

Concepción Cabrillana

Praedicativum and subject complement

A question revisited in light of the Latin verb *sto*

Abstract: The problematic distinction in Latin between the praedicativum and the subject complement has been the subject of various scholarly discussions; despite progress made here, difficulties in the identification of each of these functions persist. This is the case with the predicate to be the basis for the present study – *sto* – which, in addition, is not generally included in the traditional list of copulative verbs.

Based on the conclusions of a previous study, we (i) review omissibility as a fundamental criterion in the distinction between praedicativum and subject complement, and (ii) propose and verify the relevance of a new aspect – constituent order – as a subsidiary criterion in the disambiguation between the two functions.

The results of the study will make it possible to shed some light on the specific way in which the test for omissibility would need to be applied, the possibility of a gradual distinction rather than a binary distinction between the two syntactic functions analysed, and the role of constituent order in differentiating the two structures. In addition, these findings may also strengthen the idea that the verb *sto* has, since classical times, undergone a gradual process of copularization.

Keywords: Latin linguistics, praedicativum, subject complement, *sto*, copularization, word order

Acknowledgment: This study forms part of the Research Projects FFI2013–47357–C4–4–P (‘Problems of government in Greek and Latin: stative and existential verbs’) and FFI2017–83310–C3–2–P (‘The Lexicon-Syntax Interface in Greek and Latin: Praedicativum and copularization processes’), funded by the Ministry of Economics and Competitiveness (Spanish Government) and the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) FEDER funds.

Concepción Cabrillana, University of Santiago de Compostela, Spain

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110678222-007>

1 Introduction: objectives, previous studies, criteria for analysis

The difficult distinction between the praedicativum (*P*) and the subject complement (*SubjC*), especially when these elements agree with the subject (*S*) constituent¹ or are in combination with specific predicates, has been the focus of previous discussions.²

Clear examples of these two functions are (1) and (2), respectively:

- (1) *ubi sunt isti scortatores qui soli inuiti cubant?*³ (PLAUT. Amph. 286): P
‘where are those lechers who are lying **alone against their will**?’⁴
- (2) *nam et praecleara res est et sumus . . . otiosi.* (CIC. Lael. 17): SubjC
‘for the subject is a **noble** one, and we are . . . **free from public business.**’

This distinction becomes especially complicated with verbs that might have copulative uses in addition to their more frequent non-copulative ones. In a previous study,⁵ I addressed this issue to some extent; one finding was that the criterion of omissibility⁶ – one of the criteria most often invoked to distinguish the two functions in question – was shown to be relevant if applied not only at the syntactic level but also at the informational level.

1 As we know, in the case of SubjC, this function can be carried out, for example, by adverbs, or the S can be a sentence, an infinitive, etc. There are more numerous possibilities for the P, which can also be coded by Prepositional phrases or Noun Phrases in cases other than the nominative, by subordinate clauses, etc.

2 See, e.g., Pfister (1973), Longrée (1989), Pinkster (1983, 1991, 1995: 181–210).

3 Latin texts, where not otherwise indicated, are taken from the website Perseus, which itself contains the material used for the REGLA (D)ata–(B)ase; in the case of Cato and Pliny (*paneg.*) the Latin texts are from the Loeb edition; for Columella, they are from the online version of PHI #5.3. The works by these authors selected for analysis are not available at the Perseus site.

4 Translations, except when otherwise indicated, and at the risk that they do not always adequately reflect the nuance of the verb, are taken from the Loeb Classical Library. When these deviate excessively from the structure of the original Latin text, I provide my own English translations, these made using translations from the Spanish series *Biblioteca Clásica Gredos*.

5 Cabrillana (2010).

6 For the theoretical model which argues in favour of, and illustrates, the relation between the meaning of the verb and the properties of the constituents that this verb selects as obligatory see, e.g., Dik (1989), Van Valin and LaPolla (1997), Devine and Stephens (2013, especially Ch. 3) and Pinkster (2015, especially Ch. 4).

For the specific functions examined in that study, the analysis was based on a selection of verbs traditionally considered to be copulatives,⁷ or which could be said to be susceptible to having copulative uses in certain contexts. As a means of building a working corpus, occurrences of these verbs were analysed when they appeared with 50 adjectives or with participles of different semantic classes, those which – once again according to traditional grammar⁸ – frequently perform the function of P. It was concluded that the criterion of omissibility could be considered not only at the syntactic level; rather, its application implied that, in the structures under investigation here, an interpretation consideration was possible which was similar to the argumental structure in copulative and non-copulative predicates, in such a way that verbs like *esse* could be analysed in the same manner as other, non-copulative verbs. Within this group of verbs, it was seen that, in contrast to *esse*, which showed a clear preference for occurring with the SubjC, *sto* showed the contrary tendency (preference for the construction with P), even if the data for this verb were scant.

In the present study the selection of analysable instances will be made differently, that is, without any restriction on the type of adjective/participle, but limiting the verb nucleus to a single predicate (*sto*) with which such determinations appear; the reason for this was that, on the one hand, *sto* was found with these adjectives/participles in only 13 cases from a total of 611 occurrences in the corpus,⁹ and, on the other hand, that the verb *sto* is usually not included among the copulatives,¹⁰ although several authors,¹¹ though not specifically for Latin, have considered comparable forms in other languages to be a ‘semi-copula’ or ‘pseudo-copula’.¹²

7 See Kühner and Stegmann (1912, I: 15–19): among others, *feri, nasci – renasci, existere, manere – permanere – remanere, uideri, apparere, euadere*.

8 Kühner-Stegmann (1912, I: 235–237).

9 Cf. Cabrillana (2010: 239).

10 See Pinkster (1987: 216–217), Cabrillana (2018).

11 See, e.g., Hengeveld (1992: 41–42, 237).

12 Hengeveld (1992: 41) provides examples such as ‘John stood alone’ and ‘Sheila stood in a need of help’ and argues for ‘to stand’ to be understood as a ‘semi-copula’, providing, among other arguments, the fact that it would not be correct to paraphrase the former sentence as ‘John stood while he was alone’. Something similar can be said of PLIN. *paneg.* 94,3: *neque enim sine auxilio tuo, quum altissima quaeque quaterentur, hic, qui omnibus excelsior erat, inconcussus stetit*: (‘no one could have stood high above them all and remained untouched except by your intervention’).

The choice of *sto* as object of the present study is also justified by my observation, in another study,¹³ that this predicate exhibits certain features in common¹⁴ with verbs that do have unequivocally copulative uses. Those verbs – such as *maneo*, *fio*, etc. – show occasional difficulties when we try to distinguish clearly whether, in a construction in which S and adjective/participle appear in concordance, the latter has to be considered P or SubjC: it is very much possible that we are dealing here with examples which are in different stages of the process of copularization. The same might be said of *sto*. From this and other characteristics arises the hypothesis that *sto* could effectively be considered copulative in certain conditions.¹⁵ Without doubt, in terms of relative frequency this verb shows 1) a fairly significant number of cases in which the semantic value of *sto* is its locative macro-meaning ('to be standing up / stand [somewhere]'); 2) a lower number of instances with SubjC than in other verbs usually considered to be copulatives. This is consistent with Hengeveld (1992: 238–240): the frequency of P is higher when the copulative realization of the verb is less generalised.

Statistical support for this claim appears in Table 1, where we can compare the behaviour of several verbs with recognised copulative uses with that of *sto*: in the case of the latter, the proportions are the inverse of what is observed for the other verbs. These statistics and all other data in the present study are taken from the REGLA–D(ata)B(ase): CATO (agr.), PLAVT. (Amph., Asin., Aul., Bacch., Capt., Cas., Curc., Epid.), CAES. (Gall.), SALL. (Catil., Iug.), CIC. (Verr., Catil., S. Rosc., Mil.,

Table 1: Frequency of SubjC and P in REGLA DB.

Function/Verb	<i>exsisto</i> (110x)	<i>fio</i> (2315x)	<i>maneo</i> (359x)	<i>sto</i> (458x)
SubjC	31x (28.18%)	641x (27.68%)	51x (14.20%)	38x (8.29%)
P	3x (2.72%)	17x (0.73%)	7x (1.94%)	66x (14.41%)

¹³ Cabrillana (forthcoming).

¹⁴ E.g., the particular status of the locative element in the majority construction of *sto*, the presence of existential constructions and the corresponding diffuse boundary between these and the locative structures, or the incipient appearance of constructions comparable to purely copulative ones.

¹⁵ See Cabrillana (2015: Section 2.1.1 and pp. 204, 208, 214); Cabrillana (2016: 324–325); Cabrillana (2018: 619–623). See, also, Ernout and Meillet (1932 [1985]), s.v. *sto*, in relation, among others, to LVCR. 5, 199 (*tanta stat* [sc. *natura*], *praedita culpa* ['so great are the faults with which it stands endowed'], where – they point out – '*stat* joue le rôle de la copule').

Mur., Sest., dom., off.), Ov. (met.), LIV. 1–10, COLVM., PLIN. (paneg.), PLIN. (nat.), TAC. (ann.), SEN. (dial. 6, 12; epist.), PETRON.¹⁶

The main focus of this study is on the criteria for distinguishing the two constructions: omissibility¹⁷ (Section 2) and, in a somewhat subsidiary way – hence more briefly – the order of constituents (Section 3). The principal aims of such an approach are: 1) to revisit the question of omissibility as a fundamental criterion in the distinction between P and SubjC; 2) to see whether constituent order may constitute a distinctive aspect in structures with P and with SubjC, that is, whether in the case of the construction appearing to be a SubjC this implies a different order, e.g. with respect to the verb, from when what appears is a P; 3) to confirm whether, in the contexts analysed here and in a general way, *sto* behaves like other, ‘officially’ copulative verbs.¹⁸

2 Test of omissibility

2.1 Cases of praedicativum

Let us first consider some cases that can be analysed most clearly as P, both by the application of the test of omissibility and by looking at contextual information.

- (3) *ceteri tribunal ingenti agmine circumueniunt. **stabat** Drusus silentium manu **poscens**.* (TAC. ann. 1, 25, 1)
 ‘the rest, in one great mass, flocked round the tribunal. Drusus **stood**, **beckoning** with his hand for silence.’

In (3), a certain contrast seems to exist between *circumueniunt* and *stabat*: their position in chiasmus at the very end and the beginning of two sentences underlines the movement necessary so that the S of *circumueniunt* can take that

¹⁶ In the case of *sto*, Lucretius has been included, which contains a total of 15x.

¹⁷ I refer to the omissibility of Ps (see Pfister 1973: 157, Pinkster 1995: 207, 2015: 30) or ‘secondary predicates’.

¹⁸ For reasons of space, I will not discuss the criterion of the non-permanent quality of nominal complementation or of the evaluative nature of this, that is, those criteria in which it is understood that the adjectives that make reference to a permanent property cannot be used as P, while those which indicate an evaluation can (see Pinkster 2015: 46; in prep.: Sections 1.1.1.1.–21.3; Sections 1.1.1.1.–21.4); I thank H. Pinkster for having provided me with a pre-publication version of chapter 21 of the second volume of *The Oxford Latin syntax*.

position in contrast to the static position of Drusus, something which seems to be focalized. Against this, *silentium manu poscens*¹⁹ is nothing more than the expression of a concomitant circumstance at a specific moment while Drusus is present,²⁰ which from a syntactic perspective is not essential to make the rest of the sentence inappropriate in terms of normal grammatical rules, although with its omission part of the information is lost; this is nothing unusual, and indeed happens with all satellites.

There are contexts of *sto* with a clearly locative value in which the constituent with the Semantic Function of Location is explicit, and this makes easier the identification of adjectives or participles which are in agreement with the S as having a P function,²¹ even when, as in (4) – *multitudinem ... prospectantes*,²² – such agreement is *ad sensum*:

- (4) ***stare omnem multitudinem ad portas uiam hinc ferentem prospectantes certum habeo***. (LIV. 7, 30, 22)
 ‘well I know that **all the people are standing at the gates, their eyes fixed on** the northern road.’

In addition to the above cases, in some contexts of clear locative structure there appears an adjective or participle in agreement with the S which shows either a desire to express a certain degree of focalization on the position that this S adopts (5a), or – without both reasons being mutually exclusive – the need to give the verb a semantic value which is possibly lost (5b, 5c): the principal locative meaning of *sto*; all this allows us to suggest a development towards the possible function of SubjC of the adjective/participles in these contexts:

¹⁹ There would be the possibility of understanding the structure with the verb in personal form and the present participle as a complex verbal expression, and not so much as a combination of the copula and participle, functioning as an adjective P/SubjC: see, especially for late cases, Haverling (2010: 496–497) and Pinkster (2015: 545–546). Pinkster (2015: 546) notes more specifically, referring to Christian texts, that the present participle is found as an element that describes not only actions or processes but also ‘*properties of the Subject constituent*’ (italics mine). For reasons of space I will not enter into this discussion here; I merely want to draw attention to the fact that this type of structure is documented both with *sum* and with *sto* and that the properties expressed by the participle are usually not stable.

²⁰ On the temporal anchoring of Ps at the moment of the realization of the action, process or verbal state, see Pinkster (1995: 194, 2015: 223).

²¹ The same occurs in other copulative verbs, such as *maneo*; see, e.g., LIV. 42, 15, 10 and TAC. Agr. 14, 1.

²² On the role of the present participle, see the comments on (3).

- (5a) *columellam ferream, quae in miliario stat, eam rectam stare oportet in medio ad perpendicularum.* (CATO agr. 20, 1)
 ‘the iron pivot which stands on the post **must stand straight upright** in the centre.’
- (5b) ... *balneum intrauimus, angustum scilicet et cisternae frigidariae simile, in quo Trimalchio rectus stabat.* (PETRON. 73, 2)
 ‘... we went in. It was a tiny place like a cold-water cistern, and Trimalchio **was standing upright** in it.’
- (5c) *stant obnixi Samnites, quamquam plura accipiunt quam inferunt uolnera.* (LIV. 7, 33, 12)
 ‘the Samnites **stood manfully** at bay, but they took more strokes than they delivered.’

When the meaning of the verb is not exclusively locative, the presence of adjectives or participles of this type (e.g., *firmus*, *immotus*, etc.) serves to reinforce – even more so – the possibly weakened semantic content of the verb, in order to offer a clearer idea of the type of state or situation in which the S is found, although in a strict sense the verb on its own and of itself would have sufficed:

- (6a) *aduersus incitatas turmas stetit immota Samnitium acies.* (LIV. 10, 14, 16)
 ‘the Samnite line **held firm** against their galloping squadrons.’
- (6b) *haliaëtus tantum inplumes etiamnum pullos suos percutiens subinde cogit aduersos intueri solis radios ... illum, cuius acies firma contra stetit, educat.* (PLIN. nat. 10, 10)
 ‘the sea-eagle only compels its still unfledged chicks by beating them to gaze full at the rays of the sun ... , whereas one whose gaze **stands firm** against the light it rears.’

2.2 Co-occurrence of P and SubjC

The boundary between (5a)–(5c) and (6a)–(6b) might well be gradual, in that in more than a few cases the ambiguity is not altogether resolvable,²³ and on

²³ On this difficulty, see Pinkster (2015: 206 and in prep.: sections 1.1–21.1).

occasion a single variation in punctuation in the Latin text can tip an interpretation towards the adjective or the corresponding participle as P or as SubjC; let us consider an example in which interpretations can appear to be somewhat different:

- (7) *Gallos quoque uelut obstupefactos miraculum uictoriae tam repentinae tenuit, et ipsi pauore defixi primum steterunt, uelut ignari quid accidisset.* (Liv. 5, 39, 1) ‘the very Gauls themselves, stunned by the marvellous victory they had so suddenly gained, at first **stood rooted to the spot with amazement**, like men that knew not what had happened’ / ‘ma anche i Galli, attoniti di fronte a quella vittoria miracolosa ottenuta in maniera così repentina, **rimasero sulle prime immobili** per lo sbigottimento, come se non riuscissero a capacitarsi di quanto era successo²⁴ / ‘por su parte, los galos, ante lo extraordinario de una victoria tan repentina, quedaron como estupefactos y también ellos, en un principio, **se detuvieron, paralizados de pánico**, como no comprendiendo qué había ocurrido²⁵ / ‘les Gaulois, de leur côté, étaient comme stupéfaits d’une victoire si prodigieuse et si soudaine; eux-mêmes ils restèrent d’abord immobiles de peur, sachant à peine ce qui venait d’arriver; puis ils craignirent qu’il n’y eût là quelque piège.’²⁶

The English and Italian interpretations seem to understand *defixi* as a SubjC; indeed, the English structure ‘to the spot’ (an ‘idiom’) typically occurs with verbs like ‘to be’ and ‘to become’,²⁷ although also with ‘to stand’. Nevertheless, in a context such as this:

- (8) *et ipsi, pauore defixi, primum steterunt, uelut ignari quid accidisset*

the proposed punctuation – which is reflected in the Spanish translation – is enough to suggest that *defixi* could not be understood as SubjC. The French translation, in turn, seems to take a path somewhere between the two possibilities, yet inclining towards the SubjC. This latter interpretation would be seen to be the favoured one in view of the fact that another element is present with

²⁴ Translation taken from the website Progetto Ovidio:

www.progettovidio.it/showlink.asp?CatID=8 (accessed: June 2016).

²⁵ Translation taken from the series *Biblioteca Clásica Gredos*.

²⁶ Translation taken from the website *Itinera electronica – Bibliotheca Classica Selecta*: bcs.fltr.ucl.ac.be/LIV/V.html#5-39 (accessed: June 2016).

²⁷ See *McGraw-Hill Dictionary of American Idioms and Phrasal Verbs* (2002); retrieved 2016.

a greater probability of being P: in the case of *ignari*, the participle follows the verb²⁸ and definitely denotes a way ‘to stand’ in temporal concordance²⁹ with *defixi stare*.

A similar case is seen in (9), with elements susceptible to being understood as SubjC (*obstricti*) and P (*timentes*) respectively:

- (9) *iis uinculis fugae obstricti stabant ciuem magis quam hostem timentes*.
(LIV. 10, 41, 3)
‘they **resisted gripped** by these bands so that they could not flee, more **from fear** for their compatriots than for their enemies.’

The possibility of the existence of a process of ‘copularization’³⁰ for *sto* finds support in both historical and typological accounts.³¹ In this respect, Hengeveld (1992: 239) claims: “positional verbs may develop into localizing copulas in the course of time”. Later, the same author (Hengeveld 1992: 244) refers to cases in which the use of certain adjectives might contribute to the development of such a process: “the predicability of adjectival predications opens up a potential ‘bridge’ from the localizing to the equative domain”.

As in all processes of change, intermediate situations arise which are difficult to catalogue. Indeed, such might be the case with examples (5a)–(5c), (6a)–(6b).

2.3 Cases of SubjC

In addition to those cases illustrated in Section 2.1, others can be found in which the omission of the adjectival/participial element would lead, on occasion, to non-grammaticality of the resulting construction, always leading to a significant semantic–pragmatic incoherence. Let us consider (10a)–(10b):

- (10a) “*male uiuunt, qui semper uiuere incipiunt.*” “*quare?*” *inquis, desiderat enim explanationem ista uox. quia semper illis imperfecta uita est. non potest autem stare paratus ad mortem, qui modo incipit uiuere. Id agendum est, ut satis uixerimus.* (SEN. epist. 23, 10)

²⁸ See Section 3.

²⁹ Regarding this characteristic of Ps, see the comments on (3).

³⁰ See Pinkster (1987: 216–217, 2015: 206–207). In a partially different sense, see Cabrillana (2018: 615–623).

³¹ See, e.g., Pountain (1982), Bentley and Ciconte (2016).

“They live ill who are always beginning to live.” You are right in asking why; the saying certainly stands in need of a commentary. It is because the life of such persons is always incomplete. But a man cannot **stand prepared for the approach of death** if he has just begun to live. We must make it our aim already to have lived long enough.’

(10b) *? *non potest autem *stare ad mortem, qui modo incipit uiuere. id agendum est, ut satis uixerimus.*

‘but a man cannot *?stand for the approach of death if he has just begun to live.’

In this case – in a clearly non-locative use of *sto* – the intention of Seneca is to show the correct way to live, and accordingly to die, or at least to be prepared for death, after a period taken up by the learning process. It could be argued that in omitting *paratus* it would also be necessary to leave out *ad mortem* – that, even in the reconstruction, it is a prepositional phrase that does not appear with *stare*, at least in the classical era – because this prepositional phrase depends on the participle: the result would be even more absurd, since it would not be possible to make a semantically valid interpretation in this context on the lines of ‘and who barely begins to live cannot be [standing / stopped] / continuing to exist’, since the philosopher refers not to a physical mode of being in one so recently born, but rather to the fact that this individual is as yet unable to be internally prepared for death

Let us now analyse an example with a special connection between the clause in which *sto* appears and its consecutive clause:

(11a) *trium populorum exercitus ita stetit instructus ut dextrum cornu Veientes, sinistrum Falisci tenerent, medii Fidenates essent.* (LIV. 4, 18, 4)

‘the army of the three nations **was so drawn up** that the Veientes held the right wing, the Faliscans the left, and the Fidenates formed the centre.’

(11b) *? *trium populorum exercitus ita stetit ut dextrum cornu Veientes, sinistrum Falisci tenerent, medii Fidenates essent.*

‘the army of the three nations *?was so that the Veientes held the right wing, the Faliscans the left, and the Fidenates formed the centre.’

The *raison d’être* of what is developed by the second part of the consecutive clause – the actual readiness of each army – is an explicitation of the participle *instructus*, present in the first part of the correlation and pragmatically

focused.³² In accordance with this, the presence of *ut dextrum, sinistrum, medii . . . essent* would not make full sense if *instructus* – and, of course, *ita* – has not previously been introduced.

Finally, a special and relatively infrequent case is that in which a SubjC and a P might co-occur, at different syntactic levels, since, owing to the position they occupy in the linguistic chain, it would be somewhat strange to consider these to be two Ps at the same level³³:

(12) *aliquamdiu intenti utrimque steterunt expectantes ut ab aduersariis clamor et pugna incipere.* (Liv. 9, 32, 5)

‘for some time both sides **stood fast, observing** one another closely, each waiting for the other to give a cheer and begin to fight.’

It certainly would not be syntactically impossible to omit *intenti*, candidate to be the SubjC; indeed, *expectantes*³⁴ and its completive subordinate clause do offer such a possibility.

The position of this last participle is certainly very much conditioned, among other things, by the presence of its subordinate *ut*-clause, a constituent whose weight and length make it gravitate towards the end of the sentence: that is, a specific order of constituents is the result.³⁵

These facts suggest a further possible avenue for disambiguation between P and SubjC: word order in both structures. This point will be useful as a means of reaffirming a suggestion made in a previous study³⁶: that *sto* began its process of copularization³⁷ in the classical era and that, as a consequence, we can find examples in that period which argue for the grouping of this verb (in the

³² A similar example, analysed in Cabrillana (2018: 620), is found in Liv. 8, 38, 10. For the occasional emphasis that Ps can have, see Pinkster (1995: 209).

³³ According to Pinkster (1995: 184), this might be possible if the lexemes of the P belong to different classes: see (1).

³⁴ With respect to the role of the present participle, see the observations on (3).

³⁵ See Section 3. A case which is a probably similar is seen in (9).

³⁶ Cabrillana (2018: 619-623).

³⁷ In this sense, Hengeveld (1992: 244–245) notes: “adjectival predicates come to be used as predicative adjuncts in localizing predications. Possibly the lexical origin of the localizing copula used in this predication type makes it possible to use the adjectival predicate in this way. A reinterpretation of the predicate adjunct as the main predicate of the construction then goes hand in hand with a reinterpretation of the localizing copula as a copula of wider application. Once this step has been taken, the copula used with adjectival predicates may acquire further copular functions.”

following abbreviated as *V*) with those that have copulative uses, since it shows characteristics of these.

3 Constituent order

Various studies³⁸ have shown that the most common sequence in constituent order in copulative structures is (S-)SubjC-V, at around 37% in declarative sentences in the corpus examined by Spevak (2010),³⁹ when the Subject is explicit.⁴⁰ If the subject is (lexically) omitted, and independently of whether there exists a disjunction between the various constituents, the most common order is SubjC-V (63%).⁴¹ A very similar proportion (62.50%) shows the verb *sto* in its possible copulative uses, although only those examples in prose with certain restrictions were taken into account in this percentage. This means that the following instances were not included in the analysis: 1) instances occurring in poetic texts; 2) instances in contexts which do not display a declarative modality; 3) instances in which the SubjC is not a constituent in agreement with the S (e.g., adverbs, NP in the ablative)⁴² – except if the S is an infinitive –; and (iv) instances where the S is a pronoun whose position is conditioned.⁴³

38 Among others, see Cabrillana (1994), Spevak (2010: 180–187). For reasons of space, and because its existence can already be considered to have been clearly shown, I will not here undertake a detailed study of the pragmatic origins and implications of this specific case of constituent order. As mentioned in the introduction, this criterion is applied in an auxiliary way; hence the brevity of its treatment here and the illustrative, rather than analytical, nature of this section.

39 Cic. Tusc. 1 and 3; dom.; Phil. 1 and 4; Att. 13, 50–16; CAES. civ. 1–3, 30; SALL. Iug.; the absolute number of occurrences is found in Table 2; the frequency of the sequence S-SubjC-V in Cic. Att. 1 rises to 49.22% (see Cabrillana 1994: 456).

40 To this order follow those cases corresponding to S-V-SubjC (22%), SubjC-V-S (15%) and SubjC-S-V (13%), in the same corpus but with a lower frequency; the other possible sequences (V-SubjC-S and V-S-SubjC) do not exceed, respectively, 7% and 6%.

41 A percentage similar to that found in the study of Cic. Att. 1: 65.62% (see Cabrillana, 1994: 456).

42 Except if the S is an infinitive: in this case, and since this kind of word is able to behave like any other noun, it has been included in the corresponding analysis.

43 It is necessary to apply these restrictions because they imply contexts in which, in one way or another, the order of constituents can be conditioned to a greater or lesser degree, either due to metrical needs, the modality of the sentence, or the kind of words that tend to have a fixed position in the sentence (e.g., relative pronouns, etc.).

These necessary restrictions result in a significant reduction of the number of analysable data,⁴⁴ except in the case of verbs with more frequent copulative uses (*sum*, *fio*); however, the percentages here do help us to draw some conclusions. The verbs chosen for comparison are *sum*, *fio*, *maneo* and *exsisto*, since thus far they are the ones analysed in REGLA DB with the most occurrences,⁴⁵ and Kühner and Stegmann (1912, I: 15–19) classify them as copulatives. These data are set out in Table 2:⁶

Table 2: Most common order in constructions with SubjC (REGLA DB and Spevak 2010: 182 [*sum*]).⁴⁷

Sequence/Verb	<i>sum</i>	<i>fio</i>	<i>maneo</i>	<i>exsisto</i>	<i>sto</i>
S-SubjC-V	58x (37%)	113x (50.00%)	12x (70.58%)	10x (62.50%)	6x (40.00%)
Total (S-)SubjC-V	143x (63%)	354x (77.12%)	22x (70.96%)	24x (88.88%)	15x (62.50%)

In terms of both the sequence with the three explicit constituents, and the final count that includes the lack of lexical expression of S (i.e., ‘Total (S-)SubjC-V’), the percentages for *sum* and *sto* are very similar, a very notable finding: *sto* behaves in the same way as the copulative *par excellence* in relation to the constituent order of the sequence under study here. With the remaining verbs (*fio*, *maneo* and *exsisto*) we see a clearer and more similar trend of ordering in the case of the expression of the three constituents, and one which is very similar to *sum* and *sto* when the analysis of the order of elements is made regardless of whether or not the S is explicit.

If these data are compared with those from an analysis of the participants of the construction with P in the case of *sto* – given that the occurrences with the other verbs are very infrequent⁴⁷ – we get the following data in Table 3:

⁴⁴ The total number of examples of *sto* analysed in REGLA DB is 458.

⁴⁵ With the exception of *sum*, data for which are drawn from Spevak (2010).

⁴⁶ The totals for cases of SubjC do not coincide with those from Table 1, since the noted restrictions have been applied here in relation to how the order of constituents is or might be conditioned.

⁴⁷ See Cabrillana (2010: 239): as already seen in that study – cf. Table 1 – there is an inverted trend in the frequency of appearance of SubjC and P: the greater the frequency of the copulative use, the lower the appearance of P, and vice versa.

Table 3: Most common order of constructions with SubjC and with P in *sto* (REGLA DB).

Sequence/Verb	Sto
S-SubjC-V	6x (40.00%)
Total (S-)SubjC-V	15x (62.50%)
S-P-V	8x (38.09%)
Total (S-)P-V	16x (45.71%)

The necessary restrictions made to avoid distortions in the data mean that our material is once again limited in size; nevertheless, the similarity in the total of instances analysed in both structures makes the comparison especially pertinent. The most significant feature of this comparison of the data on *sto* is that the most common relative position of the V with respect to SubjC or P is not the same in those contexts compared, so that the preferred orders are inverted (Table 4).

Table 4: Frequency of preferred order with SubjC and with P in *sto* (REGLA DB).

Sequence/Verb	Sto
(S-)SubjC-V	15x (62.50%)
(S-)V-P	19x (54.29%)

We can say that the instances analysed as P above (5a)-(5b), or (6a)-(6b), and those in which items – adjectives or participles – have been considered as P when these items (*firmus*, *rectus*, *inmotus*) reinforce the idea of the majority and basic locative meaning,⁴⁸ generally show a P-V order (4x from a total of 5 instances⁴⁹). This might be due to the proximity of such examples – cases that could be considered ‘in transition’ between the status of satellite 1 and the second argument – to those with a clearer SubjC.

⁴⁸ i.e., ‘to stand’, in opposition to sitting, walking, or lying prostrate, ‘to stand still, remain standing, stand upright’: cf., e.g., *Lewis and Short Dictionary*, s.v. *sto*, I.

⁴⁹ The number of instances is insufficient for any firm conclusions to be drawn, yet it is significant that the order PV is found in almost all the existing occurrences in the corpus.

It is possible, however, that if we expand the corpus, the results would not vary notably; indeed, in an analysis of the remaining instances in the corpus where there are no grammatical constraints⁵⁰ – stemming from the poetic genre: Plautus, Lucretius and Ovid⁵¹ – 13 out of 16 cases (81.25%) have the order V-P (Table 5).

Table 5: Frequency of the preferred order with P in *sto* (poetry): data with no grammatical restrictions (REGLA DB).

Sequence/Verb	Sto
(S-)V-P (16x)	13x (81.25%)

Some examples with a locative sense in prose works from various authors, in which this order is also shown, are the following⁵²:

(13a) *Samnites praeda impediti, infrequentes armati, pars addere gradum ac prae se agere praedam, **pars stare incerti** utrum progredi an regredi in castra tutius foret.* (LIV. 10, 20, 10)

‘the Samnites were impeded by their booty and few of them were armed; some quickened their pace and drove the cattle before them, some **stood** still, **uncertain** whether it were safer to go on or to return to camp.’

(13b) *in edito **stat admirabilis, celsus**, magnitudinis uerae.* (SEN. epist. 111, 3)

‘he **stands** in a high place, **worthy of admiration, lofty**, and really grea.’

(13c) ***stant ante te litigatores non de fortunis suis sed de tua existimatione solliciti.*** (PLIN. paneg. 80, 2)

‘before you **stood the litigants, concerned** more for your opinion of them than for their fortunes.’

(13d) *nec longe a praecone **Ascyltos stabat amictus** discoloria ueste.* (PETRON. 97, 3)

‘**Ascyltos stood close** by the crier in clothes of many colours.’

⁵⁰ E.g., cases in which S forms are coded by relative pronouns.

⁵¹ With the distortions that metrical and stylistic factors can cause in the ordering of constituents.

⁵² See also, among others, LIV. 2, 29, 2; 3, 60, 7; 10, 36, 2; SEN. epist. 36, 9; PETRON. 62, 5; and examples (3)–(4).

Even with all the restrictions implied in dealing with so small a number of analysable examples, it is most interesting that in all cases where SubjC and P can co-occur, the latter comes after the copulative sequence – in which the order SubjC-V always appears – in such a way that the complete structure shows the inverse sequence V-P in all the examples,⁵³ as summarised in (14):

(14) SubjC-V-P \implies SubjC-V \neq V-P

It is not possible to deal here with likely additional motivations for this order, and more research is needed in this area; we might, however, suggest that (1) on the one hand, it is possible that the speaker, in considering S+SubjC as a block, assigns to the S the semantic notion that denotes the P, in such a way that the order reflected in the discourse is more in keeping with the cognitive order; (2) on the other hand, in some cases the P⁵⁴ has elements depending on the P itself, which leads to P being situated to the right of the predication due to the length of the P and its complementation.⁵⁵

4 Conclusions

This study has sought to revise and refine some distinguishing criteria between the functions of praedicativum and subject complement in Latin on the base of the verb *sto*. Essentially, omissibility and the order of constituents are the criteria that have been addressed. The principal conclusions, plus other significant observations made, are as follows:

- 1) The omissibility test does not serve as a definitive means for clarifying, in all cases, the type of function (SubjC/P) that we find in contexts in which the items that codify them agree with the S, in that the alleged omission, even in the case of P, would render other fundamental elements in the discourse lacking in sense. In this sense, the omission of some P is not wholly possible from a semantic or pragmatic point of view.
- 2) The study and comparison of constituent order makes clear 1) that *sto* behaves in the same way as other copulative verbs in terms of the ordering of the sequence with SubjC; 2) that SubjC and P tend towards inverted

⁵³ Liv. 5, 39, 1: S-SubjC-V-P; Liv. 9, 32, 5: SubjC-S-V-P; Liv. 10, 41, 3: SubjC-V-P.

⁵⁴ See, e.g., (3), (4), (5c), (12), (13a), (13d); this possibility is especially frequent when the P is coded by a participle.

⁵⁵ See Pinkster (1995: 215–216).

collocations in their relative position with respect to the V, which makes this a possible subsidiary criterion of disambiguation for both functions; motivations of cognitive, syntactic and pragmatic nature can explain this tendency, which requires further investigation.

- 3) Because of the very nature of the verb analysed here, which semantically moves between the lexical domains of location, existence and relationship,⁵⁶ and in view of the fact that the process of copularization seems to have begun already in the Classical period, in particular cases the distinction between P and SubjC appears to be of a gradual quality, an insight that has already been noted other types of arguments and satellites.⁵⁷

Bibliography

- Bentley, D. & Ciconte, F. M. (2016). Copular and existential constructions. In A. Ledgeway & M. Maides (Eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Romance languages* (pp. 847–859). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cabrillana, C. (1994). Posiciones relativas en la ordenación de constituyentes (II). Estudio de la posición de Sujeto, Predicado nominal y Verbo. *Habis*, 25, 451–460.
- Cabrillana, C. (2010). Praedicativum and subject complement. In P. Anreiter & M. Kienpointner (Eds.), *Latin linguistics today* (pp. 233–245). Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Cabrillana, C. (2015). The argument/satellite distinction and absolute verbal use in Latin stative verbs. *Journal of Latin Linguistics*, 14(2), 197–239.
- Cabrillana, C. (2016). Lexical domains in Latin predicative structures: ‘agentive’, fientive and stative types. In P. Pocetti (Ed.), *Latinitatis rationes. Descriptive and historical accounts for the Latin language* (pp. 312–331). Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Cabrillana, C. (2018). La exploración de concomitancias sintáctico-semánticas como vía de caracterización verbal en la lengua latina, *Latomus* 77(2), 609–627.
- Devine, A. M. & Stephens, L. D. (2013). *Semantics for Latin: An introduction*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dik, S. C. (1989). *The theory of functional grammar: Part I, the structure of the clause*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Ernout, A. & Meillet, A. (1932 [1985]). *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: Histoire des mots*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Haverling, G. V. M. (2010). Actionality, tense, and viewpoint. In Ph. Baldi & P. Cuzzolin (Eds.), *New perspectives on historical Latin syntax: Vol. 2, Constituent Syntax: Adverbial phrases, adverbs, mood, tense* (pp. 277–523). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- Hengeveld, K. (1992). *Non-verbal predication: Theory, typology, diachrony*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

⁵⁶ See Cabrillana (2016).

⁵⁷ See, among others, Villa (2003), Cabrillana (2015).

- Kühner, R. & Stegmann, C. (1912–1914). *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache: II Satzlehre* (2 vol.). Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung.
- Longrée, D. (1989). The syntactic function of the so-called praedicativum in classical Latin. In M. Lavency & D. Longrée (Eds.), *Actes du V^e Colloque de linguistique latine* (pp. 245–256). Louvain: Peeters.
- Pfister, R. (1973). Prädikationsbezogene Sprachbetrachtung im Lateinischen. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, 31, 151–167.
- Pinkster, H. (1983). Praedicativum. In H. Pinkster (Ed.), *Latin linguistics and linguistic theory: Proceedings of the 1st international colloquium on Latin linguistics* (pp. 199–217). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Pinkster, H. (1987). The strategy and chronology of the development of future and perfect tenses auxiliaries in Latin. In M. Harris & P. Ramat (Eds.), *The historical development of auxiliaries* (pp. 193–223). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- Pinkster, H. (1991). Le ‘Praedicativum’. In C. Touratier (Ed.), *Compléments prédictifs et attributs du complément d’objet en Latin* (pp. 72–78). Aix-Marseille: Université de Provence.
- Pinkster, H. (1995). *Sintaxis y semántica del latín*. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas.
- Pinkster, H. (2015). *The Oxford Latin syntax: Vol. 1, the simple clause*. Oxford: University Press.
- Pinkster, H. (in prep.). Secondary predicates, floating quantifiers, and other forms of expansion of constituents. Chapter 21 of *The Oxford Latin syntax: II* (prefinal version 9 January 2017).
- Pountain, C. (1982). *Essere/stare as a Romance phenomenon. In N. Vincent & M. Harris (Eds.), *Studies in the Romance verb* (pp. 139–160). London/Cambridge: Croom Helm.
- REGLA Data Base: *Rección y Complementación en Griego y en Latín*, www.uam.es/proyecto_sinv/regula/index.html (accessed: 5 June 2017).
- Spears, R. A. (Ed.). (2002). *McGraw-Hill dictionary of American idioms and phrasal verbs* (retrieved 2016). McGraw-Hill: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Spevak, O. (2010). *Constituent order in classical Latin prose*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Van Valin, R. D. & LaPolla, R. J. (1997). *Syntax: Structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Villa, J. de la (2003). Límites y alternancias en los marcos predicativos. In J. M. Baños, C. Cabrilla, M. E. Torrego & J. de la Villa. (Eds.), *Praedicativa. Complementación en griego y en latín* (pp. 19–49). Santiago de Compostela: Universidad de Santiago de Compostela.