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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>First person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Second person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Third person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>Ablative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Accusative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcI</td>
<td><em>Accusativus cum Infinitivo</em> ‘accusative with infinitive’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgrO</td>
<td>Object agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgrOP</td>
<td>AgrO phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgrS</td>
<td>Subject agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgrSP</td>
<td>AgrS phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>Anaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>Complementizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPAR</td>
<td>Comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>Dative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPON</td>
<td>Deponent verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIMIN</td>
<td>Diminutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECM</td>
<td>Exceptional Case Marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Feminine gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>Future tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>Genitive case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Inflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERAT</td>
<td>Imperative mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERF</td>
<td>Imperfect tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEF</td>
<td>Indefinite pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFIN</td>
<td>Infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERROG</td>
<td>Interrogative (enclitic or free morpheme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSIF</td>
<td>Intensifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Inflection Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Locative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Masculine gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Neuter gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NcI</td>
<td><em>Nominativus cum Infinitivo</em> ‘nominative with infinitive’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>Nominative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>Participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>Passive voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>Perfect tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIE</td>
<td>Proto-Indo-European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUPERF</td>
<td>Pluperfect tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Perfect passive participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro</td>
<td>Understood subject or object, recoverable from agreement features and/or context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>Non-overt subject of control infinitival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q</strong></td>
<td>Questionizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REFLEX</strong></td>
<td>Reflexive pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REL</strong></td>
<td>Relative pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S</strong></td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBJ</strong></td>
<td>Subjunctive mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPER</strong></td>
<td>Superlative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T</strong></td>
<td>Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V</strong></td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VOC</strong></td>
<td>Vocative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VP</strong></td>
<td>Verb phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y/N</strong></td>
<td>Yes/no questionizer (enclitic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 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.

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.

![Figure 2: Checking Theory in the MP.](image)

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/tryed [PRO₁ to cross the Rubicon]
(9) Caesar, ordered the soldiers to [PRO₂ to cross the Rubicon]
(10) Caesar, told the soldiers [it was healthy [PRO₃ 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. Caesar, decided [PROi to cross the Rubicon]
b. *Caesar, decided [Caesar/he/him, to cross the Rubicon]

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

(13) a. Caesar, told the soldiersj [it was better [PROk to eat apples]]
b. *Caesar, 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’.

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 soldiers, [PRO, to cross the Rubicon]

(16) *It/There, told the soldiers, [it was better [PRO, 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) Cassandra, expected [(for) Zeus/(for) him/*PRO, 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]

Thematically, 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 [PROj to cross the Rubicon]
(24) Caesar allowed the soldiers [PROj 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 Pompeiaj [PROj to accept the divorce]

(26) Caesar, expected [Pompeiaj 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 [Pompeiaj 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]\(^2\)
    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-AcI 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] to accept the divorce
(34) *Caesar, found [PRO] to be a good role model
(35) *Caesar, understood [PRO] 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 θ-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 [\(t_1\) to be angry]
(41) The father, was likely [\(t_1\) 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 θ-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 [\(t_1\) 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 $\theta$-role (i.e. agent).

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

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

The inability of expletive it to act as subject in (45b) shows that try subcategorizes a $\theta$-role for its subject, while the acceptability of it in (44b) reveals the lack of a subject $\theta$-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$_i$ had promised [PRO$_i$ to cancel all debts$_j$]  
b. *Debts$_j$ had been promised [PRO$_i$ to cancel t$_j$]  
          b. It had been promised [PRO$_i$ to cancel all debts$_j$]
(47)  a. We believed [him to be in charge]  
    b. He was believed [tj to be in charge]  
    c. *It was believed [him to be in charge]  

(48)  a. We expected [him to call]  
    b. He was expected [tj to call]  
    c. *It was expected [him to call]  

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. *Caesari hoped [ej PROi to be killed tj by Caesarj]  

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

(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
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 consider 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).


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 *fuisset* ‘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 fuisset optumo]*

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><em>Bacch.</em></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>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>219,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,828</strong></td>
<td><strong>.017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

\[(54)\] Poti -n a me abeas, nisi me vis vomere?

POTI-2-M-ABL go away-2-S-SUBJ unless I-2-S-ACC wish-2-S vomit-INFIN

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

\[(55)\] Filium unicum adulcescentulum habeo – ah, quid dixi? –

SON-1-M-ACC son-M-ACC youth-M-ACC have-1-S-PERF ah INTERROG-N-S-ACC say-1-S-PERF

\[\text{[habere me], immo habui.}\]

HABERE-2-S-PERF habeo but have-1-S-PERF

‘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 double 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>amāvisse</td>
<td>amātus esse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>amāre</td>
<td>amāri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>amāturus esse</td>
<td>amātum iri</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 /r/ in both infinitival forms. Similarly, the long diphthong /ai/ become 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. canisNom/canaeAbl ‘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 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 (...).

\[(56) \quad \text{Ego } \left[\text{me } \text{ire...} \right] \text{ senibus } \left[\ldots \text{Sunium...} \right] \text{ dicam } \left[\ldots \text{ad mercatum,} \right] \]
\[
\text{[ancillulam emptum]} \text{ dudum quam dixit Geta.}
\]

‘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 {–nds} + ‘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 [edepol[12] quidem dormire solem].

‘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) *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) *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.
Table 7: Present-Tense Infinitive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowel Stem</th>
<th>Indicative</th>
<th>Infinitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ā</td>
<td>amō ‘I love’</td>
<td>amāre ‘to love’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ē</td>
<td>teneō ‘I keep’</td>
<td>tenēre ‘to keep’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>regō ‘I rule’</td>
<td>regere ‘to rule’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-i</td>
<td>capio ‘I take’</td>
<td>capere ‘to take’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ī</td>
<td>audio ‘I hear’</td>
<td>audīre ‘to hear’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ā</td>
<td>amāvi ‘I (have) loved’</td>
<td>amāvisse</td>
<td>‘to have loved’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ē</td>
<td>tenui ‘I (have) kept’</td>
<td>tenuisse</td>
<td>‘to have held’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>rexi ‘I (have) ruled’</td>
<td>rexisse</td>
<td>‘to have ruled’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-i</td>
<td>cepi ‘I (have) taken’</td>
<td>cepisse</td>
<td>‘to have taken’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ī</td>
<td>audīvi ‘I (have) heard’</td>
<td>audīvisse</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 *sumpisse > sumpse*, and /ss/ in *iussisse > iusse.\footnote{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 Stem</th>
<th>Participle</th>
<th>Infinitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ā</td>
<td>amātus ‘having been loved’</td>
<td>amāturus esse ‘to be about to love’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ē</td>
<td>tentus ‘having been kept’</td>
<td>tenturus esse ‘to be about to hold’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ō</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ī</td>
<td>audītus ‘having been heard’</td>
<td>audīturus esse ‘to be about to hear’</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 ero 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.\footnote{A thorough treatment of the periphrastic infinities and implications for agreement features is in Embick (2000).} 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>captos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td><em>captam</em></td>
<td>captas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuter</td>
<td><em>captum</em></td>
<td>capta</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.
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\(_{acc}\) + *ire* + supine\(_{acc}\). 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\(_{acc}\) + supine\(_{acc}\) + *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>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ā</td>
<td><em>amātus</em> ‘to love/loving’</td>
<td><em>amātum iri</em></td>
<td>‘to be about to be loved’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ē</td>
<td><em>tentus</em> ‘to keep/keeping’</td>
<td><em>tentum iri</em></td>
<td>‘to be about to be held’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td><em>rectus</em> ‘to rule/ruling’</td>
<td><em>rectum iri</em></td>
<td>‘to be about to be ruled’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-i</td>
<td><em>captus</em> ‘to take/taking’</td>
<td><em>captum iri</em></td>
<td>‘to be about to be taken’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ī</td>
<td><em>audītus</em> ‘to hear/hearing’</td>
<td><em>audītum iri</em></td>
<td>‘to be about to be heard’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{16}\) It does nonetheless occasionally occur in the passive, e.g. *Quidnam est, obsecreo 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 (Pieroni, 2000, p. 300), *ire* is thus available without ambiguity for this special use in the periphrastic infinitive.

---

\(^{16}\) It does nonetheless occasionally occur in the passive, e.g. *Quidnam est, obsecreo 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 (Pieroni, 2000, p. 300), *ire* is thus available without ambiguity for this special use in the periphrastic infinitive.
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]
OPL-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  tuli.
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 uxor em ‘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 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
      ‘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
      ‘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.
      ‘javelined’ 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

17 This is a transliteration of a Greek perfect passive participle; it is unclear whether its morpheme-by-morpheme (or even the composite) meaning was transparent to the typical Roman audience.
ingens specus.\textsuperscript{18}

huge-S-NOM cave-M-S-NOM

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

Servorum est festus dies hic quem plane
slave-M-PL-GEN be-3-S 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)

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.\textsuperscript{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]

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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] intellego, tanto, Antigona, magis [me... par] est [tibi]
   *how much*-N-S-ABL *more you*-S-ACC *that*-S-GEN measure-M-S-GEN be-INFIN understand-1-S
   *so much*-N-S-ABL Antigone-F-S-VOC *more I*-S-ACC equal-N-S-NOM be-3-S *you*-S-DAT

   *consulere et parcere*.
   *counsel-INFIN and spare-INFIN*

   ‘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.
   *because wine*-N-S-GEN *nothing-N-S-ACC carry toward*-PPP-N-ACC understand-1-S

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

(82) a. *Credidi* [silicernium eius me esse esurum].
   *believe*-1-S-PERF *funeral feast*-N-S-ACC *ANA*-M-S-GEN *I*-S-ACC be-INFIN eat- PART-FUT- M-S-ACC

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

b. *[Deum -que de consilio hoc itiner...] credo
   *god*-M-PL-GEN -and from advice-N-S-ABL *this*-N-S-ABL journey-N-S-ACC believe-1-S

   [...]conatum modo].
   *attempt*-PPP-M-S-ACC recently

   ‘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.
   *that*-M-S-NOM *ship*-F-S-ACC *safe*-F-S-ACC announce-3-S *or angry*-M-S-GEN *arrival*-M-S-ACC

---

20 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 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 [arfuise] velent.

‘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 it shouldn’t be far away, but it was far away from here.’ (Pl. Amph. 322)

(87) Hoc dolet, [med obesse], [ilos prodesse].

‘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>Copula – Perfect Passive</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copula – Perfect Deponent</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copula – 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 *esse*. The perfect-tense form *fuisse* is overt in 17 (100%) of 17 contexts, and the future forms *futurum esse* or *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 *esse* in 77 (42%) of 183 contexts. The perfect deponent, formed from the perfect (morphologically passive form but active/middle meaning) participle + *esse*, has the overt copula in 24 (52%) of 46 contexts. The future active infinitive, formed from the future active participle + copula, includes overt *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 *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.

---

21 The actual future infinitive of the copula is *fore*, but the periphrastic form *futurum* (the future active participle) + *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.

'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].

'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 *expediat*.

(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 st viro*.

‘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] st viro*.

‘through all you swear to god never me man’ (Pl. *Cas*. 561)
‘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...]
INTERROG-N-S-ABL people-M-S-ACC and city-F-S-ACC means-N-S-ABL save-INFIN

potisset
be able-3-S-IMPERF-SUBJ more Roman-F-S-ACC

‘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]
when see-2-S-FUT I- S-ACC carriage-N-S-ABL ride-S-ACC-PART lo home-F-S-ACC

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]?
here you-S-NOM aptly believe-2-S INDEF-M-S-ACC latrine-F-S-ABL seek-INFIN-PERF

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

(100) Adsimulabo [mei esse ebrium].
pretend-1-S-FUT I-S-ACC be-INFIN drunk-M-S-ACC

‘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) \[Quem \-nam te esse \] dicam?
INTERROG-M-S-ACC -for you-S-ACC be-INFIN say-1-S-FUT

‘Then who will I say you are?’ (Enn. Trag. 355)

(102) \[Alcumenam ante aedis stare saturam \] intellego.
Alcmena-F-S-ACC before wall-F-PL-ACC stand-INFIN full-F-S-ACC understand-1-S

‘I understand the pregnant Alcmena is standing in front of the house.’ (Pl. Amph. 667)

(103) \[Omnes cinaedos esse \] censes quia tu es?
all-M-PL-ACC lecher-ACC-M-PL be-INFIN believe-2-S because you-NOM be-2-S

‘Do you believe everyone is a lecher because you are?’ (Pl. Men. 513)

(104) \[Ne \[tibi me esse ob eam rem obnoxium \] reare.
not you-S-DAT I-ACC be-INFIN 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)

(105) \[At vereor cum \[te esse Alcmeonis fratrem \] factis
dedicat.
but fear-1-S since you-S-ACC be-INFIN Alcmeon-M-S-GEN brother-M-S-ACC deed-N-PL-ABL

give out-3-S

‘But I’m afraid, since he claims with facts that you’re Alcmeon’s brother.’ (Acc. Trag. 43)

(106) \[Pariter te esse erga illum \] video ut \[illum ted\22\]
equally you-S-ACC be-INFIN 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)

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

Ted is an allomorph of te, frequently occurring before a vowel or /h/. However, unlike English an, it is
not mandatory before a word beginning with a vowel, as shown by the sequence te esse in the first clause in (106).
Here the two variants can probably be attributed to poetic meter. (With a /d/, te esse would not elide into /tesse/, and
without the /d/ 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 te in the sentence. Notably, 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.’

(108) 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 AcI 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, decet [et facta 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) \[ Aio [te Aiacida Romanos vincere posse]. \]

\[ Aio (say-1-S) [te (you-S-ACC) Aiacida (son of Aeacus-M-S-ACC) Romanos (Roman-M-PL-ACC) vincere (conquer-INFIN) posse (be able-INFIN)]. \]

‘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) \[ Edico [vicisse Oresten]. \]

\[ Edico (announce-1-S) [vicisse (conquer-INFIN-PERF) Oresten (Orestes-M-S-ACC)]. \]

‘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) \[Flexa non falsa autumare\]

\[dictio Delphis solet.\]

‘The oracle at Delphi is accustomed to saying contorted [but] not false words.’ (Pac. 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) \textit{Philocomasium … quam in proxumo vidisse…} [aiebas] [...te osculantem atque amplexantem cum altero]

‘Philocomasium … whom you said you saw next door kissing and embracing some man’ (Pl. 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) \textit{Porro [eunuchum…]} dixti […velle te].

‘Then you said you wanted a eunuch.’ (Ter. Eun. 167)
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The meaning of (115) would be quite different if \textit{eunuchum} were the intended subject of the infinitive \textit{velle}. Although the irony in such meaning is exactly the lynchpin of the play’s plot, immediate context makes it clear that \textit{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 \textit{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) 
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Me -n} & \quad \text{hodie} & \quad \text{usquam} & \quad \text{convenisse} & \quad \text{te} & \ldots, & \text{audax, audes} & \ldots & \ldots \text{dicere}, \\
\text{I-S-ACC} & \quad \text{-Y/N} & \quad \text{ever} & \quad \text{meet-INFIN-PERF} & \quad \text{you-S-ACC} & \quad \text{daring-M-S-VOC} & \quad \text{dare-2-S} & \quad \text{say-INFIN} \\
\text{postquam} & \quad \text{advorsum} & \quad \text{mi} & \quad \text{imperavi} & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots \\
\text{after} & \quad \text{opposite} & \quad \text{I-S-DAT} & \quad \text{order-1-S-PERF} & \quad \text{COMP} & \quad \text{to here} & \quad \text{come-2-S-IMPERF-SUBJ} \\
\end{align*}
\]

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

In \textit{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) 
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Il’} & \quad \text{est} & \quad \text{miles meus} & \quad \text{erus}, & \quad \text{qui} & \quad \text{hinc} & \quad \text{ad} \\
\text{that-M-S-NOM} & \quad \text{be-3-S} & \quad \text{soldier-M-S-NOM} & \quad \text{my-M-S-NOM} & \quad \text{master-M-S-NOM} & \quad \text{REL-M-S-NOM} & \quad \text{from here to} \\
\text{forum} & \quad \text{abiit} & \quad \text{gloriosus} & \quad \text{impudens} & \quad \text{stercoreus} & \quad \text{plenus} \\
\text{forum-N-S-ACC} & \quad \text{go away-3-S-PERF} & \quad \text{boastful-M-S-NOM} & \quad \text{shameless-M-S-NOM-PART} & \quad \text{foul-M-S-NOM} & \quad \text{full-M-S-NOM} \\
\text{periuri} & \quad \text{atque} & \quad \text{adulteri}. & \text{Ait} & \quad \text{[se} & \quad \text{ultro} & \quad \text{omnis} & \quad \text{mulieres} \\
\text{perjury-N-S-GEN} & \quad \text{and} & \quad \text{adultery-N-S-GEN} & \quad \text{say-3-S} & \quad \text{REFLEX-ACC} & \quad \text{beyond} & \quad \text{all-F-PL-ACC} & \quad \text{woman-F-PL-ACC} \\
\text{sectarian}, & \quad \text{is} & \quad \text{deridiculo} & \quad \text{'st quaqua incedit omnibus} \\
\text{follow-INFIN} & \quad \text{ANA-M-S-NOM} & \quad \text{object of ridicule-N-S-DAT} & \quad \text{be-3-S} & \quad \text{wherever} & \quad \text{go in-3-S} & \quad \text{all-M-PL-DAT} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘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. \textit{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 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.

(118) *Nullo* -n *ego* Chremetis *pacto* adfinitatem
no-N-S-ABL -Y/N I- S-NOM Chremes-M-S-GEN means-N-S-ABL relationship by marriage-F-S-ACC

*effugere* potero?  
*flee from*-INFIN be able-1-S-FUT  
‘Will I be unable to flee a relationship by marriage with Chremes by any means at all?’  
(Ter. And. 245)

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

(119) *Nam ea* oblectat *spes* aerumnosum *hospitem* dum
for ANA-F-S-NOM please-3-S hope-F-S-NOM full of hardship-M-S-ACC stranger-M-S-ACC while

[[illud...] *quod* miser *esse* [...clam] essere *alteros*]
that-N-S-ACC REL-N-S-ACC wretched-M-S-NOM be-3-S in secret be-INFIN other-M-PL-ACC

censet.
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, chi) also accounts for some instances of non-linear word order, for example in (120) where the two infinitives *trahere* and *immittere* form the outer part of the X and the direct objects *classis* and *vela* form the inner part.

(120) *trahere* in *salam* *classis* et *vela* ventorum animae

26 The form of the infinitive *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.
‘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.  And there [osculantem meum hospitem cum ista hospita] 
vidisti?  
see-2-s-PERF

Scel.  Vidi (cur negem quod viderim?), sed [Philocomasium me vidisse] censui  
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-INFN-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><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>461</strong></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 hear-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-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 [...]ieium].
    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 ieiumum 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) \[
\text{[clanculum} \text{ te} \text{ [istaec flagitia facere]}...] \text{ censebat}
\]
\[
[...potis]?
\]

‘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) \begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{Quid} & \textit{ait} & \textit{tandem,} & \textit{Glycerium} & \textit{se} & \textit{scire} & \textit{civem} \\
INTERROG-N-S-ACC & say-3-S & at length & ANA-ACC & know-INFIN & citizen-F-S-ACC \\
\textit{esse} & \textit{Atticam}. \\
be-INFIN & Athenian-F-S-ACC
\end{tabular}

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

\section{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* |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
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 |
*polluceto.*
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-INFIN |

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

(130) *sacra* | *quae* | *[Cronia] esse* | *iterantur* | *{ab* |
sacrifice-N-PL-ACC | REL-N-PL-NOM | Cronia-N-PL-NOM | be-INFIN | repeat-3-PL-PASS | by |
illis}*ABL/*Ø iliisABL
that-PL-ABL

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

(131) *Illum* | *dics* | *cum* | *armis* | *aureis,* | *cuius* | *tu* | *legiones* |
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
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 |
*difflavisti* | *spiritu*ABL/*ex,ab spiritu*ABL.
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 Athena 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, Athena is clearly not the direct object of a verb (fugere ‘to flee’ is semantically incapable of taking an object³¹) even though Athena 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).

(132) Non ego [illam mi dotem...] duco [...esse...] quae
donot I-S-NOM that-F-S-ACC dowry-F-S-ACC lead-1-s be-INFIN REL-F-S-NOM
dos dicitur [...sed pudicitiam et pudorem et
dowry-F-S-NOM say-3-s-PASS but chastity-F-S-ACC and modesty-M-S-ACC and

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’ (< aблатум ‘carried away from’) as well as syncretism of 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.
‘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\(^\text{32}\), sic alia eodem 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.

\(^{32}\text{In translating his Greek sources, Varro inadvertently renders Greek αἰτιατικὴ = aitiatikē ‘effective, causative’ as accusativus instead of the semantically correct causativus. (The two words are related in the legal sense of a ‘cause’.) In the 6th century AD the Roman grammarian Priscianus corrected the terminology, but by then Varro’s had long become fixed in the grammatical lexicon. The original meaning is significant, as it refers to structural rather than inherent case assignment. In mistranslating the word, Varro changes the description to include only inherent case meanings.\)
‘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).
(134) *Appellandi partes sunt quattuor, e quis dicta a quibusdam provocabula quae sunt ut quis, quae; vocabula ut scutum, gladium; nomina ut Romulus, Remus; pronomina ut hic, haec. Duo media dicuntur nominatus; prima et extrema articuli. Primum genus est infinitum, secundum ut infinitum, tertium ut finitum, quartum finitum.*

‘The kinds of naming are four, of which the words that are like *quis, quae* ['which'] are called provocables by some; those like *scutum* ‘shield’ and *gladium* ‘sword’ are called vocables; those like *Romulus* and *Remus*, names; those like *hic, haec* ‘this’, pronouns. The two middle ones are called nouns; the first and last are articles. The first type is indefinite, the second is as if indefinite, the third is as if definite, the fourth definite.’

(Varro 8.45)

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,) *This/That 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}. *This/That 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 –e ending is unusual (note from Appendix C that it 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 *hunc) and hanc (instead of *hanc).

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></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) \[ Quid_i \quad illuc_i \quad est \quad quod_i \quad [med\ldots] \quad \{hisce \quad homines\}_j \]
INTERROG-N-S-NOM that-N-S-NOM be-3- S REL-N-S-ACC I-S-ACC this-M-PL-NOM human-M-PL-NOM

\[ [...insanire] \quad praeclantj? \]
be insane-INFIN say before-3-PL-SUBJ

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

(143) \[ lam \quad [hosj \quad -ce \quad absolutos]\] censeas_i.
now that-M-PL-ACC -INTENSIF loose from-PPP-M-PL-ACC believe-2- S-SUBJ

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

(144) \[ Sperabit_i \quad [sumptum_i \quad sibi\ldots] \quad senex_i \quad [...levatum\ldots] \quad esse \]
hope-3-S-FUT expense-M-S-ACC ANA-DAT old-M-S-NOM lighten-PPP-M-S-ACC be-INFIN

\[ harum_k \quad -c \quad abit\].
this-F-PL-GEN -INTENSIF departure-M-S-ABL

‘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) \[ \{Omnium \quad primum \quad iste \quad qui \quad sit \quad Sosia\}_i \quad \{hoc\}_i \]
all-N-PL-GEN first-N-S-ACC that-M-S-NOM INTERROG-M-S-NOM be-3-s-SUBJ Sosia-M-S-NOM this-N-S-ACC

dici] \quad volo.
say-INFIN-PASS want-1-S

‘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)  
\[
\textit{Sed} \quad \{\textit{Megadorus meus affinis}\}_i \quad \textit{eccum incedit}_i \quad \textit{a foro. lam hunc}_i \quad \textit{non ausim}_j \quad \textit{praeterire, quin consistam}_j
\]

\[\textit{et conloquar}_j, \quad \text{and speak with-1-S-SUBJ-DEPON}\]

‘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. \textit{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)  
\[
\textit{Davom}_j \quad \textit{video}_r \quad \textit{Nemo}_k \quad \textit{'st}_k \quad \textit{quem}_k \quad \textit{mallem}_i \quad \textit{omnium nam [hunc}_j...\] \quad \textit{scio}_i \quad \textit{[mea solide solum]}_j \quad \textit{gavisurum}_j
\]

\[\textit{gaudia}. \quad \text{joy-N-PL-ACC}\]

‘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. \textit{And.} 963-964)

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

(148)  
\[
\textit{haec erunt vilici officia. Disciplina bona utatur. Feriae serventur...}
\]

\[\textit{Discipline good-F-S-ABL use-3-S-SUBJ-DEPON}\]

‘These will be the overseer’s duties. He should use good discipline. The holy days should be observed.’ (Cato \textit{Agr.} V)

For the distal demonstrative *ille*, the probable PIE stem is *\textit{al-/ol-} ‘beyond’, also found in the Latin reflex *\textit{ultra}* (Buck, 1976, p. 225). Cognates includes English \textit{else} and \textit{eldritch}, as well as Latin *\textit{alio} ‘(an)other’ and Greek *\textit{\'al\'lo\'s} = \textit{allos} ‘other’, but apparently no other PIE.
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) \textit{Nimis demiror, Sosia, qui illaec [illic me]}  
\text{too much wonder at-1-S-DEPON Sosia-M-S-VOC how that-F-S-NOM there I-S-ACC}  
\text{donatum esse aurea patera] sciat, nisi tu dudum}  
\text{give-PPP-M-S-ACC be-INFIN golden-F-S-ABL bowl-F-S-ABL know-3-S-SUBJ unless you-S-NOM just now}  
\text{hanc convenisti et narravisti haec omnia,}  
\text{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></th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>ille</td>
<td>illa</td>
<td>illud</td>
<td>illī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>illīus</td>
<td></td>
<td>illōrum</td>
<td>illārum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>illī</td>
<td></td>
<td>ilŭs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>illum</td>
<td>illam</td>
<td>illud</td>
<td>illōs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>illō</td>
<td>illā</td>
<td>illō</td>
<td>illō</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) \textit{Ego -met mihi, non credo, quom [illaec] autumare illum]}  
\text{I-S-NOM -INTENSIF I-S-DAT not believe-1-S when that-N-PL-ACC say-INFIN that-M-S-ACC}  
\text{audio}  
\text{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) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quid</th>
<th>mihiₐ</th>
<th>melius</th>
<th>'st</th>
<th>quam,</th>
<th>quando</th>
<th>illiₐ</th>
<th>[meₐ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERROG-N-S-NOM</td>
<td>I-S-DAT</td>
<td>better-N-S-NOM</td>
<td>be-3-s</td>
<td>than</td>
<td>when</td>
<td>that-M-PL-NOM</td>
<td>I-S-ACC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*insanire* | praedicantₐ, | egoₐ | [medì...] | adsimulemₐ | [...insanire], | ut |

be insane-INFIN | say before-3-PL-SUBJ | I-S-NOM | I-S-ACC | pretend-1-S-SUBJ | be insane-INFIN | COMP |

*illosₐ | a | meₐ | absterreamₐ? |

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) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aut</th>
<th>illudₐ</th>
<th>falsumₐ</th>
<th>'st</th>
<th>[quodₐ</th>
<th>volgo...]</th>
<th>audioₐ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>that-N-S-NOM</td>
<td>deceive-PPP-N-S-NOM</td>
<td>be-3-s</td>
<td>REL-N-S-ACC</td>
<td>crowd-M-S-ABL</td>
<td>hear-1-s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[...dicī], | [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) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cliniamₐₐ</th>
<th>oratₐ</th>
<th>sibiₐ</th>
<th>uti</th>
<th>idₕ</th>
<th>nunc</th>
<th>detₐₐ</th>
<th>[illamₐₐ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cliniam-M-S-ACC</td>
<td>beg-3-s</td>
<td>ANA-DAT</td>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>ANA-N-S-ACC</td>
<td>now</td>
<td>give-3-S-SUBJ</td>
<td>that-F-S-ACC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

illiₜ | tamen | post | daturamₜₑ |

that-M-S-DAT | however | afterward | give-PART-FUT-F-S-ACC |

‘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) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quae</th>
<th>illi</th>
<th>ad</th>
<th>legionem</th>
<th>facta</th>
<th>sunt</th>
<th>memorat</th>
<th>{pater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REL-N-PL-NOM</td>
<td>there to</td>
<td>legion-F-S-ACC</td>
<td>do-PPP-N-PL-NOM</td>
<td>be-3-pl</td>
<td>tell-3-s</td>
<td>father-M-S-NOM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

meusₜ,i | Alcumenae, | Illaₐ | [illum,... | censet | [...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) *iloc* encodes the speaker’s stance toward the manner of joking.

(158)  
\[ \text{Solet } iocari \text{ saepe me -cum illoc modo.} \]  
\text{be accustomed-3-S joke- INFIN-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)  
\[ \text{Num}^{33} \{\text{vetus ille Cato}\} [\text{lacessisse}] \text{ conscius non} \]  
\text{old-M-S-NOM that-M-S-NOM Cato-M-S-NOM provoke-INFIN-PERF aware-M-S-NOM not}  
\text{erat ipse sibi?}  
\text{be-3-S-IMPERF INTENSIF-M-S-NOM ANA-DAT}  

‘Surely 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)  
\[ \text{Hinc ego et huc et illuc potero quid agant arbitrarier.} \]  
\text{from here I- S-NOM and to here and to there be able-1-S-FUT INTERROG-N-S-ACC do-3-PL-SUBJ}  
\text{think-INFIN-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)  
\[ \text{Ego ad forum illum conveniam atque illi hunc} \]  
\text{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’.
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><em>iste</em></td>
<td><em>ista</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td><em>istīus</em></td>
<td><em>istōrum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td><em>istī</em></td>
<td><em>istī</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td><em>istum</em></td>
<td><em>istam</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td><em>istō</em></td>
<td><em>istā</em></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.
‘Amphitryon, I hoped that [wife] of yours was going bear you a son, but she’s not pregnant with a boy.’ (Pl. Amph. 718-719)

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’ + ἄιτος ‘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)
Iam quidem hercle ego tibi istam scelestam, scelus, linguam abscidam.

‘Now I swear I’ll cut off that evil tongue of yours, you scoundrel.’ (Pl. Amph. 556-557)

Like the other two demonstratives, iste also has the form with the intensifying suffix –c.

In (166) the negative connotation of istuc is made explicit.

Vi in istuck tibi...], etsi incredibilek ’stk, [...credere]?

‘Do you want me to believe you about that, even though it’s unbelievable?’ (Ter. Heau. 624)

Similarly, in (167) istoc is explicitly linked to shame.

Non tei pudet [PROi prodire in conspectum meum...], {flagitium hominis}i, [...cum istoc i ornatu]?

‘Aren’t you ashamed, you disgrace of a man, to come into my sight with that clothing?’ (Pl. Men. 708-709)

Other examples with a clearly disdainful connotation of istuc are in (168-169).

Qui [istuci...] in mentem ’st tibi, [...ex mek...].

‘How has it entered your mind, my husband, to question that of me?’

[ecquid...] audesi [...de tuo, istucri] addere]?

‘Do you dare add something of yours from your own?’ (Pl. Men. 149)

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 it 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.

\[
\text{(170) Quae illi ad legionem facta sunt memorat ipater meus, Alcumenae, Illa illum censet virum suum esse quae cum moecho est.} \\
\text{My father is telling Alcmena what happened to the troops there. She believes he is her husband, when in fact she’s with an adulterer.’ (Pl. Amph. 133-135)}
\]

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>this</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>that</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>mīhi</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>tuī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>tībi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>tē(d)</td>
<td></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

\textit{nemo horum familiarium} and \textit{vos} ‘you’, the audience.

\textbf{(172)} \\

\textit{Ea signa nemo horum familiarium videre} \hspace{1cm}
\textit{poterit: verum vos videbitis.}

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

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

\textbf{(173)} \\

\textit{Atque ego quoque etiam, qui Iovis sum filius, contagione mei patris metuo malum.}

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

\textbf{(174)} \\

\textit{Age i tu secundum.}

‘Go on, you go behind.’ (Pl. \textit{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.

\textbf{(175)} \\

\textit{Ego \[ mei iniuriam i \] fecisse filiae \[ \ldots \] fateor i [ ...tuaex \]} \hspace{1cm}
\textit{Cereis vigiliis per vinum atque impulus adolescentiae].}

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

\textbf{(176)} \\

\textit{Ego \[ mei amare hanc \] fateor \[ \ldots \]} \hspace{1cm}

‘I confess I love her.’ (Ter. \textit{And.} 896)

An emphatic effect also occurs with the second-person pronouns \textit{tu} and \textit{te} in (177).
Tu ire deisidem......residem...hac esse.

‘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.

Ego non pecasse plane ostendam aut poenas

’s I 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.

Tu ade...Sosiam...dicere,

‘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*.

Deinde ego met [PRO me -cum cogitare] intervias occepi.

‘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*.

Scis tibi...facta velle me...quae tu velis

‘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 Pyrgopolynices.
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 dicit 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\textsubscript{i} was a prolific playwright. He\textsubscript{i} wrote comedies adapted from Greek models but set in contemporary Roman culture.

(185) We bought \{two pizzas\}\textsubscript{i} and ate them\textsubscript{i} 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\textsubscript{i} was a prolific playwright, but Terence\textsubscript{j} wrote only about six plays. Some people prefer him\textsubscript{i}/j, but others find his\textsubscript{i}/j,\*i/#i,\*j 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></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</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>* eius*</td>
<td><em>eōrum</em></td>
<td><em>eārum</em></td>
<td><em>eōrum</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></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 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) \[ \text{Qui}_i \text{ eorum non ita iuraverit, quod is}_i \text{ legerit omne} \]
\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{INDEF-M-S-NOM} & \text{ANA-M-PL-GEN} & \text{not} & \text{thus} & \text{swear-PERF-SUBJ} & \text{REL-N-S-ACC} & \text{ANA-M-S-NOM} \\
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{gather-3-S-PERF-SUBJ} & \text{all-N-S-ACC} & \text{for} & \text{ANA-N-S-ABL} & \text{silver-N-S-ACC} & \text{no one-M-S-NOM} & \text{give-3-S-FUT} \\
\end{array}
\]

neque debetur.

nor owe-3-S-FUT-PASS

‘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) \{ \text{Donicum pecuniam solverit aut satisfecerit aut deligarit,} \}
\[
\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}
\text{until} & \text{money-F-S-ACC} & \text{pay-3-S-PERF-SUBJ} & \text{or} & \text{satisfy-3-S-PERF-SUBJ} & \text{or} & \text{assign-3-S-PERF-SUBJ} \\
\text{pecus et familia, quae illic erit, pigneri sunt} \}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}
\text{cattle-N-S-NOM} & \text{and} & \text{household-F-S-NOM} & \text{REL-F-S-NOM} & \text{there} & \text{be-3-S-FUT} & \text{pledge-N-S-DAT} & \text{be-3-PL-SUBJ} \\
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}
\text{Siquid de \{iis rebus\}_i controversiae erit, Romae} \\
\text{anything-N-S-NOM} & \text{from} & \text{ANA-F-PL-ABL} & \text{affair-F-PL-ABL} & \text{controversy-F-S-DAT} & \text{be-3-S-FUT} & \text{Rome-F-S-LOC} \\
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}
\text{iudicium fiat.} & \text{judgment-N-S-NOM} & \text{become-3-S-SUBJ} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘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) \[ \text{Ibi ex oraclo voce divina edidit Apollo}_i \]
\[
\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}
\text{there out of} & \text{oracle-N-S-ABL} & \text{voice-F-S-ABL} & \text{divine-F-S-ABL} & \text{give out-3-S-PERF} & \text{Apollo-M-S-NOM} \\
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}
\text{[puerum, ...] primus}_k & \text{Priamo}_j & \text{qui}_k & \text{foret}_k & \text{post -illa} \\
\text{boy-M-S-ACC} & \text{first-M-S-NOM} & \text{Priam-M-S-DAT} & \text{REL-M-S-NOM} & \text{be-3-S-IMPERF-SUBJ} & \text{after -THAT-N-PL-ACC} \\
\end{array}
\]
'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)

'(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)

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*.38

---

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 *greg* ‘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. Amphitryon 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).

Intro abi, ergo et, si isti est mulier, [eam,...]

iube, [...cito domum transire] atque haec ei.

dice, say-2-S-IMPERAT

'So go inside and, if the woman is there, order her to go home right away and say these things to her.' (Pl. Mil. 255-258)

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.

[Me tibi istuc aetatis homini facinora puerilia]

obicere, neque te decora neque tuis virtutibus],

[ea te expetere ex opibus summis mei]

[ea te facere facinora], [quaes istaec...] aetas

[pudet [...me tibi in senecta obicere sollicitudinem].
'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) \[Mitto_i \quad \text{iam} \quad [\text{osculari} \quad \text{atque} \quad \text{amplexari}]], \quad [id_j \quad \text{nil}]\]

\[\text{puto}_i.\]

‘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) \{\text{Flagitium} \quad \text{hominis}\}_i \quad \text{qui}_i \quad \text{dixit}_i \quad \text{mihi} \quad [\{\text{suam} \quad \text{uxorem}\}_j]

\[\text{hanck}_k \quad \text{arcessituram}_j \quad \text{esse}_j, \quad \text{ea}_j \quad [\text{se}_j \quad \text{eamk}_j...] \quad \text{negat}_j\]

\[\text{[...morarier].}\]

‘[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></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>suī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>sibi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>sē(sē)39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>sē(sē)</td>
<td></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 *se* 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 scies 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) \[\text{Donec cum tonitru voce missa ex aethere [adulterum,} \]
then with thunder voice sent out of upper air adulterer

\[\text{se,} \]
*se*

\[\text{Iuppiter,} \]
*Jupiter*

\[\text{confessus,} \]
*confess*

\[\text{est,} \]
*be*

‘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) \[\text{Ait, [pro, tibi uxorem dare hodie].} \]
say you give wife today

‘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) \[\text{Chremes, qui, [denegarat, [se, commissurum, mihi,} \]
Chremes REL deny for me

\[\text{[gnatam suam, uxorem, id, mutavit, quom,} \]
offspring own wife change when

\[\text{immutatum, videt,?} \]
not change see

‘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) \[\text{Verum hercle opinor, [fuisse Phaniam, hoc, certo scio,} \]
but indeed think be for certain know

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

"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 se.

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

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

'as the young would aim to please you rather than themselves.' (Ter. Heau. 51-52)
Lucius-M-S-GEN Manlius- M-S-GEN nor other-M-S-ACC INDEFIN-M-S-ACC own-M-S-ABL

trick-M-S-ABL bad-M-S-ABL olive oil-N-S-ACC nor olive- F-S-ACC steal-INFIN-PERF

‘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 filios sibi 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) pro$_i$-subj pro$_j$-obj [orare pro$_k$] iussit$_i$, [si se$_i$ ames$_k$], 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.
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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) \( I_i \) \( \text{go-2-S-IMPERAT} \) \( \text{si} \) \( \text{wish-2-S} \) \( iube_i \) \( \text{order-2-S-IMPERAT} \) \( \text{pro}_j \) \( \text{[transire] go across-INFIN} \) \( \text{huc to here} \) [\( \text{quantum as much as} \) \( \text{possit}_j \)], \( \text{se}_j \) \( \text{ut} \) \( \text{videant}_k \) \( \text{domi home-F-LOC} \) \( \text{familiares}_k \).

‘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) \( \{ \text{Hanc} \) \( \text{transitive-F-ACC} \) \( \text{fidem} \) \( \text{faith-F-ACC} \) \( \text{sibi} \) \( \text{ANA-DAT} \) \( \text{mei}_j \) \( \text{plead-3-S-PERF} \) \( \text{qui how} \) \( \text{se}_i \) \( \text{sciret} \) \( \text{know-3-S-IMPERF-SUBJ} \) \( \text{[pro}_j\text{-obj]} \) [\( \text{non not} \) \( \text{deserturum}_j \) \( \text{[...ut give-1-S-IMPERF-SUBJ darem}_j \)].

‘[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) \( \text{pro}_i \) \( \text{dixit}_i \) \( \text{say-3-S-PERF} \) [\( \text{a by} \) \( \text{decem-viris ten -man-PL-ABL} \) \( \text{parum too little} \) \( \text{bene well} \) \( \text{sibi}_i \) \( \text{ANA-DAT} \) \( \text{foodstuff-PL-ACC cibaria}_j \) \( \text{[curata}_j \text{take care of-PPP-PL-ACC] esse be-INFIN} \).

‘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) \( \text{Primores}_j \) \( \text{procerum first-PL-ACC chief-PL-GEN} \) \( \text{provocavit}_i \) \( \text{call forth-3-S-PERF} \) \( \text{nomine name-N-ABL si if} \) \( \text{esset}_k \) \( \text{be-3-S-IMPERF-SUBJ} \) \( \text{quis}_k \) \( \text{QUI} \) \( \text{[se}_i \text{-cum... wish-3-S-IMPERF-SUBJ vellet}_k \text{decide-INFIN} \) \( \text{...cernere].} \)
'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$_i$ [te$_j$ scire [se$_i$ redisse]] etiam et tuom

conspectum fugitat$_i$.

‘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 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>3 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interjection</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Control</td>
<td>12 86%</td>
<td>2 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Control</td>
<td>3 18%</td>
<td>14 82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal Control</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>4 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentential Control</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Control ~ ECM</td>
<td>22 71%</td>
<td>9 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal ECM</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic ECM</td>
<td>5 56%</td>
<td>4 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcI</td>
<td>125 78%</td>
<td>35 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>152 76%</td>
<td>48 24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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 AcI 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 [sese esse Atticum].*

\[
\text{there I-S hear-1- S-PERF out of that- M-S-ABL ANA-ACC be- INFIN Athenian- M-S-ACC}
\]

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

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

\[
\text{when appearance-F-S-NOM be-3-S this-M-S-GEN in I-S-ABL decide-PPP-N-S-NOM human-M-S-ACC trick-INFIN}
\]

‘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, proi.

at the same time grass-F-PL-NOM begin-3-PL-FUTPERF be born-INFIN-DEPON take out-2-S-IMPERAT-FUT

‘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

thus-Y/N at length ask-1-S likewise as prostitute-F-S-ACC when abuse-PPP-DEPON-M-S-NOM be-2-S-SUBJ fee-F-S-ACC give-INFIN law-F-S-NOM order-3-S ANA-DAT and

amittere proj?

‘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) pro1 negas1 [pro1 novisse me1], negas1 [pro1 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) [{Manium Manilium1}j Persiumk -ve haec1 legere] nolo1,

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

(225) [{Manium Manilium1}j Persiumk -ve haec1 legere] nolo1,

‘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) Tibi1 ita hoc1 videtur1, at ego1 [non posse...] arbitrork

‘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 pro1 sine1 igitur, si pro1 [tuom... negas1 [...me1 essi], [PROi abire liberum].

‘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.
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.

(229) \( \text{Granius}_1 \) autem \([\text{pro}_1 \ non \ contemnere \ se_1] \) et \([\text{pro}_1 \ reges}_j \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pro</th>
<th>esse</th>
<th>putare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prok</td>
<td>out of rain cloud—M-S-ABL</td>
<td>south-DIMINUT-M-PL-ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro</td>
<td>know-INFIN-PERF</td>
<td>nor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro</td>
<td>know-INFIN-PERF</td>
<td>nor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘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 iusₗ ignotₗ neque proᵢ-subj proᵢ-obj *tenant.*

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

Since the two verbs *ignotₗ* and *tenant* 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 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 *tua uxor* and subsequently only with subject pro.

(231) B: *Sed* \{tua morosa\}_i -ne uxor₁ quaeso est?

A: *Va!* *Rogas*?

B: *Qui* tandem?

A: *Taedet* mentionis quae₁ mihi ubi domum adveni, adsedi, extemplo savium dat₁ ieiuna anima.

B: *Proᵢ-subj* nil peccat₁ de savio; *ut* devomas proᵢ-subj

‘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 paterj Isi peregre

missusj redimit ancillamk hospitis amore captusj prok-obj

advehitj proj-subj nave exilitj paterj advolatj vix

proj-subj {visam ancillamj}k deperitj Cuius prok-subj sitk

proj-subj percontaturj

‘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...] voloij [...]tej [proj esse adsimulare].

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

(234) Nunc [{equos iunctos}k...] iubesij [...]PROj capere...] mej
untamed-M-PL-ACC wild-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**, ... **pater**, [...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;
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** [me], **perbitere**, [pro] **illis**, opitularier {quovis exitio}
for I-S-ACC perish-INFIN that-M-PL-DAT aid-INFIN-PERF INDEFIN-N-S-ABL death-N-S-ABL

desire-1-S while be useful-1-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}**, ita {magnus moechus}1, mulierum est,
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
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‘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) [Bubus] pabulum hoc modo parari proi
cattle fodder this manner prepare

dari-que oportet.
give-and be fitting

‘It is fitting for fodder to be prepared in this manner and [for fodder] to be given to the cattle.’ (Cato Agr. 54)

(240) Ecce, Apollo, denuo me iubes [PRO facere impetum in]
behold Apollo anew I order make attack

eum qui stat atque proi.
ANA REL stand and him

‘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)

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 proi
say I here town be unwilling and

adservari verum [aliquo pacto verba me his]
oppose but INDEFIN means word this

daturam esse et proi venturam.
give and come

‘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 et caecam perhibent]
fortune insane blind maintain

philosophi saxo -que proi instare in praedicant
philosopher stone and stand in say before

[...volubileis], quia quo [id saxum] m inpulerit fors
rollable because to where stone set motion chance
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'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, i med i esse neque med i falsum dicere*.  
through Jupiter-M-S-ACC swear-1-S I- S-ACC be-INFIN nor I- S-ACC deceive-PFP-N-S-ACC say-INFIN

‘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 aspicio, gaudeo*.  
and since you-S-ACC heavy-F-S-ACC and since you-S-ACC beautifully full-F-S-ACC perceive-1-S rejoice-1-S

‘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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject Control</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Object Control</strong></td>
<td>215</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impersonal Control</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deontic Control</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sentential Control</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>273</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject Control ~ ECM</strong></td>
<td>226</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impersonal ECM</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deontic ECM</strong></td>
<td>286</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AcI</strong></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>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,630</strong></td>
<td><strong>806</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,436</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overt</td>
<td>Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>0 50%</td>
<td>0 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interjection</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Control</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Control</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>29 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal Control</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>9 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic Control</td>
<td>1 50%</td>
<td>1 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentential Control</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>2 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
<td>41 98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject Control ~ ECM
- **Subject Control**
  - 0 0%
  - 27 100%
- **Impersonal ECM**
  - 0 0%
  - 1 100%
- **Deontic ECM**
  - 2 3%
  - 62 97%
  - 64
- **AcI**
  - 8 8%
  - 87 92%
  - 95
  - 10 5%
  - 177 95%
  - 187

TOTAL 11 5% 229 95% 240

(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.* 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
correspondence, 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\textsubscript{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) \textit{Iam, pro\textsubscript{1-obj} amabo, desiste, [ludos facere] atque i,}
\textit{hac me -cum semul.}
\textit{now love-1-S-FUT stop-2-S-IMPERAT game-M-PL-ACC do-IMFIN and go-2-S-IMPERAT}
\textit{this-F-S-ABL I-S-ABL -with right away}

‘Now please stop playing games and come this way with me right away.’ (Pl. \textit{Men}. 405)

(248) \textit{An, pro\textsubscript{obj} amabo, meretrix illa est quae illam sustulit?}
\textit{but love-1-S-FUT prostitute-F-S-NOM that-F-S-NOM be-3-S REL-F-S-NOM that-F-S-ACC}
\textit{sustulit?}
\textit{carry away-3-S-PERF}

‘But please, is that the prostitute who kidnapped her?’ (Pl. \textit{Cis}. 564)

(249) \{\textit{Phaedrome mi\textsubscript{i}, ne plora, pro\textsubscript{obj} amabo. Tu\textsubscript{i}, me}
\textit{Phaedromus-M-S-VOC my-M-S-VOC not cry-2-S-IMPERAT love-1-S-FUT you-S-NOM I-S-ACC}
\textit{curato, ne sitiam, ego tibi, quod amas, iam huc}
\textit{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}
\textit{adducam.}
\textit{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. \textit{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) \textit{Meruimus et ego et pater pro\textsubscript{obj} de vobis et re publica.}
\textit{earn-1-PL-PERF and I-S-NOM and father-M-S-NOM from you-PL-ABL and affair-F-S-ABL.
public-F-S-ABL}
‘We – my father and I – have earned [something] from you and from the republic.’ (Pl. Amph. 39-40)

(251) \{**Ea signa**\}_i nemo horum familiairium videre

poterit: verum vos pro_{obj} videbitis.

‘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 *meruimus* ‘we have deserved’ subcategorizes for a direct object. Pro in (251) is linked to the overt NP *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 *me* in example (252).

(252) **Alii**_i [me_{j}... negant_{i} [...eu_{m}_{j} esse] qui_{i} sum_{j} atque

excludunt_{i} pro_{j} foras.

‘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) ne quom hic non videant_{i} me_{j} [pro_{j} conficere...] credant_{i}

[...argentum suom]_{k}

‘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><strong>Subject Control</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Object Control</strong></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impersonal Control</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deontic Control</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sentential Control</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject Control ~ ECM</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impersonal ECM</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deontic ECM</strong></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AcI</strong></td>
<td>334</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historical</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interjection</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partial</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(254) Quem_j metuunt_j pro_j oderunt_i, quem_i quisque_k odi_t_k [pro_i]
periisse expetit_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}_i si prehendisses_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_j necares_i, illa_j te_n si adulterares_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_i adulterareres_i [digito...] non auderet_i
if -or you-S-NOM commit adultery-2-S-IMPERF-SUBJ-PASS finger-M-S-ABL NOT dare-3-S-IMPERF-SUBJ
[..contingere], neque tus est.
touch-INFIN nor 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_i, {mea Antiphila}_i, laudo_i et [pro_i fortunatam_i]
deed you-S-ACC my-F-S-VOC Antiphila-F-S-VOC praise-1-S and make fortunate-PPP-F-S-ACC
‘I praise you indeed, my Antiphila, and I deem [you] fortunate.’ (Ter. Heau. 381)

‘He turns himself into Amphitrion’s shape, and all the servants who see [him] believe him to be [Amphitryon].’ (Pl. Amph. 121-122)

‘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_.

‘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)
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 proobj. 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.

‘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 Acl complement
clauses having a [- definite] continuous topic. In (262), the indefinite *quicquavm* ‘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>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>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>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL                   | 111 97%           | 4 3%      | 115  |

(262) *Di im mej perdant si ego tua quicquavm abstuli.*

‘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 egredior neque tam vespri domum revertor quin [te in fundo] conspicer fodere pro 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) Utinam [efficere pro] quod quod pro efficiere pollicitus possies.
would that do REL-N-S-ACC promise-PPP-N-S-NOM be able-2-S-IMPERF-SUBJ

‘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) [Illum mi... aequius... 'st [...quam me il... quae...
that-M-S-ACC I-S-DAT fair-COMPAR-N-S-NOM be-3-S than I-S-ACC that-M-S-DAT wish-1-S-ACC wish-1-S-FUT

‘It’s more fair for him to yield to me than for me to [yield] to him what I want.’ (Pl. Cas. 265)

(266) Si [mihi... perget... [...pro... quae... volt... [...dicere], ea
if I-S-DAT continue-3-S-FUT REL-N-PL-ACC wish-3-S say-INFIN ANAL-N-PL-ACC

‘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) Nam [quod... conabar... cum interventum est, [...dicere]
for REL-N-S-ACC try-1-S-IMPERF-DEPON when come between-PPP-N-S-NOM be-3-S say-INFIN

nunc pro expedibo.
now pro 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) $Roget_{ij} \{quin operis_j \} \{factum_j, \} \{qui_k \}$

ask-3-S-SUBJ INTERROG-N-NOM work-N-GEN be-3-S-SUBJ do-PPP-N-NOM INTERROG-N-NOM

restet_k, satis-ne temperi opera_t sient_l confecta_k
remain-3-S-SUBJ enough -Y/N time-N-LOC work-N-PL-NOM be-3-PL-SUBJ complete-PPP-N-PL-NOM

possit_m -ne quae_n reliqua_n sient_n [pro_n conficere].
be able-3-S-SUBJ -Y/N REL-N-PL-NOM remaining-N-PL-NOM be-3-PL-SUBJ complete-INFIN

‘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) $Contraxisit_j \{frontem, quia \} \{tragoediam..., dixit \} \{...futuram, hanc\}?$
draw together-2-S-PERF front-M-S-ACC because tragedy-F-S-ACC say-3-S-PERF be-INFIN-FUT this-F-S-ACC

Deus sum, pro_i commutavero.
god-M-S-NOM be-1-S change-1-S-FUT-PERF

‘Are you frowning because he said this would be a tragedy? I’m a god; I’ll change [it].’

(Pl. Amph. 52-53)

(270) $\{\{Trapetos bonos privos\}_i \} \{inparis_j \}_i \{esse\}_i \{oportet, si \}$

orbes_j contribit_j sient_j_[pro_j commutare] possis_k.
wheel-M-PL-NOM wear out-PPP-M-PL-NOM be-3-PL-SUBJ COMP exchange-INFIN be able-2-S-SUBJ

$^{44}$ 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 *tragediam* ‘tragedy’ is an Acc 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) *trapetos 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><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,828</strong></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 d be-3-S-SUBJ or b

‘It doesn’t much matter whether there’s a <d> or <b> in *abbibere* [‘to drink from’ vs. *adbibere* ‘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 quaebras*

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
atque labores.\textsuperscript{45} And work-s-SUBJ

‘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 \textbf{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.

(274) pro\textsubscript{i} consiti\textsubscript{t}it\textsubscript{i} cognovit\textsubscript{i} sensit\textsubscript{i} conlocat\textsubscript{i} sese\textsubscript{i} in locum celsum, hinc manibus rapere raudus saxeum grande et grave.

‘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 \textit{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 i46 Chremes i postridie ad mei clamitans, [indignum venit] i

facinus j 

comperisse Facinus 

Pamphilum pro uxore habere hanc。

Peregrinam j 

Ego j Illicita j sedulo negare factum.

‘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 i aggreditur i Romana i ruinas j

populi secundo.

‘The Roman legion approaches the ruins, soon [it] takes away the houses, with the shout of the people behind [it].’ (Enn. Ann. 242-243)

---

46 *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, 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, Mysis dum exeo, parumper opperire hic.

‘You, Mysis, wait here a little while until I come out.’ (Ter. And. 714)

(281) At tu ut oculos emungare ex capite per nasum.

‘But wipe your eyes out of your head through your nose.’ (Pl. Cas. 390).

(282) Sorba in sapa condere vel pro siccare, arida.

‘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], esse in animo, inscitiam!*

‘O Jupiter, for there to be such ignorance in [someone’s] mind!’ (Ter. *And.* 244)

(284) *[Tantum bellum suscitare... conari adversarios], [bellosum genus]!*

‘For the enemy to try to stir up such a war against a warlike race!’ (Caec. *Fab.* 277-278)

(285) *Nos, esse arquatos!*

‘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}, [ancillam], aere emptam sux!*

‘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}, [cum ista], -ci -n te oratione!*
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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) \[Te_i \text{-}ne \ istuc_j \text{-}loqui\!\]

you-S-ACC -Y/N that-N-S-ACC say-INFIN-DEPON

‘For you to say that!’ (Ter. Heau. 921)

(289) \[Me_i \text{-}n \text{ servasse } \text{pro}_{j} \text{ut } qui_{j} \text{me}_{i} \text{ perderent}_{i}\!\]

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) \[Sici-ne me_i \text{ atque illam}_{j} \text{\{opera tua\}_k} \text{nunc miseros}_{i+j}\!\]

thus - Y/N I-S-ACC and that-F-S-ACC work-F-S-ABL your-F-S-ABL now wretched-M-PL-ACC

sollicitari\!]!

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) \[Servo_{k} \text{-}n \text{\{fortunas meas\}_j} \text{me}_{i} \text{comisisse futtili}_{k}\!\]


‘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) \[Adeo_j \text{-}n \text{ingenio}_{k} \text{esse duro}_{k} \text{te}_{i} \text{atque inexorabili}_{k} \text{\{ut neque misericordia\}_i \text{neque precibus\}_m molliri queas}_{i}\!\]

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

neque misericordia\!] neque precibus\!] molliri queas\!]!
‘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} _ei_ esit vituperandus, [ita-ne tei hinc abisse] et [proi {vitam tuam} _k_ tutandumk aliis _l_ 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 30: Control Infinitives.

<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>351</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘want’</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘begin’</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘accustomed’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘dare’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘stop’</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘continue’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘hurry’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘try’</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘know how’</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 89 956

(295) Qui potis \(_i\) est \(_i\) refelli quisquam \(_i\) ubi nullus \(_j\)

‘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 *querē* and its negative, *nequerē*, 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

*volē* ‘to wish’ (177 instances) and its compounds *nolē* ‘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 *delectōs* and *potentēs* are [+ masculine], while *insignitā* 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 proi [rotas...] volesi [PROi facere], tardius ducetur, if wheel-F-ACC-PL wish-2-S do-INFIN slowly-COMP 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. III)

(302) proi [PROi alere...] nolunti [...{hominem edacam}_1i] et proi nourish-INFIN not wish-3-PL human-M-S-ACC and

sapiunti {mea sententia}_1k, proi [PROi pro maleficio...] si be wise-3-PL my-F-S-ABL opinion-F-S-ABL on behalf of evil deed-N-S-ABL if

[...{beneficium summum}_1i...] nolunti [...reddere].
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 proi [PROi ter sub armis...] malim_1i three times under weapon-N-PL-ABL prefer-1-S-IMPERF-SUBJ life-F-S-ACC

cernere] quam [PROi semel modo parere]. 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...] egoi [...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

[...PROi loqui]. speak-INFIN-DEPON

‘There’s an important matter that I want to speak with you about.’ (Pl. Aul. 771)

(305) Quom vinumii coctumii eriti et quom proi legetur, proi when wine-N-S-NOM cook-PPP-N-S-NOM be-3-S-FUT and when choose-3-S-FUT-PASS

facitoj uti proi servetur familiae primumii suisj -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

proj facitoj -que proj studeasj [PROj proi 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) \textit{pro\textsubscript{i} properato\textsubscript{i} apsente me [PRO\textsubscript{i} comesse prandium].}

\textit{hurry-2-S-IMPERAT-FUT be away-5-ABL-PART I-5-ABL eat-INFIN-PERF lunch-N-5-ACC}

‘Hurry and eat lunch while I’m gone.’ (Pl. Men. 628)

(307) \textit{[Casinam\textsubscript{j}... ego\textsubscript{i} [...] promisi\textsubscript{i} [PRO\textsubscript{i} vilico nostro dare].}

\textit{Casina-F-S-ACC I-5-NOM wife-F-S-ACC promise-1-5-PERF overseer-N-M-DAT our-N-M-DAT give-INFIN}

‘I promised to give Casina as wife to our overseer.’ (Pl. Cas. 288)

(308) \textit{Tu\textsubscript{i} tamen idem [has nuptias...] perge\textsubscript{i} [...] [...PRO\textsubscript{i} facere]

\textit{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) \textit{Numquam pro\textsubscript{i} destitit\textsubscript{i} [PRO\textsubscript{i} instare] ut dicerem [me ducturum patri].}

\textit{never not wish-2-S-PERF insist-INFIN COMP say-1-S-IMPERF-SUBJ I-5-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 \textit{nolle} ‘to be unwilling’. Examples of the negative command with \textit{nolle} as a control verb are in (310-312).

(310) \textit{pro\textsubscript{i} noli\textsubscript{i} [PRO\textsubscript{i} mintari], pro\textsubscript{j} scio\textsubscript{j} [crucem\textsubscript{k} futuram\textsubscript{k} mihi\textsubscript{i} sepulchrurum].}

\textit{not wish-2-S-IMPERAT threaten-INFIN-DEPON know-1-S cross-F-S-ACC be-PART-FUT-F-S-ACC I-5-DAT grave-N-S-ACC}

‘Don’t threaten [me], I know a cross will be my grave.’ (Pl. Mil. 372)

(311) \textit{Nolite\textsubscript{i} hospites\textsubscript{i} [PRO\textsubscript{i} ad me adire].}

\textit{not wish-2-PL-IMPERAT stranger-M-PL-NOM to I-5-ACC come-to-INFIN}
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‘Strangers, don’t come near me.’ (Enn. Trag. 358)

(312) \( \text{pro}_i \ nolito_i \) 
\( \text{not wish-2-S-IMPERAT-FUT} \) 
\( [\text{tibi}_1 \text{ me } \text{male } \text{dicere } \text{posse}] \) 
\( \text{PRO}_i \text{ putare} \) 
\( \text{think-INFIN} \)

‘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>\text{nolle + infinitive}</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{ne + imperative}</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{ne + subjunctive}</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{TOTAL}</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the subject-control structure with \text{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 \text{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].
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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) $Possum_i\text{ ego}_i [\text{PRO}_i \text{ istam}_j \text{ capite cladem}_j \text{ avertuncassere}]$.  

‘I can advert that disaster from you [lit. ‘from (your) head’].’ (Pac. *Trag*. 248)

(314) $Nunc \text{ pro}_i \text{ pergam}_i [\text{PRO}_i \text{ eri imperium}_j \text{ exequi}] et$

$[\text{PRO}_i \text{ me}_i \text{ domum capessere}]$.  

‘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) \[ pro_i \ [Casinam_j \ldots] \quad ego_i \ [\ldots uxorem_j \ldots] \quad promisi_i \ [\ldots vilico nostro \ldots] \]

\[ Casina-F-S-ACC \quad I-s-NOM \quad promise-1-s-PERF \quad overseer-M-S-DAT \quad our-M-S-DAT \]

give-INFIN

‘I promised to give Casina as wife to our overseer.’ (Pl. Cas. 288)

(316) \[ Satis pol proterve me \quad Syri_j \quad promissa_i \quad huc \quad induxerunt_{ij} \]

\[ enough \quad indeed \quad boldly \quad I-s-ACC \quad Syrus-M-S-GEN \quad promise-PPP-N-PL-NOM \quad to \quad here \quad lead \quad in-3-PL-PERF \]

\[ \{ \text{decem} \quad minas_{ij} \} \quad [ \text{quas}_{ij} \quad \text{PRO}_{ij} \quad mihi_k \quad dare] \quad pollicitus_{ij} \quad \text{‘t}^{\text{i}}. \]

\[ ten \quad mina-F-PL-ACC \quad REL-F-PL-ACC \quad I-s-DAT \quad give-INFIN \quad promise-PPP-DEPON-M-S-NOM \quad be-3-S \]

‘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) \[ pro_i \quad promitte_i \quad [hoc_j \quad fore]. \]

\[ promise-2-s-IMPERAT \quad this-N-S-ACC \quad be-INFIN-FUT \]

‘Promise this will be.’ (Pl. Aul. 219)

(318) \[ Qui_i \quad te_j \quad diligat_{ij} \quad [aetatis \quad facie] \quad -que \quad tuae \quad se_{ij} \]

\[ REL-M-S-NOM \quad you-S-ACC \quad esteem-3-s-SUBJ \quad age-F-S-GEN \quad appearance-F-S-GEN \quad and \quad your-F-S-GEN \quad ANA-ACC \]

\[ fautorem] \quad ostendat_{ij} \quad [fore \quad amicum_{ij}] \quad polliceatur_{ij}. \]

\[ favorer-M-S-ACC \quad show-3-s-SUBJ \quad be-INFIN-FUT \quad friend-M-S-ACC \quad promise-3-s-SUBJ-DEPON \]

‘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 archaizing 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 pro_i post hac [PRO_i inter sed_i coniurase] not -or after this-F-S-ABL [PRO_i between ANA-ACC swear together-INFIN-PERF ne -ve [PRO_i comvovise] ne -ve [PRO_i conspondise] ne -ve not -or vow together-INFIN-ERF not -or pledge together-INFIN-PERF not -or [PRO_i compromiesise] velet_i ne -ve quisquam_i [PRO fidem_i] wish-3-S-FUT not -or anyone faith-F-S-ACC ne -ve [PRO i comvovise] ne -ve [PRO i conspondise] ne -ve not -or wish-3-S-FUT not -or wish-3-S-FUT ne -ve [PRO i compromiesise] not -or wish-3-S-FUT not -or wish-3-S-FUT ‘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, god-M-PL-NOM I- S-ACC destroy-3-PL-SUBJ if I- S-NOM you- S-GEN INDEF-N-S-ACC take away-1-S-PERF ni -ve [PRO adeo apstulisse] vellem. not -or to there take away-INFIN-PERF wish-1-S-IMPERF-SUBJ ‘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, pro_i [PRO_i rogasse] vellem, ah ask-INFIN-PERF wish-1-S-IMPERF-SUBJ ‘Ah, I would want to have asked.’ (Ter. Heau. 978)

(322) [PRO ne -quid emisse …] velit […] insciente domino], not -INDEF-N-S-ACC buy-INFIN-PERF wish-3-S-SUBJ not know-PART-M-S-ABL master-M-S-ABL neo [PRO quid dominum celavisse] velit. INDEFIN-N-S-ACC master-M-S-ACC hide-INFIN-PERF wish-3-S-SUBJ ‘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 auspicas, pro_i [honorem me_i dium home-F-S-LOC when take auspices-1-PL honor-M-S-ACC I-S-ACC god-M-PL-GEN immortalium…] velim_i […]habuisse. wish-I-S-SUBJ have-INFIN-PERF
‘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_ _ non _ potes_ [PRO_ probasse _ nugas].

‘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_ [PRO_ meminisse] nequeunt_.

‘They can’t remember.’

In example (326) the [+ perfect] infinitival complement occurs with incipere.

(326) Ubi _ pro_ _ iam _ [PRO_ coctum...] incipit_ incipere... eo_ 
addito _ _ brassicae _ _ coliculos _ _ duos, _ _ betae _ _ coliculos
duos _ cum _ radice _ sua....
two-M-PL-ACC with root-F-S-ABL own-F-S-ABL

‘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_ _ forte _ [PRO_ liber_ fieri] occuperim_ 
siif by chance free-M-S-NOM make-INFIN-PASS begin-1-S-PERF-SUBJ

‘if by chance I should have begun to become [lit. ‘to be made’] free’ (Pl. Mil. 1362)

---

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

\[(328) \text{Ubi } uvae_i \text{ variae}_i \text{... coeperint}_i \text{... fieri},\]

\[ \text{when grape-F-PL-NOM different-F-PL-NOM begin-3-PL-PERF-SUBJ make-INFIN-PASS} \]

\[ \text{bubus}_i \text{ pro}_i \text{ medicamentum dato quotanis, uti pro}_j \]

\[ \text{cattle-M-PL-DAT medicine-N-S-ACC give-2-S-IMPERAT-FUT every year COMP} \]

\[ \text{valeant}_j. \]

\[ \text{be strong-3-PL-SUBJ} \]

‘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 Agr. 73)

These uses of a subject-control predicate other than velle + passive infinitive show that the [+ perfect] tense of 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).

\[(329) \text{Ne pro}_i \text{ operam perdas}_i \text{ poscere].} \]

\[ \text{lest effort-F-S-ACC lose-2-S-SUBJ demand-INFIN} \]

‘Don’t waste effort in demanding [it].’ (Pl. Aul. 341)

\[(330) \text{Sed pro}_i \text{ cesso}_i \text{ prius quam prorsus perii}_i \text{ currere?} \]

\[ \text{but stop-1-S before than completely die-1-S-PERF run-INFIN} \]

‘But do I stop before I’m completely dead from running?’ (Pl. Aul. 396)

The other examples have as the matrix predicate an adjective, the perfect participle defessi in sentence (331) and the ordinary adjective lentus in (332).

\[(331) \text{Postquam pro}_i \text{ defessi}_i \text{ sunt}_i \text{ stare] atque [PRO}_i \text{ spargere sese}_i \text{... concurrunt}_i \]

\[ \text{after tire out-PPP-DEPON-M-PL-NOM be-3-PL stand-INFIN and sprinkle-INFIN ANA-ACC spear-F-PL-ABL fit with a handle-PPP-F-PL-ABL run together-3-PL} \]

\[ \text{hastis ansatis}_i j \text{... concurrunt}_i \]

49 Although occipere ‘to begin’ appears to be a compound from coepere ‘to begin’, it actually derives from ob ‘in the way of’ + capere ‘to take’, while coepere is from co- ‘together’ + obsolete *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)

Lucius Cotta senex, crassi pater huius. (Luc. Sat. 440-442)

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’.

Paceni, magnus fuit trico nummarius, [PRO solvere nulli, lentus]. ‘The old man Lucius Cotta, the father of this dull-witted Pacenius, was a great trickster in money matters, tenacious at paying no one.’ (Luc. Sat. 440-442)

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’.

Paceni, magnus fuit trico nummarius, [PRO solvere nulli, lentus]. ‘The old man Lucius Cotta, the father of this dull-witted Pacenius, was a great trickster in money matters, tenacious at paying no one.’ (Luc. Sat. 440-442)

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.
debetis proi [PROi velle proj] quaej prok velimusk.

‘You ought to want what we want.’ (Pl. Amphi. 39)

proi ut [proj periisse] velisj [quemj PROi visere] nolueris

cum proi debueris

‘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).

Tum proi [plicatricemk...] clementer non potestj [...quin proj

muneremj].

give present-1-S-IMPERF-SUBJ

‘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.

poti proi -n [ut proi abstineasj manumj]? be able-2-S -Y/N COMP hold away hand-f-S-ACC

‘Can you hold your hand away [i.e. from hitting]?’ (Pl. Amphi. 903)

poti proi -n [proi a mej abeasj]? be able-2-S -Y/N from I-S-ABL go away-2-S-SUBJ

‘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><strong>BOUND</strong></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>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNBOUND</strong></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></td>
<td>523</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></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>15%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘allow’</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘beg’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘prohibit’</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘make’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘force’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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) *pro_{i-subj} pro_{j-obj} [PRO_{j} prandere] iube_{j} horitur_{i} -que.*  

‘He orders and encourages [them] to have lunch.’ (Enn. *Ann*. 418)

(341) *Tum -que pro_{j-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) \[ \text{pro}_i \text{-subj} \text{ pro}_j \text{-obj} \text{ [PRO}_i \text{ animo nunc -iam otioso esse] impero}_i. \]

‘I’m telling [you] to calm down right now.’ (Ter. *And.* 842)

(343) \[ \text{pro}_i \text{-subj} \text{ pro}_j \text{-obj} \text{ [PRO}_j \text{ signa extemplo canere] ac [PRO}_j \text{ tela ob moenia offerre] imperat}_j. \]

‘He orders [them] to sound the signals and hurl the weapons against the walls right away.’ (Acc. *Trag.* 377)

(344) \[ \text{pro}_i \text{-subj} \text{ pro}_j \text{-obj} \text{ [PRO}_j \{\text{tuum nefarium facinus}\}_k \text{ peiore facinore operire] postulas}_i. \]

‘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) \[ \text{pro}_i \text{ [PRO}_j \text{ abire] non sinam}_i \text{ te}_j. \]

‘I won’t let you leave.’ (Pl. *Mil.* 444)

(346) \[ \{\text{Servom hominem}\}_j \text{ [PRO}_j \text{ causam orare] leges}_i \text{ non sinunt}_i, \]

‘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) \[ \text{Ego}_i \text{ -ne huius memoriam}_j \text{ patiar}_i \text{ [PRO}_j \text{ meae voluptati obstare]}. \]

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) \[ \text{Multa}_i \text{ me}_j \text{ dehortata [PRO}_j \text{ huc prodire], \{anni, aetas, vox, vires, senectus\}}_i. \]

‘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) \[ \text{Si [PRO}_i \text{ resto}_i \text{ pro}_j \text{ pergit ut eam}_i; \text{ si [PRO}_i \text{ ire] pro}_j \text{ conor}_i \text{ prohibet [PRO}_i \text{ baetere].} \]
‘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 [PROj salvere] iubeo [spectatores optumos]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) proi iubeo te [PROj salvere], amatorj.

‘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 salve pro [salvom te advenisse] gaudeo.

‘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) \[[\text{PRO}_i \text{salvere} \text{pro}_j \text{PRO}_j \text{iubere}] \text{[PRO}_i \text{salutem}k...]\] est

\[[...mittere \text{amico}_j]\]

‘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} \text{ego}_i \text{inscitus}_i \text{qui}_i \text{[domino} \text{me}_j\text{...]} \text{postulem}_i

\[[...\text{control-INFIN-DEPON \text{moderarier}}]\]

‘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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>8 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>1 33%</td>
<td>2 67%</td>
<td>3</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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>26 65%</td>
<td>14 35%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>129 71%</td>
<td>53 29%</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>215 70%</td>
<td>92 30%</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(356) Nam quod proi de argento sperem aut [PROi posse…] for REL-N-S-ACC from silver-N-S-ABL hope-1- S-SUBJ or be able-INFIN

postulem […me fallere] nil est.

demand-1-S-SUBJ I- S-ACC deceive-INFIN nothing-N-S-NOM be-3- S

‘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 pudet, [PROj prodire in conspectum meum…],

not you-S-ACC shame-3-S [PROj come forth-INFIN into sight-M-S-ACC meum-ACC

{flagitium hominis}, [...cum istoc ornatu]? disgrace-N-S-VOC human-M-S-GEN with that-M-S-ABL ornamentation-M-S-ABL

‘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.

\[ (358) \quad \text{Pudet}_{i} \quad \text{pro}_{j} \quad \text{[PRO}_{j} \quad \text{dicere} \quad \text{hac}_{l} \quad \text{praesente}_{l} \quad \{\text{verbum} \quad \text{turpe}\}_{k}.} \]

‘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.

\[ (359) \quad \text{Nil}^{52} \quad -\text{ne} \quad \text{te}_{i} \quad \text{pudet}, \quad \text{sceleste}, \quad \text{[PRO}_{i} \quad \text{populi} \quad \text{in} \quad \text{conspectum} \quad \text{ingredi}].} \]

‘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’, *disstaedere* ‘to fatigue’, and *pigrire* ‘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).

\[ (360) \quad \text{pro}_{i} \quad \text{quaeso}_{i} \quad \text{quod}_{j} \quad \text{pro}_{i} \quad \text{te}_{k} \quad \text{percontabor}_{i} \quad \text{ne} \quad \text{[id}_{j}...} \]

‘I ask [you] what I was investigating you about – don’t let it annoy you to speak about it.’  (Pl. *Aul*. 210)

\[ (361) \quad \text{Dolet}_{i} \quad \text{pigeti} \quad -\text{que} \quad \text{magis} \quad \text{magis} \quad -\text{que} \quad \text{me}_{j} \quad \text{[PRO}_{j} \quad \text{conatum}_{i} \quad \text{hoc}_{k} \quad \text{nequiquam} \quad \text{itiner}_{k}].} \]

‘It pains and annoys me more and more to have attempted this journey in vain.’  (Pac. *Trag*. 54)

\[ (362) \quad \text{Post} \quad \text{aetate} \quad \text{pigret}_{i} \quad \text{pro}_{j} \quad \text{[PRO}_{j} \quad \text{subferre} \quad \text{laborem}_{k}].} \]

‘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*. 
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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 patiar\(_i\) [PRO\(_i\) probri\(_i\) 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_1
d_1
ad
me,
[ti_1
tei骏]
[PRO_1
nuptam_1]
INTERROG-N-S-NOM
ANA-N-S-NOM
to
F-S-ACC
you-S-NOM
you-S-ACC
veil-PPP-F-S-NOM
possis_1
[PRO_1
perpeti骏],
an
pro_1
sis
abitura骏
be able-2-S-IMPERF-SUBJ
allow-INFIN-DEPON
or
be-2-S-SUBJ
go away-PART-FUT-F-S-NOM
a
tuo
viro
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) pro_1
pro_1
[PRO_1
biennium
in
sole...
]sinito_1
...positum_1
two years-N-S-ACC
in
sun-M-S-ABL
allow-2-S-IMPERAT-FUT
place-PPP-N-S-ACC
esse].
be-INFIN

‘Allow [the jar of brine] to sit [lit. ‘to have been placed’] for two years in the sun.’ (Cato Agri. 105)

In (366) the use of patimini with the infinitival pulsum (i.e. the PPP with a non-overt copula) is especially striking since the other object-control predicates, including a form of sinere, take a [+ present] infinitive.

(366) pro_1
pro_1
[PRO_1
exulare]
sinitis_1
pro_1
sistis_1
pro_1
[PRO_1
pulsum_1
pelli骏],
pro_1
pro_1
[PRO_1
patimini骏.
be an exile-INFIN
allow-2-PL
allow-2-PL-PERF
push-INFIN-PASS
allow-2-PL-DEPON

‘You 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) pro_1
nos_1
[PRO_1
missos_1]
face骏.
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) pro_1
[PRO_1
ademptum_1
tibi骏
iam
faxon]
{omnem
take away-PPP-M-S-ACC
you-S-DAT
now
make-1-S-FUTPERF
all-M-S-ACC
metum骏},
fear-M-S-ACC
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‘I’ll remove all your fear [lit. ‘I’ll have made all fear having been taken away from you’].’ (Ter. Heau. 341)

(369) \[\text{pro}_i \text{ hoc}_j \text{ [PRO}_j \text{ missum}_i \text{] facies}_k \text{ pro}_i \text{ illo}_j \text{ me}_k\]

\(u\text{tere}_i \text{ libentex}_k.\)

‘You’ll send this one away [lit. ‘you’ll make this having been sent’], that one you’ll use while I please.’ (Luc. Sat. 1038)

Example (370) is interesting not only because of the [+ perfect] infinitival complement with \textit{habere} ‘to have’, but also because it shows an early instance of \textit{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.

(370) \[\text{pro}_i \text{ boves}_j \text{ [PRO}_j \text{ maxima diligentia} \text{] curatos}_k\]

\(\text{habeto}_i.\)

‘Have the cattle cared for [lit. ‘having been cared for’] with the greatest diligence.’ (Cato Agr. 5)

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 \textit{pigere} ‘to annoy, disgust’, shown in (371-372), and the other is with \textit{dolere} ‘to pain’, shown in coordination with \textit{pigere} in (372). Example (371) is repeated from (193), and (372) from (361).

(371) \[\text{Qui}_i \text{ in his agris praedia}_j \text{ vendiderint, [eos}_i\text{...]}\]

\(\text{pigeat}\)

‘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)

(372) \[\text{Dolet}_i \text{ piget}_j \text{ -que magis magis -que me}_j \text{ [PRO}_j \text{ conatum}_j\]

\(\text{hoc}_k \text{ nequiquam itiner}_k\).
‘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) \( \text{pro}_i \text{ pro}_j \ [\text{PRO}_j \ \text{incenatum}_j \ldots] \ iubet_o_i \ [\ldots \text{esse}]. \)

‘Order [him] not to dine [lit. ‘not to have dined’].’ (Cato Agr. 127)

(374) \( \text{pro}_i \text{ pro}_j \ [\text{PRO}_j \ \text{prorsum}_j \ \text{quodcumque}_k \ldots] \ iubebat_t_i \ [\ldots \text{fecisse}]. \)

‘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 eai domi 'stis si proj facioj [ut eami exire*  

hinc] prok videask, dignuk' -n esk {verberibus multis}1?

‘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) *proi [idk... oroij teij in commune ut proj consulasj*].

‘I beg you to consider it mutually.’ (Ter. *And.* 548)

(377) *Ego enim an perficiam [ut prok [PROk mei amare]*  

expediat]?  

‘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 servos iubei [proj hunck ad mei ferantj].  

‘Command the slaves to bring him to me.’ (Pl. *Men.* 955-956)

(379) *proi sinei [proj tei hock exoremj].  

‘Allow me to beg this from you [lit. ‘allow I beg this from you’].’ (Ter. *And.* 902)

(380) *proi [proj remk cognoscasj simul et [proj dictism*  
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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} \text{[\{vocivom tempus\}\textsubscript{k} ne quod\textsubscript{k} dem\textsubscript{j}]

\text{allow-2-S-IMPERAT I-S-ACC empty-N-S-ACC time-N-S-ACC lest INDEFIN-N-S-ACC give-1-S-SUBJ}

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. \textit{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 (\textit{pergere} and \textit{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 \textit{dicant} appears to be simply a variant of the more usual infinitival clause controlled by \textit{iubere} in 95\% of the corpus instances.

(382) pro\textsubscript{i} Telobois\textsubscript{j} iubet\textsubscript{i} \text{[pro\textsubscript{j} sententiam ut dicant\textsubscript{j} suam\textsubscript{j}]

Teloboian-M-PL-DAT order-3-S COMP say-3-PL-SUBJ own-F-S-ACC

‘He orders the Teloboians to speak his opinion.’ (Pl. \textit{Amph}. 205)

Similarly, \textit{imperat} in (383) takes the finite subjunctive \textit{deducerem}.

(383) pro\textsubscript{i} mihi\textsubscript{j} \text{[classem\textsubscript{k}... imperat\textsubscript{i} \text{[...Thessalum\textsubscript{l} nostram\textsubscript{k}-que in altum\textsubscript{m} ut pro\textsubscript{j} properiter deducerem\textsubscript{j}]

I-S-DAT fleet-F-S-ACC order-3-S Thessalian-M-PL-GEN our-F-S-ACC -and into 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. \textit{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>ALLOW – <em>sinere</em></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>BEG – <em>obsecrare</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 67%</td>
<td>1 33%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orare</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 24%</td>
<td>13 76%</td>
<td>17</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 33%</td>
<td>14 67%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORCE – <em>cogere</em></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>MAKE – <em>facere</em></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>ORDER – <em>iubere</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>107 95%</td>
<td>6 5%</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postulare</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 82%</td>
<td>4 18%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperare</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 67%</td>
<td>2 33%</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>132 92%</td>
<td>12 8%</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROHIBIT – <em>pergere</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all others</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>URGE – <em>hortari</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 33%</td>
<td>2 67%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARN – <em>monere</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL OTHERS</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 100%</td>
<td>0 9%</td>
<td>18</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) \[\text{pro}_i \text{ pro}_j [\text{PRO}_j \text{ orare}] \text{ iussit}_k \text{ si} \text{ se}_k \text{ ames}_k,\]
\[\text{era}_k, \text{mistress-F-S-NOM} \text{ iam} \text{ ut} \text{ ad} \text{ sese}_k \text{ venias}_k].\]

‘My mistress ordered [me] to beg [you], if you love her, to come to her right now.’  (Ter. *And.* 687)

(385) \[\text{Nunc} \text{ hoc...}_k \text{ me}_j [\text{PRO}_j \text{ orare} a \text{ vobis}] \text{ iussit}_i\]
\[\text{Luppiter}_i, \text{Jupiter-M-S-NOM} \text{ ut} \text{ conquaestores singula in subsellia eant per}\]
\[\text{totam caveam spectatoribus}_k.\]

‘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) \[\text{pro}_i \text{ [pro}_j \text{ prohibere} \text{ pro}_k \text{ ad} \text{ cenam} [\text{ne} \text{ pro}_j \text{ promittat}_j]\]
\[\text{postules}_i \text{ neu} \text{ [pro}_j \text{ quemquam}_k \text{ accipiat}_j \text{ alienum}_k \text{ apud se}_j?\]

‘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) \[\text{postquam advorsum mi...}_j \text{ pro}_i\text{obj} \text{ imperavi} [\text{...ut} \text{ huc venires}_i].\]

‘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) \[\text{Tempus} \text{ 'st} \text{ [monere me} [\text{hunc vicinum} \text{ Phaniam ad}\]
\[\text{time-N-S-NOM be-3-S remind-INFIN I-S-ACC this-M-S-ACC neighbor-M-S-ACC Phania-M-S-ACC to}\]
'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*₁ *pergit* [ut *eam*₁]; *si* *ire* *conor*₁ *pro*₁-obj

*prohibet* baetere.

‘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*.

(390) \[ \text{pro}_i \quad \text{sine}_i \quad \text{allow-2-S-IMPERAT} \quad \text{[proj]} \quad \{\text{tuos} \quad \text{ocellos}\}_k \quad \text{deosculer}_i \quad \text{[voluptas} \quad \text{mea}_i \quad \text{pro}_i \quad \text{sine}_i \quad \text{pro}_j \quad \text{pro}_i \quad \text{amabo}_j \quad \text{ted}_i \quad \text{[PRO}_i \quad \text{love-2-S-IMPERAT} \quad \text{your-M-PL-ACC} \quad \text{eye-DIMIN-M-PL-ACC} \quad \text{kiss-1-S-SUBJ-DEPON} \quad \text{desire-F-SS-VOC} \quad \text{my-F-S-VOC} \quad \text{love-INFIN-PASS} \quad \text{allow-2-S-IMPERAT} \quad \text{love-1-S-FUT} \quad \text{you-S-ACC} \quad \text{[PRO}_i \]

‘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).

\[(391) \text{Sic } \text{pro}_i \text{sine}_i \text{pro}_j [\text{PRO}_j \text{habere} \text{pro}_k].\]

‘So allow [her] to have [the sword].’ (Pl. \textit{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).

\[(392) \text{Ecce, Apollo}_i \text{denuo me}_j \text{iubes}_i [\text{PRO}_j \text{facere} \text{impetum}_k \text{in eum}_l \text{qui}_l \text{stat}_l \text{atque} [\text{PRO}_j \text{occidere} \text{pro}_l].\]

‘Behold, Apollo, once again you order me to make an attack against that man who is standing and to kill [him].’ (Pl. \textit{Men.} 868-869)

Other examples exhibit a combination of a simple null object and a coordinated null object, as in sentence (393).

\[(393) \text{pro}_i \text{iube}_i \text{pro}_j [\text{PRO}_j \text{nunc adtemptare} \text{pro}_k], \text{pro}_i \text{iube}_i \text{pro}_j [\text{PRO}_j \text{nunc animo}_l \text{ruspari} \text{Phrygas}_k].\]

‘Order [someone] now to attack [the Phrygians], order [someone] now to heartily search out the Phrygians.’ (Acc. \textit{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 $\theta$-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) \textit{Nec [causam$_k$...]} liceat$_i$ […PRO$_j$ dicere] mihi$_j$.  
\textit{Nor cause-F-S-ACC be allowed-3-S-SUBJ say-INFIN I-S-DAT}  
\textit{‘Nor should I be allowed to plead a cause [lit. ‘nor should it be allowed to me to plead a cause’].} (Pl. \textit{Amph. 158}).

(395) \textit{Nimis vile ‘st vinum atque amor, si ebrio$_j$ atque amanti$_j$ [PRO$_j$ impune facere pro$_k$ [quod$_k$ lubeat]} licet$_i$.}  
\textit{too much cheap-N-S-NOM be-3-S wine-N-S-NOM and love-M-S-NOM if drunk-M-S-DAT  
and love-PART-M-S-DAT without punishment do-INFIN REL-N-S-NOM  
please-3-S-SUBJ be allowed-3-S}  
\textit{‘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. \textit{Aul. 751}).

(396) [PRO$_j$ ire] igitur tibi$_j$ licet$_i$ Nausistrata$_j$.  
\textit{go-INFIN therefore you-S-DAT be allowed-3-S Nausistrata-F-S-VOC}  
\textit{‘So you’re allowed [lit. ‘it is allowed to you’] to go, Nausistrata.’} (Ter. \textit{Phor. 813})

(397) Licet$_i$ [PRO$_j$ lacrumare] plebi$_j$ regi$_j$ [PRO$_k$].  
\textit{be allowed-3-S weep-INFIN common people-F-S-DAT king-M-S-DAT}  
\textit{‘So you’re allowed [lit. ‘it is allowed to you’] to go, Nausistrata.’} (Ter. \textit{Phor. 813})
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, [PRO] 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] te -cum aetatem 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 proj liceat, [PRO] facere et [PRO] iam hoc versibus reddenere pro], quod pro_m do_m,
if be allowed-3-S-SUBJ do-INFIN and now this-N-S-ACC verse-M-PL-ABL 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…] l proj liceat, […haec…], inquam, […alveolum -que…]
sea fight-F-S-ACC be permitted-3-S this-N-PL-ACC say-1-S board-N-S-ACC -and

[PRO] putare, [...] et calces, [...et calces].
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 existimarint [...feneratorem quam furem]k, hinc proj liceat, [PRO] existimare.
how much-N-S-ABL worse-M-S-ACC citizen-M-S-ACC consider-3-PL-PLUPERF-SUBJ usurer-M-S-ACC than 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 controller.

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.

*Proper* {divitias meas} proi licuiti [PROi uxorem dotatam}k {genere summo ducere].

‘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).

*Qui* lubitum est illi [PROi condormiscere]?

‘How has he thought fit [lit. ‘was it pleasing to him’] to go to sleep?’ (Pl. Mil. 826)

*[quae...] meo quomque animo lubitum]i [...PROi facere]*

‘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) \[\text{PRO} \_\_ palam muttire] \_\_ plebeioj \_\_ piaculumi \_\_ esti,\]

openly mumble-INF mumble-INF commoner-M-S-DAT sacrifice-N-S-NOM be-3-S

‘It is a crime for the commoner to grumble openly.’ (Enn. Trag. 340)

(408) Mihi j nescessei \_\_ esti \_\_ [PRO] j eloqui], \_\_ nam scioj \_\_ [Amyclas\_k]

1-S-DAT necessary-N-S-NOM be-3-S speak out-INFIN-DEPON for know-1-S Amyclae-M-PL-ACC tacendo periise].

be silent-GERUND-N-S-ABL perish-INFIN-PERF

‘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 tibi\_j ius\_i esti \_\_ [PRO] j porco\_k piaculo\_i facere]

as you-S-DAT right-N-S-NOM be-3-S pig-M-S-ABL sacrifice-N-S-DAT do-INFIN

‘as it is right for you to make a sacrifice with a pig’ (Cato Agr. 139)

(410) Virtus\_i [PRO] j scire \_\_ [homin i rectum utile quid


likewise INTERROG-N-S-NOM useless-N-S-NOM base-N-S-NOM dishonorable-N-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)

(411) Melius, [PROj sanam...] est, mulier, [...mentem sumere].

‘Woman, it’s better to have a sound mind.’ (Pl. Men. 802)

(412) proi [[PROk tacere...] opinoi [...esse optimum]].

‘I think it best to be silent.’ (Enn. Trag. 147)

The examples in (413-414) have a deontic meaning of convenience or near-necessity.

(413) proi [commodius esse...i] opinor [...[PROk duplici spe]].

‘I think it’s more convenient to enjoy a two-way hope.’ (Ter. Phor. 603)

(414) proi nilj satisj firmi videoj quam ob rem [...[PROi accipere hunc...i] mi expediti [...metum]].

‘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 decretum is from the verb decernere ‘to decide (what is right)’, and so as a stative adjective decretum means ‘that which has been deemed (morally) right’.

(415) Nolo, hercle, nam mihi [...PROi bibere...] decretumj estj [...aquam].

‘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.

\[(416) \text{Non est } \text{mentiri}\text{[PROj meum\text{,}]}\]

‘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).

\[(417) \text{[\{Homin\text{-}M-S-DAT amico et familiari\}…]} \text{non est}\text{[PROj mentiri\text{,} meum\text{,}]}\]

‘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*.

\[(418) \text{Sed nostrum\text{,} est}\text{[PROj intellegere [utquomque atque ubi quomcum\text{,}]} opus\text{,} sit]}\]

‘But our part is to understand whatever and wherever a need may be, to fulfill [it].’ (Ter. *Heau*. 578)

\[(419) \text{Aliud\text{,} est}\text{[PROj properare], aliud\text{,} festinare\text{,}]}\]

---

54 In collocation with the copula, *opus* ‘work’ idiomatically means ‘need, opportunity.’

55 The semantic difference between these two verbs is probably in transitivity: *Properare* can be either transitive or intransitive, while *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.
Quid secundum? Arare.
Quid tertium? Stercorare.


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]i [habeasj]i [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 [PROk iubere]i [PROj salutem]i...] esti
[...mittere amico[k/m]j].
send-INFIN friend-M-S-DAT

175
‘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 praetorum56 esti [PROj ante et praere].

(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 praere; 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.
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 *molesta*, while PRO in (425) is [+ masculine, + singular] in agreement with (the human male) *Sosia*. Both instances of PRO are apparently nominative.

(424) proi [PROi molestai ei esse noloi.]

‘I don’t want to be bothersome to him.’ (Pl. Cas. 545)

(425) Ubi egoi [PROi Sosia...] nolimi [...esse], tuj estoj

sane Sosia.

‘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) proi [PROi tardusi esse ilico coepii.]

‘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) proi [PROi {bonus vates}i... poterai [...esse], nam proi]
‘You could have been a good prophet, for you say what is going to be.’ (Pl. Mil. 911)

Example (428) also has [+ masculine, + singular] adjective linked to PRO.

(428) pro̵_i [PRO_i tibi̵_i servire̵_i malui̵_i multu̵_i quam [PRO_i alii̵_i libertus̵_i esse̵].

‘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 subacta (referring to Alcumena).

(429) Tu̵_i cum {Alcumena uxor̵_i antiquam in gratiam redi̵_; haud pro̵_j promeruit̵_j quam ob rem pro̵_i pro̵_i vitio̵_k vorteres̵_i; {mea vi̵_l pro̵ subacta̵_j [PRO_j facere pro̵_m].

‘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.

(430) Era̵_i atque haec̵_i dolum̵_k ex proxumo hunc̵_k protulerunt̵_j; ego̵_l [PRO_l hunc̵_m...] missa̵_l sum [...ludere].

‘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 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 pro1 mei quidem patiar; [PROi probrij] falso
             nor pro indeed allow-1-FUT-DEPON wrong-N-S-GEN falsely

impune without punishment insulatamij.

‘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) proi nos [PROj missosj] face.
             I-ACC 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) proi proj [PROi incenatumij...] iubetoi [...esse].
             not dine-PPP-DEPON-M-S-ACC order-2-S-IMPERAT-FUT be-INFIN

‘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* [PRO] *bonas* esse [vobis 1] nos 1 quibus 1 -cum

\[ \text{est} \text{m} \text{res} \text{m} \text{non} \text{pro} \text{k} \text{sinunt} \text{k}. \]

‘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.

\[ (436) \text{Id gratum fuisse avorsum te] habeo gratiam.} \]

‘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.

\[ (437) \text{Sororem falsa creditam meretriculae genere Andriae, Glycerium vitiat gravidaque facta pro dat.} \]

‘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.)

\[ (438) \text{pro qui suam vitam superiorem atque ampliorem...} \]

‘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 \textit{dicere} does actually take a true internal direct object in a context like (439).

\begin{verbatim}
(439)  Pyth.  \textit{Sed} \textit{uder} \textit{vestrorum} \textit{est} \textit{celerior}\textit{?} \textit{pro} \textit{memora}

\textit{pro} \textit{mihi}.  \hspace{0.5cm} \textit{I-S-DAT}

Anthr. \textit{Ego, \ et \ multo \ melior.}

\textit{Pyth.} \textit{Cocum} \textit{ego, \ non \ furem \ rogo.}

\textit{Anthr.} \textit{Cocum \ ergo \ dico.}
\end{verbatim}

‘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. \textit{Aul}. 321-323)

Here the NP \textit{cocum} in the last line of the citation clearly undergoes the action of saying.

Generally, though, \textit{dicere} and the many other ECM verbs have no direct semantic relationship to the NP marked as accusative.

In addition, impersonal predicates such as \textit{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).

\begin{verbatim}
(440)  Quom \textit{id}_{i} \textit{mihi}_{j} \textit{placebat}_{i} \{\textit{tum} \{\textit{uno} \textit{ore}\} \textit{omnia}\textit{k}}\}

\{\textit{omnia} \textit{bona}\textit{l} \textit{dicere} \textit{et} \{\textit{pro}_{k} \textit{laudare} \{\textit{fortunas} \textit{meas}\textit{m}\}}\}
\end{verbatim}

‘Then that was pleasing to me, that everyone with one voice said all good things and praised my good luck.’ (Ter. \textit{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) \[Ut \text{[} \text{filium}_j \text{ bonum}_j \text{ patri}_k \text{ esse}] \text{ oportet}_i \text{ itidem}_e \text{ ego}_l \text{ sum}_n\]

\text{Ut}\_M-S-ACC \text{ filium- M-S-ACC bonum- M-S-ACC patri- M-S-DAT esse- INFIN oportet-3- S itidem- S same ego-1- S sum-1- S

\text{patri- M-S-DAT}

‘As a son should be good to his father, so am I good to my father.’ (Pl. Amph. 992)

(442) \[\text{Nos}_I \text{ quiescere} \text{ aequum}_I \text{ est}_i?\]

\text{Nos- I-PL-ACC quiescere- INFIN aequum- N-S-NOM est-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 \text{id}. An example of a trace with the ECM verb \text{velle} ‘to wish’ is in (443), where the anaphoric pronoun \text{id} refers to the proposition in the ECM clause.

(443) \text{pro}_i \text{ id}_j \text{ voluit}_i \text{ sic}_i \text{ necopinantis}_i \text{ duci}\]

\text{proi- F-PL-ACC id-3- S voluit-3- S sic-3- S necopinantis-3- S duci- INFIN-PASS}

\{\text{falso}_f \text{ gaudio}_f \text{ sperantis}_i \text{ iam}_i \text{ amet}_m \text{ metu}_m\], \text{[pro}_k \text{ interoscitantis}_k \text{ opprimi}_f \text{ ne}_n \text{ esset}_n \text{ spatium}_m \text{ cogitandi}_k \text{ ad}_a \text{ disturbandas}_r \text{ nuptias;}_s \text{ astute}_t\}


‘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 \text{id} is also used with an AcI clause.

(444) \text{Scelestissum}_e \text{ audes}_i \text{ mihi}_i \text{ praedicare}_i \text{ id}_k \text{ [domi}_e \text{ te}_i \text{ esse}_e \text{ nunc}_n \text{ qui}_i \text{ hic}_i \text{ ades}_i?\]

\text{scelestissum- F-S-LOC audes-2- S mihi-1- S praedicare- INFIN id-1- S domi- F-S-LOC te-1- S esse- INFIN nunc- now qui- REL-M-S-NOM hic- here ades-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)  \(\text{pro}_i \{\text{unum} \quad \text{hoc}_j \quad \text{scio}_k \quad [\text{hanc}_k \quad \text{meritam}_k \quad \text{esse}_j] \quad \text{ut}\)  
\(\text{pro}_i \quad \text{memor}_l \quad \text{esses}_j \quad \text{sui}_k.\)

‘This one thing I know, that she has deserved that you should remember her.’  (Ter. And. 281)

(446)  \(\text{pro}_i \quad \text{credo}_i \quad -n \quad \text{tibi} \quad \text{hoc}_j \quad \text{nunc}, \quad [\text{peperisse} \quad \text{hanc}_k \quad \text{e}]\)  
\(\text{Pamphilo}\_j?\)

‘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\_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’, *velle* ‘to wish’, *malle* ‘to prefer’ (lit. ‘to wish more’), and *nolle* ‘not to wish’. Together these lexemes account for 211 (79%) of the 266 subject-control ~ ECM predicates. An example with *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. proi [PROi *domum* ire] cupioi.  
   ‘I want to go home.’ (Pl. *Men*. 963)

b. proi [eiius…] cupioi [\{filiam virginemj} mi desponderi].
   ‘I wish (for) his maiden daughter to be promised to me [i.e. in marriage]’. (Pl. *Aul*. 172-173)

A similar distinction between co-indexed and disjoint infinitival subjects occurs in (449-450) with *velle*.

(449) a. *Numquam* proi [PROi *indicare id filioj…* voluiti]
   ‘[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. *Aul*. 9-12)

b. {*Omnes mortales*}i [sesei laudarier] optantii.
   ‘All mortals want (for) themselves to be praised.’ (Enn. *Ann*. 549)

(450) a. {*Quis pater aut cognatus*}i voleti [PROi vos contra tueri]?
   ‘What father or relative will want to look at you?’ (Enn. *Ann*. 462)
b. \[Vos_{j} -ne \ldots\] velit_{i} \[\ldots an\ me_{k}\ regnare\] era_{i}?

\[\text{you-PL-ACC \ -Y/N\ wish-3-S-SUBJ\ or\ I-S-ACC\ rule-INFIN\ master-F-S-NOM}\]

‘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 *nolle*, and (453) has *malle*.

(451) a. \[pro_{i}\ \ [in\ coloniam\ldots],\ mercules,\ \ [\ldots PRO_{i}\ scribere\ldots]\ nolim_{i}\]

\[\text{into\ colony-F-S-ACC\ my\ Hercules\ write-INFIN\ wish-1-S-SUBJ}\]

\[\text{si\ trium\ virum\ sim}_{i},\ \ [\ldots spatiatorem}_{j}\ atque\]

\[\text{if\ three-M-PL-GEN\ man-M-PL-GEN\ be-1-S-SUBJ\ walker-M-S-ACC\ and}\]

\[\text{Fescenninum}_{k}\].

\[\text{from\ Fescennia-M-S-ACC}\]

‘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. \[Atque\ ego_{i}\ quidem\ arbitror_{i}\ [Rodienses_{j}\ noluisse]\]

\[\text{and\ I-S-NOM\ indeed\ think-1-S-DEPON\ from\ Rhodes-M-PL-ACC\ not\ wish-INFIN-PERF}\]

\[\text{[nos}_{j}\ \ ita\ \ depugnare],\ uti\ \ depugnatum\ est,\ neque\ \ [prok}_{k}\]

\[\text{I-PL-ACC\ thus\ fight\ out-INFIN\ as:\ fight\ out-PPP-N-S-NOM\ be-3-S\ nor}\]

\[\{\text{regem}\ \ Persen}_{1}\ \ vincit\ t_{j}\}].

‘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)

(452) a. \[Nolo_{i}\ \ ego_{i}\ \ [\text{PRO}_{i}\ hanc}_{j}\ \ adeo\ \ efflictim\ \ amare\].

\[\text{not\ wish-1-S\ I-S-NOM\ this-F-S-ACC\ to\ there\ destruction-F-S-ACC\ love-INFIN}\]

‘I don’t want to love her to death.’ (Naev. Fab. 37-38)

b. \[pro_{i}\ \ [mirari \ldots]\ \ nolim_{i}\ \ [\ldots vos}_{j}\ \ [\text{quapropter}\ \ Iuppiter]\]

\[\text{wonder-INFIN-DEPON\ not\ wish-1-S-SUBJ\ you-PL-ACC\ why\ Jupiter-M-S-NOM}\]

\[\text{nunc}\ \ histriones\ \ curet]\]

\[\text{now\ actor-M-PL-ACC\ care\ about-3-S-SUBJ}\]

‘I wouldn’t want (for) you to wonder why Jupiter now cares about the actors.’ (Pl. Amph. 86-87)

(453) a. \[pro_{i}\ \ malis_{i} -ne\ \ [\text{PRO}_{i}\ \ esse]?\]

\[\text{prefer-2-S\ -Y/N\ eat-INFIN}\]

‘Do you prefer to eat?’ (Luc. Sat. 663)

b. \[pro_{i}\ \ [\text{regnum}_{j}\ \ tibi}_{k}\ \ permitti\ \ malunt}_{i}].

\[\text{kingdom-N-S-ACC\ you-S-DAT\ grant-INFIN-PASS\ prefer-3-PL}\]

186
‘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.


*vesci] studet₁ ut [cuncta opima levia iam* feed upon-INFIN-DEPON be eager-3- S COMP remaining-N-PL-ACC spoils-N-PL-ACC light-N-PL-ACC now

*praec illis] putet.* before that-N-PL-ABL think-3-S-SUBJ

‘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 miᵢ illect quod illaec jdo-GERUNDIVE-N-S-NOM be-3-S N-S-DAT that- N-S-NOM do- INFIN-PASS REL-N-S-ACC that-F-S-NOM

$postulat si [meᵢ {illam amantem}j ad seseᵢ [... studeamᵢ] demand-3-S if I- S-ACC that-F-S-ACC love-PART-F-S-ACC to ANA-ACC be eager-I- S-SUBJ

[... recipere] 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. *proᵢ negaboᵢ -n [velle meᵢ], modo quiᵢ sum* deny-1-S-FUT -Y/N wish-INFIN I-S-ACC just now REL-M-S-NOM be-1-S

*pollicitusᵢ [PROᵢ ducere]?' 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. *proᵢ [[puerum…] autem ne resciscatᵢ [...miᵦ esse ex ilia] * boy-M-S-ACC however lest find out-3-S-SUBJ that-I- S-ABL caution-F-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. $\text{[Casinam}_j \ldots \text{] ego}_i \text{ [\ldots uxorem }j\ldots \text{]} \text{ promisi}_i \text{ [\ldots vilico }n\text{ostro}}$

$dare]$

give-INFIN

‘I promised to give Casina as wife to our overseer.’ (Pl. Cas. 288)

b. $\text{pro}_i \text{ promitte}_i \text{ [hoc}_j \text{ fore]}$

promise-2-S-IMPERAT this-N-S-ACC be-INFIN-FUT

‘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.

(458) *Et qui [se]i … sperat i [Romae re*nnae Quadratae]?

And how does he hopes [lit. ‘himself’] to rule at Square Rome?’ (Enn. Ann. 123)

(459) *quae i sperat i [se]i [nupturam i viridulo adolescntulo]

‘who hopes to marry [lit. ‘herself to (fut.) marry’] a green young man’ (Naev. Frag. 7-8)

(460) *sperans i [[aetatem eadem] me i […haec proferre] potesse]

‘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).

(461) *[quod]… ego […me] spero […ostenturum].

‘which I hope I’ll show’ (Cato Or. 209)

(462) *pro i [orationem … sperat i […] invenisse se i] qui differat i te.

‘He hopes he’s found [lit. ‘himself to have found’] a plea by which he discredits you.’ (Ter. And. 407-408)

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*, speravi$_i$ ego$_i$ [istam$_i$ tibi$_i$ parituram$_i$ filium$_i$.]

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

(464) Hem, pro$_i$ [tibi$_i$ -ne haec$_k$ diitius licere...] speras$_i$ [...] me$_j$

> ‘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) pro$_i$ [nupturum$_i^{60}$ te$_i$ nupta$_i$ negas$_i$ quod pro$_i$ [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) pro\(_i\) [pro\(_i\) depoclassere aliqua…] sperans

\begin{align*}
\text{deargentassere}, & \quad \text{pro}\(_i\) \\
\text{decalauticare}, & \quad \text{pro}\(_i\) \\
\text{eburno speculo} & \quad \text{pro}\(_i\)
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{despeculassere}. & \quad \text{unmirror-INFIN-PRES} \\
\text{unsilver-INFIN-PRES} & \quad \text{unshawl-INFIN-PRES} \\
\text{ivory-N-S-DAT} & \quad \text{mirror-N-S-DAT}
\end{align*}

‘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

\[\text{hope-3-S-FUT sumptum}_1 \text{ sibi... senex}_1 \text{ levatum}_1 \text{ esse}\]

\[\text{harunc}_1 \text{ abitu}_2\]

‘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) pro i spero i pro j ita futurum

\[\text{hope-1-S thus be-PART-FUT-N-S-ACC}\]

‘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 mihi melius quam, quando iī
interrog-n-s-nom better-n-s-nom be-3-s than when that-m-pl-nom
insanire praedicant, ego adsimulem, [...] insanire, ut
be insane-infin say before-3-pl-subj I-s-nom pretend-1-s-subj be insane-infin
illos a me 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)

(474) Quo pro adsimularam, non pro
when I-s-acc pretend-1-s-imperf-subj go-infin to market-M-s-acc not
eo
go-1-s
‘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 42: Subjects with ‘Pretend’.

<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 adsimulem Amore istius
   certainly COMP pretend-1 S-SUBJ I S-ACC love-M S-ABL that-M S-GEN
differri].
carry away-INFIN-PASS

‘Certainly, [the plan is] that I should pretend I’m carried away with love for him.’ (Pl. Mil. 1163)

(476) proi adsimuletque sesi esse uxorem]
   pretend-3 S S-SUBJ -and ANA ACC be-INF wife-F S-ACC

‘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 infinitivals 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>
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 proi mei consulanas {nummum illum}k [quemk 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 proi pollicitu’si [...PRO dare]
dudum 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, ...] egoi [...uxorem, ...] promisi [...{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

pollicitus pro
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.
‘[He] will be fine, on my honor I promise that.’ (Pl. Men. 894)

‘Promise this will be.’ (Pl. Aul. 219)

‘Sceledrus, I promise that fate will be upon your [head].’ (Pl. Mil. 326)

‘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)

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.

‘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) \( Qui_t e_j \text{dilig}t_i \text{pro}_i \text{aetatis facie}^{63} -que \text{tuae}_j \text{tej} \text{facie}^{63} -se_i \text{fautorem}_j \text{ostendat}_i \text{pro}_i \text{fore} \text{amicum}_i \text{polliceatur}_i. \)

\( Qui_t e_j \text{dilig}t_i \text{pro}_i \text{aetatis facie}^{63} -que \text{tuae}_j \text{tej} \text{facie}^{63} -se_i \text{fautorem}_j \text{ostendat}_i \text{pro}_i \text{fore} \text{amicum}_i \text{polliceatur}_i. \)

‘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</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>

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) *Di me perdant si ego tui quicquam apstuli, ni vellem.*

‘May the gods destroy me if I stole anything from you, nor would [I] wish to have stolen anything.’ (Pl. *Aul.* 645-646)

(487) *pro adeo apstulissem vellem.*

‘...to there take away-INFIN-PERF wish-1-S-IMPERF-SUBJ’

199
‘[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) *Nunc* pro\(_i\) *velle* \_i [me\(_i\) *emitti* manu\(_j\)].

‘Now I want [lit. ‘myself’] to be manumitted.’ (Pl. Aul. 823)

(489) pro\(_i\) *domi* cum auspicamus\(_i\), pro\(_j\) [honorem\(_k\) me\(_j\) \{dium immortalium\}_1...] velim\(_i\) [...]habuisse\(_j\)].

‘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) *Sed* utrum nunc tu\(_i\) [caelibem\(_i\) te\(_j\) esse...] mavis\(_i\)

[...liberum\(_i\)] an [pro\(_i\) maritum\(_i\) servom\(_i\) aetatem degere et

{gnatos tuos\(_j\)}?\)

‘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) *Ego* \_i [me\(_i\)...] nunc *velle* [\{ius pontificium\}_1 optime scire].

‘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><strong>CO-INDEXED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>velle</em></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nolle</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>malle</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISJOINT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>velle</em></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nolle</em></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>malle</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>velle</em></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nolle</em></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>malle</em></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some examples of ECM with *nolle* are in (492-494), and with *malle* in (495-497).

(492) \[ \text{pro}_i \ [\text{mirari} \ldots nolim}_i \text{[mirari...] not wish-1-s-subj you-pl-acc why Jupiter-M-S-NOM} \]

* nunc}

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) \[ \text{pro}_i \text{id}_i \quad \text{noluerint}_i \quad \text{[...evenire]}. \]

(ANA-N-S-ACC) (not wish-3-PL-SUBJ) (happen-INFIN)

‘They wouldn’t have wanted that to occur.’  (Cato Or. 164)

(494) \[ \text{pro}_i \text{adiuret}_i \quad \text{insuper} \quad \text{[pro}_i \text{nolle} \quad \text{[pro}_j \text{esse} \quad \text{dicta}_j]. \]

swear to-3-S-SUBJ on top not wish-INFIN be-INFIN say-PPP-N-PL-ACC

(495) \[ \text{pro}_i \text{[eos}_j \quad \text{reduci} \quad \text{quam} \quad \text{relinqui}, \quad \text{pro}_j \]

lead back-INFIN-PASS than leave behind-INFIN-PASS

(ANA-M-PL-ACC) (drag away-INFIN-PASS) (than) (desert-INFIN-PASS) (prefer-1-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)

(496) \[ \text{nis}_i \quad \text{quidem} \quad \text{qui}_i \quad \text{[sese}_i \quad \text{malit}_i \quad \text{[pugnitus} \quad \text{pessum}. \]

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’

(497) \[ \text{pro}_i \quad \text{[sese}_i \quad \text{-que} \quad i \quad \text{perire}... \quad \text{mavolunt}_i \quad \text{[...ibidem} \quad \text{quam} \quad \text{cum} \]

shame-N-S-ABL return-INFIN to own-M-PL-ACC fellow countryman-M-PL-ACC

(ANA-ACC) (AND) (then) (die-INFIN) (prefer-3-PL) (same place) (than) (with)

‘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>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>194</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nelle</em></td>
<td>30 100%</td>
<td>44 100%</td>
<td>44 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>malle</em></td>
<td>12 100%</td>
<td>19 100%</td>
<td>31 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>236</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>416</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) \( D_i \) [me\( \_j \)] *servatum* [\( \_j/\_o \)] volun\( \_t \).

god-M-PL-NOM I-S-ACC save-PPP-M-ACC/save-SUPINE-N-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, [me, salvom, et servatum] volunt.*

‘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... ego, [...me,...] mavelim, [...leto malo] quam

[non ego, illi dem, hodie insidias seni].

‘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 proi militi\textsubscript{k} animum\textsubscript{j} adieceris\textsubscript{i}, simulare.
as if soldier-M-S-DAT mind-M-S-ACC throw to-2-S-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\textsubscript{i} exierit\textsubscript{i} intus, proj [istinc te\textsubscript{k}]
but when that-M-S-NOM go out-3-FUTPERF (from) inside from there you-S-ACC
procul ita... volo\textsubscript{j} [...adsimulare], [praec illius\textsubscript{i} forma\textsubscript{j}]
from a distance thus wish-1-s pretend-INFIN before that-M-S-GEN appearance-F-S-ABL
quasi prok spernas\textsubscript{k} tuam\textsubscript{k}.
as if scorn-2-S-SUBJ 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) proi adsimulato\textsubscript{i} quasi proi gubernator\textsubscript{i} sies\textsubscript{i}.
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\textsubscript{i} proj vivat\textsubscript{j} proi volo\textsubscript{i} [ut proj [PRO\textsubscript{j} mihi\textsubscript{i}]]
long time live-3-S-SUBJ wish-1-S COMP I-S-DAT
prodesse] possess\textsubscript{j}.
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) proi [me\textsubscript{i}... nolo\textsubscript{i} [...in \{tempore hoc\textsubscript{k} videat\textsubscript{j} senex\textsubscript{j}].
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)
‘If [you] want the dried figs to be fresh, place [them] in an earthenware vessel.’ (Cato Agr. 99)

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 mi [PRO] libere quidvis loqui].
‘Now I’m allowed to freely speak anything at all.’ (Pl. Amph. 393)

b. Non licet [hominem esse] saepe ita ut proj volt]
‘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 me hoc noctis esse]; proj cenavi
‘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).

(510) Quom id mihi placebat tum {uno ore} omnesk
doing-AUX-ACC please-SIMP-3rd then one-NOM-ABL all-PREP-MPL
dicere et {prok laudare {fortunas meas}m].
say-SIMP and praise fortune-PREP-MPL-ACC my-PREP-MPL-ACC
‘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 praeagnanti 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).

(511) Enim vero [praeagnanti...] oportet malum et malum
for truly pregnant-SIMP-ACC be fitting-3rd and bad-NOM-ACC and apple-NOM-ACC
dari], ut quod pro obrodat sit, [PRO animo...]
give-INFIN PASS COMP INDEF-NOM-ACC gnaw at-3rd SUBJ be-3rd SUBJ mind-MPL-ABL
‘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 màlum ‘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) satius, [me queri {illo modo}], enough-COMPAR-N-S-NOM I-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) Decet, [te equidem vera proloqui]. be fitting-3-S you-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}, quasi necessus, sit si pro pro [te non daf uxorem ducere]. laughable-N-S-VOC head-N-S-VOC as if necessary-N-S-NOM be-3-S-SUBJ if this-M-S-DAT not give-3-S you-ACC that-F-S-ACC wife-F-S-ACC lead-INFIN

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 depugnari at needs to be fought [by us] to fight with drawn [swords]’ (Pl. Cas. 344) and Necessus’est, Clitipho, consilia consequi 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) 
\[
\text{studere}\]
be eager for-INFIN

‘It is fitting for the head of the household to seek from earliest youth to manage a farm.’ (Cato Agro. III)

(516) 
\[
\text{sed}\]
but

‘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) 
\[
\text{tempus}\]
time-N-S-NOM

‘It’s time for me to remind this neighbor Phania.’ (Ter. Hea. 169)

(518) 
\[
\text{ergo}\]
therefore

‘Since these things are this way now, Antipho, so much is it right for you to be on your guard.’ (Ter. Phor. 203)

(519) 
\[
\text{melius}\]
good-N-S-COMPAR

‘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, conserere, 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$_{j}$ 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, ancillas$_{m}$ mulos$_{m}$ muliones$_{m}$ pedisequos$_{m}$
{salutigerulos pueros$_{p}$ vehicla$_{q}$ qui pro$_{r}$ vehar$_{r}$}_s
well wisher-M-PL-ACC boy-M-PL-ACC vehicle-N-PL-ACC how pro$_{r}$ 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$_{i}$ est$_{i}$ nam pro$_{j}$ [pro$_{k}$ esse bonum$_{i}$] ex voltu$_{m}$ cognosco$_{j}$
believe-INFIN decide-PPP-N-S-NOM be-3-S for be-INF 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* 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] opportuit, [ne proj dieres].

‘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,...] decretat; [...] dare sese; mi; hodie}\)

‘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 experrecta; exes; [tei]

‘But woman after rise up be-2-S you-S-ACC’

{i prodigiali Iovi{k aut} {mola salsa}l hodie aut

portentous-M-S-DAT Jupiter-M-S-DAT or meal-F-S-ABL salt-PFF-S-ABL today or
‘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></td>
<td>305</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>330</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>364</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) 

\[
\text{[pro} \_ \text{loricam}_k \text{induam}_i \text{mi}_i \text{optumum}_j \text{esse]} \text{pro} \_ \text{arbitror}_i.
\]

‘I think it’s best for me that I put on my armor.’ (Pl. Cas. 695)

(527) 

\[
\text{Videtur}\_i \text{tempus}_i \text{esse} [\text{ut} \text{pro}_j \text{eamus}_j \text{ad forum}_k].
\]

‘It seems to be time that we go to the forum.’ (Pl. Mil. 72)

(528) 

\[
\text{pro}_i \text{dicas}_j \text{-que} [\text{tempus}_j \text{maxume} \text{esse}] \text{pro}_k \text{eat}_k
\]

‘And you should say it’s high time she should go home.’ (Pl. Mil. 1101)

(529) 

\[
\text{Villam aedificandam}_j \text{si} \text{pro}_i \text{locabis}_j \text{novam}_j \text{ab}
\]

‘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)
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-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)

equally you-S-ACC be-INF towards that-M-S-ACC see-1-S as that-M-S-ACC you-S-ACC

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 compotem] 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
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‘You know she has been found participating in bad behavior.’ (Naev. Trag. 10-11)

(537) Scito [pro ratione fructum esse].

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

In addition to the verbs shown above, certain other predicates also license AcI complements. These include the NP argumentum ‘argument’, as in (538).

(538) Vincoi -n proj argumentis [tei 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.

(539) Idi quidem palam esti [eami esse]. ut prok dicisx.

‘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).

(540) [{Meum gnatum}]j... rumor 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.

(541) Sed ita dictu[...salvom esse et remm et filiumn], [mei {mea omnia...]

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) \( \text{pro}_i \ \text{hominem}_j \ \text{[PRO}_j \ \text{ad} \ \text{forum}_k \ldots \ \text{iussi}_i \ \text{[...opperiri]} \ \text{[eo}_k \ \text{me}_i \ \text{esse} \ \text{adducturum}_i \ \text{senem}_i] \).

‘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 50: AcI Predicates by Semantic Cluster.

<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>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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’ 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’ predicate 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) \[Quem_{i...} hercle ego_{1} [...item_{k} adeo perdidisse] gaudeo_{1}.\]
\[REL-M-S-ACC indeed I-S-NOM lawsuit-F-S-ACC to there lose-INFN-PERF rejoice-1-S\]

‘Indeed, I’m glad he lost the case.’ (Pl. Cas. 568)

(544) \[pro_{i} crucior_{1} \{bolum\}_{71} tantum_{i} mi_{1} ereptum_{1} tam\]
\[torture-I-S-PASS gain-M-S-ACC such-M-S-ACC I-S-DAT snatch away-PPP-M-S-ACC so\]
\[desubito e faucibus_{k}.\]
\[suddenly out of throat-F-PL-ABL\]

‘I’m in torture that such a tasty morsel was so suddenly snatched out of my throat.’ (Ter. Heau. 673)

(545) \[pro_{i} laetus_{1} sum_{1} \{laudari me_{1} abs te_{i...}\}, pater_{1}\]
\[happy-M-S-NOM be-I-S praise-INFN-PASS I-S-ACC by you-S-ABL father-M-S-VOC\]
\[a \{laudato viro\}_{j}.\]
\[by praise-PPP-M-S-ABL man-M-S-ABL\]

‘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>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disjoint</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>812</strong></td>
<td><strong>70%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,166</strong></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><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>334</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
<td><strong>431</strong></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) pro\textsubscript{i} ut [alios\textsubscript{j} in tragoeditis\textsubscript{k}] vidi\textsubscript{i}, [... {Neptunum, as other-M-PL-ACC in tragedy-F-PL-ABL see-1-S-PERF Neptune-M-S-ACC]
Virtutem, Victoriam, Martem, Bellonam\textsuperscript{72} commemorare

\[
\{\text{quae bona}\}_j \text{ pro}_j \text{ vocis}_m \text{ fecissent}_j
\]

‘as I have seen others – Neptune, Goodness, Victory, Mars, and Bellona – recount what good things they have done for you.’ (Pl. Amph. 41-44)

\[
\text{pro}_i \text{ hominem}_j \text{ conmonstrarier mi}_i \text{ istum}_j \ldots \text{ volo}_i \text{ aut } \text{ ubi}_i
\]

‘I want that man shown to me, or else where he lives to be pointed out.’ (Ter. Phor. 305-306)

\[
\text{pro}_i \{\text{qua re alia}\}_j \text{ ex crimine}_k \text{ possis}_i, \text{ pro}_i \text{ delica}_i.
\]

‘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).

\[
\text{pro}_i \{\text{quid}\}_k \text{ tam intus fuisse te}_j \ldots \text{ dicam}_i \ldots \text{ diui}\?
\]

‘For what reason will I say you were inside for such a long time?’ (Pl. Mil. 1201)

\[
\text{pro}_i \{\text{quibus}\}_k \text{ -nam te}_j \ldots \text{ aibant}_i \ldots \text{ exortum}_j \text{ locis}_k\?
\]

‘From what place [lit. ‘places’] were they saying you came?’ (Acc. Trag. 379)

\textsuperscript{72} Bellona \textit{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 \textit{Secunda}, a third, \textit{Tertia}, etc.). Perhaps because of her status as a (minor) deity, \textit{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) \[Video_1 \text{-n} \text{ego}_i \text{[Getam}_j \text{currentem}_j \text{huc} \text{advenire]}?\]

‘Do I see Geta running here?’ (Ter. Phor. 177)

(552) \[pro_i ibi \text{manens}_i \text{sedeto}_i \text{donicum videbis}_i \text{[me]}\]

‘Remain seated there until you see I’ve come home riding in a cart.’ (Liv. Ody. 20-21)

(553) \[nam \text{pro}_i \text{ut} \text{[pro}_j \text{ludere laetantes}_j \text{inter se}_j \text{vidimus}_i \text{…praeter amnem creterris sumere aquam ex fonte]}\]

‘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

---

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.

\[(554) \text{ pro } \text{id} \text{ voluit, } [[\text{nos} \text{ sic necopinantisk} \text{ duci} \text{ thus unaware-PART-M-PL-ACC lead-inFIN-PASS}} \text{ {falso gaudio}_{1}, sperantisk} \text{ iam, } \{\text{amoto metu}\}_{m}, \text{ [pro k interoscitantisk opprimi]j}, \text{ ne essetn spatiumn cogitandi ad disturbandalas nuptias; astute.} \text{ to disturb-GERUNDIVE-F-PL-ACC marriage-F-PL-ACC cunningly}}\]

\['He wanted this, for us to be lead unaware by false hope, now hoping, with fear removed, [for us] while we were gaping to be taken by surprise, so that there wouldn’t be any time for devising how to ruin the wedding; [he did it] cunningly.’ (Ter. And. 180-183)\]

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.

\[(555) \text{ pro } \text{ vidi} \text{ [tej, Ulixesj, saxo sternentemj Hectorak], vidi} \text{ [proj tegentemj clipeo {classem Doricanj1}].} \text{ to see-1-S-PERF you-S-ACC Ulysses-M-S-VOC rock-N-S-ABL spread-PART-S-ACC Hector-M-S-ACC cover-PART-S-ACC shield-M-S-ABL fleet-F-S-ACC Dorian-F-S-ACC}}\]

\['I saw you, Ulysses, lay Hector flat with a rock, I saw you protecting the Dorian fleet with your shield. (Acc. Trag. 115-116)\]

\[(556) \text{ proi memo} \text{ [ibi {candelabrum ligneum}j ardentem]} \text{.} \text{ remember-1-S-PERF there candelabrum-M-S-ACC wooden-M-S-ACC burn-PART-S-ACC}}\]

\['I remember a wooden candelabrum burning there.’ (Caec. Fab. 107)\]
(557) *Sed pro_1 [patruom_1…] video_1 […cum patre astantem]_1*.  
but father’s brother-M-S-ACC see-1-S with father-M-S-ABL stand near-PART-S-ACC  

‘But I see [my] father’s brother standing nearby with [my] father.’  (Ter. Phor. 607)

(558) *Interea [\{uxorem tuam\}_1 neque gementem\_1 neque plorantem\_1]*  
see-1-S-PERF you-ACC Ulysses-M-S-VOC rock-N-S-ABL spread-PART-S-ACC Hector-M-S-ACC  
\{nostrum quisquam\}_1 i audivimus\_1*.  
I-PL-GEN INDEFIN-M-S-NOM hear-1-PL-PERF  

‘Meanwhile not one of us heard your wife either sighing or weeping.’  (Pl. Amph. 1098-1099)

(559) *Hic [illam\_1…] vidit\_1 […osculantem\_1], [quantum hunc\_1…]*  
this-M-S-NOM that-F-S-ACC see-3-S-PERF kiss-PART-S-ACC as much this-M-S-ACC  

\{audivi\_1, \_loqui\}_1*.  
hear-1-S-PERF speak-INFIN  

‘He saw her kissing [someone], at least I heard him say so.’  (Pl. Mil. 275)

(560) *Atque ego [illi…] aspicio\_74 […osculantem\_1 Philocomasium\_1 cum\_1]*  
but I-S-NOM there look at-1-S KISS-PART-S-ACC Philocomasium-N-S-ACC with  

altero nescioquo adulescente\_1].  
another-M-S-ABL INDEFIN-M-S-ABL youth-M-S-ABL  

‘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.

(561) *Ut si illic\_1 conscirminatus sit\_1 adversum militem\_1*  
as if that-M-S-NOM allege-PPP-DEPON-M-S-NOM be-3-S-SUBJ opposite soldier-M-S-ACC  

\{meu’ conservos\}_1, [pro\_1 [eam\_1…] vidisse […]hic cum\_1]*  
my-M-S-NOM fellow slave-M-S-NOM ANA-F-S-ACC see-INFIN-PERF here with  

\{alieno\_6 osculari\}_1, pro_1 [[eam\_1…] arguam_1 […]vidisse […]apud\_1 te] contra […]{conservom meum}_1, [cum suo_1 amatore\_1]*  
another-M-S-ABL kiss-INFIN-DEPON ANA-F-S-ACC argue-1-S-FUT see-INFIN-PERF among you-S-ACC on the contrary fellow slave-M-S-ACC my-M-S-ACC with own-M-S-ABL lover-M-S-ABL  

amplexantem_1, atque osculantem_1].  
embrace-PART-S-ACC and kiss-PART-S-ACC  

‘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’ non potuit quin sermone suo aliquem familiae participaverit de amica.

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)

proPhilocomasium eccam75 domi, quam in proxumo...

Here’s Philocomasium at home – the one you said you saw kissing and embracing someone else.’ (Pl. Mil. 319-320)

Atque pro arguo [...] me vidisse [...osculantem] hic intus cum alieno viro].

But I insist I saw her kissing some other man here inside.’ (Pl. Mil. 337-338)

Tu scelestes, aies [...osculantem]?

‘Do you claim you saw me kissing [her] here next door, you scoundrel?’ (Pl. Mil. 366)

ut tususipicus esi pro [eam] vidisse [...osculantem].

‘as you suspected [you] saw her kissing [someone]’ (Pl. Mil. 399-401)

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*$_i$ *Chremes*$_i$ *postridie* *ad* *me* *clamitans*$_i$, {*indignum* *facinus*}, [pro$_i$ *comperisse* *[Pamphilum]$_k$ *pro* *uxore* *habere* *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) *Aliquot*$_i$ *me* *adierunt*$_i$, [ex *te* *auditum*…] *qui$_i$ aibant$_i$ […*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 *videre* ‘to see’ or *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$_i$ [mare$_i$ *velis* *floreere* *videres*$_i$.]

‘You would see the sea flower(ing) with sails.’ (Cato Or. 29)

(570) *Vide*$_i$ -n *tu$_i$* [illic *oculos*$_i$ *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)  
\[
\text{Tu -n [domo prohibere peregre me advenientem] postulas?}
\]

\[
\text{you-S-NOM \text{-Y/N home-F-S-ABL prohibit-INFIN barely I-S-ACC come\-PART-S-ACC demand-2-S}}
\]
‘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) \textit{Lubet}_{i} \pro_{j} \text{[PRO}_{j} \textit{Chalinum}_{k} \text{[quid]} \pro_{l} \textit{agat}_{k}…} \text{scire}

\begin{align*}
\text{Lubet}_{i} & \quad \text{please-3-S} & \quad \text{Chalinum}_{k} & \quad \text{INTERROG-N-S-ACC} \\
\text{pro}_{j} & \quad \text{do}-3-\text{S-SUBJ} & \quad \text{agat}_{k} & \quad \text{known-INFIN} \\
\text{[PRO}_{j} & \quad \text{Chalinum}_{k} & \quad \text{quid]} \pro_{l} & \quad \text{scire} \\
\text{agat}_{k} & \quad \text{do}-3-\text{S-SUBJ} & \quad \text{known-INFIN} \\
\end{align*}

\[ \ldots \{\text{novom nuptum}\}_{k} \quad \text{cum} \quad \{\text{novo marito}\}_{m} \].

‘I’d like [lit. ‘it pleases’] to know Chalinus, what the new male bride is doing with the new bridegroom.’ (Pl. \textit{Cas}. 859)

Similarly, the NP \textit{patrem} in (578) appears to be interpreted as the direct object of \textit{scire}.

(578) \textit{Phor.} \quad \text{[Hanc]}_{i} \quad \text{Demipho}_{i} \quad \text{negat}_{i} \quad \text{[...esse cognatam]}_{j}?

\begin{align*}
\text{Phor.} & \quad \text{[Hanc]}_{i} \quad \text{Demipho}_{i} \quad \text{negat}_{i} \quad \text{[...esse cognatam]}_{j} \\
\text{Geta} & \quad \text{pro}_{i} \quad \text{negat}_{i} \quad \text{deny-3-S} \\
\text{Phor.} & \quad \text{[Hanc]}_{i} \quad \text{Demipho}_{i} \quad \text{negat}_{i} \quad \text{[...esse cognatam]}_{j} \\
\text{Geta} & \quad \text{He does.} \\
\text{Phor.} & \quad \text{And [he says] that he doesn’t know her father, who he was?’} \quad \text{(Ter. Phor. 353-354)}
\end{align*}

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. \text{pro}_{i} \quad \text{volo}_{i} \quad \text{[me]}_{i} \quad \text{esse} \quad \text{bonum}].

\begin{align*}
\text{wishes-1-S} & \quad \text{be-INFIN} & \quad \text{good-M-S-ACC} \\
\text{I-S-ACC} & \quad \text{ANAL-M-S-GEN} & \quad \text{be-INFIN} & \quad \text{good-M-S-ACC} \\
\text{I-S-ACC} & \quad \text{ANAL-M-S-GEN} & \quad \text{be-INFIN} & \quad \text{good-M-S-ACC} \\
\end{align*}

b. *\text{pro}_{i} \quad \text{volo}_{i} \quad \text{[pro}_{i} \quad \text{esse} \quad \text{bonum}].

\begin{align*}
\text{wishes-1-S} & \quad \text{be-INFIN} & \quad \text{good-M-S-ACC} \\
\text{I-S-ACC} & \quad \text{ANAL-M-S-GEN} & \quad \text{be-INFIN} & \quad \text{good-M-S-ACC} \\
\text{I-S-ACC} & \quad \text{ANAL-M-S-GEN} & \quad \text{be-INFIN} & \quad \text{good-M-S-ACC} \\
\end{align*}

‘I want to be good’.
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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) proi [proi molestai ei essi] noloi.

‘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 molestai esse] noloi.

b. *[proi molestam esse] noloi.

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 proi [medaetatem viduam esse] mavelimi quam [proi

{istaec flagitia tua]j pati] quae tu facis.

‘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 [caelibem tei esse...] mavisi

[...liberum] an [proi maritum servum 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)  
\[
\text{[Emortuom}_{i\ldots}]} \text{ego}_{i} \quad \text{[...me}_{i\ldots}]} \text{mavelim}_{i} \quad \text{[...leto \ malo]} \quad \text{quam} \\
\text{die \ off-PPP-DEPON-M-S-ACC} \quad \text{I-S-NOM} \quad \text{I-s-ACC} \quad \text{prefer-1-S-SUBJ} \quad \text{death-N-S-ABL} \quad \text{bad-N-S-ABL} \quad \text{than} \\
\text{[non \ ego}_{i} \quad \text{illi \ dem}_{i} \quad \text{hodie \ insidias \ seni].} \\
\text{not} \quad \text{I-S-NOM} \quad \text{that-M-S-DAT} \quad \text{give-1-S-SUBJ} \quad \text{today} \quad \text{trap-F-PL-ACC} \quad \text{old-M-S-DAT} \\
\]

‘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 54: Co-Indexed Infinitival Subjects (all ECM combined).

<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 proi pollicitus sumi [proi suscepturum proj]

‘For I have promised [I] will raise [him] up.’ (Ter. And. 400-401)

Tu suscipit es [proi eam i vidisse osculantem]

‘You suspected [you] saw her kissing.’ (Pl. Mil. 401)

proi [proi depoclassere aliqua sperans ....] despeculassere

deargentassere, proi decalauticare, proi eburno speculo

‘hoping somewhat to ungoblet me, to unsilver and unshawl me, to unmirror me from my ivory mirror.’ (Luc. Sat. 640-641)

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) \[pro_i [experiri istuc...] mavellem_i [...me_i] quam [pro_j mi_i] \]

\[memorarier].\]

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) \[Negas_i [pro_i novisse me]? Negas_i [pro_i-ECMsubj \{patrem meum\}_i] 77 \]

\[deny-2-S get to know-INFIN-PERF I-S-ACC deny-2- S father-M-S-ACC my-M-S-ACC \]

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

(590) \[Tu_i-n [pro_i me_j vidisse in proxumo hic], sceleste ai si osculantem?\]

\[you -Y/N I-S-ACC SEE-INFIN-PERF in close-SUPER-M-S-ABL here scoundrel-M-S-VOC say-2-S kiss-PART-S-ACC \]

‘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) \[Uxorem... deceret_i [dare sese_i mi] hodie].\]

\[wife-F-S-ACC decide-3-S-PLUPERF give-INFIN ANA-ACC I-S-DAT today \]

77 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.
‘He had decided to give me a wife today’ (lit. ‘decided himself to give me a wife’) (Ter. And. 238)

\[(592) \{Omnes mortales\}_i [sese_i laudarier] optant.\]

‘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).

\[(593) Ego_i [me...] nunc volo_i [ius pontificium]_j optime scire].\]

‘I now wish [lit. ‘me’] to know the priestly law very well.’ (Cato Or. 197)

Example (594) has co-indexing in the second person.

\[(594) Ego_i faxim_i pro_j [[ted_j Amphitruonem esse...] malis_j [...quam Iovem]].\]

‘I would have made you prefer [lit. ‘yourself’] to be Amphitryon than Jupiter.’ (Pl. Amph. 511)

In (595) the co-indexing is a bound third-person entity.

\[(595) pro_i [sese_i -que i perire...] mavolunt_i [...ibidem quam cum stupro redire ad suos popularis].\]

‘They prefer themselves to die then and there than to return with shame to their own countrymen.’ (Naev. Bell. 59-60)

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) \textbf{Ille} \textit{atque adiuret i} \textit{insuper, \[pro_i \text{nolle esse dicta].}\
that-M-S-NOM and swear-3-S-SUBJ on over not-want-INFIN be-INFIN say-PPP-N-PL-ACC

‘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. \textit{Amph.} 889-890)

(597) \textbf{Menaechme} \textit{j, pro_i \[pro_i \text{amare...]} ait_i \[...te_i \text{multum]} \textit{Erotium} i}.\
Menaechmus-M-S-VOC [proo love-INFIN say-3-S you-S-ACC much Erotium-N-S-NOM

‘Menaechmus, Erotium asks ‘please’ [lit. ‘says [she] loves you a lot’].\(^{79}\) (Pl. \textit{Men.} 524)

Examples (598-601) exploit pro-drop even further by leaving both subjects as null.

(598) \textbf{Dum pro_i censent_i \[pro_i \text{terrere pro_j minis}, \text{pro_i}}\
while believe-3-PL frighten-INFIN threat-F-PL-ABL

\textit{hortantur} \textit{i} \textit{ibi sos} \textsuperscript{80}.\
encourage-3-PL-DEPON there ANA-M-PL-ACC

‘While they believe [they] frighten them with threats, instead they encourage them.’\
(Enn. \textit{Ann.} 244)

(599) \textbf{pro_i \[pro_i \text{vestimentis} i \text{frigus} j \text{atque horrorem} k \text{exacturum} i]}\
clothing-N-PL-ABL cold-N-S-ACC and shivering-M-S-ACC drive out-PART-FUT-M-S-ACC

\textit{putet} \textit{i}.\
think-3-S-SUBJ

‘He may think [he] will drive out the cold and shivering with clothes.’ (Luc. \textit{Sat.} 686)

(600) \textbf{pro_i ait \[pro_i \text{tibij} \text{uxoremj dare hodie]}}.\
say-3-S you-S-DAT wife-F-S-ACC give-INFIN today

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

(601) \textbf{pro_i \[pro_i \text{altero te occisurum} \textsuperscript{81} i...]} \textit{ait_i \[...altero vilicum}}\
other-M-S-ABL you-S-ACC kill-PART-FUT-M-S-ACC say-3-S other-M-S-ABL bailiff-M-S-ACC

\textsuperscript{78} \textit{Nollem dictum} ‘I would not want said’ is a standard formula of apology (Sedgwick, 1967, p. 119).

\textsuperscript{79} See Gratwick (p. 189) for the meaning of this sentence.

\textsuperscript{80} \textit{Sos} is an archaic form of \textit{eos}, a form of the unbound anaphor \textit{is}. In the corpus, \textit{s-} forms of \textit{is} occur only in Ennius.

\textsuperscript{81} This is an instance of non-agreement on [gender] with a future active participle: The subject NP \textit{Casina} (unambiguously recoverable from the co-text) is [+] feminine, but the form \textit{occisurum} is elsewhere only [+] masculine or [+] neuter.
‘[She] says today [she] will kill you with one [of the swords] and the bailiff with the other.’  (Pl. *Cas*. 692-693)

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) \( \text{pro}_i \; \text{[rabere se}_1 \text{ait}_i \text{]} \)

be insane-INFIN ANA-ACC say-3-5

‘He says he’s insane.’  (Caec. *Plays* 77)

(603) \( \text{ne pro}_i \; [\text{plus}_n \text{... censeat}_i \; [...sapere se}_1 \text{quam dominum}_1] \)

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) \( \text{pro}_i \; \text{deierat}_i \; [\text{se}_1 \text{non scripsisse pro}_j \; \text{et pro}_i \text{post non scripturum}_i \text{]} \)

swear-3-5 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) \( \text{pro}_i \; \text{narrabit}_i \; [\text{servom}_j \text{hinc sese}_i \text{a foribus Sosiam}_j \text{amovisse}\text{]} \)

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)
\[
\begin{align*}
(606) \quad & \text{pro}_i \quad [[\text{pro} \quad \text{imperio} \quad \text{vobis}_j \quad \text{quod}_k \quad \text{dictum} \quad \text{foret}]] \\
& \text{on behalf of} \quad \text{you-PL-DAT} \quad \text{REL-N-S-NOM} \quad \text{say-PPP-N-S-NOM} \quad \text{be-3-S-IMPERF-SUBJ} \\
& \text{scibat}_i \quad [\ldots \text{pro}_j \quad \text{facturos}_j], \quad \text{quippe} \quad \text{qui}_i \quad \text{intellexerat}_i \\
& \text{know-3-S-IMPERF} \quad \text{do-PART-FUT-M-PL-ACC} \quad \text{REL-N-S-NOM} \quad \text{know-3-S-PLUPERF} \\
& \text{[vereri} \quad \text{vos}_j \quad \text{se}_i \quad \text{et} \quad \text{metuere}_j]. \quad \text{revere-INFIN-DEPON} \quad \text{you-PL-ACC} \quad \text{ANA-ACC} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{fear-INFIN} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{‘[He] knew you would do what was commanded of you, indeed he knew you revere and fear him [lit. ‘himself’].’ (Pl. Amph. 21-23)}
\end{align*}\]

\[
(607) \quad \text{pro}_i \quad \text{dixit}_i \quad [[a \quad \text{decemviris}_k \quad \text{pars} \quad \text{bene} \quad \text{sibi}_i \quad \text{cibaria}_j] \\
\text{say-3-S-PERF} \quad \text{from} \quad \text{MAN-PL-ABL} \quad \text{little} \quad \text{well} \quad \text{ANA-DAT} \quad \text{foodstuff-N-PL-ACC} \\
& \text{curata}_i \quad \text{esse}. \quad \text{take care of-PPP-N-PL-ACC} \quad \text{be-INFIN} \\
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{‘He said little food had been prepared for him [lit. ‘himself’] by the decemvirs.’ (Cato Or. 58)}
\end{align*}\]

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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-INDEXED Subj. Ctrl. ~ ECM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic</td>
<td>33 90%</td>
<td>4 11%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>1 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcI</td>
<td>261 92%</td>
<td>23 8%</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>295 92%</td>
<td>27 8%</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISJOINT Subj. Ctrl. ~ ECM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic</td>
<td>170 85%</td>
<td>31 15%</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>290 59%</td>
<td>205 41%</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcI</td>
<td>1,002 86%</td>
<td>164 14%</td>
<td>1,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,462 79%</td>
<td>400 21%</td>
<td>1,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,757 80%</td>
<td>427 20%</td>
<td>2,184</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 *inclusis* 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 i esse per gentes...] cluebati [...omnium]

miserrimus]

miserable-SUPER-M-S-NOM

‘He was said to be the most miserable of all among the tribes.’ (Enn. *Fab.* 376)

(609) Resi magis quaequiturij quam [tj clientum...] fidesj cuius

modi clueatj

mean-SGEN be called-3-S-SBJ

‘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\}_{1} \text{cluent}_{1} \text{fecisse}_{1} \text{facinus}_{1} \\
\text{cluent}_{1} \text{do-INFIN-PERF}\text{facinus}_{1} \text{deed-N-S-ACC} \\
\text{maximum}_{1} \\
\text{great-SUPER-N-S-ACC} \\
\text{‘The two sons of Atreus are said to have done a very great deed.’ (Pl. Bac. 925)}

(611) \text{Atque}_{1} \text{me}_{1} \text{minoris}_{1} \text{facio}_{1} \text{praet}_{1} \text{illo}_{1} \text{qui}_{1} \text{cluet}_{1} \\
\text{and}_{1} \text{I-S-ACC}_{1} \text{less-N-S-GEN}_{1} \text{make-1-S}_{1} \text{before}_{1} \text{that-M-S-ABL}_{1} \text{REL-M-S-NOM}_{1} \text{be called-3-S} \\
\text{omnim}_{1} \text{all-F-PL-GEN} \\
\text{legum}_{1} \text{atque}_{1} \text{iurum}_{1} \text{fictor}_{1} \text{conditor}_{1} \text{cluet}_{1} \\
\text{law-F-PL-GEN}_{1} \text{and}_{1} \text{right-N-PL-GEN}_{1} \text{maker-M-S-NOM}_{1} \text{establisher-M-S-NOM}_{1} \text{be called-3-S} \\
\text{‘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* 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

---

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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>3 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>45 96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interjection</td>
<td>25 74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTROL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>905 87%</td>
<td>133 13%</td>
<td>1,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>184 67%</td>
<td>91 33%</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>92 99%</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic</td>
<td>31 97%</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentential</td>
<td>43 98%</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,255 85%</td>
<td>227 15%</td>
<td>1,482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECM</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subj.Ctrl. ~ ECM</td>
<td>160 60%</td>
<td>106 40%</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>17 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic</td>
<td>297 68%</td>
<td>137 32%</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcI</td>
<td>1,278 86%</td>
<td>215 14%</td>
<td>1,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,752 79%</td>
<td>458 21%</td>
<td>2,210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,080 82%</td>
<td>696 18%</td>
<td>3,776</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
greater-N-S-ABL -and work-N-S-ABL there of slaves-F-PL-NOM wedding-F-PL-NOM than
liberales_i etiam [...PRO_i curari i t_i] solent_i,
of free persons-F-PL-NOM even take care of-INFIN-PASS be accustomed-3-PL

‘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 not be able-3-S ANA-N-S-NOM do-INFIN-PASS REL-N-S-ACC
vis_i wish-2-S

‘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 how wisdom-F-S-ABL more our-F-S-ABL death-M-S-NOM avoid-INFIN-PASS
potest_i], nam-que Aesculapi_m liberorum_i saucii_k opplent_k
be able-3-S for -and Aesculapius-M-S-GEN child-M-PL-GEN wounded-M-PL-NOM fill up-3-PL
porticus_n pro_o non potest_o [PRO_o accedi]
portico-M-PL-ACC not be able-3-S approach-INFIN-PASS

‘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 mulcar]
INTERROG bad-F-S-ABL age-F-S-ABL prefer-2-S badly thrash-INFIN-PASS
‘Would you prefer at your bad time of life to be trashed about by every kind [of torture]?’ (Acc. Trag. 49)

(616) ubei proi facilumed [PROi gnoscer] potisiti
where easily know-INFIN-PASS be able-3-S-PERF-SUBJ

‘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.

(617) Nec proi [PROi retrahi...] potestur [...imperiis].
nor draw back-INFIN-PASS be able-3-S-PASS command-N-PL-ABL

‘Nor can [he] be drawn back by commands.’ (Enn. Var. 20)

(618) si [PROi qua...] proi potestur [...investigari via]
if INDEFIN-F-S-ABL be able-3-S-PASS track-INFIN-PASS road-F-S-ABL

‘if [he] can be tracked on any road’ (Pac. Trag. 98)

(619) Idi i habeat i ad summum {ansas IIII}j, uti [PROi
ANA-N-S-NOM have-3-S-SUBJ to highest-N-S-ACC handle-F-PL-ACC four COMP

transferri] proi possitur.
carry across-INFIN-PASS be able-3-S-IMPERF-SUBJ-PASS

‘It should have four handles on the top so that it can be [easily] carried.’ (Cato Agr. 154)

(620) si proi [PROi non sarciri] quitur;
if not mend-INFIN-PASS be able-3-S-PASS

‘if [it] can’t be mended’ (Caec. Fab. 273)

(621) Unde omniai [PROi perdisci ac percipi]
from there all-N-PL-NOM learn thoroughly-INFIN-PASS and comprehend-INFIN-PASS

queuntur.
be able-3-PL-PASS
‘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) pro\textsubscript{i} iube\textsubscript{i} vero pro\textsubscript{j} [PRO] \{vasa pura\}\textsubscript{k} adornari
\[ \text{order-2-S-IMPERAT but vessel-N-PL-ACC prepare-INFIN-PASS} \]
\[ t_k \text{ mihi} \]
\[ I-S-DAT \]

‘But order pure vessels to be prepared for me.’ (Pl. Amph. 946)

(623) pro\textsubscript{i} pro\textsubscript{j} Lesbiam\textsubscript{k} [PRO] adduci [t_k] iubes\textsubscript{i}.
\[ \text{Lesbia-F-S-ACC lead to-INFIN-PASS order-2-S} \]

‘You’re ordering Lesbia to be brought here.’ (Ter. And. 228)

(624) pro\textsubscript{i} pro\textsubscript{j} iussit\textsubscript{i} vestimenta\textsubscript{k} [PRO] detrahi atque \[ t_k \]
\[ \text{order-3-S-PERF clothing-N-PL-ACC pull away-INFIN-PASS and} \]
\[ flagro caedi t_k\].
\[ \text{fire-N-S-ABL cut-INFIN-PASS} \]

‘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 controlee 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) pro\textsubscript{i} iube\textsubscript{i} te\textsubscript{1} [PRO] piari \[ t_i \]
\[ \text{order-2-S-IMPERAT you-2-S-ACC propitiate-INFIN-PASS from my-F-S-ABL} \]
\[ pecunia\}, nam equidem [insanum\textsubscript{i} esse te\textsubscript{1}] certo scio. \]
\[ \text{money-F-S-ABL for indeed insane-M-S-ACC be-INFIN you-S-ACC certainly know-1-S} \]

‘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.

Note that with a different main verb, the co-indexing effect is similar to English. An example with abnuture, lit. ‘to nod away’ = ‘to prohibit’ is in (628).
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* -ne [PRO<sub>k</sub> *hac urbe privari* <sub>t<sub>j</sub></sub>] pro<sub>i</sub> *sines<sub>i</sub>*?

Pamphila-F-S-ACC -Y/N this-F-S-ABL city-F-S-ABL deprive-INFIN-PASS allow-2-S-FUT

‘Will you allow Pamphila to be kept out of this city?’ (Ter. *Phor.* 517)

(630) ne *tu<sub>i</sub> postul<sub>e<sub>i</sub></sub> {matulam unam<sub>ij</sub>} [PRO<sub>k</sub> *tibi…* ] aq<sub>i</sub>

lest you-S-NOM order-2-S-SUBJ pot-F-S-ACC one-F-S-ACC you-S-DAT water-F-S-GEN

[…*infundi* in caput <sub>t<sub>j</sub></sub>].

pour on-INFIN-PASS onto head-N-S-ACC

‘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<sub>i</sub> ordered Mercury<sub>j</sub> [PRO<sub>j</sub> to play the part of Sosia].

b. Mercury<sub>j</sub> was ordered (by Jupiter<sub>i</sub>) [PRO<sub>j</sub> to play the part of Sosia].

(632) a. Jupiter<sub>i</sub> ordered pro<sub>j</sub> Amphitryon<sub>k</sub> [PRO<sub>j</sub> to be removed t<sub>k</sub> from the house]

b. Amphitryon<sub>k</sub> was pro<sub>j</sub> ordered (by Jupiter<sub>i</sub>) [PRO<sub>j</sub> to be removed t<sub>k</sub> from the house]

Only two examples analogous to (631b) are found in the corpus, and they are shown in (633-634).

(633) pro<sub>j</sub> {mea *vi<sub>i</sub>* }<sub>i</sub> subact<sub>a<sub>j</sub></sub> 'st<sub>j</sub> [PRO<sub>j</sub> facere pro<sub>k</sub>].

my-F-S-ABL force-F-S-ABL compel-PPP-F-S-NOM be-3-S do-INFIN

‘She was compelled to do [it] by my force.’ (Pl. *Amph.* 1143)

(634) Ego<sub>j</sub> [PRO<sub>j</sub> *hunc<sub>k</sub>…* ] mis<sub>a<sub>j</sub></sub> sum<sub>j</sub> [...*ludere pro<sub>i</sub>* ] pro<sub>i</sub>.

1-S-NOM this-M-S-ACC send-PPP-F-S-NOM be-1-S play-INFIN

‘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.

(635) \( An, ut \{nequid turpe\}_1 \) civis\( sub_k \) in \( se_k \)
      admittet\( sub_k \)
      propter egestatem\( sup_i \)
      proxumo\( sub_i \)
      iussa\( sup_j \)
      aetatem\( sup_o \)
      degeret\( sup_o \)

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.
‘Now my father wants Amphitryon to be tricked.’ (Pl. *Amph.* 997)

(637) \( \text{pro}_i \) \([e_j \ \text{adsectari} \ t_k \ \text{se}_k]\) \( \text{cupidunt}_i. \)

‘[They] want to themselves to be followed.’ (Enn. *Var.* 31)

(638) \( \text{pro}_i \) \([\text{regnum}_k \ \text{tibi}_i \ \text{permitti} \ e_j \ t_k]\) \( \text{malunt}_i. \)

‘They prefer the kingdom to be handed over to you.’ (Acc. *Trag.* 468)

(639) \( \text{Haec}_m\ldots \) \( \text{tu}_i \ \text{si} \ \text{voles}_j \) \( \ldots\text{per auris}_n \ \text{pectus}_l \)

\( \text{inrigari} \ e_k \ t_i. \)

‘if you’ll allow [lit. ‘wish’] your mind to be watered by these things through your ears.’
( Luc. *Sat.* 690)

(640) \( \text{pro}_i \) \([\text{quaes}_k \ \text{diligentius} \ \text{seri} \ e_j \ t_k]\) \( \text{voles}_i, \) \( \text{[pro}_k \ \text{in} \text{calicibus}_m \ \text{seri}] \ \text{oportet}_i. \)

‘Those [plants] you’ll want sown more carefully should be sown in pots.’ (Cato *Agr.* 133)

(641) \( \text{pro}_j \) \( \text{araneas}_k \ \text{mi}_i\ldots \) \( \text{ego}_i \) \( \ldots\text{illas}_k \ \text{servari} \ t_k \) \( \text{volo}_i; \)

\( \text{pauper}_i \ \text{sum}_i. \)

‘I want those cobwebs preserved; I’m poor.’ (Pl. *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 *a vobis* is not agentive even though it occurs in the usual form (i.e. *a + NP*) and is in a passivized clause.

(642) \( \text{pro}_i \) \( \{iustam \ \text{rem} \ \text{et} \ \text{facilem}_i\} \ \text{esse}_j \ \text{oratam}_j \ t_i \)

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 proi erretis proi haecj duarumj hodie vicem hinc et illinc mulierj feretj imaginemj atque proj eademj erit verum proj aliaj esse tj adsimulabiturj.*

‘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 noctu acrioresj et vigilantioresj sintj.*

‘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 properatej, [cenamj iam esse coctamj ek tj] oportuittj.*

be fitting-3-S-PERF
‘Hurry up, dinner should have already been cooked by now.’ (Pl. Cas. 766)

\[
(646) \; [Haecc_t \; facta_k \; ab \; illo_j \; t_k \ldots] \; oportebat_o \; Syre_l,
\]

‘It was fitting for these things to have been done by him, Syrus.’ (Ter. Heau. 536)

Note the overt agentive NP \textit{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).

\[
(647) \; pro_i \; [pro_j \; \{haec \; omnia\}_k \ldots] \; vidi_i \; [\ldots inflammari], \; [pro_l \; Priamo \; vi \; vitam_m \; evitari], \; [pro_n \; Iovis \; aram_o \; sanguine \; turpari] .
\]

‘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).

\[
(648) \; a. \; \text{Jupiter}_i \; \text{told} \; \text{her}_j \; [\text{he}_i \; \text{was her husband}].
\]

\[
(648) \; b. \; \text{She}_j \; \text{was told (by Jupiter}_i \; [\text{he}_i \; \text{was her husband}].
\]

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,
However, promotion of the beneficiary to subject does occur, albeit rarely. Only three such examples occur in the corpus. Two of them are shown in (649-650).

\[(649)\quad \text{pro}_1 \quad \text{obsecro}_1, \quad \text{etiam\,-ne} \quad \text{pro}_j \quad \text{hoc}_1 \quad \text{negabis}_j, \quad [\text{te}_j \quad \{\text{auream} \text{pateram}_1\}\text{mihi}_1 \text{dedisse}_1 \text{dono}_1 \text{hodie}_1\}], \quad \text{etiam\,-ne} \quad \text{pro}_j \quad \text{hoc}_1 \quad \text{negabis}_j, \quad [\text{te}_j \quad \{\text{auream} \text{pateram}_1\}\text{mihi}_1 \text{dedisse}_1 \text{dono}_1 \text{hodie}_1\]?

\[\text{pateram}_1\text{mihi}_1\text{dedisse}_1\text{dono}_1\text{hodie}_1\text{te}_j\text{illi}\text{donatum}_j\text{esse}_j\text{dixerat}_j?\]

‘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)

\[(650)\quad \text{pro}_1 \quad \text{nimis}_1 \quad \text{demiror}_1, \quad \text{Sosia}_1, \quad \text{qui}\text{illaeck}_1\text{illic}_1, \quad \text{me}_1\text{donatum}_1\text{esse}_1\text{aurea}_1\text{patera}_1\text{illi}.
\]

\[\text{hanc}_k\text{convenisti}_k\text{et}_k\text{narravisti}_j\text{haec}_k\text{omnia}.\]

‘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 \(\theta\)-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 \(\theta\)-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 vidit [coronaₜₜ donari]*

Analogous construction is also found in Cato’s oratory, shown in (651).

(652) *Nam ego proj [PROₗ miᵢ... iam nilₜ... [...crediₜₜ]*

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).\textsuperscript{83}

Since the NcI 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\textit{ videri} in (657) is discussed in section 7.2.2.3.2. In (657) the neuter forms\textit{ illud} and\textit{ graecum} could be either nominative or accusative, but note that the verb \textit{videatur} is singular in apparent agreement with both NPs.

(657) \{\textit{pro}_{i} \ [\textit{omnis}_{j} \ \textit{res}_{j} \ \textit{gestas}_{j}^{84} \ \textit{esse} \ \textit{Athenis}_{k}] \}

\begin{tabular}{llllllll}
\textit{pro}_{i} & \textit{omnis}_{j} & \textit{res}_{j} & \textit{gestas}_{j} & \textit{esse} & \textit{Athenis}_{k} \\
\text{all-F-PL-ACC} & \text{affair-F-PL-ACC} & \text{bear-PPP-F-PL-ACC} & \text{be-INFIN} & \text{Athens-F-PL-LOC} \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{llllllllllllllllll}
\textit{autumnant}_{i}, & \textit{quo}_{j} & \textit{illud}_{m} & \textit{vobis}_{i} & \textit{graecum}_{m} & \textit{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} \\
\end{tabular}

\textit{magis}.

more

‘They say all events occurred in Athens, whereby it should seem more Greek to you.’

(Pl. \textit{Men}. 8-9)

In (658)\textit{ loquaces} and\textit{ omnes} are also ambiguous as to nominative or accusative case, but they are clearly [+ plural] and the verb \textit{habemur} is first-person plural.

(658) \textit{Nam} \ \textit{pro}_{i} \ \textit{[mulfum} \ \textit{loquaces}_{j} \ \textit{merito} \ \textit{omnes}_{j} \ \textit{t}_{j}] \\

\begin{tabular}{llllllllllllllllll}
\textit{pro}_{i} & \textit{omnes}_{j} & \textit{t}_{j} \\
\text{for} & \text{all-PL-NOM/ACC} & \text{PL-NOM/ACC} \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{llllllllllllllllll}
\textit{habemur}_{j}, & \textit{nec} & \textit{mutam} & \textit{profecto} & \textit{repertam} & \textit{nullam} & \textit{esse} \\
\text{hold-1-PL-PASS} & \text{nor} & \text{unable to speak-F-S-ACC} & \text{indeed} & \text{find-PPP-F-S-ACC} & \text{none-F-S-ACC} & \text{be-INFIN} \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllll}
\textit{aut} & \textit{hodie…} & \textit{dicunt} & \textit{[…mulierem} & \textit{aut} & \textit{ullo} & \textit{in} & \textit{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} \\
\end{tabular}

‘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. \textit{Aul}. 124-126)

\textsuperscript{83} Only one instance of NcI occurs in early Latin with an active matrix verb (Leumann & Hofmann, p. 588), in a work not included in the corpus.

\textsuperscript{84} The collocation \textit{res gestae} (nominative) idiomatically means ‘deeds, facts, history’.
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Similarly, in (659) *quae* 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 conficiunt sacra * _quae_ Cronia esse…* iterantur_ [ab _illis_].

‘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_1 [tibi…] renuniata_1 sint_1 […]* *haec_1* *sic fore*

‘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_1 non aequum_1 haberi ob _eam rem_1k, [pro_1 quod_1 bene facere voluisse_]k] quis_1 dicit, neque pro_1 pro_1 fectit_1 tamen, *Rodiensibus_1n oberit, quod_1 non malefecerunt_1n, sed quia pro_1 [pro_1 voluisse…] dicuntur_1n […]facere t_1n]?*
‘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*<sub>i</sub> ‘t<sub>i</sub> in *somnis*<sub>j</sub> *pastor*<sub>i</sub> ad *me*<sub>k</sub> *adpellere*

see-PPP-M-S-NOM be-3-S in dream-M-PL-ABL shepherd-M-S-NOM to me push toward-INFIN

\{*pecus* lanigerum\}_1 \{*eximia* pulchritudine\}_m-

herd-N-S-ACC wool bearing-N-S-ACC outstanding-F-S-ABL beauty-F-S-ABL

‘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*<sub>i</sub> \[^{[ *haec* Casina]}_j *huius* *reperietur*<sub>j</sub> *filia*<sub>i</sub> esse\]

ex proxumo.

out of near-SUPER-M-S-ABL

‘This Casina will be discovered to be the daughter of this man from next door.’  (Pl. Cas. 1013-1014)

(664) *pro*<sub>i</sub> \[^{[ *huius* autem gnatus*...* dicitur*<sub>i</sub> [...geminum alterum] falsa occidisse t<sub>j</sub>]}\]

by mistake kill-INFIN-PERF

‘But this man’s son is said to have killed one of the twins by mistake.’  (Naev. Fab. 2-3)
pro i [quorum genitor... fertur] [esse ops] [gentibus tj],

(665) ‘whose founder is said to be an aid to the people’ (Acc. Frag. 5)

pro i [quod is... intellegebar] [posse haud tj] ad

(666) ‘Since I was understood to be that way, I sent [it] to a few people.’ (Luc. Sat. 735)

pro i semper [ei tj...] dicta[tj]...[esse haec]

(667) ‘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><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

85 Ferre ‘to carry, bear’ commonly means ‘to be said’ in the passive (i.e. lit. ‘to be borne’ as an opinion or rumor).

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.’
Some examples of *videri* with unambiguous Ncl (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) \[ \text{pro}_i \ \text{[pro}_j \ [\text{sati’-n} \ \text{hoc} \ \text{plane,} \ \text{sati’-ne} \ \text{diserte…}, \ \text{ere,} \ \text{nunc} \ \text{videor}_j \ \text{[…tibi} \ \text{locutus}_j] \ \text{esse} \ \text{t}_j]? \]

‘Now, master, do I seem to have spoken this plainly and clearly enough to you?’ (Pl. *Amph.* 578-579)

(669) \[ \text{pro}_i \ \text{[aut} \ \text{ita -ne} \ \text{tandem} \ \text{idoneus}_j \ \text{tibi}_i \ \text{videor}_j \ \text{esse} \ \text{t}_j, \ \text{[quem}_j \ \text{tam} \ \text{aperte} \ \text{PRO}_i \ \text{fallere…} \ \text{incipias}_i \ \text{[…dolis]]}? \]

‘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) \[ \text{pro}_i \ \text{[quo} \ \text{facetior}_j \ \text{videare}_j \ \text{t}_j] \ \text{et} \ \text{[t}_j \ \text{scire} \ \text{plus} \ \text{quam} \ \text{ceteri} \ \text{pertisum} \ \text{hominem} \ \text{non} \ \text{pertaeasum}}^{87} \ \text{dicere}^{88} \ *** \ \text{genus}]]\]

‘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) \[pro_i \ [pro_j \ \{omnis_{k} \ res_{k}\} \ gestas_{k} \ esse \ Athenis]_{l} \ autumant_{m}, \]
\[quo \ pro \ [illud_{i} \ vobis \ graecum_{l} \ t_{j}] \ videatur_{l} \ magis. \]

‘They claim everything occurred in Athens so that it seems more Greek to you.’ (Pl. *Men*. 8-9)

(677) \[pro_{i} \ mirum_{j} \ videtur_{j} \ quod_{j} \ sit_{j} \ factum_{j} \ iam \]
\[diu? \]

‘Does what was done a long time ago seem wonderful?’ (Liv. *Trag*. 15)

(678) \[Contra \ [pro_{i} \ haec_{j} \ invitasse \ aut \ instigasse \ t_{j}] \ videntur_{j}. \]

‘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 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) \[\begin{align*}
\text{pro}_i & \text{ \ \ visa}_i \, \text{-ne} \ \ \text{est}_i \ [\text{ea}_i \ \ \text{esse}]? \\
\text{see-PPP-F-S-NOM} & \ \ \text{-Y/N} \ \ \text{be-3-s} \ \ \text{ANA-F-S-NOM} \ \ \text{be-INFIN}
\end{align*}\]

‘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) \[\begin{align*}
\text{Hercle} & \ \ \text{pro}_i \ \ \text{opinor}_i, \ [\text{ea}_j] \ \ \text{pro}_j \ \ \text{videtur}_j, \\
\text{indeed} & \ \ \text{think-1-s-DEPON} \ \ \text{ANA-F-S-NOM} \ \ \text{see-3-s-PASS}
\end{align*}\]

‘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) \[\begin{align*}
\text{Anus}_i, & \ [\text{quae}_i \ \ \text{est}_i \ [\text{dicta}_i \ [\text{mater}_i \ \ \text{esse} \ [\text{ei}_i]]} \\
\text{old woman-F-S-NOM} & \ \ \text{REL-F-S-NOM} \ \ \text{be-3-s} \ \ \text{say-PPP-F-S-NOM} \ \ \text{mother-F-S-NOM} \ \ \text{be-INFIN} \ \ \text{ANA-S-DAT}
\end{align*}\]

‘The old woman who earlier was said to be her mother, wasn’t.’ (Ter. Heau. 269-270)

(682) \[\begin{align*}
\text{Qui}_i & \ \ \text{locus}_i \ [\text{pro}_i \ \ \text{vino}_j \ \ \text{optimus}_i...] \ \ \text{dicetur}_i \ [\text{...esse} \\
\text{INDEFIN-M-S-NOM} & \ \ \text{place-M-S-NOM} \ \ \text{wine-N-S-DAT} \ \ \text{best-M-S-NOM} \ \ \text{say-3-s-FUT-PASS} \ \ \text{be-INFIN}
\end{align*}\]

‘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)
7.2.2.3.3 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 pro_i [ad nos t_k...] renuntiatum est [...te et patrem esse mortuom avo’ noster mutavit.]

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) pro_i [eam t_k...] ero nunc renuntiatum est [...nuptum huic Megadoro dari].

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) pro_i [in hac habitasse platea t_k...] dictum est [...Chrysidem].

Chrysis-F-S-ACC

‘It’s said Chrysis lived in this street.’ (Ter. And. 796-798)

(686) pro_i pulcherrume auguratum est [{rem Romanam} summam]

beautifully-SUPER take augury-PPP-N-S-ACC be-3-S affair-F-S-ACC Roman-F-S-ACC highest-F-S-ACC

fore 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 histrioniam].

‘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

dixi, [...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) proi {mater gravida}i [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>MORPHOLOGICAL</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></td>
<td>77 (99%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERIPHRASTIC</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></td>
<td>27 (87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Passive</td>
<td>94 (97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal Passive</td>
<td>10 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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) Quid est agrum bene colere? Bene arare.

INTERROG-N-S-NOM be-3-S field-M-S-ACC well cultivate-INFIN well plough-INFIN

Quid secundum? Arare.

INTERROG-N-S-NOM following-N-S-NOM plough-INFIN

Quid tertium? Stercorare.

INTERROG-N-S-NOM third-N-S-NOM manure-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) Non est i mentiri meum i.

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) quasi vero novom i nunc proferatur i [lorem i facere

as if but new-N-S-ACC now carry forth-3-S-SUBJ-PASS Jupiter-M-S-ACC do-INFIN

histrioniam i].

acting-F-S-ACC

‘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).
‘I’ll say this other twin sister of Philocomasium has arrived from Athens.’ (Pl. *Mil.* 237-239)

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 inferrable 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>ECM</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Linear</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</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>
</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>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Subject (Active)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject (Passive)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>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>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Active</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</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>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>26</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Sent.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>C.-ECM</td>
<td>Impers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</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>40%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Linear</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>0%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject (Passive)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object (Raised)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object (Finite)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised (Passive)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</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>
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
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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.* | *Curculio* ‘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’ |
| *Hec.* | *Hecyra* ‘The Mother-in-Law’ |
| *Heau.* | *Heautotimorumenos* ‘The Self-Tormentor’ |
| *Ph.* | *Phormio* ‘Phormio’ |
APPENDIX B. TAGGED CORPUS [SALT]

= Plautus
C Ut alios [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] in tragoediis vidi [aci:see:vid-], Neptunum [aci::unbound:3rd:subj], Virtutem [aci::unbound:3rd:subj], Victoriam [aci::unbound:3rd:subj], Bellonam
[acci::unbound:3rd:subj] commemorare [acci::inf:pres] [acci:say:memor-] quae
acci::unbound:3rd:subj] a vobis sibi [acci::bound:se:goal:local] meritoque
vobis bona [acci::unbound:3rd:obj] se [acci::bound:se:subj:local]
C Contraxistis frontem quia tragœdiam dixi [acci:say:dic-] futuram
C Sed ego stultior, quasi nesciam [acci:know:sc-] vos [acci::unbound:2nd:subj]
velle [acci::inf:pres] [acci::unbound:3rd:obj:null], qui divos siem
[Plautus:Amph] (56 57).
C Nam me [ecm:deontic::1st:subj] perpetuo facere [ecm:deontic::inf:pres]
[ctrl:obj:make:fac-] ut sit comoedia [ctrl:obj:inf:subjunct], reges quo
veniant et di, non [acci::inf:pres:no:cop]
acci::think:arbitr-] [Plautus:Amph] (59 61).
C Nunc hoc [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd:obj] me [ctrl:obj::unbound:2nd:subj]
[non:linear:monster] orare [ctrl:obj::inf:pres] [ctrl:obj:beg:or-] a vobis
iuissit [ctrl:obj::order:iub-] Iuppiter ut conquistores singula in subsellia
eant [ctrl:obj::inf:subjunct] per totam caveam spectatoribus [Plautus:Amph]
(64 66).
C Sirempse legem [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd:subj] iussit [ctrl:obj::order:iub-]
C Virtute dixit [acci:say:dic-] vos [acci::unbound:2nd:subj] victores vivere
acci::inf:pres], non ambitione neque perfidia [Plautus:Amph] (75 76).
[ecm:want::unbound:2nd:subj] quapropter Iuppiter nunc histriones curet
acci::inf:subjunct:indir] [Plautus:Amph] (86 87).
C Quasi vero novom [acci::unbound:3rd:subj:raise] nunc proferatur
acci::say:fer-] [linear] Ioem [acci::unbound:3rd:subj] facere
acci::inf:pres] histrioniam [acci::unbound:3rd:obj] [linear]
[Plautus:Amph] (89 90).
C Nam ego vos [acci::unbound:2nd:subj] novisse [acci::inf:perf]
acci::know:nosc-] credo [acci:believe:cred-] iam ut sit
[ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] clam virum usuramque eius corporis cepit sibi
C In Amphitruonis vortit sese imaginem omnesque eum [acci::unbound:3rd:subj]
esse [acci::inf:pres:cop] censent [acci:believe:rens-] servi qui vident
[Plautus:Amph] (121 122).
C Ut praeservire [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] amanti meo posse
C Ut ne qui essem familiares quaererent, vorsari [acci::inf:pres] crebro hic
quom viderent [acci:see:vid-] me [acci::unbound:1st:subj] domi
acci::believe:cred-] servum et conservam suum, hau quisquam quaeret qui siem
aut quid venerim [Plautus:Amph] (129 130).
C Illa illum [acci::unbound:3rd:subj] censet [acci:believe:rens-] virum suum
possitis [ctrl:subj::able:pot-] facilius, ego has habebo usque in petaso
pinnulas [Plautus:Amph] (142 143).
C Pessumest, facimus nequiter, ferire [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] male discit [ctrl:subj::know:disc-] manus
(318).
C Mirum ni hic me [ctrl:subj::ubound::1st:obj] quasi murenam
C Atque haud longe [ecm:deontic::subj::null] abesse
C Vix incedo inanis, ne ire [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] posse [aci::inf:pres]
[ctrl:subj::able:pot-] [aci::bound::2nd:subj::null] cum onere existumes
C Nescioquem [aci::ubound::3rd:subj] loqui [aci::inf:pres]
[aci::ubound::3rd:obj::null::indef] autumat [aci:say:autum-], mihi certo nomen
C At iam faciam [ctrl:obj::make:fac-] ut [aci::ubound::1st:subj::null] verum
[aci::inf:pres] [Plautus:Amph] (345).
C Possum [ctrl:subj::ubound::able:pot-] scire [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] [aci::inf:sc-],
quo profectus, cuius sis [aci::inf:subjunct:indir] aut quid veneris
[aci::inf:subjunct:indir] [Plautus:Amph] (346)?
C Pergin [ctrl:subj::continue:perg-] argutarier [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
[Plautus:Amph] (349)?
C At nunc abi sane, advenisse [aci::inf:perf] familiaris
[aci::inf:pres] [Plautus:Amph] (353).
C Quin me [aci::bound::1st:subj] esse [aci::inf:cop] huius familiae
C Vide sis quam mox vapulare [ctrl::subj::inf:pres] vis
[ctrl:subj::want:velle], nisi actatum hinc abis [Plautus:Amph] (360).
C Tun domo prohibere [ctrl:obj::inf:prob] peregre me
[ctrl:obj::ubound::1st:subj] advenientem [ctrl:obj::ubound::3rd:obj]
C Tun te [aci::ubound::2nd:subj] audes [ctrl:subj::dare:aud-] Sosiam esse
[aci::inf:cop] dicere [ctrl::subj::inf:pres] [aci:say:dic-], qui ego sum
[Plautus:Amph] (373 374)?
C Amphitruonis te [aci::ubound::2nd:subj] esse [aci::inf:cop] aiebas
C Peccaveram, nam Amphitruonis socium ne me [aci::ubound::1st:subj] esse
C Sciebam [aci::inf:sc-] equidem nullum [aci::ubound::3rd:subj] esse
[aci::inf:cop] nobis nisi me [aci::ubound::1st:subj] servum Sosiam
C Ego sum Sosia ille quem tu dudum esse aiebas mihi [__Plautus:Amph] (387).
C Obsecro ut per pacem liceat te adloqui, ut ne vapulem [__Plautus:Amph] (388).
C Immo indutiae parumper fiant, si quid vis loqui [__Plautus:Amph] (389).
C Nunc licet mi libere quidvis loqui [__Plautus:Amph] (393).
C Egomet mi non credo, quom illaec illum audio [__Plautus:Amph] (416).
C Pterela rex qui potitare solitus est patera aurea [__Plautus:Amph] (419).
C Id quidem hodie numquam poterit dicere [__Plautus:Amph] (426).
C Vincon argumentis tu negas non esse Sosiam [__Plautus:Amph] (433)?
C Tu negas med neque me falsum dicere [__Plautus:Amph] (435).
C At ego per Mercurium iuro tibi Iovem non credere [__Plautus:Amph] (436).
C Ubi ego Sosia nolim esse, tu esto sane Sosia [__Plautus:Amph] (439).
C Nonne hoc cuivis licet mirari mirum magis videtur quam mihi quam [__Plautus:Amph] (594).
 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 Si quid dictum est per iocum, non aequom [ecm::deontic:aequ-] est id [ecm::deontic:3rd:obj] te [ecm::deontic:2nd:subj] serio praevortier [aci::inf:pres] [Plautus:Amph] (920 921).
C Nunc, quando factis me impudicas abstini, ab impudicas dictis avorti [ctrl::subj::inf:pres:pass] volo [ctrl::subj::want:velle] [Plautus:Amph] (927).
C Iuben [ctrl::obj::order:iub-] mi ire [ctrl::obj::inf:pres] comites [ctrl::obj::unbound:3rd:subj] [Plautus:Amph] (929)?
C Nunc Amphitruonem [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj] volt [ecm:want::velle]
C Adsimulabo [ecm:pretend::simul-] me [ecm:pretend::bound:1st:subj] esse
C Eum [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] fecisse [aci::inf:perf]
[aci::unbound:3rd:obj:null:rel] ille hodie arguet [aci:say:argu-] quae
C Meo me [ecm:deontic::1st:subj] aequomst [ecm:deontic:aequ-
[ecm:deontic::inf:pres:no:cop] morigerum patri, eius studio
(1006).
C Naucratem [attraction] quem [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] convenire
[__Plautus:Amph] (1009).
C Nunc domum ibo atque ex uxore hanc rem [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] pergam
(1015).
C Nam me [ecm:deontic::1st:subj] quam illam questionem inquisitam
[ecm:deontic::unbound:3rd:obj] [linear] hodie amittere
[ecm:deontic::inf:pres:no:cop] mortuom satiust
C Sum Sosia, nisi me [aci::unbound:1st:subj] esse oblum
[aci::inf:perf:depon:with:cop] [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] existumas
C An fores [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] censebas [aci:believe:cens-] nobis
publicitus praebier [aci::inf:pres:pass] [__Plautus:Amph] (1027)?
[ecm:deontic::oport-] olim in adulescentia [__Plautus:Amph] (1031).
C Ne tu postules [ctrl:obj:order:postul-] matulam unam
caput [__Plautus:Amph] (1034).
C Exiuravisti [aci:say:iur-] te [aci::bound:2nd:subj] mihi dixe
[aci::inf:perf] [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] per iocum [__Plautus:Amph]
(1034).
C Quaesum advenientes morobo [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd:subj:null:impers] medicari
C Nisi hoc ita factum est, proinde ut [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:coord] factum
dico quin vero insimules probri [__Plautus:Amph] (1034).
C Quid [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] minitas [aci:say:minit-] te
[aci::bound:2nd:subj] [non:linear:interrrog] facturum
[aci::inf:fut:peri:no:cop], si istas pepulissem fores [__Plautus:Amph]
(1034)?
[__Plautus:Amph] (1034).
C Nilne te [ctrl:obj::unbound:2nd:subj] pudet [ctrl:obj::impers:pud-],
sceleste, populli in conspectum ingredi [ctrl:obj::inf:pres] [__Plautus:Amph]
(1034)?
C Qui nequias [ctrl:subj:able:qu-] nostrorum uter sit
[aci::inf_subjunct:indir] Amphitruo decernere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
C Neque ego unquam usquam tanta mira [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] me
[aci::bound:1st:subj] [non:linear] vidisse [aci::inf:perf] censeo
C Ita mi videntur omnia, mare, terra, caelum, consequi iam ut opprimar, ut enicer [Plautus:Amph] (1055 1056).
C Nec me miserier femina est neque ullae videatur [Plautus:Amph] (1056).
C Nece miserier femina est neque ullae videatur [Plautus:Amph] (1060).
C At ego faciam tu idem ut aliter praedices Amphitruo, piam et pudiicam esse tuam uxorem ut scias [Plautus:Amph] (1082).
C Scin me tuum esse erum Amphitruonem [Plautus:Amph] (1082)?
C Aedis primo ruere rebamur [Plautus:Amph] (1095).
C Dum haec aguntur, interea uxorem tuam neque mentem, neque plorantem nostrum quisquam audivimus [Plautus:Amph] (1098 1099).
C Postquam peperit, pueros lavere nos et [Plautus:Amph] (1102).
C Pol me hau paenitet, si licet boni dimidium mihi dividere cum Iove [Plautus:Amph] (1124 1125).
C Abi domum, iube vasa pura actum adornari nos et mihi, ut Iovis supremini multis hostiis pacem expetam [Plautus:Amph] (1126 1127).
C Operam praeterea numquam sumam [Plautus:Men] (244).
C Verum aliter vivos quaerere quaerere [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 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 neque novisse 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 [Plautus:Men] (309).
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 Eroticio, ut te hinc abducat potius quam his astes foris [Plautus:Men] (331 332).
C Nam istic meretricem credo habet 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 aedes esse [Plautus:Men] (356)?


C At mihi negabas [aci:say:neg-] dudum surrupuisse [aci::inf:perf] [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] te [aci::bound:2nd:subj], nunc eandem ante oculos adtines, non te pudet [__Plautus:Men] (729 730)?


C Quid illuc est quod med [aci::inf:pres] [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] praedicat [aci::say:dic-] [__Plautus:Men] (958)?
C Eo ego exemplo servio, tergo ut [aci:::unbound:3rd:subj:null] in rem esse
C Nunc fores pultabo, adesse [aci::inf:pres:cop] ut me
C Iam sublinem [ecm:deontic::3rd:subj] raptum
[__Plautus:Men] (995).
C Ecquis suppetias [ctrl:subj:::unbound:3rd:obj] mihi audet
C Epidamnii cives, erum meum [interject:::3rd:subj] hic in pacato oppido luci
deripier [interject::inf:pres:pass] in via [__Plautus:Men] (1005)!
Quae velis obsequi [__Plautus:Men] (1067 1068).

Ego quidem huilus servos sum, sed med [__Plautus:Men] (1071).

Ego hunc censebam te esse [__Plautus:Men] (1072).

Delirare mihi videre [__Plautus:Men] (1074 1075).

Hunc ego esse aio [__Plautus:Men] (1077).

Me dico, Moscho prognatum patre [__Plautus:Men] (1078).

Tuom tibi neque occupare neque praeripere postulo [__Plautus:Men] (1080).

Meliust nos adire atque hunc [__Plautus:Men] (1091).

Perge operam, obsecro hercle [__Plautus:Men] (1093).

Liber esto, si invenis hunc meum fratrem esse [__Plautus:Men] (1094).

Et ego idem spero fore [__Plautus:Men] (1095).

In Sicilia te Syracusis natum esse dixisti [__Plautus:Men] (1096 1097).

Moschum tibi patrem fuisse dixti [__Plautus:Men] (1098).

Nunc operam dare, obsecro hercle [__Plautus:Men] (1099).

Spe sororibus inventurum [__Plautus:Men] (1099).

Postquam renuntiatum est te et patrem esse mortuom, avos noster mutavit [__Plautus:Men] (1127 1129).
C Cultrum [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] [non:linear], securim [aci::unbound:3rd:obj], pistillum [aci::unbound:3rd:obj], mortarium [aci::unbound:3rd:obj], quae utenda [gerundive] vasa [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] semper vicini rogant, fures [aci::unbound:3rd:subj]

C Profecto in aedibus meos aspese neminem [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj]
(98 99).

C Nam nostro nostroque qui est magister curiae [aci::bound:se:subj:local:null]
dividere [aci::inf:pres] argenti dixit [aci:say:dic-] nummos

C Id si reliquo ac non peto, omnes illico me [aci::unbound:1st:subj]
suspicentur [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
[aci::unbound:1st:subj] [personal:passive] haberi

C Nam multum [aci::bound:1st:subj:raise:null] [aci::inf:pres:no:cop]
loquaces merito omnes habemur [aci::inf:pres:pass] haec
verba [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [__linear:deon:2nd], frater, meai fidei tuaque
rei causa facere [aci::inf:pres], ut aequum [ecm:deontic:aequ-] est
[__Plautus:Aul] (120 122).

C Quamquam haud falsa sum [aci::know:fall-] nos [aci::unbound:1st:subj]

C Ita aequum est quod [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] in rem esse
[aci::unbound:2nd:subj] et 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
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj] nullum mussari [aci::inf:pres:pass]

C Decet [ecm:deontic::dec-] teguidem [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 Id quod [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] in rem tuam optumum esse
advento [__Plautus:Aul] (144 145).


C Quod [ctrl:sent] [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] sit, liberis procreandis [__gerundive]
C Sed his legibus si quam [ctrl:subj:::unbound:3rd:obj:indef] dare
C His legibus dare [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj:null]
C Cum maxima possim [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] tibi, frater, dare
(158).
(161)?
C Dic mihi, quaeo, quis ea est quam [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] vis
(169)?
C Eius curio [ecm:want:cup-] filiam virginem [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj] mi
C Scio quid [aci::trace] dictura [aci:say:dic-] es, hanc
(174).
C Praesagibat [aci:say:praesag-] mi animus frustra me
[aci::unbound:1st:subj] ire [aci::inf:pres], quom exibam domo
C Nam neque quisquam curialium venit neque magister quem
[__Plautus:Aul] (179 180).
C Nunc domum properare [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] propero
[ctrl:subj:hurry:proper-], nam egomet sum hic, an imus domi est
C Iam illic homo aurum [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [__non:linear] scit
[aci:know:sc-] me [aci::unbound:1st:subj] haberē [aci::inf:pres], eo me
salutat blandius [__Plautus:Aul] (185).
[__Plautus:Aul] (186)?
C Da mi operam parumper, si operaest, Euclio, id quod
C Nunc hic eam rem [ctrl:subj::trace] volt [ctrl:subj::want:velle], scio,
C Credo edepol, ubi mentionem ego fecero de filia, mi ut despondeat, sese
C Quaesaeo, quod te percontabor, ne id [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd:obj] te
C Dum quidem ne quid perconteris quod [ctrl:impers::3rd:obj] non lubeat


C Tibi recte facere [historical::inf:pres] [historical::unbound:3rd:obj:null], quando quod facias perit [__Plautus:Aul] (338).


C Praeterea tibicinam, quae mi interbibere sola, si vino scatat, Corinthiensem fontem Pirenam qui sit agnus curio [__Plautus:Aul] (556 558).
C Quo quidem agno sat scio magis curiosam nusquam esse ullam beluam [__Plautus:Aul] (561 562).
C Volo ego ex te scire qui sit agnus curio [__Plautus:Aul] (563).
C Quin exta inspicere in sole ei vivo [__Plautus:Aul] (565).
C Potare ego hoe, Euclio, tecum volo [__Plautus:Aul] (569).
C At ego iussero vini veteris a me adferrier [__Plautus:Aul] (570 571).
C Nolo hercle, nam mihi bibere decretum est aquam [__Plautus:Aul] (572).
C Ego te hodie reddam madidum, si vivo, probe, tibi cui aquam [__Plautus:Aul] (573).
C Nam qui ero ex sententia servire servos in erum matura, in se sera [__Plautus:Aul] (589 590).
C Quod iubeat citis quadrigis citius properet persequi [__Plautus:Aul] (597 598).
C Eodem modo servom ratem esse amanti ero aegum [__Plautus:Aul] (600).
C Eam ero nunc renuntiatum est nuptum huic Megadoro dari [__Plautus:Aul] (604).
C Tu modo cave quoiquam indicassim aurum meum esse istic, Fides [__Plautus:Aul] (608).


Cur id [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass], ut id quod non tuum esset tangeres [__Plautus:Aul] (740)?


C Magna est res quam [ctrl:subj:::unbound:3rd:obj] ego tecum otiose, si otium est, cupio [ctrl:subj:want:cup-


tibi [__Plautus:Aul] (783).

tuae Cereis vigiliis per vinum atque impulsu adulescentiae [__Plautus:Aul] (794 795).


manu [__Plautus:Aul] (804).


C Credo [aci:believe:cred-
hic ego illum [aci::ttv::unbound:3rd:subj], ut iussi, eampse anum [aci:::ttv::unbound:3rd:obj] [__linear:ttv:::3rd:subj:adisse

C Quin ego illi me [aci::ttv::unbound:1st:subj] Invenisse [aci::inf:perf] dico [aci:say:dic-
eleguo [aci:say:loqu-
[Plautus:Aul] (817)?

C Non quod [aci::ttv::unbound:3rd:subj] pueri clamitant [aci:say:clamit] in faba
se [aci::ttv::unbound:3rd:obj:local] non reperisse [aci::inf:perf]


C Quod [aci::ttv::unbound:3rd:subj] modo fassus [aci:say:fat-] esse


C Signum clarum date mihi, ut vos [aci:::ttv::unbound:2nd:subj] mi esse
[aci::inf:pres:cop] aequos iam inae principio sciam [aci:know:sc-
[Plautus:Cas] (3 4).


C Nos postquam populi rumore intelleximus [aci:know:intelleg-] studiote
expetere [aci::inf:pres] vos [aci::unbound:2nd:subj] Plautinas fabulas
[aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [__linear], anticus eius edimus comoediam, quam vos
probatis qui estis in senioribus [__Plautus:Cas] (11 14).

C Vos omnis [ecm:want::unbound:2nd:subj] opere magno esse oratos
ad nostrum gregem [__Plautus:Cas] (21 22).

vobis volo [ctrl:subj:want:velle], Kleroumenoi vocatur haec comoedia graece, 
Sed abhinc annos factum est sedecim quom conspicatur primulo crepusculo puellam exponi. [__Plautus:Cas] (40 41).


Is sperat, si ei sit data, sibi paratas clam uxorem excubias. [__Plautus:Cas] (53 54).

Scit, si id impetret, futurum quod amat intra praesepis suas. [__Plautus:Cas] (56 57).

Senis uxor sensit virum amori operam [__Plautus:Cas] (58 59).

ille autem postquam filium sensit [__Plautus:Cas] (61 62).

Sunt hic inter se quos nunc credo dicere. [__Plautus:Cas] (67).

At ego aio id fieri in Graecia et Carthagini, et hic in nostra terra in terra Apulia. [__Plautus:Cas] (71 72).

Maioreque operie ibi serviles nuptiae quam liberales etiam curari. [__Plautus:Cas] (73 74).

Non mihi licere meam rem me solum, ut volo, loqui sine arbitro. [__Plautus:Cas] (89 90).

Quia certum est mihi, quasi umbra, quoquo tu ibis, te sequi. [__Plautus:Cas] (91 92).

Quin edepol etiam si in crucem vis, sequi decretum est. [__Plautus:Cas] (93 94).

Dehinc conicito ceterum, possis necne clam me suelis tuis praeripere Casinam uxorem [__Plautus:Cas] (94 96).

Scies hoc ita esse. [__Plautus:Cas] (115).

Ut postilena possit ex te fieri [__Plautus:Cas] (125).

Quod te gustare quicquam posis in fenestram firmiter, unde auscultare possis [__Plautus:Cas] (132 133).

Sine tuos ocellos deosculer, voluptas mea, sine [__Plautus:Cas] (134).


Nam si sic nihil impetrare potero [__Plautus:Cas] (298).
Negavi enim ipsi me concessurum Iovi [__Plautus:Cas] (323).
Ego edepol illam mediam diruptam velim [__Plautus:Cas] (325).
Non hercle opinor posse [__Plautus:Cas] (340).
Ita rem natam depugnarier [__Plautus:Cas] (343).
Necessum est vorsis gladiis [__Plautus:Cas] (344).
Sed tamen ego dis fretos saepe decipi [__Plautus:Cas] (349).
Ille edepol ardentem te extra portam mortuam [__Plautus:Cas] (354).
Credo ecastor velle [__Plautus:Cas] (355).
Qui didicit dare [__Plautus:Cas] (362).
Atque ego censui me [__Plautus:Cas] (363 364).
Ah, non id volui dicere [__Plautus:Cas] (366).
Optumum atque aequissumum esse [__Plautus:Cas] (375).
Verbero, men te censes esse [__Plautus:Cas] (380 381)?
Noli uxori credere [__Plautus:Cas] (386).
At tu ut oculos emungare [__Plautus:Cas] (390).
Paratum ex capite per nasum tuos [__Plautus:Cas] (392).
Quia tute es fugitvos omnis te iam lagueum tibi [__Plautus:Cas] (397).
Sicut factum esse Herculeis praedicant [__Plautus:Cas] (398).
C Tam huic loqui oportet quam isti [Plautus:Cas] (410).
C Scin tu rus hinc esse ad villam longe quo ducat [Plautus:Cas] (420)?
C Nam praesente hoc plura verba non desidero [Plautus:Cas] (423).
C Atque id non tam aegrest iam, vicisse opere tam magno senem [Plautus:Cas] (429 430).
C Attat, concedam huc, audio aperiri fores, mei benevolentes atque amici prodeunt [Plautus:Cas] (434 435).
C Ita fieri oportet [Plautus:Cas] (439).
C Volui Chalinum, si domi esset, mittere tecum opsonatum, ut etiam in maerore insuper inimico nostro miseriam adiungerem [Plautus:Cas] (440 442).
C Ecfoedere Hercle hic volt, credo, vesicam si domi esset, mittere te tecum opsonatum [Plautus:Cas] (455).
C Licetne amplecti te [Plautus:Cas] (457)?
C Ut, quia te tango, mel videor lingere [Plautus:Cas] (458)!
C Solet hic barbatos sane sectari [Plautus:Cas] (466).
C Iam hercle amplexari, iam osculari gestio prius deduci [Plautus:Cas] (472).
C At non opinor fieri hoc posse emitti manu [Plautus:Cas] (473).
C Si quidem cras censes te te posse [Plautus:Cas] (474).
C Is mihi se locum dixit [Plautus:Cas] (479).
C In re praesenti ex copia piscaria consulere quid emam potero [Plautus:Cas] (500).
C Argento parci nolo [Plautus:Cas] (501).
C Tribus non conducì [Plautus:Cas] (504).
Quin eapse ultro mihi negavit eius operam (601 602).
C Quin cupio tibi, quin, aliquid aegre facere (603).
Ego iam per hortum iussero meam istuc transire (605).
Qua ego hunc amorem mi esse avi dicam (616 617).
Apud nos tua ancilla hoc pacto exordiri coepit, quod haud Atticam condecet disciplinam (651).
Possim scire ego istuc ex te quid negotist (545).
Interemere ait velle vitam (659).
Insectatur omnis domi per aedis nec quemquam prope ad se sinit adire (662).
Scelestissumum me esse credo (667).
Ego expeto istuc ex te velle exquirere (689).
Habet, sed duos, quid, duos (gladios), altero te occisurum ait, altero vilicum hodie (692).
Loricam induam mi optumum esse (695).
Negat ponere alio modo ullo profecto, nisi se


C Id [aci::know:sc-] quo modo ad hunc devenerim [aci::inf_subjunct:indir] in servitutem ab eo qui servivi prius [__Plautus:Mil] (96 97).
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 profligare posse [__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 incipissi, hanc instituam astutiam, ut Philocomasio hanc sororem geminam germanam alteram dicam Athenis advenisse cum amatore aliquo suo, tam similem quam lacte lactist [__Plautus:Mil] (237 240).

C Ut si illic concriminatus sit advorsum militem meum conservos, eam vidisse, eam arguam vidisse amatorne amplexantem osculatam [__Plautus:Mil] (242 245).


C Trecentae possunt causa conligi [__Plautus:Mil] (250).

C Dum modo hunc prima via inducamus vera 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 vidisse eam arguam osculatam cum aliquo amostrae amplexantem [__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 hoc proxumo osculatam cum alieno adulescentulo [__Plautus:Mil] (266).

C Te, Palaestrio, volup est convenisse [__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).
[aci::inf:perf] [aci:see:vid-] in proxumo hic, sceleste, ais [aci:say:ai-]
C Noli [ctrl:subj:want:nolle] miritari [Ctrl:subj::inf:pres], scio
mihi sepulchrum [__Plautus:Mil] (372).
C Non possunt [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] mihi minaciis tus hisce oculi exfodiri
C Pergin [ctrl:subj:continue:perg-], sceleste, intendere
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj:want:extend-] hanc
C Hac nocte in somniis mea soror geminast germana
C Propter eandem suspicionem maximam [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] sum visa
C Nam arguere [aci::inf:pres] [aci:say:argu-] in somniis me
quasi nunc tu, esse osculatam [aci::inf:perf:depon:with:cop], quom illa
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:cop] [gerundive] ego istuc

[347]
quia istaec aetas fugere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] facta
[ctrl:subj::used:sol-] [__Plautus:Mil] (619 622).
C Eam [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd:obj] pudet [ctrl:obj:impers:pud-] me
[ctrl:obj::unbound:1st:subj] [non:linear] tibi in senecta obicere
[__Plautus:Mil] (623).
C Hancine aetatem [interject:::3rd:obj] exercere [interject::inf:pres] mei me
[interject:::1st:subj] amoris gratis [__Plautus:Mil] (625)?
(626)?
vitam [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] vivere [aci::inf:pres] [personal:passive]
[__Plautus:Mil] (627)?
C Pol id quid [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] experior [aci:find:exper-] ita esse
(637)?
C Incommoditate abstinere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] me
[ctrl:subj:::bound:1st:obj] apud convivas commodo commenini
[ctrl:subj::remember:commenisc-] et meae orationis iustam partem
[ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] itidem tacere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
[__Plautus:Mil] (644 646).
C Tute me [aci::unbound:1st:subj] ut fateare [aci:say:fat-] esse
C Huius pro meritis ut referri [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] pariter possit
[ctrl:subj::able:pot-] gratia, tibiique, quibus nunc me [aci::bound:1st:subj]
esse [aci::inf:pres:cop] experior [aci:find:exper-] summae sollicitudini
[__Plautus:Mil] (670 671).
C At tibi tanto sumptui esse [ctrl:deontic::inf:pres:cop] mihi
(672).
C Mei volo [ctrl:subj::want:velle] vivere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
[__Plautus:Mil] (678).
C Propter divitias meas licuit [ctrl:impers:lic-] uxorem dotatam
C Sed nolo [ctrl:subj::want:nolle] mi oblatraticem
[ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] in aedis intro mittere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
[__Plautus:Mil] (681).
(682 683).
C Tu homo et alteri sapienter potis [ctrl:subj::able:pot-] es consulere
C Ubi ea possit [ctrl:subj::able:pot-] inveniri [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass]
[__Plautus:Mil] (686).
C Tum plicatricem [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] clementer non potest
[ctrl:subj::able:pot-] quin munerem [ctrl:subj::inf:subjunct] [__Plautus:Mil]
(695).
C Tum opstetrix expostulavit [aci:say:expostul-] mecum, parum

348
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).
hunc militem [Plautus:Mil] (79796).

C Meretricem [ecm:deontic::inf:pres] [Plautus:Mil] (880 881).
C Quin tu huic responds [aci::say:respond-] alicquid [aci::trace], aut [aci::unbound:2nd:subj null] facturum [aci::inf:fut:peri:no:cop]
aut non facturum [aci::inf:fut:peri:no:cop] [aci::unbound:3rd:obj:null:coord] [Plautus:Mil] (1067 1068)?
C Qui tu scis [aci:know:sc-] eas [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] adesse [aci::inf:pres:cop] [Plautus:Mil] (1103)?
C Tu hic ante aedis interim speculare [historical::inf:pres], ut, ubi illaec prodeat, me provoces [___Plautus:Mil] (1121 1122).
[ecm:pretend:simul-], prae illius forma quasi spernas
[ecm:pretend::inf_subjunct] tuam [ecm:pretend:::unbound:3rd:obj]
[___Plautus:Mil] (1169 1170).
C Adsimulato [ecm:pretend:simul-] quasi gubernator sies
C Atque ut iubeat [ctrl:obj:order:iub-]
C Nisi eat, te [aci:::bound:2nd:subj] soluturum esse
[aci::inf:fut:peri:with:cop] navim [aci:::unbound:3rd:obj] [linear], ventum
[aci:::unbound:3rd:subj] operam [aci:::unbound:3rd:obj] [linear] dare


Nos secundum ferri [aci::inf:pres:pass] nunc per urbem haec omnia [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] [Plautus:Mil] (1349).


= Terence
C Sororem falso creditam meretriculae genere Andriae, Glycerium, vitiat
C Id [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] isti vituperant [aci:say:vituper-] factum
contaminari [ecm:deontic::inf:pres:pass] non
C Qui quom hunc accusant, Naevium Plautum Ennium accusant, quos hic noster
auctores habet, guorum aemulari [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] exoptat
istorum obscuram diligentiam [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] [__Terence:And]
(18 21).
C Dehinc ut quiescant porro moneo et desinant [ctrl:subj:stop:desin-] male
dicere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres], malefaca ne noscant sua [__Terence:And] (22 23).
C Quid est quod tibi mea ars efficere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] hoc
[__Terence:And] (31)?
C Sed eis quas [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] semper in te intellexi
[aci:know:intelle-
C Gaudeo, si tibi quid feci facio quod placeat, Simo, et id
C Quas [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] credis [aci:believe:cred-
d-] esse
te [ecm:want::unbound:2nd:subj] [non:linear:interrog] velim
C Nam ante qui scire [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] posses [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] aut
ingenium [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] noscere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
[__Terence:And] (53).
C Nam id [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] arbitror [aci:think:arbitr-] adprime in
C Sic vita erat [ctrl:sent], facile [ctrl:sent::unbound:3rd:subj:null] omnis
[ctrl:sent::unbound:3rd:subj:coord] pati [ctrl:sent::inf:pres], cum
quibus erat quomque una eis sese dedere, eorum studiis
[__Terence:And] (62 64).
C Comperibam [aci:know:comper-] nil [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] ad Pamphilum
C Enim vero [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:coord] spectatum
continentiae [__Terence:And] (91 92).
C Quom id mihi placebat [ecm:impers:plac-] tum uno ore omnes
(96 97).
C Haec [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] ego putabam [aci:think:put-] esse
[aci::inf:pres:cop] omnia humani ingenii mansuetique animi officia
[__Terence:And] (113 114).
[aci::inf_subjunct:indir], callidus, verberibus caesium te in pistrinum, Dave, dedam usque ad necem [__Terence:And] (196 199).
C Qui me tam leni passus est animo usque adhuc meo quomque animo lubitum facere [__Terence:And] (262 263).
C Sed peropust nunc aut hunc cum ipsa aut de illa aliquid me aut eum [__Terence:And] (265).
C Hem egon istuc conari queam [__Terence:And] (270)?
C Egon propter me illam decipi miseram sinam [__Terence:And] (271).
C Bene et pudice eius doctum atque eductum sinam coactum egestate ingenium inmutarier [__Terence:And] (274 275)?
C Sed ut vim queas ferre [__Terence:And] (277).
C Adeon me [__Terence:And] (277 280)?
C Unum hoc scio, hanc meritam esse ut memor esses sui [__Terence:And] (281).
C Ah, quanto id te satiust dare quom id eloqui magis frustra incendatur tua [__Terence:And] (307).
C Omnia experiri certumst prius quam pereo [__Terence:And] (311).
C Si nil impetres, ut te arbitretur sibi si duxerit [__Terence:And] (315 316).
C Vereor dicere sibi [__Terence:And] (323).
C Ego, Charine, neutiquam officium liberi esse hominis puto quom is nil mereat, postulare [__Terence:And] (330 331).
C Nuptias effugere ego malo quam tu apiscier [__Terence:And] (332).
C Nisi ea quae nil opus sunt sciri [__Terence:And] (337).
C Quem ego nunc credo, si iam audierit sibi nuptias [__Terence:And], audin tu illum, toto me
oppido exanimatum quaerere sed ubi quaeram? Cessas adloqui? C Ait tibi uxor dare, item alia multa quae nunc non est narrandi locus.

C Forte ibi video Byrriam, rogo, negat vidisse. C Ait uxorem dare hodie, item alia multa quae nunc non est narrandi locus.

C Interea intro ire video neminem video neminem, matronam nullam in aedibus, nil ornati, nil tumulti.

C Num videntur convenire haec nuptiis. Holera et pisculos minutos ferre obolo in cenam seni.

C Si id suscenseat nunc, quia non det tibi uxorem Chremes, prius quam tuum animum ut sese habet ad nuptias perspexerit, ipsus sibi ferre obolo in cenam seni.

C Dic te ducturum. Suadere noli.

C Nempe hoc sic esse opinor, dicturum patrem volo hodie uxorem.

C Patri dic velle, ut, quom velit, tibi iure irasci.

C Inveniet inopem potius quam te corrumpi aequo animo ferre. Accipiet neclegentem feceris.

C Puerum autem ne resciscat mi esse ex illa cautiosi, nam pollicitus sum suscepturum.
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj] unum esse verbum [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [__linear],
C Erus me [ctrl:obj::unbound:1st:subj] relictis rebus iussit
observare [ctrl:obj::inf:pres], ut quid ageret [aci::inf_subjunct:indir] de
nuptiis scirem [aci:know:sc-] [__Terence:And] (412 413).
C Utrumque [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] adesse [aci::inf:cop] video
C Hodie uxorem [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:obj] ducas [ecm:want::inf_subjunct],
C Nullane in re esse [interject::inf:cop] quoiquam homini fidem
C Verum illud verbumst, volgo quod dici [ctrl:subj::inf:pass]
[aci:say:dic-] solet [ctrl:subj::inf:pass:impersonal], omnis
C Ego illam vidi, virginem [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] forma bona memini
[aci:remember:meminisc-] videri [aci::inf:pass], quo aequior sum
Pamphilo, si se [ecm:want::unbound:se:subj:local] illam
[ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj] amplecti [ecm:want::inf:pres]
C Hic nunc me [aci::unbound:1st:subj] credit [aci:believe:cred-] aliquam
sibi [aci::unbound:se:local:goal:2nd] fallaciam [aci::unbound:3rd:obj]
gratia [__Terence:And] (432 433).
C Potin [ctrl:subj::able:pot-] es mihi verum [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj]
dicere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] [__Terence:And] (437)?
C Vix inquit drachumis est obsonatum decem, non filio videtur [aci:see:vid-]
C Nam quod peperisset iussit [ctrl:obj::order:iub-]
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)?


Haec nuptiae non adparabantur mihi nec postulabat nunc quisquam uxor(em) dare. (654).

C Haec nuptiae non adparabantur mihi nec postulabat nunc quisquam uxor(em) dare [ctrl:obj::inf:pres] (656 657).


C Nam idcirco accersor nuptias quod mi adparari sensit [aci::sense:sent-] (690).


[Terence:And] (713).

C Tu, Mysis, dum exeo, parumper opperire [historical::inf:pres] hic
[Terence:And] (714).

C Summum bonum esse erae putabam [aci:think:put-] hunc Pamphilum

C Quia, si forte opus sit ad erum iurato [aci:say:iur-] mihi non
[aci::unbound:3rd:obj:null], ut liquido possim [__Terence:And] (728 729).

C Ego quoque hinc ab dextera venire [ecm:pretend::inf:pres] me
[__Terence:And] (734 735).

C Revortor, postquam quae opus fuere ad nuptias gnatae paravi, ut iubeam

esse [aci::inf:pres:cop] idonei [__personal:passive], in quibus sic inludatis
[__Terence:And] (757 758)?

C Propera [ctrl:subj:hurry:proper-] adeo puerum [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj]

C Au, quid clamitas, quemne [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] ego heri vidi
[aci:see:vid-] ad vos adferri [aci::inf:pres:pass] vesperi [__Terence:And]
(767 768)?

C Vidi [aci:see:vid-] Cantharam [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] suffarcinatam

C Iam susurrari [aci:say:susurr-] [aci::inf:pres:pass]
civem Atticam esse [aci::inf:pres:cop] hanc [aci::unbound:3rd:subj]
[__Terence:And] (780 781).

C Hanc [ecm:deontic::3rd:subj] iam oportere
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj:raise:impers] [aci::inf:pres] [ecm:deontic:oport-] in

C Non te [aci::bound:2nd:subj] credes [aci:believe:cred-] Davom
(788).

C Alio pacto haud poterat [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] fieri
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] ut sciret haec quae volumus [__Terence:And] (793
794).

[aci:believe:cens-], ex animo omnia, ut fert natura, facias an de industria
[__Terence:And] (795 796)?

C In hac habitasse [aci::inf:perf] platea dictumst [aci:say:dic-]
[__impersonal:passive] Chrysidem [aci::unbound:3rd:subj], quae sese
quam in patria honeste pauper viveret [__Terence:And] (796 798).

[aci::unbound:3rd:subj:raise:impers] [aci::inf:pres:cop] soror

[__linear] litis sequi [ctrl:obj::inf:pres], quam id mihi sit facile atque
utile, aliorum exempla commonent [ctrl:obj:warn:mon-] [__Terence:And] (810
812).
C Clamitent [aci:say:clamit-] me [aci::unbound:1st:subj]
C Satis [ctrl:subj:::unbound:3rd:obj] pericli incepi [ctrl:subj::begin:incip-]
C Nam si cogites, remittas [ctrl:subj:stop:mitt-] iam me
[ctrl:obj:beg:or-], ut ne illis animum [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd:subj] inducas
[aci:believe:cred-], quibus id maxume utilest, illum [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] esse
C Vero voltu, quom ibi me [aci::unbound:1st:subj] adesse [aci::inf:pres:cop]
C Animo nunciam otioso [ctrl:obj::unbound:2nd:subj:null] esse
(845)?
C Eho, non tu dixti [aci:say:dic-] esse [aci::inf:pres:cop] inter eos
inimicitias [aci::unbound:3rd:subj], carnufex [__Terence:And] (853)?
C Nil equidem, nisi quod [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] illum
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj] [non:linear:rel] audivi [aci:hear:aud-] dicere
C Quid ait [aci:say:ai-] tandem, Glycerium [aci::unbound:3rd:subj]
C Si quicquam [aci::unbound:3rd:obj:indef] invenies [aci:find:inven-] me
[aci::unbound:1st:subj] [non:linear:indef] mentitum
C Ostendam [aci:show:ostend-] erum quid sit [aci::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 Tamen hanc [ctrl::subj:::unbound:3rd:obj] habere [ctrl::subj:::inf:pres]
studeat [ctrl::subj::want:stud-] cum summo probro [__Terence:And] (881).
C Vis [ecm::want::velle] me [ecm::want:::unbound:1st:subj] uxorem
[ecm::want:::unbound:3rd:obj] [__linear] ducere [ecm::want:::inf:pres],
amittere [ecm::want::inf:pres] [__Terence:And] (898)?
C Hoc modo te [ctrl::obj:::unbound:2nd:subj] obsecro [ctrl::obj::beg:obsecr-],
C Sine [ctrl::obj::allow:sin-] me [ctrl::obj:::unbound:1st:subj] expurgem
C Sine [ctrl::obj::allow:sin-] te [ctrl::obj:::unbound:2nd:subj] hoc
[ctrl::obj:::unbound:3rd:subj] [__linear:demon:2nd] exorem
[ctrl::obj:::inf:subjunct] [ctrl::obj::beg:or-] [__Terence:And] (902).
C Dum ne ab hoc me [aci:::bound:1st:subj] fallî [aci:::inf:pres:pass]
comperiar [aci::find:comper-], Chremes [__Terence:And] (903).
C Mitte [ctrl::subj::stop:mitt-] orare [ctrl::subj:::inf:pres]
C Eho tu, Glycerium [aci:::unbound:3rd:subj] hinc civem esse
C Si mihi perget [ctrl::subj::continue:perg-]
[__Terence:And] (920).
C Ibi ego audivi [aci::hear:aud-] ex illo [__oblique:antecedent] sese
[__Terence:And] (927).
C Verum hercle opinor [aci::think:opin-] fuisse [aci:::inf:perf:cop] Phaniam
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj], hoc certo scio, Rhamnusium se
[__Terence:And] (929 930).
[aci:::say:ai-] [__Terence:And] (933)?
C Tum illam [ctrl::subj:::unbound:3rd:obj] veritust [ctrl::subj::fear:ver-]
C Ne istam [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] multimodis tuam inveniri
C Egone huius memoriai [ctrl::obj:::unbound:3rd:subj] patiar
[ctrl::obj::allow:pat-] meae voluptati obstare [ctrl::obj:::inf:pres], quom ego
possim [ctrl::subj::able:pot-] in hac re medicari [ctrl::subj:::inf:pres:pass]
mihi [__Terence:And] (943 944)?
C Te [aci::unbound:2nd:subj] credo [aci::believe:cred-] credere
C Eho mecum, Crito, nam illam [aci:::unbound:3rd:subj] me


C Ne ille pro se [aci:::bound:se:oblique:distant] dictum
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj:null] [aci::inf:perf:pass:no:cop] existumet
[aci:believe:existim-], qui nuper fecit [ctrl:obj:make:fac-] servo currenti
C Date potestatem mihi [ctrl:impers:::1st:subj:dative] statariam
C Mea causa causam hanc [aci:::unbound:3rd:subj] iustam esse
laboris minatur mihi [__Terence:Hea] (41 42).
C Ut adulescentuli vobis placere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] studeant
[ctrl:subj::want:stud-] potius quam sibi [ctrl:subj::bound:se:goal:local]
[_Terence:Hea] (51 52).
C Numquam tam mane egredior neque tam vesperi domum revortor quin te
[aci:::unbound:2nd:subj] in fundo conspicer [aci:see:spect-] fodere
C Homo sum, humani nil [aci:::unbound:3rd:subj] [aci::inf:pres:no:cop] a me
mibi laboris [__Terence:Hea] (90 91).
C Hem, tibine [ctrl:impers:::2nd:subj:dative] haec
[ctrl:impers::unbound:3rd:obj] diutius
[ecm:hope:spere-] facere [ctrl:impers::inf:pres] me
[ecm:hope::unbound:1st:subj] vivo patre, amicam ut habeas prope iam in
uxoris loco [__Terence:Hea] (103 105).


esse [aci::inf:pres:cop], in Asia
[___Terence:Hea] (182).
[___Terence:Hea] (186).
C Quid [aci:::trace] narrat [aci:say:narr-], quid ille, se
(193).
C Ut ut erat, [ecm:deontic:::3rd:subj:null] mansum
[___Terence:Hea] (200).
C Huncine [ecm:deontic::3rd:subj] erat aequom [ecm:deontic:aequ-] ex more
ilius an illum [ecm:deontic::3rd:subj] ex huius vivere
[ecm:deontic::inf:pres] [___Terence:Hea] (203)?
C Scortari [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] crebro nolunt [ctrl:subj:want:nolle], nolunt
[___Terence:Hea] (206).
C Necessest [ecm:deontic:necess-], Clitipho, consilia [ecm:deontic::3rd:obj]
[___Terence:Hea] (209).
C Scitumst [ctrl:deontic:scit-] periclum ex aliis facere
a pueris ilico nasci [ecm:deontic::inf:pres] senes neque illarum adfinis
diiudicare [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] quas scis quid veri siet [___Terence:Hea]
(237)?
C Non cogitas [aci:think:cogit-] hinc longule [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:null]
esse [aci::inf:pres:cop] [___Terence:Hea] (239)?
[aci:believe:cens-] [___Terence:Hea] (253)?
C Qui harum mores cantabat [aci:say:cant-] mihi,
[aci::inf:pres:cop] [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] umquam ab hac me
(260 261).
C Tum quam gratum mihi esse [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:cop] potuit
C Nam mihi nunc nil rerum omniust quod malim [ecm:want:malle] quam me
(267 268).
esse [aci::inf:pres:cop] ei antehac [___personal:passive], non fuit
[___Terence:Hea] (269 270).


C Isne [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:raise] tibi videtur [aci:see:vid-]
C Dixi [aci:say:dic-] equidem, ubi mi ostendisti, ilico eum
[__Terence:Hea] (624)?
C Meministin [aci:remember:meminisc-] me [aci::unbound:1st:subj] esse
dicere [aci::inf:pres], si puellam parerem,
toll [ecm:want::inf:pres:pass] [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:obj: null:coord]
[__Terence:Hea] (626 627)?
C O Iuppiter, tantam esse [interject::inf:pres] in animo inscitiam
[interject::3rd:subj] [__Terence:Hea] (630)!
C Id [aci::trace] equidem ego, si tu neges, certo scio [aci:know:sc-], te
[aci::unbound:2nd:subj] inscientem atque inprudentem dicere [aci::inf:pres]
facere [aci::inf:pres] omnia [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [__linear]
C Si meum imperium [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] exsequi
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] voluisses [ctrl:subj:want:velle],
oportuit [ecm:deontic: oport-], non [ecm:deontic::2nd:subj: null] simulare
C Si potis [ctrl:subj: able: pot-] est reperiri [ctrl:subj::inf:pres: pass]
[__Terence:Hea] (659).
C Quid renuntiavit [aci:say:nunti-] olim, [aci::bound:se:subj:local: null]
[__Terence:Hea] (661).
[ecm:impers::inf:pres:cop] saepe ita ut volt, si res non sinit
C Nisi aliquid video ne [aci::unbound:3rd:subj: null] esse
[aci::inf:pres:cop] amicam gnati resciscat [aci: know: sc-] senex
C Nam quod [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] de argento sperem aut posse
[ctrl:obj::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj: able: pot-] postulem [ctrl:obj:order: postul-]
[__Terence:Hea] (671 672).
C Triumpho si licet [ecm:impers:lic-] me [ecm:impers::1st:subj] latere tecto
C Crucior [aci: emotion: cruc-] bolum tantum [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] mi
(673).
C Nil tam difficilest quin quaerendo [ _gerund] investigari
(675).
Hanc uxorem sibi dari volt Clinia (847).

Et illum aiunt aevum aiunt uxorem illum aiunt (854).

Scilicet daturum (856 857).

Quidvis tamen iam malo nunc hunc amittere (858).

Me facturum esse omnia placere (866).

Ego me non tam astutum esse id scio (874).

Ohe iam desine deos, uxor, gratulando obtundere tuam esse inventam gnatam (879 881).

Quos ais homines, Chreme, cessare (883).

Gaudere adeo coepit quasi qui cupidunt nuptias (885).

Mage, si mage noris, putes ita rem (889).

Hoc prius scire expeto (891).

Nam ubi desponsam nuntiasti filio, continuo iniecisse gnavam sponsae vestem aurum sunt sponsae vestem (891 893).

Magis unum etiam ut hodie conficiantur nuptiae (895).
C Quid est quod [ecm:pretend::inf:pres:raise] [personal:passive] [__Terence:Hea] (901)?


Si me [ecm:: want:: unbound: 1st: subj] vivom vis [ecm:: want: velle], pater, ignosce [__Terence: Hea] (1051 1052).


C Pergin [ctrl:subj:continue:perg-] ero absenti male loqui
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres], inpurissime [__Terence:Phor] (372)?
C Numquam cessavit [ctrl:subj:stop:cess-] dicere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
[ctrl:impers:plac-] potis [ctrl:subj::able:pot-] est, mi ut respondeas
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj], explana [aci:say:explain-] mihi, et qui cognatum me
[aci::inf:pres:cop] dicere [aci::inf_subjunct:indir] [aci:say:dic-]
[__Terence:Phor] (380 381).
C Quoius de stultitia dici [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] ut dignumst non potest
C Et soli licet [ctrl:impers:::3rd:subj] hic de eadem causa bis iudicium
C Id quod [ctrl:obj:::unbound:3rd:obj] lex iubet [ctrl:obj::order:iub-]
C Itan tandem, quaeo, item ut meretricem ubi abusus sis, mercedem
[ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd:obj] [ctrl:obj::unbound:2nd:subj:null] dare
[ctrl:obj::inf:pres] lex iubet [ctrl:obj::order:iub-] ei atque
C Ut nequid turpe civis in se admitteret propter egestatem, proxumo iussast
[ctrl:obj::order:iub-] [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd:subj:raise] dari
[ctrl:obj::inf:pres], ut cum uno aetatem degeret [__Terence:Phor] (415 416)?
C Omnia haec [aci::unbound:3rd:obj:rel] illum [aci::unbound:3rd:subj]
[_non:linear:hic] putato quae ego nunc dico dicere [aci::inf:pres]
C Itane es paratus [ctrl:subj::prepare:par-] facere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] me
advorsum omnia [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj], infelix [__Terence:Phor] (427 428)?
C Egon tuam expetam amicitiam, aut te [ecm:want::unbound:2nd:subj] visum
[__Terence:Phor] (431 432)?
C Nisi tu properas [ctrl:subj:hurry:proper-] mulierem
[ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] abducere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres], ego illam
C Cratinum [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:null] [aci::inf:pres:no:cop] censeo
[aci:believe:cons-], si tibi [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:raise:null]
[__Terence:Phor] (446 447).
C Si hoc [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:raise] [aci::inf:pres:no:cop] videtur
C Ego sedulo hunc [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:raise] dixisse [aci::inf:perf]
(453).
C Mihi non videtur [aci:see:vid-] [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:raise:null:rel]
quod sit factum legibus rescindi [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] posse
[aci::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj::able:pot-] [personal:passive] [__Terence:Phor]
(455 456).
C Ego [aci:::unbound:3rd:subj:null] amplius deliberandum [_gerundive]
[__Terence:Phor] (459 460).
C Sed eccum ipsum [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] video [aci:see:vid-) in tempore
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] aliis
C Alios [aci:::unbound:3rd:subj] tuam rem [linear] credisti
[aci:believe:cred-] magis quam tete [aci::bound:2nd:subj] animum vorsuros
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::bound:2nd:subj:velle] facere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
attinet [__Terence:Phor] (480 481).
C Quantum metuist [ctrl:deontic:metu-] est mihi
[aci::see:vid-] hoc [aci::inf:pres:no:cop] salvom nunc patruom
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj], Geta [__Terence:Phor] (482)! 
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] [ctrl:obj:bgcor-] ut maneas [ctrl:obj::inf:subjunct]
triduom hoc [__Terence:Phor] (488)?
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj] pulchre tibi dices [aci::say:dic-] [__Terence:Phor]
(493).
C Experire [historical::inf:pres], non est longum [__Terence:Phor] (495).
C Adeon ingenio esse [interject::inf:pres:cop] duro te [interject:::2nd:subj]
atque inxorabili, ut neque misericordia neque precibus molliri
498)! 
atque inpudentem sine modo, ut phaleratis ducas dictis me et meam ductes
gratis [__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


Me hoc est aequum [Terence:Phor] (673).
Nam illi mihi dotem iam constituerunt [Terence:Phor] (676).
Uxor opus esse dixero [Terence:Phor] (681).
Quod quidem recte curatum velis [Terence:Phor] (689).
Quid minus utibile fuit, quam hoc ulcus tangere [Terence:Phor] (690 691)?
Nil est, Antipho, quin male narrando possit [Terence:Phor] (696 697).
Haruspex vetuit ante brumam autem novi negoti incipere [Terence:Phor] (709 710).
Dicat eam dare nos nostrum nuptum, ne suscenseat, et magis esse illum nostro officio non digressos esse quantum is voluterit, datum esse [Terence:Phor] (720 723).
Non satis est tuum te officium fecisse, id si non fama ad probat [Terence:Phor] (724).
Volo ipsius haec voluntate fieri, ne se [Terence:Phor] (725).
Ita patrem adulescentis facta haec [Terence:Phor] (731).
Quod ut facerem egestas me inpulit, quom scirem infirmas nuptias hasce esse, ut id consulere, interea vita ut in tuto foret [Terence:Phor] (733 734).
Quodsi eum nunc reperire possum, nil est quod verear [Terence:Phor] (738).
C Em istoc pol nos te [ctrl:subj:::unbound:2nd:obj] hic invenire
C Quid illam alteram quaie [aci:::unbound:3rd:subj:raise] dicitur
[__Terence:Phor] (755)?
C Composito factumst quo modo hanc [ctrl:subj:::unbound:3rd:obj] amans habere
(756 757).
C Di vostram fidem, quam saepe forte temere eveniunt quae
C Offendi [aci:learn:offend-] adveniens quicum volebam et ut volebam
(758 759).
C Pater adulescentis venit eumque [aci:::unbound:3rd:subj] animo iniquo hoc
[aci::inf:pres] aiunt
C Nil periclist sed per deos atque homines meam esse [aci::inf:pres:cop] hanc
[aci:::unbound:3rd:subj] cave resciscat [aci:know:sc-] quisquam
[__Terence:Phor] (763 764).
C Nostrapte culpa facimus [ctrl:obj:make:fac-] ut malis
[ctrl:impers:exped-] esse [ctrl:impers::inf:pres:cop], dum nimium
[__Terence:Phor] (767 768).
[__Terence:Phor] (768 769)?
C Modo ut hoc consilio possiet [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] discedi
C Tu, Geta, abi praee, nuntia [aci:say:nunti-] hanc [aci:::unbound:3rd:subj]
C Praeterhac [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:null] cognatam comperi
[__Terence:Phor] (809).
C Itana parvam mihi fidem [interject:::3rd:subj] esse
C Etiam nunc credis [aci::believe:cred-] te [aci::bound:2nd:subj] ignorier
[__Terence:Phor] (931 932).
C Enim vero si porro esse [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] odiosi pergitis
C Vos me [aci::unbound:1st:subj] indotatis modo patrocinari [aci::inf:pres]
C Nescio me [aci::unbound:1st:subj] dixisse [aci::inf:perf]
[__Terence:Phor] (952 953).
C Vides [aci::see:vid-] tuum peccatum [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] esse elatum
[aci::inf:perf:pass:with:cop] foras neque iam id
[aci::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] te [aci::bound:2nd:subj]
C Nunc quod ipsa ex alis auditura sit, Chremes, Íd [ecm:deontic:::3rd:obj]
nosmet [ecm:deontic:::1st:subj] [linear:is:ist] indicare
(960 961).
C Tum hunc inpuratum [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] poterimus
[ctrl:subj:able:pot-] nostro modo ulcisci [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
[__Terence:Phor] (961 962).
C At vereor ut placari [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] possit
C Tangane aedunct quemquam esse [interject::inf:perf:pass:with:cop] hominem
[interject:::3rd:subj] audacia [__Terence:Phor] (977)!
C Non hoc publicitus scelus [interject:::3rd:subj] hinc asporrier
C Pergin [ctrl:subj:continue:perg-] credere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
non nego [aci:say:neg-] [__non:linear:is]
[__Terence:Phor] (1014).
C Cupio [ctrl:subj:want:cup-] misera in hac re iam defungier
C Aetate pro minus [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] non potest
(1033)?
C Quid mi hic adfers qua ob rem exspectem [ecm:hope:exspect-] aut sperem
C Exsequias [ctrl:impers:::3rd:obj] Chremeti quibus
C Meritone hoc [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] meo videtur [aci:see:vid-]
(1033)?
C Verum iam, quando accusando [__gerund] fieri [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass]
C Adeo hoc [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] indignum tibi videtur [aci:see:vid-]
C Nil [interject:::3rd:subj] pudere [interject::inf:pres]
[interject:::2nd:obj] [__Terence:Phor] (1042)!


C Fortunasque suas [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] coepe 
[ctrl:subj::begin:coep-] latrones inter se 
[___Ennius:Ann] (481 482).
C Unus Surus surum [partial:::3rd:obj] [pun] ferre [partial::inf:pres] tamen 
(484).
C Iam cata signa fere sonitum [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] dare 
(487).
C Non si, lingua loqui [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] saperet [ctrl:subj:know:sap-] 
quibus, ora decem sint, innumerum [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj], ferro cor 
sit pectusque revinctum [___Ennius:Ann] (547 548).
C Omnes mortales sese [ecm:want:::bound:se:subj:local] laudarier 
C Audire [ctrl:obj::inf:pres] [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd:obj:null] iubet 
imperator [___Ennius:Trag] (4).
C Quo nunc incerta re atque inorata gradum [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] 
(14 15)?
visa est [aci::see:vid-] in somnis Hecuba [__impersonal:passive] 
[___Ennius:Trag] (38 39).
C Ibi ex oraclo voce divina edidit [aci:say:ed-] Apollo puerum 
[ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] primus Priamo qui foret postilla natus 
temperaret [ctrl:subj:try:temperar-] tollere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres], eum 
Pergamo [___Ennius:Trag] (46 49).
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj:raise:null] visa [aci::see:vid-] est derepente 
ardentibus [__personal:passive] [___Ennius:Trag] (57 58)?
[ecm:impers:::1st:subj] obesse [ecm:impers::inf:pres:cop], illos 
[ecm:impers:::3rd:subj] prodesse [ecm:impers::inf:pres:cop], me 
[ecm:impers:::1st:subj] ostare [ecm:impers::inf:pres], illos 
65).
C Vidi [aci:see:vid-] videre [ctrl:obj::inf:pres] quod 
passa [ctrl:obj:allow:pat-] aegerrume Hectorem [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] curr
quadriiugo raptarier [aci::inf:pres:pass], Hectoris natum 
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj] de moero iactarier [aci::inf:pres:pass] 
[___Ennius:Trag] (91 93).
C Vidi [aci:see:vid-] ego te [aci::unbound:2nd:subj], adstante ope 
barbarica, tectis caelatis laequeatis auro ebore instructam 
C Haec omnia [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] vidi [aci:see:vid-] inflammar
[aci::inf:pres:pass], Priamo vi vitam [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] evitari 
[aci::inf:pres:pass], Iovis aram [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] sanguine turpari 
C Neque terram [ctrl:impers::3rd:obj] inicere [ctrl:impers::inf:pres], neque cruenta convestire
 [ctrl:impers::inf:pres:pass] [ctrl:impers::inf:pres] lacrimae


C Id ego [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] ac ius

C Edico [aci:say:dic-] vicisse [aci::inf:perf] Oresten

C Caelum nitescere [historical::inf:pres], arbores frondescere
[historical::inf:pres], vites laetificae pampinis pubescere
[historical::inf:pres], rami bacarum ubertate incurvescere
[historical::inf:pres], segetes largiri [historical::inf:pres] fruges,
flores [historical::inf:pres] omn\'a, fontes scatere [historical::inf:pres],

C Hector vei summa armatos educit foras castrisque castra
[ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] ultro iam conferre [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]

[ecm:deontic:aequ-] est [__Ennius:Trag] (166)?

C Neque sanguis ullo potis [ctrl:subj::able:pot-] est pacto profuens
consistere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres], si qui sapientia magis vestra mors devitari
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] potest [ctrl:subj::able:pot-], namque Aesculapi
liberorum saucii opplient porticus, non potest [ctrl:subj::able:pot-] accedi

C Qui alteri exitium parat eum [ecm:deontic::3rd:subj] scire
[ecm:deontic::inf:pres] [aci:know:sc-] oportet [ecm:deontic:oport-] sibi

C Non potest [ctrl:subj::able:pot-] ecfari [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] tantum
dictis quantum factis suppetit [__Ennius:Trag] (178).

C Hector qui haud cessat [ctrl:subj::stop:cess-] obsidionem
(182).

[__Ennius:Trag] (186).

C Qui cupidant [ctrl:subj::want:cup-] dare [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] arma
[ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] Achilli ut ipsei cunctent [__Ennius:Trag]
(191).

C Pergunt [ctrl:subj::continue:perg-] lavere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] sanguen

C Quid [aci::unbound:3rd:subj::raise] noctis videtur [aci:see:vid-]
[__Ennius:Trag] (222 223)?

C Palam mutrire [ctrl:deontic::inf:pres] plebeio
[__Ennius:Trag] (340).
C Deumque de consilio hoc itiner [aci:::unbound:3rd:obj] credo
[_linear:demon:2nd] oportet [ecm:deontic:oport-] profiteri
illam mihi [__Ennius:Trag] (345 346).
C Verum quorum liberi leto dati sunt in bello, non lubenter haec
[__Ennius:Trag] (347 348).
C Nolite [ctrl:subj:want:nolle] hospites ad me adire [ctrl:subj::inf:pres],
ilico istic [__Ennius:Trag] (358).
C Quidnam est obsuco quod te [ctrl:obj:::bound:2nd:subj] adiri
(361)?
quam [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj:null:coord] desperi
necessse [ctrl:deontic:necess-], paucis, nam omnino haud placet
[__Ennius:Frag] (400).
bona dicta teneat [__Ennius:Trag] (405 406).
C Flagiti principium est [ctrl:sent] [ctrl:sent::unbound:3rd:subj:null]
nudare [ctrl:sent::inf:pres] inter cives corpora
C Animus aeger semper errat, neque pati [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
[ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj:null] potis [ctrl:subj::able:pot-] est, cupere
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj:null] numquam desinit
C Quem metuunt oderunt, quem quisque odit
C Ille meae tam potis [ctrl:subj::able:pot-] pacis potiri
C Mox cum tu alterius abilergas bona quid [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] censes
(18)?
= Caecilius Statius
C Quamquam ego mercede huc conductus tua advenio, ne tibi me esse ob eam rem obnoxium reare [acii:think:rer-] [__Caecilius:Plays] (19 20).
C Velim paulisper te si inde abest iniuria [__Caecilius:Plays] (45).
C Nisi quidem qui sese malit pugnitus pessum dari [__Caecilius:Plays] (48).
C Hunc collum Ludo praecidi [ctrl:obj:::unbound:3rd:subj] Ludo praecidi [__Caecilius:Plays] (51)!
C Quae narrare inepti est ad scutras ferventis [__Caecilius:Plays] (68 69).
C Placere occepit graviter, postquam emortuast [__Caecilius:Plays] (156).
= Livius Andronicus
C Partim errant, nequiont Graeciam reddire [__Livius:Ody] (15).
C Ibi manens sedeto donicum videbis me [__Livius:Ody] (20 21).
= Naevius
C Censet eo venturum obviam Poenum [__Naevius:Bell] (40).
C Seseque i perire mavolunt ibidem quam cum stupro [__Naevius:Bell] (59 60).
C Huius autem gnatus dicitur dixisse [__Naevius:Fab] (2 3).
C Demea, meos equos sinam ego illos esse [__Naevius:Fab] (11)?
C Nam in scena vos nocturnos praemiatores tollere [__Naevius:Fab] (15).
C Suopte utrosque decuit acceptos cibo, alteris inanem vovulam madidam [__Naevius:Fab] (24 26).
C In alto navem destitui iubet [__Naevius:Fab] (54).
C Utrum est melius, virginemne an viduam ducere [__Naevius:Fab] (58)?
C Quae ego in theatro hic meis probavi uxorem ducere [__Naevius:Fab] (83)?
C Confidentia ausus verbum cum eo fuerim facere [__Naevius:Fab] (86 87)?
C Umquam si quicquam filium argentum amoris causa sumpse [__Naevius:Fab] (94 96).
= Pacuvius
pudet [ctrl:obj:impers:pud-]
profari [ctrl:obj::inf:pres] [Pacuvius:Trag] (138 140).
C Habet hoc senectus in sese ipsa cum pigra est spisse ut videantur [aci::see:vid-] omnia [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:raise] ei confieri [aci::inf:pass] [aci::personal:passive] [Pacuvius:Trag] (179 180).
C Neque perpetrare [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] precibus imperiove quit
[ctrl:subj::able:qu-] [__Pacuvius:Frag] (375).
C Eundem [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] filios [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [__linear]
sibi [aci::bound:se:goal:local] procreasse [aci::inf:perf] per Calypsonem
C Nulla res nec cicurare [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
neque refingere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
C Haut facul femina [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:raise] una invenietur
[__Pacuvius:Frag] (35).
caecam et brutam perhibent [aci:believe:hab-] philosophi, saxoque
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj::null:coord] instare [aci::inf:pres] in globoso
praedican [aci:say:dic-] volubilei, quia quo id saxum impulerit fors, eo
cadere [aci::inf:pres] Fortunam [aci::unbound:3rd:subj::coord] autumant
C InSANAM [aci::unbound:3rd:subj::null:coord] autem esse [aci::inf:pres:cop]
aunt [aci:say:ai-] quia atrox incerta instabilisque sit [__Pacuvius:Frag]
(40).
C Caecam [aci::unbound:3rd:subj::null:coord] ob eam rem esse
adpliCet, brutam quia dignum [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] atque indignum
[ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] nequeat [ctrl:subj::able:qu-] internoscere
C Sunt autem ali phiLosophi qui contra Fortunam [aci::unbound:3rd:subj]
C Id [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] magis verisimile esse [aci::inf:pres:cop] usus
= Accius
C Qua re alia ex crimine inimicorum effugere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] possis
[ctrl:subj::able:pot-] [aci::inf:pres:subjunct:indir], delica [aci:say:delic-]
[__Accius:Trag] (2).
C CuIatis stirpem [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj] funditus fligi
C Celebri gradu gressume [ecm:deontic::2nd:subj:null] acceIIerasse
C Inimicitias [partial::3rd:obj] Pelopidum extinctas iam atque obliteratedas
C Qui ducat [aci:believe:duc-], cum te socerum viderit, generibus tantam esse
29)?
C At vereor cum te [aci::unbound:2nd:subj] esse [aci::inf:pres:cop]
C An mala aetate mavis [ctrl:subj:want:malle] male mulcari
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] exemplis omnibus [__Accius:Trag] (49)?
C Hocinest quo tam temeriter tu meam benevolentiam [aci::unbound:3rd:subj]
C Nec qui te adiutem invenio, hortari [ctrl:obj::inf:pres]

415
C Itera, in quibus partibus, namque audire volo si est quem exopto, et quo captus modo, fortunana an forte repertus? (139 142)?

C Hic per matutinum lumen tardo procedens gradu derepente aspicio quod hic per matutinum lumen tardo procedens gradu derepente aspicio.

C Cuius sit vita indecoris mortem fugere turpem haut convenit? (157).

C Veritus sum arbitros, atque utinem memet possim obliviscier! (158).

C Qui non habuit coniugem in struprum, quod ne in summa summum esse arbitror periclum, matres contaminari stirpem admisceri genus (169 172).

C Adde huc quod mihi portento caelestum pater prodigium misit, regni stabilimen mei, agnum inter pecudes aurea clarum clam Thyestem non:linear:rel clepere ausum esse regia (175 176).

C Id est postulare, nisi laborem summa cum cura ecferas (179 180).

C Sed quid tonitru turbida torvo concussa repente aequora sunt, regni stabilimen mei, agnum inter pecudes aurea clarum coma quem clam Thyestem (183 185)?

C Ipsus hortatur me frater ut meos malis miser manderem natos (196 197).

C Nam neque sat fingi neque dici pro magnitate (211 212).

C Laetum in Parnaso inter pinos tripudiantem in circulis in ludo atque taedis fulgere (213 214).

C Melius pigasse quam properavisse est nefas (232).

C Scibam hanc mihi supremam lucem et serviti finem et serviti finem (243).

C Omnes gaudent omnes gaudent et serviti finem et serviti finem (246).

C Vel hic qui me aperte effrenata inpudentia praesentem praesens dictis mertare institit (254 255).
C Simul aurem adtendo ut quirem [ctrl:subj:able:qui-] exaudire
(266).
C Si umquam praepediari, gnathe puer, ne adtenderis [ctrl:subj:try:adtend-]
C Quibus oculis quissum nostrum poterit [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] illorum optui
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] voltus [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj], quos iam ab armis
anni porcet [__Accius:Trag] (272 273)?
C Et nonne Argivos [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] fremere [aci::inf:pres] bellum
[aci::see:vid-] [__Accius:Trag] (275)?
C Sed iam Amphilocum [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] huc vadere [aci::inf:pres]
cerno [aci::see:cern-] et nobis [ctrl:deontic::1st:subj:ative] datur bona
pausa loguendi [__gerund] et vellum [ctrl:deontic:tempus] in castra revorti
C Pateor, sed cur proferre [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] haec
[personal:pigere] [__Accius:Trag] (282 283)?
C Quid cesso [ctrl:subj:stop:cess-] ire [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] ad eam
[__Accius:Trag] (287)?
C Quod si procedit, neque te [aci::unbound:2nd:subj] neque quemquam
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj] arbitror [aci:think:arbitr-] tuae paenitum
300).
C Probis [partial:::3rd:subj:null] probatum potius quam multis fore
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj] morte campos [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] contegi
[aci::inf:pres:pass] [__Accius:Trag] (303)?
C Ab classe ad urbem tendunt, neque quisquam potest [ctrl:subj:able:pot-]
fulegentium armum armatus ardorem [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] obtui
C Primores procerum provocavit nomine si esset quis qui secum
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] [__Accius:Trag] (310
311).
C Mavortes [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] armis duo congressos
(312).
C Eos mortales, Phoenix, miseror, scire [ecm:want::inf:pres] ego istud
[ecm:want::unbound:3rd:obj] vos [ecm:want::unbound:2nd:subj]
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 Numquam erit tam immanis, cum non mea opera [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:null]
[__Accius:Trag] (331 332).
C Nam ea oblectat spes aerumnosum hospitem dum illud
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj:rel] quod miser est clam esse [aci::inf:pres:cop]
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] praedicas [aci:say:dic-], ego
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj:raise::null:coord] [aci::inf:pres:no:cop] pervicaciam aio
volo [ecm:want::velle], nam pervicacem
[aci::inf:pres] [aci::unbound:3rd:obj:raise::null] 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 meas maestaret dolor iam diu inflammari
C Regnum [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj] tibi permetti
[aci::sense::sent-] regias [_Accius:Trag] (470).
C Decorare [ecm:deontic::inf:pres] [ecm:deontic::3rd:obj:raise::null]
[ecm:deontic::3rd:obj:raise::null] 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 Cuil, quae cum illo fuerim, dignabor [ctrl:subj::dign-] dari
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] [Accius:Trag] (476)?
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 obiscar umquam aut quemquam [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:subj]
(488)?
C Iube [ctrl:obj::order::iub-] nunc [ctrl:obj::unbound:1st:subj:raise::null]
adtemptare [ctrl:obj::inf:pres] [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd:obj:raise::null:coord], iube
[ctrl:obj::order::iub-] nunc animo [ctrl:obj::unbound:1st:subj:raise::null:coord]
[_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::bound: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).
coniugis [_Accius:Trag] (518)?
C Nec tibi me [ecm:deontic::1st:subj] in hac re gratari
[ecm:deontic::dec-] [_Accius:Trag] (519).
C Volcania iam templab sub ipsis collibus in quos


= Lucilius
C In bulgam penetrare [partial::inf:pres] pilosam [__Lucilius:Sat] (61).
est, tum retia nexit [personal:passive] [Lucilius:Sat] (241 242).

C Postquam praesidium [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] castris educere

ire [ctrl:obj::inf:pres] minutim per commissuras rimarum noctis nigrore

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:subj::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
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] [Lucilius:Sat] (265).

C Peccare [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] [aci::bound:se:subj:local:null] impune rati
[aci:think:rer-] sunt posse [aci::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] et
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] iniquos [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] [Lucilius:Sat]
(270 271).

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:creds-] quemquam [aci::unbound:3rd:subj]
latrina [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [linear:indef:1st] petisse [aci::inf:perf]
[Lucilius:Sat] (283)?

C Qui te diligat, aetatis facieque tuae se [aci::bound:se:3rd:subj]

C Hunc [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] molere [aci::inf:pres]
[aci::unbound:3rd:obj:coord], illam [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] autem ut
frumentum [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [linear] vannere [aci::inf:pres] lumbis
[Lucilius:Sat] (302).

habere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres], ulcisci [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
[ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj: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] [linear] immutasse [aci::inf:perf] satumque
[aci::unbound:3rd:obj] [Lucilius:Sat] (317).

C Esuriente leoni ex ore exculpere [partial::inf:pres] praedam
[partial::3rd:obj] [Lucilius:Sat] (319).
C Abbibere [nominal::inf:pres], hic non multum est [nominal:send] d siet an b [__Lucilius:Sat] (393).
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
  [aci::unbound:3rd::subj] [_non:linear] habere [aci::inf::pres]
  [__Lucilius:Sat] (483).
C Idne aegre est magis an quod pane et [ctrl:obj::unbound:2nd::subj:null]
  viscere [ctrl:obj::inf::pres] privo [ctrl:obj::prohibit::priv-] [__Lucilius:Sat]
  (485)?
C Num vetus ille Cato lacessisse [ctrl:subj::inf::perf]
  [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd::obj:null] conscius [ctrl:subj::know::sc-] non erat
  ipse sibi [ctrl:subj::bound::se:goal::local] [__Lucilius:Sat] (487 488)?
C Naumachiam [ctrl:impers::3rd::subj:null] licet [ctrl:impers::lic-] haec
  [ctrl:impers::3rd::subj:null] [aci::inf::pres:no::cop] inquam alveolumque
  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]
  [ecm:want::velle] ac sapientibus [ecm:want::bound::se::subj:null::coord]
  esse probatum [ecm:want::inf::perf::pass::with::cop] [__Lucilius:Sat] (491 492).
C Quanto antiquius [ecm:deontic::bon-] quam [ecm:deontic::3rd::subj:null]
  facere [ecm:deontic::inf::pres] hoc [ecm:deontic::3rd::obj]
  [ecm:deontic::3rd::subj::null::coord] fecisse [aci::inf::perf]
  [aci::unbound:3rd::obj:null::coord] videri [ecm:deontic::inf::pres::pass]
  [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
  [aci::inf::pres:no::cop] monstra putant [aci:think:put-] [__Lucilius:Sat] (520
  521).
C Ut pueri infantes credunt [aci:believe::cred-] signa omnia aena
  [aci::unbound:3rd::subj] vivere [aci::inf::pres] et
  [aci::unbound:3rd::subj::null::coord] esse [aci::inf::pres::cop] homines, sic
  isti somnia ficta [aci::unbound:3rd::subj] [aci::inf::perf::pass::no::cop] vera
  putant [aci:think:put-], credunt [aci:believe::cred-] signis cor
  [aci::unbound:3rd::subj::null::coord] inesse [aci::inf::pres::cop] in aenis [__Lucilius:Sat]
  (526 528).
C Quae [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd::subj:null] gallam [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd::obj]
  bibere [ctrl:obj::inf::pres] ac rugas [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd::obj] conducere
  [ctrl:obj::inf::pres] ventris [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd::subj] [non:linear]
  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::unbound:3rd::subj] facere [ctrl:subj::inf::pres] est solitus
  [ctrl:subj::used::sol-] [__Lucilius:Sat] (540 541)?
C Scit [aci::know::sc-] [aci::unbound:3rd::subj:null] poietikon esse
  [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
  aquilonem novisse [aci::inf::perf] aiebat [aci::say::ai-] se
  [aci::bound::se::subj::local] [non:linear:demom] solos demagis, istos ex nimbo
  austellos [aci::unbound:3rd::obj] nec [aci::bound::se::subj::local::null::coord]
  nosse [aci::inf::perf] nec [aci::unbound:3rd::subj::null::coord] esse
  [aci::inf::pres] putare [aci::inf::pres] [aci:think:put-] [__Lucilius:Sat]
  (544 546).


C Favitorem tibi me amicum, amatorem putes [__Lucilius:Sat] (874).
C Habeasque in animo mi admodum causam gravem fore tuo [__Lucilius:Sat] (875 876).
C Primum Crysi cum negat signatam gnatam reddere [__Lucilius:Sat] (880).
C Hymnis, velim te id quod verum est credere [__Lucilius:Sat] (887 888).
C Deierat se non scripsisse et post non scripturum [__Lucilius:Sat] (890).
C Perge, amabo, ac si pote face dignam me ut vobis putem [__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 omnem, quovis posse me amungi bolo [__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 tequamprimum et perdere amorem [__Lucilius:Sat] (919 920).
C Quid si dare vellent velis [__Lucilius:Sat] (921)?
C Sic inquam veteratorem illum vetulum lupum Annibalem acceptum [__Lucilius:Sat] (929 930).
C Hoc [__Lucilius:Sat] (952 953).
C Aetatem istuc [__Lucilius:Sat] (969).
C Hoc [__Lucilius:Sat] (971).
C Quin amplexetur qui velit, ego non sinam [ctrl:obj:allow:sin-]
C Vini inquam cyathus unus potuit [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] tollere
videare [aci::see:vid-] et scire [aci::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj:know:sc-] plus
[aci::unbound:3rd:obj] quam ceteri, pertisum hominem [aci::unbound:3rd:obj]
non pertaesum dicere [aci::inf:pres] ferum nam genus [aci::unbound:3rd:subj]
C Neque prodire [partial::inf:pres] in altum, proeliari [partial::inf:pres]
sub vitem procul [_Lucilius:Sat] (994).
C Nos [interject:::1st:subj] esse arquatos
C Ut semel in Caeli pugnas te [aci::unbound:2nd:subj] invadere
[aci::inf:pres] vidi [aci::see:vid-] [_Lucilius:Sat] (1008).
C Et virtute tua, et claris conducere [partial::inf:pres] cartis
[_Lucilius:Sat] (1013).
C Quanti vos faciant socii quom parcere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] possint
C Scito [aci::know:sc-] etenim bene longincum mortalibus morbum
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj] in vino esse [aci::inf:pres:cop] ubi qui invitavit
dapsilius se [_Lucilius:Sat] (1022 1023).
C Omnia [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] tum endo muco videas [aci::see:vid-] fervente
C Quis totum scis [aci::know:sc-] iam corpus [aci::unbound:3rd:subj]
C Contra haec [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:raise] invitasse [aci::inf:perf]
[aci::unbound:3rd:obj:coord] videntur [aci::see:vid-]
facies [ctrl:obj:make:fac-], illo me utere libente [_Lucilius:Sat] (1038).
C Tune iugo iungas me autem et [ctrl:obj::unbound:1st:subj:coord]
succedere [ctrl:obj::inf:pres] aratro invitam et glebas
ferro [_Lucilius:Sat] (1043 1044)?
C Curare [partial::inf:pres] domi sint gerdios ancillae pueri zonarius textor
[_Lucilius:Sat] (1053 1054).
C Neu qui te ignaro famuli subducere [historical::inf:pres]
C Sperans [ecm:hope:sper-] aetatem eadem me [ecm:hope::bound:1st:subj] haec
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] potesse [aci::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] et mansum
[ecm:hope::unbound:3rd:obj] ex ore [ecm:hope::bound:1st:subj:coord]
[ecm:deontic::oport-] [__Lucilius:Sat] (1062).
[__Lucilius:Sat] (1063).
C Producent me ad te, tibi me [ctrl:obj::unbound:lst:subj] haec
[__Lucilius:Sat] (1066).
C Et Musconis manum [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] perscribere
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] posse [partial::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] tagacem
[__Lucilius:Sat] (1067).
C Nolito [ctrl:subj::want:nolle] tibi me [aci::unbound:lst:subj] male dicere
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres] posse [aci::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj:able:pot-] putare
C Quem [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] scis [aci:know:sc-] scire [aci::inf:pres]
tuas omnes maculasque [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] notasque
C Sicuti te quem [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] aequae speciem vitae esse
C Et sua perciperet [aci:see:percip-] retro rellicta [aci::unbound:3rd:subj]
C Et sola ex multi nunc nostra poemata [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] ferri
C Non datur, admittit nemo, nec [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:null] vivere
C Inluvies, scabies oculos [historical::unbound:3rd:obj] huic deque petigo
C Deducta tunc voce leo (direct quote), cur tu ipse venire
(1116 1117)?
C Uti pecudem te [ecm:deontic::2nd:subj] asinumque ut denique nasci
[ecm:deontic::inf:pres] praestiterit [ecm:deontic::praestit-] [__Lucilius:Sat]
(1129 1130).
C Quid Decius, [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj:null:coord] nuculam an confixum
[__Lucilius:Sat] (1135).
C Tubulus si Lucius umquam si Lupus aut Carbo aut Neptuni filius putasset
periuers, tam impurus fuisset [__Lucilius:Sat] (1138 1141)?
C Sit [ecm:want::inf:subjunct] me [aci::bound:lst:subj] scire
mihi conscius [aci:know:consc-] Sura ne damnum faciam [__Lucilius:Sat]
(1142 1143).
C Nunc vero a mani ad noctem festo atque profesto totus item pariterque die
populusque patresque iactare [historical::inf:pres] indu foro se
omnes, decedere nusquam, uni se atque eidem studio omnes dedere omnibus omnes [Lucilius:Sat] (1145 1151).
C Hymnis cantando quae me adservisse ait ad se [Lucilius:Sat] (1168).
C Nam in quibus mendae omnibus in rebus fiunt fierique [Lucilius:Sat] (1185 1886).
C Quid tibi ego ambages ambiu scribere coner [Lucilius:Sat] (1192)?
C Virtus Albine, est pretium persolvere verum quis in versamur quis vivimus rebus potissunt [Lucilius:Sat] (1192).
C Ergo praetorum est ante et praestare rem quaerere [Lucilius:Sat] (1215).
C Vidimus vinctum thomice canabina [Lucilius:Sat] (1218 1219).
C Sumere te amian habere [Lucilius:Sat] (1224).
C Pedetemptim huc ire salutem [Lucilius:Sat] (1247).
frumentum transferri, stercus foras efferri, stercilinum fieri, semen purgari, funes sarciri, centones fieri, cucliones familiam oportuisse sibi sarcire. [__Cato:Agri] (2).

Per ferias potuisse fossas veteres tergeri, viam publicam muniri, viam recidi, hortum recidi, pratum recidi, viam purgari, viam recidi, virgas recidi, viam vinciri, viam recidi, viam runcari, expensi far fieri. [__Cato:Agri] (2).

Cum servi aegrotarint, cibaria tanta non oportuisse. [__Cato:Agri] (2).

Quae opera fieri velit et quae locari velit, uti imperet et ut faciat. [__Cato:Agri] (2).

Patrem familias vendacem, non emacem esse. [__Cato:Agri] (2).

Prima adulescentia patrem familiae agrum conserere studere. [__Cato:Agri] (3).

Ubi aetas accessit ad annos XXXVI, tum aedificare diu cogitare non oportet, sed facere oportet. [__Cato:Agri] (3).

Patrem familiae villam rusticam bene aedificatam habere expedit, cellam oleariam, vinariam, dolia multia lubeat caritatem expectare. [__Cato:Agri] (3).
C Torcularia bona [ecm:deontic:::3rd:obj] [ecm:deontic:::3rd:subj:null]

C Cogitato [aci:think:cogit-] quotannis tempestates magnas
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj] venire [aci::inf:pres] et


C In iugera oleti CXX vasa bina [ecm:deontic:::3rd:subj] esse
beneque frequens cultumque erit [__Cato:Agri] (3).

C Trapetos [ecm:deontic:::3rd:subj] bonos privos inpares esse
sient, ut commutare [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
lores privos [ecm:deontic:::3rd:subj], vectes senos
[ecm:deontic:::3rd:subj], fibulas duodenas [ecm:deontic:::3rd:subj],

[ctrl:subj::inf:pres], tardius ducetur, sed minore labore [__Cato:Agri] (3).

C Bubilia bona [ecm:deontic:::3rd:subj], bonas praesepis
[ecm:deontic:::3rd:subj], faliscas clatratas [ecm:deontic:::3rd:subj],

C Vicinis bonus esto, familiam [ctrl:obj:::unbound:3rd:subj] ne siveris

C Vilicus si nolet [ctrl:subj:want:nolle] male facere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres],
non faciet [__Cato:Agri] (5).

C Si passus erit, dominus inpune ne [ctrl:obj:::unbound:3rd:subj] sinat


C Ne plus [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] censeat [aci:believe:cens-] sapere
[aci::inf:pres] se [aci::bound:se:subj:local] [non:linear] quam dominum

[ctrl:subj:want:velle] insciende domino, neu quid

C Haruspicem [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj], augurem
[ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj], hariolum [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj],
Chaldaeum nequem [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] consuluisse

C Opus rusticum omne [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] curet uti sciat
[ctrl:subj:know:sc-] facere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres], et id facias saepe, dum ne
lassus fiat [__Cato:Agri] (5).

C Si hoc faciet, minus libebit [ctrl:impers:lib-]
rectius et dormibit libentius [__Cato:Agri] (5).

C Boves [ctrl:obj:::unbound:3rd:subj] maxima diligentia curatos
(5).
C Scabieum pecori et iumentis caveto, id ex fame et si inpluit fieri
C Agrum quibus locis conseras, sic [ecm:deontic::3rd:subj:null] observari
C Ubi aeger crassus et laetus est sine arboribus, eum agrum
C Idem aeger si nebulosus est, rapa [ecm:deontic::3rd:subj], raphanos
C Ubi ager crassus et laetus est sine arboribus, eum agrum
C Idem aeger si nebulosus est, rapa [ecm:deontic::3rd:subj], raphanos
C In agro crasso et caldo oleam conditivam, radium maiorem, Sallentinam,
C Qui aeger frigidior et macrior erit, ibi oleam Licianam
C Vineam [ecm:deontic::3rd:subj] quo in agro conseri
C Qui locus [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:raise] vino optimus dicetur
C Fundum suburbanum arbustum [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd:obj] maxime convenit
C In eodem fundo suum quidquid [ecm:deontic::3rd:subj] conseri
C Salicta [ecm:deontic::3rd:subj] locis aquosis, umectis, umbrosis propter
C Quo modo oletum [ecm:deontic::3rd:obj] agri iugera CCXL
C Quo modo vineae iugera C [ecm:deontic::3rd:obj]
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C Per sementem primum incipient [ctrl:subj::begin:incip-] maturae esse [ctrl:subj::inf:pres], postea usque adeo sunt plus menses VIII [__Cato:Agri] (17).


fodere oportet [Cato:Agri] (43).

C Olivetum diebus XV ante aequinoctium vernum
incipito [Cato:Agri] (44).

C Si parum deprimere poteris, maileo aut mateola adigito [Cato:Agri] (46).

C Si pecus deprimere poteris, malleo aut mateola adigito, ter prius resicato, quam ad arborem poneas [Cato:Agri] (47).

C Simul herbae inceperint nasci [Cato:Agri] (48).

C Vineam si in alium locum transferre licebit [Cato:Agri] (49).

C Quae inrigiva non erunt, ubi favonius flare coeperit, cum prata defendes, depurgato herbasque malas omnis radicitus effodito [Cato:Agri] (50).

C Haec facito, antequam vineam fodere [Cato:Agri] (50).

C Ficum, oleam, malum Punicum, cotoneum aliaque mala omnia a capita propagari eximique serique oportet [Cato:Agri] (51).

C Quae diligentius propagari voles, in aullas aut in qualos propagari oportet, et cum iis in scrobem deferri [Cato:Agri] (52).

C Per fundum aut qualum ramum, quem radicem capere [Cato:Agri] (52).

C Bubus pabulum hoc modo parari [Cato:Agri] (54).

C Ubi sementim patraveris, glandem legique oportet et in aquam conici [Cato:Agri] (54).

C Inde semodios singulis bubus in dies dari, et si non laborabunt, pastcantur satius erit, aut modium vinaceorum, quos in dolium condideris [Cato:Agri] (54).
[___Cato:Agri] (112).
C Lucum conlucare Romano more sic oportet [Cato:Agri] (139).
C Úti tibi ius est porco piaculo facere illiusce sacri coercendi [Cato:Agri] (139).
C Si fodere voles, altero piaculo eodem modo facito, hoc amplius dico [Cato:Agri] (140).
C Agrum lustrare sic oportet [Cato:Agri] (141).
C Impera suovitaurilia circumagi iussi [Cato:Agri] (141).
C Cum divis volentibus quodque bene eveniat, mando tibi, Mani, uti illace suovitaurilia, fundum, agrum, terramque meam quota ex parta sive circumagi iussi cum divis voluntibus quodque bene eveniat, mando tibi, Mani, uti illace suovitaurilia, fundum, terramque meam quota ex parta sive circumagi [Cato:Agri] (141).
C Ergo agrum, terram, suovitaurilia circumagi [Cato:Agri] (141).
C Utique tu fruges, frumenta, vineta, virgultaque bene evenire siris [Cato:Agri] (141).
C Nominare vetat Martem neque agnum vitulumque [Cato:Agri] (141).
C Vilici officia quae sunt, ea omnia quae in fundo fieri oportet quaegue emi pararique oportet [Cato:Agri] (142).
C Hoc amplius, quo modo vilicam facere [Cato:Agri] (143).
C Farinam bonam et far suptile sciat [Cato:Agri] (143).
C Oleam legendam hoc modo locare [Cato:Agri] (144).
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atque confidentiam

C Laudant [aci:praise:laud-] me [aci::unbound:1st:subj] maximis laudibus, tantum navium [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj], tantum exercitum
comparare [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] potuisse [aci::inf:perf]

C Mare [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] velis florere [aci::inf:pres] videre
[aci:see:vid-] [__Cato:Or] (29).


C Si quis strenue fecerat, donabam honeste, ut alii idem

[__Cato:Or] (39).

C Si cuperent [ctrl:subj::want:cup-] hostes fieri [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass],
temere fieri [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] nunc possent [ctrl:subj::able:pot-]
[__Cato:Or] (42).

C Ridibundum [ecm:deontic:ridibund-] [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:null]
[ecm:deontic::3rd:subj:null] gerere [ecm:deontic::inf:pres], pauculos
homines [ecm:deontic::3rd:obj] , mediocriculum exercitum
(43).

C Recto fronte ceteros [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] sequi

C Dixit [aci:say:dic-] a decemviris [__ab:agent] parum bene sibi
[aci::bound:se:goal:distant] cibaria [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] curata esse

[__Cato:Or] (58).

C Nemo hoc [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] rex ausus est [ctrl:subj::dare:aud-]

C Quid [aci::unbound:3rd:obj] illos [aci::unbound:3rd:subj], bono genere
gnatos, magna virtute praeditos, opinamini [aci:think:opin-] animi habuisse
[aci::unbound:3rd:subj] habituros [aci::inf:fut:peri:no:cop], dum
vivente [__Cato:Or] (58)?

C Insignitas iniurias [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj], plagas
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres], verbera [ctrl:subj::inf:pres], vibices
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres], eos dolores [ctrl:subj::inf:pres]
atque carnificinas [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] per dedecus atque maximam
contumeliam [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj], inspectantibus popularibus suis
atque multis mortalibus, te [aci::unbound:2nd:subj] [__non:linear]

C Tuum nefarium facinus [ctrl:subj::unbound:3rd:obj] peiore facinore operire
C Domi cum auspicamus, honorem [ecm:want::unbound:3rd:obj] me
C Aquam Anienem [ecm:deontic:::3rd:obj] in sacarium
[ecm:deontic::oport-] [__Cato:Or] (74).
trepidante [__Cato:Or] (80).
oportere [aci::inf:pres] [ecm:deontic::oport-] [ecm:deontic:::3rd:subj:null]
institui [ecm:deontic::inf:pres:pass], quin minus duobus milibus ducentis sit
aerum equestrium [__Cato:Or] (85).
[aci::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj:::unbound:3rd:obj] atque religionem
[ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] domi pro supellectile
C Prorsum quodcumque [ctrl:obj:::unbound:3rd:obj] iubebat
C Quotiens vidi [aci:see:vid-] trulleos [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] assiternas
pertusos [aci::inf:perf:pass:no:cop], aqualis matellas
C Quod si non coveniatis, cum [ctrl:obj::unbound:3rd:subj:null:coord]
orationis conducat, qui auscultet [__Cato:Or] (111).
C Prusto panis conduci [ctrl:subj::inf:pres:pass] potest
C In coloniam, mercules, scribere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres] nolim
[__Cato:Or] (113).
C Quid ego cum illo dissertem amplius, quem [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] ego
denique credo [aci:believe:cred-] in pompa vectitatum iri [aci::inf:fut:pass]
ludis pro citeria, atque cum spectatoribus
C Scio [aci:know:sc-] fortunas secundas [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] neglegentiam
[aci::inf:pres] [ctrl:subj::used:sol-] [__Cato:Or] (122).
C Video [aci:see:vid-] hac tempestate [aci::unbound:3rd:subj:null]
concucurrisse [aci::inf:perf] omnes adversarios [aci::unbound:3rd:obj]
[__Cato:Or] (123).
C Aetolos [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] pacem [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] [_linear]
velle [aci::inf:pres], de ea re oratores [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] Romam
[ctrl:sent::inf:pres], aliud [ctrl:sent] [ctrl:sent::unbound:3rd:subj:null]
C iam principio quis vidit [aci:see:vid-] corona donari [aci::inf:pres:pass]
quemquam [aci::unbound:3rd:subj] [__promoted:goal], cum oppidum captum non
esse aut castra hostium non incensa essent [__Cato:Or] (148)?
C Postea, ubi irata facta est, servum recepticium


C Issi caudicem proferri, ubi mea oratio scripta erat de ea re quod sponsonem feceram cum M Cornelio [___Cato:Or] (173).


C Quamquam suam vitam dare [eci::deontic::inf:pres] superiorem atque ampliorem atque antiquiorem animum inducent quam innoxiorem [___Cato:Or] (178).

C Multa me dehortata huc prodire, anni, aetas, vox, vires, senectus, verum enimvero cum tantam rem peragier [eci::inf:pres] [___Cato:Or] (196).

C Tamen dicunt arbitrarer [eci::think:arbitr-] [___Cato:Or] (200).

C Si posset auctio fieri de artibus tuis, quasi supellectilis solet [___Cato:Or] (201).


C Nem, opinior, tam insanus esset, qui iudicaret meliorem esse Gellium quam Turium, si non melior Gellius est Turio, potius oportet credi [eci::deontic::inf:pres:pass], unde petitur [___Cato:Or] (206).


C Sed nisi qui palam corpore pecuniam aut se lenoni locavisset, etsi famosus et suspiciosus fuisset vim in corpus liberum non aecum [eci::deontic::aequ-] censure [eci::believe:cens-] adferri [eci::deontic::inf:pres:pass] [___Cato:Or] (212).
C Nunc ita aiant [aci:say:ai-], in segetibus, in herbis bona frumenta
C Saepe audivi [aci:hear:aud-] inter os atque offam multa
C In adulterio uxorem tuam si prehendisses, sine iudicio ius ne de
illa te [ctrl:subj:deon:adul-] sive tu adulterares sive tu adulterarere,
digito non auderet [ctrl:subj:dare:aud-] contingere [ctrl:subj::inf:pres],
neque ius est [__Cato:Or] (222).
C Quod conpluriens usu venit omni tempore ante ventum esse
[aci:believe:cred-] [__Baccan] (2 3).
C Neiquis eorum Bacanal [ctrl:subj:::unbound:3rd:obj] habuise
[ctrl:deontic::inf:pres] habere [ctrl:deontic::inf:pres], eois utei
ad praitorem urbanum Romam venirent [__Baccan] (3 5).
Latini neve socium quisquam, isque praitorem urbanum adiesent, isque de
senatuos sententiad, dum ne minus senatoribus C adesent, quom ea res
cosoleretur, iousisen [__Baccan] (7 9).
C Neve pecuniam [ctrl:subj:::unbound:3rd:obj] quisquam eorum comoinem habuise
C Neve magistratum [ctrl:subj:::unbound:3rd:obj], neve pro magistratud, neque
virum [ctrl:subj:::unbound:3rd:obj] neque mulierem
C Neve post hac inter sed [ctrl:subj:::unbound:3rd:obj] coniurase
[ctrl:subj::inf:perf] neve commoviese
[ctrl:subj::inf:perf] [ctrl:subj::inf:perf] [ctrl:subj::inf:perf] velet
[ctrl:subj:want:velle], neve quisquam fidem [ctrl:subj::inf:perf]
(13 14).
C Sacra [ctrl:subj:::unbound:3rd:obj] in oquoltod ne quisquam fecise
C Neve in poplicod neve in privatod neve extrad urbem sacra
[ctrl:subj:want:velle], nisi praitorem urbanum adieset, isque de senatuos
sententiad, dum ne minus senatoribus C adesent, quom ea res cosoleretur,
iousisen [__Baccan] (15 18).
C Homines plous V oinvorsei virei atque mulieres sacra
ne quisquam fecise [ctrl:subj::inf:perf] velet 
neve inter ibei virei plous duobus, mulieribus plous
depraitoris urbani senatuosque senetentiad, utei suprad scriptum est
[__Baccan] (19 22).
C Sei ques esent, quei arvorsum ead fecisent, quam suprad scriptum est, ees
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
(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</td>
<td>-ārum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>-ae ~ -ai</td>
<td>-īs (-ābus)</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>

---

93 The archaic genitival –as is fossilized in *paterfamilias*, lit. ‘father of the family’.
94 The alternative dative/ablative plural occurs only with two nouns, *dea* ‘goddess’ and *fīlia* ‘daughter’ to distinguish them from the otherwise identical forms of *deus* ‘god’ and *fīlius* ‘son’. From the earliest inscriptions it is apparent that –ābus 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>-ōrum ~ -um</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 (-īs)(^{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 (-ī)</td>
<td>-ibus</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></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th></th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>-us</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-ūs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>-ūs</td>
<td></td>
<td>-uum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>-ui</td>
<td></td>
<td>-ubus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>-um</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-ūs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>-ū</td>
<td></td>
<td>-ubus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIFTH DECLENSION** (Mostly feminine, a few masculine)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th></th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>-ēs</td>
<td></td>
<td>-ēi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>-ēi</td>
<td></td>
<td>-ērum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>-ēi</td>
<td></td>
<td>-ēbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>-em</td>
<td></td>
<td>-ēs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>-ē</td>
<td></td>
<td>-ēbus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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