STRUCTURES OF IDENTIFICATION AND ATTRIBUTION WITH *SVM**

Concepción CABRILLANA
Universidad de Santiago

Summary

Sum constructions have received several classifications, which take into account constructional and semantic differences. This paper analyses the implication of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic factors in some specific constructions with *sum*: when case agreement exists between both constituents (S-p). I will apply four criteria of analysis, in order to determine if the so-called identifier type differs from other described types: 1) Absolute and relative arrangement of the constituents; 2) Pragmatic structure which makes up the constituent elements; 3) Word class and lexical content of the constituents; 4) Referential definition of Subject and Nominal predicate.

The data taken from Livy allow us to formulate some correlations between the mentioned factors and also show some differences between the types of constructions analysed.

0. Introduction

The Latin copulative verb *sum* has been the target of numerous proposals and characterizations, of greater or lesser complexity.[1] Nevertheless, a complete description of its behaviour that takes into account the diverse nature of the factors at stake in the different constructions it forms remains an open question.

The difficulty of such a study is determined, among other reasons, by the variety of uses that the chosen verb shows, even if exclusive attention is

---

[1] Cf., among others, Marouzeau (1910), Happ (1976: 462; 560), Bolkestein (1983), Serbat (1983: 12), García-Hernández (1992), Touratier (1994: 352-354), García-Hernández (1995) o Pinkster (1995: 2). From a more general perspective the following may be of interest: Benveniste (1950), Dik (1980: 90-91; 110-111), Lyons (1980: 416-417), Matthews (1981: 113-120), Quirk *et al.* (1985: 820 ff.). A particularly thorough study, with regard to the Ancient Greek, is Kahn (1973).

---

paid to the various distributional structures it presents, that is, if the obser-
vation is limited to the syntactic criterion. Naturally, it is not possible to
circumscribe the study of a verb's behaviour to one single level of analysis
in order to account for its whole reality; specially, in the investigation of a
particularly complex verb such as *sum*.

The present paper aims at carrying out a part of the aforesaid description,
by means of the arrangement and application of a series of criteria that may
be shown relevant within the correspondent analysis, with regard to a partic-
ular type of structure. In this arrangement I shall establish the following
restrictions:

1. The first one is a methodological order reason that, at the same time,
   it has implications of a nuclear character: my treatment of the verb
   chosen for study regarding its structural description will be similar to
   that applicable to other verbs in the Latin system; that is to say, the
   verb form will be regarded as the nucleus of the predicate around
   which the different arguments and satellites are arranged. As I say, this
   procedure derives from methodological reasons rather than from the
   definition and characterization of the verb itself.[2]

2. Secondly, in this project I will not deal with certain uses of *sum*, such
   as: forms of *esse* as auxiliary verb, *esse* in nominal function, or lexical-
   ized formulas.

The structure of the study will be as follows: firstly (1.), some of the
most recent classifications of the uses of *sum* will be compared, out of
which the fundamental point of analysis can be derived. The analysis itself
will follow immediately (2.), and it will be.put into effect by studying the
criteria established for the description of the aforesaid structure: that in
which there exists a case coincidence between both constituents. Finally
(3.), some conclusions drawn from the facts displayed put an end to the
presentation.

The basis for the investigation is constituted by Livius 1.[3]

1. Approach and criteria of analysis

It is not my intention to present a detailed analysis of the different pro-
posals offered for the arrangement of the above-mentioned uses of *sum*.[4] I
will start from the data offered by two of the most recent ones.

---

[2] This question will be dealt with in more detail below.

[3] The total sum of the countable occurrences of the *sum* verb is 314.

[4] Cf. note 1.

First, Touratier (1994: 352-354) basically distinguishes two types of sentences with *esse*: (1.) those in which the verb functions by itself as a predicate, and in which it has the lexical value equivalent to "to exist" or "to live", and (2.) and those in which *esse* needs a verb complement to function as a predicate; within this second type, two semantic subclasses are to be differentiated: (i) locative phrases, (ii) copulative phrases.[5]

On the other hand, H. Pinkster's typology (1995: 1-2) establishes the following uses: 1. adjective plus copula: (1) *ouum ouo simile est*; 2. meaningless copula: (2) *Alexander erat rex Macedonum*;[6] 3. identifier: (3) *(cum) Pylades Orestem se esse diceret* (Cic. *Lael.* 24); 4. verb of two positions: (4): *ut ... uos istic commodissime sperem esse* (Cic. *Fam.* 14,7,2).[7]

Apart from these types, Bolkestein (1983) discusses the existential use; within this usage a dative may appear:

     (5a) liber puero est (Bolkestein 1983: 55).[8]

Furthermore, I believe that it is possible to comprise within these existential uses those occurrences of *sum* where no other element apart from the Subject appears, as de Groot (1983: 115-117) and Bolkestein herself (1983: 56; 1995: 36-37) acknowledge. Thus, for example:

     (5b) prudentiamne uis esse, sine qua ne intellegi quidem ulla uirtus potest? (Cic. *Tusc.* 2,31);[9]
     (5c) summum erat periculum (Cic. *Att.* 1,17, 9).[10]

---

[5] In the copulative phrases, *esse* seems to be only a grammatical link between the Subject and the constituent which might be regarded as predicate, defined as the immediate non-verbal constituent (CI) of a SV which has the verb *esse* as nucleus.

[6] In this kind of structures, *rex esse* is regarded by Pinkster as a unity, for it can be compared to *regnare* and the copula by itself does not contribute to the content of the phrase; its value is grammatical: it provides the indications of time, mood and number; the predicate is constituted, therefore, by the copula plus the nomimal predicate: it is the same point of view that had been maintained by Lyons (1971: 335), Dik (1980: 110) or Quirk *et al.* (1985: 80).

[7] Pinkster (1995: 2) also mentions the use of *sum* as an auxiliary verb which will not be dealt with here.

[8] The dative may also appear, according to Bolkestein (1983: 76-77), in another kind of structures: copulative (*turpe tibi est irasci* (Bolkestein 1983: 76)) or ambiguous (they admit two different interpretations: as existential or as copulative, as in *puero corpus infirmum est* (Bolkestein 1983: 74)). Bolkestein (1983: 56; 70; 76) makes further reference to the uses that have been considered existential in which there appears a locative complement – as in *there is a book on the table* – which, on the other hand, would coincide with those Pinkster considers of two positions.

[9] This is the example provided by Touratier (1994: 352) to illustrate the first of the uses of *esse* he distinguishes, that is, those in which the verb functions by itself as a predicate.

[10] Bolkestein explains that this example is ambiguous, since it lends itself both to an existential and a copulative interpretation; the same author (1995: 36-37) presents furthermore an example of an existential use with a verb that may be considered copulative: *tantaque inter eos dissensio extitit* (Caes. *Ciu.* 1,20,3).

On the other hand, Pinkster (1995: 1-2) explains in a footnote that his restrictive concept of "Predicate" would not include sentences like

(6)   John is a *soldier / brilliant*,

where the italicized constituents bear the label of "Subject Complement"; as can be seen, this denomination may be applied both to noun and adjective constituents.[11]

First of all, it is not completely clear, in my opinion, whether this author considers that in the uses 1 and 3 the copula has a meaning. Pinkster himself (1995: 2, n. 4) acknowledges some difficulties in distinguishing the identifying kind with respect to the copulative one, and requests further investigation in this sense. Well then, this is the particular kind of structure that I am about to study: the one formed by two constituents where there is case agreement. More particularly, within the mentioned structures, the following kinds may be distinguished:

1. constructions where the referent of the constituent with Subject function is identified with a term which has a sole referent:

    (7)   Sex. Tarquinius sum (Liu. 1,58,2);

2. constructions where the constituent with Subject function finds in the second term an attribution of quality:

    (8)   sed querellae, (...) cum forsitan necessariae erunt (Liu. *Praef.* 12);

3. constructions where the second constituent specifies its pertaining to a group or class, without this relation implying identification:

    (9)   (Tarquinius) nec ut iniustus in pace rex, ita dux belli prauus fuit (Liu. 1,53,1).

Obviously, the type 1 coincides with the so-called identifier by Pinkster; the type 2, with the one formed by the adjectives plus copula; those cases in which the copula may or may not have a meaning could be included within the type 3. I shall provisionally call those types which are not identifiers "copulative-attributive". Thus, I will study these two kinds in contrast to make an attempt towards the investigation that Pinkster (1995: 2, n. 4) was referring to.

But let us have a look now at (10) and (11):

    (10) Sextus filius eius, qui minimus ex tribus erat, transfugit ex composito Gabios (Liu. 1,53,5);

---

[11] Cf. also Pinkster (1995: 28).

(11) Numitori, qui stirpis maximus erat, regnum uetustum Siluiae gentis legat (Liu. 1,3,10),

where the second constituent is an adjective, which is the usual word class of the constructions in which a property is attached to the Subject referent. Nevertheless, in this case there is an attribution of a quality, but also, since it is an adjective in the singular and the superlative degree with a sole referent, there exists also an authentic identification.

As a result, the differentiation of the described types is indeed related, though not exclusively, to the word class; its distinction depends rather on the second constituent's having a sole reference. However, this cannot always be clearly observed; thus, (12)

(12) Numae Pompili regis nepos filia ortus Ancus Marcius erat[12] (Liu. 1,32,1).

Here the proper noun appears as S, whose referential designation is greater than that of the other term; nevertheless, given that there is no lexical expression of an article to determine the noun *nepos* as a term with a sole referent, I think that it is necessary to have recourse to the context. Both real characters have in fact been already introduced and, on the other hand, in the immediately following context we find, with reference to Ancus Marcius, *qui ut regnare coepit, et auitae gloriae memor* ...; therefore, it appears that what is at stake here is that Ancus Marcius was also of royal stock, which would not imply an identification but rather an attribution. We dare say that there is evidence to consider that the distinction between the types object of study is not always clear, but that there is a series of cases where their being included in one or another of the described types depends largely on the context; in this sense, it seems that these structures are moving along a gradual scale.

Accordingly, this project aims at studying the structures in which there is case agreement (types (7)-(9)) in both nominal terms, as well as at determining whether the so-called identifier type differs from the other described types, that is: 1) whether, irrespective of the form, the identifiers have common features with regard to the other structures, and 2) whether it is possible to find the factor or factors which determine the presence of a certain semantic relation. With that object in mind, I will be applying the following criteria of analysis: 1) Absolute and relative arrangement of the constituents. 2) Pragmatic structure which makes up the constituent elements (in the case of this

---

[12] In my opinion, the form *ortus* corresponds to a participle in agreement with *nepos,* and not with the passive form *orior,* precisely because of the presence of *nepos*; therefore, to my understanding, the verb form of the sentence is exclusively *erat.*

construction, Subject (= S) and Nominal Predicate (= p). 3) Word class and lexical content of the constituents. 4) Referential definition[13] of S and p.

The application of the aforesaid criteria, which correspond to different linguistic levels, will allow us to see if the phenomena characteristic of such levels behave in an independent or interrelated manner. In the case of the first two criteria, a relatively independent application, so to speak, is feasible, but in the case of criteria 3 and 4, the aspects they include are found, at times, narrowly related, and their study will thus be carried out as a whole.

2. Analysis

2.1. Absolute and relative arrangement of the constituents

First of all, as has been observed,[14] the tendency of the verb *sum* position is somewhat different from that of the other verbs: there's a greater tendency towards the interior position in the former than in the latter. However, these analyses have always been done in a global manner, that is, counting all the occurrences of the verb *sum* altogether. In order to proceed with a more detailed study we have to distinguish the different structures in which the verb *sum* appears. Although this task already presents some difficulties, it is possible, however, to carry out an approximate study of the verb's position in some of the possible structures,[15] which would be those exemplified below, for the time being without a determined characterization or arrangement:

1. 'zero' (ø) existential structures, that is, those where the S is the only complement present:

    (13) inde institutum mansit donec Pinarium genus fuit, ... (Liu. 1,7,13);

2. locative structures, where there is a complement with locative value:

    (14) (cum Romanus exercitus instructus) quod inter Palatinum Capitolinum-que collem campi est (complesset) (Liu. 1,12,1);

3. structures with genitive:

    (15) ... ex quibus locis, (Pythagoras) etsi eiusdem aetatis fuisset, ... (Liu. 1,18,3);

4. structures where there is case agreement in both nominal constituents:

---

[13] For the characterization of this concept, cf. Lyons (1980: 191-192), Dik (1989: 139 ff.).

[14] Cf. Walker (1918: 654), Cabrillana (1993: 258-259).

[15] I leave aside, in this first survey, the structures where the dative is present: it will be the object of an independent study.

(16)a. Brutus (...), terram osculo contigit, scilicet quod ea communis mater omnium mortalium esset (Liu. 1,56,12);

    b. quippe qui cum ueterem tum uolgatam esse rem uideam (Liu. *Praef.* 2);

    c. incensam multitudinem perpulit ut (...) exsulesque esse iuberet L. Tarquinium cum coniuge ac liberis (Liu. 1,59,11).

Thus, and bearing in mind that some cases are particularly difficult to classify, the following results could be obtained, provisional as they might be, regarding the verbal constituent's position:

Table 1

Type	% of V in interior position	% of V in non-interior position
1. exist. ø	8,34%	91,66%
2. locative	11,77%	88,23%
3. genitive	14,28%	85,72%
4. in agreem.	26,17%	73,83%

As can be seen, there is a difference between the position of the verbal element in the structures 1-3 on the one hand, and 4 on the other. But it is possible to question whether the types grouped under 4 – (16a)-(16c) – share the specific feature regarding the relative arrangement of the constituents; thus, if we break down the figures the table 2 results:

Table 2

Type	% of V in interior position	% of V in non-interior position
4.(a)	25%	75%
4.(b)	25,92%	77,08%
4.(c)	28,12%	71,88%

Although these data will be dealt with in more detail below, it may already be observed a similarity of behaviour between copulative-attributive and identifying structures in the analysed aspect. This similarity is maintained if we take into account that the majority sequence is the same in all cases (SpV), and that it shows a frequency of occurrence that only varies approximately a 10% between one type and another: 4.(a): 47, 36%; 4.(b): 37, 5%; 4.(c): 56, 25%.

2.2. Pragmatic structure of the constituent elements

Another aspect in which identifying and copulative-attributive structures coincide is the usual distribution of the pragmatic functions fulfilled by the nominal constituents; the majority sequence found is Topic (= *Top*) – Focus

(= *Foc*),[16] although there are inverse structures. Let us pay attention to three examples – (17)-(19) – of the most generalized tendency; each of them corresponds respectively to the types 4.(a), 4.(b) and 4.(c):

(17) ego sum publicus nuntius populi Romani (Liu. 1,32,6).

Previously, it is necessary to point out that in the classification of the identifying uses, as in the example (17), as opposed to the attributive ones, the Latin language presents a peculiar difficulty with respect to other languages, and it is the absence of an article marker. Nevertheless, in this particular case, the difficulty derived from the lack of information that the article would be able to provide may be overcome if we take into account the previous context of the example, and the communicative situation in which it is inserted. Thus, this text belongs to the passage where Livius (1,32,5-6) explains how Ancus Marcius tries to establish a religious rite for war-related actions. A reference to a generic personal entity (*legatus*) has indeed been made in this explanation; however, for the hypothetical audience that listens to this statement, the information offered by the noun-phrase *publicus nuntius populi Romani* is in fact new and relevant; on the other hand, there is no doubt that the p, has a sole and concrete referent: a person is identifying himself before the people, in this case, by means of his unification with a specific post.

(18) sed res Romana erat superior (Liu. 1,12,10).

The text in (18) is framed in the narration of the war between the Romans and the Sabines, hence the *res Romana* is a contextually dependent element. What makes the communication process move forward is the p *superior* which is, consequently, Focus.

(19) haec templi est origo (Liu. 1,10,7).

In (19), the S is anaphoric and refers to the actions that were described in the previous context (Liu. 1,10,5-6), therefore it is the Topic of the predication, whereas the p – *origo* – is revealed here as new information.

For the most part and with regard to the assignment of pragmatic functions I have based myself on the association of the following criteria:[17] 1. known / new; 2. given information / new information; 3. little information / much information; 4. what is being talked about / what is said about that; 5.

---

[16] I use here the definition of these pragmatic functions given by Dik (1978: 19).

[17] For the characterization of these criteria, cf., among other sources, the following: Dahl (1974: 3); Chafe (1976: 28, 33); Contreras (1978: 4); Dik (1978: 19, 130; 1989: 390-391); Panhuis (1982: 9-10); Hannay (1983: 208); Pinkster (1995: 5-6).

unstressed / stressed (in a suprasegmental sense). I have not distinguished in this analysis the different kinds of Topic and Focus that have been proposed.[18] Even if we take into account the difficulty present in this assignment of pragmatic functions,[19] a statistical analysis of the distribution of those functions in the three types of constructions I have distinguished, would show the table 3 as an approximate result:

Table 3

Sequence	Top-Focus	Focus-Top
4.(a)	84%	16%
4.(b)	70,24%	29,76%
4.(c)	87,5%	12,5%

As the table shows, the Top-Foc sequence is the majority in all cases, with a slight variation in the case where the predicate is an adjective which does not entail identification. Therefore, these data would confirm what I have suggested in another paper:[20] that one of the determinant factors of this arrangement is the amount of information that the verb provides in the identifying and copulative-attributive sequences, being lesser than that provided by other constituents of the same structures. The information is primarily contained in the nominal elements and, in the particular cases above, in p.

In this respect, it is relevant to say that the copula has been characterized as a sheer transitional element,[21] devoid of meaning that supports the time, mood, and aspect distinctions.[22] In this sense, it is not surprising that in some constructions the copulative relation should not have a necessary lexical mark; thus in (20):

> (20) arma imperata scutum pro clipeo et praeter loricam omnia eadem (Liu. 1,43,4),

---

[18] Cf. Dik (1989: 266-277; 282).

[19] Cf. Dik (1989: 266), where this author explains that the two admitted dimensions have an area of overlap in which certain elements characteristic of the Topic (Theme) may at the same time be focalizers (rhematics) in the communication. Cf. also Pinkster (1995: 226).

[20] Cf. Cabrillana (1996).

[21] Cf. Chafe (1974: 33), Panhuis (1982: 21).

[22] Cf. Dik (1980: 10), J. Juliá (1995: 300; 311). Cf. also what was formerly said in footnote 6. Kahn (1973: 198) explains that the copulative verb not only provides the grammatical marks of time, mood and aspect, but also denotes a static nature as opposed to the dynamic verbs.

the identification has not accounted for the expression of the copulative verb, probably because of the lack of Communicative Dynamism[23] that the latter shows. As far as the pragmatic structure is concerned, *arma imperata* is part of the known information, for in the passage shown in the text the centuries organized by Servius Tulius are being described, each one of which is armed according to its financial capacity; the first class has already been described:

> (21) arma his imperata galea, clipeum, ocreae, lorica (Liu. 1,43,2).

Example (20) corresponds to the description of the second century's arms. Therefore, the new information will be *scutum pro clipeo et praeter loricam omnia eadem*, the Top-Foc sequence being repeated.

As opposed to this pragmatic structure, let us see what happens with ø existential constructions:

> (22) eo tempore in regia prodigium uisu euentuque mirabile fuit (Liu. 1,39,1).

This text begins a new chapter: there is no thematic linkage with what was previously presented, leaving aside the temporal frame provided by the satellite *eo tempore*.[24]

We may notice a difference in the ø existential constructions, where sometimes it is not possible to attach different pragmatic functions to a particular element or group of elements, but rather we should realize that the whole nuclear predication is Focus or unified sequence of information.[25]

Thus, taking into account what was previously said, the first two applied criteria demonstrate that the identifying and copulative-attributive uses possess common syntactic and pragmatic characteristics, as opposed to the so-called ø existential.

2.3. Word class and lexical content of the constituents. Referential definition of S and p

As was pointed out at the beginning of the analysis (2.), I have opted for the joined application of the two last criteria, because of the bonds they show. This does not imply, however, that other criteria pertaining to different linguistic levels should be absent in this part of the analysis, as may in fact be the case with those of a pragmatic nature.

---

[23] For the identification of this concept, Svoboda (1974: 38), Panhuis (1982: 16 ff.; 89-90), Cabrillana (1992), cf. Firbas (1996).

[24] In a similar case, cf. Liu. 1,30,9.

[25] Cf. Pinkster (1995: 237-238); Bolkestein (1995: 32).

This analysis will be divided into two parts: the first one (2.3.1) will deal with identification cases, and the second one (2.3.2) with attribution cases.

2.3.1. Identification

The element which defines the identifying constructions is that there should be a sole referential designation of the identifying term. This condition is usually given by the specific word class that fulfills the identifying function; thus, it is logical that we should often find proper names to fulfill the aforesaid function.

The typology of possibilities to be analysed is the following: 1. the predicate is a name referring to the inhabitants of a country or region (26); 2. the predicate is a proper name: (27), (28); 3. the first constituent is a proper name: (29), (30); 4. both nominal constituents are proper names: (31); 5. the first constituent is a pronoun and the second one is a noun or a pronoun; in these cases, the second constituent is determined by a relative clause (32), or by an agreed construction: (34). Let us see some examples:

(24) postquam audierit multitudinem Troianos esse (Liu. 1,1,8).

In (24), the Focus is undoubtedly the p, since the reality comprised by *multitudinem* is made up of a series of previous animated entities, and *Troianos* is what provides new information. On the other hand, it is clear that it is part of what causes a particular reaction in Latinus; in this sense, the previous context is enlightening: the landing of the Trojans has taken place in the territory of the Lawrentians, where the king Latinus and the aborigine had the sovereignty; these present themselves armed once they see an unknown crowd move forward. When the two armies meet face to face, Latinus moves to the front line without knowing who his potential enemies are, arranges an appointment for an interview with the chief of the foreigners and asks him who they are; at this moment the chief lets him know the identity of the crowd. On the other hand, immediately after the text of (24) we can see another use in which the identification of sole referents is given, this time withouth a lexically expressed verb form:

(25) ducem Aeneam filium Anchisae et Veneris (Liu. 1,1,8)

A similar case with names of the inhabitants of a country is the explanatory sentence (26):

(26) nam Fidenates quoque Etrusci fuerunt (Liu. 1,15,1);

as can be noticed, not only the p but also the S are functions fulfilled by that class of special word; each one of them has a specific referential designation, but greater in the case of the S (*Fidenates*) than in that of the p (*Etrusci*): the identification is carried out here by means of a relation of inclusion.

An example in which the function of the p is fulfilled by proper names is the following, where the S does not have a lexical expression, which would be unnecessary because of the presence of the immediately previous context; it is a case of multiple identifier:

> (27) Horatios Curiatiosque fuisse satis constat (Liu. 1,24,1).

Other cases, are those in which only one of the terms is a proper name:

> (28) fetialis erat M. Valerius (Liu. 1,24,6).

The S in (28) is clearly the Topic in this example, and this can be demonstrated by the fact that that function is fulfilled by *fetialis* which also determines word order: his figure has appeared before on two occasions in a generic manner – Liu. 1,24,4 and 1,24,5 –; here his identity is revealed, the proper name thus becoming Focus.

> (29) Mettius ille est ductor itineris huius, Mettius idem huius machinator belli, Mettius foederis Romani Albanique ruptor (Liu. 1,28,6).

In (29) the S is certainly a proper noun, unlike the p, which in this case is constituted by a series of nouns determined by genitives, that have a sole referential definition. Indeed, we are first given what has more referential definition (*Mettius*), accompanied by features that enhance its communicative force (repetition, postponed demonstrative adjectives) – although it is at the same time topic of the discourse, since the figure and the name of Mettius have already appeared – and it is later identified with second terms that can only be regarded as p.

A similar case is (30), for the S is a proper name, with greater referential definition, but in this occasion it is revealed as Focus of the predication, within the communicative situation in which it is found: Lucretia is speaking, and, after advancing the shameful action that has taken place,[26] she shows the people she is speaking to, unaware as they are at that moment of the author of such action. The p, on the other hand, which is in this case represented by a relative clause, may be considered as somewhat known information:

> (30) Sex. est Tarquinius qui hostis pro hospite priore nocte ui armatus mihi sibique, si uos uiri estis, pestiferum hinc abstulit gaudium (Liu. 1,58,8).

In (31) both nominal terms are personal proper names:

> (31) haud ambigam -...- hicine fuerit Ascanius an maior quam hic, ..., quem Iulum eundem Iulia gens auctorem nominis sui nuncupat (Liu. 1,3,2).

---

[26] Cf. Liu. 1,58,7.

This example, shows, on the one hand, a multiple S; the first one of them has a stronger referential definition and it is furthermore pragmatically underlined by the anaphoric *hic*, which is found in the first position (probably due to the presence of the enclitic and indirect interrogative clause), and by the disjunction of the second element of the noun phrase where it belongs. On the other hand, this S is at the same time Topic, since it has been already talked about in the previous context (Liu. 1,3,1).

Let us observe now at a series of cases in which the S is a pronoun and the p a noun or a pronoun which is at times determined by a relative clause – (32) – or a construction of 'participium coniunctum' – (34) –, constructions that endow the sheer nominal element with a sole referential definition:

> (32) adicit scriptorum antiquissimus Fabius Pictor, eorum qui arma ferre possent eum numerum fuisse (Liu. 1,44,2).

In (32), it is the previous context that allows us to talk about an identifying use, and not merely attributive: *milia octoginta eo lustro ciuium censa dicuntur.*

> (34) 'estisne uos legati oratoresque missi a populo Collatino ut uos populumque Collatinum dederetis?' - 'Sumus' (Liu. 1,38,2).

Obviously, we cannot lose sight of the pragmatic situation in which (34) is immersed: it is a formula of the question-answer type which corresponds to the moment when, once Collatia has been taken from the Sabines, the Collatians surrender to Tarquinius Priscus. There is a relation of identification between the pronoun's referent and that of the agreed construction.

Therefore, it appears that when there is no proper noun in the identifying use, its interpretation as such depends largely on the context;[27] thus, it could be argued that this identifying use is in fact nothing but a contextual variant of a broader type of structure.

2.3.2. Attribution

As opposed to the examples above, where the applied criteria have allowed us their interpretation as identifiers, we may now make a comparison with the cases with the following structure:

> (35) aut nulla unquam res publica nec maior nec sanctior nec bonis exemplis ditior fuit (Liu. 1, *Praef.* 11).

In (35), the new information is contained by the p – multiple and underlined by the polysindeton –, since the S has already appeared, and therefore it

---

[27] Cf. also e.g. (17).

would be the Topic of the predication (Liu. 1, *Praef.* 10). The pragmatic structure is, then, Top-Foc, however, the semantic relation that is established between both nominal constituents is not identification but attribution of quality: the *res publica* is said to have been MAIOR, SANCTIOR and *bonis exemplis* DITIOR.

Examples like (35) are the most frequent among those regarded as copulative-attributive. On the other hand, with regard to the second constituent in non-identifying structures, the possibility of its not being a noun does not constitute an isolated case; a statistical analysis demonstrates that in a 18,56% of the cases the second constituent is, in fact, a noun. We may ask ourselves about those distinctive features, if there are any, as opposed to those cases where the function of the p is not fulfilled by an adjective but by a noun, as in (36) and (37):

> (36) templum ...; quod monumentum sit posteris ... uoueo (Liu. 1,12,6);

> (37) cum commune Romani nominis tum praecipue id domus suae dedecus fore (Liu. 1,40,3).

In this kind of examples we may pay attention to two common features, I believe, with a mutual bond: on the one hand, there is no identifying relation between both nominal members of the structure, but one of attribution; on the other, the designation of the nouns that are present refers to abstract realities. With regard to this last point, we might think that it is a fortuitous case; a more detailed analysis of the type of nouns that appears as p in structures that have been considered attributive, reveals that those concepts could constitute a group with its own lexical features: they are frequently abstract or, when they are specific, they have a non-physical referent which designates their pertaining to the class to which the S's referent is attached; and this is in a way that such designation is not identifying but attributive.[28] Thus, for example, (38) and (39):

> (38) Sex. est Tarquinius qui hostis pro hospite priore nocte ui armatus mihi sibique, si uos uiri estis, pestiferum hinc abstulit gaudium (Liu. 1,58,8);

> (39) Potitii ab Euandro edocti antistites sacri eius per multas aetates fuerunt (Liu. 1,7,14).

3. Conclusions

According to what was shown above, the following conclusions could be drawn:

---

[28] Interestingly, the nouns that appear are the following: *auctor* (4 occurrences), *uir* (3 occurrences), *causa* (2), *proelium* (2), *monumentum* (2), *antistites* (2), *opus, ultor, fama, origo, finis, pars, dedecus, tegumenta, confessio, testis, exsules, consilium, simulatio, receptaculum, rex, dux, filium.*

1. As opposed to the ∅ existential type, we may notice that the identify-
   ing and copulative-attributive uses share several characteristics:

   1. with regard to their structural description, they have the same struc-
      ture of binding constituents (S and p); they also share the same ten-
      dencies of absolute and relative arrangement of constituents.
   2. Concerning its pragmatic structure, in the identifying and non-iden-
      tifying uses there is also, generally speaking, a similarity in the
      assignment and sequence of the Topic and Focus functions, and in
      the de-dynamic process undergone by the verbal element.

2. As far as the differences are concerned, it appears that we can only
   make reference to the kind of semantic relation established between
   the two nominal terms (identification ≠ attribution), which is associa-
   ted to the type of specific referential designation – a sole designation
   in the case of the identifiers –, for whose task the language generally
   selects particular kinds of words and syntactic structures.

3. Thus, although it is possible to refer at times to clearly identifying[29]
   and non-identifying uses,[30] the question becomes more complicated in
   other cases[31], and it would appear that a sharp differentiation may not
   be established between those two uses: in the last analysis, the ques-
   tion may be solved because of the information provided by the context
   – a context which is ambiguous in some cases –. Therefore, the dis-
   tinction between one case and another is, so to speak, gradual; the gra-
   dual difference is located at the level of the semantic relation. The fact
   that, on the one hand, we find both nouns and adjectives as a second
   constituent in the copulative-attributive uses, and proper nouns, nouns
   and adjectives in the identifying uses, explains the existence of the
   aforesaid gradation; in other words: there is no exclusive association
   with the word class, in a way that if the identifying and the copula-
   tive-attributive type could be clearly distinguished by the word class,
   such gradation would not exist.

Thus, it seems preferable to consider that the identifying use constitutes
a subgroup within the copulative uses,[32] given the fact that the syntactic
and pragmatic structural features basically coincide. The lexical-semantic

---

[29] Cf., among others, egs. (7), (27), (28), (30), (31), (34).

[30] Cf., for instance, egs. (8), (16b), (18), (35).

[31] Cf. egs. (12), (17).

[32] Cf. Kahn (1973: 372, n.1; 400, n. 33); Peteghem (1991: 21).

1. As opposed to the ø existential type, we may notice that the identifying and copulative-attributive uses share several characteristics:

    1. with regard to their structural description, they have the same structure of binding constituents (S and p); they also share the same tendencies of absolute and relative arrangement of constituents.
    2. Concerning its pragmatic structure, in the identifying and non-identifying uses there is also, generally speaking, a similarity in the assignment and sequence of the Topic and Focus functions, and in the de-dynamic process undergone by the verbal element.

2. As far as the differences are concerned, it appears that we can only make reference to the kind of semantic relation established between the two nominal terms (identification ≠ attribution), which is associated to the type of specific referential designation − a sole designation in the case of the identifiers −, for whose task the language generally selects particular kinds of words and syntactic structures.

3. Thus, although it is possible to refer at times to clearly identifying[29] and non-identifying uses,[30] the question becomes more complicated in other cases[31], and it would appear that a sharp differentiation may not be established between those two uses: in the last analysis, the question may be solved because of the information provided by the context − a context which is ambiguous in some cases −. Therefore, the distinction between one case and another is, so to speak, gradual; the gradual difference is located at the level of the semantic relation. The fact that, on the one hand, we find both nouns and adjectives as a second constituent in the copulative-attributive uses, and proper nouns, nouns and adjectives in the identifying uses, explains the existence of the aforesaid gradation; in other words: there is no exclusive association with the word class, in a way that if the identifying and the copulative-attributive type could be clearly distinguished by the word class, such gradation would not exist.

Thus, it seems preferable to consider that the identifying use constitutes a subgroup within the copulative uses,[32] given the fact that the syntactic and pragmatic structural features basically coincide. The lexical-semantic

---

[29] Cf., among others, egs. (7), (27), (28), (30), (31), (34).

[30] Cf., for instance, egs. (8), (16b), (18), (35).

[31] Cf. egs. (12), (17).

[32] Cf. Kahn (1973: 372, n.1; 400, n. 33); Peteghem (1991: 21).

and contextual aspects would be the truly distinctive here; the word class does not have in these cases implications of a syntactic nature but affect rather the referential designation.

REFERENCES

Benveniste, E. 1950: "'Être' et 'avoir' dans leurs fonctions linguistiques". *BSL* 46, 113-134.

Bolkestein, A.M. 1983: "Genitive and dative possessors in Latin". S.C. Dik (ed.), 55-91.

Bolkestein, A.M. 1995: "Functions of verb-subject order in Latin". *STUF* 48, 1/2, 32-43.

Cabrillana, C. 1992: "Aproximación al concepto de 'Dinamismo Comunicativo'". *RSEL* 22, 397-404.

Cabrillana, C. 1993: "Posiciones relativas en la ordenación de constituyentes (I). Estudio de la posición de Sujeto, Objeto y Verbo". *Habis* 24, 249-266.

Cabrillana, C. 1996: "Multifunctional Analysis of Word Order". H. Rosén (ed.), *Aspects of Latin.* Innsbruck, Beitr. zur Sprach., 377-388.

Chafe, W.L. 1974: "Language and Conciousness". *Language* 50, 111-133.

Chafe, W.L. 1976: "Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics and Point of View". Ch.N. Li (ed.), *Subject and Topic.* New York, Academic Press, 25-55.

Contreras, H. 1978: *El orden de palabras en español,* trad. Madrid, Cátedra.

Dahl, Ö. 1974: "Topic-comment structure revisited". *Papiere zur Textlinguistik,* 6. Hamburg.

Dik, S.C. 1978: *Functional Grammar.* Amsterdam, North-Holland.

Dik, S.C. 1980: *Studies in functional grammar.* London, Academic Press.

Dik, S.C. 1983 (ed.): *Advances in Functional Grammar.* Dordrecht, Foris.

Dik, S.C. 1989: *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part I: The structure of the clause.* Dordrecht, Foris.

Firbas, J. 1966: "Non-Thematic Subjects in Contemporary English". *Travaux Linguistique de Prague* 2, 239-256.

García-Hernández, B. 1992: "El dativo con *sum* y la vulgarización de la noción de posesión". *RSEL* 22, 325-337.

García-Hernández, B. 1995: "El dativo llamado posesivo: una confusión terminológica y conceptual". D. Longrée (ed.), *De Vsu. Études de syntaxe latine offertes à M. Lavency.* Louvain-la-Neuve, Peeters, 155-162.

Groot, C. de. 1983: "On non-verbal predicates in Functional Grammar: the case of possessives in Hungarian". S.C. Dik (ed.), 93-122.

Hannay. M. 1983: "The focus function in functional grammar: questions of contrast and context". S.C. Dik (ed.), 207-223.

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

Jiménez Juliá, T. 1995: "Frase verbal, cláusula, estructura copulativa". *Moenia* 1, 269-314.

Kahn, Ch.H. 1973: *The verb 'be' in Ancient Greek* , vol. 6 of 'The verb "be" and its synonyms: philosophical and grammatical studies'. M. Verhaar (ed.), = Foundations of Language, Suppl. Ser. 16. Reidel, Dordrecht.

Lyons, J. 1971: *Introducción en la lingüística teórica*, repr. 1986. Barcelona, Teide.

Lyons, J. 1980: *Semántica*. Barcelona, Teide.

Marouzeau, J. 1910: *La phrase à verbe "être" en latin*. Paris.

Matthews, P.H. 1981: *Syntax*, repr. 1987. Cambridge, C.U.P.

Panhuis, D.G.J. 1982: *The Communicative Perspective in the Sentence. A Study of Latin Worder Order.* Amsterdam, Benjamins.

Peteghem, M. Van 1991: *Les phrases copulatives dans les langues romanes*. Heidelberg.

Pinkster, H. 1995: *Sintaxis y Semántica del Latín*. Madrid, Ed. Clásicas.

Quirk, R. - Greenbaum, S .- Leech, G. - Svartvik, J. 1985: *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London, Longman.

Serbat, G. 1983: "Le verbe *Sum*: Syntaxe et Sémantique". *VL* 73, 8-12.

Svoboda, A. 1974: "On Two Communicative Dynamisms". Daneš, F. (ed.) 1974, *Papers on Functional Sentence Perspective*. Prague, 38-42.

Touratier, C. 1994: *Syntaxe Latine*. Louvain, Peeters.

Walker, A.T. 1918: "Some Facts of Latin Word Order". *CJ* 13, 644-657.