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Chapter 5

The Accusativus cum Participio (AcP)

5.1 Motivation

In Latin, there is another nonfinite structure closely resembling the AcI. This structure is referred to as *Accusativus cum Participio* (AcP). Note that the name AcP is obviously morphologically motivated, as was the case with the AcI. The AcP is found either with *verba sentiendi* or with a small group of *verba dicendi*.¹ This makes it interesting for us to study the construction AcP, as well, because *verba sentiendi et dicendi* are also found with AcI-constructions. We want to compare the distribution of the *Accusativus cum Participio* to that of A+I and AcI, and we expect to find parallels. As the name of the AcP refers to its morphology, we presume that a study done from a syntactic perspective might also result in a more fine-grained differentiation, analogous to that between A+I and AcI.

5.2 Literature Overview

Although the *Accusativus cum Participio*-construction (AcP) itself is well-known amongst classical linguists, we do not find much literature on this topic. The AcP is briefly discussed in Kühner and Stegmann (1912:703-705), Woodcock (1959:74-75), and Pinkster (1984:160-162).

¹Cf. Kühner and Stegmann (1912:703f.)
5.2.1 Kühner and Stegmann (1912)

Kühner and Stegmann (1912) mention the AcP marginally within their extended discussion of the Acl-phenomena: there are some verbs, belonging to the semantic group of *verba sentiendi*, which can construct in two ways. They are found with both an Acl- and an AcP-construction. Kühner and Stegmann (1912) list them (1912:704). The AcP is chosen if there is immediate perception. The construction of an accusative NP and a predicative participle in present tense and active voice serves to express the state in which an object is perceived. Kühner and Stegmann (1912) claim that if the Acl-construction is used instead, only the beginning of the action or the action itself is indicated. They discuss examples (1) and (2):

(1) video puerum currentem.
   I-see boy(acc) running(part,acc).
   ‘I see the boy running.’

(2) video puerum currere.
   I-see boy(acc) to-run.
   ‘I see the boy run.’

(1) is closer akin to ‘I see how the boy is running’, or: ‘I see the boy in the state of running.’ The connotation of (2), however, is different: ‘I see the boy begin to run’. Kühner and Stegmann (1912) mention that the infinitival construction obligatorily has to be used if there is no participle form of the verb, as in (3):

(3) Respiciens videt magnis intervallis sequentes, unum
    looking-back he-sees big distances following(acc.pl), one
    haud procul ab sese abesse.
    not-at-all at-a-distance from self to-be-away
    ‘Looking back he sees that they are following him at large distances, and that there is one very close to him.’

*Liv., 1, 25, 8*

As there is no participle of the verb *abesse* ‘to be absent’, the infinitive necessarily has to be used in (3), even if it was intended by the author to stress the state in which the action is perceived. According to Kühner and Stegmann (1912), the slight differences of meaning between AcP and Acl which originally existed got lost in later periods, so that the two constructions became more or less interchangeable. Generally speaking, the participle
construction is less frequent, and authors preferred the infinitive instead. (4) suggests that AcP and AcI are indeed interchangeable (Kühner and Stegmann 1912:704):

(4) (vestigia) omnia foras versa vidit

(footprints(acc.pl)) all(acc.pl) outside turned(acc.pl) he-sees

nec in partem aliam ferre

and-not in direction other to-lead

‘He saw that the footprints had all turned to the outside and that they were not leading to any other direction.’

_Liv._ 1, 7, 6

(4) is a coordination of a participle construction _vestigia omnia versa vidit_ and an infinitival construction 

\[ \text{[vestigia omnia] ferre [vidit]} \]

Coordinated structures generally have the same, or at least a similar category. Therefore, coordination serves as a test in linguistics to find out whether two structures are of the same or of similar categories. Note, however, that there are exceptions to this rule. We will come back to the argument of coordination in section 3 of this chapter.

Note that the participle in (4) _versa_ is past tense and passive voice. However, Kühner and Stegmann explicitly designate as AcP only combinations of accusative noun phrases combined with present participles in active voice (1912:704). According to their definition, (4) should be ruled out as an example of coordination of AcP and AcI: _vertens_ should be the participle we are looking for. Hence it follows that Kühner and Stegmann’s description is overly restrictive. I shall regard (4) as an AcP construction.

Not only the _verba sentiendi_ construct with the AcP, there are two more verbs which do so, as well. In the classical period _facere_ and _inducere_, if used in the meaning of ‘to represent’ and ‘to introduce’ respectively, are also found with either AcP or AcI. If the participle construction is used, the participle can be either present tense and active voice (as with the _verba sentiendi_) or past tense and passive voice. It is my impression that the latter, however, is less frequent. (5) illustrates an AcP in present tense and active voice, whilst (6) indicates an AcP in past tense which is a deponent:²

²Deponentia are verbs which are morphologically passive, but semantically active.
(5) Xenophon facit Socratem disputantem formam dei
Xenophon he-says Socrates(acc) arguing(acc) form of-God
querci non oportere.
to-be-asked not it-is-important
‘Xenophon says that Socrates was arguing that it was not important
to ask for the form of God.’

_Cic._, _N.D._, 1, 31

(6) Hac oratione Plato facit Socratem usum apud
this speech Plato says Socrates(acc) to-have-used(acc) with
judices.
judges
‘Plato says that Socrates used this speech with the judges.’

_Cic._, _Tusc._, 1, 97

(7) Poetae impendere apud inferos saxum Tantalo
poets(nom) to-hang-over in netherworld rock(acc) Tantalus(dat)
faciant.
they-say.
‘The poets say that the rock is hanging over Tantalus in the netherworld.’

_Cic._, _Tusc._, 4, 16, 35

In (5), the matrix verb _facit_ subcategorizes for a participle construction
using the participle present active, whilst in (6), the participle subcategorized
for by _facit_ is past passive. In (7), the matrix verb _faciant_ subcategorizes for
an AcP-construction. _facere_ in (5)-(7) is more exactly ‘to present someone
as,’ e.g. to present Socrates as arguing that... in (5).

Kühner and Stegmann (1912) classify (6) as an AcP-construction. But
Pinkster (1984) criticizes Kühner and Stegmann. See section 2.3 for his
alternative analysis. Note that in infinitival constructions where the infinitive
is in past tense, bearing passive morphology, the copula is often omitted. So
instead of _usum esse_ ‘to have used’ we can encounter _usum_ alone. Kühner
and Stegmann (1912) do not mention this important detail in the discussion of the
AcP used with past participles; morphological identity of the participle and
the infinitival construction increases the ambiguity between two structures
found in coordination.
5.2. LITERATURE OVERVIEW

5.2.2 Woodcock (1959)

According to Woodcock, *verba sentiendi*, chiefly *video* and *audio*, can construct with either a predicative participle or an “Accusative and Infinitive noun-phrase” (1959:74). The two constructions coexist. He discusses the same pair of examples as Kühner and Stegmann (1912): (1) and (2) are repeated here as (8) and (9):

(8) *video puerum currentem.*
    I-see boy(acc) running(acc).
    ‘I see the boy running.’

(9) *video puerum currere.*
    I-see boy(acc) to-run.
    ‘I see that the boy is running.’

According to Woodcock, the participle in (8), *currentem*, is used adverbially, not as a predicated adjective. This means that *video* in (8) does not denote a relation between a seer and a proposition. The predicate would be obligatory in a proposition. *currentem* is an optional extension and not an essential complement (1959:75). Originally the AcP and the AcI-constructions differed in meaning in that the AcP expresses a more vivid and physical experience on part of the subject. However, this original difference soon disappeared, so that the two structures became more and more interchangeable. This process could have been motivated by the absence of a present participle in passive voice: in passive voice, the AcI necessarily had to be used, even if the speaker intended to stress the vivid intellectual realization of the subject. Woodcock stresses that, although the two structures became interchangeable with regard to the vividness of perception, one fundamental difference still kept them apart: the AcP-construction always implies direct perception of the subject. Compare (10) to (11):

(10) *audivi eum loquentem.*
    I-have-heard him speaking(acc).
    ‘I heard him speaking.’

(11) *audivi eum loqui.*
    I-have-heard him to-speak.
    ‘I heard him speak or: ‘I heard that he was speaking.’

In (10), the listener is present. He listens to the words of the one who is speaking, i.e. he perceives the sound of the speaker’s voice. In (11), the
situation is ambiguous. The listener could be present. Then (10) has the same meaning as (10), although the vividness of the experience of listening is less stressed. But a second interpretation is also possible: the listener just heard, from someone else, that the speaker had said something. His perception is not direct, but it is by hear-say, involving a physical barrier between speaker and listener.

Like Kühner and Stegmann (1912), Woodcock mentions that there are some verbs which do not construct as participles. Here, the infinitive necessarily has to be used, and therefore it is impossible to find out whether any distinction was intended or not. For illustration, Woodcock gives the example previously used by Kühner and Stegmann (1912), involving the infinitival abesse.3

Interestingly, Woodcock also discusses (4), where the participle is past tense. In contrast to Kühner and Stegmann (1912), he realizes that it is problematic to differentiate between the participle and the infinitival construction in (4). However, Woodcock stresses that in (4), it is by no means certain that esse should be understood, as the participle keeps its connotation of greater vividness.

5.2.3 Pinkster (1984)

Pinkster states that the Acp-construction is found with verba sentiendi. Example (12) illustrates the construction:

(12) idque Socraticum audio dicentem
    so Socrates(acc) I-hear saying(acc)
    ‘So I hear Socrates saying’

(example taken from Pinkster (1984:160))

Verbs constructing with an AcP form a perfect subset of those constructing with an AcI.4 The AcP is used in order to stress perception, and the AcI is chosen in order to stress cognition and reflexion (1984:160). Pinkster analyses the AcP as a construction consisting of two constituents: in (11),

3See (3) in the previous subsection.

4Note that Kühner and Stegmann (1912) and Woodcock (1959) did not differentiate between A+I and AcI yet. Both constructions are referred to as AcI by the traditional grammarians. Pinkster, however, notices the difference. He refers to the A+I as accusativus + aanvullingsinfinitief, accusative + supplementary infinitive (1984:154). With respect to the traditional literature, he notices that the term AcI is often used to refer to A+I structures, too, although they are not AcIs in the strict sense.
5.2. LITERATURE OVERVIEW

_Socrates_ is listened to whilst he is speaking. The matrix verb _audio_ subcategorizes for the NP _Socrates_ and for the VP _dicit_. So Pinkster’s interpretation of the AcP closely resembles that of Woodcock: the participle _dicit_ extends the clause _Socrates audio_.

Pinkster remarks that he came across one counter-example. See (13):

(13) _a ille ut Carthaginem venit multo aliter ac sperarat and he when to-Carthago he-came much otherwise and he-hoped rem publicam se habentem cognovit._

affair(acc) public(acc) self(acc) to-have he-realized

‘But when he came to Carthago he realized that the republic was in a state quite different from what he had hoped.’

_Nep., Ham., 2, 1_

Example (13) is already noted by Kühner and Stegmann (1912) as an example illustrating an AcP (1912:704). Pinkster argues that the AcP interpretation necessarily implies that “he”, the subject of the matrix verb _cognovit_, must have been able to realize the changes with his own eyes as a direct witness of the circumstances, since the AcP always indicates direct perception, presumably since it denotes an abstract entity. However, Pinkster claims that _res publica_ is not a possible direct object for _cognosce_ with direct perception. Therefore he classifies (13) as an exception. (14) illustrates the regular use of the AcP with _cognosce_ as a three-place predicate:

(14) _firmaatem et constantiam eandem cognosces quam strength(acc) and steadiness(acc) going(acc) you-realize when reliquisti you-have-left_

‘You will find [me] in the same strength and steadiness as when you left.‘

_Cic., Epist., 9, 11, 1_

The tree below illustrates the structure of (14):

```
S
  /|
subject   predicate   object   participle
  /|
not-realized cognosces firmitatem eandem
```
Pinkster notices that the participle and the constituents belonging to it can be omitted in many cases without the remaining clause losing its grammaticality. This, however, is not possible in case of the exceptional (13).

In a closing section, Pinkster discusses participle constructions found with the matrix verb *facere*. Kühner and Stegmann (1912) treat these as occurrences of the AcP (see (5) and (6)). Pinkster comes to a different interpretation: he reanalyses (5), repeated here as (15):

(15) Xenophon facit Socratem disputantem formam dei
    Xenophon he-says Socrates(acc) arguing(acc) form of-God
    quaeri non oportere.
    to-be-asked not it-is-important
    ‘Xenophon says that Socrates was arguing that it was not important
    to ask for the form of God.’

*Cic.*, *N.D.*, 1, 31

In (15), Pinkster maintains, the matrix verb *facit* is *not* a *verbum sensiendi*. Perception does not take place. Participle and constituents belonging to it cannot be omitted, as is the case with the “true AcP”. Pinkster concludes that (15) should therefore not be called an AcP. Neither should (16), which Kühner and Stegmann (1912:704) also list as an AcP-construction:

(16) offendi eum sedentem in exedra et cum C.Velleio
    I-have-come-upon him sitting(acc) in hall and with C.Velleio
    senatore disputantem
    senator arguing(acc)
    ‘I came across him sitting in the hall and arguing with senator C.Velleius.’

*Cic.*, *N.D.*, 1, 15

In (16), we have no direct perception. Pinkster analyses the participle as fulfilling the function of a predicative modifying *eum* which is a free adjunct. Note that the VP* _pur* _sedentem* cannot be replaced by a VP * _inf*. We will turn to a discussion of (16) in section 6.

### 5.3 Is there only one AcP?

Kühner and Stegmann (1912) present a detailed account of verbs constructing with both an accusative NP and a participle. Their work is morphologically
motivated. Pinkster looks at the phenomenon of the AcP from a syntactic point of view. He discovers discrepancies. These lead him to the conclusion that there is a true AcP, found with *verba sentiendi*, and another structure in which no direct perception is involved. Pinkster suggests that these two structures should be kept apart. The situation found with the AcP is similar to that we encountered already with the Acl/A+I: there we found two syntactically different structures, both consisting of an accusative noun phrase and an infinitival VP. And here we find again two syntactically different structures, both consisting of an accusative noun phrase and a participle VP and both formerly referred to as AcP. I suggest that we call these two structures A+P and AcP, thus stressing their similarity to the A+I and the Acl, respectively.

We have a semantic group of *verba sentiendi et dicendi*: as we already saw, these verbs can construct with either an A+I or an Acl. In case of direct perception the *verba sentiendi* construct with an A+I. The A+I can be replaced by a two-constituent construction consisting of an NP_{acc} and a VP_{part}. This construction will be referred to from now on as A+P. The structure appears as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{S} \\
/ \& \& \backslash \\
\text{VP} & \text{NP}_{acc} & \text{VP}_{part} \\
\text{video} & \text{puellam} & \text{venientem} \\
\end{array}
\]

*Verba dicendi* are non-transitive verbs constructing with an Acl which is a clausal one-constituent structure. Some of these verbs, such as *facere*, can also construct with a participle. Compare (17) to (18) and (19):

(17a) video puellam.
    I-see girl(acc).
    ‘I see the girl.’

(17b) video puellam venientem.
    I-see girl(acc) coming(acc).
    ‘I see the girl coming.’

(17c) video puellam venire.
    I-see girl(acc) to-come.
    ‘I see the girl coming.’

(18a) *facit Socratem.
     *he-says Socrates(acc).
     ‘*He says Socrates.’
(18b) facit Socratem disputantem.
    he-says Socrates(acc) arguing(acc).
    ‘He says that Socrates is arguing.’

(19a) *dicit Socratem.
    *he-says Socrates(acc).
    *‘He says Socrates.’

(19b) dicit Socratem disputare.
    he-says Socrates(acc) to-argue.
    ‘He says that Socrates is arguing.’

In (17), *videre* is a *verbum sentiendi*. It is transitive. Both (18b) and (17c)
have two-constituent structures, spanning the NP and the participle in (17b),
the NP and the infinitive in (17c). The ungrammaticality of (18a) suggests
that in (18b) *Socratem* is not the accusative object of the matrix *verbum
dicendi* facit. Compare (18) to (19): in (19), the *verbum dicendi* dicit
constructs in a similar way. No direct object is possible, and the infinitival
construction *Socratem disputare* is analysed as one single constituent, an
Acl-clause. Now consider (20):

(20) Polyphemum Homerum cum ariete colloquentem facit
    Polyphemus(acc) Homerus with ram talking(acc) he-says
ciusque laudare fortunas.
    his-and to-praise fortunes
    ‘Homerus says that Polyphemus was talking to the ram and was prais-
ing his luck.’

*Cic., Tusc., 5, 39*

(20) is a coordinated structure. We already encountered a coordinated
structure in (4), repeated here, for sake of convenience, as (21):

(21) (vestigia) omnia foras versa vidit
    (footprints(acc,pl)) all(acc,pl) outside turned(acc,pl) he-sees
    nec in partem aliam ferre
    and-not in direction other to-lead
    ‘He saw that the footprints had all turned to the outside and that
    they were not leading to any other direction.’

*Liv., 1, 7, 6*
5.3. IS THERE ONLY ONE ACP?

In (21), the participle _versa_ is past tense and passive voice. We already saw that, as the copula _esse_ is often omitted in Acls with a perfective VP_inf in passive voice, so we must conclude that (21) is not free from syntactic ambiguity. It is possible to claim that (21) is a coordination of either an AcP and an AcI, or a coordination of two Acls: (vestigia) _omnia foras versa_ and [vestigia omnia] in _partem aliam ferre_.

We have a closer look at (20) now. (20) offers no ambiguity concerning the question whether we have an AcP or an AcI. _colloquenter_ is a present participle in active voice and _laudare_ is a VP_inf in present tense and active voice, _facit_ is the matrix verb. There are two structures dependent on _facit_: the participle construction _Polyphemum cum ariete colloquenter_ and the infinitival construction _eiusque laudare fortunas_. We regard the latter as an AcI. Then _Polyphemum_ is both the subject of the AcP _Polyphemum cum ariete colloquenter_ as well as the understood and phonetically unrealized subject of the AcI-clause _[Polyphemum] eiusque laudare fortunas_. Or we could say that we have only one infinitival clause dependent on _facit_ in which _Polyphemum_ is the subject and _colloquenter_ and _laudare_ are coordinated VPs. Let us consider word order.\(^5\) Being the first word, _Polyphemum_, the subject of the AcP, stands in a prominent position, followed by _Homerus_, the nominative subject of the matrix clause. Then come the remaining elements of the AcP _cum ariete colloquenter_. After the AcP is fully realized, we encounter _facit_, the matrix verb, followed by _eiusque laudare fortunas_, an infinitival phrase which is not headed by a phonetically realized accusative subject. This cannot decide between the clausal vs. VP coordination hypothesis, so it remains possible that coordination could take place on two different levels. Compare the two tree structures below, demonstrating _clausal coordination_ and coordination of participle and infinitive.

\(^5\)In this dissertation, word order is not treated explicitly. We consider it here for its value in determining the categories of some phrases.
$S_{inf} + S_{inf}$

\[
\begin{tree}
\text{VP} & \text{facit} \\
\text{NP}_{acc} & [\text{NP}_{acc}] & \text{VP}_{inf} & \text{VP}_{inf} \\
\text{Polyphemum} & \text{colloquentem} & \text{[Polyphemum]} & \text{laudare} \\
\text{VP}_{part} & \text{S}_{inf} & \text{S}_{inf} \\
\text{VP} & \text{S}_{inf} \\
\text{facit} \\
\end{tree}
\]

This analysis would imply that *Polyphemum* is not phonetically realized a second time, but syntactically it is the subject of the AcI *eiusque laudare fortunas*. The other interpretation is also possible:

$\text{VP}_{part} + \text{VP}_{inf}$

\[
\begin{tree}
\text{VP} & \text{facit} \\
\text{NP}_{acc} & \text{VP}_{nonfin} \\
\text{Polyphemum} & \text{VP}_{part} & \text{VP}_{inf} \\
\text{colloquentem} & \text{laudare} \\
\text{VP} & \text{S}_{inf} \\
\text{S}_{inf} \\
\end{tree}
\]

This reading sees coordination taking place on one level further down. Note that the first reading would imply coordination of categories which are not perfectly identical. Both *Polyphemum colloquentem* and *[Polyphemum] laudare* are nonfinite clauses. So this putative coordination might be construed as the coordination of elements which are roughly alike. The second reading would imply coordination of two nonfinite VPs, as *colloquentem* is a participle and *laudare* is an infinitive.

If we have a look at (21), we encounter the same ambiguity. In word order, *vestigia omnia* ranks first. It is followed by *versa*, the verb of the AcP. After full realization of the AcP, there is *vidit*, the matrix verb. The

---

6Or *versa* is the verb of the first AcI, if we understand it as *versa [esse]*.
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AcI in partem aliam ferre is phonetically realized without a subject. A look at the trees below shows us that (21) is even more ambiguous than (20), because the participle versa is perfect and in passive voice.

\[
\begin{align*}
S_{\inf} + S_{\inf} & \\
\text{VP} & \quad \text{NP}_{\text{acc}} \quad \text{VP}_{\text{part/inf}} & \quad [\text{NP}_{\text{acc}}] \quad \text{VP}_{\inf} \quad \text{vestigia} \quad \text{versa} \quad \text{ferre} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{VP}_{\text{part/inf}} + \text{VP}_{\inf} & \\
\text{VP} & \quad \text{NP}_{\text{acc}} \quad \text{VP}_{\text{part/inf}} & \quad \text{NP}_{\text{acc}} \quad \text{VP}_{\text{inf}} \quad \text{vestigia omnia} \quad \text{versa} \quad \text{ferre} \\
\end{align*}
\]

So (21) offers four possible ways of interpretation. We can have coordination of either two infinitival clauses, being an AcP and an AcI or being an AcI and an AcI, or we can have coordination of two VPs, being either a participle and an infinitive, or being two infinitives. As no example is attested in which an AcI and an AcP, both fully phonetically realized, are coordinated, we cannot resolve this ambiguity.

The ungrammaticality of (18a), together with considerations of simplicity, makes us conclude that in (18b), where no coordination takes place, Socratem disputandum may be analysed as one single constituent, an AcP-clause. The structure of (18b) looks as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{AcP} & \\
\text{VP} & \quad \text{S}_{\text{part}} & \quad \text{NP}_{\text{acc}} & \quad \text{VP}_{\text{part}} \quad \text{Socratem disputandum} \\
\end{align*}
\]

See section 5.5.1 for further discussion.
5.4 Analysis of the A+P

The A+P is an object-control construction. It is in most cases interchangeable with the A+I. Both structures, A+I and A+P, consist of two constituents, an accusative object (NP_{acc}) and a nonfinite complement (VP_{inf} or VP_{perc}). A semantic restriction is exercised on both constituents, in both constructions. (22) is the lexical entry for *audio* as an A+I-verb, and (23) is the lexical entry for *audio* as an A+P-verb:

\[ (22) \text{audio} \begin{array}{c} A+I\text{-verb} \\ \text{arg-st} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \langle \text{NP_{acc}} \rangle \text{ NP_{acc}} \text{ VP} \\ \text{spr} \text{ sem} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{VFORM inf} \\ \langle \text{NP_{acc}} \rangle \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{index s} \\ \text{restr} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \langle \text{reln audire} \rangle \\ \text{sit s} \text{ audiens ref} \text{ auditus ref} \text{ soa-arg ref} \end{array} \]

\[ (23) \text{audio} \begin{array}{c} A+P\text{-verb} \\ \text{arg-st} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \langle \text{NP_{acc}} \rangle \text{ NP_{acc}} \text{ VP} \\ \text{spr} \text{ sem} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{VFORM perf} \\ \langle \text{NP_{acc}} \rangle \text{ [AGR]} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{index s} \\ \text{restr} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \langle \text{reln sit} \rangle \\ \text{auxpre ref} \text{ auxitus ref} \text{ soa-arg ref} \end{array} \]

The formation of passive is treated in terms of a lexical rule (24). A morphological function maps an A+P lexeme into the corresponding passive verb. It generates a passive lexeme to which the appropriate endings for number and person and gender in verb forms specifying for gender are added.
(24) **Passive Lexical Rule**

\[
\left\langle \text{arg-st} \ \ \left\langle \text{NP} \ \ \text{NP} \ \ \text{VP}_{\text{part}} \right\rangle \right\rangle \Rightarrow \\
\left\langle f_{\text{pass}}(\mathbb{2}), \left[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\text{word} & \text{vform pass} \\
\text{head} & \text{arg-st} & \left\langle \text{NP} \ \ \text{VP}_{\text{part}}, \ldots, [\text{PP}] \right\rangle
\end{array} \right] \right\rangle
\]

Note that the rule given in (24) is an application of rule (19) given in the previous chapter. A+P-lexeme is a subtype of *trans-verb-lxm*. (25) is an A+P-construction with a passivized matrix verb:

(25) *Itaque sol per zodiacum circulum currens*

Therefore *sun*(nom) through *zodiac circle* running(nom)

*videtur*.

*is-seen*.

‘Therefore the sun is seen running through the zodiac circle.’

*Hyg., Astr.*, 1, 8, 10

If we re-examine (23), we note that a case variable is introduced. This is done deliberately, because case in A+P-constructions is only accusative in the active voice. In (25) the matrix verb is passive and the participle *currens* bears nominative case.

### 5.5 Analysis of the AcP

The AcP is a one-constituent clausal structure. It is found with a small number of verbs, such as *facere* ‘to sketch someone as...’ and *inducere* ‘to make someone out to be...’. No direct perception is involved. The AcP is interchangeable with the AcI: the group of verbs taking an AcP-complement form a perfect subset of the AcI-constructing verbs. As with the AcI, the same grammatical rule (26) assigns accusative case to subjects of AcP-clauses. The verbal participle has to agree with its subject in case, number, and gender:
This marginal construction is not found with passive matrix verbs. Due to the low frequency of the distribution of the AcP it is hard to decide whether the form is just unattested or should also be judged as ungrammatical.

5.5.1 A Two-Constituent Structure?

It is striking that we do not present the same range of the evidence here that was adduced in chapter 4 in favour of a single constituent analysis of the AcI, viz., the range of forms involving the passive, and in particular the existence of impersonal passives in which the AcI is treated as a constituent. We have examined the corpus for such examples, but we have found none. In this case the absence of evidence cannot reliably be taken as evidence that the combination of structures does not exist, since the AcP is relatively rare to begin with. The reader, and in particular the reader familiar with the (standard HPSG) analyses of similar structures in English involving two non-subject constituents (object and predicate), might well fairly ask why we propose a single-constituent analysis of the AcP.

It is clear that the AcP is semantically similar to the AcI in that both involve relations between individuals on the one hand and propositions (or predications) on the other. Chapter 4 argues that the syntax of the AcI "mirrors" its semantics, involving a single constituent which realizes the propositional (or predicational) argument of the relation, the standard HPSG analysis of similar English constructions notwithstanding. In particular, the fact that Latin impersonal passives are never possible in clauses with underlying (accusative) objects, but that clauses with AcI's may surface as impersonal passives, was crucial to the rejection of the standard HPSG analysis. The same constellation of supporting evidence is not available with respect to the AcP, however.
It would be trivial to formulate a two-constituent analysis of the AcP in accordance with standard HPSG theory. (27) illustrates such an analysis:

(27)

If we assume the analysis illustrated in (27) to be correct, then we receive the following lexical entry for the verb *facit*, subcategorizing for a two-constituent structure:

(28)  

We do not propose that (27) illustrates the structure of AcP examples. Out of simplicity we propose that the syntactic structure of the AcP is similar to that of the AcI. We have already postulated that "raising" may be realized in Latin via a subcategorization constellation involving a single non-finite clause, and we prefer to re-use this analysis rather than postulate a second possibility with this language. This preference has nothing to do with the range of possibilities we imagine cross-linguistically, and we also recognize that the coordination facts adduced above should be viewed sceptically in the light of all that is know about possibilities for coordinating non-constituents and unlike constituents.
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So far, we got to know two syntactically different occurrences of the accusative VP_{par}. In this section we will see that participles and participial phrases may occur not only as complements to verbs, but also as modifiers of nouns. Let us repeat our results from the previous two sections:

- The A+P is a two-constituent structure.
- The matrix verb exercises a semantic restriction on both its complements, the NP_{acc} and the VP_{par}.
- The A+P is found with *verba sentiendi* expressing direct perception. These verbs are transitive.
- The participle can be replaced by a VP_{par}, thus the A+P can be replaced by an A+I.

We contrast these with AcP properties:

- The AcP is a one-constituent structure.
- The matrix verb exercises no semantic restriction on this constituent, which is a clause having an accusative subject (NP_{acc}) and a participle verb (VP_{par}).
- The AcP is found with a limited set of *verba dicendi*. No direct perception and therefore no *verba sentiendi* are involved.
- The participle can be replaced by an infinitive, thus the AcP can be replaced by an AcI.

Now let us have another look at (16), repeated here as (29):

---

7We take the fact that the matrix verb exercises a semantic restriction in case of the A+P, and that it exercises no semantic restriction in case of the AcP, as very important evidence in favour of a necessary distinction between the two structures. In 5.7.2, we have a look at the verb *audire*, which can construct as an A+I, AcI, and A+P-verb. If AcP and A+P were one structure, then it should not matter whether the matrix verb exercises a semantic restriction on its complement(s). In this case, we would not be able to block the ungrammatical (32f). The ungrammaticality of (32f) relies exclusively upon the fact that *hereditatem* is no possible direct object of *audivit*, due to its semantics. This semantic restriction is lacking with the marginal AcP-construction.
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(29) offendi eum sedentem in exedra et cum C.Velleio I-have-come-upon him sitting(acc) in hall and with C.Velleio senatore disputantem senator arguing(acc)

'I came across him sitting in the hall and arguing with senator C.Velleius.'

Cic., N.D., 1, 15

Can (29) be an A+P- or an AcP-construction? We have a syntactic test, as well as a semantic test. The semantic test runs as follows: is offendere either a verbum sentiendi or a verbum dicendi? It is no verbum dicendi. It might eventually be construed as a verbum sentiendi meaning ‘to come upon’ or ‘to notice’. If offendere in (29) is interpreted as a verb of perception, we have no AcP. Can we have an A+P? In order to find out, we apply the syntactic test. It consists of a replacement of the VP\textsubscript{par}, by a VP\textsubscript{aj} which is done in (29a):

(29a) *offendi eum sedere in exedra et cum C.Velleio senatore I-have-come-upon him to-sit in hall and with C.Velleio senator disputatione
to-argue

'*I came across him sit in the hall and argue with senator C.Velleius.'

The replacement of the VP\textsubscript{par}, by a VP\textsubscript{aj} is most probably ungrammatical.\footnote{Pinkster (1984:162), discussing (29a) says that it is impossible to replace the participle by an infinitive.} With A+P- and AcP-verbs both nonfinite structures are attested: if a verb is an A+P-verb, it is always an A+I-verb as well. If a verb is an AcP-verb, it is always also an AcI-verb. But with offendere, no infinitival construction is found. We take this as sufficient evidence to show that offendere is neither an A+P nor an AcP-verb. We propose therefore that in (29), the participle sedentem is used as a predicative. The predicative use of the participle is not restricted to the accusative case alone, as can be seen in (30):

---

\footnote{Pinkster (1984:162), discussing (29a) says that it is impossible to replace the participle by an infinitive.}
(30) Non decret talia Alexandro concupiscenti
not ἰς-absent such-things(acc) Alexander(dat) wanting(dat)
perniciosa adulatio,
pernicious(nom) adulation(nom).
‘In his desire for such things Alexander did not lack pernicious adulation.’

Curt., 8, 5, 6

For purposes of demonstration, the tree structure of (30) is given below:

```
predicative
     \ /
   S  
  /   /
NP  VP  NP
     \   \  
      deest N  VP
          \  /
           Alejandro V_part NP
               \  
                  concupiscenti talia
```

The dative noun *Alexandro* is modified by the participle construction *concupisceni talia* in which the dative participle *concupisceni* subcategorizes for an accusative object *talia*, because *concupiscere* ‘to want’ is a transitive verb. Predicative constructions may occur in accusative case, such as (29), but also in dative case, such as (30). But this does not turn them into an AcP nor into an A+P.

5.7 Is there a Class of *Verba Sentienti et Dicendi*?

5.7.1 Introduction

The discussion concluded in the previous two chapters focussed on the differentiation between the A+I and the AcI as well as that between the AcP and the A+P. In both chapters we saw that the *verba sentiendi* are structurally ambiguous. *Verba sentiendi* can construct as either A+I-verbs (direct perception) or AcI-verbs (indirect perception). If *verba sentiendi* express direct
perception, they can also occur in A+P-constructions. *Verba dicendi* occur in Acl or in AcP constructions. Traditional grammarians all focussed on morphology. From a morphological point of view, both *verba sentiendi* and *verba dicendi* are found in constructions governing an NP$_{acc}$ and a VP$_{inf}$ or an NP$_{acc}$ and a VP$_{part}$. Bolkestein was the first to show that from the perspective of syntax, a careful distinction has to be drawn between object-control verbs (A+I) and the Acl-construction. Likewise we need to differentiate between A+P and AcP.

### 5.7.2 The Data

A closer scrutiny of the *verba sentiendi et dicendi* within the refined framework of a syntactical analysis shows that they fall into two different semantical groups. Bolkestein’s work (1976 a,b) suggests this subdivision. She showed that *dicere* and *credere* are “real” Acl-verbs, whilst *audire, videre, sentire* are not. If we go one step further than Bolkestein, we see that the same syntactic and semantic differences she noted with Acl- and A+I-constructions also appear with respect to the AcP and A+P. The data below demonstrate syntactic differences that we already observed in (17) - (19). This time, the differences are indicated in a more elaborate way:

(31a) *dico virum.
    I-say man(acc).

(31b) dico virum venire.
    I-say man(acc) to-come.
    ‘I say that the man comes.’

(31c) dico hoc.
    I-say that(acc).
    ‘I say that.’

(31d) *facit Polyphemum.
    he-says Polyphmus(acc).
    He says Polyphemus.

(31e) facit Polyphemum colloquenatem.
    he-says Polyphemus(acc) talking(acc,part).
    ‘He says that Polyphemus is talking.’
(31f) facit hoc.
he-says that(acc).
He says that.

(32a) audio puellam.
I-hear girl(acc).
‘I hear the girl.’

(32b) audio puellam venire.
I-hear girl(acc) to-come.
‘I hear that the girl comes.’

(32c) audio puellam venientem.
I-hear girl(acc) coming(acc)
‘I hear the girl coming.’

(32d) *audivit hereditatem.
he-heard legacy(acc).

(32e) audivit venisse hereditatem.
he-heard to-have-come legacy(acc)
‘He heard that a legacy had come.’

*Cic., Verr., 2, 21*

(32f) *audivit hereditatem venientem.
he-heard legacy(acc) coming(acc).

Dicere and facere, if used as *verba dicendi*, are intransitive verbs taking as
direct object only either

- AcI/AcP-constituents or
- semantically general adjectives (e.g., *multum* ‘a lot’, ‘much’) or
  pronouns, number: singular, gender: neuter, or a small number of semantically
  general nouns, such as *sententiam*, *veritatem*.

---

*32c+d taken from Bolkestein (1976a:284)*
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Verba dicendi subcategorize for the nonfinite clausal constructions Acl and Acp. But the situation with audire, a verbum sentiendi (verb of perception), is structurally ambivalent. As Bolkestein (1976a:283 - 288) notices, verba sentiendi govern both A+I and Acl. They can be transitive, as we see in the example of (32a). The grammaticality of (32a) makes (32b) syntactically and semantically ambiguous. (32b) could be either an A+I or an Acl. An analysis of (32b) as A+I would imply direct perception: the listener actually hears the sound of the footsteps of the approaching girl. An Acl-analysis, however, would imply that the listener was only informed via hear-say about the arrival of the girl. So epistemically the hearer is less sure whether she is actually coming or not. In an A+I-construction with verba sentiendi the accusative NP (here: puellam) is semantically restricted. The NP can only refer to someone or something producing a sound or to something which is a sound.¹⁰ This explains the ungrammaticality of (32d). hereditas does not fulfill the semantic restrictions of a direct object of audire.

As we already saw in the previous chapter, the Acl-construction lacks these semantic restrictions. The accusative NP is not a direct object of the matrix clause as can be seen from (32c,d). In constructions such as (32d)

"neither the referent of the accusative noun within the Acl-clause, nor of the entire Acl-clause, ..., need necessarily refer to a thing, respectively event or state which is itself audible at the time referred to by the verb audire" (Bolkestein (1976a:285))¹¹.

The A+I-interpretation of (32b) is semantically identical to the structurally unambiguous (32c), which is an A+P.¹² A+P constructions always refer to direct perception.

5.7.3 Situation Semantics

The semantic difference between verba sentiendi used in A+I/A+P- constructions and in Acl-constructions is parallel to a distinction in situation semantics. Barwise and Perry (1983:179) refer to verba sentiendi as either

---

¹⁰Cf. Bolkestein (1976a:283-288)

¹¹ In fact, (32b) could also be analysed as an Acl, i.e. with no direct perception taking place. The semantics would then be different, indicating some rumours about the girl coming, not expressing the auditory perception heard of the girl’s arrival (i.e. her footsteps). The correct analysis of (32b) therefore depends on the context.

¹² Rivas (2000:111) however notes differences in aspect: “The difference between both sequences lies in the aspect carried by the nonfinite form. In (32b), the infinitive conveys perfective aspect while in (32c) the present participle shows progressive aspect.”
CHAPTER 5. THE ACCUSATIVUS CUM PARTICIPIO (ACP)

EPISTEMICALLY NEUTRAL or EPISTEMICALLY POSITIVE, (33a) is an example of an epistemically neutral construction whilst (33b) illustrates the epistemically positive case: 13

(33) a. Austin saw a man get shaved in Oxford.
    b. Austin saw that a man got shaved in Oxford.

Note that in (33a) ‘get shaved’ is an untensed bare infinitive whilst in (33b) ‘got shaved’ is a tensed finite form. (33a) and (33b) are verbs of perception giving psychological attitude reports. According to Barwise and Perry, “attitude reports describe psychological states of individuals that are connected in a lawlike way to other psychological and behavioral states” (1983:172). Moreover, they give evidence about the external world, Barwise and Perry are interested in epistemically neutral perception reports as the naked infinitive has the clearest semantic properties. They claim that three Principles are valid for epistemically neutral attitudes (1983:181ff.):

- **Principle of Veridicality**
  If b sees φ, then φ.
  This means that if Austin sees a man get shaved, then indeed a man gets shaved. The epistemically positive report (33b) follows this principle in a less strict sense.

- **Principle of Substitutivity**
  If b sees φ(t₁), and t₁ is t₂, then b sees φ(t₂).
  Consider, for example, the validity of the following sort of inference (Barwise and Perry 1983:182):

Russell saw G.E. Moore get shaved in Cambridge.
G.E. Moore was (already) the author of *Principia Ethica*.
So, Russell saw the author of *Principia Ethica* get shaved in Cambridge.

In this respect, it does not matter whether Russell knew that G.E. Moore was already the author of *Principia Ethica*, the moment he saw him getting shaved. The truth of the conclusion drawn out of the two premises is not dependent on Russell’s state of mind.

---

13 We use the definitions here exactly as they were introduced by Barwise and Perry (1983:179f). However, they do not appear to us as ideal, as we think that the opposite use of the terms ‘neutral’ and ‘positive’ would be more natural.
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- **Existential Generalization**
  If \( b \) sees \( \phi \) (the man), then there is something \( i \) such that \( b \) sees \( \phi \) (it). For example, if Austin saw a man get shaved, then there is someone whom Austin saw getting shaved.

Note that all three principles support the idea “that we use see [in its epistemically neutral meaning] when we are interested in the subject matter, what is seen, not the state of the observer’s mind” (Barwise and Perry 1983:182). Note furthermore that these principles only apply to absolutely persistent statements (1983:188). For example, they do not apply if Austin saw nobody getting shaved.

The semantics of construction (a) is epistemically neutral, because the seer does not have to have any further concept of the man who is shaved—apart from recognizing that he is shaved. He does not have to recognize or identify him later, in a different situation, as the same man whom he saw being shaved. The epistemically positive sentence (b) behaves in a semantically different way. For (b), the three principles are not necessarily valid, Consider ‘Austin saw that a man got shaved’. This is a statement made by somebody else about Austin. Austin himself might not even have watched properly in the situation described by (b). He might only have seen evidence that the man was shaved; for example, he might have seen a razor and a sink with shaving lather and hair trimmings in the drain. This means that (33b) is not veridical in the same sense as (33a). As Austin did not actually see the man getting shaved and only assumes that he was shaved, the Principle of Veridicality is not valid. Someone might have put the razor and the shaving lather there in order to lay a false track. The Existential Generalization might not hold, either: maybe no-one was shaved. As it is thus not clear whether anybody got shaved and whether this person is G.E. Moore, the Principle of Substitutivity can likewise not be applied. In (b), contrary to (a), nothing is said about what Austin actually recognized or what thoughts were going through his mind. Therefore, epistemically positive sentences are weaker than epistemically neutral ones.

The semantic differentiation made by Barwise and Perry matches nicely with the syntactic classification of Latin *verba sentiendi* as either object-control verbs, found with A+I or A+P-constructions, or Acl-verbs. Let us once again consider (32e) and (32b), repeated here as (34) and (35):
(34) audivit venisse hereditatem.
    he-heard to-have-come legacy(acc)
    ‘He heard that a legacy had come.’

_Cic., Verr.,_ 2, 21

(35) audio puellam venire.
    I-hear girl(acc) to-come.
    ‘I hear that the girl comes.’

(34) is unambiguously an AcI-construction. First, we interpret (35) as an
AcI-construction, too. This means that in both (34) and (35) the listener
may only hear rumours about a legacy or a girl coming. Both sentences
are epistemically positive, according to the definition given by situation se-
manitics. The rumour might be true or false. “I hear stories about the girl
coming”—but maybe she is not coming at all. So the listener, in affirming
that he has heard such stories or rumours, makes an epistemically positive
report. Now let us interpret (35) as an A+I-construction. Then it means the
same as the participial construction (22c), repeated here as (36):

(36) audio puellam venientem.
    I-hear girl(acc) coming(acc)
    ‘I hear the girl coming.’

Both (35) and (36) in the intended interpretation are epistemically neutral
reports for which the three principles listed by Barwise and Perry are valid.
Note that in cases such as (35) only the context can tell us whether the
construction is epistemically positive or neutral. From an isolated sentence
we cannot say whether the AcI- or the A+I-reading is implied. I suppose that
in order to reduce ambiguity, the AcP-construction (36) is given preference
to (35), if it is crucial that an epistemically neutral report be delivered.

5.8 Conclusion

Two syntactically different structures both formerly referred to as AcP have
to be kept apart. We suggest to call them A+P and AcP. Both A+P and
AcP can be found with either a present participle in active voice or a past
participle in passive voice. A+P-verbs belong to the semantic group of _verba
sentienti_. With these verbs, the A+P construction is mostly in parallel
use with the A+I-construction. A semantic restriction is exercised on both
constituents.
5.8. CONCLUSION

The AcP is found with a small group of *verba dicendi*. It is used in parallel with the AcI. No semantic restriction is exercised. The AcP is analysed as one single clausal constituent.

There are instances in which an NP_{acc} gets modified by a predicative VP_{part} in accusative case. In these cases, the participle cannot be replaced by a verbal infinitive and the matrix verb is neither a *verbum sentiendi* nor a *verbum dicendi*. These are not cases of A+P or AcP.
5.9 Appendix

list of A+P-verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A+P-verb</th>
<th>English translation occurrences</th>
<th>occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>audire</td>
<td>to hear</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspicere</td>
<td>to look at</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conspicere</td>
<td>to perceive</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cernere</td>
<td>to perceive</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spectare</td>
<td>to watch</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>videre</td>
<td>to see</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

list of AcP-verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AcP-verb</th>
<th>English translation occurrences</th>
<th>occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>facere</td>
<td>to say</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inducere</td>
<td>to suppose</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invenire</td>
<td>to find out</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>