sosiam}_j \text{ amovisse}. \]
\quad tell-3-S-FUT slave-M-S-ACC from here ANA-ACC from door-F-PL-ABL Sosia-M-S-ACC remove-INFIN-PERF

‘[He] will say the servant Sosiam removed him [lit. ‘himself’] from this house.’ (Pl. Amph. 467-468)
He knew you would do what was commanded of you, indeed he knew you revere and fear him [lit. ‘himself’]. (Pl. Amph. 21-23)

‘He said little food had been prepared for him [lit. ‘himself’] by the decemvirs.’ (Cato Or. 58)

A summary of overt and non-overt infinitival subjects in ECM is shown in Table 56.

Table 56: Subjects with ECM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Null</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO-INDEXED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj. Ctrl. ~ ECM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcI</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISJOINT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj. Ctrl. ~ ECM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcI</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,757</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data show that the majority (80%) of infinitival subjects are overt in all types of ECM clauses combined. When the embedded subject is co-indexed with the matrix subject, it is more likely (92%) to be overt than when disjoint from the main subject (79%). This difference between overtness in co-indexed and disjoint subjects is surprising since the former (i.e. those
NPs with more likely to be overt) are more readily recoverable from the immediate context and thus less essential than disjoint NP subjects. Such a trend goes against the principle of transparency.

6.6 SUMMARY

The corpus of early Latin contains 3,828 infinitives, of which 52 have too little context to be further identified. The remaining 3,776 are classified into nominal infinitives, historical infinitives, interjections, control structures, and ECM. Nominal and historical infinitives are part of matrix clauses, and together they comprise only 2% of the total. Interjections have a subject NP marked for accusative case but without any matrix verb; that is, the interjection verb is an infinitive. The majority of interjections in the corpus are from the plays of Terence, and that fact should be framed as part of the psychological portraits that Terence conveys among his characters: The relatively frequent interjections the characters use are markers of personal (i.e. long-term) traits as well as indicators of state of mind.

The true embedded infinitival complements are control structures and ECM, and these account for 96% of the corpus instances. Of the control structures, subject control is by far the most frequent type. It occurs among 89 different lexemes in a total of 956 predicates. The most common types of subject control are predicates meaning ‘able’ or ‘want’, but many other less-frequent predicates such as ‘accustomed to’, ‘hurry’, and ‘try’ also occur. One idiomatic use of subject control is with a negative command, using the predicate *nolle* ‘not to wish’ + infinitive. A subject-control infinitive is sometimes used as a gerund, despite the fact that early Latin has a distinct morphological gerund form. The use of subject-control structures as a modal (such as with *debere* ‘to owe’) is rare in early Latin, occurring in only two corpus examples. The infinitival tense with subject-control predicates is overwhelmingly [+ present], with the majority
of exceptions having [+ perfect] tense with ‘wish’ verbs. The oldest corpus text, *Senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus*, presents a very high usage of the [+ perfect] tense with ‘wish’. This suggests both that the [- present] infinitival tense developed relatively early and that infinitival tense selection is lexical. Only three corpus examples contain a finite (subjunctive) variant with subject control, and in them the complementizer is optional if it is not negative.

Object-control structures are the next most frequent type of control complements. Compared with subject-control predicates, the number of distinct object-control lexemes (41) is high since they occur in only one third as many predicates. The most frequently occurring object-control predicates mean ‘order’ or ‘allow’. One idiomatic function of object-control clauses is a greeting with *iubere* ‘to order’ + *salvere* ‘to be well’; the meaning of the sentence does not have literal force, but rather serves as a reminder that language functions through convention.

In addition to direct-object controllees, there are also dative (i.e. beneficiary) controllees with impersonal verbs such as *licere* ‘to be allowed’, deontic predicates such as *necesse* ‘necessary’, and sentential control with the entire infinitival clause treated as a [+ neuter, + singular] NP. Controllees in object-control structures tend to be null in about one third of contexts, with a slight preference for overt objects when the controllee is co-indexed with the matrix subject. This fact is not readily predictable from the principle of transparency, since a shared subject has less need to be expressed overtly than a disjoint one – but nonetheless tends to be overt more often. Infinitival tense in object-control complements is typically [+ present], but at a slightly lower rate than for subject control and with a larger set of lexemes and greater variety of meanings. The finite subjunctive variant occurs in 51 instances, with no clear pattern based on matrix lexeme or meaning. However, the finite variant does sometimes occur when the
sentence contains another infinitival clause, such that the finite clause appears to prevent syntactic ambiguity.

One implication for GB theory is the case assignment of PRO. Early Latin data suggest that rather than being assigned empty or null case, PRO takes the default case assignment of the NP to which it is linked through the copula. Evidence for this occurs in both the nominative and accusative case with infinitival object-control complements.

ECM in early Latin occurs in four types. One type is the predicates that vary between subject-control and ECM complements, including the verbs meaning ‘wish’, ‘hope’, ‘pretend’ and ‘promise’. With these variant matrix predicates, there appears to be some relationship between infinitival tense patterning and overtness of the subject NP. The ‘pretend’ and ‘want’ verbs pattern their infinitival tenses like control verbs, showing a high preference for [+ present] tense in the infinitive, and they take an overt accusative subject in 82%-89% of instances depending on whether that subject is co-indexed with the matrix subject. In contrast, the ‘hope’ and ‘promise’ verbs pattern their infinitival tenses more like other ECM predicates (i.e. allowing more frequent use of [+ perfect] and [+ future] infinitives), and they take an overt accusative subject in only 71% of instances regardless of the subject’s indexicality.

Another type of ECM is impersonal, in which the subject of the infinitive is accusative. Some lexemes take only either an impersonal-control or an impersonal-ECM complement, but many of the same predicates can take both types, as shown by various corpus examples. The most common lexeme, licere ‘to be allowed’, overwhelmingly favors the impersonal-control structure, but even within the same author the same lexeme sometimes takes an impersonal ECM complement. Related to the impersonal ECM is deontic ECM, which differs by having a predicate with deontic force. Of these, the most commonly occurring is oportere ‘to be fitting’,
which takes only an ECM complement and never a deontic-control one. However, other less-frequently occurring ECM predicates do sometimes take a deontic-control infinitival clause. The overall distinction between impersonal and deontic complements is their preference for infinitival clause type. The impersonal predicates tend to take control complements in which an overt subject is marked with dative case, while the deontic ones more typically take ECM complements (i.e. with subject marked for accusative case). Thus, the semantic distinction between general impersonal predicates and those with deontic force has syntactic consequences.

The largest group of ECM complements is the AcI type. These are mostly bridge verb complements, with verbs meaning ‘say’ or ‘believe’ accounting for over half of the instances. Infinitival tenses pattern distinctly from those with control complements, in which [+ present] tense occurs at the rate of 95% or more. With AcI, [+ present] tense infinitivals occur in only two thirds of contexts, with most of the remaining infinitives being [+ perfect]. This syntactic pattern follows semantics, since bridge verbs often point to events in the past and sometimes to those expected in the future. There is a finite subjunctive variant with the AcI structure, but its usage is completely conditioned by semantics. When the embedded proposition is an indirect question, the verb is subjunctive, while an infinitive is used for questions about the literal content of the embedded proposition. The finite variant occurs in no other contexts, so that unlike what happens with the control structures and other ECM types, the AcI variant is completely predictable based on meaning rather than (apparently) pragmatics. The present participle is sometimes used in place of the present infinitive in bridge verb complements, with no apparent difference in meaning; its function appears to avoid syntactic ambiguity. There is also some evidence that the ECM subject is interpreted as an internal argument of the matrix verb, and this also distinguishes AcI complements from all other types found in the corpus.
CHAPTER 7. INFINITIVAL COMPLEMENTS
IN EARLY LATIN, PART 2

7.1 RAISING

Since Latin is a pro-drop language, there is little intrinsic motivation for raising to occur (outside of passivization; see section 7.2) in order to fill a subject position. In fact, only 64 (2%) of the 3,828 infinitival complements in the corpus are possible raising structures. Of these, 62 are actually passivized AcI complements, which are discussed further below in section 7.2.4. The majority are from the verb *videre* ‘to see’, which has a special lexical meaning of ‘to seem’ when passivized.

What is left are only two instances of possible inherent raising. These are shown in sentences (608-609) with the matrix verb *cluere* ‘to be called, be said’; the same lexical root appears above in *inclutis* in example (454a). Like German *heissen* with the same meaning, this verb takes active-voice morphology but must be expressed in English with a passive meaning. *Cluere* thus contrasts with Latin verbs such as *vocare* ‘to call, summon’, *appellare* ‘to address, accost’, and *nominare* ‘to give a name to, name’, which can also be passivized in meaning but then must take on true passive morphology.

(608) proi t esse per gentes…] cluebat i [omnium
miserrimus i.

‘He was said to be the most miserable of all among the tribes.’ (Enn. *Fab*. 376)

(609) Resi magis quaequitur quam [t clientum…] fidesi cuius
modi clueat

‘Their property is more asked about than what sort of trustworthiness is said to belong to their clients.’ (Pl. *Men*. 575-576)
As expected with a raising construction, the subjects *miserrimus* in (608) and *fides* in (609) are assigned nominative case; note that the copular infinitive *esse* is non-overt in both examples.

The nominative case assignment for *miserrimus* and *fides* is confirmed from two examples in the works of Plautus not included in the corpus; Terence offers no examples, and two additional contexts from Plautus are ambiguous. The two clear-cut examples are in (610-611).

(610)  \{Atridae duo fratres\} \textsubscript{i} \textit{cluenti} \textsubscript{i} \textit{fecisse facinus} \textsubscript{son of Atreus-M-PL-NOM two-M-PL-NOM son-M-PL-NOM be called-3-PL do-INFIN-PERF deed-N-S-ACC} maximum\].

‘The two sons of Atreus are said to have done a very great deed.’ (Pl. Bac. 925)

(611) \textit{Atque me i minoris facio i prae illo i qui i omnium legum atque iurum fictor i conditorij clueti} \textsubscript{j} \textit{and I- S-ACC less-N-S-GEN make-1-S before that-M-S-ABL REL-M-S-NOM all-F-PL-GEN law-F-PL-GEN and right-N-PL-GEN maker-M-S-NOM establisher-M-S-NOM be called-3-S}

‘And I consider myself better off compared with that one, who is called the maker and establisher of all laws and rights.’ (Pl. Epi. 522-523)

Note that *cluere* has a single argument. Although the verb’s meaning is best expressed in English with a passive verb, the morphology is unambiguously active-voice in Latin (i.e. such verbs are the binary opposite of deponents, which have passive morphology but active-middle meaning). When an overt NP occurs with *cluere*, the case assignment is nominative, for example *Atridae duo fratres*\textsuperscript{82} with *fecisse* in example (610). Since the one-place argument structure has a built-in slot for a thematic role, *cluere* cannot legitimately be classified as raising.

In addition, the impersonal verbs such as the modal-like *decere* ‘to be proper’ and *oportere* ‘to be fitting’ never have a nominative-marked argument, and when they take an overt argument it is always marked for dative (as control) or accusative (as ECM) case. The overt argument is the experiencer, the person (and it is always a human) for whom it is ‘proper’ to be

\textsuperscript{82} The inflectional endings on *duo* and *fratres* are ambiguous between nominative and accusative, but the appositive *Atridae* can only be nominative (its accusative form is *Atridas*).
or do something. These too are not raising verbs. The modal verbs take only a theme argument, which is obligatorily realized as an infinitival complement. This supports Pepicello’s (1977) claim that raising does not occur in Latin except through the assignment of accusative case to the infinitival subject of a complement.

7.2 PASSIVIZATION

Passivization occurs in nearly one fifth of infinitival complements found in the corpus, as summarized in Table 57.

Table 57: Infinitive Voice by Clause Type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Embedded Infinitive</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>3 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>45 96%</td>
<td>2 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interjection</td>
<td>25 74%</td>
<td>9 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>905 87%</td>
<td>133 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>184 67%</td>
<td>91 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>92 99%</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic</td>
<td>31 97%</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentential</td>
<td>43 98%</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,255 85%</td>
<td>227 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj.Ctrl. ~ ECM</td>
<td>160 60%</td>
<td>106 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>17 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic</td>
<td>297 68%</td>
<td>137 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcI</td>
<td>1,278 86%</td>
<td>215 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,752 79%</td>
<td>458 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,080 82%</td>
<td>696 18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some issues on passivization in these constructions are discussed below.
7.2.1 Control

The two subtypes of control with any notable occurrence of passive complements are subject and object control.

7.2.1.1 Subject Control

Subject-control predicates embed a passive clause in 133 instances. By far, the most frequently occurring lexemes are predicates meaning ‘be able’, which together account for 109 (82%) of the 133 cases. Some examples of passivization with subject-control predicates are in (612-616). Traces are indicated by a roman <t> to distinguish them from the italicized Latin text.

(612) [{Maiore -que opere}... ibi serviles_i nuptiae_i quam liberales_i etiam [...PRO_i curari t_i] solent_i.

> ‘The weddings of slaves there are accustomed to be celebrated even more grandly than those of free persons.’ (Pl. Cas. 73-74)

(613) quoniam non potest_i id_i [PRO_i fieri] quod_i pro_i

> ‘although that which you wish can’t be done’ (Ter. And. 305)

(614) si qui sapientia_i magis vestra_i mors_i [PRO_i devitari

> ‘if death can somehow be avoided more by our wisdom, for the wounded of Aesculapius’ children fill up the porticos, [it] can’t be approached’ (Enn. Trag. 170-171)

(615) An pro_i {mala aetate}i mavis_i [PRO_i male mulcari

>
Would you prefer at your bad time of life to be trashed about by every kind [of torture]?
(Acc. Trag. 49)

where [it] would easily be able to be known’ (Bacc. 27)

One notable feature of some subject-control predicates meaning ‘to be able’ with a passivized complement is the attraction of passivization into the main clause. That is, the matrix verb is not normally passivized (indeed, does not make semantic sense as a passive form) but sometimes does occur morphologically marked as passive. The three corpus examples with posse are in (617-619), and the two with quire are in (620-621); the passive forms end in –ur.

Note that the English translations fail to render the flavor of the pleonastic passives.

Nor can [he] be drawn back by commands.’ (Enn. Var. 20)

if [he] can be tracked on any road’ (Pac. Trag. 98)

‘It should have four handles on the top so that it can be [easily] carried.’ (Cato Agr. 154)

‘if [it] can’t be mended’ (Caec. Fab. 273)
Everything can be learned thoroughly and comprehended from that.’ (Acc. Did. 18)

7.2.1.2 Object Control

Not surprisingly, the most frequently occurring control lexeme, *iubere* ‘to order’, also occurs most often in control examples with a passivized complement. A passivized control complement occurs with *iubere* in 51 (56%) of the 91 passivized control structures. Some examples are in (622-624).

(622) proi iubei vero proj [PRO] {vasa pura}k adornari

order-2 S-IMPERAT but S-ACC pure N-PL ACC prepare INFIN-PASS

mihi

I S-DAT

‘But order pure vessels to be prepared for me.’ (Pl. Amph. 946)

(623) proi proj Lesbiak [PRO] adduci tk iubesi.

Lesbia F S ACC lead to INFIN PASS order 2 S

Atque

and

Lesbia to be brought here.’ (Ter. And. 228)

(624) proi proj iussiti vestimentak [PRO] detrahi tk atque

order 3 S PERF clothing N-PL ACC pull away INFIN PASS and

flagro caedi tk.

fire N S ABL cut INFIN PASS

‘He ordered [their] clothing to be pulled off and destroyed in the fire.’ (Cato Or. 58)

These examples are semantically felicitous because *iubere* takes object control and one entity can ‘control’ another to do whatever the infinitival’s action is.

However, when an overt controllee is co-indexed with the matrix subject and the main verb is *iubere*, the result is semantically odd in English. In Latin it is apparently acceptable. The corpus examples are shown in sentences (625-626).

(625) proi iubei tei [PRO] piari t i de mea

order-2 S IMPERAT you-2 S ACC propitiate INFIN PASS S from my- F S ACC

pecunia nam equidem [insanum]i esse tei certo scio.

money F S ABL for indeed insane M S ACC be INFIN you S ACC certainly know 1 S

‘Order yourself to be propitiated by using my money, for indeed I certainly know you’re insane.’ (Pl. Men. 291)
‘Else order yourself to be propitiated, you very crazy man.’ (Pl. Men. 517)

Note that in both examples the addressee is explicitly called insane, so it is possible that the co-indexing is for humorous effect or is even meant to be iconic of the insanity.

In example (627) the PP *a me* appears to be an agent NP since it co-occurs with the passive clause. However, it would be pragmatically odd as a command for the passive action to be done by the speaker. Rather, *me* is probably metonymic for ‘my house’ or ‘my household’.

As a result, the intention is for the wine to be brought either ‘by [the servants] in my household’ (i.e. as an agentive NP) or ‘from my house’ (i.e. the preposition *a* has its literal meaning of ‘from’ rather than serving as the marker for agentivity). The ambiguity is not resolved by the discourse co-text, and in reality the perlocutionary effect is the same regardless of the speaker’s exact intention.

‘But I’ll order [lit. ‘will have ordered’] a jar of aged wine to be brought here from my house(hold).’ (Pl. Aul. 570-571)

Note that with a different main verb, the co-indexing effect is similar to English. An example with *abnutere*, lit. ‘to nod away’ = ‘to prohibit’ is in (628).

‘For why is it, I beg you, that you prevent yourself from being approached?’ (Enn. Trag. 361)
The remaining 12 object-control lexemes with passivized complements provide only a few examples each in the corpus. The most frequently occurring are *sinere* ‘to allow’ (14 instances, 15%) and *postulare* ‘to order’ (10 instances, 11%). Some examples are in (629-630).

(629) *Pamphilam*_j -ne [PRO_k hac urbe privari t_j] pro_i sines_i?

‘Will you allow Pamphila to be kept out of this city?’ (Ter. Phor. 517)

(630) ne tu_i postules_i {matulam unam}_j [PRO_k tibi,…] aquai

[…*infundi in caput* t_j].

‘Don’t order a pot of water to be poured onto your head.’ (Pl. Amph. 1034)

So far, we have seen what happens when the matrix verb is active but the object-control clause has a passivized infinitive. When the main verb is passivized, the controllee can raise to subject, as in shown in the contrast between examples (631) and (632). The embedded clause is active in (631) and passive in (632).

(631) a. Jupiter_i ordered Mercury_j [PRO_j to play the part of Sosia].

b. Mercury_j was ordered (by Jupiter_i) [PRO_j to play the part of Sosia].

(632) a. Jupiter_i ordered pro_j Amphitryon_k [PRO_j to be removed t_k from the house]

b. Amphitryon_k was pro_j ordered (by Jupiter_i) [PRO_j to be removed t_k from the house]

Only two examples analogous to (631b) are found in the corpus, and they are shown in (633-634).

(633) pro_j {mea vi}_i subacta_j ’st_j [PRO_j facere pro_k].

‘She was compelled to do [it] by my force.’ (Pl. Amph. 1143)

(634) Ego_j [PRO_j hunc_k…] missa_j sum_j […]ludere pro_i pro_i.

‘I was sent to play [this trick] on him.’ (Pl. Cas. 688)
Example (634) is less prototypically an object-control structure than (633), and it is the only other example of this construction with the matrix verb passivized.

The corpus contains just a single instance analogous to (632b). Shown in (635), this example occurs in one of Terence’s works not in the corpus.

![Latin sentence](635)

‘Or, so that a citizen might take on no shame on account of her poverty, has she been ordered to be given to her nearest [male relative], so that she might live out her life with one man?’ (Ter. Phor. 415-417)

Both of these passivized constructions, analogous to (631b) and (632b), are extremely rare in early Latin.

### 7.2.2 ECM

As Table 57 above shows, passivization with ECM occurs overall at a somewhat higher rate (21%) than with control structures (15%). However, the ECM mean obscures the differences in passivization among the four subtypes.

#### 7.2.2.1 Subject Control ~ ECM

The subject control~ECM predicates take passivized complements in 40% of contexts, a rate much higher than for regular subject-control complements (13%). The majority of this effect stems from the ‘wish’ verbs that take ECM, in which the infinitival subject is promoted through passivization. Sentences (636-641) have a disjoint infinitival subject.

![Latin sentence](636)
pa\texttext{ter}\}}_i.
father-M-S-NOM

‘Now my father wants Amphitryon to be tricked.’ (Pl. \texttext{Amph.} 997)

(637) pro\text{\textsubscript{1}} \[e_j \text{adsectari} \text{t}_k \text{se}_k\] cupiunt\text{\textsubscript{i}}.
follow-INFIN-PASS ANA-ACC desire-3-PL

‘[They] want to themselves to be followed.’ (Enn. \texttext{Var.} 31)

(638) pro\text{\textsubscript{1}} \[\text{regnum}_k \text{tibi}_k \text{permitti} \text{e}_j \text{t}_k\] malunt\text{\textsubscript{i}}.
kingdom-N-S-ACC you-S-DAT send through-INFIN-PASS prefer-3-PL

‘They prefer the kingdom to be handed over to you.’ (Acc. \texttext{Trag.} 468)

(639) \[\text{Haec}_m\ldots \text{tui}_i \text{si voles}_j \text{\ldots per auris}_n \text{pectus}_l\]
this-N-PL-ACC you-S-NOM if wish-2-S-FUT through ear-F-PL-ACC breast-N-S-ACC

\text{inrigarier} \text{e}_k \text{t}_l.
water-INFIN-PASS

‘if you’ll allow [lit. ‘wish’] your mind to be watered by these things through your ears.’ (Luc. \texttext{Sat.} 690)

(640) pro\text{\textsubscript{1}} \[\text{quaes}_k \text{diligentius ser}i \text{e}_j \text{t}_k\] voles\text{\textsubscript{i}}, \[\text{pro}_k \text{in calicibus}_m \text{seri}\]
REL-N-PL-ACC more carefully sow-INFIN-PASS wish-2-S-FUT in
pot-F-PL-ABL sow-INFIN-PASS be fitting-3-S

‘Those [plants] you’ll want sown more carefully should be sown in pots.’ (Cato \texttext{Agr.} 133)

(641) \[\text{pro}_j \text{araneas}_k \text{mi}_i, \ldots \text{ego}_i \text{\ldots illas}_k \text{servari} \text{t}_k\] vol\text{\textsubscript{o}}i;
co\text{\textsubscript{bweb-F-PL-ACC I-S-DAT I-S-NOM that-F-PL-ACC preserve-INFIN-PASS wish-1-S}

\text{pauper}_i \text{sum}_i.
poor-M-S-NOM BE-1-S

‘I want those cobwebs preserved; I’m poor.’ (Pl. \texttext{Aul.} 87)

In example (642) the speaker, Mercury, addresses the audience with a request, so that the unexpressed agent of the lower clause is apparently co-indexed with Mercury. As a result, the PP \text{a vobis} is not agentive even though it occurs in the usual form (i.e. \text{a + NP}) and is in a passivized clause.

(642) pro\text{\textsubscript{1}} \[{e}_i \{\text{iustam rem et facilem}\}_j \text{esse}_j \text{oratam}_j \text{t}_i\]
just-F-S-ACC affair-F-S-ACC and easy-F-S-ACC be-INFIN beg-PPP-F-S-ACC
‘It’s a just and easy thing I want to request [lit. ‘want requested’] from you.’ (Pl. Amph. 33)

The corpus contains a single instance of a passive matrix verb with an active infinitive, shown in (643).

(643) Et mox ne proi eretis, haecj duarumj hodie vicem
and soon lest proi wander-2-PL-SUBJ this-F-S-NOM two-F-PL-GEN today in turn
hinc et illinc mulierj feretj imaginemk atque proj
from here and from there woman-F-S-NOM carry-3-S-FUT likeness-F-S-ACC and
eademj erit verum proj [aliaj esse tj] adsimulabiturj.
same-F-S-NOM be-3-S-FUT but proi other-F-S-NOM be-INFIN pretend-3-S-FUT-PASS

‘And so you won’t soon be mistaken, today this woman will bear at different times the likeness of two women, one from here and one from there, and it’ll be the same woman but she’ll be pretended to be the other.’ (Pl. Mil. 150-152)

7.2.2.2 Deontic ECM

Among the deontic ECM structures, the most frequently occurring predicate taking a passivized complement is oportere ‘to be fitting’. This verb occurs in 73 (53%) of the 137 such constructions. All but 18 of the instances are in Cato’s De Agri Cultura – hardly surprising, considering the stated purpose of the work: to instruct a Roman citizen how best to purchase and manage a farming estate. Some examples of oportere with a passivized complement are in (644-646).

(644) [proi canesj interdiu clausosj esse tj] oportet, ut
dog-M-PL-ACC during the day shut-PPP-M-PL-ACC be-INFIN befit-3-S COMP
noctu acrioresj et vigilantioresj sintj.
night-F-S-ABL keen-COMPAR-M-PL-NOM and watch-PART-COMPAR-M-PL-NOM be-3-PL-SUBJ

‘It’s fitting for dogs to be locked up during the day so that they’ll be keener and more vigilant at night.’ (Cato Agr. 124)

(645) proi properatei, [cenamiam esse coctamk ek tj]
hurry-2-PL-IMPERAT dinner-F-S-ACC already be-INFIN cook-PPP-F-S-ACC

oportuitj.
be fitting-3-S-PERF
‘Hurry up, dinner should have already been cooked by now.’ (Pl. Cas. 766)

(646) \[Haec_{k} \quad facta_{k} \quad ab \quad illo_{j} \quad t_{k}... \quad oportebat_{o} \quad Syre_{l} \]

‘It was fitting for these things to have been done by him, Syrus.’ (Ter. Heau. 536)

Note the overt agentive NP \(ab \ illo\) in (646).

There are no instances of passivized deontic ECM predicates with an active-voice complement.

7.2.2.3 AcI

As shown in Table 57, passive complements with AcI occur at a lower rate (14%) than with ECM overall (21%). An example of the structure is in (647).

(647) \(pro \ _{i} \ [pro \ _{j} \ \{haec \ \ omnia\}_{k}... \ vidi_{i} \ \ldots.inflammari\}, \ [pro_{l} \ Priamo \ vi \ vitam_{m} evitari], \ [pro_{n} \ Iovis \ aram_{o}\]

\(sanguine \ turpari\).

‘I saw all these things set on fire, the life taken away from Priam by violence, the altar of Jupiter debased with blood.’ (Enn. Trag. 106-108)

In English, the \(\theta\)-role of beneficiary or goal can raise to subject when the matrix verb is passivized, as shown in example (648a-b).

(648) a. Jupiterj told herj \([hej \ was \ her \ husband]\).

b. Shej was told (by Jupiteri) \([hej \ was \ her \ husband]\).

Traditionally, it is said that the beneficiary is not available for subject-promotion when the matrix verb is passivized in Latin: “The indirect object of the active verb (dative case) cannot be properly used as the subject of the passive. The dative remains unchanged, and the verb becomes a passive in the third person singular (impersonal verb)” (Gildersleeve & Lodge,
Only three such examples occur in the corpus. Two of them are shown in (649-650).

(649) pro\textsubscript{1} obsecro\textsubscript{\text{ni}}, etiam -ne pro\textsubscript{\text{ji}} hoc\textsubscript{\text{hi}}, negabis\textsubscript{\text{ji}}, [te\textsubscript{\text{ji}} auream pateram\textsubscript{\text{i}} mihi dedisse dono hodie\textsubscript{\text{k}}, qua\textsubscript{\text{i}} te\textsubscript{\text{ji}} illi]
pateram\textsubscript{\text{j}} mihi dedisse dono hodie\textsubscript{\text{k}}, qua\textsubscript{\text{i}} te\textsubscript{\text{ji}} illi donatum\textsubscript{\text{ji}} esse dixeras\textsubscript{\text{i}}?
pateram\textsubscript{\text{i}} mihi dedisse dono hodie\textsubscript{\text{k}}, qua\textsubscript{\text{i}} te\textsubscript{\text{ji}} illi donatum\textsubscript{\text{ji}} esse dixeras\textsubscript{\text{i}}?

‘Come on, do you also deny this, that you gave me a golden bowl as a gift today, which you’d said was given to you there [lit. ‘by which you’d said you were given’]?’ (Pl. Amph. 760-761)

(650) pro\textsubscript{1} nimis demiror\textsubscript{\text{ni}}, Sosia\textsubscript{\text{ni}}, qui illaec illic [me\textsubscript{\text{i}}]

‘I very much wonder, Sosia, how she should know I was given the golden bowl there, unless you just now met up with her and told her all these things.’ (Pl. Amph. 765-767)

What is particularly revealing are the overt NPs expressing thematic roles in the first part of (649), because two parallel propositions are expressed first in the active and then in the passive. In the active clause, \textit{te auream pateram mihi dedisse dono hodie}, the embedded subject is the accusative \textit{te}. The direct object of \textit{dedisse} is \textit{auream pateram}, also marked for accusative case, and \textit{mihi} in the dative bears the \textit{θ}-role of beneficiary. In the next clause, the addressee (i.e. the referent of \textit{te}) is the recipient of the bowl, and the NP’s \textit{θ}-role of beneficiary is now the subject of the infinitival clause. The embedded verb \textit{donatum esse} is passive, and the NP \textit{qua} is a relative pronoun in the ablative case, acting as an instrument. That is, instead of the original direct object \textit{auream pateram} becoming the subject in the passivized clause, that NP is still demoted, but it bears the lower-ranking role of instrument. The agent is not expressed at all, and the beneficiary, \textit{te}, is promoted to subject position. It is clear from the context that this syntactic
strategy focuses pragmatically on the referent of *te* since the conversation is about the remarkable fact (divinely orchestrated by Jupiter) that the bowl has changed hands. In (650) the same passivized structure occurs, except that the beneficiary is now *me* (equal to *mihi* in an active clause), and instead of a relative pronoun the full NP *aurea patera* occurs in the ablative as instrument.

An analogous construction is also found in Cato’s oratory, shown in (651).

(651) *Iam principio quis i vidit i [corona_k] donari quemquam_], cum oppidum_1 captum_1 non esset_1 aut castra_m hostium_m non incensa_m essent_m?

‘Now first of all, who has seen someone presented with a crown when no town was captured and no enemy camps were burnt up?’ (Cato Or. 148)

More typically than what is shown in (649-651), if passivization occurs in an AcI clause the beneficiary role remains with an assignment of dative case, and instead the direct object is promoted to subject. Some examples of with an overt NP as beneficiary in a passivized clause are shown in sentences (652-656). Sentence (654) is repeated here from example (65) and (655) is from (207).

(652) *Nam ego_1 pro [PRO_j mi_... ] iam nil_k [...credi t_k]*

‘For now I’m not demanding that anything be believed of me.’ (Pl. Mil. 302)
‘When the poet first set his mind toward writing, [he] believed this alone was given to him [lit. ‘to himself’] as his business, that the plays he had written should please the people.’ (Ter. And. 1-3)

‘Ever since he’d heard a wife wouldn’t be given to his son, [he] never said a word to any of us and [he] didn’t take it badly.’ (Ter. And. 177-178)

‘Then Romulus perceived by the auspice that the throne and territory of the kingdom had been favorably given to him [lit. ‘to himself’].’ (Enn. Ann. 99-100)

‘I knew this day was given to me as the last one and the end to my slavery.’ (Acc. Trag. 243)

These examples clearly show that the beneficiary NP is not the subject of the passivized verb. Rather, the theme NP argument is the subject and the beneficiary remains with its inherent case assignment of dative.

7.2.2.3.1 Personal Passive

One notable feature among passives with bridge verbs is whether or not the embedded clause is raised. With raising, the embedded subject is assigned nominative case, such that the structure is more properly termed nominativus cum infinitivo ‘nominative with infinitive’ (NcI). Overall the NcI construction is not common in early Latin, occurring in only 96 (6%) of 1,493
possible contexts in the corpus. Diachronically, however, its usage increases markedly (Salor, 1983, p. 328).\(^{83}\)

Since the Ncl construction has the embedded subject assigned [+ nominative] case, the verb must agree with it in [number] and if a participle also in [gender]. For this reason, the construction is sometimes referred to as the personal passive. Some corpus examples are in (657-561). The special construction with *videri* in (657) is discussed in section 7.2.2.3.2. In (657) the neuter forms *illud* and *graecum* could be either nominative or accusative, but note that the verb *videatur* is singular in apparent agreement with both NPs.

\[(657) \{\text{pro}_1 \ [\text{omnis}_j \ \text{res}_j \ \text{gestas}_j^84 \ \text{esse} \ \text{Athenis}_k]\}

\[\text{autumnant}_t, \ \text{quo}_1 \ \text{illud}_m \ \text{vobis}_n \ \text{graecum}_m \ \text{videatur}_m\]

\text{say-3-PL} \ \text{REL-N-S-ABL} \ \text{that-N-S-NOM} \ \text{you-PL-DAT} \ \text{Greek-N-S-NOM} \ \text{see-3-S-SUBJ-PASS}

\text{magis.}

more

‘They say all events occurred in Athens, whereby it should seem more Greek to you.’

(Pl. *Men*. 8-9)

In (658) *loquaces* and *omnes* are also ambiguous as to nominative or accusative case, but they are clearly [+ plural] and the verb *habemur* is first-person plural.

\[(658) \text{Nam} \ \text{pro}_1 \ [\text{multum} \ \text{loquaces}_j \ \text{merito} \ \text{omnes}_j \ t_j]\]

\[\text{habemur}_j, \ \text{nec} \ [\text{mutam} \ \text{profecto} \ \text{repertam} \ \text{nullam} \ \text{esse}]

\[\text{aut} \ \text{hodie…}] \ \text{dicunt} \ [\text{…mulierem} \ \text{aut} \ \text{ullo} \ \text{in} \ \text{saeclo}].

\text{or} \ \text{today} \ \text{say-3-PL} \ \text{woman-F-S-ACC} \ \text{or} \ \text{any-N-S-ABL} \ \text{in} \ \text{generation-N-S-ABL}

‘For we are deservedly considered [to be] very talkative, and indeed they say no non-speaking woman has ever been discovered either today or in any generation.’ (Pl. *Aul*. 124-126)

\(^{83}\) Only one instance of Ncl occurs in early Latin with an active matrix verb (Leumann & Hofmann, p. 588), in a work not included in the corpus.

\(^{84}\) The collocation *res gestae* (nominative) idiomatically means ‘deeds, facts, history’.
Similarly, in (659) *quaef* and *Cronia* are [+ neuter, + plural] forms that could be either
nominative or accusative. However, just as in (658) the verb is unambiguously inflected for
[+ plural], suggesting that the forms in question are actually nominative plural.

(659) | Maxima | pars | Graium | Saturno | et | maxime | Athenae |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>greatest-F-S-NOM</td>
<td>part-F-S-NOM</td>
<td>Greek-M-PL-GEN</td>
<td>Saturn-M-S-DAT</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>mostly</td>
<td>Athens-F-PL-NOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conficiunt</td>
<td>sacra</td>
<td>[quaef]</td>
<td>Cronia</td>
<td>esse...</td>
<td>iterantur</td>
<td>[ab illis].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Most of the Greeks and above all Athens perform sacred rites which are said by them to
be the “Cronia.”’ (Acc. Ann. 2-3)

In (660) *haec* is neuter plural and appears to agree with the matrix verb *renuniata sint*, also
neuter plural, as conveniently revealed by its PPP form.

(660) | qua-si | non | pro | [tibi...] | renuniata | sint | [...haec] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>as-IF</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>you-S-DAT</td>
<td>announce-PPP-N-PL-NOM/ACC</td>
<td>be-3-PL-SUBJ</td>
<td>this-N-PL-NOM/ACC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sic</td>
<td>fore</td>
<td>thus</td>
<td>be-INFIN-FUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘as if these things haven’t been reported to you that they will be so [lit. ‘thus to (fut.)
be’]’ (Ter. And. 499)

In (661) the only overt NP that marks agreement with the matrix verb is *Rodiensibus*,
which occurs two clauses earlier. That NP marks agreement in [person] and [number] with the
passive *dicuntur*.

(661) | Sed | si | [honorem] | non | aequum | haberi | ob | [eam] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td>if</td>
<td>honor-M-S-ACC</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>fair-M-S-ACC</td>
<td>have-INFIN-PASS</td>
<td>because of</td>
<td>ANA-F-S-ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rem,</td>
<td>[pro]</td>
<td>quod</td>
<td>bene</td>
<td>facere</td>
<td>voluisse</td>
<td>quis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affair-F-S-ACC</td>
<td>INDEFIN-N-S-ACC</td>
<td>well</td>
<td>do-INFIN</td>
<td>wish-INFIN-PERF</td>
<td>INDEFIN-M-S-NOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dicit,</td>
<td>neque</td>
<td>pro</td>
<td>pro</td>
<td>fecit</td>
<td>tamen,</td>
<td>Rodiensibus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>say-3-S</td>
<td>nor</td>
<td>you-3-S</td>
<td>you-3-S</td>
<td>do-3-S-PERF</td>
<td>however</td>
<td>from Rhodes-M-PL-DAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oberit,</td>
<td>quod</td>
<td>non</td>
<td>malefecerunt</td>
<td>sed</td>
<td>quia</td>
<td>pro</td>
<td>[pro]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be against-3-S-FUT</td>
<td>INDEFIN-N-S-ACC</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>do harm-3-PL-PERF</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>because</td>
<td>pro</td>
<td>pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro</td>
<td>voluisse...</td>
<td>dicuntur</td>
<td>[...facere</td>
<td>t]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wish-INFIN-PERF</td>
<td>say-3-PL-PASS</td>
<td>do-INFIN</td>
<td>...t</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
‘But if someone says honor is not considered fair because of the fact he has wished to do something well but nevertheless didn’t do it, will it be held against the Rhodians not that they did harm but because they are said to have wanted to do it?’ (Cato Or. 168)

In all these examples, even when the inflectional ending is ambiguous between nominative and accusative, the [number] marking agrees with that of the passive verb. For that reason, the ambiguous forms can be resolved as nominative and therefore the grammatical subject of the passive verb. Such an interpretation is confirmed by the overt θ-role of agent ab illis in (659). That is, if ab illis is a demoted agent, then the subject position was available for NP raising, here the relative pronoun quae.

Example (662) has an unambiguous [+ nominative] NP as the subject of a personal passive construction.

(662) Visus\textsubscript{i} 't\textsubscript{i} in somnis\textsubscript{j} pastor\textsubscript{i} ad me\textsubscript{k} adpellere
\{pecus lanigerum\}_{1} \{eximia pulchritudine\}_{m}.

‘In my dreams a shepherd seemed to drive toward me a woolly flock of exceptional beauty.’ (Acc. Fab. 19-20)

Additional examples of AcI with other matrix predicates are in (663-667).

(663) pro\textsubscript{i} [{haec Casina\textsubscript{j}} huius reperietur\textsubscript{j} filia\textsubscript{j} esse
\{pecus lanigerum\}_{1} \{eximia pulchritudine\}_{m}.

‘This Casina will be discovered to be the daughter of this man from next door.’ (Pl. Cas. 1013-1014)

(664) pro\textsubscript{i} [{huius autem gnatus\textsubscript{i}...} dicitur\textsubscript{i} \{pecus lanigerum\}_{1} \{eximia pulchritudine\}_{m}.

‘But this man’s son is said to have killed one of the twins by mistake.’ (Naev. Fab. 2-3)
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(665) proi [quorum genitorj...] fertur\textsuperscript{85} [...]esse ops\textsubscript{j} gentibus t\textsubscript{j}.

‘whose founder is said to be an aid to the people’ (Acc. Frag. 5)

(666) proi [quod isj...] intellegebar\textsubscript{j} [...posse haud t\textsubscript{j}] ad

paucos rettuli\textsubscript{i},\textsuperscript{86} few-M-PL-ACC send back-1-S-PERF

‘Since I was understood to be that way, I sent [it] to a few people.’ (Luc. Sat. 735)

(667) proi semper [ei t\textsubscript{j}...] dicta\textsubscript{j} ’st [...esse haec\textsubscript{j}] atque

habita\textsubscript{j} ’st soror\textsubscript{j},
hold-PPP-F-S-NOM be-3-S sister-F-S-NOM

‘She has always been said to be and considered to be that one’s sister.’ (Ter. And. 809)

7.2.2.3.2 Videri ‘To Seem’

Of the 86 NcI instances in the corpus, 74 (86%) are with videri. As the morphological passive of videre ‘to see’, videri often has the special lexical meaning ‘to seem, appear’ (Simpson, 1968, pp. 641-642). The occurrences of videri + infinitival complement are summarized in Table 58.

Table 58: Subjects with Videri.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitival Subject</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous (nom./acc.)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous (no overt NP)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{85} Ferre ‘to carry, bear’ commonly means ‘to be said’ in the passive (i.e. lit. ‘to be borne’ as an opinion or rumor).

\textsuperscript{86} The fragment is corrupt in the manuscripts, so there is a possibility that is is not the subject of intellegebar. Warmington (p. 3:237) renders it as ‘because I was understood, being what I am, to have the power (sc. to write tragedies) … I referred it to a few friends.’
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Some examples of *videri* with unambiguous NCI (i.e. an overt NP unambiguously marked for [+ nominative] case) are below. In (668-669) the matrix verb is inflected for first-person singular and its grammatical subject is a nominative singular form.

(668) pro\textsubscript{i} [pro\textsubscript{j} [sati’-n hoc plane, sati’-ne diserte…], ere, nunc videor\textsubscript{j} […tibi locutus\textsubscript{i} esse t\textsubscript{j}]]?

‘Now, master, do I seem to have spoken this plainly and clearly enough to you?’ (Pl. *Amph.* 578-579)

(669) pro\textsubscript{i} aut ita -ne tandem [idoneus\textsubscript{j} tibi\textsubscript{i} videor\textsubscript{j} esse t\textsubscript{j}, [quem\textsubscript{i} tam aperte PRO\textsubscript{i} fallere...] incipias\textsubscript{i} [...dolis]]?

‘Or do I nonetheless seem to you so suitable as someone you should openly start to deceive with such tricks?’ (Ter. *And.* 492-493)

In (668) the matrix verb *videor* is co-indexed with the participle *locutus*, which is overtly marked for [+ masculine, + nominative, + singular]. Similarly, in (669) *ideoneus* has the same agreement features, co-indexed with the pro subject of *videor*.

Some instances of nominative-verb agreement in the second person are shown in (670-671). In (670) *facetior* is unambiguously nominative singular, and likewise so is *mendax* in example (671); both main verbs are marked for second-person singular.

(670) pro\textsubscript{i} [pro\textsubscript{j} quo facetior\textsubscript{j} videare\textsubscript{j} t\textsubscript{j}] et [t\textsubscript{j} scire plus quam ceteri pertisum hominem non pertaesum dicere gen\textsubscript{i}]]

‘Whereby you may seem more elegant, to know more than the rest of the human race, to say “tiered” instead of “tired.”’ (Luc. *Sat.* 983-984)

---

87 Presumably the difference is between roughly /pertisum/ and /pertaisum/, using Allen’s (1978) system for the classical period.

88 The manuscripts are corrupt here, but the meaning remains clear.
‘If you invent falsehoods, you seem to be a liar.’ (Cato Or. 244)

In (672-673) a form of *videri* is inflected for third-person singular and its subject is unambiguously assigned nominative singular case. The gender agreement is [+ feminine] in example (672) and [+ masculine] in (673).

Examples (674-675) have a plural inflection on *videri* and their grammatical subjects mark agreement with the nominative plural form.

In 26 instances, the case assignment for the subject of *videri* is ambiguous. These NPs all have the gender feature [+ neuter] or [+ feminine]. Since the neuter form is always identical between nominative and accusative within the [singular] or [plural] number (see Appendix C),
such forms are inherently ambiguous as to case. Likewise, many [+ feminine, + singular] forms have the same ending as certain [+ neuter, + plural] forms, so there is ambiguity as to both [number] and [gender]. Some examples with a neuter NP and videri are in (676-678).

(676) pro\textsubscript{i} \{omnis\ \textsubscript{all-F-PL-ACC} res\textsubscript{k} \textsubscript{affair-F-PL-ACC} gestas\textsubscript{k} \textsubscript{do-PPP-F-PL-ACC} esse \textsubscript{be-INFIN} Athenis\textsubscript{loc} \textsubscript{be-INFIN} assertum\textsubscript{PL} quo pro \{illud\textsubscript{i} \textsubscript{that-N-NOM/ACC} vobis \textsubscript{you-PL-DAT} graecum\textsubscript{i} \textsubscript{Greek-N-NOM/ACC} t\textsubscript{j} \textsubscript{see-3-S-PASS} magis\textsubscript{S} quod \textsubscript{be-3-S-SUBJ} sit \textsubscript{be-3-S-SUBJ} factum\textsubscript{i} \textsubscript{do-PPP-N-N-NOM} iam

‘They claim everything occurred in Athens so that it seems more Greek to you.’ (Pl. Men. 8-9)

(677) [pro\textsubscript{i} mirum\textsubscript{i} \textsubscript{wonderful-N-N-NOM/ACC} videtur\textsubscript{i} \textsubscript{see-3-S-PASS} quod \textsubscript{be-3-S-SUBJ} sit \textsubscript{be-3-S-SUBJ} factum\textsubscript{i} \textsubscript{do-PPP-N-N-NOM} iam

diu?

‘Does what was done a long time ago seem wonderful?’ (Liv. Trag. 15)

(678) Contra [pro\textsubscript{i} haec\textsubscript{j} \textsubscript{this-N-N-NOM/ACC} invitasse \textsubscript{invite-INFIN-PERF} aut \textsubscript{or} instigasse \textsubscript{goad-INFIN-PERF} t\textsubscript{j} \textsubscript{see-3-P-PL-PASS}

‘On the contrary, these things appear to have invited or incited [it/them].’ (Luc. Sat. 1031)

In these examples, the words illud and graecum in (676), mirum in (677), and haec in (678) are all ambiguous between nominative and accusative case assignment. Contra in (678) is either an adverb or a preposition whose complement is assigned accusative case. Since haec could be accusative, contra haec may be a PP. However, since haec can be [+ plural] and videntur is also plural (and no other overt NPs are available as its subject), it is straightforward to interpret haec as the (nominative) subject of videntur. \(^{89}\)

Since these three examples in (676-678) appear to be the same kind of structure – and they also parallel the unambiguous nominative forms in (670-675) – it is reasonable to conclude that these neuter forms are also assigned nominative case. Further, both neuter forms in (676-89

\(^{89}\) Although less plausible, another possibility is that some unspecified plural NP is the subject videntur, and haec is accusative as the direct object of the two infinitives.
are [+ singular], and the finite verbs *videatur* and *videtur*, respectively, are also overtly marked as [+ singular]. In (678) the [+ neuter, + plural] form *haec* agrees in [number] with the finite *videntur*. Together, the evidence shows that – in spite of the various possibilities resulting from ambiguity – these overt NPs agree in [number] with the finite form of *videri*. The clauses are thus personal passives.

That *videri* is actually a raising structure can be seen explicitly in example (679).

(679) \[ \text{pro}_i \text{ visa}_i \text{-ne est}_i [\text{ea}_i \text{ esse}]? \]

‘Did [the woman] seem to be her?’ (Pl. Mil. 462)

Frequently, the copula is omitted in the embedded clause. In (680) *ea* has the same grammatical function (i.e. subject of a clause embedded by *videri*) as it does in (679) but without an overt copula.

(680) \[ \text{Hercle pro}_i \text{ opinor}_i [\text{ea}_j \text{ pro}_j \text{ videtur}_j, \]

‘Yes I think so, [the woman] seems [to be] her.’ (Pl. Mil. 417)

Some other examples of completely overt embedded clauses are shown in (681-682).

(681) \[ \text{Anus}_i, \text{ quae}_i \text{ est}_i [\text{dicta}_i [\text{mater}_i \text{ esse} \text{ ei}_j]] \]

‘The old woman who earlier was said to be her mother, wasn’t.’ (Ter. Heau. 269-270)

(682) \[ \text{Qui}_i \text{ locus}_i [\text{pro}_i \text{ vino}_j \text{ optimus}_i,] \text{ dicetur}_i [...esse} \]

‘Whichever place is said to be best for wine and exposed to the sun, plant [there] the small Aminnian [grape], the double high-quality [grape], and the small yellow [grape].’ (Cato Agr. 6)
7.2.2.3 Impersonal Passive

All the videri examples so far appear to show [number] agreement between the presumed subject and the verb. However, in (683-686) the infinitival subject is unambiguously assigned accusative rather than nominative case. Since the matrix verb does not agree in [case] and [number] with the lower subject – rather, the embedded clause is AcI – the structure is called the impersonal passive.

(683) Postquam pro1 [ad nos tk…] renuntiatumj est [...[te1 et patremm esse mortuum[,m]]k avo’ noster mutavit.90

father-M-S-ACC be-INFIN dead-M-S-ACC grandfather-M-S-NOM our-M-S-NOM change-3-S-PERF

‘After it was reported to us you and father were dead, our grandfather changed.’ (Pl. Men. 1127-1129).

(684) pro1 [eam1 tk…] ero nunc renuntiatumj est [...nuptum huic Megadoro dari]91.

marry-SUPINE-S-ACC this-M-S-DAT Megadorus-M-S-DAT give-INFIN-PASS

‘It was reported just now to the master that she was going to be married to this Megadorus.’ (Pl. Aul. 604)

(685) pro1 [in hac habitasse platea tk…] dictumj ‘st [...Chrysidem]k.

Chrysis-F-S-ACC

‘It’s said Chrysis lived in this street.’ (Ter. And. 796-798)

(686) pro1 pulcherrume auguratumj est [...{rem Romanam}1 summam]k.

beautifully-SUPER take augury-PPP-N-S-ACC be-3-S affair-F-S-ACC Roman-F-S-ACC highest-F-S-ACC

be-INFIN-FUT

‘It was most favorably predicted the Roman state would be supreme.’ (Acc. Fab. 36-38)

90 Some manuscripts have two additional clauses here (Nixon, p. 2:282), but since they are both AcI, the argument being made remains the same.
91 Nuptum dari appears to be a variant of the future passive infinitive nuptum iri; also see section 4.1.3 on the grammaticalization of this form and the implications of [gender] agreement. Alternatively, the phrase may just be the present passive infinitive of dare ‘to give’ with nuptum as a supine (= lit. ‘to be given to marry’). Since the marriage has not yet occurred, the future passive participle is the more felicitous interpretation.
In these examples the infinitival subject is not raised into subject position of the matrix verb. Rather, that main verb is passive, third-person singular, and the indirect statement is AcI. In example (687) the neuter singular adjective *novom* appears to be in agreement with the matrix verb *proferatur*, and the AcI clause is an apposition to it.

(687) quasi vero *novom* nunc *proferatur* [Iovem facere

*histroniam*.

‘as if indeed it were now spoken of as a new thing for Jupiter to do acting’ (Pl. *Amph.* 89-90)

Only two instances of the impersonal passive with *videri* are found in the corpus, shown as example (688-689).

(688) *Numquid* *videtur* [demutare alio atque... uti *pro*

*didem* [... esse... *vobis* *dudum* [...{hunc moechum

*militem*]??

‘Does it seem to you that this lecherous soldier is changing, that he’s different from what I told you just now?’ (Pl. *Mil.* 1130-1331)?

(689) *pro* [mother heavy *parere se ardentem facem*]

*visa* est in *somnis* Hecuba.

‘[My] mother Hecuba, when pregnant, seemed to herself to appear in her dreams burning a torch.’ (Enn. *Trag.* 38-39)

Example (689) is discussed in footnote 92 below.

Note that the matrix verb *visa est* in (689) is in a periphrastic tense. Salor (p. 339) claims that when the matrix verb is passivized periphrastically, the impersonal passive is preferred over the personal passive, even more so when the infinitive itself is also periphrastic. However, as shown in Table 59, that claim does not hold up for early Latin. As these data show, the rate of
personal and impersonal infinitivals is very high (92% and 81%, respectively) regardless of whether the matrix verb is morphologically passive or is formed periphrastically. Specifically, Salor’s claim that a periphrastically formed matrix passive co-occurs with the impersonal passive does not hold in 25 (81%) of 31 instances. Even less supported is his finding of a stronger co-occurrence of the impersonal passive when the infinitive itself is a periphrastic form; only two instances are found in the corpus. Finally, these data also reveal that the impersonal passive construction is rare, with only 12 such contexts.

Table 59: Matrix vs. Infinitival Tense on AcI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrix Form</th>
<th>Infinitival Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morphological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MORPHOLOGICAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Passive</td>
<td>71 (99%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal Passive</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>77 (99%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERIPHRASTIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Passive</td>
<td>23 (92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal Passive</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>27 (87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>94 (97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Passive</td>
<td>10 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal Passive</td>
<td>104 (95%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significance of the periphrastic matrix verbs is that they are necessarily a past tense (either perfect, pluperfect, or future perfect) since they are formed from the PPP + copula. Earlier we saw that *velle* ‘to wish’ has a tendency to take a [+ perfect] infinitival when the matrix tense is also [+ perfect]. However, no such effect of infinitival tense by attraction occurs with either personal or impersonal passives. Out of the 31 contexts with a periphrastic matrix verb, only 7 (23%) also have a [+ perfect] infinitival.
Although the impersonal passive in AcI is rare, the fact that it does occur must be explained. In the personal passive (i.e. NcI), the matrix verb is passivized and the underlying infinitival subject is raised to become the matrix subject. Any overt NPs co-indexed with that subject in the embedded clause are also assigned nominative case. The nature of the construction itself means that the main and embedded subjects are necessarily co-indexed. In contrast, in the impersonal passive the matrix verb is passivized but the underlying infinitival subject does not raise to become its subject. Instead, the infinitival subject remains as AcI, and as a result the main and embedded subjects are not co-indexed.92

According to syntactic theory, passivization includes the absorption of the accusative case structurally assigned to the direct object. In indirect statements, the “direct object” is actually the subject of the infinitive through ECM. However, the impersonal passive retains the accusative case on the infinitival subject in spite of the matrix verb’s being passivized. One way to resolve the problem is to claim that verbs which license the impersonal passive structure assign no thematic role to the infinitival subject. That is, such verbs lexically have no internal argument and thus they have available a subject position for the complement; when the matrix verb is passivized, a thematic role is subsequently assigned to that lower subject (Bortolussi, 1992, p. 30). But the whole point of the term “ECM” is to express the linguist’s first-blush surprise that a verb which does not assign a thematic role to an NP nonetheless can assign its case.

92 The only corpus exception is shown in (689), where the bound anaphor se in the embedded clause is co-indexed with the matrix subject since the only other possible antecedent is the ‘burning brand’, but the adjective *gravida* ‘pregnant’ makes it clear that the subject of *parere* ‘to give birth’ must be the ‘mother’, not the ‘brand’. The structure of this sentence as a co-indexed impersonal passive is odd, but it is the exception that proves the rule.
A more promising solution is based on a general fact: Sentential complements in Latin behave as [+ neuter, + singular] NPs (Pinkster, 1992, p. 163), and this is confirmed by data in section 6.4.5. An example is shown in (690), repeated here from (420).

(690) \[\text{Quid est agrum bene colere? Bene arare.}\]

\[\text{INTERROG-N-S-NOM be-3-S field-M-S-ACC well cultivate-INFIN well plough-INFIN}\]


Here the infinitives colere, arare, and stercorare are in apposition to the [+ neuter, + singular] forms quid, secundum, and tertium.  Note especially that in the first question, the predicate includes the infinitive colere’s internal argument, agrum.  Likewise, an adjective co-indexed with an infinitival is marked as [+ neuter, + singular], as in example (691), repeated from (416).

(691) \[\text{Non est mentiri meum.}\]

\[\text{not be-3-S lie-INFIN-DEPON my-N-S-NOM}\]

‘It is not my [habit, duty, ...] to lie.’  (Ter. Heau. 549)

Since it is clear that an infinitival clause is treated as [+ neuter, + singular], it is no big syntactic leap to the impersonal passive construction.  The matrix verb always occurs as a [+ singular] form, and in the periphrastic forms (i.e. the only contexts in which a [gender] assignment is made) it is overtly marked as [+ neuter].  These features of [+ neuter, + singular] then agree with the properties of the embedded clause itself.  In (687), repeated as (692), those features are overtly marked on the adjective novom.

(692) \[\text{quasi vero novom nunc proferatur Iovem facere histrioniam.}\]

\[\text{as if but new-N-S-ACC now carry forth-3-S-SUBJ-PASS Jupiter-M-S-ACC do-INFIN}\]

‘as if indeed it were now spoken of as a new thing for Jupiter to do acting’  (Pl. Amph. 89-90)
It appears that in the impersonal passive the entire infinitival clause is raised to subject position of the passivized matrix verb, and any adjective such as novom in (692) thus agrees with both the verb and the embedded clause itself. Accusative case assigned by the matrix verb is absorbed, but the subject of the infinitive itself must be accusative, as occurs independently in constructions such as the interjection. The pragmatic effect is the similar to an expletive it in English: It was announced [(that) AcI clause] or to an embedded complement with an obligatory overt complementizer: [That AcI clause] was announced.

7.3 SUMMARY

Since early Latin allows subject pro, there is little inherent motivation for raising. When raising occurs, it is through passivization. Overall, 18% of infinitival complements have a passivized verb. The highest rates are in subject control ~ ECM, object control, deontic ECM, and interjections. The lowest rates of passivized infinitivals are in impersonal, deontic, and sentential control and in impersonal ECM.

In subject control, the most frequent lexeme for passivized infinitival complements is pot- ‘to be able’. Sometimes the matrix verb itself is also passive through attraction. The most frequent lexeme for complement passivization in object control is iubere ‘to comand’. With this particular lexeme, the controllee may be co-indexed with the matrix subject and is frequently overt; the result is unfelicitous in English but apparently acceptable in early Latin. While passive complements are frequent, passive matrix verbs are rare: The corpus contains just two examples of a passive matrix in object control with an active complement and one example with a passive complement.

Among ECM complement types, the subject control ~ ECM variants meaning ‘want’, ‘hope’, ‘promise’, or ‘pretend’ have the highest rate of passivized complements. Most are from
the various ‘want’ predicates, especially *velle* ‘to want’ and its compounds. While the passivized complement is frequent with such matrix predicates, only one instance of a passive matrix occurs. Another ECM type with frequent use of a passivized complement is deontic ECM. Here the most frequent lexeme is *oportere* ‘to be fitting’ and it is used most often by Cato; such usage is appropriate to the discourse topic, but it must also be noted that the same predicate occurs in conversational dialog in both Plautus and Terence.

Passivization with AcI occurs at a relatively low rate compared with the other infinitival types, and it is even lower than the overall average – despite the fact that AcI complements account for nearly 40% of all corpus infinitives. The most typical form of complement passivization in AcI is straightforward, with the underlying accusative-marked subject being demoted and the object promoted to subject position (i.e. assigned accusative case). Three corpus examples have an underlying beneficiary (marked with dative case) promoted to accusative subject position, and these data are important to show that – contrary to traditional claims – dative promotion does actually occur in early Latin. In addition to the ordinary form of passivization with AcI, there are two additional types. One is the personal passive, in which the embedded subject raises to nominative and takes agreement morphology with respect to [gender] and [number] with the matrix verb. The most frequent lexeme with the personal AcI passive is *videri* ‘to be seen’ = ‘to seem’, although the active form of the same verb is not the most frequent matrix predicate with active AcI complements. The other special type of AcI passivization is the impersonal passive. In this structure, the embedded subject does not raise but instead remains marked for accusative case. As a result, there is no agreement morphology between the embedded subject and the matrix verb. Instead, the entire embedded AcI clause is treated as a [+ neuter, + singular] complement in agreement with the passivized matrix verb. Some corpus
examples include an overt adjective marked for [+ neuter, + singular] in apposition to the clause, providing direct evidence for how the structure operates in its grammatical features.
CHAPTER 8. CONCLUSION

As a human behavior, language is both observable and measurable. Even when a particular language is no longer spoken and thus the observer lacks direct access to native speakers, the language still reveals itself through surviving texts. In the case of early Latin, those extant texts approach nearly a quarter of a million words and contain almost 4,000 infinitival complements. As a result, the language is readily observable. But measuring syntax is not a straightforward type-and-token count. Rather, it requires multiple tagging within a clause because syntax affects more than a single morpheme or word. Often the effects being measured go beyond even the local clause. For infinitival complements, it is just as important to tag the type of matrix predicate as it is to tag the embedded subject, object, and infinitival tense and form. This study includes over 800 distinct tags applied to a total of more than 12,700 instances. While such tagging is cumbersome to implement, it is the only systematic way to measure the syntax at issue. Observations alone do not lead to any systematic knowledge of the language, but by measuring those observations within a theoretical framework it is possible to understand even a dead language. From the body of surviving data, certain linguistic parameters and syntactic patterns emerge. Those patterns, in turn, have pragmatic effects.

Three main parameters have a significant effect within early Latin. These are (a) rich overt inflectional morphology, (b) variable as opposed to a fixed word order, including scrambling, and (c) the pro-drop setting for both subjects and objects. Since all three parameters operate simultaneously, their interplay results in a pragmatic tension between opposing forces. On the one hand, the fact that NPs are morphologically marked for grammatical information such as [case], [number], and [gender] means that a full NP contains redundant specifications. An extreme example is the NP *hanc sororem geminam germanam alteram* shown in (693).
The five-word NP has five overt markings for accusative case (all ending in –m except for the demonstrative *hanc*), with the vowel –a– for [+ feminine] in the adjectives *geminam, germanam*, and *alteram* as well as in *hanc*; *sororem* is [+ feminine] lexically. All five forms are also unambiguously [+ singular]. Thus, the NP provides more than enough information to identify Philocomasium’s alleged sister (i.e. actually Philocomasium herself being passed off as her own twin). This excessive information is used by Plautus for humorous effect, and that humor consists in the irony of grossly redundant information applied to a non-existent entity. It could not be as funny if that level of redundancy – both lexical and grammatical – were the norm. Indeed, most fully explicit NPs do not contain so many words and therefore not as much repetitive information. Nonetheless, overt inflections do often convey more grammatical information than is strictly necessary for interpretation.

On the other hand, the pro-drop settings in early Latin allow both subject pro and object pro. Because both subjects and objects can occur as pro rather than overt, there are actually four possible results of the pro-drop settings. These combinations yield three levels of transparency. The most explicit form is having both subject and object overt. As discussed earlier, overt NPs tend to provide more than enough grammatical and lexical information to identify both the referents in the real world and the constituents in the clause. Thus, a clause with a transitive verb and an overt NP for both subject and object is fully transparent. As shown in Tables 60-61, subject and object co-occur as overt NPs in 23% of all infinitival complements combined. (For
the sake of readability, the token counts are shown in Table 60 and the percentages appear separately in Table 61.)

Even within the group of infinitival clauses with fully transparent accusative NPs, there is another syntactic factor that contributes to transparency. This factor is word-order variation, sometimes as scrambling. The linear order of the two accusatives is not fixed, and as a result word order does not implicate an interpretation of one or the other NP as the subject and the other as object. While subjects tend to precede objects, Table 15 above shows that the reverse order holds in nearly half of contexts. When the two parameters of unfixed word order and pro-drop intersect, syntactic ambiguity is a potential result: The relative position of an overt accusative NP does not predict its function within the clause. Since both overt NPs are marked for accusative case, the third parameter of inflectional morphology is no help in disambiguating the meaning.

At the intermediate level of transparency are clauses with either subject or object as pro, but not both. That is, just one overt accusative NP occurs in the infinitival clause. If either (but not both) is [+ human], transparency is maintained by having one of the accusative NPs as pro. But this very flexibility sets up a potential conflict for transparency: If the subject is [+ human] and has the thematic role of agent, as the highest-ranking role it can be overt; the object can be null as long as its referent is recoverable. Thus, an overt agentive [+ human] subject with null object provides semantic iconicity in that the most important information is explicit while less critical details (i.e. a lower-ranking thematic role referring to an entity otherwise available in the discourse) are not. Conversely, the very fact that a [+ human] agentive subject is prototypical means that it need not be overt since its thematic role is readily inferable from a transitive-verb
context. That leaves the object to be expressed as overt – a situation that is especially helpful if
the object’s referent is not otherwise easily recoverable.

Both strategies of overt subject + object pro and subject pro + overt object appear to
satisfy Grice’s Maxim of Quantity: not too much and not too little information. As can be seen
from Tables 60-61, 55% of all infinitival clauses have just one of the two main accusative NPs
overt. For all clause types combined, the preference is for subject pro + overt object. As we saw
earlier in Tables 25 and 27, across both transitive and nontransitive embedded clauses, subject
pro occurs at the rate of 33%, and object pro at 23%. Within the transitive embedded clauses
summarized in Tables 60-61, the majority of the pro subjects are [+ human]. However, many of
the overt objects are also [+ human]. As a result, there is potential syntactic ambiguity in
assigning the intended [+ human] referent to the appropriate NPs (overt and null).

The lowest level of transparency occurs when both subject and object are null, as happens
in 22% of all infinitival complements. For subject-control complements, the rate of 35% null
NPs is highest among all the clause types. However, this is because such clauses are unable to
have an overt subject NP in the lower clause (i.e. it must occur as PRO), and for them the
greatest transparency possible is having one NP (i.e. the embedded object) overt. Likewise,
minimal transparency for subject control consists in having the embedded object as pro rather
than overt, as occurs 35% of the time. This rate of object pro is lower than the overall rate of one
pro NP in 55% of all clause types.
Table 60: Accusatives in Embedded Transitive Clauses (Counts).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accusative NPs</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Histor.</th>
<th>Interjct.</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
<th>ECM</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Acl</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Sent.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>C.-ECM</td>
<td>Impers.</td>
<td>Deontic</td>
<td>AcI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Linear</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject (Active)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object (Active)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject (Passive)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object (Raised)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object (Finite)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No object (Raised)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised (Passive)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 61: Accusatives in Embedded Transitive Clauses (Percentages).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accusative NPs</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Histor.</th>
<th>Interjct.</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>ECM</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Linear</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject (Active)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object (Active)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject (Passive)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object (Raised)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object (Finite)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No object (Raised)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised (Passive)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0% = Active, 1% = No object (Raised), 2% = Raised (Passive), 3% = Passive
The frequency of the lowest transparency level (22%) is particularly interesting since it is comparable to the rate of fully explicit embedded NPs (23%). Put another way, the two extremes of transparency occur at the same rate, but even in combination they are not as frequent as semi-transparency. At that intermediate transparency level, the most common type is for embedded subject pro + overt object with an active verb. The next most frequent type is an embedded passive verb with an overt subject (i.e. promoted object), occurring in 11% of all clauses. In passivization, the subject is demoted and need not occur overtly. Thus, passivization allows one embedded NP (i.e. the agent role) to be easily recoverable pragmatically without requiring it to be overt. As we have seen, when both embedded subject and object are overt, there is no clear-cut scheme such as linear order to interpret which NP is which. Passivization resolves that dilemma by leaving only one NP overt while still allowing the agent NP to be unambiguously understood even if not overtly expressed. Out of the 1,609 clauses with an embedded transitive predicate, 178 (11%) use passivization to leave just one embedded NP overt. This means that more than one out of every ten such clauses employs passivization. Even more strikingly, when just the embedded clauses with a single overt entity are considered, passivization actually occurs at the rate of 20% (178 out of 880 contexts) – or in one out of every five possible instances.

Not only does passivization resolve the potential ambiguity in clauses with two overt NPs, but it also plays a role in those clauses with no overt embedded NPs. In 5% of the transitive embedded contexts, passivization occurs and neither the raised object nor the agent NP is overt. Although such a situation is classified among the lowest level of transparency, in actuality the promoted subject can often be recovered semantically because of the passive verb. If only one of the two NPs is [+ human], there is little chance for ambiguity as the verb’s meaning will favor a reading of the human entity as either the doer of the action or the receiver
of it (e.g. from an external force such as what someone ‘wants’ or through deontic necessity).

Accordingly, passivization even with no overt NPs can result in a relatively transparent meaning for the clause. When just the clauses with no overt NPs are counted, the 75 instances of passivization account for 21% of all such contexts.

Thus, passivization plays an important role in avoiding syntactic ambiguity. Without it, clauses with two overt embedded NPs are often scrambled and there is no definitive pattern for determining the subject versus the object NP. One strategy to avoid such ambiguity is for either subject or object to occur as pro – but that too can result in ambiguity since there is still no straightforward way to figure out which intended entity is the null NP and which is the overt one. The overall preference is to have embedded subject pro + overt object, but nonetheless overt subject + object pro occurs often enough (86 out of 880 times, or 10%) that it cannot be excluded from potential parsing. An alternative strategy for an embedded clause with a transitive verb is passivization. The majority of such clauses have the embedded verb passivized, and they represent 20% of the possible contexts in each of two categories of transparency. There are also 31 clauses with raising through passivization. When all these types of embedded passivization are combined, they account for 284 (18%) of the 1,609 contexts with transitive verbs.

One other variant structure also serves to avoid syntactic ambiguity. This is a finite subjunctive clause instead of the expected infinitival complement. Such a clause avoids ambiguity because instead of having an embedded accusative NP, it has a nominative subject in agreement with the [number] marking on the verb. As a result, the only structural accusative can be the direct object, and thus no ambiguity among accusative NPs is possible. While this finite
variant is useful because it resolves the syntactic dilemma, it is nonetheless not frequently employed, occurring in 33 (2%) instances.

In summary, the three parameters of overt inflection, word-order variation, and both subject pro and object pro intersect to make syntactic ambiguity a frequent possibility. Three variant syntactic structures have the pragmatic effect of reducing ambiguity. The present participle instead of the infinitive sometimes serves to avoid syntactic ambiguity by separating different types of embedded clauses. Within infinitival complements, the finite subjunctive variant avoids ambiguity by reducing the number of possible overt accusative NPs. By far the most wide-ranging strategy to avoid ambiguity is passivization. Through it, the number of potential NPs is reduced without sacrificing transparency since the agent NP is readily recovered through the co-text. Even when morphology, scrambling, and overtness intersect and the result is potential syntactic ambiguity, there are three main strategies to resolve the ambiguity. Participles and finite-clause variants play a minor role in avoiding ambiguity, while passivization occurs in nearly one out of every five possible contexts. The result overall provides the listener-reader ample means to resolve most such ambiguities without garden-path processing. Transparency is ultimately adhered to and communication maintained through the small sacrifice of some inflectional morphology for the sake of others.

Regarding the use of GB framework, the present study shows that even without direct access to native speakers it is possible to examine a dead language – given sufficient texts. Even without analyzing the remaining fifteen plays of Plautus and three of Terence excluded from this study, we can observe patterns of syntax in the infinitival complements. The corpus-based approach makes such study possible and even feasible by allowing frequency counts to serve as evidence of competent speakers’ grammaticality judgments: The types of complements that
occur most frequently are the de facto norm, while other patterns (such as passivized matrix + passivized complement in object control) can be legitimately characterized as rare based on their very low frequency of occurrence. The overall result is a measurable analysis of infinitival complements in early Latin.

The data in this study show that GB is a valid framework for examining early Latin. No syntactic structures analyzed in this study appear to violate any portion of the standard GB claims. The patterns of complements show more variety than in some other languages, but those additional varieties still fit within the major complement types delineated by GB. For instance, early Latin has impersonal control, in which the controllee is a beneficiary/goal overtly marked with dative case – but such clauses are still instances of control and their subjects are still PRO. Because of early Latin’s pro-drop parameters for both subjects and objects, there are various combinations of overt and non-overt NPs within infinitival complements. The ability of NPs to be null does not invalidate any GB claims, but rather the corpus used here shows that the patterns hold regardless of whether a particular embedded NP is overt or not.

The one area in which the present study shows departure from standard GB assumptions is the issue of case assignment for PRO. The evidence from overt inflectional morphology in early Latin confirms that, following Chomsky and Lasnik, PRO does receive a case assignment. That assignment is not merely null as claimed, but PRO takes the default case assignment according to its function in the clause. Examples from this study show overt nominative or accusative case assignment as well as overt marking for [gender] and [number]. Together, these overt features are more than a mere null.

Finally, this work facilitates the examination of language change. By focusing on the syntax of infinitival complements in early Latin, the present work sets up a baseline for
analyzing diachronic development of the language. Directly following the period of early Latin is the “classical” stage, in which the majority of extant Latin works were written, including the most famous works of literature. By selectively analyzing texts from key authors in the classical period, it will now be possible to articulate how Latin changed from the early to the classical period with respect to infinitival clauses. Based on the data in the current study, it is clear that the future passive infinitive (formed from the perfect passive participle + iri) is changing: Some instances show agreement on [gender] and [number] between the embedded subject and the participle, while others do not. Early in the classical period, the data show agreement, indicating that grammaticalization occurred just after the early Latin period. By the time of late Latin (the period just before the emergence of the separate Romance dialects which eventually became distinct languages), phonological changes resulted in a need for fixed word order and even the change of the pro-drop parameter for objects. Since this study measures the rate of subject and object pro in infinitival complements, it will be possible to measure the changes diachronically by examining data from the classical, immediately post-classical, and late stages of Latin to determine when major shifts in the object parameter setting occurred.

One area of grammaticalization representing change between early and later Latin has to do with syntax, which differs both quantitatively and qualitatively. One qualitative change that develops diachronically is the form of the negative command. For example, early Latin has three main variants for expressing a negative command: (a) the negative particle ne + imperative (e.g. ne abi ‘don’t leave’), (b) ne + subjunctive (e.g. ne abeas lit. ‘not you should leave’ = ‘don’t leave’), and (c) imperative of nolle ‘to be unwilling’ + infinitive (e.g. noli abire lit. ‘be unwilling to leave’ = ‘don’t leave’). The frequency of each of these forms in early Latin is discussed above in section 6.4.1.1. While all three forms remain possible in later periods of Latin, only option (c)
is regularly employed in later prose. The other two forms are reserved for poetic register only (Palmer, 1954, pp. 310-311) and are thus not mere variants as earlier, but highly marked. In addition, option (b) with the subjunctive later becomes reserved for clauses of prohibition or negative result. While Cicero can still use ne + subjunctive as a negative command (e.g. sin te quoque inimici vexare coeperint, ne cessaris ‘if your enemies have begun to harass you too, don’t give way’, Quint. 5, ca. 50 BC), by the time of Tacitus ne is almost exclusively a negative complementizer (e.g. tum Agrippina ... de genere veneni consultavit, ne repentino et praecipiti facinus proderetur, ‘then Agrippina ... took advice about the type of poison, lest the deed be brought about by a sudden and too-hasty type’ Ann. 12:66, ca. 115 AD). Thus, the qualitative aspects of the syntax of negative commands shift from early to later stages. Two of the earlier forms are later reinterpreted as being outside the vernacular register, and one form narrows its scope of operation.

Quantitatively, certain syntactic constructions also change from their form in early Latin. One such change is the variation between bridge verb complements. Lakoff claims (1968, pp. 76-77) that the deep structure in Latin (including the early period) has two main variants: (a) matrix verb + complementizer quod ‘that’ (< neuter singular relative pronoun quod) + finite clause and (b) matrix verb + ECM accusative + infinitive clause. Data from this study’s corpus show that option (b) occurs 100% of the time, although option (a) occurs infrequently in the remaining works of Plautus and Terence not included in the corpus. Moreover, when a complementizer does occur in the finite (a) variant, it is more likely to be ut ‘so that’ rather than quod for bridge verbs. Finally, when option (a) occurs at all in early Latin, it is typically not with indirect statements but with adjectives and indirect questions (Draeger, 1878, p. 2:223). In contrast, later vernacular (so-called vulgar) Latin (e.g. Petronius’s Satyricon, ca. 60 AD) features
nearly exclusive use of option (a). In some even later texts, option (b) occurs but is constrained with respect to the position of the main verb (Herman, 1989, p. 137). This means the preferred subordinate construction shifts diachronically, at least in the vernacular register. This is a qualitative change rather than a syntactic reanalysis or other fundamental shift, even as it also represents a decreasing use of hypotaxis outside the formal register of the classical period. Lakoff also argues (p. 84) that classical Latin requires a shared subject NP to be overt (i.e. no “equi-deletion”) in complements to bridge verbs, although again the early Latin corpus shows that such NPs are not necessarily overt (see section 6.5.4.3). If Lakoff’s claims are generally valid for the classical period, then early Latin indeed represents a qualitatively different stage of syntax from the later language.

Among the various diachronic syntactic changes is the AcI construction itself. In the early and classical periods, AcI is the overwhelmingly preferred form for many types of clauses including indirect discourse. By late Latin, however, AcI is no longer the usual way to express indirect statements. Instead, indirect statements are realized as a finite clause headed by a complementizer such as *quod, quia, or ut* (Draeger, pp. 1:xvii-xviii). Those options are available in early Latin but occur only infrequently. However, by the time of the Vulgate Bible (ca. 380 AD) the AcI construction is extremely rare (Plater & White, 1926, p.121), with the finite clause having won out instead. Over a period of some six hundred years there is thus a complete reversal of the preferred construction for indirect statements, going from nearly exclusive use of AcI in early and classical Latin to nearly exclusive use of a complementizer + finite clause in the later periods. Together, all these diachronic shifts distinguish early Latin from later stages of the language.
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APPENDIX A. LATIN AUTHORS AND WORKS CITED

Works cited for examples but not comprising the electronic corpus of early Latin are marked with an asterisk (*). English titles of the works of Plautus and Terence are as listed in the Harvard Loeb series (many are proper names).

Acc. Accius, Lucius (“Accius”)
    *Fab. Fabulae Praetextae ‘Roman Plays’
    Frag. Fragmenta ‘Fragments’
    Misc. Miscellanea ‘Miscellany’
    Trag. Tragoediae ‘Tragedies’

Cae. Caecilius Statius (“Caecilius”)
    Trag. Tragoediae ‘Tragedies’

Cato Cato, Marcus Porcius (“Cato”)
    Agr. De Agri Cultura ‘On Farming’
    Or. Orationum Fragmenta ‘Fragments from speeches’

Enn. Ennius, Quintus (“Ennius”)
    Ann. Annales ‘Annals’
    Frag. Fragmenta ‘Fragments’
    Trag. Tragoediae ‘Tragedies’

Liv. Livius Andronicus, Lucius (“Livius”)
    Trag. Tragoediae ‘Tragedies’

Luc. Lucilius, Gaius (“Lucilius”)
    Frag. Fragmenta ‘Fragments’
    Sat. Saturae ‘Satires’

Naev. Naevius, Gnaeus (“Naevius”)
    BP Bellum Poenicum ‘Punic War’
    Frag. Fragmenta ‘Fragments’
    Trag. Tragoediae ‘Tragedies’

Pac. Pacuvius, Marcus (“Pacuvius”)
    Frag. Fragmenta ‘Fragments’
    Trag. Tragoediae ‘Tragedies’

Pl. Plautus, Titus Maccius (“Plautus”)
    Amph. Amphitruo ‘Amphitryon’
    *Asi. Asinaria ‘The Comedy of Asses’
    Aul. Aulularia ‘The Pot of Gold’
    *Bac. Bacchides ‘The Two Bacchises’
    *Cap. Captivi ‘The Captives’
    Cas. Casina ‘Casina’
*Cis.  Cistellaria  ‘The Casket Comedy’
*Cur.  Curculo  ‘Curculio’
*Epi.  Epidicus  ‘Epidicus’
  Men.  Menaechmi  ‘The Two Menaechmuses’
*Mer.  Mercator  ‘The Merchant’
  Mil.  Miles Gloriosus  ‘The Braggart Soldier’
*Mos.  Mostellaria  ‘The Haunted House’
*Per.  Persa  ‘The Persian’
*Poe.  Poenulus  ‘The Little Carthaginian’
*Ps.  Pseudolus  ‘Pseudolus’
*Rud.  Rudens  ‘The Rope’
  Sti.  Stichus  ‘Stichus’
*Tri.  Trinummus  ‘Three Bob Day’
*Tru.  Truculentus  ‘The Tale of a Traveling Bag’

Ter.  Terentius Afer, Publius (‘Terence’)
  And.  Andria  ‘The Lady of Andros’
*Ade.  Adelphoe  ‘The Brothers’
*Eun.  Eunuchus  ‘The Eunuch’
  Heau.  Heautotimorumenos  ‘The Self-Tormentor’
  Ph.  Phormio  ‘Phormio’
APPENDIX B. TAGGED CORPUS [SALT]

= Plautus
[ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] vostrorum omnium bene expedire
[___Plautus:Amph] (1 5).
C Et uti bonis vos [ecm:want:::bound:2nd:subj] vostrosque omnis
[ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj] nuntiis me [ecm:want::unbound:1st:obj]
[___Plautus:Amph] (8 9).
C Donec cum tonitru voce missa ex aethere adulterum [aci::inf:no:cop] se
[aci:::bound:se:subj:local] Iuppiter confessus [aci:say:confit-]
est
[___Plautus:Amph] (9 10).
C Nam vos quidem id [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] iam scitis [aci:know:sc-]
datum [aci::inf:perf:with:cop] mi esse ab dis aliiis [_abl:agent]
[___Plautus:Amph] (11 12).
C Haec [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:obj] ut me [ecm:want:velle]
[ecm:want::unbound:1st:subj:null:coord]
[ecm:want::inf:pres] lucrum
[___Plautus:Amph] (13 14).
C Tam etsi pro imperio vobis quod dictum foret scibat [aci:know:sc-]
[aci::unbound:3rd:obj:null:rel], quippe qui intellexerat
metuere [aci::inf:pres], ita ut aequum [ecm:deontic:aequ-] est
[ecm:deontic::unbound:3rd:obj] [ecm:deontic::inf:pres:dup] Iovem
C Humana mater natus, humano patre, [ecm:deontic::3rd:subj:null:impers]
mirari [ecm:deontic::inf:pres] [aci:wonder:mir-] non est aequum
C Iustam rem [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj] et facilem esse oratam
[___Plautus:Amph] (33).
(35).
C Iusta [ecm:deontic::3rd:obj] autem ab iniustis
C Ut alios [aci:::unbound:3rd:subj] in tragodiis vidi [aci:see:vid-],
Neptunum [aci::unbound:3rd:subj], Virtutem [aci::unbound:3rd:subj],
Victoriam [aci::unbound:3rd:subj], Martem [aci::unbound:3rd:subj], Bellonam


C Ea signa [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] nemo horum familiarium videre
147).
C Erit operae pretium hic spectantibus [aci::see:spect-] Iovem
[aci::inf:pres] et Mercurium [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] facere
[__Plautus:Amph] (151 152).
[ctrl:impers::inf:pres] mihi [ctrl:impers::inf:pres] [ctrl:impers:::1st:subj:dative], neque ero
quicquam auxili siet, nec quisquam sit quin me [aci::unbound:1st:subj] omnes
esse [aci::inf:pres] dignum deputent [aci::think:put-] [__Plautus:Amph]
(158 159).
C Nonne idem hoc luci me [ctrl:subj::unbound:1st:obj] mittere
C Quodquomque homini [ctrl:impers::inf:pres] accidit
[ctrl:impers::accid-] lubere [ctrl:impers::inf:pres],
[aci::inf:pres] [aci::unbound:3rd:subj]::null:coord] posse [aci::inf:pres]
[aci::think:put-], non reputat labori quid sit, nec aequum anne iniquum
C Satius [ecm:deontic:.sat-] me [ecm:deontic:::1st:subj] queri
meritis agere [aci::inf:pres] atque [aci::unbound:3rd:subj]::null:coord]
alloqui [aci::inf:pres] [__Plautus:Amph] (180 181)?
C Ne illi edepol si merito meo referre [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] studeant
C Facit ille quod volgo hau solent, ut quid se
[ecm:deontic::dign-] sciat [aci::know:sc-] [__Plautus:Amph] (185).
C Quod [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] numquam opinatus [aci::think:opin-] fui neque
alius quisquam civium sibi [aci::bound:se:goal:local] eventurum
[aci::inf:fut:peri:no:cop], id contigit ut salvi poteremur domi
C Sed quo modo et verbis quibus me [ecm:deontic::1st:subj] debeat
[ecm:deontic::dec-] fabularier [ecm:deontic::inf:pres]
[ecm:deontic::inf:pres]::unbound:3rd:obj]::null], prius ipse mecum etiam volo
[__Plautus:Amph] (201 202).
sententiam [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd:obj] ut dicant [ctrl:obj::inf_subjunct]
suam, si sine vi et sine bello velint [ctrl:subj:want:vole] rapta
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres], si [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj]::null:rel] quae
asportassent reddere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres], se [aci::bound:se:local]
exercitum [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [__linear] extemplo domum redducturum
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj], [aci::bound:se:local]::null:coord] pacem
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] illis, sin aliter sient animati neque dent quae petat,
sese [aci::bound:se:local] igitur summa vi virisque eorum oppidum
[aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [__linear] oppugnassere [aci::inf:fut]
[__Plautus:Amph] (205 210).
C Ego sum Sosia ille quem tu dudum [aci:::unbound:2nd:subj:null] esse
aci::inf::pres::cop aiebas [aci:say:ai-] mihi [__Plautus:Amph] (387).
C Obsresco ut per pacem liceat [ctrl::impers::lic-] te [ctrl::impers:::2nd:obj]
ctrl::impers::inf::pres adloqui [ctrl::impers::inf::pres], ut ne vapulem
C Immo indutiae parumper fiant, si quid [ctrl::subj:::unbound:3rd:obj:indef]
vis [ctrl::subj:want:velle] logui [ctrl::subj::inf::pres] [__Plautus:Amph]
(389).
C Nunc licet [ctrl::impers::lic-] mi [ctrl::impers:::3rd:subj:indef] libere
quidvis [ctrl::impers:::3rd:subj:indef] loqui [ctrl::impers::inf::pres]
[__Plautus:Amph] (393).
C Egomet mihi non credo, quom illaec [aci:::unbound:3rd:obj] autumare
C Pterela rex qui potitare [ctrl::subj::inf::pres]
ctrl::subj:::unbound:3rd:obj null solitus est [ctrl::subj:used:sol-]
patera aurea [__Plautus:Amph] (419).
C Id [ctrl::subj:::unbound:3rd:obj] quidem hodie numquam poterit
C Vincon argumentis [aci:say:argu-] te [aci:::unbound:2nd:subj] non esse
[aci::inf::pres::cop] Sosiam [__Plautus:Amph] (433)?
C Tu negas [aci:say:neg-] med [aci:::unbound:1st:subj] esse
[aci::inf::pres::cop] [__Plautus:Amph] (434)?
C Per Iovem iuro [aci::say:iur-] med [aci::bound:1st:subj] esse
[aci::inf::pres::cop] neque me [aci::bound:1st:subj:coord] falsum
aci::inf::pres [__linear] dicere [aci::inf::pres] [__Plautus:Amph]
(435).
C At ego per Mercurium iuro [aci::say:iur-] tibi Iovem
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj] non credere [aci::inf::pres]
[ctrl::subj:want:nolle] esse [ctrl::subj::inf::pres::cop], tu esto sane Sosia
[__Plautus:Amph] (439).
C Ita vix poteris [ctrl::subj:able:pot-] effugere [ctrl::subj::inf::pres]
C Nonne hoc [ctrl::impers:::3rd:obj] cuvis [ctrl::impers::3rd:subj:dative]
mirari [ctrl::impers::inf::pres] licet [ctrl::impers::lic-], neque tibi istuc
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj:raise] [aci::inf::pres::no:cop] mirum magis videtur
C Omnium primum iste quid sit [aci::inf::subjunct:indir] Sosia, hoc
ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj:partic pass dici [ecm:want::inf::pres::pass]
[aci::say:dic-]
C Quin intro [ctrl::impers::inf::pres] null ire [ctrl::impers::inf::pres]
in aedis numquam licitum est [ctrl::impers::lic-] [__Plautus:Amph] (617).
C Non soleo [ctrl::subj:used:sol-] ego somniculose eri imperia
(622).
C Qui, malum, intellegere [ctrl::subj::inf::pres] quisquam
[ctrl::subj::unbound:3rd:obj null] potis [ctrl::subj:able:pot-] est
[__Plautus:Amph] (626)?
C Satis [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] mi esse [aci::inf::pres::cop] ducam
C Edepol me [aci::bound:1st:subj] uxori exoptatum credo [aci:believe:cred-]
adventurum [aci::inf::fut::peri::no:cop] domum [__linear], quae me amat, quam
contra amo, praesertim re gesta bene, victis hostibus [__Plautus:Amph] (654 656).


C Quia salutare [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] advenientem me
[ctrl:subj::unbound:1st:obj] solebas [ctrl:subj::used:sol-] antidhac


C Quin huc adducis meum cognatum Naucratem, testem quem adducturum dixeras te non venisse [Plautus:Amph] (919 920)?

C Si quid dictum est per iocum, non aequom est id te serio praevortier [Plautus:Amph] (920 921).

C Nunc, quando factis me impudicis abstini, ab impudicis dictis avorti volo [Plautus:Amph] (927).

C Iuben mi ire comites [Plautus:Amph] (929)?

C Arbitratu tuo ius iurandum iabo me meam pudicam esse arbitrarier [Plautus:Amph] (931 932).


C Primum cavisse oportuit ne diceres [Plautus:Amph] (944).


C Nam quia vos tranquillos video, gaudeo et volupest mihi [Plautus:Amph] (958).

C Atque ita servom par videtur frugi sese instituere [Plautus:Amph] (959).

C Derides qui scis haec dudum me dixisse per iocum [Plautus:Amph] (963).

C Iam hic ero quom illic censebis esse [Plautus:Amph] (969).

C Iam hisce ambo, et servos et era, frustra sunt duo, qui me Amphitruonem rentur esse [Plautus:Amph] (974 975).

C Volo deludi illunc deludi [Plautus:Amph] (974 975).


C Nam mihi deo minitarier populo, ni decedat mihi, quam servolo in comoediis [Plautus:Amph] (986 987)?

C Ille navem salvam nuntiat aut irati adventum senis [Plautus:Amph] (988).

C Quam ob rem mihi magis par est via [Plautus:Amph] (992).

C Ut filium bonum patri esse est via et concedere [Plautus:Amph] (990).

C Quod [Plautus:Amph] (996).
C Ita mi videntur omnia, mare, terra, caelum, consequat iam ut opprimar, ut enicer. [Plautus:Amph] (1055 1056).

C Nec me miserior est neque ualla videatur [Plautus:Amph] (1060).

C Ardere censi est neque magis [Plautus:Amph] (1067).

C Scin me tuum esse erum Amphitruonem? [Plautus:Amph] (1082)?


C Aedis primo ruere rebamur [Plautus:Amph] (1095).

C Postquam peperit, pueros lavere et


C Ego cunas recessim et

C Is se dixit cum Alcumena clam consuetum cum Alcumena clam cubitibus, eumque filium qui illas anguis vicerit, alterum tuum esse qui Iove [Plautus:Amph] (1122 1124).

C Abi domum, vasa pura actuum adornari cum Iove [Plautus:Amph] (1126 1127).
[ctrl:obj::force:subig-] facere [ctrl:obj::inf:pres]

credunt [aci:believe:cred-] advenam eumque appellant meretrix, uxor et socer

C Omnis res [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] gestas esse
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj:raise] [aci::inf:pres:no:cop] vobis graecum videatur

C Ita forma simili pueri, ut mater sua non internosse [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
mammam dabat [__Plautus:Men] (18 20).

C Postquam Syracusas de ea re rediit nuntius [aci:say:nunti-] ad avom
puerorum, puerum [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] surruptum

C Propterea illius nomen menini facilius, quia illum [aci::unbound:3rd:subj]
(46).

C Si quis quid [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj] vestrum Epidamnum curari

C Sed ita ut det unde curari [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] id possit
(53).

C Sicut familiae quoque solent [ctrl:subj:used:sol-] mutarier

[__Plautus:Men] (83).

ne aufugiat voles [ctrl:subj:stop:desin-] sibi [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] id possit

C Ni mala, ni stulta sies, ni indomita ipseque animi, quod

C Nam quotiens foras ire [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] volo [ctrl:subj:stop:desin-] me
[ctrl:obj::inf:pres:dup], revocas, rogitas, quo ego eam, quam rem agam, quid
negoti germa, quid petam, quid feram, quid foris egerim [__Plautus:Men] (114
116).

C Portitorem domum duxi, ita omnem [ctrl:deontic::3rd:obj] mihi
eloqui [ctrl:deontic::inf:pres] est, quidquid egi atque ago [__Plautus:Men]
(117 118).

C Malo cavebis si sapis, virum [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] observare
122).

C Illic homo se [ecm:pretend:::bound:se:subj:local] uxor simulat
[ecm:pretend:simul-] me loqui [ecm:pretend::inf:pres], loquitur mihi
[__Plautus:Men] (125).

conferre [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] omnes gratulanties, quia pugnavi fortiter
C Operam praeterea numquam sumam quaerere numquam desistam exsequi quaerere [__Plautus:Men] (244).
C Verum alter vivos numquam desistam exsequi [__Plautus:Men] (245).
C Illoc enim verbo esse me servom scio [__Plautus:Men] (251).
C Non potuit paucis plura plane proloqui [__Plautus:Men] (252).
C Verum tamen nequeo contineri quin loquar [__Plautus:Men] (253).
C Dixine tibi esse hic sycophantas [__Plautus:Men] (283)?
C Iube te piari de mea pecunia, nam equidem insanum esse te certo scio [__Plautus:Men] (291 292).
C Ego te non novi adeo volo [__Plautus:Men] (296).
C Tun cyathissare mihi soles, qui ante hunc diem Epidamnum numquam vidi neque veni [__Plautus:Men] (305 306)?
C Si me consulas nummum illum quem mihi dudum pollicitus es dare, nam tu quidem hercle certo non sanus satis, Menaechme, qui nunc ipsus male dicas tibi, iubeas si sapias porculum adferri [__Plautus:Men] (310 315).
C Solet iocari saepe mecum illoc modo [__Plautus:Men] (317).
C Ire hercle meliust te, interim atque accumbere, dum ego haec appono ad Volcani violentiam [__Plautus:Men] (329 330).
C Ibo intro et dicam hic astare Erotio, ut te hinc abducat potius quam his astes foris [__Plautus:Men] (331 332).
C Edepol hau mendacia tua verba mihi aducat potius quam his astes foris [__Plautus:Men] (333 334).
C Nam istic meretricem credo habetare mulierem, ut quidem ille insanus dixit qui hinc abiit modo [__Plautus:Men] (335 336).
C Nunc in istoc portu stat navis praedatoria,aps qua
C Sed ubi ille est quem coquos ante aedis esse ait [__Plautus:Men] (356)?
C Animule mi, mihi mira videntur te [__Plautus:Men] (351).

Dicam [aci::say:dic-] [aci::unbound:2nd:subj:null] curare [aci::inf:pres]

Haec [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [acil:non:linear:demon] me


Demam hanc coronam atque abiciam ad laevam manum, ut, si quid sequantur me [aci::unbound:1st:subj] hac abissse [aci::inf:perf] censeant

Clientes [ecm:want:::unbound:3rd:subj] sibi

Datum [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:null:rel] [aci::inf:perf:pass:no:cop]

denegant [aci::say:neg-] quod datum est [Plautus:Men] (582).


[ctrl::subj::inf:pres] [Plautus:Men] (588 589).


[ctrl::subj::unbound:3rd:subj] [Plautus:Men] (598).


Clanculum te [aci::bound:2nd:subj] istaec flagitia
[ctrl::subj::inf:pres] [Plautus:Men] (605).


Per Iovem deosque omnis adiuro [aci::say:iur-], uxor, satin hoc est tibi, me

Properato [ctrl:subj::hurry:proper-] absente me comesse

Non ego te [aci::unbound:2nd:subj] modo hic ante aedis cum corona florea
vidi [aci::see:vid-] astare [aci::inf:pres] [Plautus:Men] (633 634)?

Quom negabas [aci::say:neg-] mihi esse [aci::inf:pres:cop] sanum sinciput
[aci::bound:2nd:subj] [Plautus:Men] (633 634)?

Non mihi censebas [aci:believe:cens-] esse [aci::inf:pres:cop]

Non potes [ctrl:subj::able:pot-] celare [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]

[ctrl::subj::unbound:3rd:obj] [Plautus:Men] (641).

Quando nil pudet neque vis [ctrl:subj::want:velle] tua voluntate ipse
profiteti [ctrl::subj::inf:pres] [ctrl::subj::unbound:3rd:obj] [Plautus:Men] (642 643).
[EM:want:velle] noctuam [EM:want::unbound:3rd:subj], quae tu tu
C Mulierem [EM:deontic::3rd:subj] aequom [EM:deontic:aequ-
C Nam ex hac familia me [EM:bound:1st:subj] plane excidisses
C Neque edepol te defrudandi [EM:gerund] causa posco, quin tibi dico
C Frustra me [EM:subj:able:pot-] ducere [EM:subj::inf:pres] non
[EM:Plautus:Men] (697)?
[EM:inf:pres] in conspectum meum, flagitium hominis, cum istoc ornatu
[EM:Plautus:Men] (708 709)?
C Etiamne, impudens, muttire [EM:subj::inf:pres] verbum unum
aut mecum loqui [EM:subj::inf:pres] [EM:subj::inf:pres] [EM:Plautus:Men] (710 711)?
C Ut loqui [EM:subj::inf:pres] [EM:subj::unbound:3rd:subj:null]
on audeam [EM:subj::inf:pres] [EM:Plautus:Men] (712)?
C Nonne tu scis [EM:know:sc-], mulier, Hecubam [EM:unbound:3rd:subj]
[EM:inf_indicat:indir] [EM:Plautus:Men] (714 715)?
C Etaque adeo iure coepta [EM:subj:begin:coep-] appellari
C Non ego istaec tua flagitia [EM:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] possum
C Quid id ad me, tu te [EM:subj::bound:2nd:subj] nuptam
C At mihi negabas [EM:say:neg-] dudum surrupuisses [EM:inf:perf]
oculos adtines, non te pudet [EM:Plautus:Men] (729 730)?
C Tun tibi hanc [EM:unbound:3rd:subj] surrupsum
[EM:subj::able:aud-] quam mihi dedit alia mulier ut concinnandam
C Tuam qui possim [EM:subj::able:pot-] [EM:subj::inf:pres]


(eat) avis squamosas [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj], piscis pennatos [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] [__Plautus:Men] (916 918)?
C Quae velis obsequi [__Plautus:Men] (1067 1068).
C Ego quidem huius servos sum, sed med [__Plautus:Men] (1071).
C Ego hunc censebam te esse [__Plautus:Men] (1072).
C Delirare mihi videre [__Plautus:Men] (1074 1075)?
C Hunc ego esse aio Menaechmum [__Plautus:Men] (1077).
C Me tibi neque occupare neque praeripere postulo [__Plautus:Men] (1080).
C Mellius nos adire atque hunc atque hunc percontarier [__Plautus:Men] (1091).
C Perge operam dare, obsecro hercle [__Plautus:Men] (1093).
C Liber esto, si invenis hunc meum fratrem esse [__Plautus:Men] (1093 1094).
C Et ego idem spero fore [__Plautus:Men] (1094).
C Menaechmum, opinor, te vocari dixeras [__Plautus:Men] (1095).
C In Sicilia te Syracusis natum esse dixisti [__Plautus:Men] (1096 1097).
C Moschum tibi patrem fuisse dixti [__Plautus:Men] (1098).
C Nunc operam dare potestis ambo mihi dare [__Plautus:Men] (1099).
C Spes sper est, vos inventurum fratres germanos duos geminos, una matre natos et patre uno die [__Plautus:Men] (1101 1102).
C Utinam efficere quod pollicitus possies [__Plautus:Men] (1103).
C Patrem tibi ais [__Plautus:Men] (1108)?
C Postea inter homines me deerrare a patre atque inde avehi [__Plautus:Men] (1112 1113).
C Di me servatum volunt [__Plautus:Men] (1120).
C Contineri quin complectar non queo [__Plautus:Men] (1124).
C Postquam ad nos renuntiatum est te [__Plautus:Men] (1127 1129).
C Cultrum [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [non:linear], securim [aci::unbound:3rd:obj], pistillum [aci::unbound:3rd:obj], mortarium [aci::unbound:3rd:obj], quae utenda [gerundive] vasa [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] semper vicini rogant, fures [aci::unbound:3rd:subj]
venisse [aci::inf:perf] atque apstulisse [aci::inf:perf] dicit
C Profecto in aedis meas me apsente neminem [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj]
(98 99).
C Nam noster nostrae qui est magister curiae [aci::bound:se:subj:local:null]
dividere [aci::inf:pres] argenti dixit [aci:say:dic-] nummos
C Id si relinquo ac non peto, omnes ilico me [aci::unbound:1st:subj]
suscipicentur [aci:believe:suspic-], credo, habere [aci::inf:pres] aurum
C Nam non est veri simile [ecm:deontic:simil-], hominem pauperem
C Nam nunc cum celo sedulo omnis, ne sciant, omnes
C Nam multum [aci::bound:1st:subj:raise:NULL] [aci::inf:pres:pass:cop]
loquaces merito omnes habemur [aci:believe:hab-] [__personal:passive], nec
mutam [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] profecto repertam nullam esse
C Quamquam haud falsa sum [aci:know:fall-] nos [aci::unbound:1st:subj]
C Nam optuma nulla potest [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] eligi
C Ita aequum est quod [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] in rem esse
[aci::unbound:2nd:subj:sub] e tibi me [aci::bound:1st:subj] consulere
[aci::inf:pres] et monere [aci::inf:pres], neque occulum
[aci::inf:pres:pass] [aci:believe:hab-] [__personal:passive] neque per metum
C Decet [ecm:deontic:dec-] te quidem [ecm:deontic::inf:pres]
C Nam optuma nulla potest [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] eligi
C Idem ego arbitror, ned tibi advorsari [ecm:deontic::inf:pres] certum
[ecm:deontic::cert-] est de istac re umquam, soror [__Plautus:Aul] (141).
C Nam arbitror, ned tibi advorsari [ecm:deontic::inf:pres] certum
[ecm:deontic::cert-] est de istac re umquam, soror [__Plautus:Aul] (141).
C Id quod [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] in rem tuam optumum esse
advento [__Plautus:Aul] (144 145).
C Quod [ctrl:sent] [ctrl:sent::unbound:3rd:subj:NULL] tibi sempiternum
salutare [ctrl:sent::inf:pres] sit, liberis procreandis [__gerundive]
C Quo, obsecro, pacto esse [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] possum [ctrl:subj::able:pot-] [__Plautus:Aul] (733)?
C Magna est res quam ego tecum otiose, si otium est, cupio loqui [__Plautus:Aul] (771).
C Id volo noscere [__Plautus:Aul] (780).
C Is me nunc renuntiare repudium iussit [__linear: Plautus:Aul] (783).
C Quin ego illi me hanc praedam dico [__linear: Plautus:Aul] (817)?
C Non quod pueri clamitant in faba se repperisse [__linear: Plautus:Aul] (818 819).
C Nunc servom esse ubi dicam meum Strobilum non reperio [__Plautus:Aul] (804).
C Nunc volo me emitti manu [__Plautus:Aul] (823).
C Quod modo fassus esse in arca [__Plautus:Aul] (829).
C Salvere in arca inquam sono, ut vos mi esse spectatores optumos [__linear: Plautus:Cas] (1).
C Nol volo me omnis operam ut operam ad nostrum gregem [__Plautus:Cas] (21 22).
C Comoediai nomen dare vobis volo [__linear: Plautus:Cas] (30 32).


C Mi illa nubet, machinare [historical::inf:pres]
C Una libella liber [pun] possum [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] fieri
C Negavi [aci:say:neg-] enim ipsi me [aci::bound:1st:subj] concessurum
C Ego edepol illam [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj] mediam diruptam
C Credo [aci:believe:cred-] edepol [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:null] esse
t intellego [aci:know:intelleg-] [__Plautus:Cas] (343).
C Necessum [ecm:deontic:necess-] est vorsis gladiis
[__Plautus:Cas] (344).
C Sed tamen vidi [aci:see:vid-] ego dis [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] fretos saepe
multos [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] [non:linear] decipi [aci::inf:pres:pass]
[__Plautus:Cas] (349).
C Ille edepol videre [historical::inf:pres] [aci:see:vid-] ardentem
[__Plautus:Cas] (354).
C Credo [aci:believe:cred-] [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:null] ecastor velle
C Qui didicit [ctrl:subj:know:disc-] dare [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
C Atque ego censui [aci:believe:cens-] aps te posse [aci::inf:pres]
[ctrl:subj:able:pot-] hoc [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] [non:linear:demon]
me [aci::bound:1st:subj] impetrare [ctrl:subj::inf:pres], uxor mea, Casina
ut uxor mihi daretur [__Plautus:Cas] (363 364).
C Ah, non id [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] volui [ctrl:subj:want:velle]
C Optumum atque aequissumum istuc [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] esse
C Verbero, men te [aci::unbound:2nd:subj] censes [aci:believe:cens-] esse
[aci::inf:cop] [__Plautus:Cas] (380 381)?
C At tu ut oculos [historical::inf:pres] ex capite per nasum tuos [__Plautus:Cas] (390).
C Quia tute es fugitvos, omnis [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj] te
[ecm:want::bound:2nd:obj] [linear] imitari [ecm:want::inf:pres] cupis
[ecm:want:cup-] [__Plautus:Cas] (397)?
C Sicut [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:null] factum esse
[__Plautus:Cas] (398).
[_Plautus:Cas] (410).
C Malo, Chaline, tibi cavendum [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:null]
[_Plautus:Cas] (411).
C Scin [aci:know:sc-] tu rus [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] hinc esse
[aci::inf:pres:cop] ad villam longe quo ducat [__Plautus:Cas] (420)?
C Nam praesente hoc plura verba [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj] fieri
(423).
C Atque id [ecm:deontic::3rd:obj] non tam aegrest [ecm:deontic:aegr-] iam,
[_non:linear:is], quam id [ecm:deontic::3rd:obj] expetivisses
C Attat, concedam huc, audio [aci:hear:aud-] aperiri [aci::inf:pres:pass]
fores [aci::unbound:3rd:subj], mei benevolentes atque amici prodeunt
[_Plautus:Cas] (434 435).
C Volui [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] Chalinum [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj], si
domi esset, mittere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] tecum opsonatum [_supine], ut etiam
in maerore insuper inimico nostro miseriam hanc adiungerem [__Plautus:Cas]
(440 442).
C Ecfodere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] hercule hic volt [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass],
C Ut, quia te tango, mel [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] mihi
[aci::inf:pres] [personal:passive] [__Plautus:Cas] (458)!}
C Iam hercule amplexari [ctrl:subj::inf:pres], iam osculari
C At non opinor [aci:think:opin-] fieri [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] hoc
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj] posse [aci::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] hodie
__[Plautus:Cas] (473).
C Siquidem cras censes [aci:believe:cens-] te [aci::inf:pres:pass]
posse [aci::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] emitti [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass]
manu [__Plautus:Cas] (474).
C Is mihi se [aci::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] manu
[aci::inf:fut:peri:no:cop] [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] uxor mea
__[Plautus:Cas] (483).
C In re praesenti ex copia piscaria consulere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] quid emam
potero [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] [__Plautus:Cas] (500).
C Argento parci [ecm:want::inf:pres:pass]
[__Plautus:Cas] (501).
libertatibus [__Plautus:Cas] (504).
C Quin eapse ultro mihi negavit eiusmod operam [601 602].
C Quin cupio tibi, quin, alicquid [602 603].
C Ego iam per hortum iussero meam istuc transire [605 607].
C Qua ego hunc amorem mi esse avi dicam [613 614].
C Apud nos tua ancilla hoc pacto exordiri coepit, quod haud Atticam condecet disciplinam [651 652].
C Possum ex te quid negotist [545]?
C Interemere ait velle [659].
C Insectatur omnis domi per aedis nec quemquam prope ad se sinit adire [662 663].
C Scelestissimum me esse credo [667].
C Istuc expeto, vilicum, volebam [674].
C Quia se des uxorem Olympioni, neque se suam neque viri vitam sinere in crastinum protolli [677 679].
C Ego hunc missa sum ludere [688].
C Est quod ex te volo exquirere [689].
C Dic med orare ut exoret orare. Plautus: Cas (698 699).

C Dic med med ut exore orare. Plautus: Cas (705 706).

C Cesso: magnifici patricii amici. Plautus: Cas (722 723).

C Potin a me abeas nisi me vis vomere. Plautus: Cas (731).

C Gladii: Casinam habere ait. Plautus: Cas (751).

C Sic sine habere habere. Plautus: Cas (750).

C Novi ego illas habere. Plautus: Cas (751).

C Nec pol ego Nemeae credo neque neque ludos tam festivos quam hic fiunt ludi ludificabiles seni nostro et nostro Olympioni.

C Properate, cenam iam esse coctam. Plautus: Cas (766).

C Quasi nil scient fore. Plautus: Cas (771 772).

C Latae autem senem cupiunt extrudere incenatum ex aedibus, ut ipsae sola ventris distendant suos. Plautus: Cas (775 777).

C Nam novom maritum et novam nuptam volo rus prosequi. Plautus: Cas (782 784).

C Sed properate istum et istam actutum. Plautus: Cas (785).

C Quid hic speculare. Plautus: Cas (791).

C Di hercle me servatum. Plautus: Cas (813).

C Cubitum ergo ire volt. Plautus: Cas (853).

C Acceptae bene et commode eximus intus ludos visere. Plautus: Cas (855 856).
Curate ut splendor meo sit clupeo clarior quam solis radii esse [Plautus:Mil] (1 2).

Nam ego hanc machaeram volo, ne lamentetur neve animum despondeat [Plautus:Mil] (5 6).

Mars haud ausit dicere suas virtutes ad tuas [Plautus:Mil] (11 12).

C Edepol vel elephanto in India, quo pacto ei pugno praefregisti bracchium, illud dicere volui [Plautus:Mil] (26 27).

Ne hercle operae pretium quidem mihi te narrare tuas qui virtutes sciam [Plautus:Mil] (31 32).

Ehem, scio iam quid vis dicere memini [Plautus:Mil] (34 35).

Novisse mores tuos me meditate decet curamque adhibere ut praeolat mihi quod tu velis [Plautus:Mil] (40 41).

Tantum esse oportet [Plautus:Mil] (47).

Quid tibi ego dicam, quod omnes mortales Pyrgopolynicem te unum in terra vivere virtute et forma et factis invictissumis [Plautus:Mil] (55 57)?

Nimiast miseria nimis pulchrum hominem [Plautus:Mil] (68).

Orant, ambiunt, exobsecrant videre ut liceat, ad sese ut tuo non liceat dare [Plautus:Mil] (69 71).

Videtur tempus esse ut eamus ad forum, ut in tabellis quos consignavi hic heri latrones, ibus denumerem stipendium [Plautus:Mil] (72 74).

Qui autem auscultare volt [Plautus:Mil] (82).

Ait sese [Plautus:Mil] (91 92).

Id quod ad hunc devenerim in servitutem ab eo qui servivi prius [Plautus:Mil] (96 97).

Occepit vino [Plautus:Mil] (106 107).


C Qui illam [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] hic vidit [aci:see:vid-] osculament


C Interclude inimicis commeatum, tibi muni viam qua cibatus commeatusque ad te et legiones tuas tuto possit pervenire [__Plautus:Mil] (224 225).
C Tute unus si recipere hoc ad te dicis, confidentiast nos inimicos [__Plautus:Mil] (229 230).
C Et ego impetrare dico id quod petis [__Plautus:Mil] (231).
C Auden participare me quod commentus [__Plautus:Mil] (232)?
C Nunc sic rationem incipisso, hanc instituam astutiam, ut Philocomasio dicam Athenis advenisse cum amatore aliquo suo, tam similem quam lacte lactist [__Plautus:Mil] (237 240).
C Ut si illic concrimatus sit advorsum militem meum conservos, eam vidisse [__Plautus:Mil] (242 245).
C Trecentae possunt causa conligi [__Plautus:Mil] (250).
C Dum modo hunc prima via inducamus vera ut esse credat quae mentibitur [__Plautus:Mil] (253 254).
C Intro abi ergo et, si isti est mulier, eam iube cito domum transire, atque haec ei dice, monstra, praecipe, ut teneat consilia nostra quem ad modum exorsi sumus de gemina sorore [__Plautus:Mil] (255 258).
C Nam ille non potuit quin sermone suo aliquem familiarium participaverit hic cum alieno osculari [__Plautus:Mil] (262 264).
C Egomet tacere nequeo solus quod scio [__Plautus:Mil] (265).
C Nisi quidem ego hobie ambulavi dormiens in tegulis, certo edepol scio me vidisse hic proxumae viciniae Philocomasium erilem amicam [__Plautus:Mil] (272 274).
C Te, Palaestrio, volup est [__Plautus:Mil] (276 277).


neque hortum [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] nisi per impluvium [__Plautus:Mil] (339 340)?
C Sed ego hoc quod ago, id [ecm:deontic::3rd:obj] me
manibus, patibulum quom habebis [__Plautus:Mil] (359 360).
[__Plautus:Mil] (363).
[aci::inf:perf] [aci:see:vid-] in proxumo hic, sceleste, ais [aci:say:ai-]
C Noli [ctrl:subj:want:nolle] munitari [Ctrl:subj::inf:pres], scio
[aci:know:sc-] crucem [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] futurum [aci::inf:cop]
mihi sepulchrum [__Plautus:Mil] (372).
C Non possunt [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] mihi minaciis tuis hisce oculi exfodiri
C Pergin [ctrl:subj:continue:perg-], sceleste, intender
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj:want:extend-] hanc
C Hac nocte in somnis mea soror geminast germana
C Propter eandem suspicionem maximam [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] sum visa
[aci::unbound:1st:subj:raise:null] [aci:see:vid-] sustinere [aci::inf:pres]
C Nam arguere [aci::inf:pres] [aci:say:argu-] in somnis me
[aci::unbound:1st:subj] meus mihi familiaris [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:raise]
viso me [aci::unbound:1st:subj] cum alieno adulescentulo, quasi nunc tu, esse osculatam [aci::inf:perf:depon:with:cop], quom illa
osculata mea soror gemina esset suompte amicum [personal:passive]
[__Plautus:Mil] (389 391).
C Id [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] me [aci::bound:1st:subj] [non:linear:is]
insimulatam [aci::inf:perf:pass:with:cop] perperam falsum esse somniavi
C Narrandum [aci::inf:pres:no:cop] [gerundive] ego istuc
Sed meam esse erilem concubinam censui, quoi me custodem erus addidit miles meus. Nam ex uno puteo similior numquam potis aqua aquai sumi quam haec est atque ista hospita. Et me despexe ad te per impluvium tuum fateor. Nam ex uno puteo similior numquam potis aqua aquai sumi quam haec est atque ista hospita. Et ibi osculantem meum hospitem cum ista hospita vidisti? Vidi, cur negem quod viderim, sed Philocomium vidisse censui. Ratun istic me hominem esse omnium minimi preti, si ego me sciente paterer apud me tam insignite iniuriam? Nunc demum a me factum esse arbitror quom rem cognosco. Nam hominem servom suos domitos habere oportet oculos et manus orationemque. Ita facere certum est. Vincam animum meum, ne malitiose factum id esse aps te arbitrer quom rem cognosco. Vincam animum meum, ne malitiose factum id esse aps te arbitrer quom rem cognosco. Sat edepol certo scio occisam saepe sapere plus suem. Frequens senatus poterit nunc haberier. Sinite me prius perspectare, ne uspiam insidiae sient concilium quod habere volumus. Atque eadem quae illis voluisti facere certum est. Magis non potest esse ad rem utibile. Pol ita decet facere hoc. Me tibi istuc aetatis homini facinora puerilia obicere, ea ex opibus summis mei honoris gratis mihi Amandae atque ea opitulatum atque ea adrem utibile.
quaestae aetas fugere magis quam securi solet
C Eam pudet me
durum tibi in senecta obicere
C Hancine aetatem exercere amor meus gratis
C Itane tibi ego videor oppido Achertonicus
C Huius pro meritis referri pariter possit
C Tu homo et alteri sapienter potis consulere
C Tu homo et alium mecum, parum
C Tum plicatricem clementer non potest
C Tum opstetrix expostulavit mecum, parum

348
C At illa laus [ecm:deontic:laus] est, magno in genere et in divitiis maxumum
[_non:linear] educare [ecm:deontic::inf:pres], generi monumentum
[ecm:deontic::3rd:obj] et sibi [ecm:deontic::bound:3rd:goal:distant]
[__Plautus:Mil] (703 704).
C Huic homini dignum [ecm:deontic:dign-] est divitias
(723).
fuit [__Plautus:Mil] (730).
C Nam hosptes nullus tam in amici hospitium devorti [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass]
C Nam ei solent [ctrl:subj:used:sol-], quando accubuere, ubi cena adpositast,
dicere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres], (direct quote) quid opus fuit hoc, hospes,
sumptu tanto nostra gratia [__Plautus:Mil] (753).
C Neminem [aci:::unbound:3rd:subj] eorum haec [aci:::unbound:3rd:obj]
[__Plautus:Mil] (762).
C Possum [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] expromere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
C Igitur id [ecm:deontic::3rd:subj:rel] quod agitur ei hic primum praevent
C Dari [ecm:want::inf:pres:pass] istanc rationem
C At ego mi anulum [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj] dari
(771).
suam [aci::unbound:3rd:subj], itaque omnes [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] se
C Edepol qui te [ecm:want::unbound:2nd:subj] de isto multi cupiunt
[ecm:want::inf:pres:pass] non mentirier [ecm:want::inf:pres], sed ego ita
[ecm:want:velle] an quae nondum sit lauta [__Plautus:Mil] (787)?
C Ut simulet [ecm:pretend:simul-] se [ecm:pretend::bound:se:subj:local] tuam
esse [ecm:pretend::inf:pres:cop] uxorem et
[ecm:pretend::bound:se:subj:local::null:coord] deperi
hunc militem [__Plautus:Mil] (79796).
aut non facturum [aci::inf:fut:peri:no:cop] [aci::unbound:3rd:obj:null:coord] [Plautus:Mil] (1067 1068)?
C Tu hic ante aedis interim speculare [historical::inf:pres], ut, ubi illaec prodeat, me provoces [__Plautus:Mil] (1121 1122).
= Terence
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callidus, verberibus caesum te in pistrinum, Dave,
dedam usque ad necem (__Terence:And) (203).

C Neque tu haud dicas [aci:say:dic-] tibi [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:null] non

C Quoi verba [ecm:deontic::3rd:obj] [ecm:deontic::2nd:subj:null] dare
(211).

C Audireque [ecm:deontic::inf:pres] [ecm:deontic::2nd:subj:null] eorumst
operae pretium [ecm:deontic:pret-] audaciam [ecm:deontic::3rd:obj]
[__Terence:And] (217).

C Sed quidnam Pamphilum [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] examinat
[__Terence:And] (265).
-] [__Terence:And] (267)?
-] [__Terence:And] (270)?
C Bene et pudice eius doctum atque eductum sinam [ctrl:obj::allow:sin-]
coactum egestate ingenium [ctrl:obj:::unbound:3rd:subj] inmutariar
C Sed ut vim [ctrl:subj:::unbound:3rd:obj] queas [ctrl:subj::able:qu-
C Adeon me [aci:::unbind:1st:subj] [aci::inf:pres:no:cop] ignavum putas
[aci:think:put-], adeon porro ingratum aut inhumanum aut ferum, ut neque me consuetudo neque amor neque pudor commoveat neque commoneat ut servem fidem
[__Terence:And] (277 280)?
C Unum hoc [aci:::trace] scio [aci:know:sc-], hanc [aci:::unbind:3rd:subj]
meritam esse [aci::inf:perf:depon:with:cop] ut memor esses sui
[__Terence:And] (281).
C Quoniam non potest [ctrl:subj::able:pot-] id fieri
C Ah, quanto id te [ecm:deontic:::2nd:subj] satiust [ecm:deontic:sa-
[linear:debon:2nd] qui ab animo amoveas tuo, quam id [ecm:deontic:::3rd:obj]
lubido frustra incendatur tua [__Terence:And] (307).
[__Terence:And] (311).
C Si nil impetres, ut te [aci:::unbind:2nd:subj] arbitretur
316).
C Ego, Charine, neutiquam officium [aci:::unbind:3rd:subj]
[ecm:deontic:offici-] liberi esse [aci::inf:pres:cop] hominis puto
[aci:think:put-], quom is nil mereat, [ecm:deontic:::3rd:subj] postulare
[ecm:deontic::inf:pres] [ctrl:obj::order:postul-] id
istas malo [ctrl:subj::want:malle] quam tu apiscier [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
[__Terence:And] (332).
C Quem [aci:::unbind:3rd:subj] ego nunc credo [aci:believe:cred-], si iam
[aci:hear:aud-] tu illum [aci:::unbind:3rd:subj], toto me


Hanc fidem sibi me obsecravit, qui se non desertum iri, ut darem (402).

Cave te esse tristem sentiat (403).

Hic nunc non dubitat quin te ducturum neges (405).

Orationem sperat invenisse se (407 408).

Crede inquam, Pamphil, numquam hoc mihi, Pamphilum hodie tecum commutaturum patrem unum esse verbum, si te dices ducere (409 411).

Erus me Pamphilum hodie observare, ut quid ageret de nuptiis scirem (412 413).

Utrumque adesse video (416).

Hodie uxorem ducas, ut dixi, volo (418).

Nullane in re esse quoiquam homini fidem (425).

Verum illud verbumst, omnis sibi sibi malle melius esse quam alteri (426 427).

Ego illam vidi, forma bona memini, Pamphilo, si se illam amplecti maluit (428 430).

Hic nunc me credit aliquam sibi fallaciam portare et ea hic restitisse (432 433).

Potin es mihi verum dicere (437)?

Subtristis visust esse alienum mihi (447).

Ait nimium parce facere sumptum (450).

Vix inquit drachumis est obsonatum decem, non filio videtur uxorem dare (452 453).

C Quom intellexeras [aci:know:intelleg-] id consilium [aci:::unbound:3rd:obj] capere [aci::inf:pres], quor non dixti extemplo Pamphilo [__Terence:And] (517 518)?
C Qua audacia id [ctrl::subj::unbound:3rd:obj] facere [ctrl::subj::inf:pres] audeam [ctrl::subj:dare:aud-] [__Terence:And] (613)?
C Etiam nunc me [ctrl::obj::unbound:1st:subj] ducere [ctrl::obj::inf:pres] [ctrl::obj::unbound:3rd:obj:null] istis dictis postulas [ctrl::obj:order:postul-] [__Terence:And] (644)?
C Nec te [ctrl::subj::unbound:2nd:obj] quivit [ctrl::subj:able:qu-] hodie cogere [ctrl::subj::inf:pres] [ctrl::obj:force:cog-] illam
Haec nuptiae non aparahantur mihi nec postulabat nunc quisquam uxorem dare. Scio equidem illam ducturum esse, ut dicerem me daret quosquam uxorem multum, sed [...]

**Terence:** And (654).

Haec nuptiae non aparahantur mihi nec postulabat....

**Terence:** And (656 657).

Scio....

**Terence:** And (659).

Numquam destitit instare, ut dicerem me ducturum patri, suadere....

**Terence:** And (660 662).

Nescio nisi mi deos fuisse iratos, qui auscultaverim....

**Terence:** And (663 664).

Ego, Pamphile, hoc tibi pro servito debeo, conari manibus pedibus noctisque et dies, capitis periclum....

**Terence:** And (675 677).

Noli te macerare....

**Terence:** And (685).

Orare iussit, si se ames, era, iam ut ad se venias, si se ames, era, iam ut ad se venias....

**Terence:** And (687).

Videre ait....

**Terence:** And (688).

Nam idcirco accersor nuptias qui adparant mihi sciam esse esse omnis homines omnis homines....

**Terence:** And (694 695).

Si poterit fieri, si se ames, era, iam ut ad se venias, si se ames, era, iam ut ad se venias....

**Terence:** And (699 701).

Dies hic mi ut satis sit vereor ad agendum....
C Tu, Mysis, dum exeo, parumper opperire [historical::inf:pres] hic [__Terence:And] (714).
C Clamitant [acci:say:clamit-] me [acci::unbound:1st:subj]
[acci::inf:pres:no:cop] sycophantam, hereditatem [acci::unbound:3rd:obj]
C Nam si cogites, remittas [ctrl:subj:stop:mitt-] iam me
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] iniuriis
[__Terence:And] (827).
[ctrl:obj:beg:or-], ut ne illis animum [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd:subj] inducas
[ctrl:obj::inf_subjunct] [ctrl:obj:allow:duc-] credere [ctrl:obj::inf:pres]
[acci:believe:cred-], quibus id maxume utilest, illum [acci::unbound:3rd:subj]
C Vero voltu, quom ibi me [acci::unbound:1st:subj] adesse [acci::inf:pres:cop]
(841).
C Animo nunciam otioso [ctrl:obj:make:fac-] dicere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
(842).
(845)?
C Eho, non tu dixti [acci:say:dic-] esse [acci::inf:pres:cop] inter eos
inimicitias [acci:unbound:3rd:subj], carnufex [__Terence:And] (853)?
C Videtur [acci:see:vid-] [acci::unbound:3rd:subj:raise:null] esse
(854).
C Nil equidem, nisi quod [acci::unbound:3rd:subj] illum
[acci::unbound:3rd:subj] [non:linear:rel] audivi [acci:hear:aud-] dicere
C Quid ait [acci:say:ai-] tandem, Glycerium [acci::unbound:3rd:subj]
C Si quicquam [acci::unbound:3rd:subj:indef] invenies [acci:find:inven-] me
[acci::unbound:lst:obj] [non:linear:indef] mentitum
C Ostendam [acci:show:ostend-] erum quid sit [acci::inf_subjunct:indir]
C Tantum laborem [interject:::3rd:obj] [interject:::3rd:subj:null] capere
[interject::inf:pres] ob talem filium [__Terence:And] (870)!
C Rem potius ipsam dic ac mitte [ctrl:subj:stop:mitt-] male loqui
C Quasi quicquam in hunc iam gravius dici [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] possiet
C Aetate me [aci::unbound:1st:subj] putavit [aci:think:put-] et sapientia
plus [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [linear] scire [aci::inf:pres] et
[aci::unbound:1st:subj:null:coord] [aci::unbound:3rd:obj:null:coord]
provire [aci::inf:pres] quam se ipsum [aci::bound:se:subj:local] sibi
C Video [aci::see:vid-] alios [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] festinare
[aci::inf:pres], [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:null:coord] lectos
[aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [linear] sternere [aci::inf:pres],
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj:null:coord] cenam [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [linear]
C Ubi video, haec [ctrl::subj::unbound:3rd:obj] coepi [ctrl::subj:begin:coep-]
C Sed gnatum unicum, quem [ecm:deontic::3rd:subj] pariter uti
[ecm:deontic::inf:pres] his decuit [ecm:deontic:dec-] aut etiam amplius, quod
illa aetas magis ad haec utenda [gerundive] idoneast, eum ego hinc eieci
miserum iniustitia mea [__Terence:Hea] (131 134)!
[ecm:want::inf:pres] minus [linear] iniuriae, Chremes, meo gnata
facere [ecm:want::inf:pres] dum fiam miser, nec fas
ulla me [ecm:deontic::1st:subj] voluptate hic frui [ecm:deontic::inf:pres],
nisi ubi ille huc salvos redierit meus particeps [__Terence:Hea] (148 150).
C Nec tibi illest credere [ctrl::subj::inf:pres] ausus [ctrl::subj:aud-]
C Menedeme, at porro recte spero et illum [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] tibi
propediem [__Terence:Hea] (159 160).
filius [__Terence:Hea] (164).
C Non convenit [ecm:deontic:conven-], qui illum ad laborem hinc pepulerim
nunc me ipsum [ecm:deontic::1st:subj] fugere [ecm:deontic::inf:pres]
[__Terence:Hea] (165 166).
C Sed ut diei tempus est, tempust [ecm:deontic:tempus] monere
[ecm:deontic::inf:pres] [ctrl::obj:advise:mon-] me [ecm:deontic::1st:subj]
hunc vicinum Phaniam [ctrl::obj::unbound:3rd:subj] [linear] ad cenam ut
C iam dudum domi praesto apud me [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:null] esse
C Et illam [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] simul cum nuntio hic tibi adfuturam
C Huic filium [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:null] scis [aci:know:sc-] esse
[aci::inf:pres:cop], audivi [aci:hear:aud-]
C Scin hanc quam [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] dicit [aci:say:dic-] sordidatam
[__Terence:Hea] (297)?
C Magnum hoc quoque signumst [aci:show:sign-] dominam
[__Terence:Hea] (298).
C Nam disciplinast [ctrl:impers:disciplin-] isdem
ancillas [ctrl:impers::3rd:obj] primum ad dominas qui adfectant viam
[__Terence:Hea] (300 301).
C Ferge, obsecro te, et cave ne falsam gratiam [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj]
(301 302).
C Ubi dicimus [aci:say:dic-] redisse [aci::inf:perf] te
[aci::inf:pres] [aci::unbound:3rd:obj:null] uti veniret ad te
[__Terence:Hea] (304).
C Ut facile scires [aci:know:sc-] desiderio id [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] fieri
C At ego nil [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] esse [aci::inf:pres:cop] scibam
C Quas, malum, ambages [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] mihi narrare
multimodis iniurius, Clitipho, es neque ferri [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass]
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres], vis [ecm:want:velle]
C Siquid id [ctrl:sent] [ctrl:sent::unbound:3rd:subj:null] saperest
[non:linear:is:2nd] quod non potest [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] contingere
C Etsi consilium [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] quod cepi rectum esse
C Adsimulabimus [ecm:pretend:simul-] tuam amicam
[ecm:pretend:proj:] tuam amicam
[ctrl:obj:make:fac-] omnem metum [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd:subj]
[__Terence:Hea] (341).
C Aut illud falsum quod volgo audio dici aegritudinem hominibus [__Terence:Hea] (421 422).
C Nuntium adporto tibi quoius maxume te video ad mulierculam [__Terence:Hea] (427 428).
C Non volt te scire se redisse etiam et tuam conspectum fugit [__Terence:Hea] (433 434).
C Si te tam leni et victo esse animo ostenderis [__Terence:Hea] (438).
C Ea coacta ingratiis postilla coepit victum volgo quærere [__Terence:Hea] (447).
C Nunc quom sine magno intertrimento non potest haberi dare cupis eius sumptus [__Terence:Hea] (448 449).
C Decretumst pati illud permagni referre arbitror ut ne scientem sentiat te id sibi dare [__Terence:Hea] (466 468).
C Falli te sinas technis per servolum [__Terence:Hea] (470 471).
C Et subsensi id quoque, illos ibi esse agere inter se [__Terence:Hea] (471 472).
C Et tibi perdere talentum hoc pacto satius est quam illo [__Terence:Hea] (474 475).
C Nam si semel tuum animum intellexerit ille intellexerit qui proditurum te tuam vitam [__Terence:Hea] (474 475).
Non est mentiri meum (549).

Tractare possim meum (557).

Numquam commodium erum non audii, nec quom male facerem mi (559 561).

Itane fieret (562)?

Vidin ego te modo manum inserere (563 564)?

Nam istaec contumeliast, hominem amicum recipere (565 566).

At mihi est nil me istius facturum, pater (571).

Quod illum facere credo (577).

Sed nostrum est intellegere ut quomque ubi quomcum opus sit obsequi (578).

Chreme, vin tu homini stulto mi auscultare (585)?

Iube hunc abire hinc aliquo (585 586).

Quid illum porro credas facturum, Chreme (591 592).

Pessuma haec est meretrix, ita videtur (599).

Cliniam orat uti id illam et nunc post daturam (605 606).

Quid nunc facere nunc cogitas (607)?

Dicam hanc esse captam ex Caria ditem et nobilem (608 609).
C O Iuppiter, tantam esse [interject::inf:pres] in animo inscitiam [interject::3rd:subj] [Terence:Hea] (630)?


Hanc uxorem sibi dari volt Clinia (847).
Sculcit [sci:know:sc-] daturum (856 857).
Quidvis quam hunc amittere (858).
Me facturum esse omnia generum (874).
Ohe iam desine uxor, gratulando obtundere tuam esse inventam gnatam (879 881).
Quos ais homines, Chreme, cessare (883)?
Gaudere adeo coepit quasi qui cupiunt nuptias (885).
Gnatus quod se adsimulat laetum (888).
Mage, si mage noris, putes ita rem (889 890).
Hoc prius scire expeto (891).
Nam ubi desponsam nuntiasti filio, continuo iniecisse gnatam filii Dromonem scilicet, sponsae vestem aurum atque ancillas opus esse (891 893).
Magis unum etiam instare ete conficiantur nuptiae (895).
Ut ne paululum quidem subolat esse amicam hanc Cliniae (899).
C Ditto amicam hanc osculari atque amplexari nil puto (900 901).
C Quid est quod amplius simuletur nil puto (901)?
C Hem Clinia haec fieri videbat (907)?
C Quemquamne animo tam communi esse aut leni putas (912)?
C Quot res dedere ubi possem persentiscere (916).
C Tene istuc loqui (921)!
C Nonne id flagitium te aliis consilium dare sapere, tibi non posse (922 923)?
C Id quod me fecisse aiebas parum (924).
C Fac patrem esse sentiat, fac ut audeat (925 926).
C Nam si illi pergo suppeditare sumptibus (930).
C Difficilem te esse ostendes (933).
C Duo talenta pro re nostra ego esse (940).
C Sed ita dictu opus est, si me vis salvum esse (941 942).
C Id mirari te simulato (943).
C Sine me in hac re gerere mihi morem (947).
C Qui sibi pro deridiculo ac delectamento putat (953).
C Non, ita me di ament, auderet [ctrl:subj:dare:aud-] facere
quae in me fecit [__Terence:Hea] (953 954).
C Scio [aci:know:sc-] tibi esse [aci::inf:pres:cop] hoc
C Hic patrem [acci::unbound:3rd:subj] astare [aci::inf:pres] aibas
C Ubi te [acci::unbound:2nd:subj] vidi [acci::see:vid-] animo esse
quae essent prima [acci::unbound:2nd:subj:null:coord] habere [acci::inf:pres]
neque [acci::unbound:2nd:subj:null:coord] consulere [acci::inf:pres] in
longitudinem, cepi rationem ut neque egeres neque ut haec
C Tibi [ctrl:impers::2nd:subj:dative] non licuit [ctrl:impers:lic-] per te
mihi dare [ctrl:impers::inf:pres] [ctrl:impers::3rd:obj:null]
[__Terence:Hea] (965).
C Satius [ecm:deontic:sat-] est quam te ipso herede [__abl:compar] haec
(971).
C Prius quaeso disce [aci:show:disc-] quid sit [aci::inf_subjunct:indir]
C Quod peccavi [ecm:deontic:pecc-] ego, id [ecm:deontic::3rd:subj] obesse
C Vah, rogasse [ctrl:subj::inf:perf] [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj:null]
C Tibi iam esse [aci::inf:pres:cop] [acci::unbound:3rd:subj:null] ad sororem
C Adeon rem [interject::3rd:subj] redisse [interject::inf:perf] ut periculum
etiam a fame mihi sit, Syre [__Terence:Hea] (980)!
C Modo liceat [ctrl:impers::3rd:subj] vivere [ctrl:impers::inf:pres]
[__Terence:Hea] (981).
[__Terence:Hea] (981).
C Et quantum [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] ego intellegere
C An tu ob peccatum hoc esse illum [acci::unbound:3rd:subj] iratum
C Auxilio in paterna iniuria solent [ctrl:subj:used:sol-] esse
adripi [ctrl:obj::inf:pres:pass] [acci::unbound:3rd:subj] iusse
[acci::inf:perf] [ctrl:obj::order:iub-] [__Terence:Hea] (1001).
C Quo modo tam ineptum quicquam tibi venire [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] in mentem,
mi vir, potuerit [ctrl:subj::able:pot-] [__Terence:Hea] (1005).
C Oh pergin [ctrl:subj::continue:perg-] mulier esse [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:cop]
[__Terence:Hea] (1006)?
C Oh iniquos es qui me [ctrl:obj::unbound:1st:subj] tacere
[ctrl:obj::inf:pres] de re tanta postules [ctrl:obj::order:postul-]
[__Terence:Hea] (1011).
Non potuit cogitata proloqui [__Terence:Phor] (283).
Ere, salve, advenisse gaudeo [__Terence:Phor] (286).
Iam dudum omnis nos accusare inmerito et me horunc omnium inmeritissumo [__Terence:Phor] (289 290).
Namquid in hac re facere habere [__Terence:Phor] (296).
Hominem comonstrarier mi istum volo aut ubi habitet [__Terence:Phor] (305 306).
Itane patris ais conspectum [__Terence:Phor] (315)?
Tibi omnest exedendum aut accingere [__Terence:Phor] (318).
Quot me censes iam deverberasse usque ad necem [__Terence:Phor] (327)?
Cedo dum, enumquam iniuriarum audisti mihi scriptam [__Terence:Phor] (329)?
Periclum unde aliquid abradi potest [__Terence:Phor] (334).
Alere nolunt hominem edacem et sapiunt mea sententia, pro maleficio si beneficium summum nolunt reddere [__Terence:Phor] (335 336).
Non potest satis pro merito ab illo tibi referri [__Terence:Phor] (337).
Ten interject::asymbolum venire unctum atque lautum e balineis [__Terence:Phor] (339).
Pro deum immortalium, negat Phanium esse [__Terence:Phor] (352)?
Hanc Demipho negat esse cognatam [__Terence:Phor] (354)?
Ipsum esse esse opinor [__Terence:Phor] (355).
Saepe interea mihi senex narrabat se [__Terence:Phor] (356)
Pergin ero absenti male loqui, inpurissime?

C Numquam cessavit dicere hodie.

C Si tibi potis est, mi ut respondes.

C Quem amicum tuom ais fuisse istum sibi esse.

C Quoius de stultitia dixit ut dignum non potest?

C Et soli licet hic de eadem causa bis iudicium.

C Ut nequid turpe civis in se admitteret propter egestatem.

C Omnia haec illum putato quae ego nunc dicere.

C Itane es paratus facere me advorsum omnia?

C Ego tuam expetam amicitiam, aut te visum auditem velim?

C Nisi tu properas mulierem abducere, ego illam eiciam.

C Cratinum censeo, si tibi hic sit.

C Si hoc videtur videtur.

C Ego sedulo hunc dixisse credo.

C Mihi non videtur quod sit factum legibus rescindi.

C [391]
C Ego amplius deliberandum [ _gerundive ]
[_Terence:Phor] (459 460).
C Sed eccum ipsum [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] video [aci:see:vid-] in tempore
huc se [aci::bound:se:obj:local] [ _linear ] recipere [aci::inf:pres]
C Enim vero, Antipho, multimodis cum istoc animo es vituperandus
[ _gerundive ], itane te [interject:::2nd:subj] hinc abisse
[interject::inf:perf] et vitam tuam tutandam [ _gerundive ] [ _linear ] aliiis
[_Terence:Phor] (465 466)! 
C Alios [aci:::unbound:3rd:subj] tuam rem [ _linear ] credidisti
[aci:believe:cred-] magis quam tete [aci::bound:2nd:subj] animum vorsuros
[aci::inf:fut:peri:no:cop] [ _Terence:Phor ] (467)?
C Nisi Phaedria haud cessavit [ctrl:subj:stop:cess-] pro te eniti
C Tum Phormio itidem in hac re ut in aliis [aci::bound:se:subj:local:null]
[_Terence:Phor] (476).
C Ut aibat [aci:say:ai-] de eius consilio sese [aci::bound:se:subj:local]
velle [aci::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj::want:velle] facere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
attinet [ _Terence:Phor ] (480 481).
C Quantum metuist [ctrl:deontic:metu-] est mihi
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj], Geta [ _Terence:Phor ] (482)! 
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] [ctrl:obj:beg:or-] ut maneas [ctrl:obj::inf_subjunct] triduom hoc
[ _Terence:Phor ] (488)?
C Experire [historical::inf:pres], non est longum [ _Terence:Phor ] (493).
C Adeon ingenio esse [interject::inf:pres:cop] duro te [interject:::2nd:subj]
atque inexorabili, ut neque misericordia neque precibus molliri
498)! 
atque inpudentem sine modo, ut phaleratis ducas dictis me et mean ductes
gratii [ _Terence:Phor ] (499 500)! 
C Neque Antipho alia quom occupatus esset sollicitudine, tum hoc
C Quam indignum facinus [interject::trace], ancillam [interject::3rd:subj]
C Nequeo [ctrl:subj:able:qu-] exorare [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
C Dorio, exoret [ctrl:obj::inf_subjunct] [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd:obj:null]
C Pamphilamne [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd:subj] hac urbe privari
C Tum praetera horunc amorem poterint pati
[C] [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] [ctrl:obj::able:pot-]
[C] [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] [ctrl:obj::allow:pat-] [__Terence:Phor] (518)?
C Dorio, tandem facere oportet [__Terence:Phor] (527)?
C Nam hic me scibat huius modi esse
[C] [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] [ctrl:obj::able:pot-]
[C] [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] [ctrl:obj::able:pot-] [__Terence:Phor] (531 532).
C Quod, hic si pote fuisset exorarier
[C] [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass], triduom hoc, promissum fuerat [__Terence:Phor] (535 536).
C Quin, quom opust, beneficium rursum ei experiemur [ctrl:subj::try:exper-] reddere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
[C] [__Terence:Phor] (537)?
C Age ergo, solus servare hunc
C Non triumpho, ex nuptiis tuis si nil naciscor mali, ni etiam nunc me
[C] [ctrl:obj::inf:pres:pass] [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] in malo iubeas [ctrl:obj::order:iub-] crucem
[C] [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] [__Terence:Phor] (543 544)?
C Certumst [ecm:deontic:cert-] persequi [ecm:deontic::inf:pres] [ecm:deontic::inf:pres]
C Vide siquid opis potes [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass]
C Sed opus est mihi Phormionem adhuc rem aduitorem dari [__Terence:Phor] (560).
C Verum abi domum et illam miseram
[C] [ctrl:subj::inf:perf:with:cop] metu, consolare
C Sed venisse eas salvas audivi [aci::inf:perf:with:cop]
C Te mihi fidelem esse aegue atque egomet sum [aci::inf:pres:cop]


C Non, obsecro, es quem semper te esse dicitasti [__Terence:Phor] (743 744)?
C Em istoc pol nos te hic invenire miserae numquam potuimus [__Terence:Phor] (747).
C Quid illam alteram qua dicitur [__Terence:Phor] (755)?
C Composito factumst quo modo hanc amans habere posset sine dote [__Terence:Phor] (756 757).
C Di vostram fidem, quam saepe forte temere eveniunt quae non audeas optare optare [__Terence:Phor] (758 759).
C Offendi adveniens quicum volebam et ut volebam locatam [__Terence:Phor] (758 759).
C Pater adulescentis venit eumque hoc animo iniquo hoc oppido ferre [__Terence:Phor] (760 763).
C Nonne id sat erat, accipere ab illo iniuriam [__Terence:Phor] (768 769)?
C Tu, Geta, abi prae nuntia hanc venturam [__Terence:Phor] (777).
C Factum volo [__Terence:Phor] (787).
C Nollem datum [__Terence:Phor] (796).
C Abduci non potest [__Terence:Phor] (799).
C Vin scire aut scire [__Terence:Phor] (807)?
C Una omnis nos hoc aut hoc aut [__Terence:Phor] (809).
C Itana parvam mihi fidem esse apud te [__Terence:Phor] (810)!
C Sophrona huc fratrem modo inquit [aci:say:inquam] senis introduxit Chremem
[aci::inf:perf] [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] omnia [ctrl:subj:::unbound:3rd:obj]
C Ait [aci:say:ai-] uterque tibi potestatem [aci:::unbound:3rd:subj] eius
C Tantam fortunam [interject:::3rd:subj] de inproviso esse his datam
C Summa eludendi [gerund] occasiost [ctrl:impers:occas-] mihi
[ctrl:impers:::3rd:subj:dative] nunc senes et Phaedriae curam
C Quo me [ecm:pretend::bound:1st:subj] adsimularem [ecm:pretend:simul-] ire
C Iaque adeo venio nuntiatum [supine] [aci:say:nunti-], Demipho, paratum me
C Nam omnis posthabui mihi res, ita uti par fuit, postquam id tanto opere vos
C Quia ne alteram quidem illam [ctrl:subj:::unbound:3rd:obj] potero
C Tum autem Antiphonem [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] video [aci::see:vid-] ab sese
[aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [linear::is:2nd] [__Terence:Phor] (920 921).
C Tum autem video [aci::see:vid-] filium [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] invitum sane
mulierem [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [linear] ab se
C Sed transi sodes ad forum atque illud mihi argentum
[ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj] apud te, dos hic maneat, Demipho
[__Terence:Phor] (925 926).
C Nam non est aequum [ecm:deontic::aequ-] me [ecm:deontic::1st:subj] propter vos decipi [ecm:deontic::inf:pres:pass], quom ego vostri honoris causa
repudium alterae remiserim, quae dotis tantundem dabat [__Terence:Phor] (927 929).

= Ennius


C Fortunasque suas coepere latrones inter se memorare [__Ennius:Ann] (481 482).
C Unus Surus surum ferre tamen latrones inter se defensere [__Ennius:Ann] (484).
C Iam cata signa fere sonitum dare voca parabant [__Ennius:Ann] (487).
C Decretum est stare et fossari corpora telis [__Ennius:Ann] (511).
C Non si, lingua loqui saperet quibus, ora decem sint, innumerum, ferro cor sit pectusque revinctum [__Ennius:Ann] (547 548).
C Omnes mortales laudarier optant [__Ennius:Ann] (549).
C Audire iubet vos [__Ennius:Trag] (4).
C Quo nunc incerta re atque inorata gradum regredere conare [__Ennius:Trag] (14 15)?
C Mater gravida parere se ardentem facem visa est in somnis Hecuba [__Ennius:Trag] (38 39).
C Ibi ex oraclo voce divina edidit Apollo puerum primus Priamo qui foret postilla natus temperaret tollere, eum esse exitium Troiae, pestem Pergamo [__Ennius:Trag] (46 49).
C Sed quid oculis rapere visa est derepente ardentibus [__Ennius:Trag] (57 58)?
C Hoc dolet me obesse, illos prodesse, me obstare, illos obsequi [__Ennius:Trag] (64 65).
C Vidi ego te, adstante ope barbarica, tectis caelatis laequeatis auro ebore instructam passa [__Ennius:Trag] (91 93).
= Caecilius Statius
C Quamquam ego mercede huc conductus tua advenio, ne tibi me esse ob eam rem obnoxious reare [aci::think:rer-] [Caecilius:Plays] (19 20).
C Nullus sum nisi meam rem iam ommem propere incursim perdere [Caecilius:Plays] (42).
C Facile aerumnam ferre possunt [ctrl:subj::abl:pot-] si inde abest iniuria [Caecilius:Plays] (43).
C Hunc collum Ludo praecidi [ctrl:subj::inf:pass] lube [ctrl:subj::bound:pass] [Caecilius:Plays] (51)!
C Quin machaera licitari adversum ahenum coepisti [ctrl:subj::begin:coep-] sciens [Caecilius:Plays] (69 70).
C Memini ibi candelabrum ligneum [ctrl:subj::bound:pass] (107).
C Credidi silicernium eius me esse esurum [aci::inf:fut:peri:with:cop] [Caecilius:Plays] (120).
C Placere occepit graviter, postquam emortuast [Caecilius:Plays] (156).
= Livius Andronicus
Partim errant, nequiont Graeciam reddire [__Livius:Ody] (15).

Ibi manens sedeto donicum videbis me carpento vehentem en domum venisse [__Livius:Ody] (20 21).

Censet eo venturum obviam Poenum [__Naevius:Bell] (40).

Seseque i perire populo fieri per gentes [__Naevius:Bell] (61 62).

C Huius autem gnatus dicitur dixisse [__Naevius:Fab] (2 3).

Demea, meos equos sinam ego illos esse [__Naevius:Fab] (11)?

Nam in scena vos nocturnos praemiatores tollere [__Naevius:Fab] (15).

Nam perdocere multa, non perdocere [__Naevius:Fab] (16 17).

Suopte utrosque decuit acceptos cibo, alteris inanem madidam dari, alteris nuces in proclivi profundier [__Naevius:Fab] (24 26).

Nolo ego hanc adeo efflictim amare, diu vivat volo ut mihi prosesse possit [__Naevius:Fab] (37 39).

In alto navem destitui iubet [__Naevius:Fab] (54).

Utrum est melius, virginemne virum magnum stuprum [__Naevius:Fab] (58)?

Quae ego in theatro hic meis probavi plausibus, ea ducere [__Naevius:Fab] (58)?

Quam si quicquam filium argum amoris causa sumpse [__Naevius:Fab] (86 87)?

Umquam si quicquam filium argum amoris causa sumpse [__Naevius:Fab] (86 87)?

C Confidentia ausus cum eo fuerim facere verbum [__Naevius:Fab] (83)?

Confidentia ausus cum eo fuerim facere [__Naevius:Fab] (83)?

C Etiamne audent mecum una apparere [__Naevius:Fab] (83)?

C Umquam si quicquam filium argum amoris causa sumpse [__Naevius:Fab] (86 87)?

C Quae ego in theatro hic meis probavi plausibus, ea ducere [__Naevius:Fab] (58)?

Quam si quicquam argum amoris causa sumpse [__Naevius:Fab] (86 87)?

C Confidentia ausus cum eo fuerim facere verbum [__Naevius:Fab] (83)?

C Um quam si quicquam filium argum amoris causa sumpse [__Naevius:Fab] (86 87)?

C Confidentia ausus cum eo fuerim facere [__Naevius:Fab] (83)?

C etiamne audent mecum una apparere [__Naevius:Fab] (83)
= Pacuvius
C Men [interject::1st:subj] servasse [interject::inf:perf] [interject::3rd:obj] ut essent qui me perderent [__Pacuvius:Trag] (45)?
C Quid quod iam, ei mihi, [ctrl:obj::unbound:1st:subj] piget [ctrl:obj::impers:pig-] paternum nomen [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd:obj], maternum
C Vel cum illum videas sollicitum
[Caelius:Trag] (141).
C Hoc est illud quod fore quod quid
[Caelius:Trag] (148 149).
C Nihil coniectura quivi interpretari quorsum flexivia
[Caelius:Trag] (151 152).
C Aut hic est aut hic actum autum actum
[Caelius:Trag] (159).
C At si tanta sunt promerita vestra, aequiperare
[Caelius:Trag] (165 166).
C Cum neque me aspicere aequales dignaret meae
[Caelius:Trag] (172).
C Lamentas fletus facere compendi licet
[Caelius:Trag] (173).
C Et obnoxium esse aut aut elinguem putes
[Caelius:Trag] (177).
C Habet hoc senectus in sese ipsa cum pigra est spisse ut videantur
[Caelius:Trag] (179 180).
C Tyndareo fieri contumeliam, cuius a te veretur maxime
[Caelius:Trag] (181 182).
C Quid benefacta mei patris, cuius opera te
[Caelius:Trag] (186)?
C Neque reliquias quaeso mea sieris aut
[Caelius:Trag] (218 219).
C Usi honore, credo, Achivi hunc sceptrum
[Caelius:Trag] (226).
C Quis deos infernos, quibus caelestis
[Caelius:Trag] (227)?
C Si resto, pergit ut eam si ire
[Caelius:Trag] (240)!
C Cedo quorsum itiner tetrinisse
[Caelius:Trag] (246)?


= Accius
At vereor cum te [aci:::unbound:2nd:subj] esse [aci::inf:pres:cop]
Alceonis fratrem factis dedicat [aci::say:dic-] [__Accius:Trag] (43).
Namque, ut dicam, te metu aut segnitate adiuvere addubitare, haut meum est.

Quod beneficium haut sterili in segete, rex, te

Quanto magis te isti modi esse intellego, tanto, Antigona, magis me [par] et parcere [par] [par] (88 89).

Huius me dividia cogit plus quam est loqui [par] (99 100).

Quem ego me [par] [par] [par] esse esse [par] me [par] est aecum [par] frui [par] fraternis armis mihique [par] [par] [par] (106 108).

Hem, vereor plus quam fas est captivam [par] (118).

Maior erit luctus cum me damnatum [par] [par] (119).

Nunc, Calcha, finem religionum fac, desiste [par] [par] [par] [par] (136 137).
Itera, in quibus partibus, namque audire volo si est quem exopto, et quo captus modo, fortunane an fortunae repertus [Accius:Trag] (139 142)?

Hic per matutinum lumen tardo procedens gradu derepente aspicio ex nemore pavidum et properantem egredi [Accius:Trag] (145 146).


Veritus sum arbitros, atque utinem memet possim obliviscier [Accius:Trag] (158)!

Qui non habuit re in summum esse coniugem insexum, matres cointuinari stirpem aedificari genus [Accius:Trag] (169 172).

Adde huc quod mihi portento caelestum pater prodigium misit, regni stabilimen mei, agnum inter pecudes aurea clarum coma quem clam Thyestem [Accius:Trag] (175 176).

Sed quid tonitru turbida torvo concussa repente aequora [Accius:Trag] (183 185)?

Ipsus hortatur me frater ut meos malis miser manderem natos [Accius:Trag] (196 197).

Nam neque sat fingi neque dici potest pro magnitate [Accius:Trag] (211 212).


Melius quam pigrasse est nefas [Accius:Trag] (232).

Scibam hanc mihi supremam lucem et serviti finem [Accius:Trag] (243).


Vel hic qui me aperte effrenata inpudentia praesentem praesens dictis mertare institit [Accius:Trag] (254 255).
C Sed ubi ad finem ventum est quo illum fors expectabat loco, atque Orestes gravis sacerdos ferro prompto adsistere [historical::inf:pres] [__Accius:Trag] (321 322).
C Ex taurigeno semine ortam fuisse [aci::inf:perf:cop] an humano feram
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj] [__Accius:Trag] (451)?
C Tu pertinaciam esse [aci::inf:pres:cop], Antiloche, hanc
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj] praeedicatas [aci:say:dic-], ego
volo [ecm:want:velle], nam pervicacem
[aci::inf:pres] [aci::unbound:3rd:obj:empty] perfacile patior
C Ego me [aci::bound:1st:subj] non pecasse [aci::inf:perf] plane ostendam
[aci:show:ostend-] aut poenas sufferam
[__Accius:Trag] (462).
[partial::3rd:obj] ventorum animae immittere [partial::inf:pres]
[__Accius:Trag] (463 464).
C Quod si ut decuit stares mecum aut meus maestaret dolor iam diu inflammari
C Atque adeo valvas [aci::inf:pres] sonere [aci::inf:pres] sensi
C Decorare [ecm:deontic::inf:pres] [ecm:deontic::3rd:subj:empty]
[ecm:deontic::3rd:obj:empty] est satius [ecm:deontic::sat-] quam verbena et
taeniis [__Accius:Trag] (471).
C Haut quisquam potis [ctrl:subj::able:pot-] est tolerare
[__Accius:Trag] (473).
C Cui, quae cum illo fuerim, dignabor [ctrl:subj::dign-] dari
C Quid si ex Graecia omni illius par nemo reperiri [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass]
potest [ctrl:subj::able:pot-] [__Accius:Trag] (477 478)?
C An ego Ulixem obliiscar umquam aut quemquam [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj]
(488)?
adtemptare [ctrl:obj::inf:pres:pass:empty:coord], iube
[__Accius:Trag] (489).
C Exprome quid fers, nam te [aci::unbound:2nd:subj] e longo vadere
C Coniugium [partial::3rd:obj] Pisis petere [partial::inf:pres], ad te
C Nam med [aci::unbound:1st:subj] ut credam [aci:believe:cred-] ex tuo esse
conceptum [aci::inf:perf:pass:with:cop] satu tua argumenta redigunt animum et
conmovent [__Accius:Trag] (516 517).
and capere
coniugis [__Accius:Trag] (518)?
C Nec tibi me [ecm:deontic::1st:subj] in hac re gratari
C Volcania iam templa sub ipsis collibus in quos
= Lucilius
C Nam si tu fluctus undasque e gurgite salso tollere, venti prius Emathii vim, ventum, ingquam tollas [__Lucilius:Sat] (42 45).
C Serpere uti gangraena mala atque herpestica posset decretis animamque [__Lucilius:Sat] (52).
C In bulgam penetrare [partial::inf:pres] pilosam [__Lucilius:Sat] (61).
C Graecum te quam Romanum atque Sabinum municipem Ponti, Tritani, centurionum, pareclorum hominum ac primorum signiferumque, maluisti [__Lucilius:Sat] (87 90).
C Conturbare animam potis est quicumque adoritur [__Lucilius:Sat] (87).
C Quod si nulla potest mulier tam corpore duro esse, tamen tenero manet cui sucus lacerto, et manus uberibus lactanti in sumine sidat [__Lucilius:Sat] (167 169).
C Ne agitare manu tu possis [__Lucilius:Sat] (170 171).
C Verum illud credo fore [__Lucilius:Sat] (177).
C In quo Laelius clamores ille solaet, compellans gumias ex ordine nostros [__Lucilius:Sat] (201 202).
C Laevius pauperem ait se ingentia munera fungi [__Lucilius:Sat] (213).
C Verum unum cecidisse [__Lucilius:Sat] (230 231).
C Lascivire pecus Nerei rostrique repandum [__Lucilius:Sat] (235).
C Da [ctrl:impers:dar-] ab summio [__Lucilius:Sat] (237).
C Possisne elabi an porro prodenda dies sit [__Lucilius:Sat] (238).
C Hic solus vigilavit, opinor, et cum id mi visus facere
C Postquam praesidium [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] castris educere
ire [ctrl:obj::inf:pres] minutim per commissuras rimarum noctis nigrore
[__Lucilius:Sat] (247 248).
C Servorum est festus dies hic quem [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] plane
hexametro versu non dicere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] possis [ctrl:subj:able:pot-]
[__Lucilius:Sat] (252 253).
C Salvere [ctrl:obj::inf:pres] [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd:subj:null]
[ctrl:sent::inf:pres] iubere [ctrl:sent::inf:pres]
C Quem [ctrl:sbj::unbound:3rd:obj] neque Lucanis oriundi montibus tauri
ducere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] protelo validis cervicibus possent
C Quid [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:obj] ipsum me [ecm:want::unbound:2nd:subj]
[__Lucilius:Sat] (264).
C Hortare, illorum si possim [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] pacis potiri
[aci:think:rer-] sunt posse [aci::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] et
C In suam enim hos [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] invadere [aci::inf:pres] rem
C Chauno meno inquit balba, sororem [aci::unbound:3rd:subj]
[personal:passive] siccam atque abstemiam ubi audit [aci:hear:aud-]
[__Lucilius:Sat] (275 276).
C Hic tu apte credis [aci:believe:cred-] quemquam [aci::unbound:3rd:subj]
latrina [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [__Lucilius:Sat] (283)?
C Qui te diligat, aetatis facieque tuae se [aci::bound:se:3rd:subj]
[__Lucilius:Sat] (292 295).
C Hunc [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] molere [aci::inf:pres]
[aci::unbound:3rd:obj:null:coord], illam [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] autem ut
frumentum [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] vannere [aci::inf:pres] lumbis
[__Lucilius:Sat] (302).
habere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres], ulisci [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
[ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj:null:coord] pro scelere eius, testam sumit homo
Samiam sibi [__Lucilius:Sat] (303 304).
C Solem [aci::unbound:3rd:subj], auram adversam [aci::unbound:3rd:subj]
segetem [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] immutasse [aci::inf:perf] satumque
C Esuriente leoni ex ore exculpere [partial::inf:pres] praedam
C Leae iratae ad catulos accedere [aci::inf:pres] inultum
[aci:::unbound:3rd:subj] fluitare [aci::inf:pres] capronas altas frontibus
immissas ut mos fuit illis [__Lucilius:Sat] (321 322).
C Sallere [partial::inf:pres] murenas [partial::3rd:obj], mercem
(340).
semper iter [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] coepturus videtur [aci:see:vid-]
C Quid ergo si ostrea [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] Cerco cognorit
[aci:know:cognosc-] fluvium limum ac caenum [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [__Lucilius:Sat] (357 358)?
C Tu milli nummum [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] potes [ctrl:subj:able:pot-]
C Labora [ctrl:subj::try:labor-] discere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] ne te res ipsa
ac ratio ipsa refellat [__Lucilius:Sat] (366 367).
C Sallere [partial::inf:pres] murenas [partial:::3rd:obj], mercem
(340).
semper iter [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] coepturus videtur [aci:see:vid-]
C Quid ergo si ostrea [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] Cerco cognorit
[aci:know:cognosc-] fluvium limum ac caenum [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [__Lucilius:Sat] (357 358)?
C Tu milli nummum [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] potes [ctrl:subj:able:pot-]
C Labora [ctrl:subj::try:labor-] discere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] ne te res ipsa
ac ratio ipsa refellat [__Lucilius:Sat] (366 367).
C Nam veluti intro aliud [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:raise] esse
[aci::inf:pres:cop] atque intus videmus [aci:see:vid-], sic item apud te
aliud longe est, neque idem valet ad te [__Lucilius:Sat] (398 399).
C Primum hoc quod [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] dicimus [aci:say:dic-] esse
C Scipiadae magno improbus obiciebat [aci::say:obic-] Asellus lustrum
[aci:::unbound:3rd:subj] illo censore malum infelixque fuisse
C Lucius Cotta senex, crassi pater huius, Paceni, magnus fuit trico
nummarius, solvere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
C Scipiadae magno improbus obiciebat [aci::say:obic-] Asellus lustrum
[aci:::unbound:3rd:subj] illo censore malum infelixque fuisse
C Lucius Cotta senex, crassi pater huius, Paceni, magnus fuit trico
nummarius, solvere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
C Conicere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] in versus dictum
[__Lucilius:Sat] (448 449).
C huic homini quaestore aliquo esse [aci::inf:pres:cop] opus
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj] atque corago, publicitus qui mi atque e fisco
praebat aurum [__Lucilius:Sat] (456 457).
C Hunc [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] centum non possunt [ctrl:subj:able:pot-]
[__Lucilius:Sat] (461 462).
C Hunc homini quaestore aliquo esse [aci::inf:pres:cop] opus
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj] atque corago, publicitus qui mi atque e fisco
praebat aurum [__Lucilius:Sat] (456 457).
C Hunc [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] iuga multorum proteo ducere
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] centum non possunt [ctrl:subj:able:pot-]
[__Lucilius:Sat] (461 462).
C Hunc [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] iuga multorum proteo ducere
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] centum non possunt [ctrl:subj:able:pot-]
[__Lucilius:Sat] (461 462).
C Hunc homini quaestore aliquo esse [aci::inf:pres:cop] opus
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj] atque corago, publicitus qui mi atque e fisco
praebat aurum [__Lucilius:Sat] (456 457).
C Hunc [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] iuga multorum proteo ducere
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] centum non possunt [ctrl:subj:able:pot-]
[__Lucilius:Sat] (461 462).
C Hunc [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] iuga multorum proteo ducere
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] centum non possunt [ctrl:subj:able:pot-]
C Aut forte omnino ac fortuna vincere [partial::inf:pres] bello
[Lucilius:Sat] (477).
C Dilectum [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] video [aci:see:vid-] studiose vulgus
[Lucilius:Sat] (483).
C Idne aegre est magis an quod pane et [ctrl:obj::unbound:2nd:subj:null]
(485)?
C Num vetus ille Cato lacesisse [ctrl:subj::inf:perf]
ipse sibi [ctrl:subj::bound:se:goal:local] [Lucilius:Sat] (487 488)?
putare [ctrl:impers::inf:pres] [aci:think:put-] et calces [Lucilius:Sat]
(489).
C Non paucis [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:null] malle [aci::inf:pres]
C Quanto antiquius [ecm:deontic::bon-] quam [ecm:deontic::3rd:subj:null]
[aci:see:vid-] [Lucilius:Sat] (494)!
C Hunc milli passum qui vicerit atque duobus Campanus sonipes successor
nullus sequetur maiore in spatio ac diversus [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:raise]
videbitur [aci:see:vid-] ire [aci::inf:pres] [personal:passive]
[Lucilius:Sat] (511 513).
C Multa [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] homines protenta in Homeri versibus ficta
521).
C Ut pueri infantes credunt [aci:believe:cred-] signa omnia aena
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj] vivere [aci::inf:pres] et
isti somnia ficta [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] [aci::inf:perf:pass:no:cop] vera
putant [aci:think:put-], credunt [aci:believe:cred-] signis cor
(526 528).
farre aceroso oleis decumano pane coegit [ctrl:obj:force:cog-]
[Lucilius:Sat] (536 537).
C Ac de isto sacer ille tocoglyphos ac Syrophoenix quid
[ctrl:subj::used:sol-] [Lucilius:Sat] (540 541)?
[aci::inf:pres:cop], videt [aci:see:vid-] tunica et toga quid sit
[aci::inf:subjunct::indir] [Lucilius:Sat] (542).
C Rex Cotus ille duo hos ventos [aci::unbound:3rd:obj], austrum atque
aquilionem novisse [aci:perf] aiebat [aci:say:ai-] se
[aci::bound:se:subj:local] [non:linear:demon] solos demagis, istos ex nimbo
(544 546).
C Cetera contemnit [aci:say:contemn-] et in usura omnia ponit non magna,
C Sic tu illos fructus quaeras, adversa hieme olim quis uti
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] possis [ctrl:subj::able:pot-] ac delectare
C Peniculamento vero reprehendere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] noli
[ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj:Null], ut pueri infantes faciunt, mulierculam honestam
C Fingere [partial::inf:pres] [partial::3rd:obj:Null:rel] praeterea, adferri
C Granius autem non contemnere [aci::inf:pres] se [aci::unbound:se:subj:local]
C Manium Manilium [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj] Persiumve
[ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj] Persiumve
Congum [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj] [ecm:want::inf:pres:dup]
[ecm:want::inf:pres] [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:obj:Null] Laelium Decumum
[ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj] [ecm:want::inf:pres:dup]
C Rediisse [aci::inf:perf] [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:Null] ac
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj:Null:coord] repeadesse [aci::inf:perf], ut Romam
vitet, gladiatoribus [__Lucilius:Sat] (636).
C Depoclassere [ecm:hope::inf:fut] [ecm:hope::bound:se:subj:Null] aligua
sperans [ecm:hope:spere-] me ac deargentassere [ecm:hope::inf:fut]
[ecm:hope::unbound:1st:obj:Null:coord], decalauciicare [ecm:hope::inf:pres]
[ecm:hope::bound:se:subj:Null:coord], eburno speculo despeculassese
[ecm:hope::inf:fut] [ecm:hope::bound:se:subj:Null:coord] [__Lucilius:Sat]
(640 641).
C Tibi porro istaec res idcirco est cordi quod rere [aci:think:rer-]
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj:null:coord] [aci::inf:pres:no:cop] utilem
[__Lucilius:Sat] (707).
C Contra flagitium [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [aci::unbound:1st:subj:null]
nescire [aci::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj:know:sc-] bello vinci
[ctrl::subj::inf:pres:pass] a barbaro Viriato [_abl:agent], Annibale
[ecm::inf:pres] est satius [ecm:deontic:subj=at] quam illa
[__Lucilius:Sat] (718).
C Nunc itidem populo, his cum scriptoribus, voluimus [ctrl:subj:want:velle]
capere [ctrl::subj::inf:pres] animum [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] illorum
[__Lucilius:Sat] (720 721).
C Quam fastidiosum ac vescum [partial:::3rd:subj] vivere [partial::inf:pres]
[__Lucilius:Sat] (722).
C Quod is [aci::unbound:1st:subj:raise] intellegebar [aci:know:intelleg-]
posse [aci::inf:pres] haud ac paucos rettuli [_personal:passive]
[__Lucilius:Sat] (735).
C Quam non solum devorare [aci::inf:pres] se [aci::bound:se:subj:local]
omnia [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [linear] ac
C Ego enim an perficiam [ctrl:obj:make:fac-] ut me [ctrl:impers:::1st:obj]
[ctrl::obj::inf:pres:exped-] [__Lucilius:Sat] (741)?
C Insanum vocant quem [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] [aci::inf:pres:no:cop] maltam
[aci::see:vid-] [__Lucilius:Sat] (744).
C Parcat illi magis cui possit, cui fidem [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] esse
C Cocus non curat [aci:emotion:cur-] cauda insignem esse [aci::inf:pres:cop]
illam [aci::unbound:3rd:subj], dum pinguis siet [__Lucilius:Sat] (761).
C Tu Lucilium [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] credis [aci:believe:cred-] contenturum
[aci::inf:pres:cop:with:cop] [aci::unbound:3rd:obj:NULL:indef], cum me
ruperim, summa omnia fecerim [__Lucilius:Sat] (763 765)?
C Nulli me [aci::unbound:1st:subj] invidere [aci::inf:pres], non strabonem
fieri [aci::inf:pres:pass] saepius deliciis me [aci::unbound:1st:subj:coord]
istorum [__Lucilius:Sat] (766 767).
C Quod si paulisper captare [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
C Rem [ctrl::obj::unbound:3rd:obj] cognoscas [ctrl::obj::inf_subjunct] simul,
et dictis animum [ctrl::obj::unbound:3rd:obj] attendas
[ctrl::obj::inf_subjunct] postulo [ctrl::obj:order:postul-] [__Lucilius:Sat]
(771).
C Aut quod animum induxit semel et [aci::unbound:3rd:obj:null:coord]
(775).
C Cum sciam [aci:know:sc-] nihil [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] esse in vita
C Re in secunda tollere [partial::inf:pres] animos [partial:::3rd:obj], in
[__Lucilius:Sat] (779).
C Favitorem tibi me amicum, amatorem putes [__Lucilius:Sat] (874).
C Habeasque in animo [__Lucilius:Sat] (875 876).
C Primum Crysi cum negat [__Lucilius:Sat] (880).
C Hymnis, velim te id [__Lucilius:Sat] (887 888).
C Dolerat se non scripsisse et post non scripturum [__Lucilius:Sat] (890).
C Perge, amabo, ac si pote face dignam me [__Lucilius:Sat] (892).
C Mihi commodum statuerat dare, vestimenta et in toro reposueram [__Lucilius:Sat] (898 899).
C Certum scio esse ita ut dicis [__Lucilius:Sat] (901 902).
C In me illis spem esse esse omnem, quovis posse [__Lucilius:Sat] (903).
C Praetera ut nostris animos adtendere dictis atque adhibere velis [__Lucilius:Sat] (910 911).
C Nunc tu contra venis, vel quid in nuptis voluisse negas te [__Lucilius:Sat] (913 915)?
C Ubi erat copia, eicere istum abs te quamprimum et perdere amorem [__Lucilius:Sat] (919 920).
C Quid si dare vellent velis [__Lucilius:Sat] (921)?
C Hic corpus [__Lucilius:Sat] (924).
C Amicos hodie cum inprobo illo audivimus [__Lucilius:Sat] (929 930).
C Sic inquam veteratorem illum vetulum lupum Annibalem acceptum [__Lucilius:Sat] (952 953).
C Hoc [__Lucilius:Sat] (969).
C Aetatem istuc [__Lucilius:Sat] (971).
C Nos [interject:::1st:subj] esse arquatos [interject::inf:perf:pass:with:cop] [ _Lucilius:Sat] (1007)!
C Omnia [aci:::unbound:3rd:subj] tum endo muco videas [aci::see:vid-] fervente micare [aci::inf:pres] [ _Lucilius:Sat] (1024).
C Neu qui te ignaro famuli subducere [historical::inf:pres] [historical:::unbound:3rd:obj:null] [ _Lucilius:Sat] (1057).
C Nunc vero a mani ad noctem festo atque profesto totus item pariterque die populusque patresque iactare [historical::inf:pres] indu foro se


= Cato

frumentum transferri, stercus transferri, stercus foras efferri, stercilinum fieri, semen purgari, funes sarciri, centones fieri, cucliones fieri, novos fieri, centones, cucliones familiam non oportuisse sarcire Cato (2).

C Per ferias potuisse fossas veteres tergeri, viam publicam muniri, viam publicam recidi, hortum fodiiri, pratum purgari, virgas vinciri, spinas runcari, expensi far munditias non oportuisse Cato (2).

C Cum servi aegrotarint, cibaria tanta dari non oportuisse Cato (2).

C Ubi ea cognita aequo animo sint, quae reliqua opera sint curare putare argentariam, frumentariam, pabuli causa parata sunt Cato (2).

C Quae opera fieri velit et quae locari velit, uti imperet et uti faciat Cato (3).

C Patrem familias vendacem, non emacem esse Cato (2).

C Aedificare diu cogitare oportet, conserere cogitare non oportet, sed facere oportet Cato (3).

C Ubi aetas accessit ad annos XXXVI, tum oportet Cato (3).

C Patrem familias villam rusticam bene aedificatam habere Cato (3).


Si helvolum vinum facere voles, dimidium helvoli, dimidium Apicii vini indito, defruti veteris partem tricesimam addito Cato (24).

Quom vinum coctum erit et quom legetur, facito uti servetur familiae primum suisque, facito studeas bene percoctum

Quom vinum coctum erit et quom legetur, facito uti servetur familiae primum suisque, facito studeas bene percoctum siccumque legere Cato (25).

Vindemia facta, vasa torcula, corbulas, fiscinas, funis, patibula, fibulas iubeto suo quidquid loco condi Cato (26).

Si voles de faece demere vinum, tum erit ei rei optimum tempus Cato (26).

Oleas, ulmos, ficos, poma, vites, pinos, cupressos cum seres, bene cum radicibus eximito cum terra sua quam plurima circumligato et uti ferre possis in alveo aut in corbula ferri iubeto Cato (28).

Vineas arboresque mature face incipias Cato (32).

Susum vsorsum, quod eius facere poteris vitis facito uti ducas Cato (32).

Vitem novellam resicari tum erit tempus, ubi valebit Cato (33).

Ubi vinea frondere coeperit, pampinato Cato (33).

Ubi uva varia fieri coeperit, vites subligato, pampinato uvasque expellito, circum capita sarito Cato (33).

In caldissimmis locis sementim postremum fieri oportet Cato (34).

Siliginem, triticum in loco aperto celso, ubi sol quam diutissime siet, seri Cato (35).

Hordeum, qui locus novus erit aut qui restibilis fieri poterit et qui locus restibilis crassitudine fieri poterit, seriti Cato (35).

Trimestre, quo in loco sementim maturam facere et qui locus restibilis crassitudine fieri poterit, seri spargere oportet Cato (35).

Stercus columbinum in pratum vel in hortum vel in segetem Cato (36).
fodere oportet (43).

C Olivetum diebus XV ante aequinoctium vernum incipito putare (44).

C Si parum deprimere poteris, malleo aut mateolo adigito (46).

C Si pecus deprimere poteris, voles putare, ter prius rescicato, quam ad arborem poneas (47).

C Simul herbae inceperint incipito (48).

C Vineam si in alium locum transferre incipias (50).

C Quae inrigiva non erunt, cum prata defendes, depurgato herbasque malas omnis radicitus effodito (50).

C Haec facito, antequam vineam fodere incipias (50).

C Ubi daps profanata comestaque erit, verno arare incipito (50).

C Ficum, oleam, malum Punicum, cotoneum aliaque mala omnia, laurum, murtum, nuces Praenestinas, platanum, haec omnia a capita propagari eximique serique eodem modo oportet (51).

C Quae diligentius propagari voles, in aullas aut in qualos pertusos propagari oportet, et cum iis in scrobem deferri oportet (52).

C Per fundum aut qualum ramum, quem radicem capere oportet, et si non laborabunt, pascantur satius erit, aut modium vinaceorum, quos in dolium condideris (54).
C Ubi verno dare [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj:indef] 
coeperis [ctrl:subj:begin:coep-], modium glandis aut vinaceorum dato aut 
modium lupini macerati et faeni P XV [__Cato:Agri] (54).
C Nihil [ctrl:sent] est quod magis expediat, quam boves 
C Boves [ecm:deontic::3rd:subj] nisi per hiemem, cum non arabunt, pasci 
(54).
C Nam viride cum edunt, semper id expectant, et fiscellas 
[ecm:deontic::3rd:obj] [ecm:deontic::3rd:subj:null] habere 
[ecm:deontic::inf:pres] oportet [ecm:deontic:oport-], ne herbam sectentur, 
cum arabunt [__Cato:Agri] (54).
coeperint [ctrl:subj:begin:coep-], panis P V, usque adeo dum ficos esse 
C Eos [ecm:deontic::3rd:obj] non est nimium [ecm:deontic:nim-] in annos 
singulos vini Q X [ecm:deontic::2nd:subj:null] ehibere 
C Postea oleas tempestivas, unde minimum olei fieri 
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] poterit [ctrl:subj::able:pot-], eas condito 
[__Cato:Agri] (58).
C Sculponias bonas [ecm:deontic::3rd:obj] alternis annis 
[ctrl:sent::unbound:3rd:subj:null] colere [ctrl:sent::inf:pres], bene 
[ctrl:sent::unbound:3rd:subj:null] arare [ctrl:sent::inf:pres], quid 
secundum, [ctrl:sent::unbound:3rd:subj:null] arare [ctrl:sent::inf:pres], 
quid tertium, [ctrl:sent::unbound:3rd:subj:null] stercorare 
C Cetera cultura est [ctrl:sent] multum [ctrl:sent::unbound:3rd:obj] 
diligenter eximere [ctrl:sent::inf:pres] semina [ctrl:sent::unbound:3rd:obj] 
et per tempus radices quam plurimas [ctrl:sent::unbound:3rd:obj] cum terra 
radices bene operueris, [ctrl:sent::unbound:3rd:obj:null:coord] 
ne aqua noceat [__Cato:Agri] (61).
C Quot iuga boverum, mulorum, asinorum habebis, totidem plostra 
C Funem torculum [ecm:deontic::3rd:subj] esse 
pedes LV [__Cato:Agri] (63).
[ecm:deontic::inf:pres:pass] oportet [ecm:deontic:oport-], quam minimum in 
terra et in tabulato [ecm:deontic::3rd:subj:null:coord] esse 
[aci:believe:cred-] oleum [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] in tabulato posse 
[aci::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj::able:pot-] crescere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] 
[__Cato:Agri] (64).
C Postea dolium calfacito minus, quam [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] si picare 
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] velis [ctrl:subj:want:velle], tepeat satis est 
[__Cato:Agri] (69).
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C Haec licet facere (138).
C Lucum conlucare Romano more sic oportet (139).
C Uti tibi ius est porco piaculo facere illiusce sacri coercendi (139).
C Si fodere voles, altero piaculo eodem modo facito, hoc amplius dicit (140).
C Agrum lustrare sic oportet (141).
C Impera suovitaurilia circumagi iussi (141).
C Ergo agrum, terram, suovitaurilia circumagi iussi (141).
C Utique tu fruges, frumenta, vineta virgultaque grandire beneque evenire siris [aci:::allow:sir-] (141).
C Nominare Martem neque agnum vitulumque (141).
C Vilici officia quae sunt, ea omnia quae in fundo fieri oportet quaeque emi pararique oportet (142).
C Hoc amplius, quo modo vilicam oportet et quo modo eae imperari (142).
C Scito dominum pro tota familia rem divinam facere (143).
C Farinam bonam et far suptile sciat (143).
C Oleam legendam hoc modo oportet (144).


Si caput aut cervices dolent, eo lotio caldo lavito, desinent [ctrl:subj::stop:desin-] dolore [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] [Cato:Agri] (157).


atque confidentiam


C Postea, ubi irata facta est, servum recepticium [ctrl:obj::inf:pres] sectori [ctrl:obj::inf:pres]

C Scio solere plerisque atque excellere atque superbiam atque ferociam atque prosperis animum

C Atque ego guidem arbitror Rodienses
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] nos [ecm:want::inf:pres], uti depugnatum est, neque regem Persem
C Sed non Rodienses modo id nolure, sed multis populos
[ctrl:subj::inf:perf] arbitror
[eci:deontic::inf:pass] arbitror
[eci:deontic::inf:pres] idem
C Libertatis suae causa in ea sententia fuisse
[eci:deontic::inf:cop] arbitror
[eci:deontic::inf:pres] idem
C Quod [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] illos idem
[ctrl:subj::inf:perf] facere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres], id
[ctrl:subj:allow:occup-] [__Cato:Or] (165)?
C Qui acerreme adversus eos dicit, ita dicit [eci:say:dic-],
C Ecquis est tandem, qui vestrorum, quod ad seae attineat,
[eci:deontic::inf:cop] aequum
[eci:deontic::inf:pass] censeat [eci:believe:cens-]
[eci:deontic::inf:pres] dare
[eci:deontic::inf:perf] [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] [__Cato:Or] (166)?
C Si quis illud [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj::inf:pass] male facere
[ctrl:subj:inf:pres] voluerit [ctrl:subj::want:velle], mille minus dimidium familiae multa esto,
si quis plus quingenta iugera
C Atque nos omnia plura [ctrl:subj::inf:pass] habere
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] volumus [ctrl:subj::want:velle], et id nobis impoene est
[ctrl:subj::inf:perf] [ctrl:subj::inf:perf] [ctrl:subj::inf:perf] [ctrl:subj::want:velle]
quid dicit [eci:say:dic-], neque fecit tamen, Rodiensibus obierit, quod non maleferunt, sed quia voluisse


C In adulterio uxorem tuam si prehendisses, sine iudicio inpoene necares, illa te [ctrl:subj::unbound:2nd:obj], si adulterares sive tu adulterarere, digito non auderet [ctrl:subj::dare:aud-] contingere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres], neque ius est [__Cato:Or] (222).

= De Baccanalibus
C Homines plous V oinvorsei virei atque mulieres sacra
[ctrl:subj::want:velle], neve inter ibei virei plous duobus, mulieribus plous
tribus arfuise [ctrl:subj::inf:perf:cop] velent [ctrl:subj::want:velle], nisi
de praitoris urbani senatuosque senetentiad, utei suprad scriptum est
[__Baccan] (19 22).
C Sei ques esent, quei arvorsum ead fecisent, quam suprad scriptum est, eis
rem caputalem faciendam [aci:::unbound:3rd:obj] [gerundive]
C Atque utei hoce in tabolam ahenam inceideretis, ita senatus
[aci:believe:cens-], uteique eam [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd:subj] figier
gnoscier [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] potisit [ctrl:subj::able:pot-] [__Baccan]
(25 27).
APPENDIX C. NOUN/ADJECTIVE INFLECTIONS

General note: Following both PIE and its contemporary daughter languages, early Latin nominals take identical inflections in the nominative and accusative cases within the singular or plural system for all [neuter] forms.

Common variants in early Latin are listed after a tilde (~); forms in parentheses are rare or restricted to only a few nouns. Some adjectival inflections differ slightly from those of nouns, which are shown below.

**FIRST DECLENSION** (mostly feminine, a few masculine)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-ae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>-ae ~ -ai&lt;sup&gt;93&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-ārum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>-ae ~ -ai</td>
<td>-īs (-ābus)&lt;sup&gt;94&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>-am</td>
<td>-ās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>-ā</td>
<td>-īs (-ābus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>93</sup> The archaic genitival –as is fossilized in *paterfamilias*, lit. ‘father of the family’.

<sup>94</sup> The alternative dative/ablative plural occurs only with two nouns, *dea* ‘goddess’ and *filia* ‘daughter’ to distinguish them from the otherwise identical forms of *deus* ‘god’ and *filius* ‘son’. From the earliest inscriptions it is apparent that –abus was the original first-declension form but later lost the /b/ and developed a compensatory long vowel.
SECOND DECLENSION (Mostly masculine and neuter, a few feminine [declined like masculine])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>-us ~ -os(^{95})</td>
<td>-um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>-ī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>-ō</td>
<td>-īs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>-um ~ -om</td>
<td>-ōs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>-ō</td>
<td>-īs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THIRD DECLENSION (Masculine, feminine, and neuter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>-(^{96})</td>
<td>-ēs (-ēs)(^{97})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>-is</td>
<td>-(i)um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-ibus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>-em (-im)</td>
<td>[same as nominative]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>-e (-ē)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{95}\) The variant endings -os and -om (accusative singular) are a hallmark of early Latin, disappearing by the classical period.

\(^{96}\) Unlike all other declensions, the third declension has no paradigmatic ending in the nominative singular.

\(^{97}\) The -ē ~ -ī variation and the presence or absence of /i/ in other endings depends on whether the stem ends in i-. I-stems take the /i/ variants.
**FOURTH DECLENSION** (Mostly masculine, a few feminine and neuter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>-us</td>
<td>-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>-ūs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>-ui</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>-um</td>
<td>-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>-ū</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIFTH DECLENSION** (Mostly feminine, a few masculine)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>-ēs</td>
<td>-ēi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>-ēi</td>
<td>-ērum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>-ēi</td>
<td>-ēbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>-em</td>
<td>-ēs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>-ē</td>
<td>-ēbus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Thus began her interest in systematically understanding Latin, and by high school she was able to begin formal study of that language. The initial reason for studying Latin was to learn more word roots, but the focus quickly expanded into understanding what the ancient Romans had to say about themselves, in their own language. Ms. Ross enjoyed Latin so much that she decided to major in it in college, and she received an undergraduate degree in Classics (a major in Latin and minor in Greek). Eventually she formalized those language studies by earning the Master of Arts degree in linguistics from Louisiana State University and plans to continue research in linguistics and Latin.