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0. Introduction and aims

The Latin infinitival inflection shows an articulation in three tenses\(^1\) (present, perfect and future) and in two diatheses (active and passive\(^2\)), as in Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>present</th>
<th>laudare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>laudavisse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>future</td>
<td>laudatur-um (-am, -um; -os, -as, -a) esse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>present</td>
<td>laudari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>laudat-um (-am, -um; -os, -as, -a) esse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>future</td>
<td>laudatum iri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This morphological richness promotes a large use of the infinitive in the so called

---

\(^1\) Following Reichenbach (1947: 287-298), “the tenses determine time with reference to the time point of the act speech”. In particular, he individuates three elements in order to give a complete analysis of the verbal tenses: the “point of speech”, the “point of the event” and the “point of reference”. An event, in fact, can be anterior, contemporary, and posterior with respect to the point of speech or to the point of reference. In this sense, a past tense can also be anterior, while a future tense, posterior.

\(^2\) Latin also has “deponent verbs” that have passive voice form but active voice meaning.

University of Venice
Working Papers in Linguistics
Vol. 20, 2010
“infinitival structures”. Under this label it is possible to distinguish, at least, five different structures:

1. **Accusativus cum Infinitivo** (Aci): \[Dico \ Quad \ [iP \ illum \ venire]]\] (I say that he comes);

2. **Raising structures**: \[NP, flamma \ [iP \ videtur \ ardere]]\] (The flame seems to burn);

3. **Control structures**: Galli, interniserant \[iP \ PRO_i \ obsides \ Caesari \ dare\] (The Welsh stopped giving hostages to Caesar);

4. **Simple infinitives**: Ridiculum est \[iP \ currere\] (Run it is ridiculous);

5. **Restructuring structures**: Audeo \[iP \ dicere \ hoc\] (I dare to say this)

This paper deals with restructuring structures (5) (henceforth RSs)\(^3\), parallel to recent studies\(^4\) and suggests an analysis of the RSs with modal and aspectual verbs in archaic and classical Latin. In particular, I will extend Zennaro's (2004) analysis of possum, debo, incipio, destino and Costantini and Zennaro’s (2005) analysis of verba voluntatis, giving some examples to demonstrate that Latin modal and aspectual verbs enter RSs. Furthermore, I will discuss some of their properties in relation to Cinque’s (1999; 2004) theory on the hierarchy of functional projections. I will show that the syntactic behaviour of each of the modal and aspectual verbs depends on the kind of modality or aspectuality they express, that is, on the functional projection they occupy with respect to the others, and to the Past Tense in particular.

A corpus of authors from earliest times to the 2\(^{nd}\) century A.D. was collected using the B(bibliotheca) T(eubneriana) L(atina). During this period, Latin shows an interesting syntactic homogeneity.

The paper is organized in the following way: section 1 is devoted to a quick description of the framework which inspired the present approach to the syntax of the Latin RSs, while section 2-3 give a brief overview of the main properties of the Latin RSs with

---

\(^{3}\) About the constructions in (1)-(4) cf. Oniga (2007).

modal and aspectual verbs; finally, section 4 proposes a syntactic analysis of the RSs with modal and aspectual verbs.

1. The framework and the data

As argued by Rizzi (1976), Burzio (1986) and Cinque (2004), the term “restructuring” is used to refer to a syntactic structure in which an infinitive is contained within a monoclusal structure with the main verb of particular verb classes, namely, modal (i.e. to want, can, to seem), aspectual (i.e. to finish, to stop, to continue) and motion verbs (i.e. to come), as in the following Italian and English sentences:

(6) a. Gianni [vuole rientrare tardi la sera]_{VP}
   b. John [wants to come back late in the evening]_{VP}

Rizzi (1976, 1978) notes that modal, aspectual and motion verbs (unlike other verbs) show some particular properties and proposes three tests in order to identify RSs:

- Clitic climbing
- Auxiliary change
- Object raising in connection to the impersonal *si* (Long Object Preposing in Burzio 1986)

The following examples (respectively from Cinque (2004: 132) and from Vanelli and Salvi (2004: 231) illustrate this pattern:

(7) **Clitic climbing**
   a. Lo volevo vedere t subito
   b. Volevo vederlo subito
   “I wanted to see him immediately”
   c. *Lo preferisco vedere t in quello stato
   d. Preferisco vederlo in quello stato
   “I detest seeing him in that state”
(8) Auxiliary change
   a. Piero è voluto partire prima
   b. Piero ha voluto partire prima
      “Piero wanted to leave earlier”
   c. *Piero è preferito partire prima
   d. Piero ha preferito partire prima
      “Piero preferred leave earlier”

(9) Long Object Preposing
   a. Si vorrebbero dare dei pasticcini a Maria
   b. Si vorrebbe dare dei pasticcini a Maria
      “One would like to give some cookies to Maria”
   c. *Si preferisco dare dei pasticcini a Maria
   d. Si preferisce dare dei pasticcini a Maria
      “One prefers to give some cookies to Maria”

The above examples demonstrate that in Italian, in the presence of a modal verb\(^5\), the three tests give grammatical results and this suggests that the main predicate and the embedded one can give rise to a monoclusal structure, in which the two predicates are part of the same clause. In (7a), (8a) and (9a), in fact, phenomena like clitic placement, auxiliary selection and use of the impersonal \(si\), which are generally clause-bound, are able to span over two clauses in the presence of modal, aspectual and motion verbs (cf. footnote n.5). However, the grammaticality of the sentences in (7b), (8b) and (9b) suggests that these verbs allow two distinct possibilities: they can be either functional verbs - inserted in the head position of the corresponding functional projection - or lexical verbs\(^6\). On the other hand, a verb like preferire (7c-d)-(9c-d) in Italian does not

---

\(^5\) Finding certain phenomena, such as Clitic Climbing (and other “trasparency effects” cf. Cinque: 2004), in complex predicates in which the main verb is not only a modal, but also an aspectual or a motion verb can account for considering them monoclusal structures. Cf. \(io\ volevo vedere subito ‘(I) him wanted to see immediately’ (modal); \(io\ finisco di vedere domani ‘(I) it finish to see tomorrow’ (aspectual) and \(io\ vengo a prendere domani ‘(I) it come to fetch tomorrow’ (motion).

\(^6\) Cinque (2004) suggests that restructuring verbs are always functional. “This has the conceptual advantage that such verbs do not need to be marked in the lexicon as either lexical or functional” (p. 153-154).
show the same properties, so it constitutes a predicate regardless of the infinitive.

Cinque (2004) analyses RSs within his theory on the hierarchy of the functional projections, proposed in Cinque (1999), and claims that they are rigidly ordered in the following hierarchy:

**Cinque’s (2004) hierarchy**

\[
\text{MoodP}_{\text{speech act}} > \text{MoodP}_{\text{evaluative}} > \text{MoodP}_{\text{evidential}} > \text{ModP}_{\text{epistemic}} > \text{TP (Past)} > \text{TP (Future)} > \text{MoodP}_{\text{irrealis}} > \text{ModP}_{\text{alethic necessity}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{habitual}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{repetitive(I)}} > \text{TP (Anterior)} > \text{AspP}_{\text{terminative}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{continuative}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{retrospective}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{proximative}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{durative}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{durative}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{generative/progressive}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{prospective}} > \text{ModP}_{\text{obligation}} > \text{ModP}_{\text{permission/ability}} \geq \text{AspP}_{\text{completive}} > \text{VoiceP} > \text{AspP}_{\text{celerative(II)}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{repetitive(II)}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{frequentative(I)}}
\]

In particular, Cinque (1999) suggests that the adverbs are generated in the specifier of each functional projection. This theory of adverbs is also useful to understand the restructuring phenomenon: Cinque (2004), in fact, proposes that the verbs which give rise to a monoclausal structure are generated in the head of a functional projection depending on their semantics. The fact of being generated in functional projections justifies their definition as “functional verbs”. In this perspective, a Latin modal verb like *queo* (*I can*) is merged in the head of the functional projection ModP<sub>permission/ability</sub>, while an aspectual verb like *soleo* (*I am used to*) is merged in the head of the functional projection in AspP<sub>habitual</sub>.

Concerning the Latin infinitival structures with modal and aspectual verbs, I consider the verbs included in Table 2:

---

7. In Cinque (1999: 79–81) ModP<sub>obligation</sub> > ModP<sub>permission/ability</sub> are unified under the label of ModP<sub>root</sub>.
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modal Verbs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audeo</td>
<td>I dare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debeo</td>
<td>I must</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exopto</td>
<td>I desire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malo</td>
<td>I prefer$^8$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nequeo</td>
<td>I cannot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolo</td>
<td>I do not want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possum</td>
<td>I can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queo</td>
<td>I am able to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volo</td>
<td>I want</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspectual Verbs$^9$</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggedior</td>
<td>To be about to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesso</td>
<td>I stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coepi/Incipio</td>
<td>I start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conor</td>
<td>I try</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunctor</td>
<td>I wait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curo</td>
<td>I make effort to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desino</td>
<td>I leave out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festino</td>
<td>I speed up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturo</td>
<td>I accelerate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persevero</td>
<td>I continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soleo</td>
<td>I usually…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

$^8$. In Latin the verb *malo* “to prefer”, differently from English and Italian, enter RSs. This peculiarity demonstrates the great variability which can be found among languages from this point of view. It also suggests reexamination of aspectual verbs cross-linguistically, with a closer attention to differences among aspectual verbs in terms of their syntactic distributions and semantic properties, as argued in studies such as Newmeyer (1975), Lamiray (1987), Rochette (1999), and Cinque (2003).

$^9$. Although there are other verbs that show similar characteristics, we focus on these aspectual verbs because they are some of the most frequently attested in Latin and they represent basic aspectual specifications.
2. The Latin RSs with modal verbs

2.1 The Latin weak pronouns

According to Costantini and Zennaro (2005), the three tests (Clitic Climbing, Auxiliary Change and Long Object Preposition) proposed by Rizzi (1976, 1978) and Cinque (2004) are not applicable to Latin, since Latin misses clitic pronouns, auxiliary selection and *si* constructions. However Salvi (2004) shows that Latin has strong and weak pronouns, as put forward by Cardinaletti and Starke (1999). In particular, Salvi (2004: chap. IV and V) argues that, although there is only one pronominal morphological form in Latin, in some cases strong pronouns can be distinguished from weak ones on the basis of syntactic and pragmatic evidence. Strong pronouns can occupy any position in the sentence and can be substituted by nouns, unlike weak pronouns, which only have anaphoric reference and occupy the position after the first element of the sentence ("Wackernagel’s position"), independently of their syntactic function. This is shown in the following example (from Salvi (2004: 126)), in which the pronoun *me* is placed in Wackernagel’s position:

\begin{quote}
(10) \textit{Caninius noster me tuis verbis admonuit}\\
\hspace{3cm} Our friend Caninius gave me your message. \hspace{3cm} \textit{(Cic., epist., 9,6,1)}
\end{quote}

Salvi (2004) uses pronoun collocation in Wackernagel’s position as a test of monoclausality and, following this idea, Costantini and Zennaro (2005) demonstrate that the presence of a weak pronoun in the Wackernagel’s position involves the verb *possunt*, and the *verba voluntatis*. In the following examples, they show that the first and second person pronouns occur in the second position after the first syntactic unit, namely in the matrix clause, even if they are arguments of the embedded verb:

---

(11) *Quid mihi nunc invideri potest?*  
What can one envy me about, now?  
(Cic., epist., 9,16,6)

(12) *Huc te e balneo, prius quam accumberes, ducere volebat.*  
To this place he wanted to lead you form the bath, before you lay down.  
(Cic., Deiot., 17)

(13) *Si Carpinatius mihi tum respondere noluit, responde tu mihi nunc.*  
If Carpinatius would not answer me then, do you, answer me now.  
(Cic., Verr., 2,190)  
(from Costantini and Zennaro 2005: 4-5)

In this sense, I will show that RSs can be found with all modal verbs, as can be seen in the following examples regarding *queo, nequeo, debeo* and *audeo*:

(14) *Neque eam queo locare cuiquam*  
I cannot give her in marriage to anyone.  
(Varro., ling., 5,2)

(15) *Sed*\(^{11}\) *ego hoc nequeo mirari satis*  
But I can’t marvel enough at this.  
(Plaut., Trin., 1132)

(16) *Quae ipsi debeo huic libro libenter inserui*  
For him I gladly have to insert these things in this book.  
(Stat., Silv., 2,21)

(17) *Nondum id quidem audeo dicere*  
On that point I do not yet dare to speak  
(Cic., fin., 4,1,1)

The above examples demonstrate that not only *possum, debeo* and the *verba voluntatis*

---

11. As for the difficulties in precisely define the “second position of the sentence”, cf. Salvi (2004: 133 ff.). He also adds that “in latino la relazione tra l’elemento debole e il primo costituente del dominio sintattico è tutt’altro che stretta” (pg. 180). In this particular case, we can affirm that the presence of *sed* is not a problem for considering *hoc* in second position. Also in German, for example, in a sentence like *Aber John ist dann zu uns gekommen*, the presence of *aber* does not prevent for considering *ist* collocated in V2 position. I thank Marco Coniglio for the discussion on this example.
can enter RSs, but other modal verbs can do so too, constituting a homogeneous class from the syntactic point of view.

2.2. The (un)marked word order in the Latin clause

A second test proposed by Salvi (2004: 43) for RSs regards the position of the infinitive and the restructuring verb. Salvi (2004) affirms that the unmarked word order in Latin is that with the verb in the final position in the clause, as in the following example:

(18) Neque ego ad te his duobus mensibus scripséram
And I have not written to you for the last two months. (Cic., epist., 8,9,1)
(from Salvi 2004: 43)

Salvi (2004: 47-48) also notes that in sentences with two predicates, namely finite verb plus infinitive, the former follows the latter, at least in the unmarked order:

(19) Hoc tempore Catilinam, competitorem nostrum, défendere cogitámus
At the present time I am thinking about defending my fellow candidate Catiline. (Cic., Att., 1,2,1)
(from Salvi 2004: 47)

However, Salvi (2004: 47) adds that the unmarked SOXV (S-O-infinitive-finite verb) order above can change into SOVX (S-O-finite verb-infinitive), if the verb (V) and the infinitive (X) form a unit:

---

12. This is also confirmed in Devine-Stephens (2006: chap. 2). Nevertheless, they specify that, even if Latin has "the verb in the default clause final position [...]", however you don't have to look for in a text of Cicero to find sentences in which the verb is not final. [...] There are good grounds for assuming that the verb has moved to a higher position in the clause" (pg. 146).

13. "Quando il verbo e la parola che lo precede formano un'unità relativamente stretta, l'ordine dei due elementi può essere invertito. Questo avviene nel caso delle costruzioni participio+ausiliare, gerundio+ausiliare, infinito+verbo e oggetto+verbo in una costruzione idiomatica" (Salvi: 2004: 47).
(20) *Si haec mala fixa sunt, ego vero te quam primum, mea vita, cupio videre*

If these ills can never be removed, I assure you, my dears, that my desire is to see you as soon as possible.  
(Cic., *epist.*, 14,4,1)
(from Salvi 2004: 48)

According to Salvi (2004), the verb position at the end of the clause, the infinitive-finite verb order with lexical verbs and the inversion of that order in the case of functional verbs constitute an important tendency which can be found in archaic and classical Latin. However, as noted in Devine-Stephens (2004: chap. 5), in addition to this, there is a wide range of options in the placement of the verb (or of the verbal group) and of the other elements of the sentence. Let us consider the following examples:

(21) *Audeo dicere hoc*

I dare to say that.  
(Liv., 2,34,11)

(22) *Is tamen hanc causam ab illa debet seiungere*

He ought none the less to make a distinction between that case and this.  
(Cic., *Cluent.*, 96)

(23) *Te ipsum mihi iam dudum exoptabam dari*

I’ve been hoping to run into you for a while.  
(Ter., *Heaut.*, 758)

(24) *Proditorem nolo dicere, certe speculatorem habemus in sinu*

I do not want to say a traitor, but we have in our bosom at least a spy.  
(Liv., 40,5,12)

(25) *Mavult dicere voluptatem quam vacuitatem doloris*

He prefers to talk of the pleasure than of the absence of the pain.  
(Cic., *fin.*, 2,16)

(26) *Quid istuc sit [...] nequeo noscere*

I cannot know that’s the place you mention.  
(Plaut., *Asin.*, 36)

(27) *Sed tamen hoc queo dicere*

But still I can say this much.  
(Cic., *Cato.*, 32)
Sentences from (21) to (27) confirm that in the case of a complex predicate, the infinitive generally follows the finite verb. As noted in Costantini and Zennaro (2005) for *debeo*, finding this property in predicates, especially those involving modal verbs, constitutes an important piece of evidence for the hypothesis that modal verbs form a single predicate with the infinitive. Nevertheless, the above examples show that, even if the verbal group is generally placed in the final position in the sentence (22), (23), (26), (27), this is not the only possibility. In (21) and in (25), for instance, the predicate precedes the object, while in (24) the verbal group *nolo dicere* is contained within a complex object (*proditorem nolo dicere, certe speculatorem*), which regularly precedes the main verb.

Although in archaic and classical Latin there is a great variability in word order, the sentences above show that it is possible to find some regularities and that the disposition of the elements in the sentences is changeable, but it is not unrestricted. In particular, the data show that, from a quantitative point of view, the unmarked order between a modal verb and the infinitive is that in which the former precedes the latter, even if the complex predicate can occur in different positions in the sentence, as shown in (21)-(27). This is confirmed on considering a larger number of occurrences. Taking into account the verbal structures with a modal verb plus an infinitive found in a corpus of Latin texts available in the BTL, the situation is the following in archaic and classical Latin:\(^{14}\):

(28) a. *Audeo dicere* 24 vs *dicere audeo* 3  
b. *Debet seiungere* 1 vs *seiungere debet*  
c. *Exoptabam dari* 1 vs *dari exoptabam*  
d. *Nolo dicere* 4 vs *dicere nolo*  
e. *Mavult dicere* 3 vs *dicere mavult*  
f. *Nequeo noscere* 2 vs *noscere nequeo*  
g. *Queo dicere* 5 vs *dicere queo*  

From these data it is clear that, independently of the collocation of the verbal group in the sentence, in the presence of RSs, the only possible word order in many cases is that in which the infinitive follows the finite verb to which it is adjacent. The only three

\(^{14}\) The data presented in (28) refer to the unmarked word order. As also shown in a large number of examples discussed here, it is frequent to find the inversion of the order for independent reasons, especially in poetic texts for stylistic motivations and in particular informational contexts.
cases of classical texts in which the (statistically irrelevant) infinitive-finite verb order is attested can be accounted for when considering their information structure:

(29) \[ \text{TOP Rem a nostris positam|[[FOC nec dicere} \ [IP audeo} \ [t_{\text{TOP}} [[t_{\text{FOC}} ]]]], quia infirma uidetur, nec praeterire \]
I am afraid to mention a theory established by our (Stoic friends), because they seem to be weak. I am also afraid to be silent about them. \hspace{1cm} (Sen., nat., 4b,5,1)

(30) \[ \text{Tum ille vere vertens annus appellari potest; in quo} \ [FOC vix dicere \ [IP audeo} \ [quam multa hominum saecula teneantur} \ [t_{\text{FOC}} ]]] \]
In that case the passage of the year can be explained. I hardly dare to say how many generations of men are contained within such a year. \hspace{1cm} (Cic. rep. 6,23)

(31) \[ \text{Id quod adversus hunc dicere audeo magis auderem adversus nutricem dicere} \]
What I dare to say against him I should dare all the more to say against the foster mother. \hspace{1cm} (Quint., decl., 338,24)

In (29) the infinitive \textit{dicere} is a Focus: its emphasis is due to the fact that it is in contrast to the other complex predicate \textit{\textit{nec praeterire (audeo)'}, with which it shares the same main verb; in (30) the infinitive \textit{dicere} expresses new information, so it is a Focus and regularly precedes the finite verb; finally, in (31) Quintilianus creates a particular stylistic effect using \textit{dicere audeo} \[\ldots\] \textit{auderem} \[\ldots\] \textit{dicere} in the same sentence in a chiastic construction.

3. The properties of the aspectual verbs

The two tests used to individuate a monclausal structure with modal verbs - namely weak pronoun dislocation in the Wackernagel's position (§2.1) and inversion of SO\textit{infV + restrV} into SO\textit{ restrV+inf.V} order (§2.2) - also provide good results with aspectual verbs. This evidence confirms that aspectual verbs constitute another class of restructuring verbs. Let us consider the following three examples, which demonstrate the presence in Wackernagel's position of weak pronouns as the object of the embedded verb:
(32) *In vobis hoc maxime admirari soleo*
   I usually admire especially this in you  (Cic., *Orat.*, 2,126)

(33) *Prior quam illa*\(^{15}\) *conor attingere quibus orationem ornari atque illuminari putem*
   Before attempting to deal with the qualities that seem to me to give ornament and
   brilliance to a discourse.  (Cic., *de orat.*, 3,25)

(34) *Ille mihi risum magis quam stomachum movere solet*
   He excites my laughter rather than my rage  (Cic., *Att.*, 6,3,7)

As in the above examples from (21) to (27), also in those from (32) to (34) it is possible
 to note a variability in the order of the elements in the sentence. In particular, there is
evidence that pronoun collocation in Wackernagel's position is always found, while the
verbal group can be placed in the final position in the sentence (32) or in the last
position of the matrix clause, before the relative clause (33); finally the verbal group can
also be attested in the unexpected order with the infinitive preceding the finite verb (32);
(34). Nevertheless, the following examples illustrate that the unmarked order with the
aspectual verbs is one in which the infinitive follows the finite verb (as for the modal
verbs):

(35) *Audi, antequam ego incipio secedere*
   Hear, before I start to live apart  (Sen., *Epist.*, 17,4)

(36) *Haec illi solem praecipere*
   I am accustomed to give him advice.  (Cic., *Planc.*, 59)

---

\(^{15}\) The possibility for *ille, illa, illud* of being considered a weak pronoun is quite controversial. However,
if so, such a weakening could have favored the rise of the article in Romance languages from the
can also be observed in classical Latin, in which nominal expression of the type *N+Ille+Predicative
Adjective* are frequently attested. A Latin nominal expression such as *Chilo ille sapiens*, for instance, can
be translated in Italian not only with a demonstrative *Chilone, quello sapiente* (*Chilon, the sapient one*),
but also with a relative pronoun *Chilone che è sapiente* (*Chilon who is sapient*) or with an article *Chilone
il sapiente* (*Chilon the sapient*). In this construction *ille, illa, illud* can be considered a morphologically
rich determiner, which, together with the adjective, gives rise to an appositive DP (cf. Iovino: 2011).
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(37) *Non ipsis libentissime soleo respondere quos mihi videor facillime posse superare*
I do not find the greatest pleasure in refuting those persons whom, I think, I can easily defeat.  
(Cic., Sull., 46)

(38) *Effigem conor efficere*
I am endeavouring to draw an immortal picture.  
(Plin., epist., 3,10,6)

In addition to this, even though, generally speaking, the corpus only contains a few examples in which the aspectual verbs *incipio, soleo* and *conor* occur with an infinitive, the only possible word order is that in which the infinitive follows the finite verb:

(39) a. *Incipio secedere 1 vs secedere incipio*
b. *Soleo praecipere 1 vs praecipere soleo*
c. *Soleo respondere 1 vs respondere soleo 1*
d. *Conor efficere 1 vs efficere conor*

The single case in which the unexpected word order between the infinitive and the aspectual verb is found can be explained in terms of information structure:

(40) *Ego respondere soleo meis consiliis, periculis, laboribus patriam esse servatam, non tam sum eximandus de gestis rebus gloriari quam de obiectis confiteri*
I am in the habit of replying that it was by my forethought, at my risk, and through my exertions that my country was saved; it must be considered that I am not so much boasting of my own exploit, as stating facts in answer to charges.  
(Cic. dom., 93)

It is quite clear, in fact, that in (40) *respondere soleo* is a contrastive Focus. Cicero creates, in fact, an opposition between two highly emphatic verbal groups by the preposing of the infinitive with respect to the finite aspectual verb and of *sum* with respect to the gerundive: "ego respondere soleo [...] non tam sum eximandus"\(^\text{16}\). The correspondences between the features of the modal and aspectual verbs confirm the hypothesis that together they belong to the class of restructuring verbs and constitute the class of the restructuring verbs.

\(^{16}\) In the unmarked order the auxiliary generally follows the gerund, the gerundive, the participle and the infinitive. Cf Salvi (2004) and footnote n. 13.
4. Syntactic analysis of the RSs with modal and aspectual verbs

In this section, I suggest a syntactic configuration for RSs based on Cinque’s (1999; 2004) framework. I will show that the syntactic behaviour of each of the functional verbs depends on the functional projection it occupies with respect to that of the Past Tense.

4.1. Syntactic analysis of RSs with modal verbs

Let us consider the following two examples, in which there is a modal verb (*queo, *possunt*) (*I can*) plus an infinitive:

(41) *Non queo durare*
I cannot tolerate it. (Plaut., *Asin.*, 907)

(42) *Nec tecum possunt vivere, nec sine te*
I cannot live with or without you. (Mart., *epigr.*, 12,46)

From a semantic point of view, one notes that the two infinitives *durare* and *vivere* are two monoargumental verbs which should express a subject, but in these contexts the respective subjects are non-overt. At first glance one might think that the subject of the infinitive must be a PRO\(^\text{17}\); such an analysis, however, creates at least two problems. First of all, PRO needs a "controller" element which is absent in predicates with modal (and aspectual) verbs; these are, in fact, "light verbs" which do not project any argument structure, in the same way as auxiliary verbs do\(^\text{18}\). Furthermore, Cecchetto and Oniga (2002) demonstrate that, also in Latin, PRO is not compatible with a past infinitive:

\(^{17}\) The Generative Grammar defines PRO the covert subject of an infinitive clause. Cecchetto and Oniga (2002: 153–155) observe the following properties of PRO: it is phonologically silent; it is in complementary distribution with other pronouns; it cannot be found in a position in which case is assigned (*He*(NOM) invited John vs. * He invited PRO*(ACC)*); it cannot have referents out of the linguistic context (unless it receives an arbitrary interpretation *He went vs. PRO to go is stupid*), but it must be bound by a controller.

\(^{18}\) Cf. Pollock (1989) and Cinque (2004: 142), who suggests that "the functional verbs [...] like auxiliaries should have no thematic roles to assign, and hence no arguments of their own".
while in (43) and in (44) the subject is overtly realized so the infinitive can be present or future, in (45) no lexical subject is visible and PRO must be assumed. The presence of PRO forces the infinitive to be [-T]:

(43) Promittebas te os sublinere meo patri.
    (You) promised you would make fun of my father. (Plaut., Merc., 621)

(44) Fac quod facturum te promisisti mihi.
    Do what you promised that you would do. (Plaut., Poen., 421)

(45) (Ego) promisi [PRO ei dolium vini dare].
    I promised that I would give him a jar of wine. (Plaut., Cist., 541)

    (from Cecchetto and Oniga 2002: 167)

Nevertheless, modal verbs in Latin can occur with a past infinitive, as in examples (46)-(49). Also in these sentences, the order of the element shows variability: in (46) and in (48) the finite verb precedes the infinitive, but it is not adjacent to it and in (47) and in (49) the order between the finite verb and the infinitive is not the expected one:

(46) Nequeo nil commisisse nefandum
    I cannot now undo the wrong that I have done. (Ov., Met., 9,626)

(47) Tametsi statim vicisse debo
    Although I must have immediately won. (Cic., S. Rosc., 73)

(48) Fortuna, sepulcrum/dicere Pompei, quo condi maluit illum/quam terra caruisse socer?
    Is it the will of Fortune to call this the grave of Pompeius, this grave which Caesar preferred for his son-in-law to no burial at all? (Lucan., 8,793-795)

(49) Non discere debemus ista, sed didicisse\(^{19}\)
    We ought not to be learning such things; we should have done with learning (Sen. epist. 88,2)

\(^{19}\) I thank Imre Szilágyi for this example.
The same compatibility of a modal verb with a past infinitive can also be found in Italian and in English:

(50) Io (non) posso/voglio/devo farlo
     I can(not)/(do not) want/must (not) do it.

(51) Io (non) posso/voglio/devo averlo fatto
     I can(not)/(do not) want/must (not) have done it.

According to Cecchetto and Oniga (2002), the presence in all these examples of a past infinitive confirms that PRO is excluded from predicates with modal verbs. This evidence suggests that, in order not to violate the Thematic Criterion, the argument realized as the subject of the modal verb must be the argument of the infinitive, namely of the one verb which projects its argument structure (given that the modals are light verbs). The subject cannot receive case in its merge position (SpecVP of the infinitive), so it moves to the SpecIP of the matrix clause, the only position in which a finite verb can assign nominative case to it. This is shown in (52), which is the structure of (46):

(52)
```
IP
  \[
  \begin{array}{c}
  Pro \\
  \downarrow \\
  I^1 \\
  \downarrow \\
  I^0 \\
  \downarrow \\
  nequeo \\
  \downarrow \\
  [nom] \\
  \end{array}
  \]
  \[
  \begin{array}{c}
  [\text{-fin}] \\
  \end{array}
  \]
  \[
  \begin{array}{c}
  [\text{acc}] \\
  \end{array}
  \]
  \[
  \begin{array}{c}
  VP \\
  \downarrow \\
  t_{pro} \\
  \downarrow \\
  V' \\
  \downarrow \\
  V^0 \\
  \end{array}
  \]
  \[
  \begin{array}{c}
  \text{commisise} \\
  \end{array}
  \]
```

Although there is a large number of modals compatible with a past infinitive (volo, nolo, malo, queo, nequeo, possum, debeo), the corpus offers two modals, namely exopto and audeo respectively attested in sentences (23) and (17), which cannot occur with a past infinitive, but only with an infinitive in the present tense. The corresponding Italian and English data show the same distinctive feature:
(53) Io ti esorto a farlo  vs.  *Io ti esorto ad averlo fatto.
   I exhort you to do this  vs.  *I exhort you to have done this.

(54) Io oso guardarti negli occhi  vs.  *Io oso averti guardato negli occhi.
   I dare to look in your eyes  vs.  *I dare to have looked in your eyes.

Semantic and syntactic motivation can explain this evidence: from a semantic point of
view, "exhortation" and "daring", unlike "possibility", "impossibility", "duty" and
"preference"- are conceptually incompatible with the past. From a syntactic point of
view, following Cinque (1999; 2004), I suggest that, in general, the problem of the
compatibility or incompatibility of modals with a past infinitive is due to the existence
of different classes of modal verbs, merged in different structural positions with respect
to Tense merge position. As regards the above examples in which a modal occurs with a
past infinitive, we note that they express different kinds of modal meanings. In
particular, in the case of nequeo commisisse (46), the linguistic context favours an
epistemic meaning, so the sentences in which it occurs could be explained by an
expression such as: I cannot have done such a thing, because generally it is not the kind
of thing I would do. On the other hand, as regards vicisse debo (47), the linguistic
context suggests that there is some evidence confirming the triumph to which Cicero
refers. In his hierarchy, Cinque (1999; 2004) proposes that these two kinds of modalities
correspond to specific functional projections merged in a structural position higher than
Past Tense. This accounts for their compatibility with a past infinitive, as is shown in
the following structure which illustrates the possibility for the infinitive to move in
order to check Tense without any violation of the head movement constraint:

(55) \[\text{Mood}_{\text{evidential}} \]
    \[\text{debo} \quad \text{Mod}_{\text{epistemic}} \]
    \[\text{nequeo} \quad \text{Tense}_{\text{past}} \]
    \[\text{vincisse} \quad \text{VP} \]
    \[\text{commisisse} \]

In contrast, the modals occurring with a present infinitive express neither evidential nor
epistemic meaning: the examples found in the corpus which show modal verbs only
occurring with a present infinitive express, in fact, volition – volo (ducere volebat (12)), nolo (respondere noluit (13)), exoptio (exoptabam dari (23)) –, udio tion – debo (debet seiungere (22)) – ability nequeo (nequeo noscere (26) nequeo mirari (15)), permission – queo (queo locare (14)), udio (udio dicere (17)). Cinque (1999) includes these semantic values under the label of “root modality” and merges its functional projection below Tense. In this perspective, it is possible to explain the incompatibility of root modals with a past infinitive. In these cases, the infinitive cannot escape its position in order to check Tense without violating the locality constraints. In the following structure the infinitive commovere cannot check Tense without re-merging across the modal verb:

As regards root modals, the corpus offers an interesting example in which debo occurs with the past infinitive didicisse (49); this, however, does not represent a counterexample. The linguistic context suggests, in fact, that such a sentence is highly emphatic. As a matter of fact, it is clear that what is involved is the contrast between Seneca’s declaration that we must not study now because we should have already finished studying. Such an observation suggests that the semantics of the modal verb is compatible with an idea of necessity, while that of the past infinitive is more aspectual than temporal. Thus, in this case, it is possible to merge the first in the functional projection Modalethic necessity and to move the latter to TP anterior. This is displayed in the following structure which accounts for the possibility for the infinitive to move in order to check TP anterior:
4.2. Syntactic analysis of restructuring structure with aspectual verbs

With respect to aspectual verbs, the corpus shows that they are only compatible with a present infinitive. Let us consider the following examples:

(58) *Non ego laudari curo*
I am not interested in being praised.  (Tib., 1,1,57)

(59) *Ergo ego, ne scribam, digitos incidere cunctor?*
Do I then hesitate to cut my fingers that I may not write?  (Ov., Pont., 4,14,19)

(60) *Hostis vivos rapere soleo*
I am used to capturing the enemies alive.  (Plaut., Pseud., 655)

(61) *De rerum natura pangere conor*
I am about to fashion touching the Nature of Things.  (Lucr., 1,25)

(62) *Inuriam facere fortissime perseverat*
[Dolabella] most manfully persevered in acting wrongfully.  (Cic., Quinct., 8)

(63) *Maturat ab urbe proficisci*
[Caesar] hastens to leave Rome.  (Caes., Gall., 1,7,1)

(64) *Quem equidem cruci adfixum videre festino*
A man whom I, form my part, am in haste to see nailed to a cross.  (Curt., 6,3,14)
(65) *Orbis situm dicere aggredior*
   I start to talk about the site of the city. (Mela., 1,1)

(66) *De re publica dicere incipio*
   I begin to speak on public affairs. (Cic., Phil., 1,11)

As for the intrinsic variability of word order in archaic and classical Latin data, the examples from (58) to (66) show that it is less predictable in the presence of an aspectual verb than in the presence of a modal verb. In the above cases, in fact, the infinitive precedes the finite verb and the verbal group is regularly placed in the final position in the sentence, except for (63) in both respects. Comparing the Latin with the Italian and English data, it can be noticed that, also in these languages, aspectual verbs always occur with a present infinitive, as shown in the sentences from (67) to (75), which are the translation of those from (58) to (66):

(67)  
a. *Non mi interesso di essere stato lodato.*
   b. *I am not interested in having been praised.*

(68)  
a. *Esito a essermi tagliato le dita per non scrivere.*
   b. *I hesitate to have cut my fingers that I may not write.*

(69)  
a. *Sono abituato ad aver preso i nemici vivi*
   b. *I am used to have captured the enemies alive.*

(70)  
a. *Mi accingo ad aver scritto sulla natura delle cose.*
   b. *I am about to have written about the nature of things.*

(71)  
a. *Continua audacissimamente ad aver commesso un’ingiuria.*
   b. *He perseveres in have acted wrongfully.*

(72)  
a. *Si sbriga ad aver lasciato Roma.*
   b. *He hurries to have left Rome.*

(73)  
a. *Certamente io ho fretta di averlo visto appeso alla croce.*
   b. *Of course I haste to have seen him nailed to a cross.*
(74)  a. *Esordisco con l’aver parlato del sito della città.
     b. *I start to have talked about the site of the city.

(75)  a. *Inizio ad aver parlato della Repubblica.
     b. *I begin to have spoken on public affairs.

The absence of Latin, Italian and English sentences constituted by an aspektual verb occurring with a past infinitive can be explained by considering that an aspektual verb specifies an event taking place from an aspektual point of view, expressed by the infinitive. It implies that, in order to be aspektually specified, the event denoted by the infinitive cannot be accomplished, so it has to be realized in the present tense (namely in the imperfective stem). Such semantic intuition appears to find confirmation from Cinque’s (1999; 2004) perpective. In his hierarchy, the aspektual verbs are merged in a functional projection lower than Tense. Like the root modals, the infinitive cannot escape its merge position to check tense.

5. Conclusions

In this paper I have put forward a syntactic analysis of infinitive structures with modal and aspektual verbs. First of all, following Rizzi (1976, 1978) and Cinque (2004), I provided further evidence in favour of the idea that such infinitive structures are instances of RSs. In addition, I explained the problem of the (in)compatibility of modal and aspektual verbs with a past infinitive in the light of Cinque’s (1999) theory on functional projections.

The different merge position of modal and aspektual verbs can account for this (apparent) idiosyncrasy. In this sense, the Mod_{epistemic} and the Mod_{evidential}, being generated above Tense, can occur with a past infinitive, while the Mod_{root(volition/obligation/ability)} and all aspektual verbs, being generated below Tense, cannot. In order to check Tense, these would have to escape their position and re-merge across the head of the matrix verb, violating the head movement constraint.

A syntactic analysis of the RSs also sheds light on the problem of Latin word order, at least in the period taken into account in the present research. The data demonstrate that in the unmarked order the predicate is placed at the end of the clause; furthermore, in the presence of a complex predicate, the unmarked order is that of “finite verb-infinitive”. These are both, in fact, statistically prevalent. These data allow us to
conclude that also in Latin, it is necessary to distinguish an unmarked word order which is predominant from a quantitative point of view.
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