

Purpose and result clauses

1. Introduction: Clarification of previous concepts and methodologies

In accordance with the approach to the concept of subordination accepted in this chapter (cf. the author's Introduction), purpose clauses (sometimes called "final clauses") are those in which the dependent state of affairs represents the purpose (goal) that must be achieved by the main state of affairs. On the other hand, in result clauses (sometimes called "consecutive clauses") the dependent state of affairs represents the result (outcome) of the main state of affairs (i.e., "result relations" in Cristofaro 2003: 155).

The overall method of dealing with clauses of purpose and result that has been chosen in this chapter can be justified in a variety of ways. (1) In general, and from a semantic-cognitive point of view, in the cause–effect relationship shared by causal, conditional, concessive, purpose, and result clauses, the last two have in common precisely the specific feature that they influence the "effect". Therefore, for modern linguists such as Kortmann (1997: 80–81, 197),¹ both result and purpose clauses would express "result or consequence", although with some clarifications discussed below (Section 3.1). (2) From the formal point of view, the most productive structure in the linguistic representation (*ut* + subjunctive) of the two semantic relations is very similar in many respects.

Despite this, it remains significant that in Cristofaro (2003), purpose clauses are dealt with but result clauses are not, perhaps because the prototypical correlative structure considers them to be more halfway between coordination and subordination (prototypicality is understood as an instrumental procedure suitable for describing some facts; so the notion "prototypical" will be applied to the linguistic fact/construction that possesses all

1. In the same sense, see Quirk et al. (1985: 1108).

or most of the features that identify it as such; cf. also n. 37). This apparent inconsistency raises the question of the syntactic status granted to result relations as opposed to that of purpose relations. In other words, is the presence of correlative structure – an almost essential characteristic in some clausal constructions – the factor responsible for not dealing with functional types such as modal-comparative or consecutive clauses in this approach? In fact, one can speak of a nondiscrete relationship between juxtaposition, coordination, and subordination. In this, one of the intermediate stages would correspond to correlative structures. For reasons of methodological clarity, careful study will be made of the terminology in use. In the clausal types which are the object of study, we refer without distinction to clauses/states of affairs/events/structures that are dependent and independent, main (head) and subordinated (governing-governed). This does not preclude us from trying to clarify the question at hand, which for the time being is only being raised (cf. Sections 4.1, 4.2.3).

In regard to the methodology followed in this chapter, and in keeping with what has proven to be productive in crosslinguistic research,² the fundamental options are to examine (1) the functions expressed by a given form, and (2) the specific forms for expressing certain functions. I opt for a combination of the two, although the latter seems more appropriate in the analysis of an individual language. In keeping with that and with the functional approach adopted in this work, I first briefly detail the structures which can carry out the functions discussed in this chapter (Section 2), in order to later pass on to detailed analysis of the more productive constructions. In this analysis, I distinguish functional relations on the semantic level (Section 3) from those on the syntactic level (Section 4). Historical facts, typological considerations, and pragmatic implications of the various constructions are gradually introduced while the functional characteristics and phenomena related to diachronic, comparative, and interpretive aspects that affect them are presented.

2. See Croft (1990: 13), Cristofaro (2003: 13–14, 20).

2. Function and possible syntactic structures

As occurs with other semantic notions, language can express the functions of purpose and result in various ways, which exhibit variations depending, for example, on genre and literary style or stages of historical development. It seems advisable, therefore, for a brief investigation to allow us to visualize the diachronic paths of the various linguistic expressions of the two functions, taking into account their frequency index and literary genre. Table 1 gives approximate text frequencies in Plautus (*Amph.*, *Asin.*) and Terence (*Andr.*, *Haut.*), Sallust (*Iug.*), Seneca (*nat.* 1–3), the *Itinerarium Egeriae*, and Augustine (*conf.* 1–5), considering the distinction of polarity. The amount of text sampled is not extensive but is sufficiently representative of literary periods, genres, and styles.³ This said, some selected observations can be made on the basis of the data.

Concerning the development of structures that express purpose, and generally:

1. The formalization, so to speak, of the “less marked” always includes the conjunction *ut*, although it appears once in Sallust quite balanced between the non-finite and the relative forms.
2. The formal diversification lessens over time, and more noticeably starting with Seneca.
3. In this process, the nonfinite forms tend to survive more than those in which a relative appears, most likely due to the very nature of the formalization of the relative and its intrinsic function. However, if the data are considered independent of their diachronic evolution, the proportion reached by the nonfinite forms and the constructions with the relative is very similar.

Concerning the development of the structures that express result:

1. Greater formal uniformity is observed than in the case of coding purpose. It must be taken into consideration that the most common grammatical expression entails greater complexity: language tends to make more formal

3. The amount of text to analyze for each author was determined by the extent of the *Itinerarium Egeriae*, one of the sources of Late Vulgar Latin par excellence, which contains almost 19,000 words. The corpus of each analyzed text thus ranges between 19,000 and 21,000 words.

Table 1. Grammatical expression of purpose and result

	Plautus – Terence		Sallust		Seneca		Itin. Eger.		Augustine		Frequency	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A. Purpose function												
<i>ut</i>	50	55.58	11	28.96	27	77.15	19	59.38	30	65.23	137	56.88
Relative	8	8.88	9	23.68	8	22.85	2	–	27	4.34	54	11.20
Non-finite form	6	6.66	10	26.31	–	–	6	18.75	8	17.39	30	12.44
<i>ne</i>	21	23.33	8	21.05	–	–	7	21.87	6	13.04	42	17.42
<i>ut ne</i>	4	4.44	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	4	1.65
<i>si</i>	1	1.11	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	0.41
Total	90		38		35		32		46		241	
B. Result function												
Correl. <i>ut</i>	18	75.01	9	100	27	81.82	21	100	6	66.67	81	84.38
∅ ... <i>ut</i>	2	8.33	–	–	3	9.09	–	–	2	22.22	7	7.29
Relative	3	12.50	–	–	3	9.09	–	–	1	11.11	7	7.29
<i>ut ne</i>	1	4.16	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	1.04
Total	24		9		33		21		9		96	

changes so that a specific semantic notion could be understood as such.

2. Taking into account what has been said previously, the parallelisms that can be observed are notable between: (i) comedy and Seneca and (ii) Sallust and the *Itinerarium Egeriae*.
3. As in the case of purpose, flexibility in grammatical formalization is greater in comedy, which possesses features that are absent in the other authors: here we are dealing with the spoken language, prone to the addition of gestural information, which has the form of a dialogue and exhibits a lesser state of evolution than later writings.
4. Finally, and if diachronic considerations are left aside, the coincident frequency of the appearance of forms of expression with greater restrictions must be pointed out: constructions without introductory element and relative structures.

As an introductory example of the grammatical expressions possible in the language to indicate purpose and result, each is exemplified. First I address the most frequent, least restricted structure used to code the two functions under study, *ut* + subjunctive. Then those structures are described which (i) are used by one or the other of the above-mentioned notions, (ii) appear rarely, or (iii) are normally linked to additional selection conditions. The classification of the various grammatical forms lends support to the diachronic account, since, logically, their evolution varies according to the particular coding in question.

2.1. *Vt* + subjunctive

Result (a) and purpose (b) clauses are introduced by *ut* + subjunctive throughout the history of Latin, as demonstrated in (1)–(3).⁴

- (1) a. Ter. Andr. 277–280: *me ... putas, / adeo porro ingratum ... / ut neque amor ... neque pudor / commoveat neque commoneat ut seruet fidem?*
 ‘do you think me so cowardly, so utterly ungrateful, that neither love nor shame can move or admonish me to keep faith?’

4. The possible presence of a correlative element is addressed below (see Section 4.2.2).

- b. Ter. Ad. 706: *ego eo intro ut quae opus sunt parentur*
‘I’ll go in to have the arrangements made’
- (2)
 - a. Liv. 1,2,5: *tanta opibus Etruria erat ut iam non terras solum sed mare etiam per totam Italiae longitudinem. . . fama nominis sui implesset*
‘so great was the power of Etruria that the renown of her people had filled not only the inland parts of Italy but also the coastal districts along the whole length of the land’
 - b. Cic. fin. 2,12: *ab aratro abduxerunt Cincinnatum illum ut dictator esset*
‘they brought Cincinnatus from the plow that he might be dictator’
- (3)
 - a. Boeth. cons. 1,4,35: *eccuius umquam facinoris manifesta confessio ita iudices habuit in seueritate concordēs ut non aliquos uel ipse ingenii error humani uel fortunae condicio cunctis mortalibus incerta summitteret?*
‘and did ever any direct confession of a crime find its judges so well agreed upon exercising harshness, that neither the liability of the human heart to err, nor the changeableness of the fortune of all mankind, could yield one dissenting voice’
 - b. Itin. Eger. 27,6: *nam ut semper populus discat legem, et episcopus et presbyter praedicant assidue*
‘in order that the people may always be instructed in the law, both the bishop and the priest preach diligently’

In Late Latin, *ut* begins to be accompanied by another conjunction (*ut quia*, *ut quoniam*, *ut si*), and its older function becomes progressively weaker, until it almost constitutes an equivalent to a colon (“:”) or to expressions such as “namely”. The starting point of this evolution is indicated in the expressions *illud (hoc, sic) ut* (*ut* explanatory), *aequum est ut*, or *persuadeo ut*, not purely of result.⁵

5. See Hofmann & Szantyr (1965: 646).

It must be explained, however, that some texts, such as *de miraculis sancti Stephani* (ca. 425 CE),⁶ reveal a significant presence of *ut* with comparative, completive, resultive, and purposive meanings.⁷ The features exhibited by these last two constructions appear to be the most frequent ones in the classical period: no correlatives in purpose clauses as opposed to a marked representation of them in result clauses (11 out of 13 cases).

As an introductory element for result clauses, *quin*⁸ also increases in frequency, although examples already exist with the presence of negation in Archaic and Classical Latin (4)–(5).

- (4) Ter. *Haut.* 67–69: *numquam tam mane egredior neque tam uesperis / domum reuortor quin te in fundo conspicer / fodere aut arare aut aliquid ferre denique*
 ‘I never go out so early in the morning nor return home so late in the evening that I fail to see you digging or plowing or carrying something about on your farm’
- (5) Cic. *Verr.* II 3,95: *numquam tam male est Siculis quin aliquid facere et commode dicant*
 ‘the Sicilians are never in such distress as not to be able to say something facetious and clever’

The expression of purpose by conjunctions changed over time: in the late period, for example, the use of *quod* increased considerably. One of its uses – the first example appears in Cyprian – was to replace the *ut* of purpose (6). Among the causes that facilitated this substitution can be cited the cognitive proximity between the notions of cause (which *quod* expresses in great measure) and purpose, the probable morphological confusion between *quod* and *quo* of purpose, and the analogical pressure from parallel constructions such as *ob hoc... quod* – *ob hoc... ut* or *eo... quod* – *eo... ut*.⁹

6. And similarly the *Historia Francorum* by Gregory of Tours: see Griffe (1996: 121).

7. See Griffe (1996: 123).

8. See Pisani (1948: 306).

9. Expressions with the meaning of purpose in the late period, with higher or lower frequency, would be, e.g., *pro eo... ut*, *pro hoc... ut* (*ne*), *per hoc... ut*, *in hoc... ut*, *in eo... ut*.

- (6) Cypr. *epist.* 62,7: *uini utique mentio ideo ponitur ut Domini sanguis uino intellegatur et quod calice dominico postea manifestatum est prophetis adnuntiantibus praedicaretur*
 ‘therefore, mention is made of wine, that the Lord’s blood may be understood and that which was afterwards manifested in the cup of the Lord might be foretold by the prophets who announced it’

The same cognitive proximity between purpose and result could have favored the extension of the use of *quod* to result contexts (7). Other conjunctions that – on rare occasions – replace *ut* in its purpose usage are *dum* and *donec* ((8)–(9)).

- (7) Hist. Aug. *Max. Balb.* 17,3: *nulla uox < tam > fortis, nulla oratio tam felix, nullum ingenium tam fecundum numquam fuerit, quod possit publicam felicitatem digne exprimere*
 ‘no voice was so strong, no speech so fortunate, no talent so prolific that it could express public happiness deservingly’
- (8) Vet. Lat. *gen.* 19,16: *tenuerunt angeli manus eius et manus uxoris eius et manus duarum filiarum eius dum parceret dominus Deus eis*
 ‘the angels seized his hand and the hand of his wife and the hand of his two daughters so that God the Lord would forgive them’
- (9) Lucif. *reg. apost.* 9: *cum sis Arianus, ad hoc te fingis Christianum, donec ueneno haeresis tuae possis inermes sauciare*
 ‘though you are an Arian, you pretend to be a Christian; because of this, you are able to harm the defenseless with the poison of your doctrine’

2.2. Non-finite forms

The construction with conjunctions, albeit the most frequent, does not exhaust the coding of result¹⁰ and purpose relations. In the case of the latter, their expression through nonfinite verbal forms exhibits great variety.

10. Although, in the case of the result clauses, the *ThLL*, s.v. *ad* (*consecutiuum*), includes an unusual case of the construction *ad* + gerund(ive): Cic. *Tusc.* 4,37, see n. 119.

– *ad* + gerundive:

- (10) Liv. 9,27,8: *dextra pars, qua et Samnites raris ordinibus aut ad circumeundos hostes aut ne ipsi circumirentur constiterant, latius patefacta stetit*
 ‘the Roman right was drawn up in more open order than usual, as the Samnites opposed to them were standing in thinly extended ranks in order either to surround the enemy or to prevent themselves from being surrounded’

– *ob/propter* + gerundive:

- (11) Sall. *Iug.* 89,2: *existumans Iugurtham ob suos tutandos in manus venturum ...*
 ‘thinking that Iugurtha would openly come in order to protect his subjects ...’

– *causa/gratia* + gerundive:

- (12) Cic. *Catil.* 1,19: *quid, quod tu te ... uitandae suspicionis causa ad M. Lepidum te habitare uelle dixisti?*
 ‘what of your having said, ... that you were willing to dwell in the house of Marcus Lepidus in order to avoid suspicion?’

– dative/genitive + gerund(ive):

- (13) a. Plaut. *Mil.* 745–746: *seruiendae seruituti ego seruos instruxi mihi, / hospes, non qui mi imperarent ...*
 ‘I have trained my slaves to serve me, my friend, not to give me orders’
 b. Tac. *ann.* 2,59,1: *Aegyptum proficiscitur cognoscendae antiquitatis*
 ‘he sets out for Egypt to study old times’

– supine in *-um*:¹¹

- (14) Liv. 3,25,6: *uenerunt questum iniurias*
‘they came to complain of injustices’

– future participle:¹²

- (15) Verg. *Aen.* 2,675: *si periturus abis*
‘if you are going away to perish’

– infinitive:¹³

- (16) Ter. *Hec.* 345: *filius tuos intro iit uidere, . . . , quid agat*
‘your son has gone in to see how she is doing’

This variety of possible purpose expressions using nonfinite forms in the classical period underwent some changes in Late and Vulgar Latin. Among others, the structure *causa/gratia* + gerund(ive) disappeared and was replaced by *ad/pro/propter* + gerund(ive) in the accusative/ablative; and, in some authors,¹⁴ the gerund(ive) in the genitive temporarily gained ground over *ad* + gerund in the accusative. Likewise, the gerund appeared in the accusative, and without a preposition (17).

- (17) Ps. Cypr. *mont.* 103: *a Deo accepit (legem) illis tradendam . . .*
‘he received the law from God in order to give it to them’

Although more extensive research is necessary to determine the conditions in which a particular construction is selected or employed, some criteria and features that distinguish these constructions¹⁵ from those expressed by *ut* +

11. Its use is frequently linked to the presence in the independent clause of verbs with a meaning of movement (see Michel 1995: 231).

12. Basically in poetry. In prose, the construction is more frequent beginning in the post-classical period.

13. Most of these examples are found in poetry and mainly appear with verbs with certain semantic notions.

14. See Maltby (2002: 227–229).

15. In this sense and already in the ancient grammars (see Allen and Greenough 1903: 344–345), it is usually stated, e.g., that constructions with gerund(ive) are commonly limited to brief expressions.

subjunctive can be pointed out:¹⁶ the sequential position of the clauses;¹⁷ the distinction of levels in which each structure can appear;¹⁸ the possible “interlacing” of the “necessary” constituents and their lexical expression;¹⁹ the $\pm$ factual nature of the state of affairs;²⁰ the semantic notion of the governing verb; the constituents that are to be focused, etc. Even when it is admitted that these expressions represent different manifestations of the same cognitive material or deep structure,²¹ it has been clarified²² that both the purpose clauses introduced by *ut* and those coded by a gerundive construction (+ *ad, causa, or gratia*) can be placed on the same level as the clause structure.²³

Special mention should be made of structures with a pronoun or a relative adverb (*ubi, unde, quo*, etc.) in which a semantic value of purpose is also usually found. The volitive connotation attributed to this adverbial relation helped Ernout & Thomas (1953: 336) to justify the required use of the subjunctive. The independent treatment of these types of structures can be justified by their special relation with other types of subordinates and by the attention research has paid to them,²⁴ somewhat greater than in the case of the above-mentioned alternatives.

16. A detailed study of the range of each of these criteria is beyond the scope of this study. In the following syntactic and semantic analysis, reference is made to those that are more directly relevant.

17. The lower syntactic complexity generally implies a greater possibility of appearing before the verb: see Pinkster (1995: 215–217).

18. The question will be taken up again later (see Section 4.3).

19. See Lehmann (1988: 205–206); the phenomenon of “interlacing”, from a semantic point of view, is understood by this author as the possibility that the two relations share required elements. Torrego (2001: 637) specifies that the distribution of *ad* + gerund(ive) and *ut* + subjunctive seem to be conditioned in Latin not so much by semantic reasons as by syntactic factors: among others, whether they share the same subject in the main and subordinate clauses.

20. See Bolkestein (1989a: 46).

21. See Elerick (1985: 294).

22. See Vester (1994: 273), Torrego (2001).

23. I.e., that of (satellites of) the predication; see Section 4.3.

24. For the “relatives of purpose”, see, among others, Maurais (1980) or Elerick (1985).

2.3. Relative connector-clause

2.3.1. *Generic relative in purpose clauses*

Regarding relative structures, in traditional grammar (e.g., Ernout & Thomas 1953: 336) the sense of the volitive subjunctive has been resorted to in these constructions, which would explain why the indicative never appears in them (18).²⁵

- (18) Cic. *Manil.* 63: *uos unum illum ex omnibus delegistis quem bello praedonum praeponeretis*
 ‘you chose him alone of all men to appoint to the management of the war against the pirates’

With respect to the selection conditions of these types of structures, in general, various reasons have been suggested²⁶ and are mentioned below. In sum, I believe that the basic factors that must be taken into consideration are: (i) relative, result, or purpose clauses do not express these contents explicitly (like the conjunctions) but rather “contextually”, this term being understood in a broad sense; (ii) the use of *ut* causes the clause to modify the action as a whole, indicating the purpose with which the subject of the main verb carries out the action. In this way, the use of *ut* calls attention to the purpose in a comprehensive way, whereas the clause introduced by a relative pronoun represents a greater restriction. Thus, it is worth mentioning that a whole series of factors exist that make possible their interpretation as purpose clauses and not, for example, causal or concessive clauses. To the extent that a greater number of the proposed factors may concur, it will be specifically the notion of purpose that proves to be the most explicit. Among the factors that have been mentioned, the following may be quoted, not all with the same importance.

- (i) Morphosemantic characterization of the constituents:
 – In the classical period, these structures are usually limited to cases in which the verb of the independent clause expresses an idea of

25. See Sections 3.2.1 and 4.2.6.

26. See Maurais (1980), Elerick (1985), Torrego (1988).

send/choose (*mitto, creo*, etc.).

- The referent (expressed or implicit) of the relative pronoun is mainly singular, [+anim(ate)]. It can also be quantified and possesses the feature [–def(inite)] (e.g., *duos legatos*).
- (ii) Syntax and polarity:
 - The referent of the relative fulfills the syntactic role of object of the main verb, or of subject, if this verb appears in the passive voice.
 - Preference for constructions in which the verb of the dependent clause is in the 3rd person.²⁷
 - The impossibility of expressing negation in relative clauses of purpose.
- (iii) Pragmatics and textual cohesion:
 - The greater ease of presenting the purpose preposed to the independent clause, so that the marked nature of this order is considerably reduced; less frequent in conjunctive structures.
 - The appearance of the structures in specific levels.
 - The desire to focus the co-referent of the relative form.
 - The cohesive ability of the anaphoric relative in extended or interrupted development of the purpose.
- (iv) Style:
 - Desire to avoid a possible repetition of the conjunction *ut*, whether to express the relation of purpose²⁸ or other possible relations (causal, temporal, completive, etc.).

Nevertheless, some difficulties exist in formulating all of these conditions in a clear and definitive way, such as, for example, the scarcity of corpora on which to establish the fulfilment of some of the principles.²⁹ On the other

27. In which case, regarding the construction with *ut*, the infinitive or a supine would be preferred: see Maurais (1980: 235).

28. See, e.g., Plaut. *Amph.* 339–340: *uerum certum est confidenter hominem contra conloqui, / qui possim uideri huic fortis, a me ut apstineat manum*: ‘but I’m determined boldly to address this fellow to his face, **so that** I may be able to appear valiant to him; **that** he may keep his hands off me’.

29. The research carried out by Elerick (1985: 292–293) is limited to 100 examples of the prose of Caesar, Nepos, Sallust, and Livy, whereas Maurais (1980: 233) only considers the verb *mitto*. In no case are statistical data provided that would reflect the impact of the different criteria proposed.

hand, the factors enumerated can have an influence in the choice of the relative structure only to the extent of a more or less clear tendency. In some cases, in addition, the criteria provided are not so much a sure exponent of the choice of the specific relative structure, but rather an indication of the desire to express the semantic relation in some way other than with a conjunction. Finally, there is the limited explanatory ability of the argument based on the characterizations “marked” and “unmarked”.³⁰

The need for more extensive research into this point is clear.

2.3.2. *Quo*

One special case within the relative structures is constructions using *quo*.³¹ It has commonly been acknowledged³² that when this relative is used, a comparative element is present (19). However, there do exist cases ((20a)–(20b)) in which this notion does not appear. In light of these examples, this phenomenon does not seem to be limited to the late period.³³

- (19) Cic. *epist.* 15,4,10: *comprimere eorum audaciam, quo facilius ceterorum animi frangerentur*

‘to repress their audacity, that the spirits of the others might be broken more easily’

- (20) a. Plaut. *Amph.* 833–834: *mi extra unum te mortalis nemo corpus corpore / contingit, quo me impudicam faceret*

‘no mortal being except yourself alone has ever touched my person in contact with his so as to render me unchaste’

30. Thus, for example, with regard to the condition [+animate] of the antecedent of the relative clause, counterexamples are found such as: Cic. *Quinct.* 22: *huic ne ubi consisteret quidem contra te locum reliquisti* ‘you have left him no ground even to make a stand against you’. Logically, not all of the criteria will always occur, nor are all of them equally relevant.

31. There are, nevertheless, those who do not see in this type of relative purpose clauses anything more than some relative clauses without an antecedent constructed with the morpheme of possibility (Touratier 1994: 691).

32. See, e.g., Ernout & Thomas (1953: 343).

33. As implied by Bassols (1963: 340).

- b. Sall. *Catil.* 11,5: *L. Sulla exercitum, ..., quo sibi fidem faceret ..., luxuriose ... habuerat*
 ‘L. Sulla had treated the army luxuriously, in order to make it devoted to him’

This fact leads to the reconsiderations:

- (i) That purposive *quo* does not always take the comparative, even though examples are not particularly common. Therefore, conventional wisdom should be modified to say that if the presence of the comparative is relevant to the choice of the structure with *quo*, this feature does not constitute a condition *sine qua non*.³⁴
- (ii) That the introductory element mentioned does not share all of the contexts of final *ut*. In this sense, Torrego (1988) demonstrated that the undeniable origin and relative nature of *quo* makes it incompatible with use as a subordinating element when the relation appears on the level of an utterance, since, in this case, the characteristic thing is precisely the absence of a significant relationship between the statement and the subordinate clause. In this way, the relative does not have anything to fill it with content. Therefore, despite the evolution of *quo* toward the *status* of a conjunction, its functioning allows us to see that the loss in productivity of its grammatical features never became total, as was in the case with, for example, *ut*.

2.3.3. *The relative pronoun as an introductory element for result clauses*

Finally, cases exist in which some clauses introduced by a relative pronoun plus a verb in the subjunctive exhibit an idea of result (21). The lack of coherence in the determination of the characteristics that individualize these types of construction allows us to recognize certain difficulties. If Bennett (1910: 296–297) declares that this type of clause necessarily offers an intensifying element in the main clause, Hofmann & Szantyr (1965: 558) exemplify the construction with a text that exhibits not only the absence of an intensifier but

34. This would be confirmed by examples of the juxtaposition of purpose structures with *quo* and with *ut*: Sall. *Catil.* 58,3: *sed ego uos, quo pauca monerem, aduocaui simul uti causam mei consili aperirem*.

also the indicative mode in the verbal form (22). The fact is not interpretable as a *hapax*; the quote continues with the repetition of the structure (23). One type of structure with some similarities to these is that which exhibits relative pronoun + indicative/subjunctive, and which can express a certain idea of result ('some people think ...'), in which the antecedent is deliberately indefinite, and which also act as generic presentative clauses (24). Nevertheless, in the classical period, only those constructed with the subjunctive – with an indefinite referent or not – could express a notion of effect or result (25). Questions regarding the use of the verbal mode are addressed in Sections 3.2.1 and 4.2.6.

- (21) Cic. *Tusc.* 3,16: *est innocentia adfectio talis animi quae noceat nemini*
'he is so innocent, he could not harm anyone'
- (22) Plaut. *Trin.* 91: *sunt quos scio esse amicos*
'there are some whom I suspect to be friends'
- (23) Plaut. *Trin.* 91–92: *sunt quos suspicor* (sc. *esse amicos*), / *sunt quorum ingenia atque animos nequeo noscere*³⁵
'there are some who I suspect are friends, and whose dispositions and feelings I am not able to discover'
- (24) Liv. 1,4,7: *sunt qui ... putent ...*
'some (writers) think that ...'
- (25) Liv. 9,3,12: *ista sententia ... ea est quae neque amicos parat nec inimicos tollit ... ea est Romana gens quae uicta quiescere nesciat*
'that policy is the (very) one which neither gains friends nor removes enemies: the Roman race is such that it does not know how to rest when beaten'

In light of what has been presented thus far, it is worth asking, on the one hand, whether any of Plautus's texts really contain a notion of result. On the other hand, the following two questions arise: (i) Can one really speak

35. Pinkster (1995: 26–27) in fact, sees a different syntactic role for these constructions which are included among the arguments of the predication; however, the result clauses introduced by *ut* are adjunct satellites with a function of "Result" (see Section 4.3).

of a specific linguistic form for result and purpose clauses when they are introduced by the same conjunction? and, therefore, (ii) How can either one be detected in the discourse?

To try to respond to these questions, a formal and functional analysis of the most relevant aspects on two of the main linguistic levels is necessary. The interrelation that exists between these levels inevitably brings about the presence of mutual references in the analysis of any one of them. In this way, the division that is established – semantics, syntax – more likely serves the purpose of methodology and expository clarity.

3. The semantic level

3.1. Characterizing semantic features

This section presents semantic features – shared or different – that characterize the ideas of purpose and result, and a development that allows us to examine to what extent these features are relevant.

Generally and semantically, result clauses are defined as those whose meaning makes known the result – real or predictable – of the action or state expressed in the clause by the main verb.³⁶ Concerning purpose clauses, one speaks of the expression of aim or intention (Bassols 1963: 313; Ernout & Thomas 1953: 342), and also of “*resultat cherché*”, by way of a subjunctive that is used in accordance with its own meaning of intention or will. This note of volition also appears in the definition accepted by many current scholars in general linguistics, this criterion being in turn one of the principles (and sometimes the only one) when distinguishing result clauses from purpose clauses. As has already been stated in the introduction, result and purpose are considered to express results or consequences which, in the case of purpose clauses, are desired – and not yet attained – and in result clauses are unintentional and usually factual (cf. Section 3.2.2).

36. See, among others, Bennett (1910: 296), Ernout & Thomas (1953: 343), or Bassols (1963: 317). More recently, Pinkster (1995: 150–152).

A recent recapitulation (Torrego 2001: 629–630) of the prototypical characteristics³⁷ of purpose clauses enumerates the features that would be associated with these clauses: (i) in the main clause, the features of [+control] – implying a human subject agent – and [+intention]; (ii) in the subordinate clause, virtuality and, as a consequence, a prospective nature. This characterization could be assumed in principle. With regard to prototypical result clauses, the most pertinent associated features would be: (i) the presence of [–control] and indifference as to the feature [$\pm$ intention]; (ii) in the subordinate, the tendency toward a greater degree of factuality than in the purpose clauses, with which they share the feature of [+prospectivity] in a general way. There are, therefore, intermediate situations that allow us to ascertain a special semantic *continuum* (cf. Section 3.4) between purpose and result clauses.

On the semantic level, this first approach involves the existence of two aspects whose analysis becomes necessary: the characterizing features that seem to be pertinent and the ascertainable proximity between different semantic notions that come into play in dealing with the types of clauses being studied. These are dealt with, respectively, in Sections 3.2 and 3.3.

3.2. Analysis of the characterizing features

Among the features presented as belonging to constructions of purpose and result, one can distinguish possibility, factuality, volition, referential identity,³⁸ control, prospectivity, and the semantic notion of the governing verbs. Certainly, the analysis of the controversial origin of the *ut* of result and purpose provides information about semantic features, some more and some less differentiating. Nevertheless, given the greater involvement that this discussion demonstrates on the syntactic level, it is dealt with in Section 4.1.

37. One could also speak of “paradigmatic” characteristics, understanding that this occurs in structures in which the essential features of the construction, in syntactic, functional, and conceptual terms, manifests itself in a clear and nonconflictive way and, consequently, to the maximum of its possibilities.

38. This feature is addressed when speaking about the various levels in which purpose and result constructions can appear.

3.2.1. Possibility and Factuality

It has been correctly proposed that the subjunctive has a modal meaning that would have evolved from a meaning of contingency to a meaning of present time. The existence of this meaning would be confirmed by its clear presence in verbs with a character of potentiality in no small number of clauses³⁹ in early literary Latin (26).

- (26) Ter. *Eun.* 840–842: *apud Antiphonem uterque, mater et pater, / quasi dedita opera domi erant, ut nullo modo / intro ire possem quin uiderent me*

‘Antiphon’s mother and father were both at home, as if on purpose, so there was no way **I could** go in without them seeing me’

On the other hand, a radical dichotomy has been presented within purpose and result subcategories: *ut* + subjunctive to indicate a possible fact, as opposed to the expression of a real fact, using *ut* + indicative (Griffe 1985).⁴⁰ Nevertheless, this complementary distribution is not respected as early as in the Latin of Plautus and Terence, where real results appear with the verb in the subjunctive. It is possible to think, therefore, that the extension of the subjunctive indicates the loss of awareness of the modal meaning on the part of the speakers, beginning in very early times, so that already in the archaic period, and then gradually, it is the mode used without any nuance of modality, a mark more of a morphosyntactic than of a semantic type.

Although a clear place has been claimed⁴¹ for a potential meaning of result clauses, and a distinction has been described between the modes of purpose (jussive subjunctive) and result (potential subjunctive), the generalization of the potential meaning to all result clauses would have favored loss of

39. Bennett (1910: 297) provides the data that, of 106 examples, no less than 30 showed verbs which, in his opinion, reveal the origin of the construction (*possit, audeat, uelit*, etc.). See also Woodcock (1959: 99–100, 114).

40. Concerning this question, Harris (1974: 171) proposed, already in Latin, the existence of two different uses of the subjunctive: one in which it functions as a formal marker and one in which it possesses a complete meaning, in real and distinctive opposition to the indicative.

41. See Perret (1958: 115, 123), Woodcock (1959: 120–121), Touratier (1982: 327–331).

the primitive meaning of the subjunctive, converting this verbal mode into a purely morphological necessity. Thus, the proposed distinction would not always be operative between purpose and result based on the presence of two homonymous morphemes as main senses of the subjunctive – volition and possibility – which would be applied respectively to these two types of clauses.

As a consequence of the general linguistic tendency toward the reduction of the subjunctive,⁴² the replacement of this verbal mode by the indicative begins to extend itself from the late period onward; some examples are found in inscriptions beginning in the middle of the 2nd century CE (27).

- (27) *CIL VIII 2728 (EDH): apparuit fossuras a rigore(m)(!) errasse, adeo ut superior fossura dextram petit ad meridiem uersus, inferior similiter suam petit ad septentrionem*
 ‘it became clear that the diggings strayed (because of the hardness of the earth) in such a way that the upper diggings veered toward the south, on the right side, and, similarly, the lower ones toward the north’

The presence of the indicative is also clear in the legal texts, *Itala*, Tertullian, the *Itinerarium Egeriae*, Cassiodorus, Gregory of Tours, and others (Hofmann & Szantyr 1965: 645). However, in some of these texts,⁴³ the tendency does not seem very pronounced. Väänänen (1979: 213) accepts that in Late Latin there was a strong reduction in the use of the subjunctive, especially in subordinate clauses.⁴⁴ But this is an affirmation that cannot be generalized in an absolute manner; Väänänen himself, in a later work (1987: 75–82), alludes to the coexistence of the indicative and the subjunctive – a mode

42. See Calboli (1995: 57–58) and references in his Note 1.

43. See Griffe (1996: 129), Cabrillana (1998).

44. In this regard, see also Wanner (1995: 274–277) or Calboli (1994: 32, 36), who proposes (1994: 43ff.) the hypothesis that the subjunctive is abandoned in result clauses in the late period at the same time that it is abandoned as a medium of definite identification of the noun, since the article is born and begins to extend. Väänänen (1987: 78) offers four examples of result clauses in the indicative in the *Itin. Eger.*, three of them with the verb in the main clause in the present.

that preserves its own vitality⁴⁵ – in several types of subordinate clauses, including result and purpose. Therefore, the functioning of the subjunctive would be, in a special way in result clauses, more clearly an instrument for marking grammatical senses of subordination and not semantic senses of factuality or modality.

Several explanations have been proposed for the introduction of the indicative – a mode consistent with the factual character of result clauses.⁴⁶ Among them are the influence of Greek in the translations of ὥστε + indicative, the constructions of *quod* + indicative, or a possible anacoluthon (28). The first construction of *ut* + infinitive appears in a translation in the *Vet. Lat.* and is interpreted as a Graecism, as a word-for-word translation (29).

- (28) *Itin. Eger. 7,3: nam mihi credat uolo affectio uestra, quantum tamen peruidere potui, filios Israhel sic ambulasse ut, quantum irent dextra, tantum reuerterentur sinistra, quantum denuo in ante ibant, tantum denuo reuertebantur: et sic fecerunt ipsum iter, donec peruenirent ad mare rubrum*

‘for I hope that your affection will believe me when I say that, as far as I could see, the children of Israel marched in such ways that as far as they marched to the right, they regressed to the left; as far as they advanced, they then retreated, journeying thus until they reached the Red Sea’

- (29) *Vet. Lat. 2 Cor. 2,7: ὥστε τοῦναντίον μᾶλλον . . . ὑμεῖς χαρίσασθαι ⇒ (sufficit illi qui eiusmodi est obiurgatio haec quae fit a pluribus) uti e contrario magis uos donare⁴⁷*

‘this punishment, imposed by the majority, is sufficient to such a man, so that, on the contrary, you ought rather to forgive and comfort him’

In the Greek language, the development of ὥστε + infinitive is basically post-Homeric (Calboli 1995: 58, 60). Basing himself – among other reasons –

45. Especially present in concessive, comparative, indirect interrogative, purpose, and result clauses with *verba declarandi* and *affectuum*.

46. See Löfstedt (1911: 255; 1933: 431) or Hofmann & Szantyr (1965: 639), among others.

47. *Vulg. 2 Cor 2,7: ita ut e contra magis donetis et consolamini.*

on arguments from historical and comparative linguistics, Calboli (1995: 69) points out the use of two possibilities (indicative/infinitive) as a resource for expressing the consequent in different ways: the mere assertion of the consequent (infinitive) versus the presentation of it as foreseen by the subject of the “governing” clause (indicative). In this way, the infinitive would be used in a “modalized” way.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, the strongest tendency in the Romance languages is to use the indicative.

The observation of the use of ὥστε in Biblical and Literary Greek also leads to the assertion of an extremely diffuse borderline between its meanings of result or purpose. In this sense, Muraoka (1973: 216) points out that, since the ambiguous uses of ὥστε are attested in both Biblical and non-Biblical Greek, it does not seem absolutely necessary to look for an explanation for this very ambiguity.

On the other hand, the spoken language confuses the infinitive (*accedere*) and the imperfect subjunctive (*accederem*) (30).⁴⁹ This phenomenon leads to the introduction into writing of mere mechanical reproduction of what has been heard. The homophony (Molinelli 1998: 563–568) that exists between the imperfect *amarem* and the contracted form of the perfect *amarim* must also be taken into consideration,⁵⁰ a phenomenon that could lead to confusion.

- (30) *Itin. Eger. 22,2: sed quoniam de Tharso tertia mansione, ..., est martyrium sanctae Theclae, gratum fuit satis ut etiam illuc accedere (= accederem)*

‘I had already been in Tarsus (on my way to Jerusalem), but as Saint Thecla’s memorial is three stations from Tarsus, it was very pleasant for me to go there’

48. In a partially similar manner, see Clinquart and Lambert (1984) or Milani (1999).

49. See Löfstedt (1911: 250).

50. See Hofmann & Szantyr (1965: 552) or Ernout & Thomas (1953: 418). This aspect is also commented upon by Väänänen (1979: 317) with regard to an example by Gregory of Tours (*Franc. 8,31,7*), a phenomenon that does not seem to occur in a text from an earlier date such as the *Itinerarium Egeriae*.

The irregularities in the use of the mode could also be due to loss of the strict meaning of subordination.⁵¹ Contaminations proliferate in this final stage of Latin: *ut* is constructed with the indicative because of the influence of *quod* + indicative, and at the same time *quod* is gradually converted into a universal conjunction, pulling along with it the disappearance of *ut*.

Finally, the interchange between clauses with *ut* and infinitive constructions becomes more and more frequent (31).

- (31) Epiphan. in euang. 57, p. 152, 24: *ire desiderauit, ... ut ... doceret ... aut ... dare ueniam*⁵²
 ‘he wanted to go, so that he could teach or authorize’

In conclusion, the difficult individualization of clauses of purpose and result introduced by *ut* became an almost unmanageable task during the passage from Classical to Late Latin.

3.2.2. Control, intentionality, animacy, and prospectivity

Considering what is more and what is less paradigmatic allows us to clarify, along with Cristofaro (2003: 157–158), that the proposition expressed in a purpose clause does not necessarily involve control on the part of the subject. Nevertheless, by their very nature, in these relations it is implied that the agent (performer) of the main state of affairs is in some way involved in carrying out the dependent state of affairs, at least insofar as there exists an element of his will toward this realization. The involvement of this volition will be greater if the agent of the main state of affairs exercises control over the dependent clause, a situation that is more frequent when both subjects have the same referent. In this way, the paradigmatic relations of purpose will be those in which the same entity is involved in the two states of affairs, and this entity can control the realization of the dependent state of affairs. It would be possible, therefore, to apply a gradual instantiation of the [+control] feature (Torrego 2001: 632–635). In this way, although the degree of control would

51. In this regard, Lundström (1943: 60–63) observed that in the Latin translation of Ireneus in which the construction *ut* + infinitive frequently appears, taken from the Greek, this phenomenon never occurs in the first part of a broad grammatical element.

52. See Löfstedt (1917: 92).

diminish in intensity, its existence would permit us to continue to consider clauses such as (32) to be purpose clauses.

- (32) Sen. nat. 1,1,6: *ideo nulla sine eiusmodi spectaculis nox est, non enim opus est ad efficienda ista magno aeris motu*
 ‘therefore, there is no night without a sight of this kind; in fact, a great movement of air is not necessary in order to cause those fires’

The above-mentioned degree of control would be provided by the presence of an idea of inducement to a change of state, which has some points in common with virtuality, a feature which in turn is associated with purpose. This is precisely the only feature whose presence can distinguish purpose from result clauses.⁵³ Thus, whereas in (33a), which is quite distant from the prototypical conditions of purpose, a “simulated purpose” can be seen,⁵⁴ which is not possible in (33b), where what occurs is more of a consequence.

- (33) a. Liv. 7,27,1: *exercitibus dimissis, cum et foris pax et domi concordia ordinum otium esset, ne nimis laetae res essent, pestilentia ciuitatem adorta coegit senatum imperare decemuiris ut libros Sibyllinos inspicerent*
 ‘after the armies were disbanded, as there was peace abroad and harmony at home thanks to the understanding among the orders, to prevent things from becoming too pleasant, a pestilence attacked the citizens, and the senate found themselves under the necessity of issuing an order to the decemvirs requiring them to consult the Sibylline Books’
- b. Liv. 5,33,11: *(Raetos) loca ipsa effecerunt ne quid ex antiquo praeter sonum linguae nec eum incorruptum retinerent*
 ‘the Raetians, who had through the nature of their country become so uncivilized that they retained no trace of their original condition except their language’

53. This is understood to be so when an introductory particle does not exist in either of the two types of clauses.

54. See Pinkster (1995: 148–149).

Intentionality is seen to be one of the most relevant features when making the distinction between purpose and result. Result clauses – say Ernout & Thomas (1953: 342–343)⁵⁵ – express a result which is unintentional, independent of the will of the subject, whereas purpose clauses respond to an established intention, even if this has not been achieved at the time of its expression. Even though in some cases it is not obvious, the feature [+intention] is characteristic of purpose clauses, whereas result clauses are indifferent to this feature. Consequently, there should be examples of this last type in which there is an intention and others in which such an intention is absent. It seems clear that in (34), an intentional consequence (*occiderit Mamilius*) is the desired result of the action expressed by *ui maiore quam paulo ante magister equitum cum hostium duce proelium iniit, ut et uno ictu transfixum per latus*. At the same time, it is clear that the clause – joined by coordination – *ipse ... exspirauerit* expresses an unintentional consequence. Similarly, in (35) it is evident – thanks to the lexical meaning of the different elements – that the consequence (*ridentis etiam speciem praebuerit*) could only be voluntarily sought, because what precedes it (*superante laetitia dolores*) makes that clear.⁵⁶

- (34) Liv. 2,20,8–9: *hos agmine uenientes T. Herminius legatus conspicatus, ..., tanto ui maiore quam paulo ante magister equitum cum hostium duce proelium iniit, ut et uno ictu transfixum per latus occiderit Mamilius et ipse inter spoliandum corpus hostis ueruto percussus, cum uictor in castra esset relatus, inter primam curationem exspirauerit*

‘when T. Herminius saw them (the cohort of exiles) coming, he attacked the enemies’ commander much more fiercely than the Master of the Horse had previously done, so much so, in fact, that he killed him by a single spear-thrust through his side. While despoiling the body he himself was struck by a javelin, and after being carried back to the camp, expired while his wound was being dressed’

55. The distinction is maintained in more recent papers: see, among others, Vester (1994: 271), Crespo (1988), or Ehrenfellner (1996).

56. For the implications of these cases in the tense system, see Cabrillana (1999: 97–101).

- (35) Liv. 21,2,6: *eo fuit habitu oris ut superante laetitia dolores ridentis etiam speciem praebuerit*
 ‘the look on his face was such that, joyfully mastering his pain, he even seemed to be smiling’

In this way, although the presence of intentionality takes shape as a prototypical feature in purpose clauses, problematic and borderline examples still remain in which the perception of this feature is not always easy ((36); cf. Section 3.2.3). It is clearly difficult to decide between the senses of volition or possibility of the verb *habeat* in (37). However, the distinction in the area in which result and purpose coincide – purpose/result unachieved/unintended – would be a question of an emphasis that the reader has to make the effort to discover in the intention of the author. In other words: the lack of a distinction would be resolved into a question of interpretation,⁵⁷ assisted by the context in the best of cases (38). On the other hand, the different linguistic expressions of both constructions and the analysis of some of their formal elements allow one to see that the feature of emphasis can also be present in purpose clauses, even though it is found closely linked to result clauses.⁵⁸

- (36) Cato agr. 124,11: *canes interdiu clausos esse oportet, ut noctu acriores et uigilantiores sint*
 ‘dogs should be shut in during the day so that they are fiercer and better guards at night’
- (37) Cato agr. 8,5: *fundum urbanum, et qui eum fundum solum habebit, ita paret itaque conserat, uti quam sollertissimum habeat*
 ‘a market garden, and more so if it is the only one that one owns, needs to be planted and cultivated for maximum productivity’
- (38) Liv. 3,72,5: *quem enim hoc priuatae rei iudicem fecisse ut sibi controuersiosam adiudicaret rem?*
 ‘for what judge has ever dealt with a private suit to thus appropriate the property in dispute to himself?’

57. See Griffe (1978: 90), Rubio (1982: 310, 315–316) and Touratier (1994: 647).

58. See Sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.2. On the origin and presence of this emphasis, see Cabrillana (1997: 568–570).

Thus, and as opposed to other adverbial constructions, result clauses do not permit formal focalization without ceasing to be grammatical or losing their own condition of being a result (39b). The reasons that prevent it are situated (i) on the level of the principle of iconic motivation, according to which the result clause cannot precede its cause; and (ii) in the very pragmatic nature of the result clause, which is already in and of itself a focalization of a cause seen from the point of view of its consequence, a focalization usually coded by the intensive particles that introduce it. On this same level, also characteristic of result clauses is the impossibility of assuming thematic roles, which complement relations and other adverbial constructions are in fact capable of adopting.

- (39) Liv. 1,15,7: *tantum ualuit (Roma) ut in quadraginta deinde annos tutam pacem haberet*
 a. '(Rome) was so powerful that it enjoyed assured peace for forty years'
 b. *'it was the consequence that (Rome) enjoyed assured peace for forty years, because it was so powerful'

It is not infrequent for purpose clauses to permit focalization, which is usually accompanied by correlative structures such as *eo ... ut, et quod ... et ut, non solum quod ... sed ut, magis ut*, etc. (40).

- (40) Sall. *Iug.* 24,10: *sed quoniam eo natus sum ut Iugurthae scelerum ostentui essem, non iam mortem neque aerumnas*
 'but since I was born for that, to be a proof of Iugurtha's villainy, I do not now beg a release from death or distress'

The presence of intentionality has been linked to the presence of a nominal constituent [+animate] in the governing clause, whose appearance would be almost required in purpose clauses and voluntary in result clauses.⁵⁹ At the same time, animacy appears linked to the control feature. As was already seen in Section 3.1, the relevance of these features could only be affirmed for

59. Thus, e.g., S. Salor (1993: 176, 182), who assigns to result clauses, for their part, the feature of [+constatation] of purpose and not of an intended search.

those cases – and not always – in which it is strictly a question of prototypical constructions. Thus, Touratier (1994: 150) affirms:

On ne peut pas dire qu'en latin classique, une proposition finale se laisse toujours interpréter comme la volonté du premier actant du verbe principal. Car l'ensemble *ut* et le subjonctif a un sens final, même quand il ne représente pas la volonté du premier actant du verbe principal, ce verbe pouvant en effet désigner une action hors de la volonté de la personne concernée. Ou bien être impersonnel. Ou encore avoir un premier actant non animé et par conséquent non susceptible de volonté.

Nevertheless, Touratier himself (1994: 648) inconclusively uses the argument of volition to explain the functioning of the sequence of tenses in result clauses.⁶⁰

Finally, with regard to the feature of prospectivity, it must be pointed out that purpose clauses are by definition prospective and posterior to the main clause, but result clauses are not necessarily so (41).

- (41) Sen. *nat.* 1,3,10: *hunc, quem toto terrarum orbe maiorem probat ratio, acies nostra sic contraxit*⁶¹ *ut sapientes uiri pedalem esse contenderent*
 'this, according to calculation bigger than the whole orb of the earth, has to be reduced by our sight in such a way that wise men even held that its diameter was one foot'

3.2.3. *The semantic value of the governing verb*

Another feature that has been considered is the semantic value of the verb in the governing clause. The purposive *ut* appears to depend on verbs which, because of their meaning, allow the expression of this semantic relation,⁶² and

60. See Cabrillana (1999: 100–101).

61. Perfect with a habitual present sense.

62. It is relevant that the governing verb is *faciendi*, *dicendi* (pseudo-purpose), of movement or of command (completive with content of purpose); together with the presence or not of the feature [control], the verb provides a differentiation between paradigmatic purpose clauses or those in which a dissociation takes place in the relationship between the syntactic structure and the conceptual quality of the clauses in connection (see Prandi 1996:

never verbs of state. The consecutive *ut* appears to depend on verbs whose semantic content covers the notions of ‘happen’ and ‘bring about’. Nevertheless, already in traditional manuals – such as Woodcock (1959: 103) – it is pointed out that both purpose and result clauses can depend on verbs such as *facio*, *perficio*, *efficio*, etc.

Bennett (1910: 299) understood these constructions (called substantive clauses of result) as a development of pure result clauses with an origin in expressions of the type seen in (42). A valid objection is that the “original” examples – *euenit ut* – are as ancient as the derived ones – *miserorum, ut ... sint*. However, understanding matters in this way explains the current confusion, in which clauses are called “result” which are not such, although they could have been so in their origin.

- (42) Ter. *Andr.* 916–917: *itane adtemperate euenit, hodie in ipsis nuptiis / ut ueniret, ant(e) hac numquam?*
 ‘To come so opportunely today just at the very nuptials, and yet never to have come before?’

Bennett himself confesses (1910: 300), on the other hand, that on occasion it is impossible to determine with certainty whether one is dealing with substantive clauses of result or substantive clauses derived from a volitive idea. Thus, for example, perhaps both (43a) and (43b) are understandable, but the most plausible interpretation seems to be the substantive one (43c).

- (43) Plaut. *Amph.* 647: *id modo si mercedis datur mi, ut meus uictor uir belli clueat*
 a. ‘if only I could receive the reward of hearing my husband hailed conqueror’
 b. ‘if only the reward of hearing my husband hailed as conqueror could be given to me’
 c. ‘if only this reward could be granted me, that my husband be hailed the conqueror in the war, thus I would be satisfied’

75–76). It is fundamentally a matter of objective expressions of purpose (“plants have roots to nourish themselves”) and pseudo-purpose clauses (see Section 4.3).

Three considerations emerge from the facts which have been presented:

- (i) There does not appear to be sufficient reason⁶³ to include this type of clause among those of result or purpose, since practically the only thing that facilitates the understanding of “that which occurred” as a consequence of “occur” is the lexical meaning of the governing verbs. Certainly, the traditional consideration categorizes them as a subgroup of result clauses, a posture criticized by, among others, Scherer (1975: 253). More recent papers, such as Rosén (1989: 198), consider that its designation as a result “should therefore not be upheld”. In fact, depending on the type of negation that these clauses indicate, they will use *ne* or *ut non*. I understand this posture as a prudent position that does not clearly opt for the consecutive condition of the clauses mentioned. Cuzolin (1996a), for his part, unites the greater presence of factuality to the constructions *accidit quod* (as opposed to that which occurs preferentially in *accidit ut*). However, both the previous argument and the fact that the constructions with *ut* could appear with the formal distribution of a result clause do not necessarily imply that we are dealing with variants of result expressions strictly speaking. Rather, it is a matter of structures that are situated halfway between completive and result clauses, sometimes closer to the former and other times to the latter by virtue of diverse factors (the presence of a certain type of sentence and/or evaluative/factive adverbs).
- (ii) Features such as intention, factuality, and animacy as well as the lexical meaning of the governing verb do not turn out to be completely distinctive in result and purpose constructions in their typological variety.
- (iii) The presence of features shared by various types of clauses suggests a nondiscrete approach to semantic relations.

63. The intended equality in the internal distribution theme–rheme–focus proposed by Eckert (2003: 65–66) does not seem to be so, either.

3.3. Some related semantic relations

3.3.1. 'Conditionals'

Traditionally,⁶⁴ it has been accepted that some clauses introduced by *si* can have a semantic value equivalent to that of purpose (44). Some of the features⁶⁵ that bring this type of constructions closer to those that express a relationship of purpose are: the intentionality or volition present in its statement; the “virtual” (unrealized) character of the subordinate predicate; or the necessity that the dependent relationship should express a time later than that of the main predicate.

- (44) Plaut. *Men.* 1048–1049: *nunc ibo intro ad hanc meretricem, quamquam suscenset mihi, / si possum exorare ut pallam reddat quam referam domum*
 ‘I’ll go now to this courtesan’s house, even though she is angry with me, to see if I can get the mantle back off her, and take it back home’

However, given that these criteria are not always fulfilled and that they are the same ones that allow differentiation between purpose and causal clauses (cf. Section 3.3.3), with which they share more features, it seems preferable to understand that this type of clause (whose purposive interpretation is on many occasions subject to contextual conditions)⁶⁶ constitutes a subgroup of causal clauses. The designation proposed for them is “pro-causal conditionals”.

Likewise, a manifestation of the proximity between the notions of purpose and condition is the existence of cases in which the clause introduced by *ut* can have, with the help of the context, a conditional interpretation. It is precisely in some of these cases that the subsequentness of the dependent event is not clearly expressed (45).

64. Gildersleeve (1883: 421) spoke of the “half-interrogative, half-final character of *si* in Latin”. Some more recent studies also deal with conditional clauses with a close semantic value to purpose clauses in Latin: Bodelot (1988), or van de Griend (1989), Núñez (1998). For these same constructions in Greek, see Crespo (1988), Crespo, Conti, and Maquieira (2003: 418), or Wakker (1994).

65. See Núñez (1998: 606) and Bodelot (1998: 93–94).

66. For Bodelot (1998: 96), the idea of purpose is, at most, implicit. The author bases her approximation on criteria of pragmatic and cognitive nature.

- (45) Liv. 3,45,6: *‘ferro hinc tibi submouendus sum, Appi’ inquit, ‘ut tacitum feras quod celari uis’*
 ‘“you will have to remove me from here at the point of the sword, Appius,” he said, “if you would stifle all comment on what you want to keep concealed”’

3.3.2. *Comparative-Modal clauses*

Among the meanings that result clauses can have are listed⁶⁷ those that make reference to the manner and the restriction on the process of the main verb. These nuances, or special constructions as they are called by Ernout & Thomas (1953: 345–346), could not be anything but semantic clarifications of the overall meaning of result. This result could occur with a meaning of “limiting” the scope of the main verbal action (46). These types of clauses have, nevertheless, one restriction: the action or condition that constitutes the content of the result clause is in disagreement with the content of the main clause, instead of following it naturally.⁶⁸

- (46) Sen. *epist.* 24,26: *omnia sic transeunt ut reuertantur*
 ‘all things pass away in such a way that they return again’

According to Krylová (1997: 80), if the result is presented as a consequence of the mode, it would be a matter of a semantic relationship of “proper consequence”, which is a type of semantic relation of result in the broadest sense of the term, and has been modified by the addition of the semantic feature Manner. In turn, the nature of this feature can be quantitative⁶⁹ (scope, intensity, degree; (47a)) or qualitative (type, manner in the restrictive sense, etc.; (47b)).⁷⁰ This distinction, on the other hand, is common in the grammars of very different languages. Within the Latin language itself, it is suggestive

67. See, e.g., Ernout & Thomas (1953: 345–346), Touratier (1994: 649–650).

68. What Krylová (1997: 88–89) refers to as “inference”.

69. For Ehrenfellner (1996), the expression of this type of notion by result clauses constitutes a different feature (semantic-syntactic) of these clauses as opposed to purpose clauses.

70. Examples given by Krylová (1997: 82–83) show an unclear border between these features in both Greek and Latin. On occasion, it is impossible to distinguish whether the result follows from a qualitative or quantitative feature, both interpretations being equally probable: Vulg. *Ioh.* 3,16: *sic enim dilexit deus mundum ut filium unigenitum daret* ‘for

that elements such as *qualiter* appear in place of the *ut* of purpose, especially in the late period (48). Apparently more debatable, at least in Latin, is the acceptance of the type called “consecutive comparison”, in which I believe that the idea being clearly highlighted is the comparative (49).

- (47) a. Sen. *epist.* 46,1: *tanta ... dulcedine me tenuit et traxit (liber tuus) ut illum sine ulla dilatazione perlegerim*
 ‘your book captivated and fascinated me with such a grace that I read through it without delay’
 b. Sen. *epist.* 43,4: *sic uiuimus ut deprendi sit subito aspici*
 ‘we live in such a way that to be seen unexpectedly means to be caught in the act’
- (48) *Lex Alam.* 36,2: *si culpabilis est, componat, qualiter per neglectum non euadat*
 ‘if somebody is guilty, the action should be recorded, so that the person should not be set free by negligence’
- (49) Sen. *epist.* 21,8: *et apertior ista sententia est, quam ut interpretanda sit, et disertior, quam ut adiuuanda*
 ‘this idea is clearer than that which should be interpreted, and more eloquent than that which should be supported’

In this regard, in addition to its parallelism with ὥστε, some data could be adduced which support the close kinship between comparative and result clauses. According to Mellet (1998), both ideas express identification between the process described in the governing clause and the reference that appears in the governed. Nevertheless, despite sharing this aspect, differences exist between these two relations. Some of them make reference to (i) the type of identification that each one codes and (ii) the pragmatic status that they possess.

In consequence, whereas comparative clauses would carry out an identification “avec alterité”, result clauses would execute an identification “sans

God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son’. The same phenomenon is observed, e.g., in Greek (ὥστε).

alterité”.⁷¹ The first type of identification refers to the operation that relates one element with another that is recognized as different and therefore susceptible to receiving a comparative relation (“X is as high as Y”). The identification “sans alterité” is a circular operation that does not depend on an exterior referent but rather resends the idea to itself (“X is so dumb [that he does not understand anything]”), for which reason it refers to its pragmatic status, and the comparative clauses would determine a rhematic element and the result clauses would establish a thematic element.

The type of complementary distribution outlined between the two semantic relations, however, has the rank not of a selective law, but of a tendency (Mellet 1998: 537–538). On the other hand, the difficult – and on occasions nonexistent – borderline between some of these and other semantic relations can be used by an author for stylistic purposes (Krylová 1997: 96). It seems preferable, therefore, not to grant these constructions (“comparative result”) their own differentiated syntactic status.

3.3.3. *Causal clauses*

As early as in Archaic Latin, there existed a more than close relationship between causal and purpose clauses. This relationship has on occasion been considered so close that in practice it could be identical.⁷² In support of this thesis, linguistic proof of certain scope exists, such as coordination in complement function (50) or in a relation of contrast (51).⁷³ This is a situation with typological parallels. With regard to Greek, Crespo (1988) bases his position on the fact that purpose results from the combination of a few subordinators (ὅνα, μέ) with verb forms that always possess intentionality. However, most of the conjunctions (ὅφρα, ἕως, ὅπως, ὥς, ἐἰ) can introduce clauses which, depending on the context, can be interpreted as purposive or causal.

71. Mellet (1998: 537–538) invokes the distinction suggested by Culioli (1991).

72. See Torrego (1988: 318–321), Bolkestein (1991), and Eckert (2003: 69–70).

73. Additional support is found in the existence of common correlatives (*propterea*, *idcirco*, *ideo*) or the response to a causal question with a clause with clear purposive meaning.

- (50) Liv. 30,3,1: *omnibus tamen, uelut eam sortitis, Africae cura erat, seu quia ibi summam rerum bellicae uerti cernebant, seu ut Scipioni gratificarentur*
 ‘they were all, however, concerned about Africa, as if the ballot has assigned it to them, either because they saw that the issue of the war and their country’s fate would be decided there, or because they wished to lend a service to Scipio’
- (51) Cic. *Caecin.* 101: *id feci non quod uos hanc defensionem desiderare arbitrarer, sed ut omnes intellegerent nec ademptam cuiquam ciuitatem esse neque adimi posse*
 ‘I did so, not because I thought that you wished for a defense, but so that all men might understand that the rights of citizenship had never been taken away from anyone, nor could they be’

Nevertheless, and according to Núñez (1998: 608–610), the fact that different types of clauses share some semantic feature(s) does not seem to be sufficient reason for including all of those relations in the area of the same semantic function. Result clauses as well as causals, those of purpose and conditionals share the feature [+cause] in their possible semantic interpretation. In turn, however, other features exist in which some of these relations are opposed. This is the case, for example, with the features of prospectivity and control, which are required in purpose clauses but not in causals. In fact, these features are the same ones that helped Crespo (1988: 292, 294) to ascribe a “purpose function” to ἵνα and to μή that is linked to the volition function. In consequence, and in turn ruling out the presence of the feature of intentionality for all purpose clauses, it does not seem that the identification between cause and purpose must be made in an absolute manner, but rather in the framework of a continuum of many adverbial relations, and determining the factors that make a certain construction more similar to one semantic value or another by virtue of prototypicality. Among the determining factors, especially in the possible distinction between cause and purpose, must be included, naturally, the factor referring to the perspective from which the relationship between the two linguistically coded states of affairs is considered. Example (52) illustrates this in that way.

- (52) Sen. nat. 2,32,2: *nos putamus, quia nubes collisae sunt, fulmina emitti; ipsi existimant nubes collidi ut fulmina emittantur*
 ‘we think that the lightning bolts are thrown because the clouds clash; they think that the clouds clash so that the lightning bolts can be thrown’

3.4. Continuum in/between semantic relations

The consideration of cognitive and typological aspects provides some additional basis for supposing a special semantic proximity between the ideas of result and purpose. In keeping with this perspective,⁷⁴ nondiscreteness in a semantic continuum of clausal interrelations is greater if an interrelation is more primitive and central. This “centrality” or special necessity in that which concerns life is involved in this interrelation because of the high frequency of use of the coded notion.⁷⁵ In this sense, both the notions of result and purpose belong to what has been called the “hard core” of interclausal semantic relations, along with the relations of time, cause, condition, and concession.⁷⁶

However, this last argument has some limitations. For example, it is at least dubious that the notion of purpose cannot be simpler than that of result from a cognitive point of view. Michel (1995: 231), for example, understands that purpose is a more specific notion than cause or result, insofar as this purpose is desired by the agent of the action.⁷⁷ In consequence, and if one shares the opinion that specific notions are acquired before abstract ones, purpose would precede result in the process of acquisition of circumstantial categories. Michel (1995: 232) even points out that the expression of consequence with the conjunction *ut* does not exist, for example, in Cato, from which it would follow that the notion of consequence appears late in the

74. See Kortmann (1997: 168).

75. See Eaton (1940: ix) apud Kortmann (1997: 135).

76. This is what Kortmann (1997: 156) proposes. Others (e.g., Michel 1989: 282) present a somewhat different organization: Place/Time – Purpose – Result – Cause – Condition – Opposition – Concession.

77. For the restrictions on this affirmation see Section 3.2.2.

development of Latin.⁷⁸ This affirmation, however, does not have absolute scope. Apart from the abundant examples of the Latin of archaic comedy, cases are found in Cato such as (53)–(54). Independent of that, the design of the pathways of union in semantic relations – central, in this case – carried out by Kortmann (1997: 168) is revealing. In the representation of this cognitive map, the relation of purpose, for example, is linked to condition by way of, so to speak, the relation of causality. The analysis by Núñez (1998), which is about the above-mentioned pro-causal meaning of the conjunction *si* in certain conditions, proves to be consistent with that.

- (53) Cato *orig.* 39: *sus usque adeo pinguitudine crescere solet ut se ipsa stans sustinere non possit*
 ‘the pig usually gets so fat that it cannot remain standing by itself’
- (54) Cato *agr.* 151,4: *si quando non pluet ut terra sitiāt*
 ‘if at some point it will not rain, so that, as a result, the ground becomes thirsty’⁷⁹

3.5. Recapitulation of semantic features

The facts described so far allow a tentative proposal concerning the ascription of fundamental semantic features to structures of result and purpose. The symbols “+” and “–” indicate, respectively, the preferential or significant presence or absence of a feature, not a rigid exclusion of the contrary feature. When these symbols are found in parentheses, they indicate that the feature can be present in a low percentage of occasions. The symbol “±” indicates the possible presence or absence of the feature in question with a similar degree of probability (Table 2).

78. The author finds support in diachronic facts. Hittite, which has temporal and hypothetical subordinates, lacks purpose and result subordinates. In this language, result would be expressed implicitly, by way of coordination.

79. Example from Pinkster (1995: 152).

Table 2. Semantic features in result and purpose clauses

Features	Clauses	
	Result	Purpose
1. Factivity	+ (–)	– (+)
2. Prospectivity	+ (–)	+
3. Control	– (+)	+ (–)
4. Animacy	±	+ (–)
5. Intention	– (+)	+ (–)

The distinction of the clauses under study, as can be seen, cannot be made clearly on the semantic level. It is a matter of features that are attributable to the constructions to a higher or lower degree.⁸⁰

4. The syntactic level

In this section, we analyze various issues that are unequivocally situated on the syntactic plane or that possess implications on this level. First (Section 4.1) we address the syntactic status in which purpose and consecutive clauses can situate themselves, in order to then continue on to the examination of the behavior of different features with syntactic repercussions (Section 4.2). The final issue is to determine the syntactic function(s) of the constructions under consideration. In this regard, we will see the possibility of the appearance of the constructions on the different levels that can be distinguished in discourse (Section 4.3).

80. A broad descriptive and specific statistical study of the attribution of these features to constructions that express purpose or result will be conducted on another occasion.

4.1. Syntactic status

From studies in traditional grammar⁸¹ to much recent individual research,⁸² different scholars have considered the description and functioning of purpose structures and, above all, result structures in light of their origin. This direction is also justified here by (i) the historical focus granted to this volume and (ii) the light that it could shed on the determination of the semantic value of each of the constructions.

One approach has been based on the paratactic origin, primarily for those constructions with a correlative structure. At issue is a series of adverbs deriving from the Proto-Indo-European root **k^wo-*, **k^wi-* used in correlation with a parallel series of adverbs of place, so that constructions such as *ibi ... ubi*, *eo ... quo*, *i-nde ... u-nde*, *ea ... qua*, *i-ta ... *u-ta (ut)* turn out to be frequent. This paratactic framework would evolve to a hypotactic framework in which the relation between the members of the correlation is first understood as relative. In a later stage, the relative element would end up attaining the function of a conjunction. At the same time, attention is drawn to the fact that, in the beginning, relative clauses with the notion of result or purpose are frequently preceded by particles such as *ut*, *quippe*, or *utpote* ((55); Meillet & Vendryes 1924: 647). According to these authors (1924: 659), “il n’y a pas de raison pour la séparer étymologiquement du thème relatif”. However, at the same time, “elle s’emploie le plus souvent au sens final devant un verbe au subjonctif”. The support comes from arguments of a textual and comparative-typological nature (1924: 652). In inscriptional Archaic Latin, *ut* (which soon converts into a simple tool for marking dependence) can be found with a role of merely reinforcing the subjunctive, similar to what occurs with the French *que*.

- (55) Plaut. *Rud.* 462: *satin nequam sum, utpote qui hodie amare inceperim?*
 ‘am I not stupid, in, today of all days, beginning to fall in love?’

81. See, e.g., Meillet & Vendryes (1924: 638, 647–652, 658–659), Löfstedt (1933: 415), Tovar (1946: 207–209), Ernout & Thomas (1953: 332, 343–345), Bassols (1963: 317–318), or Hofmann & Szantyr (1965: 630–631).

82. Among others, Haudry (1973), Hamp (1982), Hettrich (1987), and Ehrenfellner (1996).

Three points can be deduced from the reasoning of Meillet & Vendryes: (i) At some time the function of *ut* – as an anticipator of the real relative – was reinforcement, a function that is perhaps similar to that which would later be performed by other particles: *sic*, *ita*, *adeo*, etc.; (ii) The consecutive *ut* has correlation, in common with the comparative, this being understood as the original; (iii) The construction with subjunctive is a common feature of consecutive and purposive *ut*.

Continuing to seek the origin of the construction of result in a relative element with a local sense, which evolves until it acquires modal and then resultative sense, we find the opinion of Löfstedt (1928–1933, 2: 415). This author's position is different, on the one hand, from that of Hofmann & Szantyr (1965: 631), for whom the result function is a secondary development of the *ut* interrogative-exclamative, which evolves until it is converted into a conjunction; and on the other hand from Kroll's (1925: 85), who sees it as the development of a meaning that came from adverbs plus the presence of the subjunctive.

Another position (Hamp 1982: 118) proposes a different origin of syntactic status for result and purpose clauses, beginning with the distinction favored by the type of negation employed by each of these constructions. Purpose constructions, negated in Proto-Indo-European by **me* (Gk. μή), would have a status of authentic subordination. Result clauses, negated by **ne* in Proto-Indo-European (Gk. οὐ), would be descendants of adjoining independent clauses.⁸³ This posture also revises the morphological origin of the elements of the correlative scheme. If *ita* was formed over the zero grade of the locative (**i-tH*), *ut(a)* would have to come from **ku-tH*. In accordance with these arguments, and based on the improbability of a relative origin of a connector with the sense 'so that', Hamp (1982: 119–120) proposes different origins for the *uts* of purpose and of result. The latter would derive from the connector of RV clauses *utá* ('and').⁸⁴

83. Hamp adds that the fact that the particle introducing the correlation of result is frequently absent in colloquial use of the language constitutes another indication that the two clauses were rather concatenated, or subordinated. In support of this opinion, see Pinkster (1995: 35 n. 5) regarding the special use of the tenses in result clauses.

84. Hamp (1982: 120) finds confirmation in the discovery, by Tovar (1975: 11), of the Celtiberian *utā* ('and', 'also'), a particle that would be shared by Indo-Iranian and later

An attempt to link the relative origin and the modal sense⁸⁵ is observed in the proposal by Leumann (1940: 230–233; 1977: 482), whose support again centers on typological arguments such as the fact that in Greek and Old Indic, where interrogative and relative have different forms (Gk. ὥς, ὅπως :: Skt. *yāthā*; Gk. πῶς :: Skt. *katham*), result and purpose clauses are introduced by forms corresponding to the relative (Gk. ὥς, ὥστε, ὅπως :: Skt. *yāthā*).⁸⁶ In turn, the distinction between purpose and result is established by the absence of correlation (Leumann 1940: 234). In this way, in the clause that follows, it would suffice to do without *ita* in order to convert the clause into one of pure purpose (56).⁸⁷

- (56) Plaut. *Pseud.* 579: *ita paraui copias ... facile ut uincam*
 ‘I have so prepared my forces ... that I may easily conquer’

The existence of hypotaxis as early as Proto-Indo-European is more clearly defended above all by Jean Haudry, who points out (1973: 152) that correlative structures – of an ancient syntactic type – are situated in an intermediate stage between parataxis and hypotaxis.⁸⁸ The fact that the correlation is expressed by means of identical signifiers arranged in parallel would explain why each of the two parts of the statement is independent. Haudry’s explanation of the processes of inversion and substitution in the original correlative schemes seems in need of a greater basis of support.⁸⁹

On the other hand, Haudry (1973: 179) states categorically that the relative of union does not represent an original use, although the author recognizes that this does not explain the uncertainty about the origin of this use,

by Latin. The thesis is taken up again by Hettrich (1987) and clarified by Ehrenfellner (1996: 306).

85. A similar line of argument is found in the most recent study by Hettrich (1987).

86. According to Leumann (1940: 233), the volition would originally be expressed by way of the mood, not by the presence of *ut*.

87. Eckert (2003: 64–65) puts forward the coincidence in the internal pragmatic distribution (Thema – Rhema – Fokus) of comparative, result, and purpose clauses as support – a little forced on occasion – of the unitary origin of these constructions. See Cabrilla (2006: 410–411).

88. In this regard, the most recent study by Fruyt (2005: 22) explains that “en latin la corrélation est une forme particulière de subordination”.

89. See Viré (1989: 465–466).

and that the only sure thing that can be said is that the theme **kwo-* has never had a meaning of referring back to a previous entity.⁹⁰ The question therefore remains open.⁹¹

Typological arguments⁹² can also provide arguments for or against the controversial relative origin of the subordinator of result and purpose *par excellence*. Thus, it seems clear that the status of the various subordinating elements is not always easy to establish. This fact comes from, or perhaps is rather a consequence of, the nondiscrete nature of these elements. Accordingly, Kortmann (1997: 59, 340) points out specifically that adverbial subordinators are located at the intersection of the two categorical continua: (i) complementizer – adverbial subordinator – relativizer/interrogative, and (ii) adposition – adverbial subordinator – adverb.

What does seem clear is that the gradual transition⁹³ between parataxis and hypotaxis is manifested in some languages in the fact that coordinating connectives can be functionally equivalent to adverbial subordinators. Thus, there exists the case of *-que / et* ('and')⁹⁴ in (57a)–(57b), in which a notion of result or purpose can be seen respectively.

90. On the other hand, the most recent hypothesis of Maurel (2005: 67) defends the relative nature of *ut* in all of its uses.

91. In this regard, see Hettrich (1988: 165–169), Calboli (1995–1996: 142). Mendell (1926: 152) completes his study of *ut* with a skeptical position: “it may very likely never be possible to determine accurately the exact origin of *ut*”.

92. See, among others, Kortmann (1997).

93. See Foley and Van Valin (1984), and Van Valin and LaPolla (1997), who identify the continuum coordination – cosubordination – subordination. See also Lehmann (1988: 185), Cristofaro (2003: 18–20, 22–25).

94. E.g. “He heard an explosion *and* phoned the police” (Kortmann 1997: 62 [emphasis added]). It would be a case of cosubordination or, in Lehmann’s terminology (1988: 185), “clause chaining”. Another example would be the relative “that”, which can evolve and become a complementizer.

- (57) a. Plaut. *Asin.* 421–423: *quoi numquam unam rem me licet semel praecipere furi / quin centiens eadem imperem atque ogganniam, itaque iam hercle / clamore ac stomacho non queo labori suppeditare*
 ‘this fellow, a thief to whom I can never once enjoin a single thing, but that I must command the same things a hundred times, and din them in his ears; *and* so, now, by Hercules, what with bawling and passion, I cannot endure the labor’
- b. Plaut. *Amph.* 1128–1129: *ego Teresiam coniectorem aduocabo et consulam / quid faciundum censeat*
 ‘I will apply to Tiresias the soothsayer, *and* consult him as to what he thinks ought to be done’

If it is a question of specifying the main stages in the above-mentioned syntactic continuum, the typological approach can be useful. Thus, for Ancient Greek, a scale has been proposed (de la Villa 2000: 127) which crosses some of the syntactic types that can code different stages of union of clauses (vertical axis) with the features that characterize clausal dependence (horizontal axis). In a general way, this scale can be adopted in Latin (Table 3). According to this scale, result and purpose clauses can be situated between degrees 4 and 5, depending on their degree of prototypicality.

Table 3. Degrees of clausal syntactic relations and features of dependency

	a	b	c	d
1. Juxtaposition	—	—	—	—
2. With (non)subordinating conj. (<i>enim</i> , <i>nam</i> , etc.)	+	±	—	—
3. Extra-predicational subordination	+	+	—	—
4. Correlation	+	+	±	—
5. Noncomplement subordination	+	+	+	—
6. Complement subordination and restrictive attrib.	+	+	+	+

- a. Marks of morphological dependence exist
 b. Clause requires the presence of another, which acts as its main clause
 c. Clause carries out a function in another
 d. Clause is a necessary complement to the main clause

4.2. Analysis of (formal) features with syntactic implications

4.2.1. *Correlation*

The presence of introductory elements of correlation has been one of the most frequently mentioned features in the distinction between result and purpose clauses. Nevertheless, although they are more frequent in result structures, they do appear in purpose structures with a certain frequency beginning in the archaic period (58)–(59). On the other hand, result clauses do not always show correlative particles (60)–(61).

- (58) Ter. *Eun.* 1005: *nunc id prodeo, ut conueniam Parmenonem*
 ‘now I’m going forward to meet Parmeno’
- (59) Cic. *Phil.* 10,10: *Plancus et ceteri pares: qui id pugnant. id agunt ut contra rempublicam restitui esse uideantur*
 ‘and Plancus, and others like him, who strive with all their hearts, appear to have been restored against the will of the republic’
- (60) Ter. *Haut.* 945–946: *ut eius animum, ... / redigam, ut quo se uortat nesciat*
 ‘(I do so) to bring him down so that he does not know which way to turn himself’
- (61) Liv. 3,44,1: *sequitur aliud in urbe nefas, ... ut non finis solum idem decemuiris qui regibus sed causa etiam eadem imperii amittendi esset*
 ‘this was followed by a second atrocity, so that not only was the end of the decemvirs the same as that of the kings, but it was also the same cause of their losing their power’

Hofmann & Szantyr (1965: 633) speak of the “frequent omission” of the correlative in the main clause in result constructions, although they do not provide statistical data. According to the analysis of 96 result clauses from different periods and authors (see Table 1), this situation occurs in 7.29 % of occasions. In addition, the presence of correlatives in result clauses is a tendency that increases especially in late Christian authors (Herman 1963:

100).⁹⁵ A difference could certainly be adduced between the presence of cor-relatives with result clauses and those with purpose clauses; with purpose clauses the correlative involves a focalization, whereas in the result clauses this focalization is inherent. It is a differentiation that has been diluted over time, and in which the constructions of purpose and result possess elements of distinction that are more or less clear.

In any case, this fact has typological support,⁹⁶ as described by Cuzzolin (1996b: 119–120), who clarifies that only introductory or cataphoric elements can be missing in the case of the structures of result, which he calls (1996b: 108–109) “exophoric”. The prototypical features of this type of clause are: (i) the consequence is a result of an external process and not of a feature $\pm$ static;⁹⁷ (ii) the cause that produces it is efficient and not formal; (iii) the logical relationship between the main clause and the result clause is one of necessity and not of sufficiency; (iv) the temporal relationship is one of subsequence (62).⁹⁸ At any rate, it is not unusual to find – especially in the late period – examples of this type which do not respond to the prototypical characterization made by Cuzzolin of exophoric result clauses. In (63) there does not seem to be, for example, a perceivable logical relationship of necessity between the main and result clause.

- (62) Sen. *dial.* 4,7,2: *nusquam oculi eius flectentur ut non quod indignentur inueniant*⁹⁹
 ‘nowhere will he turn his eyes that he does not find something to move them to indignation’

95. See Section 2.1.

96. See, for Spanish, Álvarez (1999: 3793–3794).

97. In this assumption, the “endophoric” result clause would be found to be less prototypical than the exophoric. The application of prototypicality involves the existence of a continuum between exophoric and endophoric result clauses (Cuzzolin 1996b: 112).

98. In Italian, as in other languages, result clauses prove to be sensitive to the time and aspect of the main verb and to its semantics. Thus, if the predicate of the main clause is, by its nature, telic, the result clause will be equally exophoric, regardless of the tense in which it appears (Cuzzolin 1996b: 137).

99. This example is from Cuzzolin (1996b: 120), who translates it as: ‘i suoi occhi non si volgono da nessuna parte, cosicché non trovino di che indignarsi’.

- (63) Vulg. *Colos. 4,6: sermo uester semper in gratia sale sit conditus ut sciatis quomodo oporteat uos unicuique respondere*
 ‘let your speech always be with grace, seasoned with salt, so that you may know how you ought to answer each one’

4.2.2. *First element of the correlation*

In Cabrillana (1997: 558), a diachronic distribution is shown for the different linguistic items that introduce the correlation in purpose and result clauses – reproduced in Table 4 – created from the data provided by Hofmann & Szantyr (1965: 640–641) and Löfstedt (1928–1933, 1: 263).¹⁰⁰ There it is also clarified that the examples with which Hofmann & Szantyr (1965: 640) try to illustrate the correlations *hoc ... ut* and *id ... ut* in result clauses in the spoken language are nothing other than cases of the so-called explanatory *ut*.

Table 4. First element of correlation in result and purpose clauses

	Result	Purpose
Archaic Latin	<i>ita</i>	<i>ita</i>
	<i>sic</i>	
	<i>adeo</i>	<i>id</i>
	<i>usque adeo</i>	
Classical Latin	Continues:	Continues:
	<i>ita, sic, adeo, usque adeo</i>	<i>id</i>
	New forms:	New forms:
	<i>usque eo, in eo, ab eo, cum eo, tam</i> (only adjectives)	<i>idcirco (ne), quo, ideo</i>
Post-Classical and Late Latin	New forms:	New forms:
	<i>in tantum, pro eo</i>	<i>ad hoc, in hoc</i>
	Accumulations: <i>tam, ...</i>	
	Rare cases: <i>huc usque, illo usque</i>	
Spoken language	<i>hoc ... ut, id ... ut</i>	

100. To these data must be added the introductory elements pointed out by Ernout & Thomas (1953: 343) for purpose clauses: *eo, ob eam rem/causam, eo consilio, ea causa*. In turn, the presence of these introductory elements, plus the conjunction *ut*, would not distinguish them grammatically from the explicative completive developed by the correlative.

The most striking thing about this distribution is that, based on the assumption – held by the majority in the case of result clauses – that the first element of the correlation is lexically explicit, purpose and result clauses exhibit different elements in every case, with the exception of the construction *ita ... ut* in the archaic period. This fact, therefore, becomes a differentiating feature between the two constructions in most of the cases.

On the other hand, *ita* – more frequent than *sic* starting in the classical period¹⁰¹ – gradually displaced *sic* starting in the Imperial period. This fact could be related to the more neutral quality of *ita*. According to Mellet (1998: 533), *ita* simply indicates the conditions for the realization of the process suggested by the governing clause, as well as the consequences of this realization, whereas *sic* would highlight the special way in which the process is realized.¹⁰²

With regard to the formulas *hoc ... ut* or *id ... ut*, Löfstedt (1928–1933, 1: 262–263) adduces a series of examples in which it can be seen that these correlations expanded in the late period especially to clauses with a causal sense, a notion that the typological perspective has indicated as close to the notions of result and purpose, so that in both Classical Latin (*ut*) and Greek (ὥς),¹⁰³ as well as in many of the European languages,¹⁰⁴ the same adverbial subordinator (henceforth AS) can mark the relations of purpose and cause (64)–(65).¹⁰⁵

101. In the work of Cicero, *ita* appears three times as often as *sic* (see Mellet 1998: 533).

102. Nevertheless, the proposal has exceptions. A broader investigation of this point is necessary.

103. See de la Villa (2000: 156).

104. Galán (1999: 3599) affirms that the area of causality covers five different semantic relations: causal (in its pure form), purpose, conditional, concessive, and result. At the same time, he highlights the special proximity of purpose and result clauses, since both would be found in the effect of an action. See also Kortmann (1997: 198–199).

105. This is a use, on the other hand, already announced in Seneca: (*con.* 10,3,10): *an non hoc puella perierit, quod pater illi tam dure responderit?*: ‘can it really be that a girl could die because her father punishes her so severely?’. See Löfstedt (1928: 263).

- (64) Tert. *adv. Marc.* 4,21,2: *ex quibus quicumque fuisset, non utique hoc esset suscitatus, ut alium deum post resurrectionem praedicaret*
 ‘whosoever of all these He might have been, He certainly was not raised up for the purpose of announcing another god after his resurrection’
- (65) Mart. Brac. *ira* 5: *est etiam aliquis, qui hoc occulte loquitur et maligne, ut amicitias dirimat cohaerentes, aut ut certe*
 ‘there is someone who speaks so secretly and maliciously that he breaks up close friendships’

Another possible reason for the lesser semantic restriction of *ut* could be the accumulation of different uses of the conjunction, some dependent on others, which Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 646–647) attribute to the language of common people, and frequently in both the archaic period and in late texts. It is only avoided in Classical Latin (66).

- (66) S.C. *de phil. et rhet.* (Suet. *rhet.* 25): *quod uerba facta sunt de philosophis et <de> rhetoribus, de ea re ita censuerunt, ut N. Pomponius praetor animaduerteret curaretque, ut si ei e republica fideque sua uideretur, uti Romae ne essent*
 ‘as the result of a discussion about philosophers and rhetoricians, the Senate decreed *that* N. Pomponius, the praetor, should take heed and provide, *in whatever way* seemed in accord with the interests of the State and his oath of office, *that* they not be allowed to live in Rome’

In a detailed description of the function of the first element of the correlation, it is also necessary to distinguish whether the intensification carried out by this first element in the result structure is of the entire main clause or a specific constituent.¹⁰⁶ These particularities cannot, logically, occur in purpose clauses if there is no explicit correlation in them, which is the most frequent situation.

106. See Cabrillana (2006: 416–418).

4.2.3. *Introductory element*

As seen above (Section 2.1), the conjunction *ut* is a common element in both of the clausal relations under consideration. This phenomenon is not exclusive to these relations, nor to the Latin language.

Thus, there exist constructions introduced by *ut* which are susceptible to an ambiguous interpretation. The presence of the negation *ut non* – which is in principle “proper” to result clauses compared to the *ne* of purpose clauses – in completive and result clauses may have contributed to the mixture of the two notions.

For completive, purpose, and result clauses, the common feature of “purpose toward which” has been presented.¹⁰⁷ Some classifications (Lavency 1985: 242–243), in fact, speak of *ut* of purpose, completive purpose, result, result completive, etc. The position of Touratier (1994: 644) tends to situate completive and result clauses in functional areas that are very close to each other, turning to arguments of a more syntactic type. The discontinuous signifier “/*ut* ... Subj/” would have the same grammatical meaning in both cases, which would be to indicate syntactic subordination.

In reality, constructions with *ut* depending on impersonals that express notions close to those of “happen” and the innumerable constructions assimilated to the type *est ut* see a broad development over the course of the history of Latin.¹⁰⁸ A clear indication of the completive character is the alternation in constructions with the infinitive as early as Archaic Latin. The same can be said of constructions called *ut*-explicative, explanatory of the main clause or of a pronoun that constitutes part of it (67)–(68).

- (67) Cic. *Att.* 11,22,2: *etiam illud mea magni interest te ut uideam*
 ‘it is of great importance to me that I should see you’

- (68) Plaut. *Merc.* 240–241: *mi illud uideri mirum, ut una illaec capra / uxoris simiai dotem ambederit*
 ‘this seemed extremely surprising to me, that this very she-goat could possibly have eaten the dowry away’

107. See, e.g., the proposals of S. Salor (1993: 176).

108. See Hofmann & Szantyr (1965: 645).

There is no completely convincing reason for considering these clauses to be result clauses.¹⁰⁹ They fulfill the function of a noun and alternate with infinitives. Another reason for coming to this conclusion is their behavior with regard to the use of the tenses of the subjunctive (see Section 4.2.6).

Along the same lines as these facts about functional proximity, the typological study by Kortmann (1997: 134) points out that result and purpose are notions that in reality appear grouped together in the inventory of adverbial subordinators of greater antiquity in the English language by virtue of their common origin: (*swa*): (*swa*) *þæt*(*te*) > (*so*, *such*) *that*. In this way, in languages such as this, the same AS (*so* [*that*]) can introduce both semantic notions. Quirk et al. (1985: 1070) state it this way, as do the lexical inventories of the English language.

This fact is confirmed in many European languages; it is also consistent with the principles that establish the Inverse Relation Hypothesis formulated by Zipf (1949: 66–123, 127–128) and taken up and clearly stated by Croft (1990: 64–94, 156–164). The hypothesis establishes a correlation between morphological complexity, semantic versatility, the age of lexical items, and their frequency of use. According to this hypothesis, there exists a correlation between the form and meaning of the adverbial subordinators, so that the subordinators which are morphologically less complex (e.g. *ut*,¹¹⁰ *cum*, *dum*) present a much lower degree of semantically polyfunctional items, whereas the more complex (the polymorphemic subordinators [e.g. $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, $\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$] or those of more than one word) would be practically limited to the expression of a single semantic notion. In other words, the lower the morphological complexity, the greater the polyfunctionality or the possibility of expression of several notions. Consequently, the morphological type of the adverbial subordinators (mono- or polymorphemic) would determine the semantic functionality.

109. Potůček (2000) comes to the same conclusion.

110. See Mellet (1998). With regard to the polysemy of Latin *ut*, Michel (1995: 234) suggests that the “plasticity” revealed in this conjunction is due to the fact that the primitive link between *ut* and *ita* (ascertainable in the appearance of the archaic adverb *aliuta* only once [see Fest., 5,15/v. *aliuta*, 6M]) is not seen in Classical Latin. This perception would allow *ut* to be available for expressing different circumstances whose notions would end up being contradictory. What has been said to this point is the opinion of Michel. Among other objections one could list the scarce documentary support at hand.

Nevertheless, a different tendency is observed if Classical Latin and Classical Greek are compared – which have more than half (53 %) of their adverbial subordinators with semantic polyfunctionality – to most European languages, in which semantic monofunctionality predominates (66 %).¹¹¹

A separate question is the possibility of the lexical absence of the conjunction itself in some cases, which at times has been classified as examples of paratactic result clauses ((69a)–(69b)) and purpose clauses ((69c)–(69d)) which can exhibit non-unitary structure. The nature of this type of clause has been linked¹¹² to the formal and syntactic origin of result clauses. In sum, the texts do not refer exclusively to an early period of Latin.

- (69) a. Plaut. *Poen.* 323: *ita sunt turpes, credo ecaster Venerem ipsam e fano fugent*
 ‘so ugly are they, by Castor, that I do believe they would drive Venus herself away from the temple’
- b. Cato *agr.* 157,14: *et siquis ulcus taetrum uel recens habebit, hanc brassicam erraticam aqua spargito, opponito; sanum facies. Et si fistula erit, turundam intro trudit. Si turundam non recipiet, diluito, indito in uesicam, eo calamum alligato, ita premito, in fistulam introeat*
 ‘if there is a suppurating or fresh sore, sprinkle this ground wild cabbage with water and apply: you will cure it. In the case of a fistula, squeeze *so that* it is inserted as a pack. If the pack will not stay in, dilute the ground cabbage, put in a bladder, attach a reed, squeeze *so that* it is inserted into the fistula’

111. See Kortmann (1997: 129). I believe that the typological perspective, considered in an isolated fashion, does not take into account other criteria that could prove relevant when determining the variety of semantic notions expressible by a subordinating element. In other words, there is a tendency to excessively simplify the factors that determine the complex network of interclausal semantic relations and their coding.

112. See Tovar (1946: 208–209) and, more recently, Heberlein (2001: 47).

- c. Ter. *Phorm.* 179–180: *nullus es, Geta, nisi iam aliquod tibi consilium celere reperis, / ita nunc inparatum subito tanta te inpendent mala*
 ‘Geta, you are undone, unless you instantly find out some expedient; so suddenly do such mighty evils now threaten me thus unprepared, which I do not know how to shun’
- d. Catull. 66,15–18: *atque parentum / frustrantur falsis gaudia lacrimulis, / ubertim thalami quas intra limina fundunt. / Non, ita me diui, uera gemunt, iuerint*
 ‘and are the parents’ joys turned aside by feigned tears, which they shed copiously within the threshold of the bedchamber. The gods sigh over these questions so that they would not please me’

It is not out of place to consider style and discourse as an additional reason for the use of this type of construction. The paratactic expression of consequence helps the author in some cases to accelerate the narration or description of events. Naturally, the will to provide a change of construction and/or avoid a repetition of the subordinator *ut* could also be present (Sznajder 1987: 296, 300–301). In fact, the repetition of syntactic structures of the same type is not possible in many languages without running into difficulties in comprehension and stylistic peculiarities.¹¹³

In an overall description of the functioning of the AS, it is necessary to consider (i) the position of the clause that contains it with respect to that which codes the main event, and (ii) its location within the clause that expresses the dependent event.

(i) The traditional description and later structuralist postures¹¹⁴ have asserted that the structure of the discourse constitutes a differentiating element between purpose and result clauses. The purpose clause can precede the main clause, but the result clause never can. However, since the initial position of the purpose clause is simply potential, this criterion is not decisive. In the best

113. Even assuming this, Cuzzolin (1996b: 129–130), studying Italian, shows that a restriction exists. In a sequence of result clauses, only the first can be of an endophoric type. The rest must be exophoric.

114. See, among others, Rubio (1982: 313–314).

of cases, it is a “negative distinction”, since in initial position the possibility that it could be a result construction is excluded.

Even taking into consideration the limitations of this criterion, the argumentation offered from a functional-cognitive point of view is significant. It was already put forward by, among others, Haudry (1973: 161).¹¹⁵ In this way, if subordination is understood – Cristofaro (2003: 2) – as a procedure for coding cognitive relations between two events, it is logical that the result clause, considered as a result of the main action, is placed after it. It is a reflection of the attempt to harmonize the logical and grammatical orders, a harmonization that contributes to configuring the direction of processing of the information.

Nevertheless, this circumstance would also tend to operate in the case of the prototypical purpose clauses, and therefore cannot become a universal differentiating criterion.

On the other hand, and with regard to the communicative function of the dependent clause in discourse, research in some languages¹¹⁶ suggests, for the purpose clauses, that initial position implies a thematic function that is developed through its role as a linking element in the communicative chain.¹¹⁷ The reversed position in turn helps to indicate a locally relevant purpose with regard to a type of semantic unity in the independent clause that precedes it (Chafe 1984).

At least in the case of Latin, the question requires a broader investigation in which the level of integration of the clause is taken into account. Thus, for

115. Especially clear in the case of result clauses with a prospective future. With regard to the iconic motivation or correspondence between structure and linguistic meaning, see Haiman (1985: 11). Along the same lines, see Cuzzolin (1996b: 127); for this author, the decisive reason result clauses do not appear in initial position is more a matter of the impossibility of separating the correlative construction that joins the two clauses and which constitutes the mechanism through which a semantic relation of result is expressed.

116. In general, a relationship between the clause that expresses secondary information and its expression as a dependent relationship is accepted, and vice versa: see Bolkestein (1987: 166). As the author points out, this view is not without problems: among others, (i) the difficulty of a clear division between the informative functions which are being resorted to; (ii) the absence of statistical evidence. In fact, languages exist in which there is no incompatibility between the expression of focal information and its coding as a dependent relation (Bolkestein 1987: 168).

117. See Thompson (1985), Panhuis (1984).

example, irrespective of the purpose clauses which do not express the real purpose of the event described by the independent clause,¹¹⁸ cases of initial position exist in which the pragmatic function of the clause is not always easy to assign. Thus, in (70), the position of the purpose clause seems more to obey stylistic factors, such as the desire to avoid a repetition of the conjunction in clauses that are too close, with a different semantic sense. At any rate, there are cases with similar pragmatic characteristics, in which the purpose clause can appear not only at the very beginning of the sequence, but also breaking it up (71)–(72).

- (70) Caes. civ. 1,80,1: *tali dum pugnatur modo, lente atque paulatim proceditur crebroque ut sint auxilio suis subsistunt; ut tum accidit*
 ‘while skirmishes were fought in this manner, they advanced but slowly and gradually, and halting frequently to help their rear, as then happened’
- (71) Liv. 3,30,7: *tribunicia comitia, ne id quoque post bellum ut cetera uanum esset, extemplo habita*
 ‘this agreement might not, like all the others, prove illusory, when once the war was over, the elections for tribunes were held immediately’
- (72) Liv. 3,49,6: *Sp. Oppius, ut auxilio collegae esset, in forum ex altera parte inrumpit*
 ‘Sp. Oppius, to support his colleague, burst into the Forum from the other side’

Furthermore, in cases like these it is very probable that the initial position entails focalization of the purpose clause. Thus, the subject of the main clause refers to a previous topic of discourse: in (71) the need to elect a greater number of tribunes of the *tribuni plebis* in order to avoid the plebs continuing to be unprotected. The temporal chain of events is thus linked together by an element that is already known in part, to which information is added in the second part of the main clause, information that is of less relevance than that contained by the purpose clause itself. In the same way, in (72) the fact that

118. See Section 4.3.

the ally of Spurius Oppius (the already known Apius) needs help is something easily observable in the previous context. What is really new, rather, is that what Oppius does is burst in on exactly the opposite side of an already known forum.

(ii) With regard to the position of the subordinating element itself, the general typological data show relative scope, in light of the following universal: VO language $\Rightarrow$ conjunction + clause // OV language $\Rightarrow$ clause + conjunction. However, counting in favor is the fact that most of the European languages show preference for the initial position for the adverbial subordinator, and even use this position exclusively. Not many studies have considered this question applied to Latin. Ambrosini (1992) notes that the non-initial position of the subordinating element in general is a constant phenomenon in Latin literature. In some authors – and especially in certain poetic genres – this procedure becomes regular usage (Ambrosini 1992: 193). In other words, elements of the subordinate clause itself (purpose or result) can appear before the conjunction that introduces it, and in such cases this element “in conjunctional anastrophe” is or can be focused.

In the two types of clauses that we are concerned with, the subordinating element can be in enclitic position (73)–(74).

- (73) Plaut. *Amph.* 487–490: *pater curauit uno ut fetu fieret, / uno ut labore absoluat aerumnas duas. / et ne in suspicione ponatur stupri / et clandestina ut celetur consuetio*

‘my father will take care that it shall happen in one birth, so that in one travail she may complete her double pangs, (and not be laid under suspicion of unchastity, and that the clandestine connection may remain concealed)’

- (74) Plaut. *Aul.* 591: *sin dormitet ita dormitet, seruom sese ut cogitet*
‘but if he sleeps, let him sleep such that he does not forget that he is a servant’

4.2.4. Nominalization

Depending on the loss of features proper to independent clauses in the different types of subordinates, it is possible to establish a scale of nominalization, showing that the process of subordination goes more or less together with

nominalization. Typologically, the features involved in this scale, according to Lehmann (1988: 200), range from the loss of illocutionary force, typical verbal categories (time, mode, aspect) and conjugation, to verbal nominal government or limitations on objects.

In the case of Ancient Greek (de la Villa 2000: 129), subordinate clauses with a personal verb can show some features that involve a loss of clausal character on a progressive scale: (i) illocutionary force; (ii) absence of illocutionary force but presence of modality; (iii) absence of modality and presence of limited modal and temporal content; (iv) absence of person and number and special government of the subject.

For Latin, the constructions studied here generally stand between groups (ii) and (iii), although it is worth adding a clarification: whereas prototypical purpose clauses can generally be replaced by a constituent of a nonverbal nature, in result clauses this is not possible.¹¹⁹ In addition to the difficulty involved in the conceptual structure of the construction, the basic reason would reside in its special syntactic structure, in which the correlative dyptich prevents the phenomenon of nominalization.¹²⁰

4.2.5. Polarity

A datum that seems to be decisive in the distinction between result and purpose is provided by the negative transformation of these constructions. In Classical Latin, the following distribution is observed: *ut non* (and *quin* = *qui* + *ne*)¹²¹ for negation of result clauses; *ne* for negation of purpose clauses.¹²²

119. See in Section 2.2 the example from Cic. *Tusc.* 4,37, considered by the *ThLL* to be a grammatical hapax: *is est beatus, cui nihil humanarum rerum... intolerabile ad dimittendum animum... uideri potest*: 'he is happy, who cannot consider any of the things that regard mankind as unbearable so as to make him lose heart'.

120. See Cuzzolin (1996b: 130–131) in relation to Italian.

121. *Quin* is a less frequent marker of negation that requires more restrictions than the usual *ut non*, namely the appearance of *tam* in the main clause: Sall. *Iug.* 63,7: *nouus nemo erat tam clarus atque neque tam egregiis factis erat, quin is indignus illo honore et quasi pollutus haberetur*. More examples in Acc. *trag.* 338; Quint. *inst.* 7,1,46, etc.

122. A distribution confirmed by Mellet (1992), who bases the opposition between these two negations on the notion of alterity: whereas *ne* maintains the alterity, *non* eliminates it. Previously, Woodcock (1959: 101) had made note of the possibility that *ut non* (*ut nihil*, etc.) could negate words – not the entire clause – in purpose clauses, or that this negation

Nevertheless, traces of vacillation appear at low frequency, even in Ciceronian prose:¹²³ constructions with *ut ne* in result (75) and purpose (76) expressions.¹²⁴ Comparison with the archaic period provides an explanation.¹²⁵ The following negative conjunctions alternate: *ut non / ne / ut, ne / ut, neque* ((77)–(78)). In inscriptions and literary writings beginning with Columella, in Tacitus, and more frequently in later writers, *ne* is used more regularly than *ut non* for the negation of result clauses (79). For their part, result clauses appear in Late Latin negated with *ut non / ne* ((80)–(81)). The facts reflected here show that the distinction between purpose and result clauses based on the expression of polarity is operative but not in a universal way, and to a lesser extent even in the late period.

- (75) Cic. *ad Brut.* 1,10,5: *sed ita multi labefactant ut ne moueatur interdum extimescam*
 ‘but so many are trying to shake his loyalty that at times I am mortally afraid of his giving way’
- (76) Cic. *Sest.* 53: *lex erat lata uastato ac relicto foro et sicariis seruisque tradito, et ea lex quae ut ne ferretur senatus fuerat ueste mutata*
 ‘a law was passed after the forum had been desolated and abandoned, and given over to assassins and to slaves; a law so as to prevent the passing of which the senate had changed its dress and gone into mourning’
- (77) Plaut. *Asin.* 25–26: *ita me opstinate adgressu’s ut non audeam / profecto percontanti quin promam omnia*
 ‘so determinedly have you accosted me, that I really do not dare otherwise than to disclose everything to you making all these enquiries’

could communicate special emphasis. See also Bassols (1963: 315).

123. See Merguet (1962); Hamp (1982: 118) affirms the existence of the vacillation from Columella onwards. Likewise, *ut ne* appears especially in constructions of a completive type.

124. In the opinion of Touratier (1994: 647), *ne* appears when the result is implicitly or explicitly(?) sought. He also notes the possibility that the result clauses can be negated by *quin* (1994: 647). With regard to the type of negation used and its connotations, see Calboli (1995–1996: 145–147).

125. Likewise, another influence is the fact that in dependence of verbs such as *facio*, *efficio*, etc., the negation *ne* is also found. Concerning this, see Cabrillana (1997: 560).

- (78) Ter. *Phorm.* 768: *ita fugias ne praeter casam*
 ‘so run away as not to run beyond the house’
- (79) Lact. *inst.* 5,13,2: *illi malitia et furore caecantur, ne uideant ...*
 ‘they are so blinded by their malevolence and madness that they do not perceive ...’
- (80) a. Vet. Lat. *Matth.* 6,18: *et faciem tuam laua ut non uidearis hominibus ieiunans*
 b. Vulg. *Matth.* 6,18: *et faciem tuam laua ne uidearis hominibus ieiunans*
 ‘and wash your face, so that you are not seen by men to be fasting’
 c. Aug. *conf.* 5,2,2: *sed fugerunt ut non uiderent te uidentem se*
 ‘but they fled so as not to see that you saw them’
- (81) a. Vulg. *Matth.* 26,41: *uigilate et orate, ut non intretis in tentationem*
 b. Vulg. *Marc.* 14,38: *uigilate et orate, ut non intretis in tentationem*
 ‘watch and pray that you may not undergo the test’
 c. Vulg. *Luc.* 22,40: *orate, ne intretis in tentationem*
 ‘pray that you may not undergo the test’
 d. Vulg. *Luc.* 22,46: *surgite; orate, ne intretis in tentationem*¹²⁶
 ‘get up and pray that you may not undergo the test’

4.2.6. *Verb tense*

The functioning of some verbal categories seems different in principle in the two constructions being studied. Purpose clauses are constructed with the present¹²⁷ and when they depend on a past tense with the imperfect subjunc-

126. There are two further examples of purpose clauses negated with *ut non* in the Gospels (*Matth.* 24,20: *orate autem, ut non fiat fuga uestra hieme uel sabbato* and *Marc.* 13,18: *orate uero, ut hieme non fiat*), and two with *ne*. With regard to (81), it might be supposed that the differences come from the Greek text; but it reads ἵνα μή in (81a, b, and d), but μή in (81c).

127. The implications of the verbal mode for linking the category of tense to the features of possibility and factuality are given in Section 3.2.1.

tive.¹²⁸ Result clauses, on the other hand, do not follow the usual *consecutio temporum*.¹²⁹ More specifically, the anomalies can be reduced to the use of the present subjunctive and present perfect subjunctive, both depending on the past tense.

With regard to the use of the perfect subjunctive, the proposals have basically turned to the following: failing to obey sequence of tenses, absence of chronological approximation between main and subordinate clause, and interruption of narrative discourse (Ronconi 1959: 176–179). These explanations are not completely convincing. Thus there is no absence of chronological approximation nor interruption of discourse in cases such as (82).

- (82) Liv. 1,16,1: *tempestas ... tam denso regem operuit nimbo ut conspectum eius contioni abstulerit*¹³⁰
 ‘a thunderstorm enveloped the king in so dense a cloud that he was quite invisible to the assembly’

As for alternation between the perfect subjunctive and imperfect subjunctive, on the one hand (Ronconi 1959: 178–180), an aspectual distinction has been proposed (perfect: punctual / imperfect: durative); on the other (Woodcock 1959: 122), a modal differentiation (perfect: real action [indicative] / imperfect: mental connection [subjunctive]) is presented. Third, a difference in the type of discourse has been alluded to (perfect [not temporally marked]: *discours*¹³¹ / imperfect [temporally marked]: simple discourse). However, this use was significantly weakened already in the post-classical period, in which the perfect hardly ever appears for stylistic contrast.¹³² For their part, the first two arguments have little scope. In fact, counterexamples can be found, such as (83) and (84) respectively.

128. The formulas *-urus sim / essem* are used occasionally; see, e.g., Kühner & Stegmann (1914: 175), Ernout & Thomas (1953: 394–395, 408).

129. Statistical details can be found in Griffe (1978), later clarified in Cabrilla (1999: 93–96, 104).

130. Similarly Liv. 24,16,1; 25,2,7, etc.

131. In Benveniste's sense; see Griffe (1978: 96–97).

132. As recognized by Griffe (1978: 96–97) himself.

- (83) Liv. 25,6,11–12: *tamen tantum afuit ab eo ut ulla ignominia iis exercitibus quaereretur ut et urbs Roma per eum exercitum qui ab Allia Veios transfugerat reciperaretur, et Caudinae legiones quae sine armis redierant Romam, armatae remissae in Samnium eundem illum hostem sub iugum miserint*
 ‘but so far were those armies from having any humiliation inflicted upon them, that the City of Rome was recovered by the very army which had fled from the Alia to Veii, and the Caudine legions that had returned to Rome without their arms were sent back armed to Samnium, and made the same enemy ... themselves fall under the yoke’
- (84) a. Cic. Att. 6,2,8: *inclusum in curia senatum habuerunt Salaminum ita multos dies ut interierint non nulli fame*
 ‘they kept the senate shut up in the senate-house for so many days that some of them actually perished of hunger’
- b. Cic. Att. 6,1,6: *inclusum in curia senatum Salamine obsederat, ut fame senatores quinque morerentur*
 ‘he had shut up and besieged the senate in the senate-house, so that five senators died of hunger in consequence’¹³³

Other theories appeal to the use of the perfect in order to highlight the impression that a past action still has on the speaker or if there is a change in temporal reference and the moment of the occurrence of the speech act is referred to, not to the past of the verb of the main clause.¹³⁴ The proposed solutions fit only some cases.¹³⁵

Alternative explanations are those that justify the use of the perfect by virtue of (i) the influence of a perfect tense in the main clause and (ii) the possible indicative in a nonsubordinated construction. Examples (84) show the impact of the main verb tense: *habuerunt* → perfect subjunctive *interierint*; *obsederat* pluperfect indicative → imperfect subjunctive *morerentur*. For its

133. The translations of (84a–b) are proposed by Woodcock (1959).

134. See, among others, Kühner & Stegmann (1914: 187–188), Thomas (1940: 365–366), and Segura (1974: 233).

135. See Cabrillana (1999: 99–100), Torrego (1999: 208).

part, the influence of the possible tense in a nondependent clause is exemplified in (85). These proposals have typological, statistical, and textual support.¹³⁶ Thus, for example, it is not unusual to find examples in which the result is articulated in this way ((86)–(87)). What we are trying to show is that the corresponding forms of the indicative mode that appear in the result clause would have been employed. In other words, in the real result clause, subjunctive forms appear that correspond temporally to those of the indicative of the equivalent nonsubordinated clause.

- (85) a. Liv. 22,61,14: *quo in tempore ipso adeo magno animo ciuitas fuit ut consuli ex tanta clade, cuius ipse causa maxima fuisset, redeunti et obuiam itum frequenter ab omnibus ordinibus sit, et gratiae actae quod de republica non desperasset*
 ‘such a lofty spirit did the citizens exhibit in those days that, though the consul was returning from a terrible defeat, for which they knew he was mainly responsible, he was met by a vast concourse drawn from every class of society, and a formal vote of thanks was made to him, because he had not given up on the republic’
- b. Liv. 22,61,14: *quo in tempore ipso, consuli ... redeunti et obuiam itum frequenter ab omnibus ordinibus est, et gratiae actae (sunt) ... : adeo magno animo ciuitas fuit*
 ‘in those days, the consul was met by a vast concourse drawn from every class of society, and a formal vote of thanks was made to him: such a lofty spirit did the citizens exhibit’
- (86) Liv. 1,10,7: *bina postea, inter tot annos, tot bella, opima parta sunt spolia: adeo rara eius fortuna decoris fuit*
 ‘for after so many years have elapsed and so many wars been waged, only twice have the *spolia opima* been offered: so seldom has Fortune granted that glory to men’

136. See Cabrilla (1999: 102–108), Heberlein (2001: 49–52).

- (87) Liv. 24,5,14: *consciorum nemo, cum diu socios consilii torqueretur, aut latuit aut fugit; tantum illis in uirtute ac fide Theodoti fiducia fuit*¹³⁷
 ‘not one of the actual conspirators either concealed himself or sought safety in flight; so great was their confidence in the courage and honor of Theodotus’

Consistent with these approaches is the proposal that the perfect can provide a jump forward in the narration, in accordance with the link between the systems of grammatical aspect and narrative structure. In addition, it must be taken into account that subsequence is an inherent feature of the result clause.¹³⁸ The broad application of these proposals grants them greater explanatory force.

With regard to the use of the present subjunctive in dependence on a past-tense verb, this is a phenomenon that is much less frequent and evidently limited to appearing with verbs depending on perfects with a resultative sense (88) or those required by the context (89).

- (88) Cic. Verr. I 1,12: *quam (prouinciam = Siciliam) iste ... ita uexauit ... ut ea restitui in antiquum statum nullo modo possit*
 ‘which he devastated so effectually that nothing can restore it’
- (89) Cic. ac. 3,6: *in eodem (Lucullo) tanta prudentia fuit ... ut hodie stet Asia Luculli institutis seruandis*
 ‘Lucullus took so great a care that Asia still remains today with its institutions preserved’

The imperfect subjunctive depending on a main clause in the present appears very sporadically and can be explained by the atemporal sense of that present.¹³⁹

137. Other examples: Ter. *Phorm.* 179–180, 282–284; Liv. 2,27,3; 2,45,6; 21,11,1; 2,42,4–5; 2,52,8; Fro. 1, p. 246; Tac. *ann.* 3,22,2, etc. See Section 4.2.2.

138. See Calboli (1995–1996: 140), Torrego (1999: 208–213).

139. The use of the pluperfect is also extremely reduced in the classical period. See Heberlein (2001: 52–53).

In contrast to the problem addressed in the result clauses, it must be pointed out that purpose clauses demonstrate a “model” behavior of adaptation of verbal tenses, with the exception that, since they possess the necessary feature of prospectivity, they do not employ the periphrasis *-urus sim / essem*. This constitutes an indication of the greater syntactic integration of the purpose clauses with regard to the main clause, something that is reduced in the case of result clauses, as has been seen in Section 4.1.

4.3. The syntactic function and the level of integration

Regarding the syntactic function of result and purpose clauses, the relations that subordinate adverbial clauses have in general is decisive. The most purely functional perspective understands that an embedded relationship occurs in the predication attributes to these clauses – in their prototypical form – a function of satellite attached to a nuclear predication.¹⁴⁰ In these cases, the dependent clauses do not provide information external to the development of the state of affairs described in the main clause.

One criterion for verifying this is the behavior of negation (Dik et al. 1990: 55 ff.). Specifically, the Adjuncts of the Predication that are less structurally close to the nucleus of the clause can be affected (90a) or not (90b) by negation. In the latter case, the negative situation expressed by the main clause is realized in the result (because this case involves a consecutive sentence) of the adverbial relation described in the dependent clause.

- (90) a. *Caes. civ. 1,27,2: ne milites oppidum irrumperent, portas obstruit*
 ‘he barricaded the gates in order that the soldiers might not break into the town’

140. See, e.g., Pinkster (1995: 125). For a definition of satellite of predication, see Dik et al. (1990: 28): “Predication satellites capture the lexical means which locate the State of Affairs designated by a predication with respect to spatial, temporal and cognitive dimensions”.

- b. Liv. 1,43,11: *nec fere unquam infra ita descenderent (sc. equites) ut ad infimos peruenirent*
 ‘the voting (of the infantry of the First Class) very seldom decreased so that they never lowered themselves so far that they reached the lowest classes’

A somewhat different approximation is that of the aforementioned typological-functional approach.¹⁴¹ Here, the concept of embedding is not dealt with because, among other reasons, this embedding does not seem to be identical in the case of purpose and result clauses,¹⁴² nor does it occur in the same way in equivalent constructions in similar languages. This fact would considerably reduce its validity in interlinguistic description. Therefore, priority is given to the relation between the ways of perceiving and conceptualizing the two state of affairs (main and dependent) expressed by linked clauses, and the status they have in the context of the discourse.

In spite of this difference in perspective, both functional approaches recognize more specifically that clauses which, among other semantic relations, express purpose – and less clearly if they express result – can appear in different levels. In general, as was said above, they are most frequently located on the predication level. In this case, the dependent state of affairs expresses the purpose of the event of the main or independent state of affairs (91).

- (91) Liv. 1,60,1: *flexit uiam Brutus ... ne obuius fieret*
 ‘Brutus made a circuit in order to avoid meeting him’

In some cases, purpose clauses can appear on the proposition level when the motivation of the main state of affairs is a subjective, nonfactual opinion. The dependent clause would provide information about the degree of truthfulness in the situation described in the independent clause or about the speaker’s subjective evaluation of the situation (92). It would correspond to the Satellite Disjunct of level 3 (σ_3) or Proposition in the model of Dik (1989: 50).¹⁴³

141. See Section 1.

142. See Section 4.1.

143. See also Dik et al. (1990: 28) or Vester (1994: 272): “Proposition satellites capture the lexical means through which the speaker specifies his attitude towards the proposition

- (92) Liv. 7,1,7: *inde ... et ab seditione et a bello quietis rebus, ne quando a metu ac periculis uacarent, pestilentia ingens orta*¹⁴⁴
 ‘afterward when the situation was free from revolts and war, a great plague arose, so that they were never free from fear and dangers’

Finally, it is also possible that disjuncts can be found on the speech act or illocution level. In these cases, the state of affairs that expresses purpose does not correspond to the event of the main state of affairs, but rather it incorporates information relating to the purpose of the message. These are the cases that Pinkster (1995: 43–44) calls “Pseudo-Purpose satellites”, and which are situated on the periphery of the predication as disjuncts (93).¹⁴⁵

- (93) Ter. *Phorm.* 1043–1045: *immo ut meam iam scias sententiam, / neque ego ignosco neque promitto quicquam neque respondeo/ priu’ quam gnatum uidero*
 ‘even more, so that you may now know my determination, I neither forgive nor promise anything, nor give an answer before I have seen my son’

These last constructions exhibit some characteristics of their own compared to prototypical purpose clauses, for example the dependence of clauses in which the verb is not situated in the *facere* sphere, but rather in the *dicere–scire* sphere; the frequent tendency toward initial position of the main clause; or the use of the present subjunctive even if there is a past tense in the main clause.¹⁴⁶ There are also cases of indirect speech in which the imperfect subjunctive appears in the clause introduced by *ut* and a future tense in the main clause (94).

he puts forward for consideration and therefore either explain the subjective epistemic modality of the matrix clause or justify its illocutionary force”.

144. Example from Torrego (2001: 634).

145. In Dik’s (1989: 60) terminology, Satellite of illocution (σ_4). A definition can be seen in Dik et al. (1990: 28): “Illocutionary satellites capture the lexical means through which the speaker modifies the force of the basic illocution of a linguistic expression so as to make it fit his communicative strategy”. For an explanation of the different levels (which have also been called layers) in relation to adverbial clauses, see Hengeveld (1998: 344–347, 413).

146. See Torrego (2001: 635–636).

- (94) Liv. 3,46,3: (*Appius . . . diceret*) *ut iam sciret non id petulantiae suae sed Verginio absenti et patrio nomini et libertati datum, ius eo die se non dicturum neque decretum interpositurum*
 ‘(Appius declared) that, to let him know that it was not to his insolence that he was making a concession, but to the absent Verginius, to the name of father, and to liberty, he would not administer justice on that day, or issue any degree’

The explanation of these characteristics lies, among other reasons, in the fact that they are not syntactically integrated into the nuclear predication and, therefore, they can escape from the *consecutio*. In addition, they are not affected by negation, do not respond to questions of the type “why?”, and cannot be focused.

In principle, and in accordance with Pinkster’s description, it could be thought that the same possibilities exist for relations that express result.¹⁴⁷ However, examples are not infrequent in which a result clause is clearly found on the clause level, although the fact that other semantic relationships appear¹⁴⁸ on this level and in related languages such as Greek¹⁴⁹ would allow us to suppose the possibility to its existence in Latin. Finally, it seems to be expected that result clauses would not be found on the level of the statement or illocution.

According to these data, the level of integration of purpose and result constructions can be outlined as in Table 5.

147. Vester (1994: 273) affirms that, when they are introduced by *ut*, these constructions only accept propositional satellites and therefore describe a propositional content. As additional support, the author offers the classification made by Quirk et al. (1985: 1070–1072): purpose clauses are handled as adjuncts (i.e., satellites of the predication), whereas result clauses are understood as disjuncts of content (i.e., satellites of the proposition). In contrast, Krylová (1997: 77) accounts for the rarity of this construction on the level of the proposition. Among other questions, it must be recognized that different authors do not seem to have the same concept of “proposition”.

148. See, e.g., Pinkster (1995: 44–45) or Núñez (1998: 598) for conditional clauses, and Bolkestein (1989b) or Pinkster (1995: 45) for the causal type.

149. See Pl. *Ap.* 26a, in de la Villa (2000: 149) or Pl. *Ap.* 25e in Crespo, Conti, and Maquieira (2003: 430–431).

Table 5. Integration level of purpose and result clauses

	Extended predication	Proposition	Illocution
Purpose	+	+	+
Result	+	+?	—

By way of conclusion, it can be said that from the semantic and syntactic point of view, distinctive features exist between result and purpose clauses when these possess paradigmatic characteristics. This distinction is obscured in cases in which the semantic-cognitive continuum between the two notions documents the existence of borderline constructions, and it becomes practically impossible as the language changes over time.

References

- Allen, Joseph Henry, and James Bradstreet Greenough
 1903 *A New Latin Grammar*. Boston: Ginn.
- Álvarez, Alfredo I.
 1999 Las construcciones consecutivas. In: Ignacio Bosque and Violeta Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, 3: 3739–3804. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Ambrosini, Riccardo
 1992 La collocazione degli elementi subordinanti in latino. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 77: 173–195.
- Bassols, Mariano
 1963 *Sintaxis latina*, vol. 2. Madrid: CSIC. Repr. 1983.
- Bennett, Charles E.
 1910 *Syntax of Early Latin*, vol. 1. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bodelot, Colette
 1998 *Tempto si, subsisto si...* ou les propositions hypothétiques à sens ‘final’ chez les historiens latins. In: Bruno Bureau and Christian Nicolas (eds.), *Moussyllanea. Mélanges de linguistique et de littérature anciennes offerts à Claude Moussy*, 91–100. Louvain: Peeters.
- Bolkestein, A. Machtelt
 1987 Discourse functions of predications: The background/foreground distinction and tense and voice in Latin main and subordinate clauses. In: Jan Nuyts and Georges de Schutter (eds.), *Getting One's Words in Line: On Word Order and Functional Grammar*, 163–179. Dordrecht: Foris.

- 1989a Parameters in the expression of embedded predications in Latin. In: Gualtierio Calboli (ed.), *Subordination and other topics in Latin*, 3–35. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
 - 1989b Latin sentential complements from a Functional perspective. In: Marius Lavency and Dominique Longrée (eds.), *Actes du Ve Colloque de Linguistique Latine*, 41–52. Louvain: Peeters.
 - 1991 Causally related predications and the choice between parataxis and hypotaxis. In: Robert Coleman (ed.), *New Studies in Latin Linguistics*, 427–449. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Cabrillana, Concepción
- 1997 Partícula introductoria, negación y uso de los tiempos verbales en oraciones consecutivas latinas: Revisión crítica, *Moenia* 3: 541–580.
 - 1998 Evolución en la *consecutio temporum*: La *Historia Francorum*. In: Maurilio Pérez González (coord.), *Actas del II Congreso Hispánico de Latín Medieval*, 1: 287–296. León: Universidad de León.
 - 1999 La *consecutio temporum* en las oraciones consecutivas latinas. In: Empar Espinilla, Pere J. Quetglas, and M. Esperanza Torrego (eds.), *La consecutio temporum latina*, 91–113. Lleida: Universidad de Barcelona.
 - 2006 Especificidad, distribución pragmática y estructuras correlativas: Revisión crítica y propuesta. *Moenia* 11: 409–421.
- Calboli, Gualtierio
- 1994 Le changement des modes verbaux du latin au roman et l'emploi du réfléchi. *Papers on Grammar* 4: 29–63.
 - 1995 La frase consecutiva greca: rapporto con la sua sovraordinata e uso dei modi. In: Pierluigi Cuzzolin (ed.), *Studi di linguistica greca*, 57–72. Milan: Franco Angeli.
 - 1995–1996 The consecutive clause in Latin. *Studi orientali e linguistici* 6: 137–155.
- Chafe, Wallace
- 1984 How people use adverbial clauses. In: Claudia Brugmann and Monica Macaulay (eds.), *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 437–449. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Clinquart, Fabienne, and Isebaert Lambert
- 1984 La théorie de la marque et la syntaxe des consécutives en grec ancien. *Les Études Classiques* 52/4: 301–312.
- Crespo, Emilio
- 1988 La expresión de la finalidad en las subordinadas del griego antiguo. *Revista de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística* 18: 285–298.
- Crespo, Emilio, Luz Conti, and Helena Maquieira
- 2003 Oraciones finales. In: *Sintaxis del griego clásico*, 414–420. Madrid: Gredos.
- Cristofaro, Sonia
- 2003 *Subordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Croft, William
- 1990 *Typology and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Culioli, Antoine
 1991 *Pour une linguistique de l'énonciation: opérations et représentations*, vol. 1. Paris: Ophrys.
- Cuzzolin, Pierluigi
 1996a Some Considerations on the *Verba accidendi*. In: Alfred Bammesberger and Friedrich Heberlein (eds.), *Akten des VIII. Internationalen Kolloquiums zur Lateinischen Linguistik*, 222–232. Heidelberg: Winter.
 1996b La proposizione consecutiva dell'italiano. *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata* 25/1: 103–151.
- de la Villa, Jesús
 2000 La subordinación en Griego antiguo: Análisis y perspectivas. In: Emilio Crespo and M. José Barrios (eds.), *Actas del X Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos*, 1: 117–169. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas.
- Dik, Simon C.
 1989 *The Theory of Functional Grammar*. part 1: *The Structure of the Clause*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Dik, Simon C., Kees Hengeveld, Eline Vester, and Co Vet
 1990 The hierarchical structure of the clause and the typology of adverbial satellites. In: Jan Nuyts, A. Machtelt Bolkestein and Co Vet (eds.), *Layers and Levels of Representation in Language Theory: A Functional View*, 25–70. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Eaton, Helen S.
 1940 *Semantic Frequency List for English, French, German, and Spanish*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Eckert, Gunter
 2003 *Spezifität. Eine Studie zur Unterscheidung von ut [...] ita- und ut [...] sic-Konstruktionen*. Münster: Nodus.
- Ehrenfellner, Ulrike
 1996 Zur semanto-syntaktischen Differenzierung von Final- und Konsekutivsatz. *Historische Sprachforschung* 109: 291–308.
- Elerick, Charles
 1985 Latin relative clause of purpose: Lexical, syntactic and stylistic determinants. In: Christian Touratier (ed.), *Syntaxe et Latin*, 289–305. Aix-en-Provence: Université de Provence – J. Laffitte.
- Ernout, Alfred, and François Thomas
 1953 *Syntaxe Latine*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Foley, William A., and Robert D. Van Valin
 1984 *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fruyt, Michèle
 2005 La corrélation en latin: Définition et description. In: Paulo de Carvalho and Frédéric Lambert (eds.), *Structures parallèles et corrélation en grec et en latin*, 17–44. Saint-Étienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Étienne.

Galán, Carmen

- 1999 La subordinación causal y final. In: Ignacio Bosque and Violeta Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, 3: 3597–3642. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.

Gildersleeve, Basil L.

- 1883 On the final sentence in Greek. *American Journal of Philology* 4: 416–444.

Griffe, Michel

- 1978 Statistique linguistique et syntaxe latine: L'imparfait et le parfait du subjonctif dans les consécutives. *Langages* 12: 87–97.
- 1985 VT: adverbe ou conjonction? In: Christian Touratier (ed.), *Syntaxe et Latin*, 429–452. Aix-en-Provence: Université de Provence – J. Laffitte.
- 1996 L'oralité dans les *Miracles de saint Étienne*, un test: L'étude de la subordination par *ut*. In: Jacqueline Dangel and Claude Moussy (eds.), *Les structures de l'oralité en latin*, 119–130. Paris: Université de Paris IV.

Haiman, John

- 1985 *Natural Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hamp, Eric P.

- 1982 Latin *ut/ne* – and *ut* (... *nōn*), *Glotta* 60: 115–120.

Harris, Martin B.

- 1974 The subjunctive mood as a changing category in Romance. In: James M. Anderson and Charles Jones (eds.), *Historical Linguistics*, 1: 169–188. Amsterdam: North Holland.

Haudry, Jean

- 1973 Parataxe, hypotaxe et corrélation dans la phrase latine. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 68: 147–186.

Heberlein, Friedrich

- 2001 Zur Entwicklung des lateinischen Konsekutivsatzes. *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 41: 41–54.
- 2002 Die lateinischen Konsekutivesätze auf der Satzverbindungshierarchie. In: A. Machtelt Bolkestein, Caroline H. M. Kroon, Harm Pinkster, H. Wim Remmelink, and Rodie Risselada (eds.), *Theory and Description in Latin Linguistics*, 169–182. Amsterdam: Gieben.

Hengeveld, Kees

- 1998 Adverbial clauses in the languages of Europe. In: Johan van der Auwera (ed.), *Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe*, 335–419. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Herman, Józef

- 1963 *La formation du système roman des conjonctions de subordination*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Hettrich, Heinrich

- 1987 Zur Entwicklung der Finalsätze altindogermanischer Sprachen, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 100: 219–237.
- 1988 *Untersuchungen zur Hypotaxe im Vedischen*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.

- Hofmann, Joseph, and Anton Szantyr
 1965 *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, vol. 2. München: Beck.
- Kortmann, Bernd
 1997 *Adverbial Subordination: A Typology and History of Adverbial Subordinators Based on European Languages*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kroll, Wilhelm
 1925 *Die wissenschaftliche Syntax im lateinischen Unterricht*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Krylová, Barbora
 1997 Comparison between Greek and Latin consecutive clauses. *Graecolatina Pragensia* 15: 73–98.
- Kühner, Raphael, and Carl Stegmann
 1914 *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, vol. 2. München: Max Hueber.
- Lavency, Marius
 1985 *VSVS Grammaire latine: Description du latin classique en vue de la lecture des auteurs*. Paris: Duculot.
- Lehmann, Christian
 1988 Towards a typology of clause linkage. In: John Haiman and Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*, 181–225. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Leumann, Manu
 1940 Zur Vorgeschichte der lat. Finalsätze mit *ut*. In: *Mélanges de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes, offerts à A. Ernout*, 231–235. Paris: Klincksieck.
 1977 *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. München: Beck.
- Löfstedt, Einar
 1911 *Philologischer Kommentar zur "Peregrinatio Aetheriae": Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
 1917 *Arnobiana: Textkritische und sprachliche Studien zu A. Lund*: Gleerup.
 1928–1933 *Syntactica: Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins*. 2 vols. Lund: Gleerup.
- Lundström, Sven
 1943 Studien zur lateinischen Irenäusübersetzung, Diss. Lund: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. *Studia Latina Upsaliensia* 18.
- Maltby, Robert
 2002 Gerund and gerundive usage in Isidore of Seville. In: A. Machtelt Bolkestein, Caroline H. M. Kroon, Harm Pinkster, H. Wim Rammelink, and Rodie Riselada (eds.), *Theory and Description in Latin Linguistics*, 219–233. Amsterdam: Gieben.
- Maurais, Jacques
 1980 Les relatives finales du latin. In: Jean-Benoît Caron, Michel Fortin, and Gilles Maloney (eds.), *Mélanges d'études anciennes offerts à Maurice Lebel*, 231–240. Québec: Éditions du Sphinx.

- Maurel, Jean-Pierre
 2005 VT comme (co-)relatif. In: Paulo de Carvalho and Frédéric Lambert (eds.), *Structures parallèles et corrélation en grec et en latin*, 63–74. Saint-Étienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Étienne.
- Meillet, Antoine, and Joseph Vendryes
 1924 *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*. Paris: Champion.
- Mellet, Sylvie
 1992 L'alternance *ne/non* en latin classique. *L'Information Grammaticale* 55: 28–31.
 1998 *Ita ... ut, sic ... ut*: polysémie et synonymie? In: Benjamín García-Hernández (ed.), *Estudios de lingüística latina*, 1: 529–540. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas.
- Mendell, Clarence W.
 1926 *Ut* Clauses: Part II. *American Journal of Philology* 47: 124–152.
- Merguet, Hugo
 1962 *Lexicon zu den Reden des Cicero*, vol. 4. Hildesheim: Olms.
- Michel, Jacques-Henri
 1989 L'ambiguïté sémantique dans la syntaxe de la phrase complexe en Latin. In: Marius Lavency and Dominique Longrée (eds.), *Actes du Ve Colloque de Linguistique latine*, 279–284. Louvain: Peeters.
 1995 Observations de méthode à propos d'*ut* consécutif. In: Dominique Longrée (ed.), *De Vsu: Études de syntaxe latine offertes en hommage à Marius Lavency*, 229–236. Leuven: Peeters.
- Milani, Paolo
 1999 Alcune osservazioni sul sistema delle subordinate consecutive in greco antico, *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti* 157: 155–165.
- Molinelli, Piera
 1998 The evolution of subjunctive (mood and tenses) in subordinate clauses from Latin to Romance. In: Benjamín García-Hernández (ed.), *Estudios de lingüística latina*, 2: 555–570. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu
 1973 Purpose or result? ὥστε in Biblical Greek. *Novum Testamentum* 15: 205–219.
- Núñez, Salvador
 1998 Los enunciados condicionales 'procausales' en latín. In: Benjamín García-Hernández (ed.), *Estudios de lingüística latina*, 1: 597–612. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas.
- Panhuis Dirk G. J.
 1984 Prolepsis in Greek as a Discourse Strategy. *Glotta* 62: 26–39.
- Perret, Jean
 1958 *Le verbe latin*. Paris: Centre de Documentation Universitaire.
- Pinkster, Harm
 1995 *Sintaxis y Semántica del Latín*. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas.
- Pisani, Vittore
 1948 *Grammatica latina, storica e comparativa*. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.

- Potůček, Petr
2000 Some syntactic and textual aspects of existence, possibility, and occurrence in Latin. *Listy Filologiae* 123, 1/2: 1–11.
- Prandi, Michele
1996 I costrutti finali. *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata* 25: 67–101.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik
1985 *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Ronconi, Alessandro
1959 *Il verbo latino: Problemi di sintassi storica*. Florence: Felice Le Monnier.
- Rosén, Hannah
1989 General subordinators and sentence compliments. In: Gualtiero Calboli (ed.), *Subordination and Other Topics in Latin*, 197–217. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Rubio, Lisardo
1982 *Introducción a la sintaxis estructural del latín*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- S. Salor, Eustaquio
1993 *Semántica y Sintaxis: La oración compuesta latina*. Cáceres: Universidad de Extremadura.
- Scherer, Anton
1975 *Handbuch der lateinischen Syntax*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Segura, Bartolomé
1974 *La consecutio temporum: una posibilidad de relación temporal*. *Estudios Clásicos* 72: 205–233.
- Sznajder, Lyliane
1987 Un procédé d'art chez César: les complétives paratactiques. In: Sylvie Mellet (ed.), *Études de linguistique générale et de linguistique latine offerts en hommage à Guy Serbat*, 293–306. Paris: Société pour l'Information Gramaticale.
- Thomas, François
1940 Sur les débuts de la proposition consécutive en latin. In: *Mélanges de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes, offerts à A. Ernout*, 355–368. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Thompson, Sandra A.
1985 Grammar and written discourse: Initial vs. final purpose clauses in English. *Text* 5, 1/2: 55–84.
- Torrego, M. Esperanza
1988 Variantes conjuncionales para la expresión de la finalidad en las oraciones subordinadas latinas. *Revista de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística* 18: 317–329.
1999 Algunas reflexiones sobre la CT. In: Empar Espinilla, Pere J. Quetglas, and M. Esperanza Torrego (eds.), *La consecutio temporum latina*, 189–217. Lleida: Universidad de Barcelona.
2001 Typologie sémantique des propositions finales latines. In: Claude Moussy (ed.), *De lingua Latina novae quaestiones*, 626–639. Leuven: Peeters.

Touratier, Christian

1982 Valeurs et fonctionnement du subjonctif latin II. *Revue des Études Latines* 60: 313–335.

1994 *Syntaxe Latine*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.

Tovar, Antonio

1946 *Gramática histórica latina: Sintaxis*, 208–210. Madrid: Afrodísio Aguado.

1975 Pre-Indoeuropeans, Pre-Celts, and Celts in the Hispanic Peninsula. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 34: 11–23.

Väänänen, Veikko

1979 *Introducción al latín vulgar*. Madrid: Gredos.

1987 *Le Journal-Épître d'Égérie (Itinerarium Egeriae): Étude linguistique*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia.

Van de Griend, Margreet E.

1989 Pseudo-conditionals in Latin. In: Marius Lavency and Dominique Longrée (eds.), *Actes du Ve Colloque de Linguistique latine*, 447–455. Louvain: Peeters.

Van Valin, Robert D., and Randy J. LaPolla

1997 *Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vester, Eline

1994 The internal structure of adverbial *ut*-clauses. In: Joseph Herman (ed.), *Linguistic Studies on Latin*, 269–279. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Viré, Ghislaine

1989 Structuration du latin et formalisation: Les propositions subordonnées. In: Marius Lavency and Dominique Longrée (eds.), *Actes du Ve Colloque de Linguistique latine*, 457–468. Louvain: Peeters.

Wakker, Gerry C.

1994 *Condition and Conditionals: An Investigation of Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam: Gieben.

Wanner, Dieter

1995 Le subjonctif de subordination en latin vulgaire: Questions indirectes et adverbiales temporelles. In: Louis Callebat (ed.), *Latin vulgaire – Latin tardif IV*, 249–280. Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann.

Woodcock, Charles Edward

1959 *A New Latin Syntax*. Bristol: Classical Press.

Zipf, George Kingsley

1949 *Human Behaviour and the Principle of Least Effort*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.