66   M. Esperanza Torrego

nen 'menschlichen Herrn': Octavian: δεσπότην φιλάνθρωπον ἑαυτῷ μνώμενος (Cic. 45,2 cf. Att. 1,17,5)[67]).

Unser hiermit vollständig vorgelegtes Material ist mehr als ein affektivisches Sondervokabular; es ist auch eine Form der Widerspiegelung des römischen Wesens bei den Griechen. Dieses erscheint in kraftvoller Sprache jenseits der marmornen Starre, die die Widerspiegelung sonst auszeichnet. Polemik ist der adäquate Ausdruck für den Machtmenschen.

The System of Substantive Clauses as Complement in Classical Latin*)

By M. ESPERANZA TORREGO, Madrid

The purpose of this article is to describe the meaningful oppositions between the different variants of substantive clauses in Classical Latin. The application of a method based on the criterion of the communicative function shows that two kinds of features can be distinguished whose combination makes it necessary, possible or impossible to use each type of substantive clause after several semantic classes of main verbs: a) the lexical meaning of these verbs, which lexicalize the communicative function of their subordinate clauses; b) the modal content borne by the predicate of the substantive clause. It is suggested as a conclusion that each kind of substantive clause is associated in Latin with the expression of a different communicative function of the language.

0. The traditional term "substantive clause" refers to sentential signifiers bearing the syntactic function of either subject or complement. The conventional analysis takes their signifiers as a point of departure of the description and interpretation of the system; then it examines together the distribution of both subject and complement sentences, thereby neglecting the fact that their syntactic function and their grammatical meaning are strongly associated. Clearly, then, a descriptive study of substantive clauses must first take into account their syntactic function; as a consequence, whatever conclu-

_____

[67]) Vgl. dazu Meyer 542–546.

sions are drawn concerning complement sentences may not be valid for sentential subjects, and viceversa.

Here we shall be concerned exclusively with the description of complement sentential signifiers, i.e. with sentences of the form (personal) Governing Verb (GV) + Complement sentence.

1. The following types of complement sentences can be found in Latin:

1) Accusative with Infinitive (AccI)
2) *Ut* + Subjunctive mood-ending[1])
3) *Quod* + indicativ mood-ending
4) *Quin/quominus/ne* + subjunctive mood-ending.

Such a variety of signifiers for a single function poses the question whether each of them lacks a specific meaning – being a variant of a unitary meaning whose appearance would be triggered by the previous choice of the GV on the part of the speaker –, or whether, on the contrary, their meaning is specific and independent of the main verb. It seems at first as if the Latin data could be used to support either alternative. In favour of the first one could adduce:

1) the alternation under certain GV's of sentential variants with identical meaning: *gaudeo te isse / gaudeo quod tu isti* ("I am glad that you went"), or *impero ut venias / impero te venire* ("I order you to come");

2) the development of *quod* into a universal conjunction after a certain period. This fact is attested first under the verbs *scio / dico*; it later affects declarative verbs and finally *quod* can introduce any complement clause, as Spanish and french show (Szantyr 1965: 572).

On the other hand, one could take the following to be indicative of the presence of a specific meaning:

1) the various complement sentence forms under a given GV are not synchronically interchangeable; the ungrammaticality of utterances like **impero quod venis* ("I order that you come"), or **gaudeo ut venias* ("I am glad that you are coming") may be attributed to their meaning;

2) certain verbs take different complement types and these exhibit systematic meaning oppositions; the difference in content between *dico ut venias* ("I tell you to come") and *dico te venire* ("I say that you are coming") provide a good example.

———————

[1]) Following Bolkestein (1976a), I shall use the term "mood-ending" to design the morphological mood and "Mood" to refer to the semantic category.

These data, which taken together yield an ambiguous picture, cannot all be granted the same status when it comes to determining the synchronic meaning of the complement clause system. The extension of *quod* as a universal conjunction – a key argument in Lakoff (1968) – may be relevant for the study of the system's evolution, i.e. in a work on diachronic syntax. But it need not imply that such an evolution stems from a deep structure synonymy. As for the synonymy between *quod* + indicative mood-ending and AccI in certain distributional patterns, it can be explained within the framework that I shall develop here (see 6.3 below), and thus constitues no serious obstacle for a proponent of the semantic specificity of complement sentences.

Recall also that the identity between *ut* + subjunctive mood-ending and infinitive has been taken by Rubio (1976) and Bolkestein (1976a) to show that AccI is the unmarked term in the complement system. But it is not, in my opinion, a valid argument, for in these patterns the infinitive variant and the conjunctional one are not syntactically comparable (see 5.3. below).

2. It can be found also a criterion based on the communicative function whose application to the study of the latin complement sentences shows that not only each of them is trager of a specific meaning, but also that the different communicative functions are responsible for the existence of the variants in the system of the complement clauses in Latin[2]). In other words, I try to demonstrate that the system of complement sentences in Classical Latin reproduces in subordinate periods every communicative function of language. This will allow also to explain why some of these sentence types progressively acquire a wider range of uses (AccI with *verba affectuum* and *quod* + indicative mood-ending with declarative verbs).

This article is organized as follows: first, the concept "communicative function" is defined, and the relation existing between verbal Moods and language functions is discussed (§3.), as well as the relation between independent messages having a communicative function and substantive clauses (§4.); then, each of the function of language is studied in independent messages and in the corresponding subordinate clauses (§ 5.-7.); finally, a number of conclusions are drawn concerning the system of Classical Latin complement sentences.

---

[2]) The interrelation between modality and substantive sentences has been set out for Ancient Greek by Crespo 1984.

3. The concept "communicative function", first formulated by
Bühler (1934), attributes to the language a communicational goal,
expressed in the independent messages by non-segmentable phonic
units, which can assume three kinds of meaning: a) an informative
meaning, used by the speaker when he informs about the surround-
ing world; b) an expressive one, attributed to the exspression of the
feelings provoked in the speaker by the facts he perceives; c) an
impressive one, used when the intention is to modify the environ-
ment. They correspond to the declarative or representational,
expressive and impressive function respectively.

Each of them contrains the verbal Mood, which has to be compat-
ible with its meaning. The declarative function, as that of the objec-
tive communication, assumes the modal content of the logical
Moods; the expressive function takes that of the *realis* Mood; the
impressive one finally, that of the imperative Mood, in a broad
sense.

The negation is also constrained by the communicational goal.
The adverb *ne* corresponds to the negation of the wishes and orders
whereas *non* is used to deny objective facts, i.e. real, potential and
non-real Moods (K-St. II 1: 814 ss.). As a consequence, the mood-end-
ing, as formal expression of verbal Mood, and the negation are both
morphological devices to identify the communicative function in the
independent messages.

4. The functional content of the phonic units can be expressed by
another procedure. It seems intuitively clear that there are syste-
matic semantic parallels between independent sentences having a
melodic communicative function and complex sentences of the form
GV + complement clause; thus:

(1) *venit.*   (1 a) *dico eum venire*
(2) *venit!*   (2 a) *gaudeo quod venit*
(3) *veniat!*   (3 a) *impero ut veniat.*

The cognitive content of (1)–(3) is the same as that of (1 a)–(3 a),
but they differ in the way it is expressed. The element bearing a
communicative function, conveyed by intonation (represented as /./,
/!/ and /!/) in (1)–(3), appears in the (a) series in the lexical content
of the GV (*dico / gaudeo / impero*). The lexical and grammatical con-
tent of the independent messages (1)–(3) is expressed in (1 a)–(3 a) in
the corresponding complement sentences[3]).

---

[3]) I shall not consider here the relation between independent messages with
an expressive function like Tib. I 10,2 *Quam ferreus ille fuit*! and complex sen-

70   M. Esperanza Torrego

The relation between (1)–(3) and (1 a)–(3 a) makes it possible to propound:

a) that the GV of the complement sentences are lexical devices for the expression of the communicative function;

b) that the grammatical contents of the various forms of complement sentences differ in the same features as the predicate of the independent messages; the phrases (1)–(3) show that the differences on function are accompanied by differences on Mood.

Then, it will be necessary to examine separately the formal expression of each of the communicative functions in the independent and subordinate messages in order to confirm a) and b).

5. Declarative function

5.1. In the independent messages the declarative function can be combined with the following verb Mood (Mariner 1957):

– *realis* Mood formaly expressed by the indicative mood-ending in the present, past and future tenses;

– potential Mood, expressed by means of the present and perfect subjunctive mood-ending; occasionally Latin uses the future indicative for the expression of potentiality (Szantyr 1965: 311);

– *irrealis* Mood, represented by the imperfect and plusperfect subjunctive, for the present and the past respectively.

They all have in common the expression of a truth value (that is why the Mood for the declarative function are considered logical Moods) and the negative adverb *non* (Szantyr 1965: 446).

5.2. The only form of complement sentence which can assume the expression of this pattern of verbal Moods is the AccI. Even though the infinitive as *nomen actionis* is originally incapable of expressing this verbal category, by the Classical period it can express these features thanks to a system of forms initially bearing notions of relative temporality; these end up expressing Moods due to the affinity between certain tenses and certains Moods. The system of the infinitive appears to be entirely parallel to that of the verbal Moods with declarative function (Mariner 1965):

---

tences like *miror quam ferreus ille fuerit!*, because the expressive lexical mark *quam* of the independent message appears also in the corresponding complement. For the same reason, I exclude indirect questions, which always exhibit a specific introductory element in their subordinate clause.

1) it permits the expression of *realis* Mood in a temporal form simultaneous, anterior or posterior to that of its GV, by means of the themes of the present, the perfect and the future *infectum*, as shown by the following sentences:

(4) Liv. 1.6.1 *hostes invasisse urbem atque adortos regiam dictitans.*

Invasisse and *adortos (esse)* express actions having occurred at a point in time preceding that of *dictitans*.

(5) Liv. 25.8.10 *nocte maxime commeare (eum) propter metum hostium*
      credebant;

the action of *commeare* is presented as real and simultaneous to that of the *credebant*.

(6) Liv. 34.12.3 *et sperate ipsas modum licentiae facturas;*
facturas indicates an idea later than that of *sperate*.

2) The potential Mood in the predicates of AccI sentences is expressed just like the future. As indicated in 5.1. in independent messages there are also contexts where future and potential are interchangeable, thanks to the semantic affinity between these two verbal forms – the same affinity that is exploited in the infinitive. For this reason, in (6) *facturas* (*esse*) can be interpreted either as potential or as posterior futur. Similary, the form *posse* + infinitive, lexical expression of potential Mood, amounts to a periphrasis of future infinitive (Szantyr 1965: 357), and is interchangeable with the theme in *-turum esse*. In the sentence

(7) Liv. 3.31.6 *et se damnari posse aiebant*

the infinitive *damnari posse* can be understood as a future posterior ("they said they were going to be condemned") or as a potential ("They said they could be condemned"), without substantially changing the content of the sentence.

3) The *irrealis* Mood, in turn, is expressed by means of the *-turum fuisse* form (Ernout-Thomas 1953: 326). In the system of the infinitive, this Mood, as the potential, does not allow for tense distinctions; it has only one form for simultaneity and anteriority. Thus:

(8) Liv. 40.55.3 *ne Romani quidem abnuunt magna sua cum clade*
      fuisse pugnaturos;

the AccI clause has here two possible meanings:

(8 a) *Romani pugnarent* – the form of the present *irrealis* –, or
(8 b) *Romani pugnavissent*, corresponding to the *irrealis* of past.

Temporal notions in the potential and *irrealis* Mood of the infinitive must be made clear by means of the context.

We could say, then, that the infinitive has a modal system which is sufficient for expressing the modal notions of the declarative function. This system allows us to establish systematic relations between AccI subordinate sentences and independent declarative messages; i.e. the sentences (4)–(8) can also be expressed by means of independent messages with melodic communicative function, and with the same modal content. So, for instance (4) could be expressed as

(4 a) *hostes invaserunt urbem atque adorti sunt regiam*;
the number (5) corresponds to

(5 a) *nocte maxime commeat propter metum hostium*;
the number (6) to

(6 a) *ipsae modum licentiae faciant* (or *facient*),
and so the other ones.

Conversely an independent declarative sentence as

(9) Caes. B. G. 3, 21, 1 *pugnatum est diu atque acriter*
could be expressed by means of a GV + AccI complement clause; thus:

(9 a) *Caesar scribit pugnatum esse diu atque acriter.*

The categorial content of the predicate of (9) is the same as (9 a); they differ only in the way in which the communicative function is expressed: (9) gets it together with the melodic contour; (9 a) through the functional lexical features of their GV.

5.3. The identity of modal system of AccI sentences and independent declaratives is necessary but not sufficient to substantiate the claim that this type of complement signifier is the vehicle for expressing the declarative function in a subordinate clause. We must also show that this kind of complement clause is univocaly associated with the declarative function, which is tantamount to saying, in the framework of our hypothesis, that it can only be subordinated to declarative verbs. This seems to be in conflict with two kinds of data:

1) AccI sentences subordinate to *verba affectuum*, which are associated with the expressive function, as in the pattern

(10) *gaudeo te venisse = gaudeo quod tu venisti*;

2) Infinitival complements to *verba imperandi,* corresponding to the impressive function as in

(11) *iubeo te venire = iubeo ut tu venias.*

On first inspection, then, we might think that AccI is an unmarked type of complement, capable of expressing any communicative function (Rubio 1976, Bolkestein 1976a, Kurzová 1970), and hence contradicting the hypothesis I am putting forward. I believe, however, that these facts can be interpreted otherwise.

Observe, first, that the type exemplified in (10) does not provide an argument against the semantic specifity of AccI, in so far as it has been establishes that such a specificity is contingent on the modal meaning of its predicate. The verbal Mood selected by the expressive function ist the *realis* one, either in present or perfect tenses. This Mood can be expressed also by an AccI clause by means of present and perfect tenses; therefore there is no reason why this signifier could not complement GV's associated with an expressive function (see also 6.3 below).

On the other hand, the data in (11) pose a more complex problem. There is no question that *verba imperandi* lexicalize the impressive function of language and that this function has nothing in common with the declarative one. How is it possible, then, that they share a subordinate signifier? The idea that AccI is an unmarked complement whose content is determined by the subordinating GV does not seem plausible to me: among infinitival complement governed by declarative GV's and those governed by impressive GV's the differences are sufficiently important to conclude that they do not have the same syntactic structure. Some of them are the following:

1) The present tense of the infinitive governed by *verba imperandi* does not signify *realis* Mood, i.e. lacks the modal features it gets from its own system when it is a predicate of a AccI sentence (as seen in 5.2.).

2) The passive constructions of impressive verbs are always personal; the type **iubetur eos venire* is ungrammatical. That allows to interpret that the accusative is not syntactic subject of the infinitive, but a complement of GV. Therefore the infinitive cannot be the predicate of the sentence but another complement of GV[4]).

---

4) Bolkestein (1976b) maintains that personal passives cannot be used to characterize either one of these types, since they both exhibit them. I believe they can, however, since the impersonal construction is excluded from Ac + infinitive structures whereas it is attested with AccI. The tense invariability, which exhibits the infinitive obeys to a lexical restriction of the GV and concerns also to the *ut* -clauses predicates.

Both features signal that the infinitival complement of an impressive verb is not an AccI structure but an Ac-Infinitive, an structure of double complementation, in which the infinitive, lacking Mood, appears in its nominal capacity as a *nomen actionis* (Wales 1982).

Latin has furthermore, a type of structure which provides significant independent evidence for the above analysis, but has been mysteriously neglected by students of the topic: the indirect style. Its importance lies in the fact that in this kind of a context - which may not be directly governed by any verb -, AccI sentences always have a declarative function, never an impressive one. The latter, as is well-known, is expressed by means of ∅ + subjunctive mood-ending. If AccI, as a complement sentence signifier, could also occur under impressive GV's, there would be no reason why it could not have an impressive function outside of government contexts. This evidence is, moreover, eminently compatible with the absence of a normal imperative infinitive in Latin; the data concerning this form are scarce and not compelling (Ernout-Thomas 1953: 272; Szantyr 1965: 366).

We can conclude, I believe, that by infinitival complement sentences we must mean exclusively structures where the infinitive is a predicate, i.e. expresses the tense and Mood features corresponding to its system and is the nucleus of a sentence. These conditions are satisfied by AccI subordinates to declarative GV's, but not by complements subordinate to impressive GV's. Infinitival sentences (AccI), therefore, are not an unmarked sentential signifier; on the contrary, they are univocally associated with the declarative function. We can safely say that they constitute the expressive vehicle of the declarative function in subordinating configurations.

5.4. The parallelism between independent messages with a melodic communicative function and the system of complement sentences implies a functional identification between communicative function and governing verbs. In turn, this poses the question how the single melodic communicative function can be split into such a wide variety of lexical GV's. To be sure, an independent declarative message can be expressed in subordinate structures by means of any GV taking AccI, provided that this AccI bears the Mood features of the declarative function. A sentence like

(12) *Romani vicerunt*

may be equivalent to any of the following:

(12 a) *dico Romanos vicisse*

(12 b) *arbitror Romanos vicisse*

(12 c) *audivi Romanos vicisse* etc.

Although these GV's lack a common lexical content, they all take complement sentences expressing the Mood features of the declarative function. Their lexical differences would correspond to the diverse attitudes accompaning in a speaker's mind the utterance of a single declarative statement; sentence (12) could imply an "I am reporting it" or an "I have heard it" "I believe it", "I swear it" etc.

Observe, however, that these nuances modify neither the grammatical meaning of the sentence (Mood and tense) nor its functional declarative content. In subordinate structures a single function, associated to a specific Mood content, can similary receive additional nuances which would be represented by each of the GV's.

6. Expressive function

6.1. The expressive function, through which the speaker expresses the feelings induced in him by facts, can only be combined with the realtity Mood,[5]) preferably in the present and past tenses; the future, expressing as it does processes which have not yet taken place, is subject to a certain degree of uncertainty that brings it close to the potential: its presence in this function is therefore theoretically possible but very infrequent.

Since the term "expressive function" can be somewhat confusing, I should like to point out that I am using it in a functional, not in a stylistic, sense. In functional terms an utterance is expressive if it contains a manifestation of "ego" when confronted with a verifiable event, not if it is caused by something not real, regardless of how much emotion it may give rise to. Consider the following examples:

---

[5]) The *irrealis* is possible in sentences whose GV is seen from the point of view of what logicians call "other possible worlds", for instance in "It would have made me happy if you had visited me". The world alluded to is not real, but this does not alter the fact that my happiness would have been contingent on an actual visit. This is made clear in Latin by the presence of the indicative mood-ending: *gavisus essem quod tu veniebas.*

76   M. Esperanza Torrego

(13) *pater venit!*

(14) *(utinam) pater veniat!*

They could both very well express certain feelings. But the intuition that they belong to the same communicative function is misleading, since they have no formal features in common: neither negation (*non/ne*), nor Moods (real / desiderative potential), nor the sentential signifier in their subordinate versions (*quod* + Indicativ / *ut* + subjunctive mood-ending) (13) expresses a feeling provoked by verifiable circumstances, whereas in (14) the feeling is caused by a fact that is not real and one wishes were so. The expressive aspect of (13) does not question the reality of the action described by the predicate; on the contrary, its very existence is due to the fact that it is real. (14) instead, is one of the forms through which the speaker tries to modify his/her environment, thus constituting a variant of the impressive function.

6.2. The content of the expressive function in subordinate structures is expressed in Latin by means of the so-called *verba affectuum* followed by *quod* + Indicative mood-ending or, in the Classical period, AccI sentences:

(15) Liv. 21.1.3 *Romanis indignantibus quod victoribus victi ultro inferrent arma;*[6])

(16) Liv. 5.4.5 *gaudebant idem partem anni se agrum suum colere.*

Two aspects of *quod* sentences are particulary relevant: their Mood and its meaning. The indicative mood-ending presents in them the reality value which is its mark and indeed determines the meaning of the whole sentence (Ernout-Thomas 1953: 295: "quod introduit des complétives qui indiquent une chose ou une circonstance effectivement réalisée et qui ... sont par suite à l'indicatif"). From the point of view of their meaning they are very close to causal complements; this is not due to the particle *quod*, however, but to the meaning of the GV's themselves. The complement of this kind of verb indicates the cause giving rise to the process they express, no matter whether it appears as *quod* sentence, as AccI, or as noun + case.

The *quod* complements must satisfy the same Mood conditions as the independent messages with a melodic expressive function: *realis* Mood, simultaneous tense, as in

---

6) The subjunctive mood-ending *inferrent* and any other further subjunctives are due to modal attraction or the indirect style (cf. Ernout-Thomas 1953: 295; Szantyr 1965: 575).

(17) Liv. 28.25.7 *laetari quod nihil tristius nec insanabilius esset,*
equivalent to

(17 a) *nihil tristius nec insanabilius est! (laetor),*
or *realis* Mood, anterior tense, as in

(18) Liv. 22.60.7 *cum prope gloriati sint quod se hostibus dediderint,*
related to

(18 a) *hostibus nos dedidimus! (gloriamur).*

6.3. AccI complements to *verba affectuum* must be understood as
an extension of the use of AccI under declarative GV's (Ernout-
Thomas 1953: 297). Under expressive verbs, the Mood system of
these sentences has the same meaning as the one they express under
declaratives, although it must take into account the restriction
against potential and *irrealis* proper to the expressive function; for-
mally, this restriction corresponds to the absence of *-turum esse /
fuisse* themes. The present and perfect themes as means of expres-
sing simultaneity and anteriority within the *realis* Mood are suffi-
ciently well documented:

(19) Liv. 3.38.3 *imperiumque ibi esse ubi non esset libertas indigna-
                    bantur;*
(20) Liv. 1.9.10 *mirantur tam brevi rem Romanam crevisse.*

The grammatical meaning of these sentential complements is
exactly the same as that of *quod*. They point to the cause giving rise
to the GV, which, as we saw above, is required by their functional
lexicon. As a consequence, sentences (19) and (20) are parallel to
independent messages like

(19 a) *imperium est ubi non est libertas!*
(20 a) *tam brevi res Romana crevit!*

AccI subordinates, characteristic of the declarative function, can
enter into this new pattern thanks in part to the fact that both func-
tions make use of the *realis* Mood. The difference between declar-
ative and expressive, in subordinate structures, is not manifest until
there appear different GV's:

(21) *Carthaginienses oppugnare narro*
(22) *Carthaginienses oppugnare indignor.*

Example (22) could adopt the typical signifier of the expressive
function:

(22 a) *indignor quod Carthaginienses oppugnant.*

78   M. Esperanza Torrego

The sentential nature of AccI with expressive function predicates
is confirmed by those syntactically autonomous predicates in which
these structures receive an expressive function, namely exclamative
infinitival sentences. These have the same Mood features as AccI
under expressive GV's: *realis* with simultaneos or anterior tense,[7]) as
in :

> (23) Cic. *Fam.* 14.1.1. *o me miserum! te in tantas aerumnas propter*
> *me incidisse.*

6.4. The above data imply that, in so far as the declarative and
expressive functions coincide in their use of Mood, *quod* and AccI
sentences are synonymus. In spite of it, the system uses each of them
for different purposes, in principle, as shown by the fact that in the
Classical period they are not interchangeable in every context. But
the artificiality of a functional separation between two signifiers
whose grammatical content is synonymus was soon to be felt. AccI
began to alternate with *quod* clauses under expressive GV's and,
later, *quod* + indicative mood-ending are documented as comple-
ment to declarative GV's in patterns of the type *dico / scio quod*
(Szantyr 1965: 576). This extension must also be accounted for in
terms of the modal meaning of the predicate; it also confirms the
relevance of this feature for the meaning of complement sentences.

6.5. The diversification of the expressive function into an indefi-
nite number of GV's must be understood in the same sense as the
same phenomenon in declaratives (cf. 5.4.). They represent the men-
tal attitudes which contribute a shade of meaning to a sentence hav-
ing an expressive communicative function but, although they enrich
the semantics of the statements, they are not grammatically relevant.

7. Impressive function

7.1. The complementation system used by Latin to express this
function in a subordinate clause is, like the ones discussed above,
syntactically and semantically parallel to independent messages with

---

[7]) I desagree on this point with Vairel-Carron (1975: 104 ff.), who claims that
these infinitives lack Mood. The fact that they exclude the *irrealis* and the con-
tingent does not prove that they are not real; on the contrary, contingency and
nonreality are excluded by the meaning of the expressive function which can be
attributed to these utterances. The same is true of AccI subordinates to *verba*
affectuum.

the same function. Impressivity in independent messages is the domain of the so-called imperative Mood, whose paradigm is fairly complex in languages like Latin and Spanish: the themes of the morphological imperative supplemented by some of the subjunctive mood-ending. It is not easy to analyze the meaning of the modal features in the verbal forms of the impressive function. First of all, note that predicates having this function lack a truth of value. This is probably the reason why it is so hard to answer the question what is the meaning of Mood in this function. The subjunctive mood-ending exhibited by some of its forms suggests that we treat them as a potential Mood with an impressive modality (Rubio 1968), but formal features like negation (*non/ne*) or the use of tenses (Touratier 1979), as well as the different expression this Mood and the imperative Mood acquire in the indirect style (*-turum esse* / $\emptyset$ subj.), seem to indicate that morphology is misleading in the impressive function. The modal meaning of verbs in this function cannot be made precise because the main factor in them is the communicative function.

7.2. It is traditionally accepted that there are two variants of the impressive Mood, and it will be convenient to keep them separate: the impressive proper and the desiderative. They differ in their use of verbal tenses. The meaning of the impressive variant excludes perfect tenses, except only in negative commands of the type

(24) Cic. *Att.* 1.9.2 *ne dubitaris mittere*

in which the perfect has not a past-tense value, but it is a suppletive form of the negated imperative present-tense. Therefore it has been interpreted as an aorist perfect (Ernout-Thomas 1953: 232). On the other hand, in the desiderative variant perfect forms such as the one in

(25) Cic. *Rep.* 4.8 *utinam ... vere auguraverim*

can be interpreted as resultative aspectuals (Ernout-Thomas 1953: 240) as aorists (Scherer 1975: 82) or as a past tense (Szantyr 1965: 331). This is of course due to the fact that one cannot formulate commands for the past, but only wishes.

7.3. Latin expresses the impressive variant in subordinate structures by means of *ut/ne* + subjunctive mood-ending sentences, in positive and negative commands respectively. The predicates in these types of sentences have similar tense and Mood characteristics:

1) temporal simultaneity tenses, excluding anteriority

(26) Liv. 3.21.7 *te, vero, Claudi, adhortor ut et ipse populum Romanum hac licentia arceas.*

80   M. Esperanza Torrego

(26 a) **adhortor ut ipse ... arcueris*

(27) Liv. 43.2.2 *ab senatu petierunt ne se socios foedius spoliari ve-*
      xarique quam hostis patiantur.

(27 a) **petierunt ne passi essent.*

2) Mood features identical to those of the imperative; the above
sentences are equivalent to independent messages with an impressive
function

(26 b) *arceas (arce) populum Romanum hac licentia*!

(27 b) *ne patiamini (ne passi sitis) nos spoliari vexarique*!

In the subordinate versions the impressive function is expressed in
the GV lexicon (*adhortor* and *peto*); in independent messages, the
contour bears it.

7.4. There is a kind of GV which can take AccI or *ut* + subjunc-
tive complements; with AccI the message takes a declarative sense,
with *ut* + subjunctive an impressive one (Ernout-Thomas 1953:
303):

(28) Liv. 27.37.3 *adiciebant sanguinis rivum in porta fluxisse.*

(29) Liv. 25.37.12 *Marcus adiecit ut ultro castra hostium oppugnaret*

Two solutions have been proposed in order to explain these verbs:

1) each of them has two different lexical entries: one for "saying",
which would take an AccI with a declarative content, and one for
"ordering", which would give an impressive content to its *ut* + sub-
junctive complements (Lakoff 1968);

2) the complement sentences themselves modify the meaning of
the whole message; AccI has a declarative meaning and *ut* an
impressive one (Rubio 1976: 127; Bolkestein 1976 a: 161).

I believe that the second alternative is closer to the truth, although
it can be refined. The declarative or impressive meaning, which is a
functional meaning, is not expressed by the sentence itself, but it is
received by the predicate either from the phonic units or from the
lexical units. The features which allow that a sentence can associate
with a function or with another one, are those of the Mood and its
predicate. Therefore it cannot be said that the AccI sentences, or the
independent messages with *realis,* potential or *irrealis* Mood, bear a
declarative meaning, but by virtue of its Mood content, they receive
as declarative the previously undefined function of the GV; for the
same reason *ut* + subjunctive sentences receive it as impressive.

7.5. Besides *ne* + subjunctive sentences, governed by the same
verbs as *ut* + subj., Latin negative impressive constructions resort to

a specific sentential signifier, *quin* + subj., whose presence is restricted to GV's with a negative lexeme, the so-called *verba impediendi*:

(30) Liv. 8.7.19 *nec te quidem recusare censeam quin ... restituas.*

As far as tense and Mood are concerned, these pattern exactly like *ut / ne*: they are variants conditioned by a lexical property of the GV, which represent the communicative function of independent messages as well as negation. A verb like *impedio* is functionally equivalent to *ne* + impressive modality. These sentences are actually synonymous to their *ne* counterparts: *impero ne* = *impedio quin.*

7.6. The desiderative variant is expressed in subordinate sentences by means of *ut / ne* + subj., just as in the impressive case except for the use of tenses. As in independent messages, these subordinates do not exclude perfect tenses, which, as we saw above, are excluded in the impressive variant:

(31) Cic. *Sull.* 1.1 *maxime vellem iudices ut P. Sulla et ... splendorem obtinere ... et fructum percipere potuisset.*

this sentence would correspond to an independent message like

(31 a) *(utinam) obtinere et percipere potuisset!*

The so-called complements of fear must be grouped together with desiratives, since their GV's are semantically related to verbs of wishing, and could even be considered negative desiratives: *timeo* = *non volo* = *nolo.* This relation is confirmed by their syntactic properties: sentences subordinate to verbs of fear exhibit the same tense pattern as desiratives, not excluding the perfect:

(32) *timeo ne venerit,*

related to

(32 a) *utinam ne venerit!*

Timeo ne is to the desiderative variant what *impedio quin* to the impressive.

8. Conclusions

From the above we can conclude the following:

1) the system of Latin complement sentences constitutes the expression of the different communicative functions of the language in subordinate structures.

82   M. Esperanza Torrego

2) Each of the sentential complement signifiers bears a specific meaning, determined by the Mood features of its own verbal predicate, these features being crucially responsible for its association with the different communicative functions represented in the GV's.

3) The Mood features expressed by each of the complement sentences are at the origin of diachronic switchings and extensions in the use of the different types.

4) The functioning of the different types of complement sentences is parallel to that of independent messages having a melodic communicative function in so far as tense and Mood restrictions are concerned.

5) The GV's behave with respect to complement sentences like communicative functions with respect to independent sentences. Some of their lexical properties – the ones we may call functional lexical properties – determine the presence of a given type of sentential complement and the absence of the others.

Bibliographic References

Bolkestein, A. M. (1976a): "The relation between Form and Meaning of Latin subordinate Clauses governed by *verba dicendi*", *Mnemosyne* 29; 155–175, 268–300.

(1976b): "AccI and *ut*-Clauses with *verba dicendi* in Latin", *Glotta* 54; 263–291.

Bühler, K. (1934): *Sprachtheorie*, Jena.

Crespo, E. (1984): "On the system of Substantive Clauses in Ancient Greek", *Glotta* 62; 1–16.

Ernout-A., F. Thomas (1953): *Syntaxe Latine*, Paris.

Kühner, R. – Stegmann, C. (1912): *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, Hannover.

Kurzova, H. (1970): "Der lateinische Infinitiv im Vergleich mit dem griechischen", *ZA* 20; 83–93.

Lakoff, R. (1968): *Abstract Syntax and Latin Complementation*, Cambridge Mass.

Mariner, S. (1957): "Estructura de la categoría verbal "modo" en latín clássico", *Emerita* 25; 449–485.

(1965): "Noción básica de los modos en el estilo indirecto latino", *Emerita* 33; 47–59.

Rubio, L. (1968): "Los modos verbales latinos en oración independiente", *Emerita* 35; 77–96.

(1976): "La subordinación", *Introducción a la Sintaxis Estructural de Latín* II, Barcelona; 79–173.

Scherer, A. (1975): *Handbuch der lateinischen Syntax*, Heidelberg.

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

Touratier, Ch. (1979): "Valeurs et fonctionnement du subjonctif latin", *REL* 55; 370–406.

Vairel-Carron, H. (1975): *Exclamation, ordre et défense. Analyse de deux systemes syntaxiques en latin*. Paris.

Wales, M. L. (1982): "Another look at the latin Accusative and Infinitive", *Lingua* 56; 127–152.

One Instance of the Partitive Subject in Literary Latin

Plin. Ep. 10. 96. 10 again

By Hannah Rosén, Jerusalem

Summary

Passimque uenire uictimarum (Plin. ep. 10.96.10), an expression generally emendated or supplemented, is upheld in its transmitted form. The genitive *uictimarum* is shown to be a partitive subject occuring in a literary Classical source (as against partitive subjects in the shape of prepositional (*de-*, *ex-*) phrases in later and Vulgar sources), a unique occurrence having ensued in the line of choosing between alternatives which belong to different registers of the Latin language.

The message in paragraph 10 of Pliny's letter 10.96 is clear: in the course of recess in exercising Christian faith and return to pagan habits, cults long interrupted are reported to be restored and sacrificial requisites claimed to be found again on the market:

> *certe satis constat prope iam desolata templa coepisse celebrari et sacra sollemnia diu intermissa repeti ...*

There is, however, divergence as concerns the subsequent words, two lines of recension having been applied to the last part of this sentence in current editions:

(1) *pastumque uenire uictimarum cuius adhuc rarissimus emptor inueniebatur.*

S. E. Stout, in his 1962 U. of Indiana edition, is the only one among modern editors to uphold this reading with *pastum*: "and fodder for