20. Schol. Pindar, Ol. II 58b: τιμάσαις πόρον Ἀλφεοῦ μετὰ δώδεκ᾽ ἀνάκτων θεῶν: καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐγκαταριθμεῖται τοῖς ιβ′ θεοῖς. ὁ δὲ ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ βωμὸς οὐ δύναται ἐξ ἄλλου ὕδατος γενέσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐκ τοῦ Ἀλφειοῦ.

3 γενέσθαι: βρέχεσθαι vel ἀρδεύεσθαι? Beck ῥαίνεσθαι? Heyne Perhaps ὑγραίνεσθαι?

Part II: The Differences between free and obligatory ut-clauses

By A. M. BOLKESTEIN, Amsterdam
(vgl. Glotta 54, 1976, 263–291)

1. Introduction[1])

Clauses of the form *ut* plus subjunctive are found as fillers of the syntactic functions OBJECT (as with the verb *imperare* 'to order'), COMPLEMENT (as e.g. with the verb *admonere* 'to admonish') or SUBJECT (as e.g. with the verb *accidit* 'it happens'). In those cases their presence is required by the governing verb, that is, they are part of the role-function frame of the verb.

However, we also find clauses of precisely the same form as fillers of role-function complexes, which are not required by the governing verb. They may freely be added to sentences with a great variety of main verbs[2]). These role-function complexes are the role-function complex of ADJUNCT + Purpose, and that of ADJUNCT + Result. An example of the first is (1).

(1) legum idcirco omnes servi sumus, ut liberi esse possimus ('we are there-fore all slaves of the law, *in order that* we may be free' Cic. *Cluent.* 146)

Now, in traditional grammars the basic distinction between clauses of the form *ut* plus subjunctive as fillers of required, or obligatory, role-function complexes and as fillers of non-required,

---

[1]) For a survey of the main theoretical assumptions underlying my terminology I refer to section O at the head of part I.

[2]) Not to any sentence, whatsoever, of course. There seem to be semantic restrictions on the type of sentences which allow of the addition of an ADJUNCT + Purpose clause, apart from the one that the Agent of the main verb must be [+ animate].

or optional, role-function complexes is often obscured by arguments of different kinds: (i) the morphological similarity, which often leads to the assumption that (ii) there is a historical development from the one type of clause to the other, and (iii) the fact that there seems to be an intuitive semantic similarity.

In this article I will show that these arguments are insufficient. I will adduce other arguments to show that the difference in syntactic and semantic status is connected with a difference in behaviour on a number of points.

My attention will ocus fon differences between *ut*-clauses governed by verba dicendi and sentiendi in the function OBJECT and COMPLEMENT, on the one hand, and *ut*-clauses in the role-function complex ADJUNCT + Purpose on the other, but mutatis mutandis a similar line of reasoning might be followed in distinguishing between other obligatory versus free *ut*-clauses.

2. Properties of the two types

I will first summarize the traditional attitudes towards the problem, and then turn to phenomena differentiating the two types of clauses.

2.1 *The traditional approach*

K.-St. (II: 171; 209; 232) recognize the fact that there is a difference in status between the two types of *ut*-clauses. They distinguish between 'Substantivsätze' on the one hand and 'Adverbialsätze' on the other. These terms have apparently been chosen because the first group is considered to be replaceable by nouns (or noun-phrases), in fact by nouns in the accusative or nominative case-form, whereas the second group may be replaced by adverbs[3]).

This in fact corresponds to our distinction between obligatory, and optional non-required *ut*-clauses respectively, as appears on pages 209 and 232, where the difference is further clarified as one between constituents which are a 'notwendige Ergänzung des Haupt-

---

[3]) Though in general terms the observation is valid, it should be realized that constituents belonging to the category adverb, may quite well be found as fillers of obligatory role-function complexes, or nouns (even in the accusative case form) as fillers of non-required role-function complexes. There is no absolute one to one correspondence between grammatical category, syntactic function and semantic role, as is suggested by the terminology of K.-St. here. See now also Happ (1976) on this problem.

satzes' and those which are only 'eine nähere Bestimmung', but not obligatory.

This remark comes close to our criterion of eliminatability for determining the status of a constituent.

A similar distinction is made by E.-Th. (: 293, par. 300) between 'propositions complétives' and 'propositions circonstantielles': the former are 'étroitement rattachées à la principale et dont elles forment le complément d'objet indispensable au sens', while the latter are only subclassified in relation to each other according to their semantic role in the sentence (: 290, par. 340).

Other grammarians give no specification of the difference in status at all, e.g. Sz (: 630 sqq.) and Blatt (: 306 sqq.)

Now, whether we do or do not find an indication about a difference in status, still semantically the two types of clauses are treated as similar in the same way by classical scholars. E.-Th. for example distinguish among the 'complétives' introduced by *ut* a class of 'finales', who 'désignent l'action voulue, désirée, attendue, possible' (: 299 par. 306). K.-St similarly describes his class of 'Finale Substantivsätze': they 'bezeichnen eine erstrebte Wirkung, ein Ziel' (: 208). Sz. who considers the two types as essentially one group, treats them under the heading 'Finale *ut*-Sätze' (: 642).

One view underlying this analysis, perhaps the most strongly present in Sz., is the hypothesis that in an earlier — and of course not attested — stage of Latin there were no subordinated clauses at all (cf. Sz.: 646; K.-St. II: 209).

In this stage, the argument runs, an independent sentence expressing 'purpose' was added paratactically to another sentence, as an afterthought or something. Only after language had developed into a more complex stage, such sentences expressing purpose became subordinated. Since the first view presupposes a stage in which the addition of such an *ut*-sentence was not required, this means that in that stage sentences (2 a–b) were just as well-formed as sentences (3 a–b):

(2) a) Volo. Ut venias. ('I have a wish. My intention is that you come.')
   b) Volo. ('I have a wish.')
(3) a) Dormit. Ut quiescat. ('He is sleeping. His intention is to rest.')
   b) Dormit. ('He is sleeping.')

We would then need at least an explanation of why or how a difference arose between sentences which came to require this addition, as with *volo*, and sentences which did not, as with *dormio*. Some explanation must be given for the strange fact that a sentence

234   A. M. Bolkestein

like (2 b) which, in this line of reasoning, must have been well-formed once in the 'paratactic' stage[4]), slowly was felt to lack a constituent by the native speakers of Latin. Such an explanation is offered by nobody.

Since justified criticism of the view that languages develop in this way is given elsewhere (cf. R. Lakoff (1968: 4–6) and Pinkster (1972: 167 sqq.)), I will not elaborate the point any further; I only point out that there is no support for the hypothesis that all *ut*-clauses were originally optional additions to independent sentences, and that therefore a synchronic description of both optional and obligatory *ut*-clauses which is based on that hypothesis is at least very doubtful. That is, I do not see any a priori reason to treat them as syntactically or semantically similar.

Another reason for the fact that semantically both optional and obligatory *ut*-clauses are supposed to indicate 'purpose' is constituted by the vagueness of the term 'purpose' itself and by the existence of a number of common properties. The content of both obligatory *ut*-clauses with verba dicendi and sentiendi and of optional *ut*-clauses usually describe an event or state of affairs, which has not yet actually taken place, respectively come about, but the fulfilment of which is somehow 'wanted' by the SUBJECT-constituent of the governing verb, or at least seems to have something to do with volition. This is the reason that verbs functioning as PREDICATOR within such clauses have certain tense-restrictions, that is, cannot normally refer to the past, as has been duly noted by some classical grammarians, cf. K.-St. (II: 195); E.-Th. (: 414 par. 401).

However, on closer inspection of the concept 'purpose', the term seems to obscure at least two things which need to be differentiated. It equates 'having an intention in doing something', or 'doing something in order to obtain a certain effect' on the one hand, with 'telling someone to do something' and 'wanting to do something' on the other, whereas with the former expression we know something about someone's intention, while by means of the latter we get no information at all about anyone's intention whatsoever[5]).

---

[4]) Unless, of course, one wants to contend that it was not acceptable. In that case it seems rather awkward to consider the *ut*-clause in (2a) to have the same status as in (3a). And that assumption, after all, is the basis for not distinguishing the two types of *ut*-clause in the later stage of Latin.

[5]) A detailed analysis of concepts like 'intention', 'volition', etc. is given by Kenny (1963).

This appears from the simple fact that we may perfectly well add information about one's intention in the latter case, the content of which may be quite different from what is contained in the obligatory clause, as I will demonstrate below.

In the following section I will present the arguments for differentiating optional clauses in the role-function complex ADJUNCT + Purpose from obligatory clauses fulfilling a role-function complex required by the governing verb. First I will briefly summarize the results of a number of more widely applicable syntactic and semantic tests[6]). I will end with a more specific property in which obligatory *ut*-clauses governed by verba dicendi and sentiendi differ from optional *ut*-clauses in the role-function complex ADJUNCT + Purpose.

2.2 Phenomena differentiating the two types of ut-clauses

I will present eight observations which offer support for analyzing the two types of *ut*-clauses as different.

(i) Passivation. As I have pointed out earlier (cf. Part I, section 0) constituents fulfilling the syntactic junction OBJECT in two or three place frames become SUBJECT-constituents when the sentence is passivized. This is also the case with constituents in this function which have the form *ut* + subjunctive[7]). Clauses in the role-function complex ADJUNCT + Purpose cannot become SUBJECT-constituents under any circumstances. However, this cannot be demonstrated, since the form which the passive verb takes, when it is in agreement with a clause as SUBJECT, is identical to the form of the impersonal passive, which may be formed with intransitive verbs.

---

[6]) Many of these tests have appeared in one form or another in Part I of this study, on the distinctions between 'real' a.c.i.-clauses and OBJECT + COMPLEMENT patterns.

[7]) This test does not distinguish between clauses fulfilling the obligatory function COMPLEMENT in two place patterns and optional ADJUNCT *ut*-clauses, since passivation is then impossible. There is a very limited number of three place frames in which the COMPLEMENT-constituent may become SUBJECT as well, but only on condition that the OBJECT-constituent is not present in the sentence. An example is the pattern with the verb *docere* ('to teach'). *doceo te linguam latinam* ('I teach you Latin') may be passivized into *doceris linguam latinam* ('you are taught Latin') or *lingua latina docetur*, (cf. *id quod dilucide docetur* ('that which is taught in a clear way' Cic. *Ac.* 2,56)) but not into **lingua latina te docetur* ('Latin is taught' and 'Latin is taught to you', respectively). The function of the constituent *lingua latina* may also be filled by a clause introduced by *ut*.

236   A. M. Bolkestein

(ii) Elimination or omittability. A clause fulfilling an obligatory role-function complex in a two place frame can never be left out. On the other hand, a clause in the optional role-function complex ADJUNCT+Purpose may always be eliminated without impairing the acceptability of the sentence as is demonstrated by (4).

(4) a) volo ut quod iubebo facias, ut scias, quae ... ('I want you to do what I tell you, in order that you know what ...' Pl. *Capt.* 462)
    b) volo ut quod iubebo facias ('I want you to do what I tell you')
    c) *volo ('I want')

This test again gives less clearcut results in the case of three place frames in which the third, not-OBJECT, function is filled by a clause, since in three place frames it is less unacceptable to leave one of the constituents out, particularly if it is not the OBJECT-filler (cf. my earlier remarks regarding this problem Part I, note 7).

(iii) Substitution-possibilities. A useful indication of the distinction for some but not all verbs governing *ut*-clauses, is the fact that the COMPLEMENT-function may be filled by constituents of other categories than clauses. These constituents may, for example, belong to a category which is usually, or even exclusively, found as filler of obligatory role-function complexes, e.g. nouns in the accusative or nominative case form[8]). I have already mentioned the example of *docere* in note 7: the COMPLEMENT-function there may be filled either by an *ut*-clause or by a noun in the accusative case-form. Other examples are e.g. *admonere*, which allows both nouns in various case-forms as fillers of its COMPLEMENT-function and clauses of various forms (a.c.i., single infinitive and *ut*-clause). Though these substitution possibilities cannot be used as an absolute proof for the status of the *ut*-clause in question, and differ according to the governing verbs anyway, it is at least significant that it is difficult to find substitutions for *ut*-clauses in the optional role-function complex ADJUNCT+Purpose.

(iv) Collocation versus coordination. The criteria of collocation on the one hand, as an indication of inequivalence between the role-function complexes of the constituents collocated, and, on the other hand, the criteria of coordination as an indication of equivalence between the role-function complexes of the constituents

---

[8]) See, however, note 3.

which are coordinated[9]), clearly show the distinction between the
two types of *ut*-clauses under consideration.

(5) a) summonuit me ut vestem cum illo mutem, ut hoc commodi caperem
('He advised me to change clothes with him, in order to take the
following advantage', cf. Ter. *Eu.* 570–72)

b) summonuit me ut vestem cum illo mutem et ut hoc commodi
caperem ('He advised me to change clothes with him and to take
the following advantage')

(6) a) invitatus erat ut nobiscum esset ut hanc laetitiam primus obicerem
ei ('He was invited to be with us, in order that I would confront
him first with this glad news', cf. Ter. *Hau.* 185–6)

b) *invitatus erat ut nobiscum esset et ut primus obicerem ... ('He
was invited to be with us and that I should confront him first ...')

Examples (5a) and (6a) are examples of two *ut*-clauses being
collocated in one sentence. They can only be interpreted in these
sentences as fulfilling different role-function complexes. If they
are coordinated, as in (5b) and (6b), they must be interpreted as
fulfilling the same role-function complex. While there is
no objection against such an interpretation of (5b) as an isolated
example, (6b) is unacceptable and cannot be interpreted at all,
since the second *ut*-clause violates certain restrictions regarding
what may be expressed within COMPLEMENT-*ut*-clauses governed
by the verb *invitare*[10]). In any case, an interpretation of (5b) and
(6b) as involving coordination between two different types of
ut-clauses gives nonsense. That is, from the fact that we sometimes
find instances of collocation, we must conclude that in those
cases there must be a difference in syntactic and/or semantic
status of the two *ut*-clauses, and from the unacceptability of (6b)
we must conclude, that *ut*-clauses attached to a main verb like
hortari in the role-function complex COMPLEMENT+(as I will
call it for the moment) Message have to obey certain rules which
ADJUNCT+Purpose *ut*-clauses attached to sentences with the
same main verb need not obey.

(v) Reference to the clause. The semantic inequivalence between
the two types of clause is also demonstrated by the following fact.
Clauses in the optional role-function complex ADJUNCT+Pur-
pose are often accompanied in the main sentence by constituents
like *eo consilio* ('with the following intention'), or *idcirco* ('with

---

[9]) Cf. Dik (1968), Pinkster (1972: 108–24) and Becker (1967: 58sqq.)
for these criteria. Also Bolkestein (forthcoming).

[10]) I will return to the exact nature of these restrictions below.

the following reason') and such like, cf. K.-St. (II: 232). We may always add such a constituent announcing the future occurrence of an *ut*-clause in the semantic role Purpose, or referring back to it, if we are dealing with such a clause. However, when we try to announce an *ut*-clause which does not fulfill the semantic role Purpose by means of a constituent like *eo consilio*, the result is unacceptable, as (7) shows.

(7) a) me hortabatur ut domum irem eo consilio, ut ipse dormire posset ('He told me to go home with the following intention, namely that he himself could sleep')

    b) *me hortabatur eo consilio ut domum irem ('He told me with the following intention, namely to go home')[11])

In (7a) the constituent *eo consilio* announces the second *ut*-clause *ut . . . posset*. Sentence (7b), however, is not a well-formed sentence, if we analyze the clause *ut . . . irem* as referring to the content of the exhortation, that is, as COMPLEMENT: in that case *eo consilio* cannot refer to it, since it can only refer to ADJUNCT+ Purpose constituents, and consequently is left hanging in the air. The sentence would, of course, be acceptable in another interpretation[12]), namely if we analyze the *ut*-clause not as referring to the

---

[11]) Parallel examples in which both an obligatory and an optional constituent are present, the latter in the semantic role Purpose, and in which a constituent like *idcirco* may only refer to the Purpose-clause, are: *quod maxime petendum est, a vobis idcirco non peto, ne dubitare videar. Est autem petendum, ne . . .* ('What I should ask most, I do not ask from you, in order that I do not seem to hesitate. What I should ask, however, is that not ...' Cic. *Balb.* 19)

Although *petere ne* is in principle a well-formed pattern, as we see from the second sentence, we still cannot interprete the clause *ne . . . videar* as referring to the content of the request and *idcirco* as referring to it, nor can we interpret *idcirco* as referring to the OBJECT-clause *quod . . . est*.

A second example is: *quod iubebo scribito istic. Nam propterea te volo scribere ut pater cognoscat litteras quando legat. Scribe. :: Quid scribam?* ('write what I tell you down here. For I want yóu to write for the following reason, namely, in order that your father will recognize the handwriting when he reads it. Write. :: What should I write?' Pl. *Bac* 729sqq.).

Scribere ut is in itself a well-formed pattern, but, as we understand from the question which follows, *quid scribam*, we cannot interpret the *ut*-clause as referring to the content of the writing and *propterea* as referring to it. Only if we analyze the *ut*-clause as an ADJUNCT + Purpose clause, *propterea* may be understood to announce it, and can we interpret the sentence as a whole.

[12]) As was pointed out to me by Prof. K. Strunk (personal communication)

content of the exhortation, but as an ADJUNCT+Purpose clause. There would then be no COMPL. present in (7b) itself, something which may have been caused by contextual factors, or which may simply be wellformed because *hortari* may also occur as a two-place verb (cf. Part I, section 0.2). In any case, if we insist upon finding an interpretation for (7b), we either have to imagine some candidate for *eo consilio* to refer to óther than *ut . . . irem*, or we have to assume that there just is no COMPL. for whatever reasons, and take *ut . . . irem* as an ADJUNCT+Purpose clause announced by *eo consilio*. (Note that, in the latter case, we may still add some 'content'-constituent to the sentence, like *ad proficiscendum* or *ut proficiscerem* ('to leave'), without essentially changing the relation between *hortari* and *ut domum irem*.) This shows how the presence of constituents like *eo consilio* may disambiguate between the semantic role of obligatory constituents of the form *ut* plus subjunctive mood-ending governed by verbs like *hortari*, and the semantic role of optional Purpose clauses.

(vi) Answers to questions. A semantic test corresponding with the last one, is formed by looking at whether or not the *ut*-clauses under consideration may constitute an answer to questions introduced by the question words *cur, quare* ('Why, for what reason, for what purpose') or the expression *quo consilio* ('with what intention'). An example attested in Plautus will suffice.

(8) a) iube vasa pura apparari! :: cur? :: ut sacrufices. ('Order clean dishes to be made ready! :: Why? :: To make a sacrifice', Pl. *Capt.* 862)

b) *iube! :: cur? :: vasa pura apparari ('Order! :: Why? :: clean dishes to be made ready')

In (8a) one may apparently ask a question about the purpose of, or the reason why, the order must be given—by means of the word *cur*. Such a question would be redundant if *cur* referred to the content of the order, that is, to the constituent *vasa pura apparari* which fulfils the role-function complex OBJECT+Message in relation to *iubere*. That *cur* is not redundant appears from the nature of the answer. Example (8b), on the other hand, is unacceptable. I have nowhere found an instance in which a question about the nature of the content of the order contained within the clause was put by means of a word like *cur*. Since with the verb *iubere* we can also find a clause of the form *ut*+subjunctive as a filler of the same function, a small change in the examples

from an a.c.i. to an *ut*-clause would not invalidate the argument.[13])

I will now turn to two phenomena which are interconnected. These are exhibited to different degrees by *ut*-clauses in obligatory rfc's only, and are not shared by *ut*-clauses in the rfc ADJUNCT +Purpose (or, to my knowledge, any other *ut*-clauses). These phenomena are, firstly, the existence of certain restrictions upon the identity of constituents functioning within the *ut*-clause, and, secondly, of the possibility to replace the *ut*-clause by a single infinitive, under certain definable conditions.

(vii) Identity conditions. Consider the following list of examples, in which the various possibilities for the referential identity of the SUBJECT-constituent within the clause, and its semantic role relation to the verb which is PREDICATOR within the clause are demonstrated, with an indication of their degree of acceptability[14]).

(9) a) mihi dixit, ut portam clauderem ('He told me to shut the door')
   b) me admonuit, ut porta clauderetur ('He told me that the door should be closed')
   c) mihi imperavit, ut porta pateret ('He ordered me that the door should be open')
   d) *me hortabatur ut laudarer ('He admonished me to be praised')
   e) *mihi suasit ut me laudarent ('He advised me that they should praise me')[15])

(10) a) statuit ut portam clauderem ('He decided that I should close the door')
   b) decrevit ut portam clauderet ('He decided that he should close the door')

---

[13]) There is one question-word which cannot be used to differentiate between the two types of clause, since it may be used to ask questions about both. This is the word *quid*, which may mean either 'what' or 'why'.

[14]) The importance of incorporating the notion of referential identity into a description of the way in which sentences are formed is argued by Dik (1968).

[15]) For (9a), cf. *nuntiatum Simonidi ut prodiret* ('the message was sent to S. to go on' Cic. *De Orat.* 2, 353) and *vos admonendos puto ne putetis* ('I believe you should be warned not to think' Cic. *De Orat.* 3, 201).

For (9b) cf. *ei dicit in aurem ut domi lectuli sternantur* ('he whispered to him, that the couches should be arranged at home' *Rhet. Her.* 4, 63) and *imperat Centuperinis ut is victu adhiberetur* ('he ordered the people from C. that he should be provided with food' Cic. *Verr.* 5, 70).

For (9c) see *ne in unius imperium res recidat admonemur* ('we are warned not to let the power fall to one man' Cic. *Har.* 54) and *scripsi ad librarios ut fieret potestas* ('I have written to the librarians that there should rise an opportunity' Cic. *Att* 13, 21a, 14).

    c) ?statuit ut laudaretur ('He decided that he should be praised')

    d) ?decrevit ut illi se laudarent ('He decided that those men should praise him')[16])

(11) a) voluit ut portam clauderem ('He wanted me to close the door')

    b) voluit ut portam clauderet ('He wanted to close the door')

    c) voluit ut laudaretur — illi se laudarent ('He wanted to be praised— that those men praised him')[17])

Examples (9) are examples of three place verbs which have one constituent in the semantic role Adressee, either as INDIRECT OBJECT (in the dative case form) or as OBJECT (in the accusative case form), and one constituent in the semantic role Message (in the form of a clause introduced by *ut*). In (10) and (11) we find examples of two place verbs without a constituent in the semantic role Adressee. In connection with this difference in semantic roles the sentences in (9) exhibit certain identity restrictions differing from those in (10) and (11), which, probably, also differ from each other in this respect. I will start with an explanation of the conditions determining the well-formedness of (9 a–e).

In (9 a) there is referential identity between the constituents fulfilling the semantic role Adressee in the main sentence and the constituent fulfilling the role-function complex SUBJECT + Agent in relation to the activity denoted by *claudere*. The only difference with (9 b) is, that there the Agent of *claudere* is not explicitly mentioned within the clause. Still, the most obvious interpretation is that we have to do with referential identity between the Adressee in the main sentence and the implied Agent of the clause. This interpretation may be confirmed by explicitly mentioning the Agent by means of a constituent *a me*. In short, there may be referential identity between the constituent in the semantic role Adressee and the constituent in the semantic role Agent within the clause.

---

[16]) We find the pattern of (10a) in *decrevisse senatum ut cognoscerent consules* ('the senate had decided that the consuls should look into' Cic. *Brut.* 85); *statuitur ne sit Creta provincia* ('it is stated that C. should not be a province' Cic. *Phil.* 2, 97).

Sentence (10b) is parallelled by *statuerent Athenienses ut naves conscenderent* ('the Athenians decided to go aboard the ships' Cic. *Off.* 3, 48); *hic decernit ut miser sit* ('the man decided to be unhappy' Cic. *Tusc.* 3, 65), and *rus ut irem constitueram* ('I had decided to go to the country' Pl. *Ps.* 549).

[17]) For (11a–b) cf. *volo ut mihi respondeas tu* ('I want you to answer me' Cic. *Vat.* 14) and *volueram inquit ut quam plurimum cum te essem* ('I had wished, he said, to be with you as often as possible' Cic. *Att.* 13, 38a, 18), respectively. For (11c) I have no exact parallel.

16*

242   A. M. Bolkestein

However, in (9c) the case is a bit different. The verb within the clause, *patere* ('to be open'), is not a verb which necessarily implies the presence of a constituent in the semantic role Agent. Still we are able to interpret the sentence in a way which resembles the interpretation we give to (9a–b). Though we need not necessarily understand that the constituent referred to by *mihi* is asked to undertake the action of opening the door personally, we still understand this referent to be capable of exercising a certain control over the door being open (either by being in a situation in which he can take care of opening or keeping it open, or e.g. by influencing possible other persons being in a position to do so). In fact, such an interpretation is similar to the less obvious one possible in the case of (9b), that is, if we do not interpret (9b) as implying referential identity between Adressee and Agent. (We would then, however, expect an Agent-constituent like *ab eis* ('by them') to be explicitly mentioned in the clause (9b), to block the more obvious interpretation of *me* as being identical to the implied Agent). So we see, that although there may be referential identity between the Adressee-constituent of the main sentence and the Agent-constituent of the clause, this is not absolutely required. If there is no identity, we are still able to interpret the sentence by attributing a certain ability to control the situation expressed within the clause to the Adressee-constituent of the main sentence.

Though referential identity between Adressee and Agent is thus seen to be not obligatory, we may not conclude from this that it does not matter at all what referential identities happen to exist between the Adressee-constituent of the main sentence and whatever constituent in the clause. This is shown by the unacceptability of (9d). In this sentence there is referential identity between the Adressee-constituent of the main sentence and the SUBJECT+ Patient constituent in relation to the activity expressed by *laudare*. Sentence (9e) differs from (9d) only in syntactic pattern, not in semantic structure. In both sentences there is referential identity between the Adressee-constituent *mihi* and the constituent fulfilling the semantic role Patient in relation to the activity expressed by the verb *laudare*, but in (9e) this constituent fulfills the syntactic function OBJECT as opposed to (9d) where it is syntactically SUBJECT. Though we are able to find an interpretation for sentences in which the Adressee-constituent of the main sentence is not identical to the Agent of the verb within the clause, we have no possible interpretation for sentences in which the Adres-

see-constituent of the main sentence is identical to the Patient of the verb within the clause[18]).

The explanation for this may sound something like the following. In the case of verbs used to refer to the exchange of communication between human beings, that is, verbs belonging to the class of verba dicendi, where by means of an *ut*-clause we get some information about the content of the message exchanged, as in (9a–e), there appears to be a requirement that what is expressed within the clause is something over which the Adressee may reasonably be supposed to have a certain control. However, undergoing some action as a Patient is not such a thing, since that always depends on the intentions of some Agent[19]). Therefore referential identity between the Adressee of the main sentence and the Patient-constituent of the clause is semantically incomp-

---

[18]) There are a number of apparent contradictions to this rule. An example is: *qui Catilinae nuntiaret ne eum Lentulus ... aliique terrerent eoque magis properaret* ('who should advise C. that Lentulus ... and the others should not alarm him and that he should make the greater haste', Sal. *Cat.* 48,4). However, I would contend that, although superficially we might seem to have to do with referential identity between Adressee and Patient (*eum*), this is not really the case. A sentence like *Lentulus me terret* ('L. frightens me') may have two different semantic patterns, one in which *Lentulus* is not undertaking any activity, but is only the phenomenon causing the state of being afraid of *me*. In the latter case the sentence might be paraphrased as 'I am afraid of Lentulus'. The semantic structure is then not that of Agent and Patient, but that of Experiencer (*me*) and Phenomenon (*Lentulus*). See for a discussion of the difference in role-structure between the two versions e.g. Halliday (1968: 193sqq.) and Fillmore (1971: 39–40). The latter pattern is the one exhibited by our example from Sallust. Fulfilling the semantic role Experiencer is apparently more compatible with 'being able to exercise control' than having the semantic role Patient. This is why the continuation *properaret*, where the Adressee is identical to the Agent again, is not felt as all too strange.

[19]) See also the restrictions noted in Part I, 2.2. (iv), for the complement infinitives governed by *admonere²* and *hortari*. The importance of the concept of 'controllability' is effectively argued by Dik (1973). Before that time attempts to explain restrictions in English similar to the ones demonstrated here for Latin were usually formulated in syntactic terms, e.g. by Ross (1967), Rosenbaum (1967b) and Perlmutter (1968). See also note 24.

In fact, the same requirement rests on what may be expressed in independent imperative sentences. It is of course not accidental that there is a relation between certain types of clauses governed by verba dicendi and certain types of independent sentences. I will not go into the question of how this relation should be described here, because this would lead us rather far from our initial purpose. This problem is treated in Bolkestein (1976).

atible with the just mentioned requirement resting on clauses introduced by *ut* that are governed by verba dicendi. This is the reason why sentences like (9 d–e) are unacceptable in Latin.

I will now turn to examples (10 a–d). Since we are not dealing with an explicit Adresse-constituent in the main sentence nor with verbs belonging to the class of verba dicendi, we would expect there to be no problems about the identity of Agent- or Patient-constituents within the clause introduced by *ut*. Indeed, we may have an Agent-constituent either different from the SUBJECT of the main verb, as in (10 a), or referentially identical to it, as in (10 b)[20]. Of course the *ut*-clause may also be in the passive voice.

However, I have found no instances of clauses governed by these verbs with referential identity between their Patient-constituent and the SUBJECT of the main sentence, whether as syntactically SUBJECT (as in (10 c)), or as syntactically OBJECT, as in (10 d). Still I hesitate to classify (10 c–d) as unacceptable, because an explanation for their unacceptability is not as easy to find for these verbs as in the case of verba dicendi. But perhaps verbs like *decernere* and *statuere*, when governing an *ut*-clause, require their SUBJECT-constituents to be capable of exercising control over the situation expressed within the clause in a way similar to what is required from Adressee-constituents with verba dicendi and the 'command-like' message they get[21].

Sentences (11 a–c) show, that not for all verbs governing *ut*-clauses there are restrictions upon the referential identity of Agent- or Patient-constituents of the clause. With a verb like *velle* there are no conditions. The Agent may be referentially different or

---

[20]) Examples of the latter are scarce. The normal procedure seems to be, that the clause is replaced by an infinitive, whenever there is identity. See also my discussion of substitution under (viii).

[21]) One step further would be to describe the semantic role-relation of the SUBJECT-constituent of such verbs as a conflation of the two roles Speaker and Adressee, in the sense that the SUBJECT-constituent is somehow viewed as semantically similar to someone expressing a command-like message to himself-silently. That would mean that there is a parallelism between 'expressing in thought' and 'expressing in speech'. Support for this hypothesis would seem to be offered by the fact that these verbs may be used to refer to an activity the product of which may then function as a form of communication between human beings. It may be read aloud (cf. Liv. 32, 34, 11) or heard (Liv. 2, 27, 8) or written down on a tablet (Cic. *Phil.* 2, 97), that is, may be formulated in human language.

identical (11a–b, respectively)[22]) and there does not seem to be any objection against the Patient of the clause to be identical in reference to the SUBJECT-constituents of *velle*. Apparently one may wish whatever one wants regardless of whether one is able to exercise any control over the wished-for situation.

To summarize the result of this test, for certain classes of verbs which may govern *ut*-clauses there are restrictons regarding the referential identity of the Patient-constituent of the clause. For other classes there are no such restrictions. The test differentiates between *ut*-clauses governed by the first classes of verbs as obligatory constituents on the one hand, and optional *ut*-clauses in the rfc ADJUNCT + Purpose on the other, because there are no identity restrictions between any constituent of optional *ut*-clauses and any constituent of the main sentence. This is easily demonstrated by (12).

(12) a) duc me ad eam, ut videam ('Bring me to her in order that I see', cf. Ter. *An.* 818)

   b) opperiar, ut sciam ('I will wait in order to know', Ter. *An.* 235)

   c) ut tu sis sciens, ego hunc provolvam ('in order that you will know, I will roll him into . . .' Ter. *An.* 775–6)

In the above examples there are different referential identity relations between some constituent of the main clause and the SUBJECT of the *ut*-clause, but all sentences are perfectly acceptable and the list could easily be expanded further.

The above test does not differentiate between free *ut*-clauses in the rfc ADJUNCT + Purpose and obligatory *ut*-clauses governed by verbs like *velle*, which do not have such identity restrictions. However, there is one more test, which I have already hinted at, which differentiates between obligatory and optional *ut*-clauses consistently. This is the possibility to replace the obligatory *ut*-clause by a single infinitive, given certain identities between constituents of the clause and constituents of the main sentence.

(viii) Substitution by an infinitive. The phenomenon that the clause may be replaced by a single infinitive given certain identities is, as far as I know, common to all *ut*-clauses in three place patterns and for all *ut*-clauses in two place patterns governed by verbs indicating either production of speech or some kind of mental activity and attitude. For optional *ut*-clauses in the rfc ADJUNCT + Purpose the possibility does not exist. The phenomenon is demonstrated by the following sentences.

---

[22]) Cf. note 20.

246 **A. M. Bolkestein**

(13) a) mihi imperavit portam claudere ('He ordered me to close the door')
     b) *me hortabatur laudari ('He exhorted me to be praised')
(14) a) statuit portam claudere ('He decided to close the door')
     b) ?decrevit laudari ('He decided to be praised')
(15) a) voluit portam claudere ('He wanted to close the door')
     b) voluit laudari ('He wanted to be praised')[23])

If we compare the above examples with the sentences under (9–11), we see, that we have acceptable replacements for all cases in which the SUBJECT + Agent of the *ut*-clause was identical to the Adressee, as in (9), or SUBJECT, as in (10–11), of the main sentence. Since instances with referential identity between Adressee and Patient were unacceptable in (9), it was to be expected that we would not have (13b) as an acceptable possibility. Since we had no attested instances of cases where we had referential identity between SUBJECT and Patient in (10), it was also to be expected that we would not find instances of (14b) either. Since both identity between SUBJECT and Agent and identity between SUBJECT and Patient were acceptable in the case of (11), it is not surprising that replacement by a single infinitive is acceptable for both sentences in (15). That is, the acceptability conditions remain the same, whatever syntactic form the obligatory constituent has,

---

[23]) For (13a) cf. *me tibi scribere hortatur* ('advises me to write to you' Cic. *Fam.* 11, 20, 4). For (14a) *quod facere constitui* ('what I have decided to do' Cic. *Ac.* 2,46) and *legiones decreverunt senatum defendere* ('the legions decided to defend the senate 'Cic. *Phil.* 5,4).

(14a plus b?) cf. *qui statuit omnem cruciatum perferre, intolerabili dolere lacerari potius quam* ('who decided to bear every sort of pain, to be torn by unbearable grief rather than' Cic. *Ac.* 2, 23). The second clause with *lacerari* is the only instance of *statuere* governing a passive infinitive which I have found. Again (cf. note 18) one may wonder whether the semantic relation between the SUBJECT of *statuere* and the situation described by *lacerari* is one of Patient or one of Experiencer. Since the active version *dolor me lacerat* (litt. 'grief tears me') seems quite well-formed we at least do not need to suppose a human Agent to be involved in the event, as we should have if *aliquis me dolore lacerat* ('someone tears me with grief') had been the only possible active version. Even so, it is difficult to concieve of 'being torn by grief' as something over which one has a certain control, but cf. the example from Cic. *Tusc.* 3,65 *decrevit ut miser sit*. (There it is quite clear from the context that *miser esse* is viewed as a thing one will not normally decide to do.)

For (15a–b) cf. *non enim vincere tantum noluit, sed vinci voluit* ('for not only did he not want to win, but he wanted to loose' Liv. 2,59,2) and *quemadmodum sepeliri vellet* ('in which way he wanted to be buried' Cic. *Tusc.* 1,103).

because they are determined by semantic rules. However, the occurrence of the replacement is conditioned by syntactic factors: although we have (9b) as a well-formed pattern, where in one of the interpretations there may be referential identity between the Adressee and the Agent-constituent of the clause, the condition for infinitive substitution is identity between the Adressee and the SUBJECT-constituent of the clause (given the semantic condition that there may not be identity between Adressee and Patient). The same goes, mutatis mutandis, for the other examples. Only those semantically acceptable patterns in which there is also referential identity between the constituent which is syntactically SUBJECT of the clause and the relevant constituent of the main sentence have alternatives with single infinitive[24].

Now, replacement of an optional *ut*-clause in the rfc ADJUNCT + Purpose by an infinitive will normally lead to unacceptability, as is shown by the following examples.

(16) a) milites laudavit ut fortiter pugnarent ('He praised the soldiers in order that they would fight bravely')

b) *milites laudavit fortiter pugnare

c) fortiter pugnavit ut laudaretur ('He fought bravely in order to be praised')

d) *fortiter pugnavit laudari

Only after verbs belonging to a definable semantic class, namely those indicating movement, we may occasionally find infinitives instead of the expected *ut*-clause[25]. Apart from this limited class the infinitive substitution test differentiates between obligatory clauses of the form *ut* + subjunctive, which fill a place required by the main verb, and optional clauses of the same form, which may be added to a great variety of main sentences in the rfc ADJUNCT + Purpose.

---

[24]) Since referential identity between constituents is a semantic phenomenon, it is not surprising that semantic well-formedness, statable in terms of conditions of (non-)identity between constituents in specific semantic roles, as I have done in the case of (9) and (10), is the more important condition, which excludes a number of possibilities from being a basis for the syntactic simplification at all. This is also the reason why the syntactic approach referred to in note 19 is unsatisfactory.

[25]) In preclassical prose and augustean and later poetry, cf. *te quaerere misso nato* ('your son sent to look for you', Ov. *Her.* 1,37). Since we need either an indication of direction with a verb like *mittere* or an indication of the purpose for sending someone, the status of such a constituent as optional might be disputed. Cf. for example, the alternative form *qui quaereret* which is more frequently found with *mittere* than a clause introduced by *ut*.

248   A. M. Bolkestein

3. Conclusion

In this study I have presented eight different criteria by which *ut*-clauses in obligatory role-function complexes can be distinguished from *ut*-clauses in the optional role-function complex ADJUNCT + Purpose. Not all criteria are always applicable to all obligatory *ut*-clauses at the same time. Some are useful in the case of two place verbs but give less clear results in the case of three place verbs, while other are more relevant for the latter group of verbs governing *ut*-clauses. In any case, if a clause is shown to be an obligatory rfc-filler by one of the criteria, it will not be shown to be an ADJUNCT + Purpose-filler by the other. Where applicable the results will reinforce each other.

This means that we have offered a number of non-intuitive counterarguments against the semantic similarity assumed to exist between the two types of clauses on intuitive grounds. The priority given to the similarity in form in many traditional descriptions of *ut*-clauses is thus shown to obscure important differences in behaviour. At the same time this makes the hypothesis that the two types are historically related considerably weaker. Or at least, the fact that so many differences can be shown to exist forms rather a complication for such a theory. We have to conclude that a lot more facts about Latin need an explanation, before the historical development hypothesis can be accepted as right.

Bibliography

Bach, E. & R. T. Harms (eds.)
   1968   *Universals in Linguistic Theory*. New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston

Becker, A. L.
   1967   *A generative description of the English subject tagmemes*. Ann Arbor (unpubl. diss. Michigan)

Blatt, F.
   1952   *Précis de syntaxe latine*. Lyon-Paris. I.A.C.

Bolkestein, A. M.
   1976   'The relation between form and meaning of Latin subordinate clauses governed by *verba dicendi*'. *Mnemosyne* 39, 155–175; 268–300
           (forthcoming) Review of Happ, *Kratylos* 1977.

Brenous, J.
   1895   *Etudes sur les Hellénismes dans la syntaxe latine*. Paris, Thèse

Calboli, G.
  1971   'Costrittori nelle proposizioni complemento: I modi del verbo e l'infinitivo'. *Atti del 1° Convegno di Grammatica Trasformazionale Italiana* 63–96. Roma, Bulzoni

Chafe, W. L.
  1970   *Meaning and the Structure of Language.* Chicago, U. P.

Chomsky, N.
  1965   *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.* Cambridge, Mass. M.I.T.

Davidson, D. & G. Harman (eds.)
  1972   *Semantics of Natural Language.* Dordrecht, Reidel Publ. C.

De Geest, W. P. F.
  1972   *Complementaire Constructies bij Verba Sentiendi in het Nederlands.* Diss. Nijmegen

Dik, S. C.
  1968 a *Coordination: Its Implications for the Theory of General Linguistics.* Amsterdam, North-Holland
  1968 b 'Referential Identity'. *Lingua* 21, 70–97
  1973   'The Semantic representation of Manner Adverbials' in: Kraak, A. (ed.)

Ernout, A. & F. Thomas
  1964[3] *Syntaxe latine.* Paris, Klincksieck. abbrev.: E.-Th.

Fillmore, C. J.
  1968 a 'The Case for Case'. in: Bach, E. & R. T. Harms (eds.) 1–88
  1968 b 'Lexical entries for verbs'. *FoL* 4, 373–93
  1970   'Subjects, Speakers and Roles'. in: Davidson, D. & G. Harman (eds.)
  1971 a 'Types of lexical information'. in: Steinberg, D. D. & L. A. Jakobovits (eds.)
  1971 b 'Some problems for Case Grammar'. in: *Georgetown University Monograph Series* 24, 35–56

Halliday, M. A. K.
  1967   'Notes on Transitivity and Theme 1 & 2'. *JoL* 3, 37–81 and 199–244
  1968   'Notes on Transitivity and Theme 3'. *JoL* 4, 179–215

Happ, H.
  1976   *Grundfragen einer Dependenz-Grammatik des Lateinischen.* Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Helbig, G. (ed.)
  1971   *Beiträge zur Valenztheorie.* The Hague, Mouton

Helbig, G.
  1971   'Theoretische und praktische Aspekte eines Valenzmodells'. in: Helbig, G. (ed.), 31–51

Huddleston, R. D.
  1971   *The Sentence in written English.* Cambridge, U.P.

Hudson, R. A.
  1971   *English Complex Sentences. An introduction to systemic grammar.* Amsterdam, North-Holland

250   A. M. Bolkestein, The Differences etc.

Katz, J. J. & P. M. Postal
    1964   *An Integrated Theory of Linguistic Descriptions.* Cambridge, Mass. M.I.T.

Kenny, A.
    1963   *Action, Emotion and Will.* London, Routledge & Kegan Paul

Kooy, J. G.
    1971   *Ambiguity in natural language.* Amsterdam, North-Holland

Kraak, A. (ed.)
    1975   *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 1972–1973. Amsterdam, Van Gorkum

Kühner, R. & C. Stegmann
    1912² *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache II. Satzlehre.* repr. Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1962, in two vols;. abbrev.: K.-St.

Lakoff, R. T.
    1968   *Abstract Syntax and Latin Complementation.* Cambridge, Mass. M.I.T.

Löfstedt, E.
    1911   *Kommentar zur Peregr. Aeth., Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lat. Sprache.* Uppsala, repr. Darmstadt 1962

Lyons, J.
    1968   *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics.* Cambridge, U.P.

Perlmutter, D. M.
    1968   *Deep and Surface Constraints in Syntax.* (unpubl. diss. M.I.T.)

Pinkster, H.
    1971   'Review article on R. T. Lakoff, 'Abstract syntax and Latin complementation''. *Lingua* 26, 383–421
    1972   *On Latin Adverbs.* Amsterdam, North-Holland

Platt, J. T.
    1971   *Grammatical Form and Grammatical Meaning.* Amsterdam, North-Holland

Rosenbaum, P. S.
    1967 a 'Phrase Structure principles of English complex sentence formation'. *JoL* 3, 103–18
    1967 b *The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions.* Cambridge, Mass. M.I.T.

Ross, J. R.
    1967   *Constraints on Variables in Syntax.* (unpubl. diss. M.I.T.) reproduced by the Indiana University Linguistics Club, 1968

Steinberg, D. D. & L. A. Jakobovits (eds.)
    1971   *Semantics.* Cambridge, U.P.

Szantyr, A.
    1965   *Lateinische Grammatik II. Syntax und Stilistik.* München, Beck. (continues J. B. Hofmann's 1928 edition) abbrev.: Sz.

Thesaurus Linguae Latinae
              in progress. Leipzig, Teubner. abbrev.: Thes.