University of Colorado at Boulder Document Delivery

ILLiad TN: 783872

Journal Title: Advances in Role and Reference Grammar

Volume:
Issue:
Month/Year: 1993

Pages: 311-373

Article Author: Laura A. Michaelis

Article Title: On deviant case-marking in Latin

Imprint:

Call #: P166 .A34 1993

Location: Norlin Library--Stacks
AVAILABLE

PATRON:

Laura Michaelis

For Use of Doc Del Staff

Printed _____ **(date)**

Posted ____ **(check mark)**

Emailed ___ **(check mark)**

Initials _____

This article scanned and delivered to you from the collections of the University of Colorado at Boulder Libraries.

On Deviant Case-Marking in Latin*

Laura A. Michaelis
University of California, Berkeley

0. Introduction

Exceptional case-marking in Latin has long been the bane of both students and grammarians. It has resisted attempts at regularization by the latter and, as a consequence, provided a formidable memorization task for the former. Indeed, the presence of genitive subjects and dative, ablative, and genitive objects — in defiance of the language's case-marking principles — has been thought to define an anarchic realm of the grammar. Latinists, including Mountford (1938), have resignedly provided long lists of those verb forms which sanction deviant case-patterns. Admittedly, there is one generalization about such forms that Latinists have long recognized: where two-place predicates depart from the nominative-accusative pattern (whereby subjects are coded by the former, objects by the latter), these deviations are to be attributed to that verb's intransitive nature — unexpected, given the number of verbal arguments. States Mountford (p. 5) "It is important to realize that in some instances the nearest English equivalent to a Latin intransitive verb is transitive. We feel that "I spare" is transitive; the Romans felt that *parco* [which takes a dative object] was intransitive."

The traditional grammars have not, however, been able to provide any explanation as to why, for example, *parco* should complete its meaning with a dative object, while, e.g., the object of *utor*, "I use," requires ablative case and that of *memini*, "I remember," requires genitive. Nor have the grammarians been able to account for the fact that, while dative objects are relatively widespread, ablative and genitive objects are comparatively rare. Such questions will be addressed here, within the framework of an account of Latin case-marking in general, and deviant case-marking in particular,

based upon Role and Reference Grammar [RRG]. It will become evident that an adequate explanation of irregular case-marking in Latin requires reference not only to verb transitivity (or the lack of it) but also to *Aktionsart* classes (e.g., states and activities) and their logical representations ("logical structure" [LS]), thematic roles, the "macroroles" of actor and undergoer, and the linking both of thematic roles to macroroles and of macroroles to grammatical functions. The principle that there exist "marked linkages" of thematic roles to macroroles, as put forth in Foley & Van Valin (1984), will be crucial to this account. Further, as will be seen, such an account also appears to require, for certain sets of predicates, more specific semantic groupings of verbs than those provided within a typology based solely upon inherent lexical aspect. Activity predicates denoting use appear to form such a subclass.

This analysis will be organized into four sections. In the following section, a general typology of the Latin verb forms to be analyzed will be presented, and the questions which these data pose will be discussed. In section 2, the RRG analysis of these Latin data will be proposed, in which the presence of deviant dative case will be explained as the means by which non-macrorole core arguments are typically coded. The presence of deviant ablative and genitive object-marking will be motivated as the manifestation of a marked linking of the locative thematic role to the macrorole of undergoer. Additionally, two instances of exceptional ablative and genitive case which are not attributable to this marked linkage will be examined here: ablative objects of deponent activity verbs and genitive "subjects" of certain impersonals. Finally, the impersonal passive construction, in its RRG formulation, will be shown to corroborate the hypothesis that two-place predicates sanctioning non-accusative objects are indeed intransitive, i.e., do not license the undergoer macrorole. In the following section, three previous analyses of deviant case in Latin, those of Pinkster (to appear, 1985) and of Jensen (1981), will be compared with the present analysis. In the final section, the expanatory advantages of the present analysis will be summarized, and consideration will be given to the notion that the RRG linking algorithm "regularizes" irregular case-marking.

1. The Latin data

Although the Latin case-marking system contains numerous irregularities, the majority of verbs license the pattern typical of nominative-accusative languages: subjects are coded by the nominative, direct objects by the accusative. Among oblique arguments, indirect objects are coded by the dative; nominals representing "sources" are coded by a simple ablative or, more commonly, by prepositional phrase whose head is the preposition *ab* and whose complement is an ablative NP. (This coding alternation will receive some attention below.) Examples of this pattern can be seen in (1)-(2). (Verbal person inflection can, of course, fill the subject requirement that would otherwise be met by a nominative argument, as in example (1c).)

(1) a. *Sacerdos hostiam cecidit.*
priest(N) victim(A) struck down
"The priest struck down the victim."

b. *Cucurrit equus ferox.*
ran horse(N) fierce(N)
"The fierce horse ran."

c. *Opes suas auxit.*
wealth(A) his own(A) (he) increased
"He increased his wealth."

d. *Crescunt divitiae eius.*
increased riches(N) him(G)
"His riches increased."

e. *Omnia mundus continet.*
all things(A) world(N) contains
"The world contains all things."

(2) a. *Populus Ciceroni immortalitatem donavit.*
people(N) Cicero(D) immortality(A) gave
"The people gave immortality to Cicero."

b. *Natura nos ab ceteris animalibus separavit.*
nature(N) us(A) from other(AB) animals(AB) separated
"Nature separated us from the other animals."

In addition to those verbs with regular case-marking, Latin contains several groups of verbs displaying irregular case-patterns: inverse verbs whose

"logical subjects" are dative and whose "logical objects" are nominative; two- and three-place predicates with non-accusative (dative, genitive, and ablative) "objects"; and impersonal verbs taking accusative "logical subjects" and genitive "logical objects".

1.1 *Inverse verbs*

In Latin, the inverse configuration — whereby a cognizer receives dative coding and a cognized item nominative coding — both characterizes a class of verbs having this valency requirement and provides two passive-patterns, of which only the so-called "passive periphrastic" is productive.

First, certain verbs of perception and cognition require a nominative argument denoting the cognized item or "logical object" and a dative argument denoting the cognizer or "logical subject":

(3) a. *Cetera item, quae cuique libuissent.*
other-things(N) same which(N) anyone(D) had-pleased
"Any other things which had pleased anyone..." Suet. Iul. 20,3[1]

b. *Non placet M. Antonio consulatus meus.*
not pleases M. Antonius(D) consulship(N) my(N)
"My consulship does not please M. Antonius." Cic. Phil. 2, 12

c. *Cum homini pedes dolere coepissent.*
when man(D) feet(N) hurt(INF) begin
"When a man's feet begin to hurt him..." Varr. R.R. 1,2,27

Second, some cognition verbs in the passive perfect are found in the inverse configuration. Although in the active such verbs sanction the nominative-accusative pattern, in the passive perfect, these verbs take a dative "logical subject" and nominative "logical object":

(4) *Haec omnia mihi perspecta et considerata*
these(N) all(N) me(D) looked-over(N) and considered(N)
sunt.
are
"I have looked over and considered all of these things."

Third, the inverse configuration constitutes the highly productive pattern sometimes called the passive periphrastic. Here, the nominative of the

gerundive (the passive future participle) of a transitive verb is used as a predicative adjective in agreement with the subject to express obligation or necessity. The person on whom the duty lies is coded by a dative argument:

(5) a. *Amici tibi consolandi sunt.*
friends(N) you(D) consoled(N) are
"You ought to console your friends."

b. *Omnia mihi erant agenda.*
all-things(N) me(D) done(N) were
"I had to do everything."

c. *Carthago delenda est Romanis.*
Carthage(N) destroyed(N) is Romans(D)
"The Romans must destroy Carthage."

1.2 *Non-accusative "objects"*

In addition to inverse verbs, there is a large class of two- and three-place predicates licensing non-accusative "objects". (The term "object" should be reserved for accusatively case-marked arguments, but will be extended here to the non-accusative non-subject argument of any "deviant" two-place predicate.) There are three groups of such verbs — requiring dative, genitive and ablative objects, respectively. As mentioned earlier, verbs taking dative objects, most of which are two-place predicates, represent the largest group in this class; this fact, it will be seen, is accounted for within the RRG analysis. A sampling of verbs with dative objects is shown in (6):

(6) a. *Fortibus auxilitur fortuna.*
brave(D) helps fortune(N)
"Fortune helps the brave."

b. *Haec res omnibus hominibus nocet.*
this(N) thing(N) all(D) men(D) harms
"This fact harms everyone."

c. *Tibi fido/diffido.*
you(D) (I)trust/distrust.
"I trust/distrust you."

d. *Legibus paruit consul.*
laws(D) obeyed consul(N)
"As consul, he obeyed the laws."

e. *Mihi ne quid facerem imperavit.*
me(D) lest anything(A) I-should-do (he)ordered.
"He ordered me not to do anything."

f. *Victor victis perpercit.*
victor(N) vanquished(D) spared
"As victor, he spared the vanquished."

g. *Militibus medeor.*
soldiers(D) (I)heal.
"I am healing the soldiers."

h. *Cum legiones hostibus resisterent.*
since legions(N) enemies(D) were-resisting.
"Since the legions were resisting the enemy." Caes. B.G. 2,22

Several of the verbs given in (6) have synonyms taking accusative objects. Some of these are given in (7):

(7) a. *Fortuna fortes adiuvat.*
fortune(N) strong(A) helps
"Fortune helps the strong." (cf. 6a)

b. *Haec laedunt oculos.*
these(N) hurt eyes(A)
"These things hurt the eyes." (cf. 6b)

c. *Puerum ne quid diceret iussit.*
boy(A) lest anything(A) he-should-say (he)ordered
"He ordered the boy not to say anything." (cf. 6e)

d. *Milites curavit.*
soldiers(A) (he)cured.
"He cured the soldiers."(cf. 6g)

Such examples indicate that, for the most part, the requirement of a dative object is lexically idiosyncratic.[2] As has traditionally been asserted, and as will be assumed in this analysis, this idiosyncracy resides in the verb's transitivity, rather than in its case-marking *per se*: despite the fact that these verbs (as well as those licensing genitive or ablative objects) each have at least two direct core arguments, they are intransitive. This assumption will not go undefended here — it has been challenged most recently by Pinkster (to appear), and his objections will be dealt with in the following section.

There appear to be three semantic subclasses of stative verbs licensing ablative and/or genitive object-coding. Each of these stative types has a corresponding causative type. Two of these subclasses are characterized by ablative-genitive variation in object coding, one class is characterized by invariant genitive object-coding.

The class of predicates allowing only genitive objects is fairly small.It contains stative verbs denoting recollection. The nominal coding the item recalled (in RRG terms, the theme) receives the genitive:

(8) a. *Vivorum memini.*
living(G) (I)remember
"I remember the living."

b. *Rerum praeteritarum obliviscor.*
things(G) past(G) (I)have-forgotten.
"I have forgotten the past."

c. *Miseremini sociorum.*
(we)feel-compassion allies(G)
"We feel compassion for the allies." Cic. Verr. 2,1,28

d. *Maiorum quibus orti estis reminiscimini.*
ancestors(G) which(AB) sprung (you)are think-about(IMP)
"Think about the ancestors from which you are sprung."

Another stative verb of recollection, *recordor* ("I recall"), generally takes an accusative object. Thus, membership in this subclass does not entail the irregular case-pattern of (8), although, as will be shown, the converse is the case: the irregular case-pattern of (8) (invariant genitive object) does entail membership in the recollection subclass.

The three-place predicate *admoneo*, "I remind", belongs in this class as well. It is the causative counterpart of *memini*, and also requires a genitive nominal denoting the item recalled. Here, however, the cognizer is denoted by an accusative nominal, with nominative coding allotted to the nominal denoting the reminder:

(8) e. *Foederis te admoneo.*
treaty(G) you(A) (I)remind
"I remind you of the treaty."

Another class, comprising states denoting plenitude and accomplishments denoting transfer, also sanctions genitive theme-coding. The deverbal adjective *repletus* ("full"), derived from the transfer verb *repleo* ("I fill

up"), appears with a genitive theme argument, as shown in (9a). The transfer verb *compleo*, "I fill," sanctions genitive case-marking of the nominal coding the item transferred (9b-c); one might compare these sentences with the standard transfer case-pattern exemplified by sentence (2a).

(9) a. *Repletae semitae puerorum et mulierum*
filled(N) (were) streets(N) boys(G) and women(G)
"The streets were filled with boys and women." Liv. 6,25,9

b. *Conviviumque vicinorum cottidie compleo.*
banquet(A) and neighbors(G) every-day (I)fill
"And everyday I fill the diningroom with neighbors." Cic. Sen. 14,46

c. *Cum completus iam mercatorum carcer esset.*
when filled(N) now merchants(G) cell(N) was
"When the cell had been filled with merchants..." Cic. Verr. 2,5,57

Both stative and causative predicates of fullness more commonly require that the NP coding the theme appear in the ablative case. As will be shown, the presence of this alternation provides support for the RRG analysis of irregular ablative and genitive case-marking.

Another class of predicates allowing both genitive and ablative case-marking of the theme argument are stative verbs of lacking and need (10) and their causative counterparts, verbs denoting removal (11). Although both statives and causatives in this class more commonly sanction ablative case-marking of the item removed, there are instances in which that nominal receives genitive case. Among statives denoting need or deprivation, the verbs *indigeo* ("I require") and *egeo* ("I lack") most commonly allow a genitively case-marked non-subject argument. The sentences in (11) can be compared with sentence (2b), exemplifying the "normal" case pattern for removal verbs.

(10) a. *Res maxime necessariae non tam artis*
things(N) most necessary(N) not so-much art(G)
indigent quam laboris.
require as labor(G)
"The most necessary things require not so much art as labor."

b. *Si pudoris egeas.*
if modesty(G) (you)should-lack
"If you should lack modesty..." Plaut. Am. 819

(11) a. *Me cum privares tui.*
me(A) when (you)deprived yourself(G)
"When you deprived me of yourself..." Afran., ap. Non. 498,17

b. *Quibus purgantis civitatem omnis facti dictique*
who(AB) purging(AB) state(A) every(G) deed(G) word(G)
hostilis (G) adversus Romanos(A).
and hostile(G) against Romans(A)
"Who when purging the state of every deed and hostile word lodged against the Romans..." Liv. 37, 28

c. *Picus... quem carmine Circe exutum*
Picus(N) whom(A) magic(AB) Circe(N) deprived(A)
formae...iussit.
form(G) ordered
"Picus whom Circe ordained by magic deprived of human form..." Sil. 8,144

The fact that the same case-marking pattern (ablative or genitive theme) should be used to express the opposing notions of abundance and lack (and their respective causative counterparts, transfer and removal) is rather puzzling. To explain this apparent anomaly, Latinists like Mountford have asserted that the ablative occurring with abundance and transfer verbs is instrumental, whereas that appearing with verbs of lacking and removal is one of separation. No motivation has been suggested for the analogous genitive pattern, however.

We might now examine these instances in which stative and causative verbs of both abundance and lack take ablative objects. Stative predicates denoting abundance license an ablative object. Examples are given in (12).

(12) a. *Flumen abundat piscibus.*
river(N) abounds fish(AB)
"The river abounds with fish."

b. *Quae [crux] etiam nunc civis Romani*
which [cross] even now citizen(G) Roman(G)

sanguine redundat.
blood(AB) soaks
"...which even now is soaked with the blood of a Roman citizen." Cic. Verr. 2,4,11

c. *Ut frumento affluam.*
that grain(AB) (I)am-rich
"...that I am rich with grain." Plaut. Ps. 191

d. *Aequilia superfluit armis.*
Aequilia(N) overflows arms(AB)
"Aequilia is overloaded with arms." Sil. 8,604

Ablative objects are also associated with those stative predicates that denote need or lacking:

(13) a. *Mortui cura et dolore carent.*
dead(N) care(AB) and sorrow(AB) are-free
"The dead are free from care and sorrow."

b. *Milites auxilio indigent.*
soldiers(N) help(AB) need
"The soldiers need help." (cf. 10a)

The causative counterparts of the stative predicates in (12) and (13) — transfer and removal verbs, respectively — also license an ablative theme argument. Again, one can compare the case patterns licensed by transfer and removal verbs in (14) and (15) with the "normal" case-patterns sanctioned by these predicate types in sentences (2a-b). Note also that the predicate *dono* "I give" sanctions both the normal case-pattern shown in (2a) and the irregular pattern shown in (14c):

(14) a. *Honoribus te cumulavimus.*
honors(AB) you(A) (we)have-heaped
"We have heaped you with honors."

b. *Naves militibus onerat.*
ships(A) soldiers(AB) (he)loads
"He loads the ships with soldiers."

c. *Ciceronem immortalitate donavit populus.*
Cicero(A) immortality(AB) gave people(N)
"The people gave Cicero immortality." (cf. 2a)

(15) a. *Eum vita privavit.*
him(A) life(AB) (he)robbed
"He robbed him of life."

b. *Si feminae caput capillo despoliaveris.*
if woman(G) head(A) hair(AB) (you)stripped
"If you stripped a woman's head of hair..." Apul. Met. 2,8

c. *Cum Caecilius a Vario magna pecunia fraudaretur.*
since Caecilius(N) by Varius(AB) much(AB) money(AB) was-defrauded
"Since Caecilius was defrauded of a lot of money by Varius..." Cic. Att. 1,1,3

As mentioned earlier, the fact that the same case-marking pattern should be used to express the antithetical concepts of abundance and dearth is rather strange. Nevertheless, as will be shown, the lexical decomposition schema entailed in the RRG account of Latin case marking does provide an explanation for case-pattern congruities between these stative predicates and their causative counterparts, the removal and transfer verbs.

We might now consider activity predicates which — like the statives of recollection, need, and abundance — sanction ablative objects. This class consists of deponent verbs denoting use and enjoyment:

(16) a. *Hannibal, cum victoria posset uti, frui maluit.*
Hannibal(N) when victory(AB) (he)could use(INF) enjoy(INF) preferred
"Hannibal, when he could have used his victory, preferred to enjoy it."

b. *Divitiarum spe functi sumus.*
wealth(G) hope(AB) (we)occupy-ourselves-with.
"We occupied ourselves with the prospect of wealth"

c. *Voluptatibus vescitur.*
pleasures(AB) (he)feeds-on.
"He feeds on pleasures."

We might now make some observations about the impersonal passive forms which characterize two-place predicates lacking an accusative argument. These observations will later serve to corroborate the claim that

these verbs are intransitive, or, in the terms of this analysis, do not assign macrorole status to their second argument.

Only a small group of those two-place predicates licensing non-accusative objects form impersonal passives. Those licensing genitive objects, like *obliviscor* "I have forgotten," are primarily deponent (i.e., have passive forms but active meanings) and hence have no true passive counterparts. Verbs of use requiring ablative non-subject arguments, e.g., *utor*, are also deponent. Stative predicates of fullness and lack (e.g., *indigeo*) are infrequently found in passive form; isolated instances are given in (17b-c). By contrast, verbs taking dative "objects", including inverse verbs (17f), frequently appear in the passive. Except for the presence of an additional core argument (the non-accusative non-subject argument, which retains its quirky case), the impersonal passive manifestations of non-accusative-object verbs are identical to those of one-place "unergative" verbs like *curro* ("I run"), shown in (17a):

(17) a. *Currītum est ab equo.*
run is(IMPER) by horse(AB)
"The horse ran."

b. *Doloribus...careri hoc remedio frequenter*
pain(AB) be-lacked(INF) this(AB) remedy(AB) frequently
experti sunt.
(they)experience
"With this remedy they frequently experienced a lack of pain." Marcel. Med. 29,11

c. *Cum praesidio earum indigeretur...*
when protection(AB) they(G) is-needed(IMPER)
"When their protection is needed..." Plin. Nat.10,75

d. *Nemini a nobis nocetur.*
no one(D) by us(AB) is-harmed(IMPER)
"No one is harmed by us."

e. *Puero imperatum est ut regem excitaret.*
boy(D) ordered is(IMPER) that king (he)wake
"The boy was ordered to wake the king."

f. *Tibi a nullo libitum est.*
you(D) by no one(AB) pleased is(IMPER)
"You were pleased by no one."

The passive verb-forms in (17) appear in the neuter third-person singular regardless of the case, gender or number of the "subject" argument. Further, this "pseudo-subject", unlike the foregrounded argument of the personal passive, does not receive nominative case; it retains the dative or ablative case it bears when an "object". Hence, the quirkily case-marked arguments in (17) neither bear subject case nor trigger agreement like subjects. In these respects they are unlike the foregrounded argument of the personal passive in (18b):

(18) a. *Cicero Pompeium laudavit.*
Cicero(N) Pompey(A) praised
"Cicero praised Pompey."

b. *Pompeius a Cicerone laudatus est.*
Pompey(N) by Cicero(AB) praised(N) is
"Pompey was praised by Cicero."

The "derived" subject of the personal passive in (18b), *Pompeius*, is nominative, and the passive past participial verb *laudatus* agrees with this nominative argument in person, number and gender.

Having briefly examined the properties of impersonal passives, let us now proceed to the final class of predicates sanctioning irregular case-marking: impersonal verbs with genitive subjects.

1.3 *Genitive "subjects"*

There is a small class of impersonal verbs in Latin which have roughly the case-marking properties of English "psych-moved" predicates: the argument denoting the cognizer appears in the accusative case. In Latin, however, the argument denoting the stimulus appears not in the nominative, but in the genitive. Examples can be seen in (19):

(19) a. *Ignavum paenitebit aliquando ignaviae.*
coward(A) will-shame(IMPER) one-day sloth(G).
"His sloth will one day shame the coward."

b. *Me non solum piget stultitiae meae*
me(A) not only troubles(IMPER) foolishness(G) my(G)
sed etiam pudet.
but even shames(IMPER).
"My foolishness not only troubles me but also shames me."

c. *Taedet me sermonis.*
tires(IMPER) me(A) sermon(G).
"Your story tires me."

d. *Tui me miseret, mei piget.*
you(G) me(A) makes-miserable(IMPER) me(G) shames(IMPER)
"You make me miserable, I shame myself."

These, like the impersonal passives in (17), appear to be "subjectless" sentences. The non-accusative argument has neither the behavioral nor the coding properties of a subject; it is genitive rather than nominative, and it does not trigger verb agreement (the verb appears in third person form regardless of the person and number of this argument).

There do appear to be cases, however, in which this genitive argument functions like a subject, despite the fact that it lacks formal subject properties. Such cases involve ideational verbs like *arbitror* ("I judge") and *demiror* ("I marvel") and speech-act verbs like *dico* ("I say"), which require clausal object complements containing accusative subjects and infinitival predicates. An example of such an embedded clause can be seen in (20a). This type of accusative-infinitive complement must be distinguished from that of one-place epistemic predicates like *constat* ("is agreed") and *manifestum est* ("is obvious"), shown in (20b-c):

(20) a. *Dixit ciceronem consulem esse.*
(he)said Cicero(A) consul(A) be(INF)
"He said that Cicero to be consul."

b. *Constat ie bonum esse.*
is-certain you(A) good(A) be(INF)
"It is certain that you are good."

c. *Manifestum est nivem esse albam.*
obvious is snow(A) be(INF) white(A)
"It is obvious that snow is white."

Such accusative-infintive complements as those in (20b-c) are readily characterized as "a single [embedded] S-constituent on a par with a finite clause," in Maraldi's terms (1983:168). According to Maraldi, such infinitival clauses have accusative subjects because they lack both INFL government and, via S′ deletion, an immediately dominating S′. Yet while

Maraldi also applies the S′-deletion analysis to accusative-infinitive complements of the type shown in (20a), it is evident that these embedded clauses have a rather different status than do those in (20b-c). The accusative subjects of such embedded clauses, unlike those in (20b-c), appear to represent core arguments of the matrix *verba sentiendi ac declarandi* (in (20a), *dico*). When the matrix verb is passive, such arguments can serve as the subjects of that matrix verb, appearing in the nominative and triggering agreement of the passive matrix predicate. This situation is shown in (21a).

It appears that only accusative "subjects" of accusative-infinitive object complements can become matrix subjects, and this only when the matrix (transitive) verb is passive. As shown in (21b), the accusative "subject" of the infinitival subject clause of *manifestum est* cannot serve as subject of the matrix predicate. (As will be argued below, Latin does not sanction a "raising to subject" construction.) The personal passive of (21a) can be compared with an alternative impersonal passive construction exemplified in (21c). In the latter case, the "subject" of the embedded infinitival clause does not represent the subject of the passive matrix verb. Instead, it seems that the entire accusative-infinitive clause represents the subject of the agentless passive verb *traditum est*. Thus, the structure of (21c) is analogous to that sanctioned by one-place active predicates requiring nonfinite sentential subjects (20b-c).

(21) a. *Cicero consul esse ab eo dictus est.*
Cicero(N) consul(N) be(INF) by him(AB) said(N) is
"Cicero was said by him to be consul."

b. *Cicero manifestus est consul esse.
Cicero(N) evident(N) be(INF) consul(N) to be
"Cicero is evidently consul."

c. *Traditum est Homerum caecum fuisse.*
said(N) is Homer(A) blind(A) have-been(INF)
"That Homer was blind is often said." Cic. Tusc. 5,114

With respect to foregrounding passives, Foley & Van Valin (1985:313) argue that, although there do exist languages (e.g., Tagalog) with passives in which peripheral (non-core) arguments serve as pragmatic pivots [PrPs], such passives are exceedingly rare cross linguistically. The far more common type of foregrounding passive is that in which only core arguments can be "promoted" to PrP status. Thus, it seems that one can conclude from the personal-passive form exemplified in (21a) that the accusative "subject" of

the embedded infinitival clause in (20a) represents a core argument not only of the embedded infinitival verb *esse* but also of the matrix verb *dico*. In RRG terms, the accusative-infinitive clause exemplified in (20a) represents an instance of core coordination, and this analysis will be justified below. The clause-union possibility exemplified by the common impersonal passive exemplified in (21c) will also be discussed.

A salient property of the accusative-infinitive construction exemplified in (20a) is its sensitivity to subjecthood. An accusative core argument of the embedded infinitival clause which is not construed as the subject of that clause (i.e., which would not appear in the nominative were that clause to appear in direct discourse) cannot serve as a core argument of the matrix predicate as shown in (22):

(22) a. *Dicit ursum mel edere.*
(he)says bear(A) honey(A) eat(INF)
"He says that the bear eats honey"

b. *Ursus dicitur mel edere.*
bear(N) is-said honey(A) eat(INF)
"The bear is said to eat honey."

c. **Mel dicitur ursum edere.*
honey(N) is said bear(A) eat(INF)
*"Honey is said the bear to eat."

While both of the accusative NPs in (22a), *ursum* and *mel*, represent core arguments of *edere*, the former can serve as a subject of the passive verb *dicitur* (22b), while the latter cannot (22c). This fact indicates that the latter argument, unlike the former, is not a core non-subject argument of *dico* . It thus appears that, in Latin, the ability to "raise to object" is a property unique to subjects, i.e., those core arguments which would receive nominative coding in *oratio recta*.

It is apparent, however, that the genitive arguments of the impersonal verbs exemplified in (19), although they lack subject coding in *oratio recta*, can also "raise to object" with their quirky case preserved. Examples of this phenomenon can be seen in (23), wherein sentences containing "quirky" raised subjects are contrasted with those in which the "raised" argument appears in the accusative):

(23) a. *Possessio cuius eos non pudere*
possession(N) which(G) them(A) not shame(INF)

demiror.
(I)marvel
"A possession which I can't believe not to shame them..."
Cic. Phil. 10,10,22

b. *Eum Gaium non monuisse ut iusseram*
him(A) Gaius(A) not have-warned(INF) as (I)had-ordered
demiror.
(I)marvel
"I cannot believe him not to have warned Gaius, as I had ordered."

c. *Tamen dicam non paenitere me*
nevertheless (I)should-say not grieve(INF) me(A)
consilii de tua mansione.
plan(G) about your remaining(AB)
"Nevertheless I will should say that the plan about your remaining does not grieve me." Cic. Att. 9,10,8

d. *Dico eum urbem capuisse.*
(I)say him(A) city(A) have-captured(INF)
"I say that he captured the city."

e. *Neque te, neque quemquam arbitror tuae*
neither you(A) nor anyone(A) (I)judge your(G)
paeniturum laudis.
grieve(INF) praise(G)
"Neither you nor anyone do I judge your praise to grieve."
App. ap. Non. 158, 5

f. *Eum arbitor bonum virum esse.*
him(A) (I)judge good(A) man(A) be(INF)
"I judge him to be a good man."

g. *Et Mysum capitisque sui ripaeque prioris*
and Mysus(A) source(G) and his(G) bank(G) and prior(G)
paenituisse ferunt.
have-shamed(INF) (they)say.
"And they report that both his own source and his prior bank shamed Mysus." Ov. Met. 15,278

h. *Ferunt eum adesse.*
(they) say him(A) be present(INF)
"They say that he is present."

Such sentences as (23a,c,e,g) raise the following question: how can one account for the fact that the genitive arguments of such predicates as *pudet* and *paentitet*, although lacking salient subject properties (nominative coding and the capacity to trigger verb agreement in *oratio recta*), can nonetheless "raise to object", as can a bona fide subject? The answer to this question will require a more inclusive definition of subject than that provided by the traditionally recognized case and agreement properties. Such a definition, it will be seen, is provided within this framework. We might then now turn to the RRG analysis of the Latin data.

2. A Role and Reference Grammar analysis of deviant case-marking in Latin

The case-marking rules to be posited for Latin are similar to those proposed by Van Valin (1991) for Icelandic and to those of many nominative-accusative languages. These coding principles assume an algorithm intended not only for the mapping of lexical representations into their syntactic manifestations but also for the linking of syntax to logical structure (See "Synopsis", sect. 4.6,5). They are stated in (24):

(24) a. PrPs take nominative case.
b. Non-PrP macrorole core arguments take accusative case.
c. The default case for non-macrorole direct core arguments is dative.

As in Icelandic, actor outranks undergoer for PrP. No argument can occupy PrP position without being a macrorole. Further, any solitary macrorole-bearing argument, whether actor [A] or undergoer [U], must be a PrP. (As will be discussed, the verbs licensing genitive subjects, shown in (19) and (23), constitute an exception to this last rule — there, the single macrorole-bearing argument lacks PrP status, as indicated by its accusative case.)

We might now examine the evidence that the grammatical function coded by the nominative in fact represents a pragmatic pivot. This discussion will necessarily be divided into two parts. First, it must be shown that the nominative argument represents a pivot, i.e, that it occupies a

privileged syntactic status in the clause, serving as "the NP type to which [many] grammatical process[es] are sensitive, either as controller or as target" (Foley & Van Valin 1985:395). Second, it must be shown that the assignment of the pivot role to the nominatively coded argument is not determined solely by semantic considerations but is also governed by discourse pragmatic factors, topicality prominent among them. According to Foley & Van Valin (1984:115), the PrP represents "the syntacticization of...discourse factors in clause-internal grammar." (See also "Synopsis", sect. 4.4.) Because, as argued by van Oosten (1984), the topical NP also typically represents a "primary" or semantic pivot [SmP] (i.e, the highest ranking core argument with respect to the actor end of the A/U hierarchy), it is sometimes difficult to determine whether semantic or discourse factors have determined the selection of pivot. One piece of evidence for the involvement of discourse considerations in the selection of pivot in a particular language is provided by voice alternations of the type active-passive. The passive in Latin, as in English and German, allows an undergoer to serve as subject and hence, as will be shown, to function as a pivot — controlling zero anaphora and serving as the target of "object-control equi." Because Latin allows a non-primary to occupy pivot status, one may conclude that the selection of pivots in Latin is not strictly semantically governed, but is also determined by considerations of topicality. (See "Synopsis", sect. 4.4, Foley & Van Valin 1984, sect. 4.1, 7.3.)

Before preceding to an examination of those instances in which a non-primary serves as pivot, we must substantiate the claim that the nominative in fact codes this uniquely privileged NP. Evidence for this claim is provided by the "raising to object" construction exemplified in sentence (20a). As shown in (22), it is only the accusative *subject* of the embedded clause (i.e., that argument which would receive nominative case in direct discourse) that can serve as a core argument both of the object complement and of the matrix "raising" verb. Other grammatical phenomena providing evidence for the pivotal status of the nominative argument in Latin syntax are the reflexive possessive adjective *suus* and the "equi" constructions. Zero anaphora occurring within coordinate and subordinate clauses provides additional evidence; nominative NPs typically both serve as antecedents for zero anaphors and are the forms reconstructible from zero anaphors. These phenomena are exemplified in (25):

(25) a. *C. Manilius ex suo numero legatos ad*
C. Manilius(N) from his(AB) group(AB) legates(A) to

Marcium Regem mittit cum mandatis.
M. Rex(A) sent with mandates (AB)
"Gaius Manilius sent legates from his army to Marcius Rex with a message." Sall. Cat. 32,3

b. *Coegerunt eum venire.*
(they)forced him(A) come(INF)
"They forced him to come."

c. *Pompeius munitiones Caesaris prohibere non*
Pompey(N) reinforcements(A) Caesar(G) prohibit(INF) not
poterat.
could
"Pompey could not prohibit the reinforcements of Caesar." Caes. B.C. 3,44

d. *Metellus... saucios cum cura reficit, meritos*
Metellus(N) injured(A) with care(AB) restores, merits(A)
in proeliis more militiae donat, univorsos in
in battles(AB) custom(AB) military(G) gives, all(AB) in
contione laudat atque gratias agit.
group(AB) praises and thanks(A) gives
"Metellus...healed the injured, gave military honors for the battles, praised all together in a group and gave thanks." Sall. J. 54,1

The reflexive possessive adjective *suus*, exemplified in sentence (25a), agrees in case, number, and gender with the nominal it modifies, rather than with its antecedent, whose number, gender, and case properties are unmarked on the modifier. The ablative *suo* in (25a) might then *prima facie* refer back to any of the three arguments of *mittit* — C. Manilius, the legates, or Marcius Rex. Sentence (25a), however, is unambiguous; *suo* refers back neither to the direct object *legatos* nor to the indirect (prepositional) object *Marcium Regem*, but only to the nominatively coded argument *C. Manilius*. Hence, (25a) demonstrates that the nominative argument alone "controls" the reflexive. Sentences (25b) and (25c) represent two types of "equi" structures; the first in which the argument missing from the infinitival complement is coinstantiated with the object of the matrix verb, the second in which that missing argument is coinstantiated with the matrix subject. In both situations, the missing argument must represent a subject — i.e., that grammatical function which, in an unembedded context, would be coded by a nominative argument. Sentence (25d) demonstrates both that the nominative NP (here, *Metellus*) controls zero anaphora in a paratactic structure, and that the missing arguments of the conjoined predicates (*donat*, *laudat*, and *agit*) are reconstructible only as nominative NPs. Hence, the nominative NP (most typically) represents both the trigger and target of zero anaphora.

We have thus seen a number of constructions to which the grammatical function represented by the nominative argument is central. The nominative argument, we have seen, is "raised to object", typically controls the reflexive adjective *suus*, is the "target of deletion" in "equi" structures, and, where zero anaphora occurs, ordinarily provides both the antecedent and the reconstruction of the null anaphor. It should be noted here that the use of the terms "raising" and "equi" obscures a crucial similarity between the two types of structures; in both, a missing complement of an embedded infinitival predicate receives its interpretation through coinstantiation with an argument fulfilling a valence requirement of the matrix verb. (See "Synopsis", sect. 7.2.) In both cases this coinstantiated argument represents the grammatical function coded by the nominative in main clauses. The nominative then appears to serve a pivotal grammatical function with respect to much of the syntax of Latin.

What remains to be demonstrated, however, is that this pivot is one whose selection is determined by discourse-pragmatic factors, particularly topichood. Such factors must be separated from those related to a semantic-role hierarchy. In Latin, as in English and German e.g., that NP bearing the actor macrorole will be the preferred choice for pivot. Thus, as shown in (20a) and (25) it is typically an actor which "raises to object", controls the reflexive possessive adjective *suus*, provides the "target" for "subject-" and "object-control equi", and serves as both antecedent and null anaphor in constructions allowing zero anaphora. Latin, however, differs from such languages as Enga and Walpiri (Foley & Van Valin 1985) in the following respect: the actor need not always serve as pivot. In Latin, an alternative choice of pivot — that of undergoer — can be made, by dint of the passive construction. And, as argued by Foley & Van Valin (1985:305), "voice distinctions of the type active-passive are a common feature of languages allowing undergoers to serve as pivots." In Latin, as in English (cf. van Oosten 1984), the placement of an undergoer in pivot position seems to provide for discourse cohesion; it allows one to reserve subject position for a particular sentence topic across clauses, whether it functions as actor or

undergoer. The behavior of the passive in Latin provides support for the argument that the choice of pivot in Latin "is not strictly semantically determined but is in part discourse determined" (Foley & Van Valin 1984). The use of passive to promote an undergoer to subject position is exemplified in (22a′) and (25′):

(22) a′. *Sed arbitror sustineri remos, cum inhibere*
but (I)believe be-held-back(INF) oars(A) when inhibit(INF)
essent remiges iussi.
were oarsmen(N) ordered(INF)
"But I had believed that the oars were held back when the oarsmen were given the order to inhibit." Cic. Att.13,21,3

(25) a′. *Naves... sexaginta tres in portu expugnatae*
ships(N) sixty-three in port(AB) attacked(N) and
captaeque quaedam cum suis oneribus,
captured(N) some(N) with their(AB) cargoes(AB):
frumento, armis...
wheat(AB) arms(AB)
"Sixty-three ships were attacked and captured in port, some with their cargoes — wheat, arms..." Liv. 26,47,9

b′. *Templa iubet fieri Veneri.*
temples(N) (she)orders be-made(INF) Venus(D)
"She ordered temples to be built to Venus." Ov. Fast. 4,159

c′. *...fierique studebam eius prudentia*
become(INF) and (I)endeavored he(G) wisdom(AB)
doctior.
wiser
"...and I endeavored to become more learned by his wisdom." Cic. Lael. 1,1

d′. *Domitius navibus Massiliam pervenit atque ab*
Domitius(N) ships(AB) Massilia(A) arrives and by
eis urbi praeficitur.
they(AB) city(D) is-installed
"Domitius reaches Massilia by ship and is placed in command of the city by them [the inhabitants]." Caes. B.C. 1,36

Sentence (22a′) demonstrates that accusative-infinitive complements of *verba sentiendi ac declarandi* allow undergoers to function as pivots — that is, to serve as accusative "subject" (via "raising to object") when the embedded infinitival verb is passive. Whereas in (22a) the actor *ursus* ("bear") serves as pivot, here, *remi* ("oars"), the undergoer of *sustineo* ("I hold back"), assumes pivot status by dint of the passive. The fact that undergoers can serve as pivots in this construction demonstrates that pivot status is not of necessity accorded to an actor.

Sentence (25a′) is intended to show that the antecedent of the reflexive adjective *suus* need not, as in (25a), be provided by the actor, which in this case is the unexpressed first argument of *expugno* ("I attack") and *capio* ("I capture"). The antecedent is instead provided here by an undergoer (the nominatively coded argument *naves*, "ships") permitted by the passive construction to occupy pivot position. Similarly, sentence (25b′) contrasts with (25b) in that the undergoer of *facio* ("I make"), *templa* ("temples"), rather than the unexpressed actor, provides the "target" for "object-control equi", owing to its having been promoted to pivot position in the lower clause by passive.

Such data as these, however, do not provide definitive proof for the claim that the nominatively coded argument represents a PrP rather than (necessarily) an SmP. One might argue that although in (22a′) and (25a′ b′) an undergoer rather than an actor serves as pivot, pivot status is nevertheless still being governed by a semantic role hierarchy. Since no higher-ranking semantic role is realized in these clauses, the undergoer is selected to receive nominative coding. Were an actor present, it would be given pivot status; since no actor is realized in the clause, the undergoer serves as pivot. Pivot selection in this scenario thus remains wholly predictable from a semantic role hierarchy.

Sentences (25c′) and (25d′), however, provide evidence against the claim of semantically governed pivot selection. In both of these passive sentences, an actor in realized as an ablatively coded argument (as per the passive rule). The presence of this actor does not, however, prevent PrP status from being assigned to that NP which is linked to the undergoer macrorole. Thus, in (25c′), the undergoer of *facio* ("I make") provides the "target" for "subject-control equi" despite the fact that the actor of that predicate, *prudentia* ("wisdom") is present in the clause. Similarly, in (25d′), an undergoer serves as the zero anaphor of the main-clause subject *Domitius*. This zero anaphor appears in the conjoined clause headed by the passive form of the verb *praeficio* ("I place in command"). Thus, the undergoer of that verb serves as the "target" of zero anaphora, despite the fact that the

higher-ranking actor of *praeficio*, *ei* ("they"), is realized in the clause (as the complement of an *ab*-phrase). Hence, neither "equi" nor zero anaphora appears to select its pivot on purely semantic grounds.

Zero anaphora is in fact regarded by Foley & Van Valin (1985:306) as "[a] good grammatical frame of reference for distinguishing pragmatic from semantic pivots." They state (ibid):

> Zero anaphora is only permitted of highly topical referents, and the control of this process by an NP type is a good diagnostic indicator that it is a pragmatic pivot; provided, of course, that its selection is not predictable in purely semantic terms. That is, if we find a language like Enga in which zero anaphora is always restricted to actors, then the pivot is a semantic one. However, [if]...both actors and undergoers [are] subject to zero anaphora, [this proves that] the...pivot is a pragmatic one, rather than a semantic one.

The presence of a pragmatic pivot in Latin does not, however, rule out the possibility that semantically selected pivots are involved in clause-internal grammatical processes. In fact, it will be argued below that in order to account for the genitive "subjects" shown in (19), the specification of the "raising to object" construction in Latin must be such as to allow SmPs lacking PrP status to fulfill a core argument position in matrix and embedded clauses linked via core coordination. It will also be shown, however, that where semantic and pragmatic pivots are represented by different arguments, PrP preferentially "raise".

Having motivated the assignment of PrP status to the nominative argument in (24a), we might now turn to the case-marking principle governing oblique arguments in (24). Principle (24c) requires that dative case be assigned to any non-macrorole core argument which is not a prepositional object. Thus, in (2b), a non-macrorole core argument coding a "source" receives ablative case; the fact that it does not appear in the dative is predicted by the fact that this argument is indirect — it is the object of the preposition *ab*.

One apparent difficulty with this last coding principle must be dealt with here: as stated earlier, "sources" need not always be coded by an *ab*-phrase; they may also appear as direct ablative arguments. The latter type of coding is, however, relatively uncommon, as one can discover through a cursory examination of the entries in the Oxford Latin Dictionary for such three-place removal verbs as *separo* ("I separate"), *distinguo* ("I distinguish"), and *removeo* ("I remove"). In each of these entries, the prepositional-phrase coding of the source argument is far better represented. For

separo, in fact, the direct coding of the source argument is held to be confined to poetic usage. Pinkster further argues (1985:174) that considerations of animacy limit the use of such direct coding; he notes that while the *ab*-phrase can code either animate or inanimate sources, the "pure caseform" can ordinarily code only inanimate sources. Hence, it appears that preposition-phrase coding represents the default for third arguments representing sources. Direct coding of non-accusative non-subject arguments is thus largely limited to the dative, as codified in principle (24c).

The principles in (24a-c) cannot account for those predicates which require direct core arguments bearing ablative or genitive case. It will be demonstrated that the case-marking principles given in (24) must be supplemented by another coding principle, this governing the manner in which a particular marked linkage is expressed. This principle is given in (26):

(26) A non-macrorole direct core argument representing a theme outranked for undergoer status by a locative, in violation of the A/U hierarchy, will receive either genitive or, more commonly, ablative coding.

Leaving aside (26) for the time being, we might now examine how the rules given in (24) apply to some of the verbs which were shown in (1) and (2) to license normal case-marking patterns. All such verbs are governed by default macrorole-assignment principles: the number of macroroles is less than or equal to the number of arguments in the LS; a verb having two or more arguments in its LS will take two macroroles, while a verb having one argument in its LS will take one macrorole — the identity of that single macrorole determined by a principle to be given below. Only when the number of macroroles is not predictable from the number of direct core arguments, as among those predicates licensing irregular case-patterns, will macrorole number be specified in a verb's lexical entry. This specification will take the form of the binary feature [±MR], with [+MR]=1 and [−MR]=0. Verbs whose lexical entries are tagged with this feature violate the default principles of macrorole assignment given above; all others assign macroroles in accordance with these principles.

The accomplishment verb *caedo* ("I strike down"), exemplified in (1a), can then be given the following lexical representation (an analogous LS can be proposed for the accomplishment predicate *augeo*, "I increase," exemplified in (1c)):

caedo: [**strike′** (x,y)] CAUSE [BECOME **fallen′** (y)]

The thematic roles associated with this predicate are predictable given the LS of its *Aktionsart* class. (Thematic relations within RRG are defined according to argument positions in the lexically decomposed predicate; see "Synopsis", sect. 3.3.1.) Here, x=effector (and by implicature, agent) and y=locative-patient. Since effector outranks patient for A, and the predicate is transitive, assigning two macroroles, the locative-patient is accorded U status. In Latin, A outranks U for PrP status, and hence, in accordance with the case-marking principles given in (24), the agent argument receives nominative case-marking, while the non-PrP macrorole core argument receives accusative. Similar analyses can be proposed for the intransitive verbs represented in (1b) and (1d), representing activity and achievement predicates, respectively:

curro: **run′** (x)
cresco: BECOME **increased′** (x)

Both of these predicates license a single macrorole. Macrorole selection among single-macrorole predicates is governed by the following principle: if there is an activity predicate in the LS, any single macrorole will be an actor. Otherwise, it will be an undergoer. Hence, the single macrorole is an actor in the case of the activity predicate, an undergoer in the case of the achievement predicate. As any single macrorole achieves PrP status, both of these verbs license single nominative arguments.

The transfer predicate exemplified in (2a) and the removal predicate shown in (2b) have much the same LS; the linking rules will be demonstrated with respect to the transfer verb *dono* :

dono: [**do′** (x)] CAUSE [BECOME **have′** (y,z)]

Here, x=effector, y=locative, and z=theme. By the A/U hierarchy (Foley & Van Valin 1984), effector (and potential agent) outranks both theme and locative for A; while theme outranks locative for U. As A outranks U for PrP, the potential agent argument receives nominative case. The non-PrP macrorole core argument, that which codes the theme, receives accusative. The residual direct core locative argument, lacking a macrorole, receives dative case.

As Van Valin (1991) points out with respect to Icelandic, the case-marking algorithm given in (24) works not only for simple clauses, but also for those containing embedded clauses. How would the case-assignment

algorithm account for the properties of the "normal" accusative-infinitive complements exemplified in (23)? Let us take sentence (23b) as an example, repeated here as (27):

(27) *Eum Gaium non monuisse ut iusseram*
him(A) Gaius(A) not to-have-warned(INF) as (I)ordered
demiror.
(I)cannot believe.
"I cannot believe Gaius not to have warned him as I ordered."

As was argued above, in the accusative-infinitive complement construction exemplified in (27), the highest ranking macrorole-bearing argument in the lower clause represents a direct core argument of the higher clause, as evidenced by the fact that the accusative "subject" of the embedded infinitival clause can appear as the nominative subject of the passive matrix verb. (Recall that the accusative-infinitive complements exemplified in (20b-c) do not have the property of sharing a core argument with the matrix verb; as shown in (21b), their accusative "subjects" cannot serve as matrix subjects.)

Within RRG, the construction underlying (27) cannot be analyzed as an instance of "raising"; underlying levels of syntactic representation are not a feature of this framework. Instead, this construction is viewed as exhibiting a type of clause linkage whereby the matrix and embedded clauses share a core argument. (See "Synopsis", sect. 7.2.2.) "Raising to object" can then be described as a situation in which the highest-ranking macrorole-bearing core argument in an embedded clause serves as a non-pivot macrorole-bearing argument in the matrix clause. Hence, within RRG, the account of clause linkage needs neither movement rules nor multiple levels of syntactic representation to account for the structural properties of the accusative-infinitive construction shown in (27).

Aside from being somewhat more elegant, the clause linkage analysis has an additional advantage over the raising-to-object account. As pointed out by Bolkestein (1979), passive sentences of the type shown in (21c) are problematic for the raising account. In contrast to (21a), (21c) has the entire clause as subject of the passive matrix verb. It then appears that this clause, rather than its accusative subject, represents a core argument of the matrix verb. The raising-to-object analysis would predict that the type of passive construction shown in (21c) does not exist, and in fact, Pepicello (1977), in arguing for the raising analysis, simply ignores the extremely common sentence-type exemplified by (21c).

Such sentences as (21c) are not, however, problematic for the clause-linkage analysis. A tenet of this theory is that a given syntactic structure can reflect one or more clause-linkage types. Thus, one need not claim that core coordination is the only clause-linkage type instantiated by accusative-infinitive complements; instead, the infinitival clausal subjects of such one place predicates as *constat* and *manifestum est* (20b-c) appear to exemplify core subordination: a unitary S-constituent serves as the core argument of a predicate, with no arguments within it bearing any relation to that matrix verb. It is apparent that *verba sentiendi ac declarandi* sanction two passive constructions, a personal passive instantiating core coordination and an impersonal passive, structurally analogous to the active sentences in (20b-c) instantiating core subordination. Only in the former case need we speak of a "shared" core argument.

As shown earlier, this shared argument must be the highest macrorole-bearing core argument in its clause; were the accusative-infinitive object complement a finite sentence, the shared argument would be PrP, and hence nominative. As an argument of the matrix verb *demiror*, however, it is a non-PrP macrorole-bearing core argument, and it hence receives accusative case in accordance with (24b). Its receiving accusative case does not depend on its occupying a particular macrorole; in (27), the "raised" accusative argument of the higher verb is an actor in its clause; in (23f), the "raised" accusative argument is an undergoer in its clause. Furthermore, the assignment of accusative case to this argument is not dependent upon its serving as grammatical object of the matrix verb. The case-marking principles in (24) are not sensitive to any grammatical function other than pragmatic pivot; (24b) simply assigns accusative case to a non-pivot macrorole core argument, whether that argument has this status by dint of core coordination or lexical subcategorization. Although (24b) does not directly account for the assignment of accusative case to the "subjects" of core subordinate infinitival clauses like (20b-c), we might adopt some version of the case-marking principle suggested by Bolkestein (1979:32), "the accusative case form is assigned to...subjects [of non-finite verbs] instead of the nominative case form which is assigned to subjects of finite verbs forms." It may be that, in RRG terms, Latin infinitival sentential subjects do not assign PrPs, in which case (24b) provides a ready account of the case of their "subjects".

The clause linkage analysis of the accusative-infinitive complement-type exemplified in (27) can profitably be compared with those of Bolkestein (1976) and Maraldi (1983). Both analysts argue that these complements represent single embedded sentential constituents. As mentioned earlier, Maraldi regards them as equivalent in structure to such accusative-infinitive clauses as (20b-c), likewise dominated by S′. Bolkestein argues (p. 285) that since the accusative argument of the infinitival complement in question "does not stand in any semantic relationship to the [matrix] verb, [it] consequently [does not stand] in a syntactic relation" to that verb. Bolkestein's position is, I think, particularly indefensible; its guiding assumption is easily falsified by such obvious counterexamples as English "raising to subject" constructions, wherein the "surface subjects" of semantically single-place predicates like *be likely* or *seem* require number and person agreement of these verbs (*The candidates *is/are likely to be incoherent*), despite lacking a semantic relationship to them (as proven by the well known tests using various semantically empty subjects, e.g., *It is likely to rain* as against **It is eager to rain*). Bolkestein's assumption that the accusative argument of the infinitival complements of *verba sentiendi ac declarandi* cannot bear any syntactic relation to the matrix predicate prevents her from providing any coherent account of the passive construction exemplified in (21a). She argues (p. 282) that "information structure" may allow promotion to subject position of an argument which does not "fulfill a syntactic function in the main clause." This principle seems both vague and somewhat *ad hoc*.

Maraldi's account of such sentences as (21a) is also unsatisfying. The case properties of both (21a) and (27) are explained in terms of S′ erasure, which allows the matrix predicate to govern the trace of NP movement, as in (21a), or the subject of an embedded S, as in (27). This treatment forces her to regard these two sentence types as manifestations of two different constructions, both of which allow S′ erasure to apply to their embedded clauses. Such a treatment, however, obscures the following fact: among verbs which take as their single semantic argument a proposition syntactically represented by an accusative-infinitive complement, only those which sanction the (core coordinate) structure in (27) permit the *nominativus cum infinitivo* construction exemplified in (21a). Predicates like *manifestum est*, which sanction core-subordinate accusative-infinitive complements (20c), do not participate in the "raising to subject" construction: as shown above, such sentences as (21b) are ungrammatical. It seems apparent, in fact, that the *nominativus cum infinitivo* "construction" exemplified in (21a) simply represents the passive version of that exemplified in (27), and that the nominative-infinitive does not have the status of an independent grammatical construction in Latin.

That Latin has no "raising to subject" was first observed by R. Lakoff (1968) with respect to adjectives, and appears to be true as well for one-place verbs like *constat* ("it is agreed"); these verbs have only the impersonal uses exemplified in (20b-c). Bolkestein (1979) mentions such apparent instances of subject raising as *ea oportent fieri* (these things (N) ought (3-PL) to be done), in which the one-place predicate *oportet*, an impersonal verb having the valence properties of *constat*, appears to manifest the person and number agreement symptomatic of subject raising. Such cases, I think, represent instead an alternate personal valence of the impersonal *oportet*, perhaps originating via analogy with the two-place predicate *debeo* ("I must"). It then appears that the nominative-infinitive "construction" is not represented in the grammar of Latin other than as the passive manifestation of the accusative-infinitive construction shown in (27). Neither Maraldi's analysis nor Bolkestein's can account for the fact that the nominative-infinitive "construction" of (21a) apparently owes its existence to the accusative-infinitive construction of (27).

RRG, however, provides a straightforward account of the relationship between the nominative-infinitive "construction" shown in (21a) and the accusative-infinitive construction exemplified in (27). Because predicates like *dico* sanction core coordination, the accusative argument *Gaium* of (27) represents a macrorole-bearing core argument of both *monuisse* and *dico*. This argument can hence serve as PrP in the matrix clause by dint of the passive linkage whose universal formulation will be given below. Thus, the RRG account of such accusative-infinitive complements as (27), unlike those of Bolkestein and Maraldi, also provides a relatively coherent account of the passive sentence-type exemplified in (21a).

Having looked at the RRG case-making algorithm with respect to the those verbs licensing "normal" case-marking patterns in both complex and simple clauses, we might now examine its application to those verbs which license deviant case-patterns, but which do assign a PrP. (This latter condition is designed to exclude the genitive-subject cases of (19) and (23) from our immediate purview.) Before turning to the representations of these verbs, we must explore a claim central to this analysis: that two-place predicates sanctioning irregularly coded "subjects" and "objects" are not irregular with respect to their case-patterns *per se*, but with respect to their transitivity, a property which, according to Van Valin (1991), represents "an area of notorious lexical idiosyncracy."

To the view that intransitivity is an idiosyncratic syntactic feature of some two-place predicates in Latin, one can object, as has Rice (1987), that "transitivity is something above and beyond the lexical or logical definition: a verb taking a direct object or one sustaining two arguments" (p. 422), and that in fact syntactic transitivity is merely the reflex of a semantic structure to which verbs licensing the nominative-accusative pattern adhere closely and to which "quirky" two-place predicates do not. Rice claims that transitive verbs instantiate, to a greater or lesser degree, a non-linguistic transitive prototype, which she characterizes thus: "two entities, which are usually conceived of as being asymmetrically related, are involved in some activity; the interaction between them is unidirectional; because there is movement and effect, contact between the two entities is presumed to take place, with the second entity being directly affected by the contact instigated by the first; finally, the two entities are taken to be distinct from each another..." (p. 423).

Hence, such force-dynamic predicates as *caedo*, "I strike down" (1a), whose semantic structures closely fit the prototype, receive nominative-accusative case patterns. The extent to which a given predicate must deviate from this model before it receives "quirky case" is, of course, a complex problem; the important issue from our point of view is, however, the following: do the "quirky" two-place predicates in Latin represent significant deviations from the transitive prototype adhered to by the "normal" verbs? It appears that the majority of "quirky" verbs certainly do. The manner in which many of the "quirky" Latin verbs deviate from the transitive prototype is rather apparent. Most of these verbs, including the inverse verbs (3) and the verbs of recollection (8), denote cognitive activities of various kinds. Such activities clearly depart from Rice's transitive-event scenario: the percept and cognizer arguments are not easily viewed as distinct from one another, their interaction does not involve movement (directed or otherwise), and neither entity is apparently contacted or directly affected by the other. The verbs of need and lack shown in (11) and (13) also deviate from the transitive prototype: the nominatively coded argument neither has contact with the item lacked nor affects it in any way. The "quirky" verbs of abundance shown in (9) and (12) differ from the verbs of need and lack in that they presumably require contact between locative and theme arguments; both of these verb classes, however, denote the type of static, configurational relationship between entities that, according to Rice, is correlated with low transitivity. Hence, it is apparent that many of the

verbs and verb classes licensing deviant case-patterns also stray rather far from the transitive canon. No one of these predicate classes reflects the sense of dynamic interaction critical to the transitive prototype.

There are, however, a number of problems for the semantically based model of the transitive case-pattern. First, it does not appear that the nominative-accusative pattern necessarily reflects close adherence to the transitive prototype. For example, as observed by Pinkster (to appear:4), emotion verbs like *doleo* ("I grieve for") and *gaudeo* ("I rejoice at"), although they do not form personal passives, regularly govern accusative arguments. Such verbs are no closer to the transitive prototype than are, for example, the inverse verbs of (3); one would not, therefore, expect them to sanction accusative objects. Secondly, as shown in (6), several verbs taking dative objects, notably *noceo* ("I harm") and such "verbs of opposition" as *obsto* ("I oppose"), *repugno* ("I fight against") and *resisto* ("I resist") appear to adhere very closely to the transitive prototype (at least in their literal uses), but fail to license the predicted nominative-accusative pattern.

To this second counterargument, one might give the following objection: insofar as surface case-patterns can be taken as evidence of "underlying transitivity", some cross-linguistic data suggest that verbs in the class of *noceo* and *resisto* (let us call this class "verbs of harming and opposing") do not constitute good examples of the transitive prototype. In German, for example, the verbs *widerstreben* ("to oppose") and *schaden* ("to hurt") sanction dative objects, as do a number of Greek verbs coding opposition, e.g., ἀντιτάσσμαι ("I oppose in battle") and ἀντιτίθημι ("I set against"). It appears, however, that certain facts of Latin impugn the claim that verbs of this class have a special affinity for dative objects: as shown in (7), many of the predicates which license dative objects have syntactically transitive synonyms. Thus, the "quirky" *noceo* has the "normal" synonym *laedo* and the "quirky" *resisto* the "normal" synonym *impedio*. If syntactic transitivity (i.e., the nominative-accusative case pattern) reflects semantic transitivity, apparently synoymous lexical items should not license both transitive and intransitive case-patterns, nor, for that matter, should those verbs which adhere closely to the transitive prototype fail to sanction the transitive case-pattern.

A third argument against the view that the allocation of case patterns in Latin is semantically governed (and in favor of the view that such allocation is idiosyncratic) involves apparent regularization of quirky case in Latin. As Pinkster (to appear:2) observes, "Apart from the "deviant" non-

accusative case-forms with the predicates involved, we also find "normal" cases with the accusative, both before and after the classical period...In fact, in the course of history the accusative prevails with most of the verbs [sanctioning non-accusative case-forms]." Further, it appears that even within the classical period, "quirky" verbs like *noceo* have occasional transitive manifestations; Pinkster (ibid) cites such instances as Caesar Civ. 1, 86. Hence, Latin appears to manifest both a synchronic and diachronic tendency toward elimination of deviant case through leveling, a tendency which suggests that deviant case-patterns are indeed idiosyncratic.

Thus, it appears that although most "quirky" verb classes examined here are atypical with respect to Rice's prototype, it does not appear that there is any one-to-one relationship between a predicate's case pattern and its degree of prototypicality with respect to the transitive-event scenario. Rather, it appears that deviant case-marking need not reflect profound deviance from a semantic transitive prototype, nor must such deviance be manifested as quirky case. The intransitivity feature held here to underlie deviant case might thus be treated as a syntactic quirk of individual predicates, one which must be noted in their lexical entries. We must then return to the question of how we might represent this sort of idiosyncracy in the lexical entries assigned these verbs.

In RRG, transitive verbs are defined as just those predicates licensing the two macroroles actor and undergoer. In the default situation, as stated, verbs licensing two or more direct core arguments license these two macroroles. Deviant case-marking verbs assign one less macrorole than one would expect, given their number of arguments. The fact that a two-place verb licenses a non-accusative "object" or non-nominative "subject" reflects the fact that the particular predicate assigns no macrorole to this argument.

The ability of a particular predicate to form a personal passive is a well established acid test for transitivity. The claim that two-place verbs sanctioning non-accusative objects can be characterized as intransitive is supported by the fact that such verbs form only the impersonal passives exemplified in (17). Passive formation in RRG involves promotion of the undergoer to subject position, with concomitant "demotion" or backgrounding of the actor. The RRG formulation of passive represents not a lexical rule, but a linking algorithm specifying the manner in which macroroles are mapped into grammatical functions. It is given the following (universal) formulation in Van Valin (1991): ~ A [universal default=U] = Pivot, A= X (A is omitted or linked to a peripheral status).

Regarding the first component of the passive statement, languages vary as to which arguments they allow to be coded as pivots by the passive linking, but universally, undergoer is the unmarked choice. (See Van Valin 1991, "Synopsis", sect. 5.5.) Latin, like English, allows the promotion to PrP status of two types of macrorole-bearing arguments: an undergoer included in a predicate's lexical representation, or an actor or undergoer of an embedded clause which is linked to a syntactic position in the main clause in a core juncture ("raising to object").

Regarding the second component of the passive rule, it seems that some of the Latin data show that a broader characterization of the demotional component of the passive rule is required for Latin. As shown in (17c) and (17f), there exist impersonal passives in which an undergoer, rather than an actor, is linked to the clausal periphery (recall that single macrorole statives are held to assign the undergoer macrorole). Such a characterization is suggested by Van Valin (class lectures), who argues that voice alternations, which he holds to be fundamentally demotional, "involve the non-canonical morphosyntactic coding of a macrorole, e.g., nonoccurence or oblique status." He further argues that languages vary with respect to which macroroles they allow to be demoted. This variation is expressed by an implicational hierarchy of the following sort:

> Actors of transitive verbs > Actors of intransitive verbs > Actors or Undergoers of intransitive verbs

English is held to represent the most restrictive type, while such languages as Turkish, which allows passives of "unaccusative" verbs, are held to exemplify the least restrictive type. Latin, it seems, lies somewhere in between these types on the hierarchy. While one-place activity verbs form impersonal passives (17a), one-place statives, e.g., *nauseo* ("I feel seasick") do not appear to have passive manifestations; such impersonal passives as **nausetur* ("it is felt seasick") are unattested. Hence, it seems that Latin, unlike Turkish, does not allow the demotion of undergoers of one-place intransitives. As mentioned, however, two-place intransitives ("quirky verbs" assigning only one macrorole) do appear to allow undergoer demotion, as shown by the impersonal passives in (17c) and (f). Thus, it appears that a relevant restriction upon macrorole demotion in Latin involves argument places: predicates having two or more places allow demotion of that argument bearing the highest ranking macrorole, whether A or U; predicates having one place allow demotion only of actors.

Having investigated the manner in which macrorole demotion is restricted in Latin, we might now turn to an examination of how the two components of the passive rule account for the data in (17) and (18). The passive algorithm accounts for such personal passives as (18b) in a straightforward manner: the argument linked to the actor macrorole, *Cicero*, is relegated to peripheral status, and is hence coded by an *ab*-phrase; the argument bearing the undergoer macrorole, *Pompeium*, is linked to PrP, and hence both triggers verbs agreement and receives nominative coding. Non-accusative objects, however, as shown in (17), cannot assume subject status when the passive linkage is in effect; they neither trigger agreement nor receive nominative coding. This fact can be shown to lend credence to the theory that such objects, although core arguments of their predicates, do not bear the undergoer macrorole.

As shown, the RRG linking rule for passive involves both a foregrounding and a backgrounding component. The verbs forming the impersonal passives in (17) can be said to license only that component whereby the subject is relegated to the clausal periphery (as shown in (17d), impersonal passives permit *ab*-phrases coding demoted actors). The foregrounding component, whereby the argument occupying the undergoer macrorole assumes PrP status, is inoperative here, for the following reason: verbs of this class do not assign the undergoer macrorole to their non-subject arguments, and macrorole status is an absolute precondition for PrP status. The non-accusative non-subject argument thus fails to receive nominative case and instead retains its quirky case when the verb is passive.

One might note that this conception of the impersonal passive also provides a straightforward account of the impersonal passives licensed by such one-place activity predicates as *curro*, shown in (17a). These impersonal passives are identical to those licensed by such "quirky" predicates as *noceo* ("I harm"), except, of course, for the presence of an additional core argument. Such impersonal passives as (17a), like (17d), involve the backgrounding of an argument bearing the actor macrorole, with no concomitant foregrounding of an undergoer, which in (17a), as in (17d), is missing. Hence, the fact that two-place "quirky" verbs and one-place predicates have identical passive manifestations can readily be accounted for within the present framework.

It might be prudent at this point to defend the intransitivity analysis of "deviant" verbs against charges of circularity recently levied against it by Pinkster (to appear). He gives the following argument against this analysis:

"[a]s for verbs whose second argument is marked by non-accusative case, they are usually not found in the personal passive construction. As a consequence these verbs are thought to lack the feature "transitivity." However, in the absence of independent arguments for postulating the feature of "transitivity," the whole line of reasoning is circular" (p. 4). Yet what Pinkster appears to overlook here is that there does in fact exist independent motivation for the postulation of the transitivity feature. Transitivity, whatever its semantic underpinnings, has a distinct syntactic manifestation in Latin: the presence of the nominative-accusative case pattern. The attribution of transitivity to a particular verb is not justified on the basis of its passive manifestation alone (i.e, whether it be personal or impersonal) but on the basis of an observed *correlation* between deviant case-patterns and impersonal passives on the one hand, and normal case-patterns and personal passives on the other. It is the correspondence between quirky case and the impersonal passive that is here claimed to reflect the lack of a particular type of non-subject argument: that which bears the undergoer macrorole. Hence, the claim that quirky case is symptomatic of "quirky transitivity" has a far more solid basis than Pinkster appears to recognize. In fact, as will be demonstrated in section 4, Pinkster's unwillingness to regard deviant case-marking verbs like *noceo* as intransitive renders him unable to account for a fact long recognized by Latin grammarians: the passive manifestations of such verbs are always impersonal.

We now turn to the following question: how is "quirky transitivity" to be represented in the LS's of deviant case-marking verbs? As discussed, these verbs, although having the requisite number of arguments, fail to assign the two macroroles required for transitivity. All two-place predicates which sanction either non-accusative objects or non-nominative subjects represent such verbs. The lexical entries for two-place deviant case-marking verbs will accordingly contain the feature [+MR], signaling that they license a single macrorole.[3] The following lexical representations can be given for five verbs taking dative objects (the lack of the macrorole feature in the lexical representation of *servio* will be explained below):

libet: **please'** (x,y) [+MR]
fido: **trust'** (x,y) [+MR]
servio: **serve'** (x, y)
irascor: BECOME **angry.at'** (x,y) [+MR]
noceo: [**do'** (x)] CAUSE [BECOME **harmed'** (y)] [+MR]

Each of the four *Aktionsart* classes is represented among those verbs taking dative objects. Statives include the inverse verbs, e.g., *libet*; these differ from other statives taking dative objects, e.g., *fido*, in that the nominative argument represents not a cognizer (i.e., locative) but a cognized item (theme). The RRG analysis of inverse verbs is straightforward. "Irregular" statives like *libet*, having one macrorole, must assign that macrorole U status, as there is no activity predicate in the LS. Of the two thematic roles connected with these stative predicates, locative and theme,[4] theme outranks locative for U; the locative, as a non-macrorole core argument, will accordingly appear in the dative. The theme, as the single macrorole-bearing core argument, is given PrP status, and hence appears in the nominative.

We now examine the application of the case-marking principles to verbs like *fido*, non-inverse statives taking a nominative and dative argument.[5] Such verbs require a marked linking of U to the thematic role locative. The cognizer (locative) is PrP, as evidenced by its nominative case, while the cognized item (theme) is a non-macrorole core argument, as evidenced by the fact that it is dative. According to the A/U hierarchy, however, theme outranks locative for U, and it is therefore the theme which would be predicted to occupy the role of PrP. Hence, this predicate can be said to license a marked linking, and this fact should be noted in its lexical representation.

Unhappily, however, the fact that *fido* allows this marked linking appears to undermine the validity of coding principle (26), viz.: ablative or genitive case-marking of "objects" signals the marked linkage of locative to U. Such predicates as *fido* require the marked linkage, and their objects appear in the dative. This fact is actually unproblematic if we recall that dative case-marking is, as codified in the case-asignment principles of (24), the standard means by which a non-macrorole core argument is coded. As mentioned earlier, the dative case-marked argument is by far the most common type of "deviant object", licensed by predicates representing each *Aktionsart* class. In contrast, ablatively and genitively marked "deviant objects" — with the as yet undiscussed exception of activity verbs denoting use — occur only with those statives and causatives of lack, abundance, and recollection which require the aforementioned marked linkage.

Because the dative represents the default coding of non-macrorole direct core arguments, it should be no surprise that dative deviant objects can occur with any verb having "quirky transitivity", even when the marked

linking is in effect. The crucial distinction between deviant dative case on the one hand, and deviant ablative and genitive case on the other is this: while the dative can code any non-macrorole core argument — including a theme outranked for U by a locative (26) — the ablative and genitive cases, with the aforementioned exception, code *only* that non-macrorole core argument representing a theme deprived of U status by this marked linking. It is perhaps significant that the dative never serves to code such a theme among *three*-place predicates licensing the marked linkage. The genitive and ablative cases, however, code the outranked theme argument among both transitive three-place predicates like *onero* (14b) and intransitive two-place predicates like *memini* (8a).

The association of ablative and genitive objects with a marked linkage provides one with a ready explanation for the pattern of case distribution discovered by Pinkster (1985). In a study of 250 pages taken from several Latin authors, Pinkster found that, among two-place predicates, 88.3% of the objects bore accusative case, 7.6% bore dative, and only 3.6% and .5% bore ablative and genitive case, respectively. The preponderance of accusative objects is, of course, unremarkable, as the nominative-accusative pattern is the norm among two-place predicates. The distributional hierarchy among exceptionally case-marked objects is also explicable within the present framework. Ablative and genitive object-coding, as the manifestation of a marked linkage, is quite rare. Dative object-marking, as a product of the same mechanism that produces normal case-patterns, is, by contrast, relatively common.

We might now examine particular instances of the marked linkage described in (26), which will be shown to be a feature not only of two-place state predicates assigning one macrorole, but also of three-place accomplishment predicates assigning the expected two. In the latter case an accusative argument is present in addition to the nominative PrP and that argument which bears deviant case; but in both instances the ablative or genitive serves to code a non-macrorole theme deprived of undergoer status by a marked linking of the thematic role locative to that macrorole.

Among two-place predicates, ablative or genitive theme-coding is a double marker of sorts: it signals the presence of both the marked linkage and intransitivity; among three-place predicates it signals only the former. These two features are associated with particular subclasses of (two-place) state predicates sanctioning ablative or genitive theme-coding. The marked linkage alone is associated with accomplishment subclasses which are systematically related to classes of intransitive state predicates taking dative or ablative objects, e.g., transfer verbs.

Yet it appears to be the case that while ablative or genitive theme-coding implicates membership in one such subclass, the converse is not necessarily the case — there are verbs belonging to these subclasses which sanction only normal theme-coding. Thus, for example, the "deviant" removal verb *privo* (15a) has the "normal" synonym *separo* (2b). While it does appear that, e.g., statives of lack sanction only the deviant case-pattern, we might for the time being continue to regard the marked linkage of (26) as a lexically governed feature, like transitivity. Thus, the presence of the marked linkage, in addition to any non-default allocation of macroroles, will be noted in lexical entries for predicates in this group. The case of the outranked theme need not be specified — given the coding principle of (26), the statement that the particular predicate requires the linkage of locative to U is sufficient. As to the question of whether the particular predicate sanctions ablative or genitive coding of the outranked theme (or both), this too need not be noted in the lexical entry — as will be discussed below, this selection is largely a function of its subclass.

We now examine the representation of two-place state predicates denoting remembrance, of which *memini*, "I remember," will be taken as representative. It can be given the following lexical representation:

memini: **remember′** (x,y) [+MR, Loc → U]

As a state predicate, this verb assigns its arguments the thematic roles locative and theme. As noted, it assigns only one macrorole, which will be an undergoer, as *memini* contains no activity predicate in its LS. According to the A/U hierarchy, theme outranks locative for U; here, however, as noted, it is the locative which bears the macrorole; it has nominative case, indicating that it occupies PrP position (for which macrorole status is a prerequisite). The theme, outranked for U, receives genitive case, in accordance with the coding convention for this marked linkage given in (26).

The RRG system of lexical decomposition also provides a ready account of the fact that the genitive object associated with the statives denoting remembrance is also associated with the causative verb *admoneo*, "I remind." As an accomplishment predicate, *admoneo* contains both an activity predicate denoting the causal action and a stative predicate denoting the goal state:

admoneo: [**do′** (x)] CAUSE [BECOME **remember′** (y,z)]
[Loc → U]

This predicate, as indicated, licenses both an actor and undergoer. The argument denoting the effector will be linked to the A macrorole, and will accordingly receive PrP status. Of the remaining arguments, locative and theme, theme outranks locative for U. As indicated, however, it is the locative which maps onto the U macrorole — in violation of the A/U hierarchy — and hence, as a non-PrP macrorole core argument, receives accusative case. The theme argument, deprived of its rightful status as U, should, according to the principle of marked linkage (26), receive either ablative or genitive case. In fact, the theme argument of this predicate is genitive, and this is predictable given the case-pattern of the stative predicate *memini:* its LS is contained within that of *admoneo*. The case-pattern parallelism obtaining between *memini* and *admoneo* is duplicated among statives of lack and abundance and their respective causative counterparts, the removal and transfer verbs. Within RRG, accomplishment predicates are derivative of state predicates; one might hence wish to regard the theme coding displayed by the statives as basic, and treat that of the corresponding three-place predicates as a function of the theme coding of their intransitive state counterparts. Does there then exist some means by which to predict the theme coding licensed by the stative?

Among the three types of state predicates, whether ablative or genitive case will be chosen to express the linking described in (26) appears to be a function of the subclass to which the particular stative belongs: verbs of recollection take genitive objects; state verbs of both lack and abundance take ablative or, less frequently, genitive objects. Given the class of the intransitive stative, one can thence predict the case of the corresponding non-macrorole core (theme) argument in the case pattern of its causative counterpart. Hence, as seen, genitive theme coding characterizes verbs of both recollection and reminding; ablative/genitive variation in theme-coding likewise characterizes both statives denoting lack and abundance and their respective causative counterparts, the removal and transfer verbs. Again, within the RRG lexical decomposition system, such parallelism can be attributed to the fact that the generalized LS's of removal and transfer verbs subsume some representation of the corresponding statives (verbs of lacking and abundance, respectively) as effected states.

We might now briefly examine the application of the linking algorithm, and the principle of marked-linkage coding (26), to statives denoting abundance and lack, and to their respective causative counterparts. The application of the linking rules to the stative predicates in the two groups represented by *abundo* ("I abound"), on the one hand, and *careo* ("I lack"), on the other, will not be appreciably different from that described for the verbs of remembrance, e.g., *memini*. Stative verbs of both dearth and abundance, being possession verbs, license a locative and theme argument. As stated, some of the verbs in these two groups allow both genitive and ablative coding of the outranked theme, but this argument is more commonly ablative. (With some such verbs, e.g. *indigeo* ("I need"), genitive coding of the theme argument commonly occurs; with most others, it is unattested or rare.) Hence, for example, *abundo* ("I abound with"), a single-macrorole stative, sanctions a marked linkage of locative to U; the theme argument is realized as ablative by (26). A corresponding causative, *onero* ("I load"), contains a representation of the stative class exemplified by *abundo* as the goal-state in its LS, and one can thus predict that *onero* most likely sanctions ablative case-marking of the item "loaded". This prediction is confirmed by sentence (14b). Given the statives *indigeo* or *careo* ("I lack"), which license ablative theme arguments, one can analogously predict that, e.g., the removal verb *privo* ("I deprive") licenses an ablative theme argument as well. This prediction is borne out by (15a). Table 1 summarizes the case-marking parallelisms obtaining among the three types of

STATES	ACCOMPLISHMENTS
recollection **remember′** (Loc,Th) Loc=U=PrP=NOM, Th=NMC=GEN	*reminding* [**do′** (Ef)] CAUSE [BECOME...] Ef=A=PrP=NOM, Loc=U=ACC, Th=NMC=GEN
lack NOT **be-at′/have′** (Loc, Th) Loc=U=NOM, Th=NMC=AB/GEN	*removal* [**do′** (Ef)] CAUSE [BECOME...] Ef=A=PrP=NOM, Loc=U=ACC, Th=NMC=AB/GEN
abundance **be-at′/have′** (Loc, Th) Loc=U=PrP=NOM, Th=NMC=AB/GEN	*transfer* [**do′** (Ef)] CAUSE [BECOME...] Ef=A=PrP=NOM, Loc=U=ACC, Th=NMC=AB/GEN

Table 1

two-place stative predicates which sanction the marked linkage and their corresponding three-place accomplishment predicate. NMC stands for non-macrorole core argument and ellipses in the LSs of accomplishments indicate the regions containing the LSs of the corresponding statives.

The principles governing marked and unmarked linkage can also account for the alternate case-patterns of variable-valence verbs. A verb of this type is exemplified in these data: the accomplishment predicate *dono* "I give," whose alternate realizations are given in (1e) and (14c). Its lexical representation, as seen above, is the following, in which, as predicted, x=effector, y=locative, and z=theme:

dono: [**do**′ (x)] CAUSE [BECOME **have**′ (y,z)]

Rather than having to posit two lexical entries for this verb — one in which the theme is realized as ablative and the locative as accusative, the other in which the theme is realized as accusative and the locative as dative — we need only state that *dono* allows, but does not require, the marked linking of locative to U. The linking producing the "normal" case pattern of (1e) has been discussed above: the effector links to A (and hence to PrP), the theme outranks the locative for U and hence appears in the accusative, and the locative, as a non-macrorole core argument, is coded by the dative. In the other instance, exemplified in (14c), the effector again links to A, and hence to PrP. The locative argument, however, links to U, in violation of the A/U hierarchy. The case of the theme is then realized as ablative, in accordance with principle (26). Hence, the general case-marking algorithm of (24), supplemented by the marked-linkage coding principle of (26), allows a single lexical entry to account for both of the case patterns associated with this predicate.

We might now give some consideration to the somewhat puzzling fact that verbs of dearth and abundance (both stative and causative) license identical case-patterns, in which the outranked theme appears in the ablative. English, where it permits the marked linking, gives distinctive case-marking to the outranked themes of removal verbs and transfer verbs: the former is assigned the preposition *with*, the latter the preposition *of* (Foley & Van Valin 1984, Jolly, this volume). Nonetheless, given the RRG lexical decomposition system, the fact that Latin does not overtly distinguish between these two types of themes is not a suprising as it may seem. The general LS for statives of abundance given here is **be-at**′ (x,y), and, as seen, the general LS for verbs of lacking differs from this only by the presence of

a negative operator. Transfer and removal verbs, subsuming these statives, also differ only in respect to this negative operator. We might then say that Latin chose to code the marked linking, but neutralized the distinction represented by the negative operator (i.e., the direction of the theme's trajectory).

The notion of "marked linking" has proven important to the understanding of deviant genitive and ablative case-marking. It has been claimed that ablative and genitive objects reflect the marked linkage of locative to the macrorole undergoer. There remain, however, three predicate classes whose behavior is troublesome to this claim. In this first exceptional class, the marked linkage is not signalled by the expected case-pattern, and in the two other classes, the case pattern said to signal the marked linkage of (26) does not in fact reflect this linkage. The first class comprises the so-called ditransitive verbs; in this class the marked linkage of (26) is manifested not by an ablative theme argument but by an accusative one. The other two classes are those in which respective genitive and ablative direct core arguments do not reflect a theme outranked by a locative in violation of the A/U hierarchy. The third class contains verbs requiring the genitive "subject" represented in (19) and (23). That the genitive should be present here, in the absence of the marked linking, should not be too problematic, as the two cases were said to signal the marked linkage only when there existed a PrP. The predicates in (19) and (23) lack a PrP. Genitive subjects will merit some discussion below, but let us now examine the two other apparent exceptions to the marked-linkage coding principle.

Ditransitive verbs, the first class of exceptions, are those three-place predicates which sanction two accusative non-subject arguments. The ditransitive verbs *doceo* , "I teach", and *rogo*, "I ask", are exemplified in (28a-b):

(28) a. *Pueros philosophiam magister docet.*
boys(A) philosophy(A) teacher(N) teaches.
"The teacher teaches the boys philosophy."

b. *C. Flaminium sententiam rogaverunt.*
C. Flaminius(A) opinion(A) (they)asked
"They asked C. Flaminius his opinion."

The verb *doceo* , e.g., can be given the following lexical representation:

doceo: [**teach**′ (x)] CAUSE [BECOME **know**′ (y,z)]

As an accomplishment, this predicate licenses the following thematic roles: x=effector, y=locative, and z=theme. Both the locative and theme arguments bear accusative case, and the coding principle (24b) might then lead us to believe that both bear a macrorole. This belief would, however, force us to reject the principle that no predicate can assign more than two macroroles. In fact, this principle can probably be preserved: it appears that only one of the two accusative NPs represents a macrorole-bearing argument. As observed by Jensen (1981:15), the passive forms of such ditransitives allow only the locative argument to occupy subject status, as shown in (29a-d). These examples demonstrate that it is only the argument representing a locative that can be endowed by the passive construction with the behavioral and coding properties of a subject:

(29) a. *C. Flaminius sententiam rogatus est.*
C. Flaminius(N-M-SG) thought(A) asked(N-M-SG) is
"C. Flaminius was asked his thoughts."

b. **Sententia C. Flaminium rogata est.*
thought(N-F-SG) C. Flaminius(A) asked(N-F-SG) is
"C. Flaminius thoughts werre asked him."

c. *Pueri philosophiam docti est ab eo.*
boys(N-M-PL) philosophy(A) taught(N-M-PL) is by him(AB)
"The boys were taught philosphy by him."

d. **Philosophia pueros docta est ab eo.*
philosophy(N-F-SG) boys(A) taught(N-F-SG) is by him(AB)
"Philosophy was taught the boys by him."

As macrorole status is an absolute prerequisite for PrP status, and as the accusatively marked theme argument cannot apparently achieve PrP status, one can thereby conclude that this argument does not bear a macrorole, having been deprived of undergoer status by a marked linkage of locative to U. This deprived theme argument, however, does not bear the ablative or genitive case predicted by (26). The small class of Latin ditransitives must then be marked as an exception to that coding principle.

The second class of exceptions to the coding principles advocated here are the activity verbs taking ablative non-subject arguments. These verbs are exemplified in (16); they have traditionally been said to denote "use and enjoyment". Here the ablative, like the dative appearing with such activity verbs as *servio*, serves merely to code a non-macrorole core argument. Activity verbs like *utor* ("I use") assign one macrorole, an actor, which is linked to the agent or effector argument, in accordance with the A/U hierarchy. Such verbs are thus intransitive. Activity verbs, by definition, assign no undergoer macrorole since, as they express inherently unbounded states of affairs and therefore cannot in principle have a patient argument, which is the prototypical undergoer (see "Synopsis", sect. 3.3.2). Thus, such verbs should be expected to lack an accusative object; their lack of transitivity is not lexically idiosyncratic, but characteristic of their class. It is for this reason that the lexical representations of two-place activity predicates do not bear the feature [+MR]; given the *Aktionsart* class of these predicates, one can predict that they license a single macrorole.

The instances that do require explication are those in which an accomplishment predicate like *edo*, "I eat," which can also serve as an activity verb (e.g., as when coupled with an object designating an unbounded quantity: *pisces (A) edit per totam noctem* "he ate fish all night" but **pisces (A) edit in decem diebus* *"he ate fish in ten days"), assigns accusative case to its object in both uses. The activity-accomplishment alternation is a common one cross-linguistically, and the assignment of accusative objects to activity verbs occurs in a number of languages sanctioning this alternation. According to Van Valin (personal communication), this case-marking "reflects the canonical use of a verb and not its particular interpretation in every clause in which it occurs."

Hence, one might conclude that such alternating activity verbs as *edo* license accusative non-subject arguments on the basis of their accomplishment readings. Those activity verbs that do not have accomplishment readings should accordingly lack the possibility of accusatively case-marked objects, and this appears to be the case. It is thus apparent that an additional function of the ablative is that of coding the non-undergoer "object" occurring with such activity verbs. Again, the dative, as the default case for non-macrorole direct core arguments, can serve this function as well; as seen above, the activity verb *servio*, "I serve," takes a dative object. Ablatively marked direct core arguments, however, outside of their use with certain statives and their corresponding accomplishments, serve only this function. Further, the ablative performs this function only with respect to a particular class of activity predicates: those denoting use; otherwise, it serves to signal the marked linkage described in (26).

We now examine the properties of the third class of exceptions to the principle of marked linkage: the genitive "subject". Given the case-assign-

ment principles in (24), one can conclude that such two-place predicates as *pudet* lack the expected two macroroles. Macrorole-bearing arguments must appear in either the nominative or accusative case, and only the accusative is represented in the case frames of such predicates, coding the cognizer. That the single macrorole-bearing argument appears in the accusative rather than in the nominative indicates that these verbs license no PrP. The claim that the genitive argument is not a PrP is corroborated by the fact that it does not trigger verb agreement; all of the verb forms licensing the genitive subject are impersonal.

Despite the fact that such verbs as *pudet* license no PrP, one might wish to give them a treatment similar to that accorded the inverse verbs of (3), which likewise sanction the linking of the cognizer role to a non-subject position. If verbs such as *pudet* were analyzed as statives akin to *placet* and *libet*, the case of the genitive "subject" would be explicable according to principle (26): the single undergoer macrorole assigned by such predicates would be occupied by the locative (cognizer) argument instead of the theme (percept), and the latter would accordingly receive genitive case.

Such a treatment would not, however, allow one to explain why, as shown in (23), the genitive "subject" appears to exhibit PrP-like properties with respect to the accusative-infinitive object complement ("raising to object" construction). It participates in this construction in the manner of a nominative subject, although it retains its deviant case when "raised", rather than appearing in the accusative. Hence, such sentences as (23a,c,e) present a problem: if the claim is to be that all "subjects" or "objects" carrying deviant case have not been assigned macrorole status (i.e., are not linked to either actor or undergoer), and if macrorole status is to be an absolute precondition for PrP status, then one has no means by which to account for the fact that the genitive arguments in these examples display a behavioral property apparently associated only with PrPs. That is, if the genitive arguments in (19) and (23) are not to be considered actors, and if non-macrorole core arguments are precluded from becoming PrPs, how can we explain the fact that, in (23), they seem to have achieved, to some degree, PrP status?

Within RRG, there is a means by which to account for those items which "act like" subjects but which otherwise lack salient subject properties. As mentioned above, in addition to a PrP, which is selected by discourse or pragmatic factors and to which traditionally recognized subject properties accrue (e.g., nominative case-marking in nominative-accusative languages), RRG recognizes a Semantic Pivot [SmP], the argument ranking highest with respect to the actor end of the A/U continuum. It is held that these semantically selected pivots can also serve a critical grammatical function in the syntax of a particular language. According to Van Valin (1991), the two types of pivots can readily coexist within a language, and both may require mention in the specification of certain grammatical constructions. One might wish to conclude that Latin allows both PrPs and SmPs to "raise to object" and to propose that the genitive arguments exemplified in (19) and (23) have SmP status, despite lacking PrP status.[6]

The assumption that these genitive arguments are semantic pivots will allow one to explain their ability to participate, like PrPs, in the "raising to object" construction. Such an analysis precludes the aforementioned treatment of this class as stative, whereby the appearance of the genitive "subject" is accounted for by (26). Verbs like *pudet* represent accomplishment predicates; if "x shames y", then "x causes y to become ashamed". In the decomposition schema associated with this *Aktionsart* class would the "stimulus" argument outrank the "cognizer" argument for actorhood, as required of a semantic pivot. One might therefore propose the following lexical representation for *pudet*:

pudet: [**do′** (x)] CAUSE [BECOME **ashamed′** (y)] [+MR]

There would be the following assignment of thematic roles for this lexical representation: x=effector, y=patient. (The attribution of agency to the effector is, of course, subject to pragmatic construal — (19d) is ambiguous is this regard.) Such verbs, licensing two argument places but a single macrorole, are, like those verbs requiring non-accusative objects, intransitive according to the definition of transitivity assumed here. Their passivization properties will be investigated below.

Since the genitive-"subject" verbs are accomplishment rather than state predicates, the fact that they sanction genitive coding of the cognizer argument cannot, as mentioned, be explained by (26), which requires the linking of the genitive to a theme argument. It thus appears that a supplementary coding principle is required for this class specifying that, for verbs which assign no PrP, an effector lacking macrorole status, or perhaps any non-macrorole direct core argument, receives genitive coding.[7] Because effector outranks patient on the A/U continuum, the argument bearing the former thematic role will have SmP status, and this will in turn account for the fact that this argument manifests subject properties with respect to the "raising to object" construction.

Such a conception of verbs like *pudet* would, however, be problematic, in that it would entail a violation of the principle of macrorole assignment proposed in the "Synopsis", sect. 3.3.2, namely, that the single macrorole with an intransitive verb is an actor if the verb has an activity predicate in its LS; otherwise it is undergoer. Any accomplishment predicate, consisting of an activity predicate linked to an achievement predicate by a causal operator, would then assign actor status to any single macrorole. It is clear, however, that if those verbs requiring genitive "subjects" license only a single macrorole, as their case pattern suggests, this macrorole is an *undergoer*, as reflected by the accusative case of the single macrorole-bearing argument. Granted, undergoer is not equivalent to object — undergoers, as has been shown, can be subjects — but arguments bearing the actor macrorole apparently receive accusative case-marking in Latin only when "raised to object", as in (20a). And although Van Valin (ibid) cautions against literal construals of the macrorole labels, the argument receiving accusative case — the metaphorical recipient of some emotional "force" — is a fairly good example of the undergoer prototype suggested by Foley & Van Valin (1984). How then can we explain the predilection of the "flip" verb for an accusative (rather than nominative) macrorole-bearing argument? The Latin "flip" verbs do constitute a special class — if the inverse class of (3-5) is to be taken as typical, then a non-PrP cognizer is ordinarily given dative, rather than accusative coding. If we should chose to view the flip verbs as an exceptional class, we might then attribute to this exceptional character their apparent defiance of the aforementioned principle of macrorole selection.

Of course, it may also be the case that the accusative argument included in the case frame associated with this class, like that coding the theme-argument of distransitive verbs (28a-b), does not in fact bear the undergoer macrorole. Evidence bearing on this question comes from the passives of verbs of this class. If the accusatively coded argument of, e.g., *pudet* ("shames") were a bona fide undergoer, one might expect that it could be promoted to PrP status via that component of the passive linking-rule licensing the "foregrounding" of undergoers. Such promotion does not appear to occur. Where passive forms of these verbs are found (gerundives like *pudendus* from *pudet* are common), their subjects code not the sufferer but the cause of the emotion. An example of such an idiomatic gerundive can be seen in (30):

(30) *Hic ager colono est paenitendus.*
this(M) field(M) colonist(D) is shaming(N)
"This field ought to shame the colonist." Col. 3,2

In (30), the field (*ager*) should not *be* ashamed, as one might predict from the passive-periphrastic form (cf. 5), but should instead be a *source* of shame. Hence, the participle *paenitendus*, in concert with the copula, means not "ought to be ashamed", but "ought to shame." The passive of such verbs is simply the deontic version of the active form. The fact that the passive of such verbs does not promote the cognizer argument to subject might seem to impugn the claim that the accusative argument coding this thematic role is here linked to the undergoer macrorole. One might also argue, however, that such verbs have no genuine passive forms merely because they are impersonal. The presence of an accusative object might be a necessary but not sufficient precondition upon personal passivization; a finite active is perhaps another prerequisite for the personal passive. Because we cannot determine here whether the lack of the personal passive reflects the lack of the requisite macrorole or the lack of a finite form, we must for the time being remain agnostic with respect to this issue.

Returning to the genitive argument sanctioned by this predicate class, it appears that there is an additional issue that must be investigated with respect to its SmP status. As discussed above,where a language allows both SmPs and PrPs, a particular construction may be tied to one or both pivot types. Are both pivot types critical to the "raising to object" construction, or only one? The typical instance of this construction, exemplified in sentences (23b,d,f), involves the "raising to object" of an argument that is both PrP and SmP, i.e., that both bears a macrorole and outranks any other argument with respect to the actor end of the A/U hierarchy. But, as we have seen in (23a,c,e), SmPs which are not PrPs can also be "raised to object", with preservation of their deviant case. These facts would compel one to conclude that it is the SmP, rather than the PrP which is crucial to this construction. This conclusion would, of course, have to be modified were it discovered that PrPs lacking SmP status could also be raised to object. A critical test might then involve the subjects of inverse verbs, which, as mentioned in fn. 5, have PrP status but, as themes, are outranked for SmP status by the locative argument receiving dative case-marking. If such subjects could serve as subjects of accusative-infinitive object complements, then this fact would indicate that this construction is sensitive to

both pivot types. In fact, as shown in (31a,c,e,) the subjects of impersonal inverse verbs like *libet* can "raise to object", as can those of the two other types of inverse verbs discussed — passive past participial verbs of perception and gerundives denoting moral obligation (the form in *oratio recta* is given following each embedded form):

(31) a. *Demiror tibi hoc libere.*
(I)marvel you(D) this(A) please(INF)
"I cannot believe this to please you."

b. *Tibi hoc libet.*
you(D) this(N) pleases
"This pleases you."

c. *Ei ego a me referendam gratiam non putem?*
him(D) I by me(AB) returned(A) favor(A) not should-think[8]
"Am I not to think that the favor should be returned to him by me?" Cic., Plan. 78

d. *Gratia referenda est mihi.*
favor(N) returned(N) is me(D)
"The favor should be returned by me."

e. *Arbitror hanc rem probatam esse homini.*
(I)judge this(A) matter(A) looked-over(A) be(INF) man(D)
"I judge this matter to have been looked over by the man."

f. *Haec res probata est homini.*
this(N) matter(N) looked-over(N) is man(D).
"This matter has been looked over by the man."

The examples in (23) and (31) demonstrate that Latin allows the "raising to object" of both an SmP lacking PrP status and a PrP lacking SmP status. Hence, it appears that both pragmatically and semantically selected pivots are crucial to the accusative-infinitive object construction. Where both pivot types are independently represented, however, it is the PrP rather than the SmP which will be "raised to object". The dative argument of inverse verbs, a locative, outranks the nominatively coded theme for SmP status; as shown, however, it is the theme, linked to the PrP function, which is permitted to "raise to object". Thus, it is apparent that although this accusative-infinitive construction admits of both pivot types, a PrP, when present, will be given preferential treatment.

3. Comparison with previous analyses

The advantages of the present analysis can best be seen by comparing it with several earlier attempts to account for deviant case-marking in Latin. In this section, three accounts of this phenomenon — authored by Pinkster (1985, to appear) and Jensen (1983) — will be summarized and compared with that proposed here. I hope to demonstrate that, while each of these analyses offers some intriguing insights into the phenomena under investigation, the present analysis is to be preferred both for the range of data it accounts for and the applicability of the coding principles suggested to the Latin case system in general.

3.1 *Pinkster (1985)*

Both this analysis and the present analysis represent attempts to provide a unified account of the case-marking of "third arguments" and non-accusative "second arguments" (i.e., the dative coding of both indirect objects and most non-accusative objects, as well as case-pattern parallelisms between certain statives sanctioning ablative and genitive objects and their causative counterparts). Both analyses recognize that certain semantic subclasses of verbs (of lacking, etc.) are associated with a case-pattern characterizing both "quirky" two-place stative verbs and three-place causative verbs.

There is, however, a fundamental difference between the two accounts: while the latter regards deviant case as an idiomatic feature of the verbs sanctioning it, the former regards it as synchronically motivated. In Pinkster's analysis, two "semantic justifications" for the presence of dative and ablative non-subject arguments are adduced. Pinkster first advances the following "quick generalization" for three-place verbs: the dative codes the third arguments of verbs of "giving" and "communication" (*do*, *dico*), while the ablative codes the third arguments of verbs of "removing, supplying and depriving" (*separo*, *dono*, *fraudo*). Certain divisions within this classification scheme are unsupportable. The suggested typology ignores the various thematic roles coded by "third arguments". Verbs of "remov-

ing" and "depriving" are distinct from one another in the following important respect: in the former instance the ablative argument — or, more frequently, the *ab*-headed PP requiring an ablative NP complement — represents a location (2b); in the latter case it represents a theme (15a, e.g.). Further, no semantic difference appears to justify the separation of "verbs of giving" from "verbs of supplying". Case-pattern differences alone seem to provide the entire motivation for this semantic division: in the former case, the theme is coded by an accusative argument; in the latter case, the theme is coded by ablative argument. It is certainly not clear that these distinct coding possibilities reflect distinct semantic verb classes. Indeed, Pinkster acknowledges (p. 171) both that the classes of verbs of "giving" and "supplying" are "semantically rather close" and that such variable-valence transfer verbs as *circumdo* ("I surround") and *dono* ("I give"), which can appear with both ablative *and* dative third arguments (2a,14c), defy the apparent dichotomy of case-patterns based on verb class. Variable valence and the existence of the two case-patterns among semantically similar verbs Pinkster eventually attributes to an animacy division, viz., the dative marks animate third arguments, while the ablative marks inanimate third arguments.

This animacy division, Pinkster argues, is well supported by three-place predicates. He concedes, however, that "...the clear-cut division found with third arguments of three-place verbs...is less prominent with two-place verbs (p.174). 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." He nevertheless decides to uphold the animacy division on the following grounds: as mentioned in section 2, there are verbs which can govern either a dative or accusative, with a concomitant change of meaning (the example of *consulo*, "I consult", is given in fn. 2). The dative, Pinkster argues, is used only when the object-referent is animate. This, however, is a line of argumentation whose validity, as noted in fn. 2, is in later work eclipsed by Pinkster himself (to appear: 8):

> ...there is [apparently] no opposition between the accusative and dative case, but [it appears that] they mark different types of constituents: either [the verb in question] is a two-place verb governing a normal accusative as its second argument and the dative constituent is a benefactive satellite, or [it] is a three-place verb with both an accusative argument and a dative argument. In specific contexts, either one or the other, or both, may be absent. Quite a few, if not all, of the verbs which are registered in our grammars as allowing different case frames are of this type. As a consequence, ostensible case-alternation of this type cannot be taken as an argument that there must be a difference in meaning.

In other words, the dative/accusative opposition among such two-place predicates as *consulo* cannot be used to support the animacy division, as no such opposition exists. Additionally, even among three-place predicates, it seems that there are exceptions to the animacy division. The verb *circumdo* ("I surround"), which sanctions the valence alternation discussed above, contains in its "unmarked" case-frame a dative locative-argument whose referent is rarely animate, as one can discover through a brief survey of the illustrative sentences given for this entry in the Oxford Latin Dictionary. Further, Pinkster's analysis simply ignores the class of verbs sanctioning genitive theme-arguments, both causative and stative, and the evident free-variation between genitive and ablative coding of theme arguments among removal verbs. And although he recognizes (p. 173) that there is "a parallel behavior of certain two-place verbs with respect to the particular case-form of their second argument and certain three-place verbs with related meaning," (he gives the pair *careo* "I lack"/*privo* "I deprive" as an example), he does not examine the thematic roles with which the ablative argument is linked in the frames associated with both stative and causative. He hence fails to recognize that this parallelism between statives and causatives consists in the consistent marking of the theme argument (as ablative or genitive). Finally, and perhaps most problematically, as he does not recognize "quirky" verbs as intransitive, he has no means by which to explain the strong correlation between the lack of an accusative object and the impersonal passive. This correlation he attempts to analyze away by adducing isolated instances in which the presence of accusative object does not implicate a personal passive. He apparently fails to see that the *lack* of an accusative object always implies an impersonal passive.

3.2 *Pinkster (to appear)*

Recognizing the difficulties, enumerated in the previous section, of treating quirky case-patterns as other than idiomatic features of the verbs bearing them, Pinkster apparently abandons his earlier synchronic semantically based explanation for quirky case-patterns and asserts two historical sources for non-accusative objects. The first he refers to as "differential

object marking", and defines it as the process by which different case-frames become "available for different semantic function patterns" (p. 9). As an example of this, he points to the development of a competing case-pattern for the verb *doleo* ("I grieve for") with an ablative rather than accusative object. It is unfortunately not made clear here what distinct "semantic functions" are associated with these two case-patterns. The second source he refers to as "satellite absorption" — a process whereby adjunct arguments are incorporated into the "predicate frame of a verb," becoming core arguments in the process. As an example of this process, he suggests that the quirky verb *faveo* ("I favor") was originally a one-place predicate with which a "dative satellite expressing "interest" became associated habitually, to the extent that it gradually became part of the predicate frame of the verb, thus yielding a two-place predicate" (p. 10). The selection of non-accusative argument by such a predicate would thus be synchronically unjustifiable in semantic terms. Although he does mention (p. 11) that there exist "certain intriguing verbs or groups of verbs" which may "suggest a semantic justification for the use of specific cases," he neither identifies these verb groups nor advances any semantic explanations for the use of non-accusative objects. (One may presume he has in mind such classes as verbs coding need and lack.)

This diachronic account of the development of non-accusative objects is not antithetical to the present analysis, which, although not encompassing the diachronic developments producing quirky case-patterns, incorporates Pinkster's claim that these case-patterns are not amenable to a synchronic semantic explanation and must thus be regarded as idiomatic. The present analysis differs from Pinkster's in that it locates the idiomaticity of verbs licensing quirky case-patterns primarily in their lack of transitivity rather than in the case patterns themselves. This difference has, as will be shown, important ramifications for the treatment of the quirky case/impersonal passive correlation.

Although Pinkster's suggestions of diachronic sources for quirky case-patterns are intriguing, his analysis fails to account for the facts of their synchronic distribution or for the behavior of predicates licensing such case patterns. In fact, even the diachronic analysis itself seems somewhat inadequate — although the diachronic process of benefactive satellite absorption can apparently explain why *faveo* sanctions a dative non-subject argument, it does not appear that this explanation suffices for all or even most verbs bearing dative objects. It does not seem plausible to suppose,

for example, that *noceo* ("I harm") was a one-place predicate at any stage of its development. Further, although this analysis may be capable of explaining why a non-accusative "object" is dative as opposed to ablative (perhaps in terms of whether that argument was originally a satellite coding a source — ablative — or beneficary — dative), it cannot apparently account for either the presence of genitive objects or the synchronic alternation between ablative and genitive object-coding among, e.g., stative verbs of abundance. Further, although Pinkster's more recent analysis does not rule out "semantic justification[s] for the use of specific cases," he does not propose again the animacy dichotomy suggested in his 1985 analysis. This dichotomy, despite the flaws enumerated above, did account for both the use of the dative to code indirect and non-accusative direct objects and the existence of case-pattern parallelisms between certain causative and quirky stative predicates. This more recent analysis, abandoning that dichotomy, does not appear to explain these facts. Finally, it seems that this analysis, like that previously discussed, contains no account of the strong correlation between quirky case and impersonal passivization, a correlation which Pinkster attempts to explain away in the manner discussed in the previous section. It seems that for Pinkster, although such verbs as *faveo* may have been intransitive at some preliterary stage, they are transitive from the point of view of Classical Latin, despite their lack of an accusative object. Hence it seems that Pinkster's analysis would make the prediction that verbs characterized by deviant case-patterns, like "normal" verbs, form personal passives — a prediction which we know to be false. An example adduced by Pinkster (p.4) in which the "quirky verb" *noceo* ("I harm") apparently sanctions a personal passive seems to indicate a regularization of the active rather than any correlation between the quirky case-pattern and the personal passive.

At best, it seems, the correlation between non-accusative-object verbs and the impersonal passive would have to be treated here as a sort of coincidence, and handled by fiat. As an explanation for this correlation falls out naturally from the RRG account, it seems that one should favor it. It remains to be shown, however, in what way the present account represents an improvement over a third account, which appears to handle the facts of Latin impersonal passivization with equal ease: that of Jensen (1983).

3.3 *Jensen (1983)*

In contrast to the two analyses discussed previously, Jensen's analysis of deviant case-marking in Latin takes as its primary focus the relationship between impersonal passivization and deviant case, arguing for a lexical formalism for passive that also incorporates the distinction, advanced within Government and Binding theory, between lexically and structurally assigned case (i.e., inherent case and case assigned under government). Quirky case is said to be of the former type, normal case of the latter. According to Jensen, all instances of deviant case-marking reflect a situation in which "a particular case is required of a complement phrase of a lexical item by virtue of being stated in that item's (lexical) subcategorization frame," thus restricting lexical insertion to "inserting an item from the lexicon generated with that case" (p. 25). Jensen also assumes that case is determined by government where no case is specified in the subcategorizaton frame, hence yielding the standard nominative case for subjects (via INFL government) and accusative case for objects (via verb government).

The distinction between inherent and structural case is relevant to the lexical redundancy rule proposed by Jensen to link active verbs to their passive forms. A lexical rule for passive which did not incorporate this distinction would not, according to Jensen, enable one to explain the fact that non-accusative objects never become passive subjects in Latin or, for that matter, in any other language allowing such objects. Jensen's lexical rule allows only a verb that is both morphologically non-passive and followed by noun phrase with no lexically assigned case features to be related to another verb phrase containing a morphologically passive verb followed by an empty noun-phrase node (said by Jensen to bear a trace of some sort, despite the fact that passive for him does not constitute a movement rule). In keeping with GB theory, Jensen assumes that the subject of passive verb is assigned a theta-role by dint of this object "trace". This rule excludes from passivization both one-place predicates (which, of course lack the requisite object) and two-place predicates having an object which bears a case feature. Hence, both of these verb classes must form impersonal rather than personal passives. With respect to the passives of such verbs as *curro* ("I run"), Jensen argues (p. 32) that "[s]ince passive verbs do not assign theta-roles to their subjects, the subject of an intransitive passive cannot be assigned a theta-role normally given to passive subjects through the object trace. Such passives are therefore impersonal" and assume the unmarked

third person singular inflection. In explaining the impersonal passives sanctioned by verbs manifesting deviant case-patterns, Jensen states (p. 33):

> [D]ative object verbs...likewise lack a subcateogorized complement unmarked for case — the case features of the complement of such verbs are marked in the lexicon, thus blocking [the passive rule] in these cases. Passives of such verbs are generated in the lexicon, but they do not assign a theta-role to their subjects, nor is there a trace to perform this function, and so they too are necessarily impersonal.

Jensen's analysis, like the present analysis, can account for the fact that while verbs having accusative objects form personal passives, verbs lacking them, whether having one or two places, can form only impersonal passives. Both analyses recognize deviant case-patterns as lexically idiosyncratic, although each locates that markedness in a different conceived component of the verb's lexical entry. The present analysis regards "quirky verbs" as sanctioning an argument position unlinked to a macrorole; Jensen's analysis regards such verbs as assigning a case feature to their objects.

Hence, both Jensen's analysis and the present analysis provide a plausible explanation for the relationship between quirky case and impersonal passivization. And yet Jensen's analysis, concentrating almost exclusively upon the passivization properties of verbs sanctioning deviant case-patterns, fails to examine the range of deviant case-patterns sanctioned by these verbs. As it focuses upon dative-object verbs, it does not attempt to explain the distributions of dative, ablative, and genitive objects — that the latter two are relatively uncommon; that they appear, unlike dative objects, to be associated with particular semantic subclasses of verbs; that they most commonly encode a theme argument; and that in this function they often appear to vary freely with one another. Further, Jensen's analysis lacks an account of the case-pattern parallelisms between two-place verbs bearing quirky case and three-place predicates. Treating the case assigned the former type of verb as a lexical idiosyncracy, he seems to overlook a general pattern of case assignment exemplified by both transitive three-place verbs and "quirky" two-place verbs. In the present analysis, the indirect-object and non-accusative-object coding function of the dative are seen as manifestations of the same case-marking principle (24c), as are the "*beweg-liches* object" and non-accusative-object coding functions of the ablative and genitive (26). Jensen's analysis, however, has no means by which to account for the evident case-pattern parallelisms obtaining between intrans-

itive two-place and transitive three-place predicates. Jensen's assumption that the "quirky" two-place predicates deviate with respect to their case *per se* prevents the recognition that their case patterns manifest general principles governing the coding of both second and third arguments.

An additional respect in which Jensen's analysis seems somewhat unsatisfactory is in its treatment of such variable valence verbs as *dono* (2a, 14c). As discussed, such verbs are regarded here as licensing two linkages of the thematic role theme to the macrorole of undergoer, one marked and one unmarked. In the case pattern exemplified in (2a), the theme is linked to U and hence receives accusative case by the coding principle (24b); the locative accordingly receives dative by (24c). The case pattern given in (14c) exemplifies the marked linkage of (26), in which the theme argument receives ablative owing to its being outranked for U by a locative argument which is thus realized as accusative by (24b). Variable-valence verbs in Latin are hence explained as those licensing the marked linkage of (26) in addition to that linkage predicted by the A/U hierarchy. Jensen's account of variable valence, however, relies upon the rather dubious claim, last embraced in transformational accounts such as Ross (1967), that in Latin "the order of the noun phrases following the verb is important for the syntactic representation," and that "the free word order generally ascribed to Latin is the result of a relative freedom of scrambling on the...branch leading from syntax to the phonetic form" (p. 15). To explain the dual subcategorization of *dono*, Jensen must claim that in the lexical entry for this predicate, only the first noun phrase following the verb can receive accusative case via government. This noun phrase may bear the thematic role feature [+goal] (locative) or [−goal] (theme); the oblique argument will then bear ablative or dative case in accordance with its thematic role (ablative if [−goal], dative if [+goal]). As tidy as this analysis may be, the claim that the presence of accusative case here is somehow a feature of word order imposes upon Latin constraints for which evidence is lacking. Since the present analysis of variable valence does not impose upon lexical entries in Latin such poorly substantiated ordering constraints, it appears a more plausible account of this phenomenon.

4. Conclusion

This paper has attempted to demonstrate that the Role and Reference Grammar account of Latin case-marking enables one to discern a considerable amount of regularity in the seemingly chaotic assignment of deviant case-patterns. The exceptional character of these verbs was shown not to reside in their case marking *per se*, but in one or both of the following components: transitivity (the assignment of fewer than two macroroles where the requisite two verbal arguments are present) and the linkage between the thematic role and macrorole tiers (the sanctioning of the marked linkage of locative to undergoer).

The following principles were shown to account for the vast majority of irregular case-patterns exemplified in these data: for those verbs licensing a PrP, any direct core argument lacking macrorole status will be given dative coding, as specified in the linking algorithm governing default case-assignment (24); if a marked linking of locative to the macrorole of undergoer is in effect, however, a direct core argument representing an (outranked) theme lacking macrorole status will receive genitive or ablative coding (26); where predicates do not license a PrP, as among the "flip" class of verbs exemplified in (19) and (23), the non-macrorole core argument will receive genitive coding. It was shown that there existed an exception to (26): ablative case was also shown to characterize the non-macrorole direct core arguments of certain activity verbs lacking accomplishment readings. That the ablative should serve this function among the small subclass of activity predicates denoting use was held not to be detrimental to the claim that the chief function of this case is that described in (26).

Thus, within this analysis, Latin's "deviant" case-patterns can be accounted for with little more than the language's default case-assignment rules and the coding principle specifying the manner in which a particular marked linkage is manifested. Further, as was seen, the lexical decomposition system entailed by this analysis provides a straightforward account of the fact that the irregular case-patterns associated with stative verbs of recollection, abundance, and lacking are identical to those of their causative counterparts. And, as was demonstrated, the answers to other vexing questions follow from this analysis of irregular case. Not only can one motivate the assignment of a particular irregular case-pattern to a particular type of predicate, but one can also explain both the paucity of ablative and genitive "objects" and the relative glut of dative "objects": while the

former case represents the default coding of non-macrorole direct core arguments, the latter two cases are associated primarily with a particular marked linking. Hence, the present analysis has provided for this deviant class of predicates an account of case-pattern selection, case-pattern parallelisms, and the relative frequencies of particular case-patterns. This account might then be said to impose some order upon a seemingly unruly realm of Latin grammar.

Notes

* I would like to thank Robert Van Valin, Harm Pinkster, Joan Maling, and Eve Sweetser for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper. I would also like to thank Charles Fillmore, and Paul Kay for valuable discussion. Abbreviations used in narrow glosses of example sentences are: A "accusative", AB "ablative", D "dative", F "feminine", G "genitive", IMP "imperative", IMPER "impersonal", INF "infinitive", M "masculine", N "nominative", and SG "singular".

1. Abbreviations of text and author names are those used in Lewis and Short's *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

2. There are several examples of two-place verbs which can take either a dative or accusative non-subject argument, with concomitant meaning modification. (The dative here is often said to code "indirect effect".) The following pair illustrates this case-marking variability:

   (i) *Senatum consulit.*
   senate(A) (he)consults
   "He consults the senate."

   (ii) *Reipublicae consulit.*
   republic(D) (he)consults
   "He considers the interests of the state".

   Pinkster (to appear) has argued that among verbs which, like *consulo*, sanction variable object-marking there is no *opposition* between dative and accusative case, but that these two cases code different arguments — an object and a "'benefactive' satellite" — one or the other of which may be omitted in context. Evidence for this claim derives from the use of these verbs as three-place predicates sanctioning *both* dative and accusative non-subject arguments (cf. Pinkster's example (22) (op. cit:8). Such evidence would suggest that the so-called variable object verbs are not in fact two-place predicates sanctioning dative "objects" but rather three-place predicates allowing object omission.

3. Although all verbs within this corpus assign at least one macrorole, there are, for example, instances in which *taedet*, "it tires," appears with only the genitive argument, the accusatively coded cognizer being generic or reconstructible from context: *Vitae (G) taedet (IMP)*, "Life tires (one)"; the verb here would then be said license no macroroles.

4. Within more recent versions of RRG, the first (cognizer) argument of stative cognition verbs is held to be an experiencer rather than a locative. I continue Foley & Van Valin's (1984) practice of assigning locative status to this argument because, I think, it allows a slightly more perspicuous statement of the marked linkage coding principle (26).

5. One can easily confirm for oneself that the "irregular" activity, accomplishment, and achievement verbs whose LS's were given above conform to the case-marking principles in (24). However, we can briefly examine their application with respect to the accomplishment verb *noceo*, which assigns these thematic roles: x=effector and y=patient. As it has an activity verb in its LS, the sole macrorole assigned will be an actor. The effector will map into this role and be linked to the PrP slot, hence appearing in the nominative, while the patient, a non-macrorole core argument, is assigned dative.

6. One can contrast this situation with that of the inverse verbs in (3-5). These verbs have clear PrPs — the argument denoting the "item cognized" is nominatively case-marked — yet this PrP is not an SmP. As theme, it is outranked by locative (the argument denoting the cognizer) on the Actorhood hierarchy.

7. This coding principle might be formulated more generally, if it were the case that, in the absence of a PrP, *any* non-macrorole direct core argument (not simply an effector) receives genitive coding. Evidence for this more general formulation is provided by another class of verbs which, in most uses, assign neither a PrP nor any macrorole. This class is composed of the impersonal verbs *refert* and *interest*, "it concerns, interests", the second of which is exemplified in the following sentence:

   (i) *Interest omnium hoc facere.*
   interest everyone(G) this(A) do(INF)
   "It is in the interest of everyone to do this."

   Interest might be given the following lexical representation: *interest*: **concern'** (x,y) [−MR] As a stative cognition verb, this predicate assigns the thematic roles locative and theme. The theme is represented by an infinitival clause. The non-macrorole-bearing locative nominal receives genitive case-marking, apparently in accordance with the more general version of the coding principle suggested. There is, however, an apparent difficulty with this evidence: the locative argument of *interest* and *refert* is frequently expressed not by the genitive, but by the ablative singular feminine of a possessive adjective, as in the following example:

(ii) *Quos quis audiat mea magni interest.*
whom(A) someone(N) listens.to my(AB) greatly concerns.
"It is of great importance to me who someone listens to."

This coding of the locative has commonly been said to be the result of a folk etymology whereby the *re* in *refert* was held to be the ablative singular of *res* , "matter" (F), and the feminine ablatives *mea*, *tua*, etc. used to modify this nominal. The use of this ablative adjective with *interest* is often attributed to some contamination effect within the class. Hence, it would seem that the genitively marked locative is the more basic, with the special ablative marking of the cognizer the effect of morphemic reanalysis. The more general formulation of the genitive-coding principle then appears a tenable account of the case manifested by the "subjects" of verbs like *pudet*, *paenitet*, and *taedet* .

8. Sentence (30c), as pointed out by Baldi (1983), constitutes an exception to the coding principle whereby the agents in passive periphrastic constructions appear in the dative. The appearance here of an *ab*-phrase rather than the expected dative is explained by Baldi as a means of ambiguity avoidance — the use of two datives would result in confusion as to which of the two dative NPs — *ei* ("him") or *mihi* ("me") is the "logical subject" and which the indirect object.

References

Baldi, Philip. 1983. "Speech Perception and Grammatical Rules in Latin". *Latin Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* ed. by Harm Pinkster, 11-26. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bolkestein, A.M. 1976. "A.c.i and *ut*-Clauses with *verba dicendi* in Latin". *Glotta* 54.263-291.

———. 1979. "Subject-to-Object Raising in Latin?" *Lingua* 48.15-34.

Foley, William A. & Robert D. Van Valin, Jr. 1984. *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

———. 1985. "Information Packaging in the Clause". *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, v. I* ed. by Timothy Shopen, 282-364. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Jensen, John T. 1983. "Case and Thematic Role in Latin: Evidence from Passive Constructions". Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Linguistics Club.

Lakoff, Robin T. 1968. *Abstract Syntax and Latin Complementation*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Maraldi, Mirka. 1983. "New Approaches to Accusative Subjects: Case Theory vs. Raising". *Latin Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* ed. by Harm Pinkster, 167-176. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mountford, J.F., ed. 1938. *Bradley's Arnold Latin Prose Composition*. New York: Longman.

Pepicello, William. 1977. "Raising in Latin". *Lingua* 42.8-19.

Pinkster, Harm. 1985. "Latin cases and valency grammar: some problems," *Syntaxe et Latin* ed. by Christian Touratier, 163-186. Aix-en-Provence: Université de Provence.

———. (to appear). "Nonaccusative second arguments of two-place verbs in Latin". *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica* .

Rice, Sally. 1987. "Towards a Transitive Prototype: Evidence from some Atypical English Passives," *BLS* 13.422-434.

Ross, John R. 1967. *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. MIT Ph.D. dissertation. (Published in 1986 as *Infinite Syntax*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corp.)

van Oosten, Jeanne. 1984. *Subject, Topic, Agent, and Passive*. UC Berkeley PhD dissertation.

Van Valin, Robert D., Jr. 1991. "Another Look at Icelandic Case Marking and Grammatical Relations". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 9.145-194.