

# Preverbation, Transitivity and Lexical-Semantic Associations in State Verbs:

## the Particular Case of *ex(s)to*\*

Concepción Cabrillana (Santiago de Compostela)

### 1. Introduction and aim

Establishing the predicate frame of a verb demands the previous analysis and organisation of the information provided by the dictionaries on the matter, even if, initially, the semantics of the verb under analysis and its syntactic structure(s) do not seem too complex. Thus, following the OLD and Gaffiot's,<sup>1</sup> this would be characterized as follows:

Figure 1: *OLD*

1.	a. To project, protrude, stand out
	b. (w. abl. of the projecting part)
	c. (also tr.) to surpass (a person) in height
2.	To be conspicuous, catch attention
3.	a. To exist, be found
	b. (of information, etc.) to be on record
	c. <i>-at ratio</i> , a satisfactory account can be given
4.	To exist (in a given manner or condition)

Figure 2: *Gaffiot*

1.	se tenir au-dessus, être élevé au-dessus, dépasser
	[poét. avec acc] dépasser qqn
2.	être visible, se montrer, exister
	[impers. <i>exstat</i> avec prop. inf.] il est certain que; [avec int. ind.] il apparaît clairement

Before implementing a corpus study to check the information in the lexicons, one of the things that calls our attention first is the possibility to have a

\* This study forms part of Research Project FFI2009-13402-C04-03, subsidized by the Ministry of Science and Innovation; and I hereby thank the Project members their comments on its early version.

<sup>1</sup> I have not included a complete, organized account of the *ThLL* data, having focused on those up to the imperial period.

transitive construction, even in the case of state verbs, which are basically of the unaccusative type.

Considering that, this study (i) analyses the transitivity of the verb chosen, going into (ii) the concatenation of the lexical-semantic features in the different notions *exsto* may express, which provide the semantic field of the verb with unity; as a result, (iii) a range of features to which the said notions may be attached more or less intensely is provided, as well as their corresponding predicate frames.

For this study, instead of using examples from different lexicons (sometimes wrongfully classified), I will be using those from another study of a corpus containing poetic and prose texts from the archaic, republican, Augustan and imperial periods including the following authors and works: Plaut. (*Amph.*, *Asin.*, *Aul.*, *Bacch.*, *Capt.*, *Cas.*, *Cist.*, *Curc.*, *Epid.*, *Men.*, *Merc.*), Cic. (*Verr.*, *Catil.*, *Sest.*, *Mil.*, *Phil.*, *orat.*, *Brut.*, *fin.*, *off.*, *leg.*, *Att.*), Lucr., Verg. (*Aen.*), Ov. (*met.*), Liv., Colum., Plin. (*Nat.* 1–11, 28–32), Stat. (*silv.*) and Tac. (*hist.*, *dial.*).

## 2. Transitivity in state verbs

When it comes to explaining transitivization causes and its process in Latin, one of the issues discussed is the cases in which a preverb acts as a catalyst of the process.<sup>2</sup> Thus, it has been admitted that it is rather common to find simple, intransitive verbs behaving as transitive ones when they are attached a prefix, as a result of the government of the preverb used autonomously; moreover, analogy-based arguments explain government ‘transformations’ in other cases of elements governing accusative. This assimilation — as Serbat (1996: 223, 225) puts it — is, nonetheless, similar to government processes acting at a different level (nominal/verbal); according to this linguist (1996: 225–226), the fact that preverbation may imply transitivization can only be taken as a possibility and a tendency and not as a rule.

Furthermore, transitivity was described by Hopper & Thompson (1980) as a gradual feature characterised, among others, by the degree of agentivity of the Subject, the degree of affection of the Object and the degree of telicity expressed by the Verb. The latter is specifically referred to by Romagno (2003) in the case of preverbed elements, bringing together, this way, transitivity and the lexical aspect expressed by the verb. In this regard, García Hernández (1980, 1989) pointed out that preverbs bring about a lexical or aspectual meaning by designing the different stages of the verbal process (ingressive, progressive, resultative); in the case under analysis here — *ex(s)to* — its preverb would be among those providing a resultative meaning, mentioning, in particular, the “appearance of a double limit” (García

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Ernout & Thomas (1953: 20–21), Álvarez H. (2009: 133 ff.).

Hernández 1989: 151);<sup>3</sup> the author (1980: 157) also acknowledges the tendency of this preverb to indicate the relative semantic value on the basis of an inner limit with state verbs such as *exsto*<sup>4</sup> or *emineo*, and this value can be more clearly spotted in dictionaries.

Among the uses quoted in the aforementioned lexicons, intransitive ones are the most abundant tones, as could be expected in a state verb derived from *sto*; notwithstanding, in almost all of them a transitive use is also attested (with the meaning of ‘to surpass somebody’), although the same example is provided all the time; only the OLD provides another example, a participial one, which I think must also be considered an example of the intransitive use:

- 1) Ov. *met.* 12.350–353: *robore Nedymnum iaculatoremq̄ Lycopen / sternit et inmissa protectum pectora barba / Hippason et summis exstantem Riphea siluis / Thereaque*

The example provided by the Oxford, Gaffiot, Forcellini and ThLL lexicons is:

- 2) Stat. *silv.* 1.2.116: *quantum... egomet Nereidas exsto* (‘by as much as... I myself stand out above the Nereids’)<sup>5</sup>

It is in fact the entry in Forcellini’s dictionary that includes it among the original uses of the verb, mentioning also its poetic use.<sup>6</sup> Thus, it is frequent, though not exclusive, to find a transitive use in intransitive verbs in poetic texts or in prose texts of poetic inspiration.<sup>7</sup> As a matter of fact, in the corpus on the site *Musisque Deoque* including Latin poetic texts such as the *Carmen aruale* or creations written until at least the 7th century A.D. there are no further examples of the transitive use of *exsto*<sup>8</sup> and the same thing goes for the corpus<sup>9</sup> mentioned in §1. Why is it that the transitivization of *exsto*, obvious as it is, appears in such specific cases?<sup>10</sup> I think it is not a unique fact, as it rests upon a set of manifold reasons:

<sup>3</sup> Cf. also Serbat (1996: 225). Similarly, Brachet (1996: XIV, 238, 342, 345, 382 ff.; 2000: 327–329, 366–370) sees in *ex-* an aspectual use of “exhaustiveness”, springing possibly from the attachment of the preverb to certain verbs already possessing such value; still, *exsto* is not one of the verbs studied by this author and its analysis is particularly relevant in the paradigm of speech verbs (*eloqui*, *enarrare*, etc.).

<sup>4</sup> To differentiate between the values of the compound in relation to its corresponding simple form, consider the case of Ov. *met.* 4.731–732, in (10a).

<sup>5</sup> Most translations of these examples are totally or partially based upon those offered by Loeb.

<sup>6</sup> Proving also a poetic use. Cf. Gaffiot, *exsto* 1.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Pinkster (forthcoming; ch. 4 (‘Verb frames’), seen in January 2014). I hereby thank H. Pinkster for having let me take a look at this material.

<sup>8</sup> 277 total occurrences; the full list of the authors included can be checked in [http://www.mqdq.it/mqdq/indice\\_autori\\_alfa.jsp?scelta=AZ&path=autori](http://www.mqdq.it/mqdq/indice_autori_alfa.jsp?scelta=AZ&path=autori).

<sup>9</sup> 176 occurrences.

<sup>10</sup> In fact, there are no examples of passive forms of the verb to prove a more settled use of the transitive construction; there is only one *exstabatur* form in the Brepols LLT–A corpus, da-

(i) On the one hand, generally speaking, the preverbation of *sto* is linked to transitive constructions that are possible in 6 of the 11<sup>11</sup> cases found: *praesto*, *antesto*, *circumsto*, *insto*, *supersto* and *exsto* itself. Two of them — *praesto* and *antesto* — also exemplify, in their transitive use, a semantic content resembling that of the transitive *exsto* (‘to surpass’):

3a) Stat. *Theb.* 4.207: *Argolicasque habitu praestabo maritas*

3b) Mela 2.75: *sed antestat omnis Atacinorum Decimanorumque colonia... Narbo*

ii) On the other hand, the semantic similarity with other verbs with a clear, frequent accusative construction might have favoured this transitivity. Thus, the ThLL (s.v. *exsto*, 1931,23) mentions *supero*<sup>12</sup> in the following construction as a verb with the same meaning:

4) Ter. *Eun.* 231: *haec superat ipsam Thaidem*

(iii) Finally, context seems to be particularly determinant here: example 2) appears among a series of bivalent transitive constructions, proving that the author might have possibly wanted to trigger a syntactic parallelism reinforced by the fact that the other two verbs in the suite — *emineo* and *premo* — are semantically related in this case to the transitive *exsto*,<sup>13</sup> considering also that the features of the objects contribute to a greater transitivity, as opposite to what would happen if the context had an abstract reference (i.e., they are specific entities, human or personified):

5) Stat. *silv.* 1.2.114–116: *Latias metire quid ultra / emineat matres: quantum Latonia Nymphas / uirgo premit quantumque egomet Nereidas exsto*

Interpreting the text otherwise would be an alternative, yet, none of the editions I have searched includes punctuation variants that might lead to think of a different construction. Furthermore, Vollmer’s commentary (1971: *ad loc.*) states, expressly, that this is a construction of *exsto* with accusative and pins down its meaning, which seems to be unmistakably clear, matching the one provided in the lexicons: “hervorragend über”. Similarly, Vollmer mentions two fragments ratifying the meaning conferred to the text in question by the construction with accusative; the first one reproduces, formally, the comparative structure used in *Silv.* 1.2.114–116:

ting from the 12th–13th centuries, which cannot be ascribed the passive meaning ‘to surpass’: *ipsum etiam est ostium magnum et euidens, quod tunc sibi apertum iri Paulus exstatur* (Iohannes de Forda, *Super extremam partem Cantici canticorum sermones cxx*: CM 18, *sermo* 113, line 211).

<sup>11</sup> Apart from the next ones: *consto*, *disto*, *obsto*, *persto* and *resto*.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. also OLD, *supero* 3. In a similar sense, *antecedo* (OLD, 7: ‘to surpass in size or extent’): *alces magnitudine paulo antecedunt* (sc. *capreas*): Caes. *Gall.* 6.27.1). Cf. also the examples of *antecedo* plus accusative in ThLL, s.v., 144,1; 145,13; 145,38.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. ThLL, *exsto*, 1931,25; OLD, *premo*, 17. A certain stylistic synonymic *variatio* could be perceived.

6a) Stat. *Ach.* 1.293–296: *sed quantum uirides pelagi Venus addita Nymphas / obruit, aut umeris quantum Diana relinquit / Naidas, effulget tantum regina decori / Deidamia chori pulchrisque sororibus obstat*

6b) Val. Fl. 5.341–349: *his turbata* (sc. *Medea*) *minis fluuios ripamque petebat / Phasidis aequali Scythidum comitante caterua. / Florea per uerni qualis iuga duxit Hymetti / aut Sicula sub rupe choros hinc gressibus haerens / Pallados, hinc carae Proserpina iuncta Dianae. / altior ac nulla comitum certante, priusquam / palluit et uiso pulsus decor omnis Auerno; / talis et in uitis geminae cum lumine taedae / Colchis erat nondum miseris exosa parentes*

The recently-published study by Liberman (2010: *ad loc.*), explains this fragment as a rare example of the transitive *exsto* (“example unique de *exsto* transitif”) and refers to the parallel use of the transitive *praesto* in the sense of ‘surpassing’ (“surpasser”) in Stat. *Theb.* 4.207 (7a) — as shown in (3a) — and *Theb.* 4.846 (7b):<sup>14</sup>

7a) Stat. *Theb.* 4.207: *Argolicasque habitu praestabo maritas*

7b) Stat. *Theb.* 4.844–846: *te nec Apollineus Ladon nec Xanthus uterque / Spercheosque minas Centaureusque Lycormas / praestiterint*

Furthermore, it might be sensible to demand further proof for the transitive characterisation of Statius’s example of *exsto*; this proof could be provided by the existence of other examples of transitivity of preverbed predicates with *ex-* when their simple counterpart is intransitive, and even more so if — as happens with *exsto* — their simple counterpart is a state verb.

The scrutiny of 134<sup>15</sup> compound verbs with *ex-* provides an affirmative answer to this question, although it must be said that there are different degrees of consolidation in the way simple verbs shift from intransitivity (either exclusive, majority or alternating with the transitive uses) to transitivity (be it total, dominant or partial) in their compound counterpart, which is a logical corollary to the graduality affecting most linguistic processes. Thus, among others, we may quote:

(i) the examples of *mineo* (‘to lean forward, to project’)<sup>16</sup> – *emineo* (‘to cause to project’, ‘outpace’), *rubesco* (‘to become red; redden’) – *erubesco* (‘to respect’),<sup>17</sup> as stative verbs/verbs of feeling;

<sup>14</sup> Liberman (2010: *ad loc.*) advocates that this transitive use also points out the fact that this is so, that the text is correct; doubts might arise from the improbable substitution of *Nereisin* by *Nereidas*, something that cannot be proved.

<sup>15</sup> The range of verbs corresponds to those in the studies by García Hernández (1980: 155–161) and Brachet (2000: 229–372) plus two verbs that do not appear in the works mentioned (*emineo* and *excieo*).

<sup>16</sup> All the meanings assigned here appear in OLD: cf. Cabrilla (2011).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. OLD, s.v., 1g; Gafiott, s.v., 2; ThLL, s.v., 821,59. Nevertheless, cf. Haverling (1994: 46; 1996: 169, 177; 2000: 332–333). According to her (personal communication), the use of *erubesco* meaning ‘to respect’ might be actually an outcome of a semantic development of the verb after the classical period. On the other hand Mayer (2008) shows that the intended use is not the case in Cicero and in Livy; moreover, he points out that the usage present in Vergil (e.g., *sed iura fidemque/ supplicis erubuit*, Verg. *Aen.* 2.541–542) is rather a

(ii) the examples of *fluo* ('to flow, run' – *effluo* ('to allow (a fluid) to escape'), *eo* ('to go, proceed, make one's way') – *exeo* ('to allow (a fluid) to escape'), *gradior* ('to make one's way, proceed, step, walk') – *egredior* ('to go outside or beyond, leave or pass', 'to pass the limit of, exceed, overstep, etc.').), *uado* ('to advance, proceed, go') – *euado* ('to climb to the top of, surmount', 'to pass through or beyond; to get through (a journey, etc.)', 'to escape past or from', 'to escape (from undesirable conditions, events', 'to transcend, exceed', 'to live beyond (a period of time), survive') or *repro* ('to move in a more or less prone position with the body close to the ground') – *erepro* ('(tr.) to crawl across', 'to crawl or clamber up; (also tr.)'), as examples of predicates where the notion of movement is already present in the simple counterpart;

(iii) examples involving speech verbs: *iuuro* ('to take an oath, swear') – *eiuro* ('to deny under oath one's ability to perform (a service)': *bonam copiam ~are*, 'to make a sworn declaration of insolvency', 'to reject upon oath (jurors or sim.) on the grounds of partiality, etc.', 'to resign (a magistracy) with an oath that one has observed the laws during one's term of office', 'to disclaim connection with, disown (one's family, country, etc.)', 'to forswear (an allegiance); to renounce solemnly (a practice, etc.)', 'to swear solemnly that'), *loquor* ('to talk, speak') – *eloquor* ('to utter (words), say', 'to put (ideas) into words, express', 'to reveal in words, divulge, tell');

(iv) or other semantic notions: *bullio* ('to bubble, efervescere, boil') – *ebullio* ('(tr.) to spot out; to chatter about', *animam ~ire*, (colloq.) 'to give up the ghost, expire').

Surely enough, the number of verbs whose compound forms admit transitive constructions (at least during the archaic and classical periods) is not particularly high; yet, it is not the frequency of this fact that is definitive as far as this is concerned, but the ascertainment that this type of processes takes place in the language.<sup>18</sup>

Therefore, the verb expands and this happens — among other reasons — because it is somewhat related to another group of bivalent<sup>19</sup> verbs, either semantically or contextually. Furthermore, this transitivization runs parallel to a certain degree of abstraction<sup>20</sup> of the primary, more specific meaning of

feature of "poetic language", perhaps inspired by some expression met with in Greek poetry. I thank G. Haverling for her comment.

<sup>18</sup> Due to length constraints, it is not possible to go into this matter in this lecture; thus, for an explanation and in-detail description of the facts and their corresponding data, see Cabrilla (2011), where it can also be seen that something similar happens with preverbed compound forms with *de-*.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Pinkster (forthcoming; seen in January 2014, ch. 4: 75, 77).

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Hofmann & Szantyr (1965: 33), García Hernández (1980: 226) or Serbat (1996: 227).

the intransitive verb: it goes from 'to protrude' — *ui locali*, as shown in the ThLL (1929, l. 41) — to 'to surpass', and not necessarily, as stated in the OLD (s.v., 1b), in terms of height, but in terms of more abstract features such as beauty,<sup>21</sup> as can be seen in (2). Strictly speaking there is no agentivity on the side of the Subject or affection as far as the Object is concerned, but there is a slight upraise in the degree of telicity of the verb, as there is a change from 'to stand out'<sup>22</sup> to 'to outdo' someone.

The question, thus, is whether it is convenient to put forward a predicate frame for such isolated, specific examples, or consider them rather as a concrete extension, what could be the most adequate option; in any case, should this turn out to be necessary, the complementation structure would remain as follows:

8) V<sub>Outdo</sub>    x<sub>1</sub>[+anim]<sub>Affected: Stative</sub>    x<sub>2</sub>[+anim]<sub>Patient</sub>

### 3. Concatenation of lexical-semantic features

#### 3.1. Original sense and degree of abstraction

This matter connects with a central aspect that must be considered when it comes to describing the possible semantic values of *exsto* and their corresponding syntactic structures.

Most certainly, the specific notion of (OLD 1a) 'to project, protrude, stand out' is clear in the lexicons and in the corpus analysed, with a seemingly monovalent structure:

9) Colum. 9.8.11: *aut extat ramus*

Yet, it can be thought that, as the verb here involves an elative notion, the entity from (according to) which something stands out forms part of the predicate frame of the verb; in other words: a complement with a sense of Origin or maybe of Spatial Reference forms part of the verb's argument structure. The preference for the non-grammaticalised semantic function of

<sup>21</sup> Cf. the previous context, which forms part of the conversation between Venus and one of the Putti escorting her about the maiden he who has been struck by Cupid's arrows had fallen in love with: Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.107–114.

<sup>22</sup> García Hernández (1980: 56) points out that transitivization entails the expansion beyond the Subject of the centrifugal verbal action, which is projects upon an Object. Besides, it seems rather possible for the transitivity of Stat. *silv.* 1.2.116 to be partly justified by the findings of Thompson & Hopper (2001), Vázquez Rozas & García-Miguel (2006) or Vázquez Rozas (2007), considering that the aforementioned example appears in direct speech and also in the first person, namely, that transitivity is also related to the expression of mental attitudes revealing the subjectivity of the speaker. In non-factitive verbs, the transitive construction might have extended towards non-prototypical situations where instead of an energy transfer, psycho-socially-oriented interactions take place: cf. Vázquez Rozas (2007).

Spatial Reference<sup>23</sup> to that of Origin, with which it shares marks,<sup>24</sup> would be explained by the fact that the argument specifies the limit or the reference entity with regards to which another entity stands out, without perceiving any movement in many cases. Nevertheless, the notion of oriented movement — from the inside to the outside — seems not to be altogether lacking in the verb, and this notion of orientation may be enough to assign a Semantic Function (henceforth SF) of Origin<sup>25</sup> to these terms; thus, it can be said that the complement structure ([preposition +] case/adverb) adds a parallel meaning to the spatial realizations even if there is not physical movement all the time,<sup>26</sup> strictly speaking, but a sort of fictional movement, a situation issuing from a trajectory.

Additionally and as usually the said complement can be easily recovered from either the linguistic or the generic context; it is possible not to state it explicitly, as happens in (9). Regardless of this, a study about the corpus selected for this research shows that this argument is explicitly stated in 43.18% of the cases (19 out of 44 examples), with different codifications:<sup>27</sup>

- 10a) Ov. *met.* 4.731–732: ... *scopulum, qui uertice summo / stantibus exstat aquis*
- 10b) Liv. 37.41.6: *cuspides circa temonem ab iugo decem cubita exstantis uelut cornua habebant*
- 10c) Ov. *met.* 6.236: *exstabat nudum de gutture ferrum*
- 10d) Colum. 5.11.7: *si pusillam arborem <in>serere uoles, imam abscidito, ita ut sesquipedem e terra extet*
- 10e) Colum. 3.6.3: *super terram gemmis tribus uel quattuor extantibus*
- 10f) Liv. 21.8.10: *praeterquam ad extremum unde ferrum exstabat*

The entity expressing Origin is a place or can be conceptualised as such and, hence, the predicate frame of this notion could be the following one:

- 11) V<sub>Stand out, appear out of (from)</sub> x<sub>1</sub>[±concrete]<sub>Affected:Stative</sub> x<sub>2</sub>[+place/+concrete]<sub>Origin</sub>

Choosing between the feature [+place] or [+concrete] in the case of the second argument will depend on whether a more prototypical ([+place]) or a more general ([+concrete]) formulation is chosen. As to the characterization of the first argument, this has in most cases a concrete nature, although there are 3 somewhat dubious cases in which this condition is not met, namely

<sup>23</sup> This Semantic Function would be similar to the one exemplified by the spot from which the distance is measured in verbs such as *absūm*; cf. Cabrilla (2014).

<sup>24</sup> The Origin is a prerogative of verbs carrying the preverb *ex-* and it is usually expressed through preposition (*a, ab, e, ex, de*) + ablative; cf. Baños (2009a: 315).

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Baños (2009a: 324), who advocates for the assignment of the SF of Direction for predicates in which a certain orientation can be perceived: *alterum* (sc. *latus*) *uergit ad Hispaniam atque occidentem solem* (Caes. *Gall.* 5.13.2).

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Baños (2009a: 327).

<sup>27</sup> It should be checked whether the use of different prepositions adds any specific semantic nuance to the meaning expressed by that constituent. Besides, Torrego's statement (2009: 237) about the argument-related quality of the ablative expressing Origin should be borne in mind.

(12a–12c), those where the lexical (abstract) nature might condition the presence and the type of x<sub>2</sub>:

- 12a) Lucr. 1.336: *namque officium quod corporis exstat*
- 12b) Lucr. 2.256: *libera<sup>28</sup> per terras unde haec animantibus exstat?<sup>29</sup>*
- 12c) Cic. *Verr.* II 3.178: *etenim noua quoque alia res, iudices, exstitit in hoc crimine*

This notion of 'standing out' physically reaches a greater degree of abstraction when combined with different aspectual shades, because surpassing a (double) limit may involve entering a certain state,<sup>30</sup> and, thus, apart from having something that already existed stand out-emerge-appear (13a–13c), something that was not may come into existence (14a–14c); at the same time, this type of notions are linked to a perfect tense in an inverted proportion,<sup>31</sup> which is something that may play a relevant role in the resultative quality observed:

- 13a) Cic. *Brut.* 32: *exstitit igitur iam senibus illis quos paulo ante diximus Isocrates*
- 13b) Liv. 22.60.19: *ex milibus septem armatorum sescenti exstiterunt qui erumpere auderent*
- 13c) Tac. *hist.* 2.72: *extiterat quidam Scribonianum se Camerinum ferens*
- 14a) Lucr. 5.70: *tum quae tellure animantes extiterint*
- 14b) Cic. *leg.* 3.31: *quaecumque mutatio morum in principibus extiterit*
- 14c) Cic. *Brut.* 161: *quod idcirco posui, ut dicendi Latine prima maturitas in qua aetate exstitisset posset notari*

Therefore, the notions 'appear' and 'exist' are semantically related: a verb of appearance could be considered a verb of coming into existence and, similarly, a verb of existence could be used to describe the state resulting from the apparition of a given entity.<sup>32</sup> This is partly why it is so difficult to isolate some of the semantic contents of *exsto*: the thin borderline exemplified by cases (13) and (14) adds up to examples in which there is a clear notion of existence.<sup>33</sup>

- 15) Cic. *Verr.* II 1.115: ... *si quis testamento se heredem esse arbitraretur quod tum non exstaret ...*

<sup>28</sup> Used in the substantivized form: cf. OLD, *liber* 10b: '(of faculties, choice, etc.) exercised or used at one's own discretion'.

<sup>29</sup> The context of this example (Lucr. 2.251–260) clearly sends to a situation of movement.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Brachet (1996: XIII–XIV).

<sup>31</sup> In the notion of existence almost ¾ of the occurrences are *perfectum* ones, while in those where it is the 'standing out' notion that can be apprehended, a similar amount of examples is expressed in an *infectum* tense. On top of this, it must be pointed out that it is difficult to tell apart morphologically the forms corresponding to *exsto* and those corresponding to *exsisto*.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Levin & Rappaport (1995: 120).

<sup>33</sup> This existence notion is stressed as, just like in the case of *esse*, it can be proved in the lexical counterpart of the reporting verb if the first argument is an event — Liv. 28.25.6 —, and it can also appear in locative existential constructions — Lucr. 6.500 — or in existential constructions with dative — Lucr. 6.494 —, although these are rather infrequent occurrences. Cf. Cabrilla (2010: 51–53, 100–103, 112–115).

And, even more frequently, they add up to others with a durative shade:

16) Plin. *nat.* 5.13: *ibi <p>au<ca> extare circa uestigia habitati quondam soli, uinearum palmeterorumque reliquias*

It could be said that existence is expressed from the point of view of its result: its permanence, its preservation and, therefore, the perpetuity of an entity, a memory, an event, etc.:

17a) Cic. *Brut.* 62: *et hercules eae quidem exstant*  
 17b) Plin. *nat.* 28.7: *exstant commentationes Democriti*  
 17c) Liv. 39.40.7: *monumentum eloquentiae nullum exstet*

The predicate frame of the notion of existence is almost unrestricted, hence, its generic predicate frame would be as follows:

18) V<sub>EXIST</sub> x<sub>1</sub>[±concrete]<sub>Affected: Stative</sub>

### 3.2 Feature [+ durative]

This durative nuance can also be seen in another meaning included in the lexicons: in a way, if something ‘keeps existing’ it may be due to the fact that such state is recorded somewhere, in other words, that it ‘appears’ (either physically or not) somehow. Yet, it is not easy to separate both meanings (19a–19b) and this may prove that this is in fact a contextual realisation of the aforementioned existential notion, rather than a new lexical value of the verb. The durative nuance occasionally found in the verb is not enough, as an argument, to mark both notions as different; and what their translations mark as a new sense is, in fact, nothing but a lexical specialisation of the first argument (in half of the cases this argument is an event and the place in which that event is recorded is mentioned on very few occasions)<sup>34</sup> (20a–20b):

19a) Plin. *nat.* 28.12: *exstat Tucciae Vestalis incesti deprecatio*  
 19b) Liv. 26.13.16: *ne stirpis, ne memoria originum suarum exstaret*<sup>35</sup>  
 20a) Liv. 29.37.8: *ut quantum numero militum, quantum pecunia ualerent in publicis tabulis monumenta exstarent*  
 20b) Plin. *nat.* 2.140: *exstat annalium memoria sacris quibusdam et precationibus uel cogi fulmina uel impetrari*<sup>36</sup>

<sup>34</sup> It appears explicitly in 4 cases out of the 15 admitting the translation ‘appear (in)’. In fact, it seems very likely in most cases for that element to be really lacking from the mind of the speaker: *ut... exstaret constantiae meae testimonium* (Cic. *Phil.* 1.38); Cicero refers to his desire to make a certain speech.

<sup>35</sup> It refers to the fact that the city of Alba had been devastated to its foundations.

<sup>36</sup> The impersonal use is already very close to the latter: *quem uero exstet et de quo sit memoriae proditum eloquentem fuisse et ita esse habitum, primus est M. Cornelius Cethegus* (Cic. *Brut.* 57).

### 3.3. Semantic displacement and (semi-)copulative uses

Some examples of the evolution towards what some lexicons call a “weaker”<sup>37</sup> use are the copulative cases with *exsto*, clearly documented sometimes (24a–24c),<sup>38</sup> although in some occasions a certain resultative nuance can be spotted (25):

24a) Lucr. 4.893: *(sc. aer) qui semper mobilis extat*  
 24b) Liv. 44.22.7: *(sc. rumores) quorum auctor*<sup>39</sup> *nemo extabit*  
 24c) Lucr. 4.956: *et multo sopor ille grauissimus exstat*  
 25) Cic. *Mil.* 64: *ergo illa falsa fuerunt quae certe uera exstitissent, si Milo...*

This resultative nuance is compatible with a notion of abstract elative movement,<sup>40</sup> and it may even act as a semi-copulative verb, meaning *fio* or *euenio*; these values show a possible intermediate stage in the gradual process of ‘copularization’:

26a) Colum. 5.9.16: *sic uelut inita arbor fecundo semine fertilior exstat*  
 26b) Lucr. 6.972: *qua nihil est homini quod amarius fronde ac<ida> extet*  
 26c) Cic. *Phil.* 14.14: *an uero ego qui Catilinam haec molientem sustulerim, euerterim, adflixerim, ipse exstiterim repente Catilina?*  
 26d) Liv. 3.33.10: *C. Iulius decemuir diem Sextio dixit et accusator ad populum exstitit*

Thus, this meaning must be provided with an independent predicate frame that would prototypically be organised as follows:

27) V<sub>Be(come)</sub> x<sub>1</sub>[±concrete]<sub>Affected: Stative</sub> x<sub>2</sub>[+quality]<sub>Subj. Compl.</sub>

The aforementioned copulative uses are somewhat ambiguous sometimes when it comes to differentiating the constructions that can be interpreted as monovalent (existential) cases with *praedicativum*, except when the said *praedicativum* does not show any agreement.

### 3.4. Lexical specialisation

Finally, and as a special use subject to a specific lexical restriction, *exsto* appears with the meaning of ‘to prove’, generally when the first argument is *ratio*:<sup>41</sup>

28) Cic. *Att.* 10.8.5: *†non simul cum Pompeio mare transierimus. Omnino non potuimus.† Exstat ratio dierum*

<sup>37</sup> Cf. ThLL, *exsto* 1934, 26.

<sup>38</sup> There are also examples where the copulative notion is followed by a genitive, as in *esse*: Cic. *Phil.* 1.13.

<sup>39</sup> The construction reminds of the lexicalised expression with *sum*, *auctor esse*; cf. OLD, *auctor* 3a.

<sup>40</sup> This feature is compatible with the possibility to attribute the SF of Origin to the complement that appears in those cases in which the notion involved is ‘standing out/appearing’: cf. *supra*, § 2.1.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. OLD, *exsto* 3c.

In spite of certain lexicons and against all odds, this meaning has to do with some others mentioned so far, as the semantic contents of ‘to prove’ is to evidence the truth or the *existence* of something,<sup>42</sup> a concept linked to the semantic field of *exsto*.<sup>43</sup> Thus, these cases could be understood — even though they are very rarely found — as a new lexical specialisation of ‘to exist’, and it would not be necessary to draw a new predicate structure for it.

#### 4. Conclusions

The common features — partly due to the presence of a preverb — accounting for the connection between the different meanings of *exsto* blur the difference between them, sometimes, or make it ambiguous, which means that they do not relate to each other in a completely discrete way, but depending on the association of certain features referring both to their semantic content and to their lexical aspect. These features are, basically, [+resultative], [+relative], [+telic], [+durative], and they appear more or less intensely depending on the notion in question.

Thus, although the features [+resultative] and [+relative] affect all the different meanings, they appear more intensely in the physical notion of ‘to protrude’ and in its projections concerning the coming into existence or the changes in someone’s way of being. The reduction of the feature [+relative] gives way to part of the copulative notion<sup>44</sup> and the intensification of the [+durative] aspect leads to contents involving ‘continuing to exist’.

Besides, the transitive construction in 2), as explained in § 1, seems to be rather the result of a punctual concentration of a certain degree of [+telicity] and of lexical-contextual reasons, rather than the result from a generalised use in the case of *exsto*.

#### Bibliographical references

- Álvarez Huerta, O., 2009, ‘V. Acusativo’, in: Baños (2009), 131–154.  
 Baños, J. M., (ed.), 2009, *Sintaxis del latín clásico*, Madrid.  
 Baños, J. M., 2009a, ‘X1. Preposiciones’, in: Baños (2009), 299–347.  
 Brachet, J.-P., 1996, *Les préverbes ab-, dē-, ex- du latin: étude linguistique*, Paris.  
 —, 2000, *Recherches sur les préverbes dē- et ex- du latin*, Bruxelles.  
 Cabrillana, C., 2010, *Consideración sintáctico-semántica de esse. Un estudio a través de la prosa de Livio*, Santiago de Compostela.  
 —, 2011, ‘Gradualidad en los procesos de transitivación de compuestos preverbados latinos: ilustración sobre verbos en *dē-* y *ex-*’, in: M. J. García Blanco, T. Amado Rodríguez, M. J.

- Martín Velasco, A. Pereiro Pardo & M. E. Vázquez Buján (eds.), *Αντίδορον. Homenaje a Juan José Moralejo*, Santiago de Compostela, 95–110.  
 —, 2014, ‘Algunos problemas en torno al marco predicativo de *absūm*’, in: C. Cabrillana & Ch. Lehmann (eds.), *Acta XIV. Colloquii Internationalis Linguisticae Latinae*, Madrid, 211–227.  
 Ernout, A., & F. Thomas, 1953, *Syntaxe Latine*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Paris.  
 Forcellini, E., 1940, *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon*, Padova.  
 Gaffiot, F., 1991, *Dictionnaire latin-français*, Paris.  
 García Hernández, B., 1980, *Semántica estructural y lexemática del verbo*, Barcelona.  
 —, 1989, ‘Les préverbes latines. Notions latives et aspectuelles’, in: M. Lavency & D. Longrée (eds.), *Actes du Ve Colloque de Linguistique Latine. Louvain-la-Neuve/Borzée, 31 mars–4 avril 1989*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 149–159.  
 Glare, P. G. W. (ed), 1982, *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford.  
 Haverling, G. V. M., 1994, ‘On the *sco*-suffix, on prefixes, and on the development of the Latin verbal system’, in: J. Herman (ed.), *Linguistic Studies on Latin: Selected Papers from the 6th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Budapest 23–27 March 1991*, Amsterdam – Philadelphia, 41–53.  
 —, 1996, ‘On *-sco* verbs, on prefixes and on semantic functions’, in: H. Rosén (ed.), *Aspects of Latin: Papers from the Seventh International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics. Jerusalem, April 1993*, Innsbruck, 169–180.  
 —, 2000, *On Sco-verbs, Prefixes and Semantic Functions*, Göteborg.  
 Hofmann, J. B., & A. Szantyr, 1965, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik (= Lateinische Grammatik, vol. 2, by Leumann, Hofmann & Szantyr)*, Munich.  
 Hopper, P. J., & S. A. Thompson, 1980, ‘Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse’, *Language* 56,2, 251–299.  
 Levin, B., & M. Rappaport, 1995, *Unaccusativity. At the Syntax-Lexical Semantics Interface*, Cambridge (Mass.)/London.  
 Liberman, G., 2010, *Stace: Silves. Édition et commentaire critique*, Paris.  
*Musisque Deoque*, archivo digitale di poesia latina, <http://www.mqdq.it/mqdq/home.jsp>.  
 Mayer, R. G., 2008, ‘Two tricky intransitives’, *Classical Quarterly* 58, 2008, 342–344.  
 Pinkster, H., forthcoming, *Oxford Latin Syntax, Part I: The Simple Clause*, Oxford.  
 Serbat, G., 1996, *Grammaire fondamentale du latin, VI. L’emploi des cas en latin, v. 1: Nominatif, Vocatif, Accusatif, Génitif, Datif*, Louvain – Paris.  
 Romagno, D., 2003, ‘Azionalità e transitività: il caso dei preverbi latini’, *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 88,2, 156–170.  
 Thompson, S. A., & P. Hopper, 2001, ‘Transitivity, clause structure, and argument structure: evidence from conversation’, in: J. Bybee & P. Hopper (eds.), *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure*, Amsterdam, 27–60.  
 Torrego, M. E., 2009, ‘VIII. Ablativo’, in: J. M. Baños (2009), 211–249.  
*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, 1900–1999, Leipzig; 2000–2006, Munich – Leipzig; 2007–, Berlin – Boston.  
 Vázquez Rozas, V., 2007, ‘A usage-based approach to prototypical transitivity’, in: N. Delbecque & B. Cornillie (eds.), *On Interpreting Construction Schemas. From Action and Motion to Transitivity and Causality*, Berlin/New York, 17–38.  
 Vázquez Rozas, V., & J. M. García-Miguel, 2006, ‘Transitividad, subjetividad y frecuencia de uso’, *Actes del VII Congrés de Lingüística General* (Barcelona, 18–21 de abril de 2006), Publ. CD-ROM (ISBN 84-475-2086-8).  
 Vollmer, F., 1971, *Publius Papinius Statius silvarum libri*, Hildesheim.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. *OED*, ‘to prove’, 1; 2a.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. § 2.1.

<sup>44</sup> It should be kept in mind that when a semi-copulative notion appears, a transformation, rather than a more or less abstract physical movement, can be observed (that is, a change in someone’s way of being).