

Constituent order in directives with stative verbs in Latin

Concepción Cabrillana

University of Santiago de Compostela

This paper considers constituent ordering in monovalent and bivalent constructions of two Latin stative verbs – *sum* ‘to be’ and *fio* ‘to become’ – when they appear in directives, assessing the degree of speaker-addressee interaction. We use Risselada’s classification of the different subtypes of directives based on the extent to which compliance with what the speaker expresses is obligatory. The findings reveal that, given (i) the difference in the number of arguments and in semantic content of monovalent and bivalent structures, and (ii) the incidence of modality (declarative/directive), the order of constituents different in each case. Furthermore, tendencies in constituent patterns are more uniform when expressions are more prototypically directive, although not in a wholly scalar way. Hence, the peculiarities or deviations observed require specific explanations, such as the structure of “world-creation”, the kind of proposal made, or the existence of expressions with different degrees of lexicalization.

Keywords: Latin, directives, pragmatics, speech act, stative verbs

1. Introduction. Objectives, structure, and corpus

The topic of this study has thus far received very little attention in the literature. Work has been done on constituent order in structures containing a verb like *sum* ‘to be’,¹ as well as on the most frequent positions of other constituents (especially of the verb) in directive expressions (‘directives’) in general.² However, these two approaches have not been combined, as a means of looking at the order of constituents in directives with Latin stative verbs.

1. Cf., for example, Marouzeau (1910), Warner (1980), and Spevak (2004; 2010: 180–93).

2. Cf., among others, Panhuis (1982: 68–72), Devine and Stephens (2006: 149, 164, 166), Bauer (2009: 276), Spevak (2010: 205–22).

This is understandable, given the special nature of the most frequently occurring statives – in many cases there is an absence of control –, since, according to Pinkster (2015: 349),³ imperative sentences with a directive illocutionary force are normally restricted to controllable states of affairs. Yet – as Pinkster (2015: 356–357) recognises –, some examples can be found with copulative verbs (3–5), quoted below.

It is this point which has motivated the present research, in that during the analysis of material for a previous study (Cabrillana 2016b), some occurrences of the imperative and the jussive subjunctive of *fiō* were found, although these were in fact few in number.

One might think that such examples correspond to typical cases of *fiō* when it functions as the lexical passive of *faciō* ('to be done'), with which [+control] exists. However, we also find cases of semi-copulative *fiō*⁴ ('to become') and of eventive *fiō* ('to take place'). This shows that plainly stative and (semi-)copulative verbs can appear in directives, with [±control]. In a parallel way, the Latin copulative verb *par excellence* – *esse* – also has impressive (semi-)copulative and existential examples, in which [+control] is not always present. Hence it is interesting to address the issue of the constituent order in these somewhat unusual structures, although it must be said that the notion of 'directive' will be considered here in a very wide sense.

One question that arises before considering any corpus data is whether the ordering trends in these cases will be similar to those of structures with the copula *sum* in declarative sentences, or if they will come closer to what has been postulated in this respect for directives in general. In other words: whether lexical-semantic factors, or those of a more broadly pragmatic nature, will take precedence.

The choice of a corpus suitable for this study was itself an initial hurdle to be overcome. At first sight, comic texts would seem appropriate, given the high degree of interaction that in many cases exists between speaker and addressee; however, a disadvantage here is that these texts are poetic in form, and hence metrical restrictions might influence the ordering of the different constituents. In this respect, Warner (1980: 255) recalls the words of Lindsay (1907: 2) in which he affirms that both the syntax and vocabulary of Plautus, as well as the prosody, etc., are a faithful reflection of the everyday language of his times; Warner (*ibid.*: 255) supports such an opinion, adding that the public would have had little patience with an artificial word order. Lindsay (1907: 2) also notes that "of course, every-day speech does not follow the strict laws of the logical expression of thought". This corpus – the comedies of Plautus and Terence – although rich in directives in comparison with other types of

3. I thank H. Pinkster for granting access to this material, which was not published when I prepared the first version of this paper.

4. With respect to the semi-copulative uses of certain verbs, and especially the verb 'to be', see Hengeveld (1992: 35ff.), Cabrillana (2010: 35–42).

texts, yields a total of 93 examples in the second and third person of the imperative and jussive subjunctive: a very small body of evidence as the basis for any conclusive generalisations. Furthermore, a comparison with other literary genres and periods is useful here; thus, legal texts and treatises of a didactic nature provide a good point of contrast, despite the fact that the degree of ‘closeness’ and of the specification of interlocutors is different⁵ from that in dramatic texts. The same applies to epistolographic texts and speeches reproduced by historians in the direct style.

Hence, the corpus used in this research includes the following authors and works: Cato (*On Agriculture*), Plautus, Terence, Cicero (*Laws, Letters to Atticus*), Livy (1–10),⁶ Columella (*On Agriculture*), Petronius, Pliny the Elder (*Natural History* 1–15)⁷ and Seneca (*Moral Letters to Lucilius*).

As we have said, an analysis will be made of those structures featuring the verbal forms of *fio* and *sum* in 2nd and 3rd person⁸ in the singular and in the plural of the imperative and jussive subjunctive, and in which one of the arguments is expressed, in monovalent or bivalent structures. Excluded from the analysis are: (i) strongly lexicalised expressions,⁹ although these are sometimes evoked in the discussion of certain issues in order to show alternative ordering;¹⁰ (ii) indirect quotations of other authors;¹¹ (iii) sentences which contain a relative pronoun encoding one of its arguments;¹² (iv) locative structures.¹³

5. Cf. Vairel-Carron (1975: 291–2), Risselada (1993: 17).

6. This kind of text was chosen essentially as a means of exploring the directives in the speeches reproduced by Livy.

7. The particular characteristics of Pliny’s prose, as well as the existence of instructions which he sometimes formulates, justify the inclusion of the work, although as we will see, the directive expressions under discussion in the present study are virtually non-existent in his treatise.

8. Although it could be considered that only the cases of 2nd person would be true directives, the ancient grammarians understand the second and third person of the subjunctive as equivalent to the imperative (Sacerdos VI.436.3–4K, 3rd century AD). Furthermore, as we have said, directives are considered here in a very general sense.

9. E.g., *pigneri / pignori sunto, bonae frugi + sum, macte virtute esto* and its variants.

10. This form of proceeding reflects a wish to account for the greatest number of possibilities offered by the corpus. Cf., for example, the analysis of ‘proposals’, ‘advice’, and ‘supplications’ in Sections 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.2.1, and 4.2.2.

11. Among others, quotations of Virgil and Horace containing imperatives or jussive subjunctives in Sen. *Ep.*

12. As we know, the position of the relative pronoun is almost always constricted.

13. Those in which the verb *sum* has the sense of ‘to be somewhere’: cf. Pinkster (1995: 2), Cabrillana (2001; 2010: 104–16). This type of structure merits a separate study, because of its different semantic and syntactic characteristics.

The study will be organised as follows: as a preliminary step, the distinction of verbal moods in the expression of directives will be explored and justified (Section 2); a brief overview of the current state of research will follow, after which the analysis itself will be presented, distinguishing between what is observed in monovalent structures (Section 4.1) and bivalent structures (Section 4.2). Some brief conclusions then summarise the main findings of the study (Section 5).

2. Illocutionary force and verbal mood

Before we begin, some clarifications are necessary concerning the inclusion in the analysis of the subjunctive.

It can be claimed, in accordance with Risselada (1993: 80–81), that the subjunctive is especially in need of added semantic properties in order to have a directive capacity: it needs to be a verb referring to a controlled state of affairs, and/or with an explicit reference to the active participation of the hearer. (1a) and (1b), which feature the use of *fiō* as a lexical passive of *faciō*, do not appear to lack such directive force, given that they have the aim and form of being an order or a firm warning (Risselada 1993: 48). When there is no control (1c) – Risselada (1993: 81) goes on to observe –, the order becomes more like a ‘wish’ or a ‘malediction’, whereas if it lacks explicit reference to the active participation of the hearer (1d), the expression is typically a proposal.

- (1) a. (... *si quid de iis rebus controversiae erit,*
Romae iudicium fiat. (Cato Agr. 149)
 Rome-LOC decision-NOM make-3SG.SBJV
 ‘(... and if there arises any dispute over such matters, (i.e. conditions which have to be met in a grazing contract) let the decision be made at Rome.’¹⁴
- b. (*Olea ubi lecta siet,*)
oleum fiat continuo, ne corrumpatur.
 oil-NOM make-3SG.SBJV immediately not spoil-3SG.SBJV.PASS
 ‘(After gathering) let the olives be pressed immediately, to prevent the oil from spoiling.’ (Cato Agr. 3)¹⁵

14. Except when the contrary is indicated, translations are taken from the collection of the Loeb Classical Library, although at the risk that they may not always adequately reflect the constructions and nuances which are under discussion in each case.

15. A similar case, but with the indicative mood, is found in Colum. 8.14.2; regarding the possibility that the directive force can be expressed in declarative sentences and with the indicative, cf. Pinkster (2015: 311–12).

- c. (the gods confuse the slave Sagaristio, who in this intervention addresses the servant Pegnio)
 ... *atque id fiat,* (Pl. *Per.* 293)
 and it-NOM happen-3SG.SBJV
 (*nisi te hodie, si prehendero, defigam in terram colaphis.*)
 ‘... and may that happen to me, (unless I plant you in the ground with my blows if I get hold of you today.)’
- d. (Mercury addresses the slave Sosia, who pleads for a truce rather than be struck by the god again)
Immo indutiae parumper fiant, si quid
 then truce-NOM.PL for a short time make-3PL.SBJV if anything
vis loqui. (Pl. *Am.* 389)
 you wish say-INF
 ‘Not in peace, but for a short time there can be a truce if you want to say anything.’

In any case, and bearing in mind that these characteristics are also applicable to the imperative mood, the present subjunctive is more common in ‘binding directives’¹⁶ which are often prohibitive, whereas the use of the 2nd person perfect subjunctive is restricted exclusively to prohibitive directive expressions.¹⁷

Two clear examples with the present subjunctive of *sum* taken from Risselada (1993: 138–139), and also found in my corpus, are (2a)–(2b),¹⁸ which the parallel appearance of the imperative confirms their equivalence and the possibility of interchange:¹⁹

16. Cf. Risselada (1993: 151–155), Pinkster (2015: 350). Risselada understands a ‘binding directive’ as a coercive or compelling order.

17. Cf. Risselada (1993: 163); this is confirmed in my corpus.

18. Expressions like this one are well documented in the corpus analysed here. Although one might think that such expressions to some extent constitute a lexicalized formula, the variety of positions of their arguments makes them suitable for the present study. In a somewhat different situation would be those of the kind *salvus sis* (‘may you be well’) or *liber/noster esto* (‘be free/one of us’), which show a greater rigidity in their order. This fact might distort somewhat the reality of the order of constituents, yet, as will be seen below (Section 4.2), motives exist for justifying their inclusion in this study.

19. And these are not isolated examples: Vairel-Carron (1975) recorded 226 cases in Plautus and 43 in Terence; although the author does not provide the full list, it is clear that these numbers are not restricted to cases of stative verbs.

- (2) a. *Molestus ne sis nunciam, i rus,*
 annoying-NOM.SG not be-2SG.SBJV now go-2SG.IMP farm
te amove. (Pl. *Mos.* 74)
 you-ACC remove-2SG.IMP
 ‘Don’t be a nuisance now, go to the farm, remove yourself.’
- b. *Abi intro, ne molestus(= sis), linguae*
 go-2SG.IMP inside not annoying-NOM=be-3SG.SBJV tongue-DAT
tempera. (Pl. *Rud.* 1254)
 control-2SG.IMP
 ‘Go in, stop being a nuisance, and control your tongue.’

However, Risselada (1993: 139ff) sees some peculiarities in jussive subjunctives which differentiate them to some degree from the imperative:

1. From a diachronic point of view, subjunctive directives are very common in the Archaic period, but rarer in Classical and later texts, something which is confirmed in the corpus used here.
2. In all stages of the Latin language, the subjunctive is linked especially to the expression of prohibitions; this preference is not observed in the general analysis of statives.²⁰
3. Whereas the subjunctive can be used in independent directive expressions, it is more frequently dependent (syntactically, paratactically or pragmatically) on the surrounding context than the imperative and appears with relative frequency in reactive directive expressions. It also appears like this in the material analysed here, above all in those comic texts in which a more intense interaction between speaker and addressee exists; it is a logical fact given the respective natures of the subjunctive and the imperative.
4. The range of subtypes of directives in which the subjunctive is used²¹ is not as wide as in the case of the imperative (Risselada 1993: 153).

20. More specifically, and by calculating the 2nd and 3rd persons in all the subtypes of directive expressions, the situation is that in monovalent constructions the percentage of affirmative sentences is very similar in the imperative (88.88%) and the subjunctive (82.14%); however, in expressions with a bivalent pattern, the proportion varies according to mood: of 49 examples in the imperative, 47 (95.91%) are affirmative; of 117 examples in the subjunctive, 71 (60.68%) are affirmative. Nevertheless, if the calculation is restricted to the 2nd person present and perfect of the subjunctive (18 examples), Risselada’s observation is supported by my corpus. Furthermore, prohibitions are especially linked to order and advice subtypes (91.17%), the more prototypical ones.

21. Restricted, at least in comedy, to orders, supplications and advice according to Risselada (1993: 153). For the different subtypes of directive speech acts, see Table 1 below.

This final point is at first sight less clear than the previous ones, at least in the present corpus. Although (i) it is very probable that the difference between the various subtypes of speech acts established depending on the degree of obligation of compliance with what the speaker expresses is gradual, and (ii) although is not always possible to distinguish these subtypes in an unequivocal manner, the two moods express practically the same number of subtypes, but these are different and are found in diverse proportions. Thus, in terms of the quantitative findings, as can be seen in Table 1, the imperative mood is prevalent almost only in the subtype ‘order’²², whereas in this same subtype, the subjunctive is reduced and is more representative of ‘advice’²³ and ‘supplications’²⁴. The complete findings, using Risselada’s (1993: 48) proposed subtypes of speech acts, in order of the degree of obligation to comply with what the speaker says are resumed in Table 1.

Table 1. Frequency²⁵ of directive speech act subtypes according to verbal mood used

Speech act subtype	Imperative mood	Subjunctive mood	Indicative mood	TOTAL
Order	52 (68.42%)	35 (24.13%)	–	87 (39.18%)
Advice	3 (3.94%)	54 (37.24%)	1 (100%)	58 (26.12%)
Supplication	3 (3.94%)	30 (20.68%)	–	33 (14.86%)
Proposal	8 (10.52%)	15 (10.38%)	–	23 (10.36%)
Request	–	–	–	–
Invitation	2 (2.66%)	–	–	2 (0.90%)
Suggestion	4 (5.26%)	7 (4.82%)	–	11 (4.95%)
Permission	4 (5.26%)	4 (2.75%)	–	8 (3.63%)
TOTAL	76 (34.23%)	145 (65.32%)	1 (0.45%)	222

Certainly, the differences with Risselada (1993: 153) can be explained not only in terms of the types of the specific verbs studied but also of the corpus used, in that she restricts her statistical analysis to comic texts.

22. Cf., e.g., Cic. *Leg.* 2.21: *quique non paruerit, capital esto* (‘and whosoever yields not obedience shall be put to death’), or Pl. *Pseud.* 162: *tu esto lectisterniator* (‘you shall be the couch arranger’).

23. The frequent recommendations found in the didactic works of Cato and Columella, among other cases, were interpreted in this way.

24. It is how the interpretation has been made – among others – of a considerable number of cases of less or more forceful wishes which are especially common in the comic texts; cf. Section 4.1 below.

25. The percentage for each subtype of directive were calculated using the total number of directive expressions in each modal verb (i.e., the figure in the bottom cell in each column: imperative (76x), subjunctive (145x) and indicative (1x)); the percentages for the totals were calculated using the total number of directive expressions (222x).

On the other hand, we must bear in mind that the subjunctive mood is commonly used in imperative sentences with an optative illocutionary force;²⁶ also, it is sometimes doubtful whether we are in fact dealing with imperative or exclamatory sentences.²⁷

In any case, I share with Risselada (1993: 154–5) the opinion that what has sometimes been claimed here does not seem to ring true; that is, the claim that the subjunctive expresses orders in a ‘milder’ way than the imperative (2a–2b). Indeed, the cases of *fio* in the imperative in my corpus might be understood more as supplications without real control on the part of the interlocutor – (3a)–(3b) –, or as invitations – (4a)–(4b) –:

- (3) (*Agite bibite, festivae fores; potate,*)
- a. *fite mihi volentes*
be-2PL.IMP me-DAT favorable-NOM.PL.PTCP
propitiatae. (Pl. *Cur.* 89)
well_disposed-NOM.PL
‘(Go on, drink, dearest door; imbibe and) be favorable and well-disposed toward me.’
- b. (*Pessuli, heus pessuli, vos saluto lubens, vos amo, vos volo, vos peto atque opsecro, gerite amanti mihi morem, amoenissumi,*)
fite caussa mea ludii barbari.
become-2PL.IMP for my sake dancers-NOM.PL foreign-NOM.PL
‘(Hey, bolts, I greet you gladly, I love you, I want you, I desire you, and I beseech you, obey me in my love, most charming bolts.) Become foreign dancers for my sake.’ (Pl. *Cur.* 150)
- (4) a. *Age, fi benignus, subveni.* (Pl. *Per.* 38)
go on be- 2SG.IMP generous-NOM help-2SG.IMP
‘Go on, be generous, help me out.’
- b. *Qui non edistis, sature fite*
who not eat-2PL.PRF full-NOM.PL become-2PL.IMP
fabulis. (Pl. *Poen.* 7)
tales-ABL.PL
‘You who haven’t eaten, fill yourselves with tales.’

26. This type, that is, desiderative sentences, does not present two of the restrictions which appear in sentences with directive illocutionary force: controllability and anteriority (cf. Pinkster 1995: 258).

27. Cf. Pinkster (2015: 359) and Pl. *Poen.* 912: *valeas beneque ut tibi sit* (‘farewell and be well’). For peculiarities of the different tenses and persons of the subjunctive in the expression of types of directives, cf. Pinkster (2015: 498–499).

Example (5), in which the young man Phaedromus addresses his slave Palinurus, is an exception:

- (5) (*Sequere hac, Palinure, me ad fores.*)
fi mi obsequens. (Pl. *Cur.* 87)
 be-2SG.IMP me-DAT obedient-NOM.SG.PTCP
 '(Palinurus, follow me this way to the door,) be obedient to me.'

As can be seen in Table 2, the overall frequency of use of the subjunctive is almost double that of the imperative, although when we look at specific authors, only in Cic. *Leg.* does the imperative constitute almost all occurrences of directive expressions, while the amounts are inverted in his epistolographic work: the text type here²⁸ justifies this.

Table 2. Frequency of directives and the use of verbal mood in the corpus according to authors and works

Author/work (number of pages and % of directives)	Imperative mood	Subjunctive mood	Indicative mood	TOTAL
Pl. (1418 p.: 5.64%)	18 (22.78%)	62 (77.22%)	–	80 (36.03%)
Ter. (331 p.: 3.92%)	3 (23.07%)	10 (76.93%)	–	13 (5.85%)
Cato <i>Agr.</i> (77 p.: 16.88%)	2 (18.18%)	11 (81.82%)	–	13 (5.85%)
Col. (648 p.: 5.55%)	7 (19.44%)	28 (77.77%)	1 (2.79%)	36 (16.21%)
Cic. <i>Leg.</i> (110 p.: 40%)	42 (95.45%)	2 (4.55%)	–	44 (19.81%)
Cic. <i>Att.</i> (677 p.: 1.62%)	–	11 (100%)	–	11 (4.95%)
Liv. 1–10 (975 p.: 0.51%)	1 (20.00%)	4 (80.00%)	–	5 (2.25%)
Sen. <i>Ep.</i> (463 p.: 3.23%)	–	15 (100%)	–	15 (6.75%)
Petr. (188 p.: 2.12%)	3 (75.00%)	1 (25.00%)	–	4 (1.80%)
Plin. <i>Nat.</i> 1–15 (1005 p.: 0.09%)	–	1 (100%)	–	1 (0.50%)
TOTAL (5892 p.: 3.76%)	76 (34.23%)	145 (65.27%)	1 (0.45%)	222

Having dealt with these aspects, it is worth asking whether the distinction of the subtype of the speech act has a clear reflection in the linguistic issue under analysis here. For this, I will begin by discussing previous research, followed by my own findings. In the latter, a separate treatment will be made of monovalent and bivalent structures.

28. On the influence of Archaic texts such as the Twelve Tables in Cicero's treatise, cf. Powell (2005: 123–5). Cf. also Panhuis (1982: 110–11).

3. Brief overview of research

Since no studies seem to be available that reveal what happens in the cases under study here, other findings that may be relevant more generally will be provided; this also reflects the fact that, on occasion, researchers are not explicit about what kind of verbs and constructions their statements are based on, and do not specify, among other things, what semantic content these verbs have, or their quantitative and qualitative valency.²⁹

Thus, looking generally at directives in Latin, Babič (1992: 64) notes the tendency for initial position verb forms in the imperative, so that the listener can distinguish from the beginning whether what is being communicated is a command or not. The same claim is made by Devine and Stephens (2006: 149), who add (2006: 166) that initial verbs are most often found in main rather than subordinate clauses. Bauer (2009: 276) notes that the initial position of the verb is common in the case of the exhortative subjunctive, and especially in imperatives (cf. also Salvi 2011: 32–33). To this it can be added that the sequence V(erb)-S(ubjet) is more frequent in intransitive than in transitive verbs (cf., among others, Bauer 2009: 280–281).

However, Panhuis (1982: 68–72) and Spevak (2010: 205ff) – although without addressing what happens in these cases with the verbs *sum* and *fio* – do not subscribe to the majority opinion that the verb in the imperative goes by preference in initial position; in Panhuis' analysis of the position of the imperatives of *do* and *reddo* in Plautus, his conclusion is that the imperative form of the verb behaves in a similar way to that seen in declarative sentences and that its position is pragmatically motivated.

On the other hand, Panhuis (1982: 110–11) claims that legal texts are also sensitive to pragmatic factors, as can be the case in colloquial Latin: thus, the fact that the V is in final position indicates its rhematic nature. Specifically, and in reference to transitive constructions, Panhuis (1982: 99) notes the tendency of the V for final position in legal and religious texts, which corresponds to word order patterns in other text types.

Spevak (2010: 206–7) notes that in declarative sentences, the position of the verb is often final, and this is not the case with imperatives. Thus, for example, in verbs of action with directive imperatives³⁰ – Spevak (2010: 213) –, the majority ordering is V-A(argument)2, i.e. the object (75%).

29. See de la Villa (2003: 21–2, 32–7).

30. On the corpus analysed in the chapter on constituent order in imperative sentences, the author only notes (2010: 12) that it is constructed fundamentally using data from LASLA <<http://www.cipl.ulg.ac.be/Lasla/>>.

Ultimately, what Spevak (2010: 221–2) finds is that in sentences with the imperative, the initial position of the V is not a constraint, but rather, as in declarative sentences, prior position can be given to the constituent with the Topic function; however, unlike declarative sentences, the relevant constituents often occupy final position.³¹

4. Analysis

4.1 Monovalent constructions

In the preceding section a brief overview of studies related to the question of verb placement was given. However, we also need to consider the available data on the verb *sum* in particular, the most common of those analysed here.

Thus, turning to absolute existential (not locative) *sum* in affirmative sentences alone, the data from Spevak's (2010: 189)³² corpus are in Table 3.

Table 3. Constituent order in declarative sentences with existential *sum* (Spevak 2010: 189)

Pattern	Frequency
VS	19 (70%)
SV	7 (26%)
V inserted inside a NP	1 (4%)
TOTAL	27

The reasons that explain these orders have to do with the fact that sentences of this type are to a great extent like presentative sentences, which are not anchored in the preceding discourse; from this point of view, Spevak sees the verb in the VS pattern as carrying new but not salient information; the Focus is the S, contextually independent and to be developed subsequently in the context.

Lets us now consider the frequency of orders in monovalent directives with *sum* and *fiō*; to begin with, we will see the data separating the purely existential meaning (present only in *sum*) from others that may appear, and in all cases regardless of whether there is disjunction between the constituents involved (Tables 4–5).

31. On the analysis of the relative and absolute positions of constituents, cf. Cabrillana (1993, 1994).

32. This corpus is composed of Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 1 and 3; *On his House*; *Philippics* 1 and 4; *Letters to Atticus* 13.50–16; Caesar, *The Civil War* 1–3.30; Sallust, *The Jugurthine War*: this, then, is the corpus used for the chapter on declarative sentences, in which these data are found.

Table 4. Constituent order in existential sentences with *sum* in directive expressions

Pattern	Frequency
VS	12 (27.07%)
SV	31 (72.93%)
TOTAL	43

Table 5. Constituent order in eventive and agentive sentences with *fi* in directive expressions

Pattern	Agentive value ('to be done')	Eventive value ('to take place')	TOTAL
VS	4 (27.07%)	–	4 (30.76%)
SV	8 (72.93%)	1 (100%)	9 (69.24%)
TOTAL	12	1	13

As we can see, the trends are very similar for both verbs in all their meanings, contrary to those seen for declarative sentences; this leads us to establish, even if provisionally, that modality has a decisive influence on the ordering of these verbs. Furthermore, the semantic value is not seen here to be determining, and thus in what follows calculations can be made jointly.

To assess the impact of the other criterion mentioned above, that is, the degree of obligation to comply with what the speaker expresses, let us see what orders have been found according to the subtype of speech act in each case (see Table 6).

Table 6. Constituent order in monovalent structures according to speech act subtype

Speech act subtype	SV	VS	TOTAL
Order	24 (100%)	–	24 (42.85%)
Advice	7 (70.00%)	3 (30.00%)	10 (17.85%)
Supplication	3 (75.00%)	1 (25.00%)	4 (7.14%)
Proposal	2 (18.18%)	9 (81.82%)	11 (19.67%)
Suggestion	3 (60.00%)	2 (40.00%)	5 (8.92%)
Permission	1 (50.00%)	1 (50.00%)	2 (3.57%)
TOTAL	40 (71.42%)	16 (28.58%)	56

Although the number of occurrences suggests that these data should be viewed with caution, a first look at them shows that as the degree of “directivity” increases, the orders become to some extent closer to the majority sequence (SV), except for the ‘proposals’, which will be addressed below (Section 4.2.1). There are several reasons for these facts:

- (7) *Age, mi Achilles, fiat quod te*
 go on my Achilles fulfill-3SG.SBJV what-ACC you-ACC
oro. (Pl. *Mil.* 1054)
 ask-1SG.IND
 ‘Go on, my dear Achilles, fulfil my request.’

On the one hand, the verb has a focal nature in contrast to the S expressed by a *quod* completive clause, which is already known and expressed in the previous dialogue.

On the other hand, the following context continues with directive expressions³⁴ in which the verb is always initial:

- (8) *Serva illam pulchram pulchre,*
 save-2PRS.SG.IMP that beautiful woman-ACC beautifully
exprome benignum ex te ingenium. (Pl. *Mil.* 1054–5)
 display-2SG.IMP kind-ACC from you nature-ACC
 ‘Save that beautiful woman beautifully, display your kind nature.’

4.1.2 ‘Proposals’

The behaviour of ‘proposals’ goes against the general trend; the explanation for this is, fundamentally, that the vast majority of the examples are of a very specific type, which – in the corpus, and always in Columella – have a fixed order; they are of a type that could be called “world creators”: the assertion of what is said subsequently “is restricted to the world proposed by the higher predicate” (Ridruejo 1999: 3228):

- (9) *Esto ager triangulus pedes quoquo versus*
 be-3SG. FUT. IMP field-NOM triangular feet-ACC on every side
 CCC. (Col. 5.2.5)
 three hundred
 ‘Suppose the field to be triangular three hundred feet on every side.’

Indeed, cases like this have been understood as ‘proposals’, without it being entirely clear whether they can be understood as a kind of imperative of conditional use (Risselada 1993: 120–2) or if they should be excluded from this sample,³⁵ since the

34. Although (7) and (8) show different persons in the verbal form, this does not invalidate the comparison established here from a pragmatic point of view.

35. Over the course of their elimination, the amounts balance out in such a way that there would be 2x cases with SV order, and another two with the opposite (VS); such small numbers do not allow for any conclusions to be drawn.

directive force is virtually non-existent.³⁶ In any case, it is possible for the role of the verbal element as the presenter to be key in orders of this type.

4.2 Bivalent structures

Concerning bivalent structures, the data of Spevak (2010: 180–1) for predicative structures with or without S show a preference for the order p(*Subject Complement*) V irrespective of whether disjunction is in evidence. When the three elements are expressed, the findings (*ibid.*: 182) are those which appear in the central column in Table 7; in the final column are the orders observed in the same constructions in directives in my study: although the quantities are clearly lower, the corresponding percentages offer sufficient data for comparison. Data for declarative sentences in Table 7 are taken from Spevak (2010: 182); *p* stands for Subject Complement.

Table 7. Constituent order in copula constructions in declarative sentences and (semi-)copulative constructions in directive expressions

Pattern	Declarative sentences	Directive expressions (corpus)
SpV	58 (37%)	29 (49.15%)
SVp	33 (22%)	12 (20.33%)
pVS	23 (15%)	6 (10.16%)
pSV	20 (13%)	5 (8.47%)
VpS	9 (6%)	1 (1.73%)
VSp	10 (7%)	6 (10.16%)
TOTAL	153	59

As regards those cases in which the S is elliptical, the majority ordering is pV (see Table 8).

Table 8. Constituent order without explicit S in copulative constructions in declarative sentences and in directive expressions

Pattern	Declarative sentences	Directive expressions (corpus)
pV	143 (63%)	85 (79.43%)
Vp	82 (37%)	22 (20.57%)
TOTAL	225	107

36. Accordingly, we could propose to remove these cases from a study on directives. Nevertheless, we want to show here what all the findings are when a general investigation of the particular predicates involved is done. It is important to take into account what structures we can find in such a research, in order to describe their characteristics and the causes of these particular features.

Contrary to what happened in the monovalent constructions, in the copulative structures the frequency of the ordering trends are similar in both the modalities compared. A preliminary assessment of these results suggests that in copulative constructions, a determining factor is the particular nature of the copula itself, which to some extent ‘neutralizes’ the potential impact of the jussive modality.³⁷

Yet one might also wonder about the influence of the degree of ‘directiveness’ on the ordering of the constituents involved. Given that sampling would become unmanageably complicated if each possibility in the different speech act subtypes were explored, I have collected data disregarding the presence of S and possible disjunctions (see Table 9), making an overall calculation of all cases that show the sequence pV in contrast to those showing Vp.

Table 9. Constituent order in (semi-)copulative structures of directives according to subtype of speech act (*sum* and *fio*)

Speech act subtype	pV	Vp	TOTAL
Order	58 (92.06%)	5 (7.94%)	63 (37.95%)
Advice	28 (58.33%)	20 (41.67%)	48 (28.91%)
Supplication	26 (89.65%)	3 (10.35%)	29 (17.46%)
Proposal	4 (33.33%)	8 (66.67%)	12 (7.26%)
Invitation	1 (50.00%)	1 (50.00%)	2 (1.20%)
Suggestion	4 (66.66%)	2 (33.34%)	6 (3.61%)
Permission	3 (50.00%)	3 (50.00%)	6 (3.61%)
TOTAL	124 (74.69%)	42 (25.31%)	166

As a preliminary to the explanation of these data, we need to recognize that in these sequences there are a number of occurrences in which expressions with some degree of lexicalization appear, which could in principle distort the statistics. It concerns at least two types of expressions in the comic texts which taken together do not reach 17% of the total number of bivalent cases:

- i. the one which is frequently used for greeting (*salvus sis*: 19x in the corpus): this has been listed here as a ‘supplication’, in the sense that it responds to a desire that can come from a supplication addressed to the gods; in some funerary inscriptions, however, the formula is attested in the inverse order (*sis salvus*). In any case, the absence of control is clear; this might perhaps render it questionable for inclusion in the current study, yet its consideration here reflects – among other reasons – the fact that speakers, at some point in the history of the language, must have had reasons for coining the expression in the way in which it has been lexicalized perhaps the fact that the non-verbal element has a special semantic density, hence its initial position;

37. Further research on this issue is needed.

- ii. the one used for emancipation or the adoption of a slave (*liber/noster esto*: 9x in the corpus); in this case, it is a reflection of legal language, something that occurs in other cases, not without a certain comic mimicry, as in the passage of *Asinaria* where the parasite reads the terms of the contract that has been drawn up between the young Diabolus, the procuress Cleaereta and the courtesan Philenium; the two cases of directive *sum* – in subjunctive or imperative mood – adopt final position:

(10) a. *Si quem alium aspexit, caeca continuo*
 if anyone else see-3SG.PRF blind-NOM immediately
siet. (Pl. As. 770)
 be-3SG.SBJV

‘If she sets her eyes on another, she shall be blind immediately.’

b. *Si dixerit, haec multa ei*
 if say-3SG.FUT.ANT this-NOM punishment-NOM her-DAT
esto, vino viginti dies ut
 be-3SG.FUT.IMP vine-ABL twenty days-ACC to
careat. (Pl. As. 801)
 be without-3SG.SBJV.PRS

‘If she does (*sc.* the procuress Cleaereta says something), then this shall be her punishment: she shall not have wine for twenty days.’

These details having been taken into account, the data in Table 9³⁸ reveal again that in general the percentage of ‘exceptions’ to the majority order (pV) diminishes as expressions have a stronger directive force, although less clearly than in the case of monovalent structures. On the other hand, it is again necessary to explain the somewhat anomalous behaviour of ‘advice’ and ‘proposals’.

4.2.1 ‘Advice’

In terms of advice, a possible justification for the data is in the negative polarity found in many of these cases, thus giving the sequence negation + verb + p, as illustrated by (11),³⁹ from different authors and genres; the ordering, on the other hand, is a carbon copy of what happens in absolute negative existential sentences with *sum* (*cf.* Spevak 2010: 189):

38. If we chose to remove these cases from the overall calculation, the proportional quantities would not show a different trend from that which appears in Table 9.

39. Cf. also, e.g., Col. 1.4.8; Petr. 52.6; Sen. *Ep.* 13.4.6.

- (11) a. (*At modice decet: moderare animo,*)
ne sis cupidus! (Pl. Mil. 1215)
 not be-2SG.SBJV eager-NOM
 ‘(Well, you need to be so in moderation. Control your heart,) and don’t
 be too eager!’
- b. ... *ac ne sis perturbatus.* (Cic. Att. 2.24.1)
 and not be-2SG.SBJV alarmed-NOM
 ‘... and don’t be alarmed.’

It is possible, however, that this order persists without the presence of negation, as in (12), in which the complexity and extension of *p* may have moved it to the right; the presence of the enclitic, on the other hand, contributes to the *V* adopting the absolute initial position:

- (12) *Sit autem vigilax, inpiger, industrius,*
 be-3SG.SBJV PTCL watchful-NOM energetic painstaking
navus. (Col. 7.9.10)
 active-NOM
 ‘(The swineherd) must be watchful, energetic, painstaking and active.’

In any case, the language does not always use rigid patterns of ordering, but rather the focal quality of a specific constituent can cause this constituent to become displaced to an initial position when this is not usual. Here are two such examples:

- (13) a. *Sit autem coloris unius.* (Col. 7.12.3)
 be-3SG.SBJV PTCL colour-GEN same-GEN
 ‘It [*sc.* the guard dog] should be the same colour all over.’
- b. *Tum etiam sit a venereis amoribus*
 further also be-3SG.SBJV from sexual indulgence-ABL
aversus. (Col. 11.1.14)
 averse-NOM
 ‘Further, he (*sc.* who is to take the duties of a bailiff) should also have an
 aversion to sexual indulgence.’
- c. *Coloris unius sit (?).*
 colour-GEN same-GEN be-3SG.SBJV

In (13a), the *S* – not even explicit – is clearly the (continued) Topic of the predication; the presence of *autem* may contribute to a certain thematic reorientation that develops in the following context and to an initial position of the *V*; to this is added the fact that the *p* is coded here through a genitive of quality, and the

The same focal quality of V can be found in (15), in that both the S and the p are contextually dependent; the choice of the postposed particle *igitur* facilitates the absolute initial position of the V:

- (15) (*Dionysius, vir optimus, ut mihi quoque est perspectus, et doctissimus tuique amantissimus, ...*)
Sit igitur sane bonus vir. (Cic. Att. 7.7.1)
 be-3SG.SBJV then very-ADV fine fellow-NOM
 ‘(The excellent Dionysius, as I also know him to be, a fine scholar too with a warm affection for you...) Agreed then that he is a very fine fellow.’⁴²

In (16), in addition to the focalization of the V,⁴³ there is a chiasm⁴⁴ which to some extent affords a certain balance after the coordination (sentence V ... *et* ... V):

- (16) *Sit haec sane patria potior et Romani omnes vocemur.* (Liv. 8.5.6)
 be-3SG.SBJV this-NOM truly our city-NOM rather and Romans-NOM
 all call-1PL.SBJV.PASS
 ‘By all means let this rather be our city and let us be known as Romans.’

Finally, there are two somewhat peculiar cases – (Example 17) – which have a low directive force. In these, the ordering seems to have been almost fixed, with characteristics similar to the cases of ‘proposal’ shown above in (9); about these, in whose sequence of constituents the V always takes an absolute initial position, the question arose as to whether they should be understood as they are here:⁴⁵

- (17) a. *Sit ista res magna, sicut est.*
 be-3SG.PRS.SBJV this thing-NOM.SG important-NOM as be-3SG.PRS
 (Cic. Leg. 1.17)
 ‘Let’s suppose such problems are important, as indeed they are.’⁴⁶

42. Translation from D.R. Shackleton-Bailey (2004), *Cicero’s Letters to Atticus*, III, Cambridge, CUP.

43. In the above context other measures are proposed and emphasis is put on some suggestions which, in a way, are seen at the end of the discourse of Annius to Tito Manlio; see Liv. 8.5.5–6.

44. Something which Devine and Stephens (2006: 164) indicate as being possible when the verb is found in the imperative in two coordinated clauses.

45. Cf. commentary in footnote to Example (9); if we propose that cases like (9) should not be considered directives, perhaps something similar should be done with this kind of examples. In any case, the initial position of the verb is a reflection of the pragmatic strategy involved here.

46. Translation from N. Rudd (1998), *Cicero. The Republic and The Laws*, Oxford, OUP.

- b. *Sit enim nobis amicus. quod incertum*
 be-3SG.SBJV indeed to US-DAT friend-NOM what not_sure
est, sed sit. (Cic. Att. 8.3.6)
 be-3SG.PRS but be-3SG.SBJV

'I do not know if Caesar will be friendly; but suppose he is.'

From a pragmatic point of view, both the S, if it is expressed, and the p are contextually dependent, so that, within the particular nature of this, we would have to consider that in expressions of this type, the strategy that locates and fixes the V in initial position configures the specific type of proposal that is made.

5. Conclusions

To summarize the main findings of this study, we can say that:

1. As regards the specific features of the use of moods in directives, this study confirms the majority of the claims made by Risselada (1993) and clarifies others (cf. Section 2). Also, it shows that the use of one verbal mood or another does not substantially alter the ordering of the constituents involved.⁴⁷
2. The distinction of speech act subtypes is shown to be relevant in the study of constituent order; both in general and even more clearly in monovalent constructions, the most frequent order appears in higher percentages when the directive force is greater.
3. In one-place constructions of a basically existential value, the verbs under analysis, although peculiar, show the same ordering as other types of verbs: modality is seen in these cases to be a determining factor of constituent order.
4. However, in bivalent constructions, the special nature of the copula, inasmuch as it is a verbal form with less predicational content, to some extent neutralizes the incidence of the modality that was decisive in monovalent constructions, thus reproducing the same trends of ordering as in declarative sentences. It is possible, also, that the observed trends of these constructions in declarative sentences in a very high number of occurrences – *sum* is the most frequent verb in the Latin language – have contributed to maintain this ordering pattern.
5. In any case, pragmatic, contextual, semantic, and syntactic factors justify not only majority patterns, but also deviations from these patterns.

47. The analysis of this statement is not addressed here due to limitations of space, but there exist statistical data supporting this conclusion.

Acknowledgements

This study falls within the framework of the Research Project FFI2013-47357-C4-4-P “*Problemas de rección en griego y en latín: verbos de estado y existencia*” (“Problems of government in Greek and Latin: stative and existential verbs”) funded by the Ministry of Economics and Competitiveness of the Spanish Government.

References

- Babič, Matjaz. 1992. Word order in Plautus: Interrogative and imperative sentences. *Živa Antika* 41(2): 56–63.
- Bauer, Brigitte L. M. 2009. Word order. In *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax, Vol. 1: Syntax of the Sentence*, Philip Baldi & Pierluigi Cuzzolin (eds), 241–316. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Cabrillana, Concepción. 1993. Posiciones relativas en la ordenación de constituyentes (I). Estudio de la posición de Sujeto, Objeto y Verbo. *Habis* 24: 249–266.
- Cabrillana, Concepción. 1994. Posiciones relativas en la ordenación de constituyentes (II). Estudio de la posición de Sujeto, Predicado nominal y Verbo. *Habis* 25: 451–460.
- Cabrillana, Concepción. 2001. Locative structures in constructions with *sum*. In *De lingua Latina novae quaestiones*, Claude Moussy (ed.), 275–290. Leuven: Peeters.
- Cabrillana, Concepción. 2010. *Consideración sintáctico-semántica de esse*. Santiago de Compostela: University of Santiago de Compostela.
- Cabrillana, Concepción. 2016a. Directives in Latin comedy: Pragmatics, dramatic role and social status. *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 15(2): 179–214. doi:10.1515/joll-2016-0012
- Cabrillana, Concepción. 2016b. Lexical domains in Latin predicative structures: ‘agentive’, fientive and stative types. In *Latinitatis Rationes. Descriptive and Historical Accounts for the Latin Language*, Paolo Poccetti (ed.), 312–331. Berlin: De Gruyter. doi:10.1515/9783110431896-022
- Devine, Andrew M. & Stephens, Laurence D. 2006. *Latin Word Order. Structured Meaning and Information*. Oxford: OUP. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195181685.001.0001
- Hengeveld, Kees. 1992. *Non-verbal Predication. Theory, Typology, Diachrony*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. doi:10.1515/9783110883282
- Lindsay, Wallace M. 1907. *Syntax of Plautus*. Oxford: James Parker and Co. (reprint 2002, London: Bristol Classical).
- Marouzeau, Jules. 1910. *La phrase à verbe “être” en latin*. Paris: Geuthner.
- Panhuis, Dirk G. J. 1982. *The Communicative Perspective in the Sentence. A Study of Latin Word Order* [Studies in Language Companion Series 11]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/slcs.11
- Pinkster, Harm. 1995. *Sintaxis y semántica del latín*. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas.
- Pinkster, Harm. 2015. *Oxford Latin Syntax, Vol. 1: The Simple Clause*. Oxford: OUP. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199283613.001.0001
- Powell, Jonathan G. F. 2005. Cicero’s adaptation of legal Latin in the *De legibus*. In *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*, Tobias Reinhardt, Michael Lapidge & James N. Adams (eds), 117–150. Oxford: OUP. doi:10.5871/bacad/9780197263327.003.0006

- Ridruejo, Emilio. 1999. Modo y modalidad. El modo en las subordinadas sustantivas. In *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, Vol. II, I. Bosque & V. Demonte (eds), 3209–5321. Madrid: Espasa.
- Risselada, Rodie. 1993. *Imperatives and other Directive Expressions in Latin: A Study in the Pragmatics of a Dead Language*. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben.
- Salvi, Giampaolo. 2011. A formal approach to Latin word order. In *Formal Linguistics and the Teaching of Latin. Theoretical and Applied Perspectives in Comparative Grammar*, Renato Oniga, Rossella Iovino & Giuliana Giusti (eds), 23–50. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.
- Spevak, Olga. 2004. Verb-subject order in Latin: the case of existential and locative sentences. *Classica et Mediaevalia* 55: 381–386.
- Spevak, Olga. 2010. *Constituent Order in Classical Latin Prose* [Studies in Language Companion Series 117]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/slcs.117
- Vairiel-Carron, Hélène. 1975. *Exclamation, ordre et défense: Analyse de deux systèmes syntaxiques en latin*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- de la Villa, Jesús. 2003. Límites y alternancias de los marcos predicativos. In *Praedicatiua. Complementación en griego y en latín, Anejo 53 de Verba*, José Miguel Baños, Concepción Cabrillana, M. Esperanza Torrego & Jesús de la Villa (eds), 19–49. Santiago de Compostela: University of Santiago de Compostela.
- Warner, Richard W. 1980. Word order in Old Latin: Copulative clauses. *Orbis* 29: 251–263.

