H. Pinkster
1985b

SYNTAXE ET LATIN

ACTES DU IIEME CONGRES INTERNATIONAL
DE LINGUISTIQUE LATINE
AIX-EN-PROVENCE, 28-31 MARS 1983

Edités par
Christian TOURATIER

1985

publications
UNIVERSITE DE PROVENCE
29, av. Robert-Schuman
13621 Aix-en-Provence Cedex

diffusion
JEANNE LAFFITTE
1, pl. Francis-Chirat
13002 Marseille

LATIN CASES AND VALENCY GRAMMAR.
SOME PROBLEMS.

RESUME. - En appliquant l'analyse dépendantielle l'auteur essaie de démontrer que dans ses grandes lignes le système casuel latin connaît une distinction :

a) entre le niveau du groupe de mots et celui de la phrase (génitif : autres cas);

b) entre "circonstants" et "actants" (ablatif : autres cas);

c) entre les "actants" appartenant à un même prédicat (nominatif, accusatif, datif).

Deux autres règles servent par ailleurs à expliquer un nombre considérable d'exceptions : l'opposition animé : inanimé (datif : ablatif) et la cohérence lexicale entre prédicats à valence différente (bivalent **egere** : trivalent **privare** avec ablatif).

Une partie des cas exceptionnels jusqu'alors inexplicables peut être éclairée à l'aide de règles mineures (par exemple : **docere** + double acc.), d'autres cas restent inexplicables jusqu'à présent et doivent être considérés comme des expressions idiomatiques (par exemple : **parcere** + datif).

My paper is organized in the following way. I will start with a few general remarks on "valency grammar" : after that I will indicate what one might expect from a case system when adopting a grammatical model in which the predicate plays a primary role; I next will try to show to what extent the Latin case system fulfils these expectations. Most attention will be paid to a number of facts with respect to the Latin case system which cannot be incorporated in a strict valency approach.

1. VALENCY

In the title of my paper I use the notion "valency grammar". I use it here in a very general sense for all those grammatical models in which the predicate is taken to play a central role in the structure of sentences. In this way the notion can be found not only in the works of German adherents of Tesnière (1959), such as Helbig (1971), Scherer (1975) and Happ (1976), but also in Lyons (1977), Dik (1978) and Matthews (1981). Adopting Dik's terminology I will make a distinction between "nuclear" terms in a predication, called **arguments**, and "peripheral" terms, called **satellites**. The former are obligatory with respect to a certain predicate, the latter are optional or facultative (1). Depending on the number of arguments which a predicate requires I will distinguish one-place, two-place and three-place predicates.

Within the domain of Latin linguistics Happ has most thoroughly explored the usefulness of the valency model. Apart from praise for its thoroughness, his work has also received serious and varied criticism (Bolkestein (1977), Guiraud (1978), Serbat (1978), Vester (1981)), the details of which are irrelevant to this paper. For one thing, it is clear that it is difficult to operationalize the distinction between nuclear and peripheral terms. The **facere** ("do so"") - test, for example, yields no watertight proof, among other things because it is only applicable to predicates which share certain aspects of its meaning (Bolkestein (1977)(2). Also, many predicates must be regarded as one-place in one meaning, as two-place in another (the difference in meaning often being subtle (3)). Still the distinction between nuclear and peripheral terms, and between a "nuclear" and an 'extended' predication, is attractive for a number of reasons.

To start with, the distinction between obligatory and optional terms is attractive from an intuitive, or rather conceptual, point of view. The action of **laudare** ("to praise"), for example, is normally taken to imply an act of praise between two persons (or a person and a non-human entity) in spite of the fact that there are instances in which one of these elements is absent. One might say that this is the case because of the meaning of **laudare**; one might also maintain that it is because that is how things are in the world. All the same, intuitively, **laudaure** is a two-place predicate. In fact, this is how Latin philologists have been working for centuries. Expressions like "intransitivization" (Feltenius 1977), "intransitive use of transitive verbs", "absolute use of verbs" all in some way or other are based upon intuitions about the inherent valency of predicates. Such intuitions may be confirmed by examining predicates in their context and by statistics. The fact that certain predicates in our dictionaries are described as (basically) transitive, others as (basically) intransitive is certainly due to statistical corroboration of intuition (4). The distinction between nuclear and peripheral terms also

underlies concepts such as "adverbial", "free dative", and "circumstantial" or "peripheral" cases (viz. dative and ablative).

Concrete arguments for considering the predicate and its nuclear terms as a unit with certain characteristics of its own are of recent date. One type of argument has to do with lexical aspect (or : "Aktionsart"). Verkuijl (1972), Dowty (1979) and others (5) have shown that the possibility of addition of a Duration Adjunct or an Adjunct specifying the Time within which an action or process comes to its end is not only determined by the verb itself, but also by properties of, for example, the Object constituent, as in (1).

(1 a) John built that house in a month
(1 b)*John built houses in a month

The possibility of addition of a "Time within" Adjunct in this example is sensitive to the distinction definite/indefinite of the Object constituent. Adjuncts specifying the Instrument, Intention or Beneficiary (dativus commodi) are also restricted in their occurrence to a certain type of nuclear predications, viz. to so-called controllable states of affairs (Pinkster 1982 : 16).

This does not mean that a valency model (of some type) - that regards the predicate as the centre of a sentence - can explain all or almost all actual or potential utterances in Latin. Guiraud (1983) and others have mentioned several problematic expression types in which the predicate seems to play no role whatsoever (6). However, a large majority of "incomplete" sentences or 'sentoids' such as (2) can only be explained by assuming some - unspecific - contextually or conventionally absent predicate.

(2 a) quid pater ? vivitne ? ("What about his father ? Is he living ?", Pl., Capt. 282).
(2 b) manum de tabula ("Hands off your tablet", Cic., **Fam.** 7,25,1).

2. THE LATIN CASE SYSTEM

I will start with a few observations in general. Then I will go on to the real issue.

2.1. Case systems in general

Case marking is just one of the means of marking semantic and/or syntactic relations that hold between nominal constituents among themselves and between nominal constituents and predicates. Other means are, of course, word order and adpositions (7), the

latter of which play a much less important role in Latin than in the Romance successors of Latin. However, especially in the case of satellites, prepositional phrases are more frequent than 'bare' case forms. Not only case marking, therefore, bears the burden of relation marking. Moreover, the interpretation of a sentence (or part of a sentence) can to a large extent be inferred from the lexical meaning of the words involved. Case marking, therefore, can be regarded as an additional means of establishing relations. A priori there need not be a one-to-one relationship between case form and semantic relation, as long as the relations are made clear enough by other means. In fact, all languages with a case system display a one-to-many relationship for one or more or even all of the cases in their system. This can be considered a manifestation of the functional principle which "asserts that systems of relational coding ought not to be more wasteful with their resources than absolutely necessary to cope with the task of overtly distinguishing ... those relational terms that co-occur in an actual ... sentence" (Plank 1979 : 612; comare also Bossong (1980: 361)). The above observations imply that it is a priori not very productive to try to establish one meaning for one form, as generations of linguists, including structuralists of various denominations, have done (8).

Now, when we turn to case systems in a valency grammar, the minimum requirements a case system might be expected to meet - leaving adpositions, etc, out of consideration - would be to distinguish, or at least to adequately contribute to the distinction of :

a) nominal constituents on the word group level (say attributes) from those on the sentence level (arguments and satellites).
b) on the sentence level : nominal arguments from nominal satellites.
c) within the nuclear predication with two- or three-place predicates : nominal arguments from each other.

(3) figure 1.

sentence level				word group level
arguments			satellites	
1	2	3		

In addition to the requirements (a) - (c) such a case system might (d) contain different forms for arguments, satellites and attributes in accordance with their semantic function. For example, (d, 1) there might be a different case-form for arguments in the syntactic function Subject with the semantic function Agent and

otherwise comparable arguments with different semantic function, as is, for example, the case in ergative languages as Dakota (Dik 1978 : 159, with reference to Chafe 1976) and in Bats (Lazard 1978 : 57). There might also (d, 2) be different case-forms for satellites according to their respective semantic function, as is in fact the case in many languages. However, as I have pointed out earlier, all such things would be additional "embellishments" and only necessary if actual sentences did not possess other cues to their semantic structure.

2.2. Latin

I will now examine the Latin case system with the exception of the vocative, which has a function different from the remaining five (9). At first appearance the Latin case system does not fit in with the requirements mentioned above for a minimal case system (a) - (c). To mention just one thing : the ablative case is used both for arguments, e.g. with the verb uti ("to use"), and for satellites, e.g. in a Manner function, cf. requirement (b). However, on closer inspection, the case system in some respects works in a way which resembles figure 1. In the first place, the genitive is almost exclusively restricted to the word group level, cf. requirement (a). But for the other, non-genitive cases too there is some resemblance to figure 1., cf. requirement (c). Consider figure 2. It represents the distribution of the five cases over the arguments in active finite sentences (impersonalia not included) in a sample of 250 pages taken form several authors. The details can be found in Pinkster (1980)(10).

(4) figure 2.

valency of verb \ argument	1	2	3
1-pl.	nom.		
2-pl.	nom.	acc. 88,3% dat. 7,6% abl. 3,6% gen. 0,5%	
3-pl.	nom.	acc.	dat. 70,3% abl. 26,6% gen. 1,7% acc. 1,4%

The figure should be read as follows (11). With one-place verbs the argument - which in Latin is necessarily Subject - is always in the nominative. With two-place verbs the Subject argument, i.e. the argument which agrees with the finite verb, is always expressed in the nominative, and the other argument in a non-nominative case, the accusative being the normal case. With three-place verbs the Subject argument again is always in the nominative; one of the two non-Subject arguments is in the accusative case, and the other non-Subject argument is never in the nominative and hardly ever in the accusative. The strategy, so to speak, which - more or less in this form - can be found in Diver (1964), as well as in Harris (1975 : 186)(12), might be formulated thus : for different arguments always use different cases, or : **always use a residual case** (abbr. : Residual case strategy). (A similar strategy holds for impersonal verbs. I will not illustrate this any further). I will discuss some of the exceptions shortly. Notice that in principle for one-place verbs other cases than the nominative might have been used, but that just like other accusative languages Latin "chooses" a similar treatment for one-, two- and three-place verbs, marking the Subject argument by the same case (cf. Lazard 1978 : 72ff)(13). In this context some observations made by Norberg in 1944 may be interesting. He observes that in the eighth century **Lex Curiensis** there occur a considerable number of (agentless) passive sentences with an accusative Subject, a smaller number of intransitive (one-place-) sentences, but only one example of a transitive (two-place) sentence with an accusative Subject (1944 : 27-32). Apparently the Subject must be in the nominative in order to distinguish it from the Object noun phrase in the accusative (14). One might explain this as due to the lack of functional justification for a specific and separate case form in one-place sentences. The strategy mentioned above is not without exceptions, however. I will now deal with a number of problems.

2.2.1. The use of non-residual cases in the nuclear predication (exceptions to requirement (c) on p. 166)

Before turning to the most obvious exceptions to the strategy formulated above I will mention one well-known exception to the rule that with three-place predicates there must be at least one argument marked by the nominative and one marked by the accusative. The verb **interdicere** ("to forbid") is regularly constructed with an animate argument in the dative and an inanimate argument in the ablative case-form, for example (5) :

(5) quasi non omnes quibus aqua et igni interdictum est exsules appellentur ("as though all to whom water and fire have been formally forbidden are not called exiles", Rhet. Her. 2,45).

The only possible explanation, to my mind, is the one given by TLL (s.v. 2174,44) viz. contamination of the structure found with verbs of communication (e.g. **dicere**) and verbs of depriving and preventing (e.g. **privare, arcere**, resp. (15)).

More important than this isolated exception **interdicere** is the class of verbs that govern two accusatives. Actually, the class can be divided into three subclasses. The first subclass is exemplified by (6) and (7). See also K. -St. I, 292-7.

(6) me universa civitas ... consulem declaravit ("I was returned consul by the entire community", Cic., **Pis.** 3)
(7) consules declarantur M. Tullius et C. Antonius ("Marcus Tullius and Gaius Antonius were proclaimed consuls", Sall., **Cat.** 24,1)

(6) is a sentence with a so-called Object Complement (**consulem**) which may be regarded as some sort of predicate of the Object constituent **me**; in accordance with the Latin rule for such equivalence relations, there is concord in case-form (just like in the passive version (7)). Thus, the exception to the strategy can be explained by obedience to another major rule of Latin syntax.

The second subclass consists of compound verbs, for example **traducere**.

(8) Caesarem ... deterrere posse ne maior multitudo Germanorum Rhenum traducatur ("that Caesar could prevent the crossing of a larger host of Germans over the Rhine", Caes., **Gal.** 1,31,16)

The accusative **Rhenum** is usually explained as a remnant of its formerly being governed by the preverb/preposition **trans** (16). This may well be the case. What is more remarkable is that a large number of compounds use the dative case for one of their arguments (e.g. **includere**, "to include"). This may either be explained for many of these verbs as due to similarity of meaning with non-compound verbs which govern the dative case (p.172 below), or may have something to do with the above-mentioned strategy of using different case-forms for different arguments.

The third subclass of verbs governing a double accusative comprises verbs of teaching, asking, hiding (e.g. (9) and (10)). See also K.-St. I, 297-305).

(9) te hoc beneficium rogo ("I ask you this favour", Antonius in Cic., **Att.** 14,13A,3)
(10) quid ? nunc te ... litteras doceam ? ("What ? Must I begin to teach you letters ?", Cic., **Pis.** 73)

What these verbs have in common is that there exist alternative case patterns, e.g. **docere aliquem** + ablative or even genitive (Petr. 46,7) (TLL s.v. 1732,39ff; 74ff) as well as alternative constructions with a preposition, that is patterns in which different case-forms are used for the second and third argument, and which, consequently, fit in with the Residual case strategy. There may be one explanation why these verbs have two accusatives and one "excuse". The explanation may be that these verbs not only have a three-place frame, but also at least one two-place frame, with a non-personal argument as its Object (in the active) and sometimes another two-place frame as well with a personal argument as its Object (K.-St. I, 304, A.10). Semantically related verbs such as **erudire** and **instituere** ("to instruct") which normally govern an accusative and an ablative case-form (17), as in (11), do not possess two-place frames with a non-personal Object in the accusative (at least not with the same meaning)(18).

(11) omnibus eos artibus erudiit ("he educated them in all the arts", Cic., Rep. 2,34)

The excuse, which I am well aware might turn against me, is that with these verbs a) there is a clear distinction between the Subject and non-Subject constituents and b) in normal situations the non-Subject argument refers to a person (or animal) and the other is inanimate, so that they are sufficiently distinguished by their lexical meaning.

In summarizing this section about the occurrence of verbs with a double accusative construction as an exception to the strategy "always use a residual case" I claim that in most of the cases - which, by the way, are not very frequent - there is another "conflicting" rule which explains the exceptions (19).

2.2.2. The use of more than one case-form for second and third arguments.

Figure 2. exhibits another problematic aspect of the Latin case system, namely the fact that both for the second argument with two-place verbs and for the third argument with three-place verbs more than one case-form is used. Moreover, the same cases occur in both columns (and, what seems to be worse, they are also used for satellites; I will come to that later). The question to be answered is whether there is any semantic justification for using different cases (requirement (d,1) on p. 166.

(a) **Three-place verbs.** I will start with the use of more than one case-form for the third argument and I concentrate on the use of the dative and ablative. Of these two the dative is the most frequent (see figure 2.). The use of the accusative for marking

the third argument has already been under discussion and the genitive is very marginal. Is there any semantic justification, then, for the use of both dative and ablative for third arguments ? Our manuals suggest that there is such a justification indeed. A quick generalization might sound like this. The dative is used (i) with verbs of communication and (ii) with verbs of giving and, its counterpart, taking away. The ablative occurs (i) with verbs of removing (20) and (ii) with verbs of supplying and, its counterpart, depriving. Examples are (12) - (15) :

(12) dictum mihi est Hippodamum ad te profectum esse ("I was told that Hippodamus had set out to join you", Cic., Q. fr. 3,1,21)
(13) navem ... tibi datam donatamque esse dico ("I assert that this ship was given and presented to you", Cic., Ver. 5,44)
(14) magistratus templis pellebantur ("Magistrates were driven from temples", Cic., Sest. 85)
(15) admiratione autem afficiuntur ii qui ... ("On the other hand those are regarded with admiration who...", Cic., Off. 2,37)

A familiar explanation of the use of these particular case-forms (dative and ablative) for the third argument with verbs of communication and verbs of removing and of the fact that different case-forms are used at all is that there exists some sort of similarity between the lexical meaning of the verbs and the presumed semantic value of the cases. For example, the use of the ablative with **pellere** ("to drive away") as in ex. (14) is labelled "separative" or "true ablative". In the approach adopted here, however, both the fact that this case is used and the fact that different cases are used for third arguments are regarded as a sign of redundancy : the 'away from' relationship between verb and argument attributed to the ablative case-form is in fact inherent to the meaning of the verb **pellere** just as the Addressee relationship between a verb of communication and its dative argument is inherent to the meaning of the verb **dicere**. However, for the other classes of three-place verbs, with an argument in the dative or ablative (ex. (13) and (15)) things are different. In fact, the verb classes exemplified by (13) and (15) are semantically rather close and there are even verbs which have both case patterns, e.g. **circumdare** (cf. Bolkestein 1983). There is, of course, a difference with respect to the treatment of the "movable" argument ("bewegliches Object", Sz. 35f). With verbs governing a dative (ex. (13)) the movable argument has (in the active) the syntactic function Object - hence it is in the accusative case. It is in the ablative case with the other type of verbs (21). However, this difference need not imply using different case-forms for the non-accusative arguments involved. The question is then, again, whether there is a semantic reason why these different cases are used with verbs which seem to be pretty close in meaning. There is

indeed one phenomenon that may be relevant, both with these verbs and the ones discussed before, viz. the property of animacy. With three-place verbs the arguments marked by the ablative case-form tend to be inanimate (22). Third arguments in the dative, on the other hand, are preponderantly, but not exclusively, animate. The strategy "always use a residual case", seems to need some sort of modification, for example in the following way : "with a three-place verb, the third argument is non-nominative : non-accusative, the dative being the normal case for animate entities, the ablative for non-animate entities". This may be stated otherwise: most three-place verbs governing a dative refer to typically inter-human states of affairs, cf. "communication", "giving", etc. Notice that such a statement very much resembles definitions of the dative as the typical case of the person involved in an action without being its Object (cf. K.-St. I, 307).

The characterization of the ablative in three-place frames as marking inanimate things, is supported by an observation on prepositional phrases occurring as an alternative to "pure case-forms" with many three-place verbs : with animate Head nouns the prepositional alternative is much more normal than the "pure case-form". This may be illustrated by figure 3, which is based on data of the lemma liberare in TLL (1309,23ff).

(16) Figure 3.

	3^d argument animate	3^d argument inanimate
liberare + abl.	-	+
liberare + ab + abl.	+	+

Notice that this observation is in agreement with the well-known fact that in passive sentences the animate agent is expressed by ab + abl. and not by the ablative alone. One might speculate that case marking alone would be insufficient to make the position of an animate being - which is neither Subject nor Object - in a state of affairs sufficiently unambiguous. Animate beings are quite "versatile", so to speak (cf. Plank 1979).

So, the lexical meaning of the three-place verbs involved and "(in)animacy" of the third argument are factors which correlate with the seeming redundancy of case marking of third arguments.

(b) **Two-place verbs.** I will now turn to two-place verbs with a second argument in the dative or ablative. Again, the genitive is very marginal. The dative occurs with more verbs than the ablative. Whereas in the case of three-place verbs the question why specific different case-forms for the third argument occur has received no systematic attention - the reason being that most grammars and lexica do not mention the existence of three-place verbs at all - there is ample literature about the case-form of second arguments with two-place verbs. I class the various explanations into three types.

The first type is the most popular : it claims that the ablative case-form with for example the verb uti is to be explained just like many "facultative" uses of the ablative, viz. as a manifestation of a common, in this case "instrumental", meaning of the ablative. Notice that in this respect Dönnges-Happ (1977 : 37) follow traditional practice.

In the second type a semantic justification is rejected. It is assumed that certain prehistoric developments have led to idiomatic combinations of particular verbs with particular case-forms. There are quite a number of adherents of this opinion. I only mention recent publications by Diver (1964 : 194); Feltenius (1977: 12f) and Strunk (1982 : 316, 320). The substitution, from archaic Latin onwards, of non-accusative oblique cases by the accusative is often advanced as an argument for the idiomatic, non-semantic, basis for these non-accusative case-forms (Väänänen 1981 : 112).

The third type assumes a (synchronic) semantic justification for the second arguments not being marked by the accusative. Several types of evidence have been presented. Ebeling (1957) and Serbat (1981 a : 139; 1981 c : 306-7), for example, argue that there must be some connection between the use of a non-accusative case and the impossibility of transitivization. This kind of reasoning would be more convincing if the use of the accusative for the second arguments always implied the possibility of passivization - which it does not. Heilig (1978 : 53, 119, 126) offers a different kind of explanation using distinctions resembling those of Chafe (1970 : 95ff), which is not convincing either (Pinkster 1980 : 120). As for the **specific** non-accusative case-forms involved, many, perhaps most, linguists who accept some sort of semantic justification assume that there is a similarity in meaning between verb and case (cf. above on three-place pellere). See, for example, Serbat (1981 a : 140; 1981 c : 311) on parcere ("to spare"). Usually, the assumption of similarity in meaning between verb and case is nothing more than a postulate. One may observe, however, a parallel behaviour of certain two-place verbs with respect to the particular case-form of their second argument and certain three-place verbs with a related meaning. Consider figure 4.

(17) Figure 4.

two-place	three-place
carere	privare
abundare	instruere

The three-place verbs in figure 4 may be regarded as causatives of the two-place verbs (23). In fact, our manuals classify two-place and three-place verbs with roughly the same meaning together. Figure 4. illustrates that apart from idiomatic relationships between particular verbs and particular case-forms, there also exists a tendency for semantic classes of verbs - whatever their valency - to behave similarly with respect to case marking. Notice that this tendency extends to abjectival predicates and also explains analogical spread of non-accusative case marking to verbs which normally govern the accusative (e.g. **occupare** + abl.∿ potiri, cf. Norberg 1943 : 143-9). When we turn to animacy again it appears that the clear-cut division found with third arguments of three-place verbs (dative : animate / ablative : inanimate) is less prominent with two-place verbs. The ablative, again, almost always marks inanimate things, but the dative is used both for animate and inanimate entities, with only a slight preponderance of animate beings. The connection between animateness and dative, however, is confirmed by the behaviour with respect to animacy of verbs which may govern either a dative or an accusative case with a difference in meaning. The existence of such verbs is always taken as a strong argument for attributing some sort of independent meaning to cases. An example is the verb **cupere** ('to desire'):

(18) is plane mihi probabat se ... cupere pacem ("He quite convinced me that he was desirous of peace", Cic., **Att.** 14,20,4)
(19) te .. ipsum cupio ("You are the very man I want to see", Cic., **Fam.** 1,9,9)
(20) ego Fundanio non cupio ? ("Am I not kindly disposed to Fundanius ?", Cic., **Q.fr.** 1,2,10)

It appears from TLL s.v. 1435, 33ff. that the dative only occurs with animate beings (24).

Concluding this section about case marking in the nuclear predication I claim that the strategy of always using a residual case interacts with the systematic behaviour of (semantic classes of) predicates with respect to case marking. There is a correlation between animacy and case marking of non-Subject / non-Object arguments.

2.2.3. The use of cases for marking satellites

I will now turn to case assignment to satellites. In our corpus the distribution of the non-nominative cases appears to be as follows :

(21) Figure 5.

abl.	79 %
dat.	16 %
acc.	5 %
gen.	-

In classical prose the proportion of dative and accusative satellites is much lower. The ablative is the case par exellence for marking satellites, as appears also from its use for marking satellite-embedded predications (the so-called Ablativus Absolutus-construction, cf. Pinkster 1972 b; Serbat 1979 : 353; Bolkestein 1980). I also stress that satellites are more often marked by prepositions than by case-forms alone (cf. Serbat 1975 : 72).

Within the framework of valency grammar there is no a priori need to use different case-forms for satellites. So, the question again is, whether there is some semantic justification for using three (25) cases for satellites instead of one. One reason might be that the number of satellites in a sentence is so large and other aspects, for example the lexical meaning of satellites, so inconclusive, that more than one case is necessary. However, most sentences do not possess more than one nominal satellite. Moreover, lexical meaning normally settles the matter. Consider Serbat's illustration of the **licentia** of the ablative (1975: 63).

(22) Cicerone consule amico auctore Marcus Athenis Romam silentio tertia hora porta Capena advenit ("When Cicero was consul Marcus came from Athens to Rome at the advice of a friend, in complete silence, in the third hour, along the porta Capena")

In fact, the number of minimal pairs where case alone seems to convey the difference in meaning is remarkably small. Familiar examples are **Romā venire** ("to come from Rome") and **Romam venire** ("to come to Rome"), where ablative and accusative, resp. seem to be responsible for the difference in meaning. Expressions with an accusative noun phrase indicating the time during which and expressions with ablative noun phrases indicating the time within which some action is performed are another example. As for the first type, it is illustrative, though perhaps not sufficiently so, that only proper nouns occur in this way (26). The second type of

minimal pairs is usually mentioned as an instance of "opposition", but appears to be an instance of "complementary distribution" : states of affairs which allow for the addition of Duration satellites do not allow for the addition of Time within satellites and vice versa (see p. 2 above).

In fact, this may explain why the formal distinction between these expressions was blurred : instead of the accusative marking Duration satellites we encounter the ablative just as - the other way around - we find instance of the accusative marking Price satellites instead of the ablative from Petronius onwards (Väänänen 1981 : 111) : lexical meaning is sufficient.

Case-marked satellites are seldom animate. (Prepositional phrases seem to be more common in that case). Here again the dative and the ablative are in contrast. The dative is, of course, used much less often than the ablative, but is, relatively, much more often animate (for example the so-called dativus commodi)(27). Lexical meaning (including animacy) seems to be more important than case marking for understanding the semantic function of satellites. Why the accusative is used at all for Duration satellites, etc. is not clear, apart from the fact that the dative was excluded because it was typically the case for animate beings and the fact that the ablative case was already in use for various temporal and spatial expressions (28). Synchronically, the use of different cases for satellites must be regarded as an idiomatic, non-semantic and therefore redundant phenomenon.

2.2.4. The use of similar case-forms for both arguments and satellites

Before examining this topic in more detail it may be useful to summarize the major functions of the 4 "sentential" case-forms as they appear from our corpus. Consider figure 6.

(23) Figure 6

case	animacy	function
nominative	animate	most likely Subject (argument)
accusative	±	most likely Object (argument)
dative	normally animate	person directly or indirectly involved in the state of affairs (argument)
ablative	inanimate	most likely an accessory element to the state of affairs (satellite)

If the Latin case system were like this, it would excellently meet the requirements which I mentioned earlier in this paper. However, as we have seen, especially the dative and the ablative are used to mark both arguments and satellites. In K.-St. (I, 307,46 and elsewhere) the dative and the ablative are both regarded as "adsentential" cases. Recently Serbat (1981 c : 311) has explained the occurrence of dative and ablative with verbs like uti and parcere as traces of presumed former peripheral (or circumstantial) use. Along this line of reasoning arguments in the dative and the ablative might be regarded as former animate and non-animate satellites respectively, which have become associated with former one- and two-place predicates in the course of time (29).

Apart from the fact that the dative and ablative are both found as markers of arguments and satellites, one may point to certain points of resemblance between third arguments and satellites as well :

a) They cannot become Subject of passive sentences (30)
b) There exist alternative prepositional expressions instead of pure case-forms. Notice that the former increase in number in post-classical Latin and that therefore third arguments and satellites also resemble each other with respect to their historical evolution.
c) There are many nominalizations of one- and two-place verbs with the arguments in the genitive (so-called "genitivus subjectivus" and "genitivus objectivus") but only a few with a third argument in the genitive. Examples of the latter are :

(24) absolutio maiestatis ("acquittal of the charge of maiestas", Cic., **Fam.** 3,11,1)
(25) liberatio culpae ("absolution from guilt", Cic., Lig., 1)
(26) privatio doloris ("absence of pain", Cic., **Fin.** 1,38)

I know no examples of a nominalization with the Addressee in the genitive (31).

d) Moreover, it is more difficult to prove the argument status of a putative third argument than of a first or second argument in Latin texts.

In spite of the above-mentioned resemblance between third arguments and satellites and between dative and ablative I would not go so far as to reject the existence of three-place verbs altogether. Apart from the arguments mentioned earlier in this paper one may point to the existence of nominalizations of three-place verbs (ex. (24) - (26)) and to a semantically "empty" verb as **afficere** ("to cause to be affected by"), which is meaningless without a third argument. However, these apparently borderline phenomena of third arguments and satellites emphasize the relevance of

the question of how a Roman could understand the structure of a sentence when case-forms seem to be used so randomly for different types of constructions.

I will now turn to this -my **final** - question and try to answer it from the valency point of view. Let me first, however, stress certain obvious facts.

a) Sentences are embedded in a context which restricts the number of sensible combinations between their constituents.
b) There are perceptual constraints on the number of constituents in a sentence or clause.
c) Nominal constituents not only have a case ending - which is almost always unaccented - but also a stem bearing the lexical information

Now, the answer to my question runs as follows :

(i) Firstly, it is not correct to call the distribution of case-forms over a sentence "random". The strategy "always use a residual case" has its exceptions, but it is still valid.
(ii) Secondly, predicates do not, by their lexical meaning (or meanings), allow for an infinite number of nominal terms to be constructed with them, neither in quantitive nor in semantic respect. In fact, by its meaning the predicate determines both how many nominal terms are necessary in order to express a "minimal event" and what kinds of nominal terms are allowed. Moreover, the predicate also determines which case frame the nominal terms will have to be expressed in. Given all these cues there is no objection to using the same cases both for obligatory terms (arguments) and, from the point of view of the predicate, accessory terms (i.e. satellites), on two conditions :
(a) Their lexical meaning must be such that their semantic function in the sentence can be determined with a reasonable amount of certainty. This is, in fact, the case : Place names occur as Locative satellites, Abstract Quality nouns as Manner satellites, etc.
(b) Their lexical meaning must be such that they cannot be easily understood as obligatory terms with the predicate, because in that case ambiguity might arise (I will come back to this shortly).
(iii) Certain nominal terms are more likely to occur in certain predicate frames and in certain satellite functions than in others. For example, nominal terms denoting human beings are much more likely to occur as argument than as satellite and are much more likely to occur as Agent (> Subject) than inanimate things are.
(iv) In addition to these three points a strong correlation can be observed between animacy and dative/ablative assignment.

I will finish with an illustration of the second - and most central -element of my answer and the conditions mentioned. With three-place verbs of buying and selling "the price" is usually expressed in the ablative case (so-called ablativus pretii). There are no restrictions on the lexical meaning of this term, although lexemes denoting money are most frequent. An example is (27) :

(27) quid enim erat quod **discessu nostro** emendum putaremus ?
("What was it then, for which we thougt that even our separation was a proper price to pay ?", Cic., **Q.fr.** 3, 8,1)

A lexeme denoting price, money, etc. may also be optionally added (as a satellite) to verbs that do not belong to the class of verbs of buying and selling. An example is (28) :

(28) cum **mercede** doceret ("Though he taught for hire", Cic., de Orat. 1,126)

It is, however, impossible to add lexemes which do not denote money and still to interprete them as "price" (condition (a)). Thus under normal circumstances (29) is impossible:

(29) *docebat equo ("He taught upon payment of a horse")

Conversely, example (30) **fidibus** ("lyre") cannot reasonably be understood as the payment for the teaching.

(30) Socraten fidibus docuit nobilissimus fidicen ("Socrates was taught to play the lyre by a very famous musician", Cic., **Fam.** 9,22,3)

Lyres are not known as a means of payment. Had they been, example (30) would be ambiguous (condition **(b)**). Fortunately, it is not.

Harm PINKSTER
University of Amsterdam

NOTES

1. I leave out of account in this paper the distinction made in Pinkster (1972 a : 96ff) between Adjuncts and Disjuncts. I also make no distinction between 'facultative' and 'obligatory' arguments, as is done in Happ (1976 : 180-263). Engelen (1975 : 64-5) has a useful distinction between constituents that may be added freely to any predicate and those that are restricted in their combinability ("nicht-spezifisch" : "spezifisch"). See also Pinkster (1972 a : 83-4).

2. The facere-test has been developed in imitation of the do so-test for English. It only selects "action" - predicates. Krause (1977) has studied the properties of the German verb 'geschehen' which may be regarded as a Pro-verb for another class of verbs.

3. Compare Lebreton (1901 : 170-85) for a list of verbs whibs may be regarded as one-place and two-place. For diachronic observations cf. Löfstedt (1950 : 32-8) and Feltenius (1977). It is also important to realize that omission of obligatory terms may be compensated for by the presence of constituents of different types. **Habitare** ("to live"), for example, normally requires a place Adjunct as its secondary argument. It may be absent, however, if a constituent such as **laxe** is expressed : Cic., **Dom.** 115 **habitare laxe et magnifice voluit** ("he wanted to live free of restrictions and sumptuously") (Pinkster 1972 a : 82).

4. Notice, however, that there is no systematic treatment of trivalent predicates in our dictionaries.

5. Cf. Pinkster (1983) for a discussion of Latin examples.

6. There is also some confusion about the notion 'predicate', which some people reduce to 'verbal predicate'. I also recognize nominal and adjectival predicates (with or without a copula).

7. The use of case marking with adpositions (prepositions and post-positions) is left out of account here.

8. For the history of case theories see Calboli (1972; 1983) and Serbat (1981 a).

9. I agree with Vairel (1981) in regarding the vocative as some sort of metacommunicative case.

10. The sample comprises sections from the following authors :

Caes.,	**Gal.** 1,1-40
Catu.,	1-14b; 69-102
Cic.,	**Mil.** 1-64; **N.D.** 2, 1-32; **Fin.** 1, 32-9; **Rep.** 6, 1-21
Hor.,	**C.** 1, 1-34
Livius,	21, 1-25

Ovid.,	**Met.** 2,1-339; 11, 410-748
Sall.,	**Jug.**, 5,4-16; **Cat.** 5-22
Sen.,	**Ep.** 1,2,5,6,7,10,12,17,18,23,26
Tac.,	**Ann.** 13, 1-43
Verg.,	**A.** 1

Copulative sentences are not included in the figure. Also, adjectives governing a particular case-form on the word group level are left out of account.

11. Of course, the percentages are based on our own interpretation of sentences and on decisions which other linguists might reject, especially with respect to the decisions of classifying a verb as a three-place predicate. I can only refer the reader to the basic material as published in Bolkestin a.o. (1976; 1978) I do not expect, however, that different decisions would affect the main line of argument. For statistical observations on the dative see Marešková Štolcová (1975).

12. Diver does not make a distinction between arguments and satellites. His description is not in terms of case marking either but in terms of semantic function, for example with three-place predicates : Agent / Patient - Non Agent / Non Patient. For restrictions on case-forms, see also Shibatani (1977 : 807) and Lüdi (1981 : 90-1).

13. I will not enter into the discussion about the special status of the first argument and of the Subject. I refer to Engelen (1975 : 105-8) and Serbat (1981 : 129-34). For "active" and "ergative" traits in Latin see Lehmann (1982).

14. Norberg explains most of his examples as due to contamination of active and passive, but also assumes that the accusative is developing into a 'universal' case. A semantic explanation might run as follows. In most of the examples the accusative Subject has the semantic function Goal. The author used the accusative for Goal constituents, whatever their syntactic function (M. Bolkestein).

15. For late Latin parallels of this type of contamination compare Norberg's example of **circumdare** + dat. + acc. (1943 : 117).

16. In poetry the rule by which the case of one of the arguments of a compound verb is governed by the prefix was revived e.g. **decurrere monte**, Hor., C. 4,2,5. Cf. Lehmann (1983), K.-St. I, 362f. and, for late-Latin, Norberg (1943, ch.9).

17. There are exceptional instances with a double accusative (K.-St. I, 299, A.5), e.g. Ovid., **Met.** 8,215. Cf. TLL s.v. **erudire** 830, 71ff; **instituere** 1990, 46ff. On the construction of teaching verbs see also Working group FG (1981).

18. We will see later on that semantically related two-place and three-place verbs tend to behave similarly with respect to case marking.

19. I have confined this discussion to finite sentences. Consequently, the use of the accusative for marking the Subject constituent of the Accusative and Infinitive-construction falls outside the scope of this paper. I have tried to explain this phenomenon in Pinkster (1982 : 96-7).

20. Unless one regarded the ablative noun phrase in these cases as a satellite (the examples can be found in K.-St. I, 364-72).

21. Traditionally, the ablatives with verbs like **liberare, privare** ("to rob") are explained as 'separative', but it is strange that with these verbs the thing taken away is in the ablative . Also, this approach is outside the scope of my paper.

22. This statement is based on counts of active sentences in books I and II of Caesar **Gal.** by Rodie Risselada and Caroline Kroon and await further confirmation, especially outside 'normal' prose.

23. Compare Also

esse	dare
deësse	adimere

and my remarks about **docere** above. Lüdi (1978) has related remarks on parallelism in construction with verbs that are both two-place and three-place.

24. The co-occurence of **metuere** + dat. alongside **metuere** + acc. is more complicated since one also finds **metuere** + dat. + acc. (e.g. Cic., **Ver.** I, 141).

25. The genitive is limited to odd examples like **Germanicus Aegyptum proficiscitur cognescendae antiquitatis** ("Germanicus set out for Egypt to view its antiquities", Tac., **Ann.** 2,59).

26. In antiquity some scholars called **Romam** and **Romā** adverbs (Pinkster 1972 a : 41). In poetry common nouns also occur in this way. One might also consider the possibility of making a distinction between the Direction-expression (Romam) and the Separative-expression (Roma) with respect to their relationship towards the predicate. Direction-expressions might be considered arguments because they play a role in the admissibility of temporal adjuncts discussed above (p. 2) (Pinkster 1983 : 281).

27. The major non-animate use is the so-called dativus finalis.

28. There are many languages in which the case for the Object is used in semantic functions similar to those encountered.

29. A similar thought can be found in Wuest (1980 : 66) : "Funktional bewirkt der Aktantenwechsel eine Hervorhebung des morphologisch zu einem zweiten Mitspieler aufsteigenden logischen dritten Mitspielers".

30. Exceptions are cases of the poetical use of so-called 'retained accusative' constructions, as Verg. **A.** 3,81 **sacrā redimitus tempora lauro** ('his brows bound with hallowed laurel') ~ **alicui tempora redimire** (dativus sympatheticus).

31. We do find the dative case-form, e.g. **sibi ipsi responsio** in Cic., **de Orat.** 3, 207 (cf. K.-St. I, 317).
Other examples of 'third argument' attributes are **consultatio nuptiarum** (plt., **Epid.** 282), **accusatio stultitiae** (Liv. 44,31,13; Paul., **Dig.** 37,9, 8), **impositio unius** (Varro, **LL** 7,32), **liberatio molestiae** (Cic., **Q.fr.** 1, 1,35), **purgatio lentiginum** (Plin., **NH** 23,164), **solutio rerum creditarum** (Cic., **Off.**, 2,84; Liv. 7,22,6).

*I thank Machtelt Bolkestein and Simon Dik for their remarks on an earlier version and Pieter Niewint for correcting my English text.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOLKESTEIN A.M., a.o., (1976, 1978), 'Verslag Grammatica-enquête', **Lampas** 9, 358-389; 11, 288-324.

BOLKESTEIN A.M., (1977), Review of Happ (1976), **Kratylos** 21, 137-146.
(1980) 'The 'ab-urbe-condita' construction in Latin : A strange type of Raising', in : S. Daalder & M. Gerritsen (eds.) **Linguistics in the Netherlands**, Amsterdam, North-Holland Publ., 83-96.
(1983 forthcoming) 'Discourse and case-marking : three-place predicates in Latin'.

BOSSONG G., (1980), 'Syntax und Semantik der Fundamentalrelation : Das Guarani als Sprache des aktiven Typus', **Lingua** 50, 359-79.

CALBOLI G., (1972), **La linguistica Moderna e il Latino. I Casi**, Bologna, Patron.
(1983), 'Problemi di grammatica latina' **ANRW** 29 1, 3-177.

CHAFE W.L., (1970), **Meaning and the Structure of Language**, Chicago, University Press.
(1976), 'Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics and point of view', in : Li, C.N. & S. Thompson (eds.) **Subject and Topic**, New-York, Academic Press, 25-56.

DIK S.C., (1978), **Functional Grammar**, Amsterdam (repr. Dordrecht, Foris, 1981).

DIVER W., (1964), 'The system of agency of the Latin noun', **Word** 20, 178-96.

DONNGES U. & HAPP H., (1977), **Dependenzgrammatik und Lateinunterricht**, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

DOWTY R.D., (1979), **Word Meaning and Montague Grammar**, Dordrecht, Reidel.

EBELING C.L., (1957), 'On case theories', **Museum** 62, 129-44.

ENGELEN B., (1975), **Untersuchungen zu Satzbauplan und Wortfeld in der geschriebenen deutschen Sprache der Gegenwart**, München, 2 vols.

FELTENIUS L., (1977), **Intransitivizations in Latin**, Uppsala, Almquist & Wiksell.

GUIRAUD Ch., (1978), Review of Happ (1976), **RPh** 52, 106-11.
L'importance du verbe dans la phrase latine', in : H. Pinkster (ed.) **Latin Linguistics and Linguistic Theory**, Amsterdam, Benjamins (1983), 117-23.

HAPP H., (1976), **Grundfragen einer Dependenzgrammatik des Lateinischen**, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

HARRIS M., (1975), 'Some problems for a case grammar of Latin and early Romance' **JoL** 11, 183-94.

HEILIG E., (1978) **Untersuchungen zur Valenz und Distribution lateinischer und deutscher Verben**, usw. Diss. Tübingen.

HELBIG G., (ed.), (1971), **Beiträge zur Valenztheorie**, The Hague/Paris, Mouton.

KRAUSE J., (1977), **Untersuchungen über das Verb 'geschehen'**, Tübingen, Niemeyer.

KÜHNER R. & STEGMANN C., (1912), **Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. II Satzlehre** (2 vols) Abbr. : K.-St.

LAZARD G., (1978), 'Elements d'une typologie des structures d'actance : structures ergatives, accusatives et autres', **BSL** 73, 49-84.

LEBRETON J., (1901), **Etudes sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron**, Paris (= Hildesheim, Olms, 1979).

LEHMANN Ch., (1982), 'Ergative (and active) traits in Latin', **Glossologia** 1, 57-66.
(1983), 'Latin preverbs and cases', in : H. Pinkster (ed.) **Latin Linguistics and Linguistic theory**, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 145-61.

LOFSTEDT E., (1950), **Coniectanea**, Uppsala, Almquist & Wiksell.

LUDI G., (1978), 'Die Alternanz zwischen Dativ und Akkusativ bei "prier", "supplier", "requérir" im 15 und 16. Jahrhundert', **Vox Romanica** 37, 160-92.

LUDI G., (1981), 'Sémantique, syntaxe et forme casuelle. Remarques sur la construction aider à qn en français romand', **Vox Romanica** 40, 85-97.

LYONS J., (1977) **Semantics**, Cambridge, U.P.

MAREŠKOVÁ-ŠTOLCOVÁ E., (1975), 'Ein Beitrag zur Charakteristik der Funktionsauslastung der lateinischen Kasus (der Dativ)', in : **Classica atque Mediaevalia Jaroslao Ludvíkocský oblata**, Brno, 91-99.

MATTHEWS P.H., (1981), **Syntax**, Cambridge, U.P.

NORBERG D., (1943), **Syntaktische Forschungen auf dem Gebiete des Spätlateins und des frühen Mittellateins**, Uppsala, Universitets Årskrift 1943, 9.
(1944), **Beiträge zur spätlateinischen Syntax**, Uppsala.

PINKSTER H., (1972 a) **On Latin Adverbs**, Amsterdam, North-Holland.
(1972 b), 'Participia in het Latijn', **Lampas** 5, 48-54.
(1980), 'Naamvallen in een valentiegrammatika', **Lampas** 13, 111-29.
(1982), **Inleiding Latijnse Taalkunde**, UvA.
(1983), 'Tempus, Aspect and Aktionsart in Latin', **ANRW** 29,1, 270-319.

PLANK F., (1979), 'The functional basis of case and declension classes : from Latin to Old-French', **Linguistics** 17, 611-40.

SCHERER A., (1975), **Handbuch der lateinischen Syntax**, Heidelberg, Winter.

SERBAT G., (1975), **Les structures du latin**, Paris, Picard.
(1978), 'Review of Happ (1976)',**REL** 56, 90-114.
(1979), 'L'ablatif absolu', **REL** 57, 340-54.
(1981 a), **Cas et Fonctions**, Paris, P.U.F.
(1981 b) 'Der Nominativ und seine Funktion als Subjektkasus im Lichte moderner Sprachtheorien', **Glotta** 59, 119-36.
(1981 c), 'Le système casuel est-il systématique', **REL** 59, 298-317.

SHIBATANI M., (1977), 'Grammatical relations and surface cases', **Lg**, 53, 789-809.

STRUNK K., (1982), 'Phänomene syn- und diasystematischer 'Selektion' im Latein', in : **Festschrift Stimm**, Tübingen, Narr, 311-26.

SZANTYR A., (1965), **Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik**, München, Beck, Abbr.: Sz.

TESNIERE L., (1959), **Eléments de syntaxe structurale** , Paris, Klincksieck.

VÄÄNÄNEN V., (1981 3), **Introduction au latin vulgaire**, Paris, Klincksieck.

VAIREL H., (1981), 'The position of the vocative in the Latin case system', **AJPh** 120, 438-47.

VERKUIJL H.L., (1972), **On the Compositional Nature of Aspect**, Dordrecht, Reidel.

VESTER E., (1981), Review of Happ (1976), **Mnem.** 34, 169-74.

WORKING GROUP FUNCTIONAL GRAMMAR, (1981), 'Teaching verbs' in : HOEKSTRA T., a.o. (eds.), **Perpectives on Functional Grammar**, Dordrecht, Foris, 203-35.

WUEST J., (1980), 'Wie weit ist die Wahl der Verbalkonstruktionen semantisch bedingt ?', **Romanische Forschungen** 92, 50-73.

INTERVENTIONS

Paulo de CARVALHO pense qu'il ne faut pas sous-estimer l'extension de la phrase nominale latine et que les possibilités assez larges de construction de phrases sans verbe suffisent à établir que le verbe n'est pas un élément essentiel de la phrase latine et que le cas par conséquent existe, syntaxiquement, indépendamment du verbe. Voilà qui paraît compromettre les chances de toute analyse du type "valenciel". C'est ainsi que la prééminence abusivement imputée au verbe est à l'origine de nos difficultés à analyser la forme casuelle dans (5) **AQUA ET IGNI interdictum est** et (30) **Socratem FIDIBUS docuit** : il n'y a pas de rapport direct entre "l'eau et le feu" et le contenu lexical de **interdicere**, ni entre la lyre et celui de **docuit**.

Il aimerait savoir comment Harm Pinkster fonde l'ordre qui l'amène à poser, par exemple, que dans les verbes "à une place", c'est le nominatif qui, à l'en croire, est toujours retenu (cf. pourtant **ME pudet**); que dans les verbes "à deux places", c'est (outre le nominatif pour l'argument un) l'accusatif qui est préféré pour l'argument deux, et ainsi de suite. Le principe "always use a residual case" n'explique pas ces préférences !

Robert COLEMAN. - In a three-place pattern containing two accusatives the decision as to which belongs to the second, which to the third place can in some instances be made by reference to passivization : **nos litteras docet — litteras docemur** but not ***litterae nos docentur.** Relevant also is the possibility of **nos de litteris docet**, with **nos** retained in second place, but not, say, ***littera nobis docet.**

The order of frequency for satellites (n° 21 of the handout) contrasts with that in the 2nd and 3rd places of the argument —abl, dat, acc, gen v acc, dat, abl, gen, which from the table in (4) seem to behave cyclically— viz. while acc is assigned to top place in 2, acc moves to bottom place in place 3, after dat, abl, gen. The fact that places (2) and (3) are thus linked together over against the satellite statistic confirms the validity of the distinction made.

A big question : How does one draw the line between argument and satellite ? The question is highlighted by Serbat's example (handout n° 22). One might say that **Athenis** and **Roma** belong to the ARGUMENT since the verb signifies movement in space from one point to another, whereas instrument, time at which, attendant circumstances etc. are all "added" to the nucleus.