

This is an offprint from:

Harm Pinkster (ed.)

LATIN LINGUISTICS AND LINGUISTIC THEORY

Proceedings of the 1st International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics

Amsterdam, April 1981

John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Amsterdam/Philadelphia

1983

(Published as Vol. 12 of the

STUDIES IN LANGUAGE COMPANION SERIES)

ISSN 0165 7763 / ISBN 90 272 3011 0

© Copyright 1983 – All rights reserved.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

**PRAEDICATIVUM* (QUANTIFYING ADJECTIVES
AND ADJECTIVES DENOTING PHYSICAL
OR MENTAL STATE)**

H. PINKSTER

University of Amsterdam

SUMMARY

I will try to show that there are semantic arguments against considering Praedicativa as Adjuncts of some sort; this holds both for quantifiers and adjectives denoting physical or mental state, albeit in a different way. Quantifiers show some remarkable parallels with quantifiers in other languages. They occur with constituents which do not allow of attribution; they do not occur in predication-like constructions; they show very few restrictions in their occurrence in Latin sentences, however, in comparison with other languages. They cannot be regarded as embedded predications. Praedicativa consisting of adjectives of physical or mental state, on the other hand, can be regarded as embedded predications which refer to the same time as the main predication. One of the terms of this embedded predication is coreferential with one of the arguments of the main predication; they seldom go with satellites.

0. *Introduction*

My main interest in this paper will be in discussing the way in which the use of what I call Praedicativa can be related to that of Adjuncts (Adverbials) on the one hand (section 1) and Attributes and Subject-/Object-Complements in the sense of Quirk e. a. (1972) on the other (section 2). More specifically, I will confine myself to two types of adjectives that may function as Praedicativum, namely quantifiers and adjectives denoting physical or mental state, the term 'state' being used in rather a loose sense. It is not my intention to present suggestions of how my observations would fit in technically into particular linguistic theories. Part of my terminology, however, derives from

Functional Grammar (Dik 1978).

Quantifiers are, roughly, those adjectives that give an answer to the question 'how many': examples are *ambo* ('both'), *omnis* ('all'), *plerique* ('most'), *pauci* ('few'), *nonnulli* ('some'). Examples of adjectives denoting physical or mental state are *maestus* ('sad'), *laetus* ('glad'), *ebrius* ('drunk'), *salvus* ('safe'). The reason for confining myself to these adjectives is not, that I consider them in some way representative of praedicativa in general, but exactly because I assume (and know) that there are quite remarkable differences between the various types of Praedicativa. Also, I do not consider it impossible that within the types of adjectives that I do discuss there may be individual differences. Paying special attention to *omnis* just because the relevant data are readily accessible may blur certain facts about other quantifiers. The following sentences exemplify the Praedicativum under discussion.

- (1) Homines qui gestant quique auscultant crimina, si meo arbitratu licet, *omnes* pendeant ('If I could have my way, tale-bearers and their hearers would all be strung up', Plt. *Ps.* 428)
- (2) At ea subterfugere potis es *pauca*, si non *omnia* ('Well, you have a chance to escape a little of it, if not all, Plt. *Cap.* 970-1)
- (3) His *nonnulli* etiam minabamur ('Against these some of us even uttered their threats', Cic. *Lig.* 33)
- (4) Amphitruo uxorem salutatur *laetus* speratam suam ('Gladly does A. greet his darling wife', Plt. *Am.* 676)
- (5) Ita me Amor *lassum* animi ludificat ('Yes, Love mocks me in my weariness of soul', Plt. *Ci.* 215)

Before turning to my main topics I will briefly touch upon some general aspects of praedicativa.

Firstly, quite some attention has been given in recent times to the ways by which one might distinguish between praedicativa and expressions with identical formal properties (agreement) such as Attributes, Subject-/Object-Complements, Apposition, etc. I refer to Fugier (1978: 124-8)¹ and Happ (1976: 286-7) for the problem of Attributes, and to Pfister (1973)² for Subject/Object-Complements. I assume that there will be contexts in which a decision can hardly be made. On the other hand the statistically predominant cases are those in which there is no reason for assuming a Subject/Object-Complement and in which praedicativa are in a sense obligatory, viz. when there is no constituent with which the adjective could be interpreted as an Attribute (Proper Nouns, often (ex. (4)), furthermore personal (ex. (5)), anaphoric (ex. (2)), in-

terrogative, relative pronouns, and in the case of 'zero-pronominalisation' (ex. (3)). For the remainder of this paper I will take it for granted that there will be instances which cannot be decided upon precisely. Nevertheless, there are also enough clear-cut instances and I will confine myself to those.

Secondly, the notion 'Praedicativum' is sometimes used to cover quite different phenomena. I only mention Scherer's application of the notion 'Praedicativum' to the so-called ablativus absolutus-construction as well (1975: 194-5). However, the very criterion of optionality which applies to Praedicativa (Pfister 1973) makes it clear that this is not correct. In (6), e.g. *invitis* cannot be omitted:

- (6) Vobis *invitis* ... una libella liber possum fieri ('Despite you I can get freed for a farthing', Plt. *Cas.* 315)³

Thirdly, I follow Fugier & Corbin (1977) for Latin and a.o. Quirk e.a. (1972: 258 ff.) for English, who have presented arguments for differentiating between certain types of adjectives on other than semantic grounds. In my opinion the usefulness of distinguishing several types of adjectives appears also from juxtaposition patterns such as the following:

- (7) Ita me gessi ut *salvi omnes* conservaremini ('My actions have secured the salvation of you all', Cic. *Cat.* 3,25)
- (8) Non vides ut *palantes solae liberae* grassentur ('Don't you see how they straggle along aimlessly, alone, untended, Plt. *Ba.* 1137)
- (9) Ubi sunt isti scortatores qui *soli inviti* cubant ('Where are those young blades that hate a lonely couch', Plt. *Am.* 287)⁴

I now pass on to my main topics.

1. *Praedicativa and Adjuncts*

The first point concerns the usual explanation of the occurrence of adjectives as Praedicativum. In reference grammars such as K.-St. (:I, 234 ff.) and Sz. (:171 f.) these adjectives are said to occur 'instead of adverbs'. A similar view, albeit in a different framework, can be found in Fugier (1978: 127, 129)⁵.

A familiar kind of argument for assuming some sort of synonymy between adjectives and adverbs is based on the occurrence of sentences like (10) and (11), in which adjectives and adverbs are coordinated or are part of a parallel construction (more examples in K.-St. I, 238; see also Fugier (1978: 129)).

- (10) Dum alii trepidi (v.l. *trepide*), cedunt, alii *segniter* subeunt ('While the one part in disorder was yielding ground, and the other was slow in coming up', Liv. 27, 12, 15)
- (11) Hoc primis diebus ... et *frequentes* et *impigre* fecerunt ('In the early days they did this both frequently and stoutly', Liv. 36, 23, 4) (et before *impigre* is lacking in most mss.)⁶

Apart from instances of coordination one may also point to cases like (12) and (13), where it is difficult to explain why in one case we find the adjective *cupidi*, in the other *cupide*.

- (12) *Libentes cupidi* que condicionem acceperunt ('They accepted the condition gladly and eagerly', *Bell. Af.* 90,2)⁷
- (13) *Cupide* accipiat ... faxo ('I'll soon make him eager to treat', Ter. *Ad.* 209)

Against this two types of argument there are several arguments for not identifying Praedicativa with Adjuncts and I think that these arguments are stronger. Firstly, I have found cases of juxtaposition of adjectives and adverbs, be it a few cases only:

- (14) Refertum praeda, quam *effuse avidi atque egentes* rapiebant ('(a land) filled with livestock which his greedy and impoverished men gathered in from far and wide', Liv. 22,9,3)
- (15) Cum *densiores manipulatim* resistere hostibus instituissent ('When they had started to resist the enemies in companies, closely crowded together', Sisenna frg. inc. 31)

Two examples of juxtaposition of an adjective and an adverb in the function Disjunct (sentence adverbial) are:

- (16) Non *recte* agis *ignominiosus* ('You have no right to bring this action, because you have been deprived of civil rights', Quint. 3,6,75)
- (17) Hostili in terra *turpiter* iacuit *insepultus* ('In a hostile land he lay shamefully unburied', Cic. *Inv.* 1,108)

Secondly, but more importantly, the fact that there are cases in which it does not make much difference for understanding the utterance whether the state of affairs is defined by additional information about one of the participants (as is the case with a Praedicativum) or about the action involved (Adjunct) is no proof of synonymy. Actually, there are cases in which the differ-

ence in meaning is quite clear and there are also cases in which an adjective is excluded. K.-St. seem to be aware of this. Thus, in order to illustrate their opinion that adjectives in a sense replace adverbs, they remark: 'Die lateinische Ausdrucksweise ist in solchen Fällen ohne Frage lebendiger, energischer und anschauliger, indem der nähere Umstand einer Handlung zugleich in die Persönlichkeit des Handelnden aufgenommen wird, als: Socrates venenum laetus et libens hausit' (: I, 234). On the other hand, they say that both types of expression are used 'ohne wesentlichen Unterschied der Bedeutung', (: I, 237).

An adjective in the function Praedicativum is excluded in impersonal sentences. This explains why we find (18) by the side of (19).

- (18) Romam inde *frequenter* migratum est ('Many persons came to live in Rome', Liv. 1, 11, 4)
- (19) Conveniunt *frequentes* prima luce ('They gathered at daybreak in large numbers', Liv. 1, 50, 2)

As for semantic differences between adjectives and morphologically related adverbs, consider the following examples:

- (20) Unde vos ire dicam ... tam *maestiter* vestitas ('Where can you have come from so sorrowfully attired?', Plt. *Rud.* 265)
- (21) Cum (Philippides) in certamine poetarum praeter spem vicisset et *laetissime* gauderet, inter illud gaudium repente mortuus est ('When Ph. had unexpectedly won the first prize in a contest of poets and was rejoicing exceedingly, he died suddenly in the midst of his joy', Gell. 3, 15, 2)
- (22) (Quid velimus dicere) *laete* an *severe*, abundanter an *presse* ('What we wish to express) in luxuriant or austere language, at length or with conciseness', Quint. 8, 3, 40)

Laetus and *maestus* are often found as Praedicativum. The related adverbs are very rare. Still, only the adverb is possible in (20), because it is not the mental state of the girls that is commented upon, but the type of clothes they are wearing (see also the following context). In the same vein, in (22) the adverbs characterize the product of speaking, not the speaker. Similarly, in (21) it is the *gaudium* that is *laetissimum*. *Cum laetissimus gauderet* would be rather silly.

I also refer to K.-St.'s distinction (: I, 238) *prudens et sciens* = 'wissentlich und mit Vorbedacht' vs. *scienter et prudenter* = 'in kluger und geschickter

rences as a Subject Complement are attested either, in the abl. abs.-construction, quantifiers such as *omnis* are excluded:

(29) *Ne ceterior Gallia nobis invitis alicui detur ...* ('That Cisalpina Gaul is not given to anyone against our will', Cic. *Prov.* 39)

(30) **Ne ceterior Gallia nobis omnibus alicui detur ...*¹⁰

In view of this there seems to be much more reason to explain the possibility for quantifiers to function as Praedicativum by referring to their functioning as Attributes. In fact, in general linguistics quantifiers are regarded as typically attributive (or, in terms of Functional Grammar, as 'term operators').¹¹ Within a transformational generative framework Carden (1976) and Akmajian & Heny (1975: 224 f.) for English and Link (1974) and Vater (1980) for German have drawn attention to pairs of sentences like (31) - (32).¹²

(31) *All* the men have found their way home

(32) The men have *all* found their way home

In the studies referred to above a sentence like (32) is transformationally derived from (31) by a rule called Quantifier-Floating (or Moving), which separates the quantifier *all* from its attributive position within the Noun Phrase *all the men*.

The concept of 'Floating' has been developed, of course, to explain differences in word order between sentences such as (31) - (32), the assumption being that the expressions are synonymous.¹³ In this respect, the concept is of little use in Latin. There is, however, a parallel between Quantifier-Floating and let us say 'Praedicativum-formation' in Latin in as far as they are both obligatory in the case of personal pronouns, etc. (see the introduction): in English, for example, it is not possible to say *all the we have found our way home* (cf. ex. (31)). The fact, however, that the phenomenon is obligatory in specific cases might be an argument against assuming a common origin for normal Attributes and Floaters as well.

Another reason for some linguists (e.g. Dik 1981) to hesitate about the equivalence of (31) and (32) and therefore to reject an identical basic (semantic) structure is that in many languages Floating is restricted to a limited number of syntactic or semantic functions. Thus Floating may be restricted to Subjects only. In the case of Latin there seem to be very few, if any, restrictions on the syntactic and/or semantic functions in which quantifiers in the function Praedicativum occur. I give a survey of my findings:

- (i) Quantifiers function as Praedicativum in relation with *arguments* of all types, e.g.
 - (a) Subject: ex. (1), more in Merguet, p. 466, a
 - (b) Object: ex. (2), more in Merguet, p. 466, b
 - (c) Recipient: ex. (33) below
 - (d) Complement: exx. (34) - (37)
- (ii) We also find quantifiers with *satellites*
 - (e) Agent in passive sentence: exx. (38) - (39)¹⁴
 - (f) 'Criterion': ex. (40)
 - (g) Beneficiary: I have not yet found examples, but they must be possible

Apart from these cases in which the quantifier is related to one of the so-called major constituents of the sentences, we also find examples of *omnis* functioning as a Praedicativum on a lower level, in relation to an attributive noun phrase (exx. (41) - (42) and as a Complement within a Praedicativum (ex. 43).

- (33) *Quas ... leges ... fuerit impositurus nobis omnibus* ('The law which he intended to inflict upon us all', Cic. *Mi.* 33)
- (34) *Ille corporis motu tantum amorem sibi conciliaret a nobis omnibus* ('Merely by the motions of his body he won all our hearts', Cic. *Arch.* 17)
- (35) *Quae detrimento, maculae ... nobis omnibus esse possint* ('That may cause injury and dishonour to all of us', Cic. *Ver.* 3, 144)
- (36) *Uni potius intus ero odio quam hic sim vobis omnibus* ('Better to bore one man inside than stay here and bore all of you', Plt. *Poe.* 922)
- (37) *Ambo ambobus nobis sint obnoxii* ('That the pair of them be under obligations to the pair of us', Plt. *As.* 284)
- (38) *Non multi mihi ab uno sic diligi videntur ut hic ab his universis* ('Few men, I think, are so much beloved by a single individual as my client is by this entire community, Cic. *Clu.* 198)
- (39) *Id agendum nobis omnibus fuit* ('This should be done by all of us', Cic. *Dom.* 11)
- (40) *Quid ego communes leges profero, quibus omnibus es exul* ('Why need I quote the universal principles of law, by all of which you are an exile', Cic. *Parad.* 32)
- (41) *Quorum omnium testimoniis de hac Dionis pecunia confirmatum est* ('Everyone of these has testified to the facts about this money that Dio paid', Cic. *Ver.* 2, 23)

- (42) *De omnibus nobis* si qui tantulum de recta regione deflexerit ('Let anyone of us all turn aside from the straight path, be it never so little', Cic. *Ver.* 5, 176)
- (43) Cum multo *nobis* (v.l. bonis) *omnibus* veniret iratior quam illis fuerat ('He was becoming much more enraged against us all than he had been against those', Cic. *Phil.* 3, 4)

It seems then, that in Latin there are very few restrictions, if any, on quantifiers occurring as Praedicativum.

Notice that the very occurrence of quantifiers with attributive noun phrases is again an argument for not explaining them as more or less equivalent to adverbs (see above). Of course, it also makes the assumption of a common basis for Attributes and Praedicativa problematic.

2.3. I now pass on to adjectives of physical and mental state. These adjectives occur in 'Predication-like' constructions, and there is no objection, therefore, to describing Praedicativa of this type as embedded predications¹⁵ of which one term is coreferential with one of the terms in the main predication. The presence of the copula in ex. (43) *iratior quam illis fuerat* also points in this direction.

There are, on the other hand, at least two objections to relating this type of Praedicativa to Attributes. One objection is the circumstance that Praedicativa as a rule denote a property of one of the constituents of the sentence, which property is relevant only as long as the state of affairs in which that constituent plays a role exists. Thus, in sentence (4), Amphitruo is glad at the moment he greets his wife, and it is irrelevant whether he is glad his entire life or sometimes glad, sometimes sad. Also in a different type of Praedicativum (44), the people referred to had lost their consciousness while lying on the floor. In the same line *parvolam puellam* in (45) was true at the time referred to by *olim*:

- (44) Plerique ut fusi *sine mente ac sine ullo sensu* iacerent ('Most of them would be lying about the place fuddled and unconscious', Cic. *Ver.* 5, 28)
- (45) Nam ego illanc olim ... *parvolam puellam* ... sustuli ('A long time ago, when she was only a little tot, I picked her up', Plt. *Ci.* 123-4)

As a consequence, it is unlikely for lexemes denoting properties of a more permanent character to occur as Praedicativum, unless the context contains additional information. In (4), for example, instead of *laetus* something

like *calvus* ('bald') might be acceptable if either Amphitruo's wife or the audience knew that Amphitruo was by no means bald before. In the light of this (46) is difficult to explain.

- (46) (Cerberus) toto ... *ingens* extenditur antro ('He stretches his bulk all over the den', Verg. *A.* 6, 423)

Attributive adjectives are not necessarily restricted in such a way.¹⁶ Notice also, that this entire argument is irrelevant to the problem of quantifiers.

Another objection against relating Praedicativa to Attributes concerns the fact that *Galli laeti in castra pergunt* in the Praedicativum interpretation necessarily refers to *all* Gauls, whereas in the attributive interpretation this need not be so.

Apart from these semantic objections against treating *laetus*, etc. in the function Praedicativum as dislocated Attributes of some sort, there is also no need for dealing with quantifiers and the adjectives involved in an identical way on account of the conditions on their occurrence as Praedicativum. These adjectives are not found in the same range of constructions as quantifiers are. In my material I have found no counterparts for (41) - (43) (wordgroup level) and only two (Beneficiary) satellites, viz. (47) and (48).

- (47) Ludos ego hodie *vivo* praesenti hic *seni* faciam quod credo *mortuo* numquam fore ('It's a royal send-off I'll give the old chap today, while he is alive and with us, which is more than he'll ever get when he dies, I'm thinking (Plt. *Mo.* 427)
- (48) *Vivo* fit quod numquam quisquam *mortuo* faciet mihi ('While alive more is done for me than anyone will do for me when I'm dead', Plt. *Am.* 459)

The material contains, for example, no Agents in passive sentences, which confirms an observation by Fugier (1978: 134). The reason for this could be that from the point of view of information structure it would be too much first to specify a state of affairs by a satellite indicating the Agent and furthermore to specify the Agent by a state of affairs in which that Agent is involved. Beneficiaries may be an exception to this, since they seem to take up a higher position in the 'semantic function hierarchy' (Dik 1978: ch. 5).¹⁷

3. Remaining Problems

One might ask, in view of the discrepancies between quantifiers and physical and mental state adjectives, whether it is feasible at all to say that they both function as Praedicativum, as I have done throughout this paper. My

reason for doing so is firstly that both types of adjectives are obligatory in certain contexts, mentioned in the introduction, and secondly that this also holds for other types of Praedicativa such as *consul*, *iuvenis*, preposition phrases (cf. ex. (44)), noun phrases in the ablative (so-called *ablativus qualitatis*) etc. The range of occurrence as Praedicativum seems to be related to the type of constituent involved. A second problem, not to be solved here,¹⁸ concerns the way in which Praedicativa can be dealt with in a grammatical model. More specifically, how can we distinguish between embedded predications functioning as Attribute and those functioning as Praedicativum?

NOTES

*) This paper is an interim-report on a research project which has also been sponsored by ZWO (Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research). Rina Knaap and Rodie Ris-selada assisted in assembling examples and testing hypotheses. Simon Dik has drawn my attention to Quantifier Floating. Machtelt Bolkestein has commented on an earlier version of the text. I also point to my *Inleiding Latijnse Taalkunde*, ch. 5 (Amsterdam, 1982). Pieter Niewint helped me with my English. I am very grateful for their help. Translations of Latin texts are taken from the Loeb editions, whenever possible.

1) Tests by which to distinguish between attributive constructions and constituents functioning as Praedicativum are pronominalisation, relativisation and question.

2) As for the possible ambiguity between Praedicativum and Subject Complement, Pfister has drawn attention to the following distinction: Subject Complements are obligatory, whereas Praedicativa are optional. Thus with the copula *esse* two constituents are obligatory, one of them being the Subject Complement, e.g. *bonus* in: *Cicero est bonus*. The distinction is quite clear in itself, but much depends on what we would like to regard as copulative verbs. K.-St. (: I, 15) count the verb *nasci* ('to be born') as a 'copula-like' verb, and as a consequence, one might ask whether *virum* in *virum me natam* (not *natum*) *vellem* ('I could wish I had been born a man', Ter. Ph. 792), is a Praedicativum or a Subject Complement. *Me natam vellem* alone would be quite uninformative, of course. Especially in poetry there seems to be a tendency to avoid 'colourless' *esse*. In a similar way one might discuss the relationship between Praedicativa and an Object Complement as *Penelopen difficilem proci* in *Non te Penelopen difficilem proci Tyrrhenus genuit parens* ('No Penelope art thou, unyielding to thy suitors, nor of Tuscan parents born', Hor. C.3, 10, 11) Normally one would not be tempted to take *gignere* for a three-place verb (comparable to e.g. *reddere*). In this context, however, *Penelopen* etc. could hardly be omitted without making the sentence uninformative. Again, especially in poetry, there is a tendency to create three place verbs.

3) It is not uncommon either to apply the notion of Praedicativum to expressions like *primo vere, in medio horto* (e.g. Happ 1977: 49) as well. The reason for doing so probably lies in the typical 'partitive' relationship in these expressions. However, we find this relationship also in cases where the attributive relationship seems beyond doubt:

Si media nox est sive prima vespera ... tamen est eundem ... ('be it midnight or be it early eve, still you must go, Plt. Cu. 4)
Illustriora enim sunt quae in principiis quam quae in mediis causis dicuntur ... ('For

statements made at the beginning stand out clearer than those made in the middle of a case', Cic. *de Or.* 2, 323)

Furthermore, as Sommer (1928: 34-7) has observed, we do find the same partitive relationship in other cases as well, where an explanation as Praedicativum is not very likely. Examples are *frigidus annus* and: *ad eam orationem venio quae est propria vestrae quaestionis* ('I pass on to that part of my argument which bears specifically on the issue before you', Cic. *Mi.* 7).

4) See Pinkster (1972: 108-33) for rules of coordination. Other instances: Hor. C. 3, 4, 29; Verg. A. 4,32; 205. It is not always possible, of course, to decide whether we are dealing with juxtaposition or with zero-coordination (the latter e.g. in Cic. *Dom.* 139).

5) Fugier's test is not confirmed by my material: I have found no evidence that a Praedicativum may correspond with a question word *quomodo*, or related expressions. Of course, in view of my description later on, it would have been rather embarrassing as well if such an example could be found. As for the example (11), in answer to a question of Ph. Baldi, I observe that coordination of *frequentes* and *impigri* would be awkward as well (cf. (12) - (13)).

6) A few other examples Plt. *Men.* 1073; Cic. *Fam.* 7, 22; *S. Rosc.* 123; *Imp. Pomp.* 47; *Att.* 2, 19, 5; *Sall. Jug.* 31, 2; *Liv.* 2, 30, 12)

7) See TLL s.v. *cupidus* 1425, 37: 'Praedicative pro adverbio'.

8) I leave out of account the fact that for certain adjectives there are no morphologically related adverbs (see Menge 1965: § 21) and the fact that metrical considerations may explain *turbidus* (in e.g. *Stat. Th.* 7, 669) instead of *turbide*. See Bednara (1906), Engel (1914), Priess (1909), etc.

9) On manner adverbs an adjectives related to Subject-constituents see now Vester (1983). We also find instances of coordination of an Adjunct and Praedicativum in the accusative case (related to the Object-constituent), e.g. *falso atque insontem arguis* (Plt. *Ba.* 474). *Falso* cannot be replaced by an adjective.

10) *Lubentes* in Plt. *Ci.* 692 is exceptional. *Inventus* and *lubens* are not used attributively either with nouns denoting human beings until Gellius. They are exceptions to what will be said below on physical and mental state adjectives.

11) Quantifiers are treated as predicates in Lakoff (1971). Criticism in Dowty (1979: 19). In Logic, quantifiers are treated as propositional operators. See Allwood e.a. (1977: 6 ff.).

12) See also Chung (1976) and (1978: 189-96) on Indonesian and Tonga, respectively, and Perlmutter (1976) on Portuguese.

13) I leave this assumption as it is. We will see later that Praedicativa like *maestus* are not synonymous with attributes.

14) For a discussion on the dispensability of Agents in passive sentences see Stein (1979: 126 ff.).

15) Quirk e.a. (1972: 258-64) pay attention to the question which adjectives may function as Attribute, which as Subject- or Object- Complement, and which both ways. As far as I know, the type of adjectives under discussion can be used in both ways in Latin, be it that, for example, *laetus* and *maestus* are used attributively much less frequently (see also the quotation from Sz. on p. 205). Some adjectives with a negation-prefix (e.g. *indemnis*, 'suffering no damage') do not occur attributively, but this may have a statistical explanation. Also two-place adjectives (e.g. *exsors*, 'deprived of') occur seldom, if at all, as Attribute. Examples of adjectives that are not or hardly ever used as Subject Complement, at least in relation with Noun Phrases denoting human beings are *diversus* ('situated apart') and *assiduus* ('constantly present'). They fall outside the scope of this paper.

16) There are exceptions to the rule that a Praedicativum has the same temporal reference as the state of affairs in the main predication. K.-St. (I. 239-40), among others, refer to the so-called 'proleptic use' of participles and adjectives. Examples are:

Incute vim ventis *submersasque* obrue aut age *diversos* ('Hurl fury into the winds, sink and overwhelm the ships, or drive the men asunder', Ver. A. 1, 69-70)

Agunt eum *praecipitem* poenae civium Romanorum ('He is being swept into madness by those executions of Roman citizens', Cic. Ver. 1,7)

Cf. Verg. A. 11, 484 *ipsum primum sterneret solo*. Verg. A. 3, 141 *tum sterilis exurere Sirius agros* may be considered attributive. The type is rather familiar in Dutch with predicates with a resultative (terminative) Aktionsart, e.g. *Hij verfde de deur groen* ('He painted the door green') (See Honselaar 1980: 50-2). I also pass over two other notable exceptions, viz. past and future participles. In examples like Tac. Ann. 6, 24:

(Tiberium *callidum olim* et *tegendis sceleribus obscurum* huc confidentiae venisse. ut ... ('That, once so astute, so impenetrable in the concealment of his crimes, he had attained such a pitch of confidence that')

where *olim* goes with *callidum* and *obscurum*, the adjectival phrase cannot be understood as a Praedicativum since *olim* explicitly refers to a time differing from *venisse*. More examples in TLL s.v. *olim* 561, 60; 563, 4 vv.; s.v. *ante* 130, 69.

17) See also Kiefer (1980) on the Focus function of so-called 'adverbial modifiers of State' as in 'Did you buy the car *in pieces*?' Examples of Praedicativa related to arguments are Plt. Am. 895; Au. 62, Ba. 517; Cas. 63; Mi. 333; St. 597; Am. 890; Cic. Ver. 4, 29; TLL s.v. *invitus* 234, 26 ff.; Merguet, Lex. Reden, s.v. *invitus* 749, b. A doubtful case is Cic. Ver. 2, 155, where *ab invitis* could be regarded as an Agent. In that case we have to assume zero-pronominalization.

18) Several people have drawn attention to this problem in the discussion. a.o. Christian Lehmann. For a transformational approach compare Williams (1980).

Additional note: Recently I found two exceptional instances of an adjective of physical state as Praedicativum on the word group level, viz. Liv. 31,18,6 *eorum vivorum* and Cic. de Orat. 2,9 *eorum...vivorum et praesentium*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akmajian, A. & F. Heny (1975) *An Introduction to the Principles of Transformational Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.
- Allwood, J. e.a. (1977) *Logic in Linguistics*. Cambridge, University Press.
- Bednara, E. (1906) 'De sermone dactylicorum Latinorum quaestiones I, II'. ALL 14, 317-60; 532-604.
- Carden, G. (1976) English Quantifiers. New York, Academic Press.
- Chung, S. (1976) 'An Object-creating Rule in Bahasa Indonesia'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7, 41-89.
- (1978) *Case Marking and Grammatical Relations in Polynesian*. Austin, Texas U.P.
- Dik, S.C. (1978) *Functional Grammar*. Amsterdam, North-Holland.

- (e.a.) (1981) Work in progress on 'Typologie van universele kwantificatie'. University of Amsterdam.
- Dowty, D.R. (1979) *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar*. Dordrecht, Reidel.
- Engel, A. (1914) *De Quinti Horatii Flacci Sermone metro accommodato*. diss. Breslau.
- Fugier, H. (1978) 'Les constructions prédicatives en Latin'. *Glotta* 56, 122-143.
- Fugier, H. & J.M. Corbin (1977) 'Coördination et classes fonctionnelles dans le syntagme nominal latin'. *Bull. Soc. Ling.*, 72, 245-273.
- Happ, H. (1976) *Grundfragen einer Dependenzgrammatik des Lateinischen*. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- (1977) *Zur Erneuerung der lateinischen Schulgrammatiken*. Frankfurt a/M, Diesterweg.
- Heilmann, W. (1973) 'Generative Transformationsgrammatik im Lateinischen'. AU, 16, 46-64.
- Honselaar, W. (1980) *Valenties en Diathesen*. Diss. University of Amsterdam.
- Kiefer, F. (1980) 'Yes-no questions as Wh-questions', in: J.R. Searle, F. Kiefer, M. Bierwisch (eds.) *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics*. Dordrecht, Reidel, 97-119.
- Lakoff, G. (1971) 'On generative semantics', in: Steinberg, D.D. & L.A. Jakobovits (eds.) *Semantics*. Cambridge U.P.
- Link, G. (1974) 'Quantoren Floating im Deutschen', in Kiefer, F. & D. Perlmutter *Syntax und Generative Grammatik*. Frankfurt, Athenaeon.
- Menge, H. (1965) *Repertorium der Lateinischen Syntax und Stilistik*. München, Hueber 1965¹⁴.
- Merguet, H. (1877) *Lexikon zu den Reden des Cicero*. Jena (4 vols.) Repr. Hildesheim, Olms 1962.
- Perlmutter, D. (1980) 'Evidence for Subject Downgrading in Portuguese', in: Schmidt-Radefeldt (ed.) *Readings in Portuguese Linguistics*. Amsterdam, North-Holland.
- Pfister, R. (1973) 'Prädikationsbezogene Sprachbetrachtung im Lateinischen'. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 31, 151-67.
- Pinkster, H. (1972) *On Latin Adverbs*. Amsterdam, North-Holland.
- Priess, H. (1909) *Usum Adverbii quatenus fugerint poetae latini quidam dactyllici*. Diss. Marburg.
- Quirk, R. e.a. (1972) *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London, Longman.

Weise': one may do something *sciens* and *prudens* in a very stupid way. (See also Happ (1976: 292) and Shackleton Baily (Comm. on Cic. *Att.* 8, 3, 4) on the 'stylistic necessity' for Cicero to use *invitiis* in Cic. *De orat.* 2, 364).⁸

As a consequence, any suggestions that such adverbs and adjectives are more or less synonymous are mistaken. It is relevant to this question that the examples on which such suggestions are based are limited to Praedicativa that are related to Subject-constituents in the sentence and to active sentences. Consider (23) and (24).

- (23) Beluarum modo *caecos* in foveam missos ('They had been driven blindly, like wild beasts, into a trap', Liv. 9, 5, 7)
 (24) Eadem nos formido *timidas* terrore impulit ('We poor women were struck with the same terror', Plt. *Am.* 1079)

Nobody would suggest that these adjectives are used 'instead of' adverbs.⁹

Furthermore, there are classes of adjectives where the identification with adverbs is much less attractive than ex. (10) - (13) might suggest. As far as quantifiers are concerned, it is in many cases quite impossible to say that, when occurring as Praedicativum, they are used 'instead of' adverbs. Consider the following examples.

- (25) Ipsi ex silvis *rari* propugnabant ('The enemy came out of the woods to fight in small numbers', Caes. *Gal.* 5, 9, 6)
 (26) Hostes *crebri* cadunt ('The foes fall in heaps', Plt. *Am.* 236)

In the majority of cases replacing the adjective by an adverb would result in a difference in meaning. So in (25) *raro* instead of *rari* and in (26) *crebro* instead of *crebri* would specify the frequency of the events mentioned, not the quantity of participants in that event (for *rari/raro* see also Happ (1979: 292)). Generally speaking adverbs related to quantifying adjectives either express the frequency of the action expressed by the (main) predication (e.g. *plerumque*) or the intensity with which the action is performed.

Apart from semantic differences adjectives in the function Praedicativum and adverbs also differ with respect to their position in the sentence. Generally speaking, both quantifiers and adjectives denoting physical or mental state occur more often after the Predicate and the average number of intervening words is smaller than in the case of adverbs (for adverbs see Pinkster (1972: 106-7)).

Summarizing, although a description of Praedicativa as Adjuncts of some sort may have some prima facie attractiveness in the case of adjectives that are morphologically related to manner adverbs, on closer inspection

there is enough counterevidence to drop that kind of explanation. This is even more conspicuous in the case of quantifiers occurring as Praedicativum.

2. *Praedicativum, Attribute and Subject Complement*

The second point I want to raise concerns the question of how adjectives in the function Praedicativum can be described if compared with attributive adjectives and adjectives occurring as Subject or Object Complement. I will first briefly state the usual way of looking at it and then discuss quantifiers and adjectives of mental or physical state separately.

2.1. This question has been dealt with most intensively in recent times by Heilmann (1973), Happ (1976) and Fugier (1978). A textbook treatment can be found in Sz. He observes (: 172) 'Die Erklärung für diesen Gebrauch ist darin zu suchen, dass in allen diesen Fällen das Adj. vorzugsweise in prädikativer, selten oder gar nicht in attributiver Verwendung auftritt, also seine aus der Grundsprache ererbte Autonomie beibehält (z.B. Plt. *Amph.* 1039 *perii miser...*)'. The explanation given by Happ and Heilmann is that adjectives occurring as Praedicativum can be explained as derived from an embedded predication in which the adjective is Subject Complement and the noun, or pronoun, with which the Predicativum is related is the Subject:

- (27) Galli *laeti* in castra pergunt = Galli in castra pergunt. (Galli) *laeti* sunt ('The Gauls gladly enter the camp = The Gauls enter the camp. They are glad').

See Happ (1976: 284). However, as Happ (1976: 294 ff.), and Heilmann before him, have demonstrated such paraphrases do not always yield acceptable results. An example is (28):

- (28) Ego vivo *miserrimus* ('I live miserably', Cic. *Att.* 3, 5) ≠ *Cum *miserrimus* sim ego vivo

Also, *invitus*, *omnis*, *totus*, and other adjectives pose problems. Heilmann and Happ want to solve this problem by looking for other types of paraphrases, which roughly have the same meaning, and are acceptable as well.

2.2. As far as quantifiers occurring in the function Praedicativum are concerned, there might be some reason to describe quantifiers as embedded predications, if they occurred either as Subject Complement in a copulative sentence (which they do not) or in some other typical Predication-like construction, e.g. in the ablativus absolutus-construction. Now, whereas we do find *libens* ('greedy') and *invitus* ('unwilling'), of which to my knowledge no occur-

- Scherer, A. (1975) *Handbuch der Lateinischen Syntax*. Heidelberg, Winter.
 Sommer, F. (1928) *Zum attributiven Adjektivum*. München. (Abh. Acad. Wiss. Bayern).
 Stein, G. (1979) *Studies in the Function of the Passive*. Tübingen, Günter Narr.
 Vater, H. (1980) 'Quantifier Floating in German', in: J. v.d. Auwera (ed.) *The Semantics of Determiners*. London, Croom Helm.
 Vester, E. (forthcoming) *Instrument and Manner Adjuncts in Latin with special attention to the use of the ablativus gerundii*. Diss. Amsterdam.
 Williams, E. (1980) 'Predication'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11, 203-38.

ABBREVIATIONS:

- K.-St.: Kühner, R. & C. Stegmann (1912²) *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache II. Satzlehre*.
 Sz.: Szantyr, A (1965) *Lateinische Grammatik II. Syntax und Stilistik*. München, Beck.
 T.L.L. *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. Leipzig, Teubner.

STUDIES IN LANGUAGE COMPANION SERIES (SLCS) ISSN 0165-7763

Series Editors: John W.M. Verhaar & Werner Abraham.

Vols. 1-12. (Series in progress; further volumes in preparation; *standing orders are invited*).This series has been established as a companion series to the periodical *Studies in Language*, International Journal, sponsored by the Foundation *Foundations of Language*, which started publication in 1977.

1. ABRAHAM, Werner (ed.): *VALENCE, SEMANTIC CASE, AND GRAMMATICAL RELATIONS. Workshop studies prepared for the 12th Conference of Linguistics, Vienna, August 29th to September 3rd, 1977*. Amsterdam, 1978. Hfl. 126,-/\$ 46.00
2. ANWAR, Mohamed Sami: *BE and Equational Sentences in Egyptian Colloquial Arabic*. Amsterdam, 1979. Hfl. 38,-/\$ 14.00
3. MALKIEL, Yakov: *From Particular to General Linguistics. Selected Essays 1965-1978*. With an introd. by the author + indices. Amsterdam, 1983. n.y.p. Hfl. 192,-/\$ 70.00
4. LLOYD, Albert L.: *Anatomy of the Verb: The Gothic Verb as a Model for a Unified Theory of Aspect, Actional Types, and Verbal Velocity*. Amsterdam, 1979. Hfl. 88,-/\$ 32.00
5. HAIMAN, John: *Hua: A Papuan Language of the Eastern Highlands of New Guinea*. Amsterdam, 1980. Hfl. 126,-/\$ 46.00
6. VAGO, Robert (ed.): *ISSUES IN VOWEL HARMONY. Proceedings of the CUNY Linguistics Conference on Vowel Harmony (May 14, 1977)*. Amsterdam, 1980. Hfl. 108,-/\$ 39.00
7. PARRET, H., J. VERSCHUEREN, M. SBISÀ (eds.): *POSSIBILITIES AND LIMITATIONS OF PRAGMATICS. Proceedings of the Conference on Pragmatics, Urbino, July 8-14, 1979*. Amsterdam, 1981. Hfl. 242,-/\$ 88.00
8. BARTH, E.M. & J.L. MARTENS (eds.): *ARGUMENTATION: APPROACHES TO THEORY FORMATION. Proceedings of a Symposium on Theory of Argumentation, Groningen, October 11-13, 1978*. Amsterdam, 1982. Hfl. 104,-/\$ 38.00
9. LANG, Ewald: *The Semantics of Coordination*. Amsterdam, 1983. n.y.p. ca. Hfl. 110,-/\$ 44.00
(English transl. by John Pheby from the German orig. edition "Semantik der koordinativen Verknüpfung", Berlin, 1977.)
10. DRESSLER, Wolfgang U., Willi MAYERHALER, Oswald PANAGL & Wolfgang A. WURZEL: *Leitmotifs in Natural Morphology*. Amsterdam, 1983. n.y.p. ca. Hfl. 108,-/\$ 43.00
11. PANHUIS, Dirk G.J.: *The Communicative Perspective in the Sentence: A Study of Latin Word Order*. Amsterdam, 1982. Hfl. 60,-/\$ 22.00
12. PINKSTER, Harm (ed.): *LATIN LINGUISTICS AND LINGUISTIC THEORY. Proceedings of the 1st Intern. Coll. on Latin Linguistics, Amsterdam, April 1981*. Amsterdam, 1983. Hfl. 100,-/\$ 36.00