

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

SUPPLEMENTUM II

STUDIA  
IN HONOREM  
IIRO KAJANTO

HELSINKI 1985 HELSINGFORS

## INDEX

Géza Alföldy	Ein neues Zeugnis für "suprafamiliare organisationen" im antiken Hispanien . . . . .	9
E. Badian	Apollonius at Tarsus . . . . .	15
Patrick Bruun	Gloria Romanorum . . . . .	23
Pierre Grimal	Le Dialogue des Orateurs — témoin de son temps . . . . .	33
Anne Helttula	<i>Post depositum militiae munus</i> . Official Phraseology in Ammianus Marcellinus . . . . .	41
G. L. Huxley	Kastor on the Foundation of Eleusis . . . . .	57
Iosephus IJsewijn	De <i>huius nymphae loci</i> (CIL VI/5, 3+e) eiusque fortuna poetica syntagmation . . . . .	61
Siegfried Jäkel	Τί τὸ σοφόν; Einige Überlegungen zu Euripides, Bakchen 877, 897 . . . . .	69
Maarit Kaimio	The Theme of Victory in Aeschylus' Oresteia and Ag. 314—316 . . . . .	79
Bengt Löfstedt	Lexikalisches zur Vulgata . . . . .	99
Olivier Masson	Sur le nom de Bilistiché, favorite de Ptolémée II . . . . .	109
Dag Norberg	Original ou fautes de copie? . . . . .	113
Ulla Nyberg	Zu den inschriftlichen Kontraktionen von <i>dominus</i> in der sakralen und in der profanen Bedeutung . . . . .	125
Martti Nyman	The Meaning of <i>micarius</i> . . . . .	143
Teivas Oksala	Carmen Vergili? abiturii (Catal. 5) . . . . .	147
Silvio Panciera	Qualche nuova iscrizione urbana d'interesse onomastico . . . . .	153
François Paschoud	Le début de l'ouvrage historique d'Olympiodore . . . . .	185
Tuomo Pekkanen	Notes on Tac. Germ. 46,3 . . . . .	197

Reijo Pitkäranta	Zur wissenschaftlichen Terminologie einer mathematischen Dissertation in Turku 1645 .....	215
Heikki Solin	Namenpaare .....	229
Giancarlo Susini	Una memoria fotografica della tradizione bolognese di C. Mario .....	261
Ronald Syme	Praesens the Friend of Hadrian .....	273
Holger Thesleff	Notes on the Name of Homer and the Homeric Question ..	293
P. G. Walsh	Catullus 17 and the Priapean .....	315
Rolf Westman	Neues Licht auf New Fragment 8 des Diogenes von Oino- anda .....	323
Ladislav Vidman	Frauen der Senatoren in der Nomenklatur ihrer Sklaven und Freigelassenen .....	329
Toivo Viljamaa	The Accusativus cum Infinitivo and <i>quod-</i> , <i>quia-</i> , <i>quoniam-</i> Clauses in Latin .....	337
Henrik Zilliacus	Ein verlorener Papyrusbrief aus der Berliner Sammlung ..	351
Jaakko Aronen	Iiro Kajanto: Bibliography of Published Works .....	355

THE ACCUSATIVUS CUM INFINITIVO  
AND *QUOD*-, *QUIA*-, *QUONIAM*-CLAUSES IN LATIN

Toivo Viljamaa

I

The Latin Accusativus cum Infinitivo (henceforth ACI), together with other infinitival constructions akin to it, is an interesting construction both in view of linguistic theory and in regard to the system of Latin syntax and its development. Recently, especially since the publication of Robin Lakoff's book (1968) on abstract syntax and Latin complementation, the construction has been a subject of constant interest among Latin linguists. No doubt it is the most vividly discussed topic of the Latin syntax.<sup>1</sup>

The ACI construction has naturally attracted attention of the linguists who have been used to deal with complement structures of the sentence, with questions concerning relations between the matrix verb and its complement: which rules and principles determine the assignment of case? under which conditions can elements be moved out of the complement clause? In the Latin ACI these questions are primarily realized in the problem how we can explain the fact that the accusative of the ACI can be understood either as the object of the matrix verb or the subject of the complement clause. However, in a sentence like *dico puerum currere* the accusative *puerum* cannot be considered an object of *dico* because *\*dico puerum* is ungrammatical, and on the other hand, because the nominative is the case of the subject it is difficult to explain the accusative

---

<sup>1</sup> For the ample literature concerning this topic, Calboli 1983: 110; Calboli and Maraldi in Pinkster 1983: 54—57 and 175—176.

*puerum* as a subject of *currere*.<sup>2</sup> Other theoretical problems arise from passive and impersonal constructions. In certain cases we have in Latin the Nominative with Infinitive construction instead of the ACI (e.g. Plaut. Rud. 161 *Herculei socius esse diceris*), and furthermore ACI constructions often appear as complements to passive or impersonal verbs (e.g. Plaut. Rud. 1165 *Filiam meam esse hanc oportet*; Cic. Tusc. 5,12 *Non mihi videtur ad beate vivendum satis posse virtutem*).<sup>3</sup>

The students of Latin syntax who apply theoretical models in Latin want to get answers to the following questions: (1) What is the origin of the ACI and how to explain the expansion of its use? (2) In what way does it belong to the Latin language system? (3) How do we explain the Latin phenomenon that subordinate finite clauses ("that"-clauses) normally cannot be substituted for ACI and it is not until in late Latin that the choice between infinitival clauses and finite *quod*-, *quia*- and *quoniam*-clauses becomes possible?<sup>4</sup> In the following I shall mainly deal with the third question, though these questions naturally cannot be treated wholly as separate problems. As my theoretical model I shall use the Government and Binding theory (GB) advanced by Noam Chomsky in the framework of the Extended Standard Theory of transformational grammar.<sup>5</sup> Most examples will be drawn from Plautus' play *Rudens* and from the so-called *Peregrinatio Aetheriae*. The latter represents later vulgar Latin and affords examples of subordinate finite clauses instead of ACI constructions.<sup>6</sup>

## II

In the GB theory the range of variation of particular grammars is defined by a higher system, Universal Grammar (Chomsky 1981:6).

<sup>2</sup> Compare Pepicello 1977, Bolkestein 1979, Pillinger 1980, Comrie 1981 and Baldi in Pinkster 1983: 23—25.

<sup>3</sup> In early Latin the impersonal use of verbs like *dicitur* was rare, cf. Calboli 1962: 93—101.

<sup>4</sup> See Wirth-Poelchau 1977 and Calboli in Pinkster 1983: 44—47.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. particularly the articles by Bertocchi and Casadio, Maraldi, and Calboli in Calboli 1980; also Viljamaa 1983.

<sup>6</sup> Compare Löfstedt 1911: 116—123. For the difference of vulgar and literary Latin, Perrochat 1932: 83.

Universal Grammar is conceived of as a parametrized system in the sense that its rules and principles provide certain possibilities of parametric variation. If we can distinguish complexes of properties typical of particular types of languages, these collections of properties are explained in terms of the choice of parameters in subsystems of Universal Grammar. For instance, Latin and Italian are similar in that they have relatively free word order and they allow subjectless sentences (cf. Chomsky 1961: 240 and Rizzi 1982:117—183). In the GB theory they may be called "pro-drop" languages because of the property of allowing pronominal elements to be dropped out. In these aspects and also in the use of complement clauses they differ radically from French and English. The difference between Italian and French is theoretically important because both languages are derived from Latin.

The GB theory assumes that the syntactic component of the grammar generates abstract "S-structures" that are assigned a phonetic and a logical representation. S-structures, in turn, are generated from Deep structures containing the categorial component with lexical items inserted in it. It is important to note that syntax is not conceived of as a system in which certain rules change the constituent structure of the sentence to another structure but as a system in which rules and principles determine how the same constituent structure is represented at different levels of description (i.e. Deep structure, S-structure and its phonetic and logical representations).

Earlier in transformational grammar and often also in traditional grammar the ACI construction was presented as a result of an operation which moves the subject of the embedded clause to the object position of the matrix clause. In this way *Video puerum currere* could be derived from an underlying sentence like *Video, quod puer currit* by application of a rule which changes the constituent structure  $V [{}_S NP VP]$  to  $V NP [{}_S VP]$ . This derivation thus assumes that the deep structure of both sentences and consequently the meaning of both is the same, although the structure of the constituents is changed. In the GB theory, as I understand it, the above-mentioned sentences would have different deep structures as they have different structural descriptions. The verb *video* can take as its complement a personal object NP plus a clause (*video NP S*) or alternatively, only a clausal complement (*video S*). To be true,

also the former case (e.g. Plaut. Rud. 42—43 *Atticus eam vidit ire*) is interpreted as an instance of ACI because of the co-occurrence of the accusative and the infinitive. In the latter case (e.g. Plaut. Rud. 988—989 *Sed tu enumquam piscatorum vidisti ... vidulum piscem cepisse*; Peregr. Aeth. 8,5 *Farao, quando vidit, quod filii Israhel dimiserant eum, ...*) there is a choice between the ACI and the "that"-clause depending on the system that allows different representations. But as I said before, the choice seems to be possible only in later Latin, apparently as a result of changes in the Latin language system.

According to Chomsky (Chomsky 1981:29) the basic principle for syntactic representations is the so-called projection principle: "Representations at each syntactic level (i.e. LF, and D- and S-structure) are projected from the lexicon, in that they observe the subcategorization properties of lexical items." The principle implies the consequence that S-structures contain abstract elements, i.e. positions which have no phonetic content. Consider the following examples (Plaut. Rud. 1200, 1264, 1199 and 1146) and their structural descriptions (only those details are marked that are relevant for discussion):

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| (a) <i>Iussique exire ... servum</i>    | Iussi servum <sub>i</sub> [ <sub>S</sub> PRO <sub>i</sub> exire] |
| (b) <i>Iubebo ... cenam coqui</i>       | Iubebo [ <sub>S</sub> cenam <sub>i</sub> coqui t <sub>i</sub> ]  |
| (c) <i>Ego eum ... arcessi ... volo</i> | Volo [ <sub>S</sub> eum <sub>i</sub> arcessi t <sub>i</sub> ]    |
| (d) <i>Deos iratos esse oportet</i>     | NP <sub>e</sub> oportet [ <sub>S</sub> deos iratos esse]         |

Each representation satisfies the structural requirements of the categorial component (S → NP INFL VP). In (a) PRO occupies the phonetically empty subject position of the embedded clause; according to the theory of Control it has a controller in the matrix sentence coindexed with it. In (b) and (c) there is the trace *t* indicating the object position from which the NP is moved in connection with passive forms. In (d) NP<sub>e</sub> indicates the phonetically empty subject of the impersonal verb *oportet*; in a "pro-drop" language like Latin overt pronominal subjects can be missing, but in English, for example, impersonal predicates require pleonastic pronouns ("it", "there") as their subjects.

The structures in (a—d) above also satisfy the subcategorization properties of lexical entries *iubeo*, *volo* and *oportet*. The projection principle assigns to the lexicon a central role in the syntax. Lexical items with

their subcategorization properties (with their possibilities for different complement structures) determine the syntactic representation at each level. Thus in Latin *iubeo* has the property of taking either an object NP and a clause or only a clausal complement (*iubeo* — NP S; — S); *volo* and *oportet* have the property of taking only a clausal complement (*volo* — S; *oportet* — S).

### III

In 1423 lines of Plautus' *Rudens* there are more than two hundred occurrences of ACI. The construction is very frequent indeed in early Latin. In this material the ACI occurs most frequently with *volo*, *dico*, *oportet*, *video*, *scio*, *iubeo* and *credo* (verba affectuum are not included because they normally can take either an ACI or a *quod*-clause as their complement).<sup>7</sup>

If those verbs that can take an ACI are classified according to their subcategorization properties, we can distinguish the following types:

(1) type *video* (verbs which can denote direct perception) has four different subcategorization frames: — NP (v. 333 *Quem ego video*), — NP AP (v. 162 *Mulierculas video sedentis*), — NP S (v. 313—14 *Ecquem adolescentem huc ... vidistis ire*), — S (v. 988—89 *Sed tū enumquam piscatorem vidisti ... vidulum piscem cepisse*).

(2) type *iubeo* (verbs which can denote direct ordering) has two subcategorization frames: — NP S (v. 308 *Me huc obviam iussit sibi ire*) and — S (v. 1264 *iubebo nobis continuo cenam coqui*).

(3) type *volo* is subcategorized for — S but has two different structural representations, one with PRO controlled by the subject NP of the main verb (v. 422 *volui dicere*), the other without a controller (v. 273 *nos hostias agere voluistis*).

(4) type *dico* (verbs which can denote naming) has two subcategorization frames: — NP AP (v. 790 *me lenonem dixerit*; v. 161 *Herculei socius esse diceris*) and — S (v. 831 *dico ... me adire ad illas*).

(5) type *scio* (verba sentiendi) is subcategorized for — S (v. 316 *nullum ... venisse huc scimus*).

<sup>7</sup> See Kühner—Stegmann 1955: I 653 and II 277.



(6) type *oportet* (impersonal verb phrases and impersonal passives) is subcategorized for —S and has an unspecified subject NP coindexed with S at the logical representation (v. 368 *Meas oportet intus esse hic mulieres*).

From these types *video* NP AP can result in the Accusativus cum Participio construction; *dico* NP AP and more frequently *video* NP S and *iubeo* NP S cause the Nominativus cum Infinitivo construction to appear if the main verb is in the passive form (e.g. v. 601 *Videtur ad me simia aggredirier*). Because lexical items with their subcategorization properties determine the constituent structure at the levels of syntactic representation, the Latin ACI occurring with the verbs listed above into six types is derived from the following four different structures:

- A) V S [NP<sup>Acc</sup> VP<sup>Inf</sup>] with such verbs as *video*, *dico*, *scio*, *iubeo*, *volo*.
- B) V NP<sub>i</sub><sup>Acc</sup> S [PRO<sub>i</sub> VP<sup>Inf</sup>] with verbs like *video* and *iubeo* when they denote direct perception or ordering.
- C) NP<sub>i</sub> V S [PRO<sub>i</sub> VP<sup>Inf</sup>] with verbs like *volo*; here the accusative does not appear at all in the actual utterance because the subject NP of the complement is coreferential with the subject of the main verb.
- D) [NP<sub>e</sub>]<sub>i</sub> V S [NP<sup>Acc</sup> VP<sup>Inf</sup>]<sub>i</sub> with impersonal verbs like *oportet*.

Only the structure A represents the ACI as an independent constituent separated from the rest of the sentence. Thus we can assume that in this case a border-line (I shall mark it with  $\bar{S}$ ) will develop between the main clause and its complement so that finite clauses introduced by conjunctions (COMP) may appear in place of the ACI.<sup>8</sup> The structure would then have the form V  $\bar{S}$  COMP S [NP VP]; e.g. Petr. 46,4 *dixi  $\bar{S}$  quia S [mustella comedit]*. In fact, also in classical Latin, when a wish or an indirect command is expressed, verbs like *volo* and *iubeo* take a finite (*ut-*, *ne-*)

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Calboli, in Pinkster 1983: 47—49, who thinks that the existence of the S node is dependent on the existence of the real COMP element.

clause rather than an ACI as their complement (cf. Kühner—Stegmann 1955: I 717—18).

The structures B—D, instead, apparently have more resistance against the substitution of the ACI by finite clauses. In these cases the embedded clause S is bound to some elements of the main clause and the ACI is not represented by a single constituent separable from the rest of the sentence. Thus it is no wonder that in the *Peregr. Aeth.* the structure C (especially with *dignor*) is very common and ACI most frequently occur with the impersonal phrase *necesse est* (the structure D).

I return to the structure A. As noted above, if the complement clause expresses wish, purpose or indirect command, then normally a subordinate subjunctive clause is used in Latin. This can happen also with verbs like *video* and *dico*. In any case, *ut*- and *ne*-clauses are normal substitutes for the ACI in connection with *volo* and *iubeo*. Thus our conclusion from the discussion of the structures representing the ACI is that *quod*-, *quia*- and *quoniam*-clauses can be used for the ACI in the first place with such verbs as *video*, *dico* and *scio*, i.e. with *verba sentiendi* and *dicendi*. There is, however, a small modification: *video*, which often denotes direct perception (the structure B), is more resistant against the use of finite clauses. The most apparent candidates for taking "that"-clauses in place of the ACI are then verbs of saying, knowing and believing (such as *dico scio* and *credo*). The conclusion is supported by linguistic material, by attestations from late Latin texts. In the *Peregr. Aeth.* (*eo*) *quod*-, *quia*- or *quoniam*-clauses instead of the ACI occur 18 times (cf. Löfstedt 1911: 116—123): once with *video*, nine times with *verba dicendi* (*dico* 5, *testor*, *refero* 2, *per scripturas invenitur*), and eight times with *verba sentiendi* (*scio* 4, *credo* 3, *audio*).

#### IV

I take up again the third question posed above in chapter I: why there is in Latin only a limited choice between infinitival and finite clauses and it is not until in late Latin that the choice between the ACI

and "that"-clauses seems to become possible? Or to posit the question somehow differently: what are the properties of Latin that favour the use of the ACI? Probably it is not an isolated phenomenon but forms part of a system including several phenomena related to each other. Calboli, who has examined the problem (Calboli 1978), has in my opinion convincingly shown that one reason must be the lack of the article in Latin. Thus in late Latin the change of the pronominal system leading to the birth of the article and the appearance of finite clauses in place of the ACI must be related phenomena. Indeed, in classical Greek, which has the definite article, there is a choice between infinitival clauses and "that"-clauses, and in Latin both phenomena, the use of the article and the replacement of the ACI, seem to appear simultaneously.

Calboli's explanation is supported by rules of the GB theory, by its subtheories of Case, Government and Binding. At the level of the abstract S-structure cases are assigned to NPs on the basis of the structural notion of government. To account for the appearance of the accusative case we have the following Case-assignment rule (cf. Chomsky 1981: 52, 253—275; Maraldi in Pinkster 1983: 171; Calboli 1983: 147—148): a NP is assigned Objective case (Accusative in Latin) if governed by V, and a NP is governed by a V if the VP dominating the V also dominates the NP and no major category (NP or  $\bar{S}$ ) intervenes between them. The rule directly explains the appearance of the accusative in the control structure of the Latin ACI (structure B above). But the other type with an overt accusative in the subject position of the infinitival clause needs further explanation (structures A and D above). Therefore we must assume that in this case  $\bar{S}$ -deletion has taken place leaving the subject NP of the infinitival clause to be governed by the matrix V. Actually the same happens in English too, where according to Chomsky "believe" and similar verbs have the marked property of deleting the  $\bar{S}$  node. The procedure is known as Exceptional Case-marking. In Latin, the deletion of  $\bar{S}$  is a property of those verbs that can be subcategorized for only a clausal complement. Perhaps, as referred to above, we should rather think of the absence of  $\bar{S}$  in Latin, because it seems that it will come into presence only when there is an overtly realized COMP introducing the complement clause. If we thus assume that there is no  $\bar{S}$  node between the main clause and its infinitival complement, the above rule of case-assignment applies here

too.<sup>9</sup> This means that also impersonal verbs and impersonal passives can assign the accusative case. The Latin evidence, in fact, supports this explanation: for instance, an impersonal phrase like *mibi videtur* ("it appears to me") can be replaced by the active verb *censeo* ("I think, suppose") without any change in meaning.

ACI constructions are so common in Latin that the "Exceptional Case-marking" is rather a rule than an exception. It is not clear at all how to describe the phenomenon. It seems that there are some structural or lexical reasons for  $\bar{S}$ -deletion. And the deletion of  $\bar{S}$  (or the absence of it) evidently is in connection with the presence or absence of the COMP node. The phenomenon may also be associated with the factuality feature of predicates, so that deletion is possible with non-factive verbs meaning "think, suppose, seem", which merely qualify the main assertion contained by the complement. It is worth noticing that in classical Greek the use of the ACI clearly is semantically determined: it is just the verbs of the "believe"-type that require the ACI construction (cf. Kurzowá 1970).

Why does Latin favour COMP-less sentences and consequently has only a limited choice between infinitival and finite clauses? Above I have referred to the lack of the article and to the development of the Latin pronominal system. These phenomena, which are in some relation to the order of words, can be treated in the light of the theory of Binding of the GB theory. The Binding theory specifies the relations of anaphors, pronominals, names and variables to their possible antecedents (Chomsky 1981: 188):

- (a) an anaphor is bound in its governing category,
- (b) a pronominal is free in its governing category,
- (c) an R-expression (name, variable) is free.

These principles restrict movements within complex sentences, particularly they prevent a NP movement out of a finite clause. If, for instance, the

---

<sup>9</sup> Baldi's conclusion in his article "Speech perception and grammatical rules in Latin" (in Pinkster 1983: 25) is in essence the same, though he speaks of a perceptual, not of a grammatical choice: "The subject of the dependent clause occupies a perceptual slot associated with objecthood; thus, the accusative case form is chosen."

subject NP of a finite clause were moved, the trace *t*, which is left behind, being an anaphor would then be neither bound in its governing category (but from outside of it) nor properly governed. But if the movement is from an infinitival clause the principles are not violated.<sup>10</sup> There may be many factors in a language that make it necessary to move elements to the front of the sentence (e.g. topicalization, relative and interrogative sentences) but in Latin, which does not have the definite or indefinite article, such requirements are more numerous than in many other languages. Furthermore, in classical Latin it is just the relative pronoun that is most frequently used to refer to things mentioned previously in the text. In the lack of the article Latin must make use of word order in adjusting utterances into the textual or situational context. Thus in Latin sentences the elements have to be relatively free from the ties of the syntactic order to be moved according to the requirements of the contextual or informational structure. As shown above, infinitival constructions release elements to be used more freely for these purposes.

Finally I shall illustrate my discussion of the Binding theory by examples from the *Peregr. Aeth.* Firstly I want to emphasize that in late Latin demonstrative pronouns were just developing to be used as the definite article. Thus it is too much to say that there was an article. However, demonstrative pronouns were used in a similar way as the article for purposes of textual reference. Compare the following sentences, in which *illas*, *ipsa*, and *ipse* act like definite articles: 12,9 *Tunc dictum est nobis, quia isdem diebus, qua sanctus Moyses vel filii Israhel contra illas civitates pugnaverant, castra ibi habuissent*; 12,7 *Sed mihi credite, ..., quia columna ipsa iam non pareret, locus autem ipse tantum ostenditur.*

In the following I shall quote the other examples of finite clauses with *dico* or *credo*: 8,2 *nam dicent, eo quod filii Israhel ... eas posuerint*; 12,7 *Nam episcopus ... dixit nobis, quoniam iam aliquot anni essent, a quo non pareret columna illa*; 15,5 *Illud etiam presbyter sanctus dixit nobis,*

---

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Chomsky 1981: 153, who speaking of the domains characterized as opaque by the Binding theory says: "These two binding principles have a wide range of application, and relate in an interesting way to the theory of movement in that the transparent (non-opaque) positions within clauses are those from which movement is free out of the clause (namely, COMP and subject of infinitive)." See also Calboli 1983: 144—147.

*eo quod ... quicumque essent baptizandi ... omnes in ipso fonte baptizarentur*; 39,5 *et dicentibus ei aliis apostolis, quia dominum vidissent*; 17,2 *Nam mihi credat volo affectio vestra, quoniam nullus christianorum est, qui non se tendat illuc ...*; 19,6 *Ecce rex Aggarus, ..., credidit ei, quia esset vere filius Dei*. It is easy to see that the NPs occupying the "opaque" positions in these sentences do not need an article or a referential pronoun to remove opacity because their reference is determined by other means (*filiis Israhel, aliquot anni, quicumque ... omnes, dominum*, which thanks to its meaning is used like a proper noun, *nullus christianorum, filius Dei*).

The relevance of the Binding principles can be demonstrated by comparing the above *eo quod*-, *quoniam*- and *quia*-sentences to those where infinitival clauses occur. I quote the examples with *dico*: 5,8 *id est in ea valle, quam dixi subiacere monti Dei*; 8,2 *in quo sunt duae statuae exclusae ingentes, quas dicunt esse sanctorum hominum*; 19,6 *Nam erat et iuxta archiotipa ..., quam dixit filius ipsius esse Magni*; 12,2 *qui et ipsi tamen maiores ita sibi traditum a maioribus suis esse dicebant*; 4,4 *petra ingens est ..., in qua stetisse dicuntur ipsi sancti*; 8,3 *Et est ibi praeterea arbor sicimori, quae dicitur a patriarchis posita esse*; 12,7 *Columna autem ipsa dicitur mari mortuo fuisse quooperta*; 17,2 *ad visendos sanctos monachos, qui ibi plurimi et tam eximiae vitae esse dicebantur*; 37,2 *Et quoniam nescio quando dicitur quidam fixisse morsum et furasse de sancto ligno, ...*

In each sentence there is a movement from the complement clause so that substitution of finite clauses for ACI is blocked by Binding conditions. In most cases the fronting is obligatory because of the use of relative pronouns, in one case because of the interrogative *quando*. In 12,2 the moved element is anaphorical *ita*. In 12,7 the fronting of *columna autem ipsa* is evidently made by reason of emphasis. Similar instances of topicalization are also those sentences where the ACI appears with *credo* or *scio*: 7,3 *Nam mihi credat volo affectio vestra, quantum tamen pervidere potui, filios Israhel sic ambulasse, ut ...*; 20,9 *Sanctum Abraam ... scio per scripturas in eo loco venisse*.

The examples taken from the Peregr. Aeth. quite expressly show that the choice between an infinitival and a finite clause after verbs of saying, knowing or believing is determined by the thematic structure of sentences.

I have not discussed those factors (the influence of Greek, changes in Latin morphology, for instance) that changed the system of Latin syntax so that finite clauses could replace the ACI in late Latin. I have rather accepted the change as a recognized fact. Syntactical phenomena are usually complex phenomena resulting from interaction of several components. Thus also a small change in the system can have many consequences. In the limits of my short study I have wanted to emphasize that the Latin ACI is related to a range of other phenomena: overtly missing subjects, word order, lack of the article, anaphoric pronominals, extensive use of relative pronouns, demonstrative pronouns and their scope of reference, to mention some of them. All of them are at least partly reducible to some principles of general nature. This means that single phenomena cannot be treated separately without considering their relations to other phenomena. General rules and principles are of great help in finding out what the relations may be. I hope that I have been able to show some of the Latin phenomena related to the use of the ACI and to give an answer to the question why infinitival constructions are favoured in Latin.

## REFERENCES

- Bolkestein, A. M., Subject-to-Object Raising in Latin? *Lingua* 48 (1979) 15—34.
- Calboli, G., *Studi grammaticali. Studi pubblicati dall'Istituto di Filologia Classica di Bologna XI*. Bologna 1962.
- „ Die Entwicklung der klassischen Sprachen und die Beziehung zwischen Satzbau, Wortstellung und Artikel. *IF* 83 (1978) 197—261.
- „ (ed.) *Papers on Grammar I*. Bologna 1980.
- „ *Problemi di grammatica latina*. *ANRW* II:29:1 (1983) 3—177.
- Chomsky, N., *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht 1981.
- Comrie, B., The theoretical significance of the Latin accusative and infinitive: a reply to Pillinger, *Journal of Linguistics* 17 (1981) 345—349.
- Kurzowá, H., Der lateinische Infinitiv im Vergleich mit dem Griechischen, *Živa Antika* 20 (1970) 83—93.
- Kühner, R.—C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache, Satzlehre*. 3. Aufl. durchgesehen von A. Thierfelder. Leverkusen 1955.
- Lakoff, R. T., *Abstract Syntax and Latin Complementation*. Cambridge Mass. 1968.
- Löfstedt, E., *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae*. Uppsala 1911.

- Pepicello, W., Raising in Latin, *Lingua* 42 (1977) 209—218.
- Perrochat, P., *Recherches sur la valeur et l'emploi de l'infinitif subordonné en latin*. Paris 1932.
- Pillinger, O. S., The accusative and infinitive in Latin: a refractory complement clause, *Journal of Linguistics* 16 (1980) 55—83.
- Pinkster, H., (ed.) *Latin Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*. Studies in Language Companion Series, vol. 12. Amsterdam 1983.
- Rizzi, L., *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht 1982.
- Viljamaa, T., The Latin Accusativus cum Infinitivo and the Government and Binding theory, *Publications of the Linguistic Association of Finland* 11 (1983) 29—42.
- Wirth-Poelchau, L., *AcI und quod-Satz im lateinischen Sprachgebrauch mittelalterlicher und humanistischer Autoren*. Diss. Erlangen—Nürnberg 1977.