Agentivity and possession in Latin: The "dative of agent"

Jaume Mateu
(Centre de Lingüística Teòrica-Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)
jaume.mateu@uab.cat

Abstract
In this paper I analyze the different syntactic distribution and structural semantics of so-called "ablatives of agent" and "datives of agent" in Latin. As for their semantics, my proposal is that the agentivity that can be expressed by a nominal phrase in the nominative case (in the active voice) and by an *ab*-phrase in the ablative case (in the passive voice) is provided by grammar (see Kratzer [1996], i.a.). In contrast, the agentive interpretation of "datives of agent" is conceptual but is syntactically determined in the sense that, unlike ablatives of agent, "datives of agent" are not licensed in non-verbal contexts: i.e. in spite of what is often assumed in Latin grammars, these datives are not to be analyzed as depending directly on adjectival participles nor on verbal adjectives in -*nd*-/gerundives but rather on the verb *esse* 'to be' (Suárez-Martínez 2001). In agreement with this syntactic fact, I argue that the structural semantics associated to these datives is not agentivity but rather possession, which will lead me to review some relevant structural parallelisms between the so-called "dative of possession" (aka "dative with *sum*") and "dative of agent". All in all, the present study of "datives of agent" offers a nice piece of evidence for the important distinction between grammatical vs. conceptual meaning.

Outline
1. On the syntactic expression of agentivity in Latin. Ablatives of agent vs. "datives of agent"
2. "Datives of agent": conceptual agentivity vs. structural possession
3. Apparent examples of "datives of agent"
4. On the different analysis of ablatives of agent and "datives of agent" in participial and gerundival constructions
5. Concluding remarks

1. On the syntactic expression of agentivity in Latin. Ablatives of agent vs. "datives of agent"

It is often pointed out in Latin grammars that the semantic notion of agentivity can be expressed in the nominative case (e.g. *C. Caesar* in [1]), in an *a/ab*-prepositional phrase with a noun in the ablative case (e.g. *ab istis civitatibus* in [2]), and in the dative case (e.g. *mihi* in [3]).[1]

---

[1] Some Latin grammars also include the *per*-phrase with a noun in the accusative case as another possible expression of agentivity (e.g. cf. Ernout and Thomas [1953: 207], Hofmann and Szantyr [1965: 240], Molina-Yévenes [1996: 181], and Pinkster [2015: 249-250]). However, see Baños (2021: 377-378) for the plausible claim that examples like (i) and (ii) can be taken as evidence for the proposal that *ab*-phrases are agents, whereas *per*-phrases are better to be regarded as intermediaries. See also Santos-Guzmán (2001) for further discussion on the alleged agentive meaning of *per* expressions.
(i) a. **Caesar** postquam **per Ubios exploratores** *comperit* Suebos se in silvas recepisse (...)
        (Caes. Gall. 6, 29, 1)
        'Caesar, after he discovered through the Ubian scouts that the Suevi had retired into their woods (...)' (Perseus site)
     b. praeter hasce insidias Habito **ab Oppianico per Fabricium** *factas*
        (Cic. Cluent. 62)
        'except these plots which were laid against Habitus by Oppianicus, through the instrumentality of the Fabricii?' (C. D. Yonge, 1856, Perseus site)
(ii) Quid ais? Volgo *occidebantur*? **Per quos** et **a quibus**? (Cic. S. Rosc. 80)
     'What do you say? Men were constantly being killed? By whose agency? and by whom?' (C. D. Yonge, 1903, Perseus site)

(1) **C. Caesar** (...)   bellum   contra Antonium   sua
     C. Caesar.NOM.SG   war.ACC.SG   against Antonius.ACC   REFL.ABL.F.SG
     sponte   *suscepit.*   (Cic. Phil. 8, 5)
     accord.ABL.F.SG   undertake.PERFV.3SG
     'Caius Caesar (...) undertook war against Antonius of his own accord.' (C. D. Yonge, 1903, Perseus site)

(2) bellum   **ab istis**   **civitatibus** cum populo   Romano
     war.ACC.N.SG   by this.ABL.PL   city.ABL.PL   with people.ABL.SG   Roman.ABL.SG
     esse   susceptum.   (Cic. Flacc. 58)
     be.INF   undertake.PERF.PTCP.ACC.N.SG
     '(...) war was undertaken by those cities against the Roman people.' (C. D. Yonge, 1856, Perseus site)

(3) qua   re   **mihi**   cum perditis   civibus
     REL.ABL.SG   thing.ABL.SG   me.DAT with   wicked.ABL.PL citizen.ABL.PL
     aeternum   bellum   *susceptum*   *esse*
     eternal.ACC.N.SG   war.ACC.N.SG   undertake.PERF.PTCP.ACC.N.SG be.INF
     video.   (Cic. Catil. 4, 22)
     see.PRES.1SG
     'So that I see that an eternal war with all wicked citizens has been undertaken by me.' (C. D. Yonge, 1856, Perseus site)

The appearance of the so-called "dative of agent" (aka *dativus auctoris*) in participial constructions like (3) has been said to be typically restricted to those verbal predicates whose agent/experiencer can be claimed to coincide with the beneficiary of the action/state (e.g. see Kühner & Stegmann [1912, II, 1: 324-325] for this claim).[2]

---

[2] Serbat (1996: 502) criticizes Kühner & Stegmann's (1912, II 1: 324-325) observation that datives like the one in (3) express both the agent (Germ. «Urheber») and the beneficiary/maleficiary: "Il nous semble que c'est confondre le message linguistique et son interprétation dans une situation donnée (...) Il est vrai que l'interprétation exacte du D[atif] est parfois délicate, surtout avec un verbe qui peut être suivi de la mention d'un bénéficiaire, comme *emere* ['to buy'] ou *comparare* ['to prepare']. Dans Cic., *Cat.* III 27, *praesidium mihi comparatum est*, faut-il comprendre «une protection m'a été procurée»; ou «la mise en place d'une défense est, pour moi, chose faite»? Le contexte montre que la deuxième interprétation est la bonne".
    See also Ernout & Thomas (1964: 74): "Datif complément du participe passé passif (adjectif en -*to*-): (…) Aussi le datif fut-il tout d'abord limité au perfectum passif, en particulier aux formes *auditus* ['heard'], *cognitus* ['known'], *compertus* ['discovered'], *exploratus* ['explored'], *inventus* ['found'], *conductus* ['led'], *emptus* ['bought'], *susceptus* ['undertaken']; *decretum* ['decided'], *deliberatum* ['deliberated'], *institutum* ['established'], *perspectum* ['seen through'], etc.".
    For reasons of space, the subsequent influence of Greek on the extension of the "dative of agent" to *infectum* forms is not dealt with here (see Brenous 1895/1965; Mariani 2002; Calboli 2009: 98-100; i.a.). For example, Brenous includes the typical example in (i), which is found in many Latin grammars, among the uses that can be traced back to Greek.
(i) ne=que   *cernitur*   **ulli**.   (Verg. Aen. 1, 440)
     not=and   distinguish.PRES.PASS.3SG   somebody.DAT.SG
     'nor is he seen by anybody.'

The more frequent and by far less restrictive instantiations of "datives of agent" are found in constructions with verbal adjectives in *-nd-* (aka "gerundives" or, somewhat misleadingly, "future passive participles") like (4).

(4) is   **sibi**   nefarium   bellum   contra
     this.NOM.M.SG himself.DAT   nefarious.ACC.N.SG   war.ACC.N.SG   against
     patriam   *suscipiendum*   putaret? (Cic. Sul. 58)
     country.ACC.F.SG undertake.GERNDV.ACC.N.SG   think.IMPF.SUBJV.3SG
     'he (...) should think it possible himself to undertake a nefarious war against his country?' (C. D. Yonge, 1856, Perseus site)

The use of ablatives of agent in gerundi(v)al constructions is often said to be related to stylistic factors: e.g. to avoid ambiguity (e.g. see [5]) or to maintain a parallelism (e.g. see [6]). Still, as pointed out by many authors (e.g. Suárez-Martínez [2001] and Santos-Guzmán [2004], i.a.), there are examples like (7) that cannot be explained this way.

(5) Aguntur   bona   multorum   civium   *quibus*
     act.PRES.PASS.3PL   good.NOM.N.PL   many.GEN.PL   citizen.GEN.PL   REL.DAT.PL
     est   **a**   **vobis**   et   ipsorum   causa   et
     be.PRES.3SG   by   you.ABL.PL   and   own.GEN.PL   sake.ABL.SG and
     rei publicae   *consulendum.*   (Cic. Manil. 6)
     republic.GEN.SG   take_care.GERND(V).NOM.N.SG
     'The property of many citizens is at stake, which you ought greatly to regard, both for your own sake, and for that of the republic.' (C. D. Yonge, 1856, Perseus)

(6) Nec,   si   *a*   *populo*   *praeteritus*   *est*
     nor   if   by   people.ABL.SG pass_over.PERF.PTCP.NOM.M.SG   is
     quem   non oportuit,   **a**   **iudicibus**
     REL.PR.ACC.M.SG   not be_necessary.PERFV.3SG   by   judge.ABL.PL
     condemnandus   *est* qui   *praeteritus*
     condemn.GERNDV.NOM.M.SG   is   REL.NOM.SG   pass_over.PERF.PTCP.NOM.M.SG
     non   est.   (Cic. Planc. 8)
     not   is
     'And it does not follow because a man has been passed over by the people who ought not to have been, that he who has not been passed over is to be condemned by the judges.' (C. D. Yonge, 1891, Perseus site)

(7) Sed   tamen   et   Crassus   **a**   **consulibus**   meam
     but   still   and   Crassus.NOM.SG   by   consul.ABL.PL   my.ACC.F.SG
     causam   *suscipiendam*   *esse*   dicebat. (Cic. Sest. 41)
     cause.ACC.F.SG   undertake.GERNDV.ACC.F.SG be.INF   say.IMPF.3SG
     'But still Crassus said that my cause ought to be undertaken by the consuls.' (C. D. Yonge, 1891, Perseus site)

When dealing with how agents are expressed in gerundival constructions, Pinkster (2015: 297) points out that "the *ab* expression is much less frequent than the dative (in Cicero's orations twenty-three instances as against 457 datives according to Lebreton 1901: 412–414) … There is no semantic difference between the two expressions".[3]

As for the different syntactic distribution of ablatives of agent and "datives of agent", it is important to point out that, besides appearing in verbal contexts (e.g. see [2]), the former can also be found in non-verbal contexts like (8). In contrast, the latter are only to be found in verbal contexts (e.g. see [3]), whereby the ablative of agent *a me* in (8) could not be replaced by *mihi* on the relevant dative-of-agent reading.

(8) Haec   ad te   scripsi   liberius
     this.ACC.N.PL   to you.ACC.SG write.PERFV.1SG   frankly.COMP.ADV
     fretus   conscientia   offici   mei
     trusting_to.NOM.SG knowledge.ABL.F.SG   duty.GEN.SG   my.GEN.SG
     benevolentiae=que,   quam   **a**   **me**   certo
     goodwill.GEN.F.SG=and   REL.ACC.F.SG by   me.ABL.SG   determined.ABL.N.SG
     iudicio   *susceptam*,   quoad   tu
     judgement.ABL.N.SG undertake.PERF.PTCP.ACC.F.SG   so_long   you.NOM.SG
     voles,   conservabo.   (Cic. fam. 3,7,6)
     wish.FUT.2SG   preserve.FUT.1SG
     'I have written to you rather frankly, confident in the knowledge of my own sense of duty and goodwill, an attitude which, as I have adopted it of deliberate choice, I shall mantain so long as you wish.' (Jon Hall, 2009, OUP).

---

[3] Similarly, Risselada (1993: 179; fn. 14) points out that "[i]n a small number of cases the regular passive agent expression (*a/ab* plus ablative case form) is used, for instance when the utterance includes another dative case form which could cause confusion <e.g. see [5]: JM>. There seems to be no difference between the two types of agent expression".

On the other hand, Bolkestein (1980, 2001) and Santos-Guzmán (2004) claim that there *is* a semantic difference between (ia) and (ib): i.e. according to them, *a me* in (ib) expresses an Agent, whereas *mihi* in (ia) encodes an Experiencer. As shown below, I agree with them that there is a semantic difference between (ia) and (ib) but I claim that the relevant semantic function assigned to *mihi* in (ia) is not Experiencer but rather Possessor: see below for the parallelism between "datives of agent" and "datives of possession", which is also acknowledged by Bauer (2000), Bolkestein (2001), and Suárez-Martínez (2001), i.a. See also Bolkestein (2001: 276) for the claim that in (ia) "the predication is existential, and what is predicated to exist is a relation between a potential action and a human Experiencer participant".

(i) a. Mater   **mihi**   *laudanda*   *est*.
         mother.NOM.F.SG   me.DAT   praise.GERNDV.NOM.F.SG   is
         'I have to praise my mother.'
     b. Mater   **a me**   *laudanda*   *est*.
         mother.NOM.F.SG   by me.ABL   praise.GERNDV.NOM.F.SG   is
         'My mother has to be praised by me.'

Similarly, unlike "datives of agent", ablatives of agent can be found in non-verbal contexts like in a so-called "dominant participle" (aka *ab urbe condita*) construction (e.g. see [9]). For example, the dative *Lucio Bruto* in *post civitatem Lucio Bruto*_{DAT} *liberatam* could be interpreted as a beneficiary but not as a "dative of agent".[4]

(9) post   civitatem   **a Lucio   Bruto**   *liberatam*
     after   city.ACC.F.SG   by Lucius.ABL.SG Brutus.ABL.SG free.PERF.PTCP.ACC.F.SG
     'after the liberation of the city by Lucius Brutus' (lit. 'after the city liberated by
     L. B.')   (Cic. Phil. 5,17)

It should be noted that Vester's and Bolkestein's intuitions on the ungrammaticality of (10) are not correct (at least if we take Cicero's works into account), since, as was shown by Audouin (1887), some examples with this very same structural pattern can be found in Cicero: e.g. see (11).

(10) de   militibus   *laudandis*   (***a   duce***)   loquuntur.
      about   soldier.ABL.PL praise.GERNDV.ABL.PL by   chief.ABL.SG talk.PRES.3PL
      'They speak about the praising of the soldiers by the chief.'
                                            Vester (1991: 303-304), after Bolkestein (1986: 7)

(11) a.   De   provinciis   **ab   iis**   qui
           about   province.ABL.F.PL by   this.ABL.M.PL REL.NOM.M.PL
           obtinerent   *retinendis*…   (Cic. fam. 12, 22, 1).
           obtain.IMPF.SUBJV.3PL retain.GERNDV.ABL.F.PL
           'On the retention of provinces by those who would obtain them…'
      b.   De   mercenariis   testibus   **a   suis**
           about   mercernary.ABL.M.PL witness.ABL.M.PL   by   REFL.ABL.F.PL
           civitatibus *notandis*…   (Cic. fam. 3, 11, 3)
           city.ABL.F.PL   notice.GERNDV.ABL.M.PL
           'That the hired witnesses must have been noticed by their countrymen'
           (Baldi 1981: 22)

Cf. the well-formedness of (11a) with the ill-formedness of **De provinciis iis*_{DAT} *qui obtinerent retinendis* (*on the relevant dative-of-agent reading of *iis*). The two examples in (11) are interesting since they involve a gerundive in a passive context but a "dative of agent" is not licensed in this non-verbal context. One could object that an alleged example like **De provinciis iis qui obtinerent retinendis* is to be avoided due to

---

[4] As expected, the same happens when dealing with Ablative Absolute constructions (e.g. see [i]), which can be regarded as a particular case of a dominant participle construction (see Pinkster [1990: 132]). In an Ablative Absolute like *Commisso equitibus*_{DAT} *proelio*, the dative *equitibus* could not be interpreted as an agent (cf. *ab equitibus* in [i]) but rather as a beneficiary ('for the cavalry').

(i) *Commisso*   **ab equitibus**   proelio, ...   (Caes. Gall. 1, 41).
     commence.PERF.PTCP.ABL.N.SG by cavalry.ABL.PL battle.ABL.N.SG
     'Once the battle was commenced by the cavalry…'

ambiguity/processing reasons: e.g. the dative *iis* could turn out to be interpreted as associated to the ablative *provinciis*. However, I think that such a functionalist explanation, which is, by the way, the one provided by Baldi (1983: 21-22),[5] is wrong and does not account for the <u>structural</u> constraint I am dealing with here: an example like *De provincia*_{ABL.SG} *iis*_{DAT.PL} *qui obtinerent retinenda*_{ABL.SG}, where there is no such ambiguity nor any "perceptual muddle" is involved, would also be ill-formed on the dative-of-agent reading of *iis* due to the following structural/syntactic reason: namely, "datives of agent" are not licensed in non-verbal contexts.[6]

The same structural constraint applies to perfect participles. As in (11), only ablatives of agent are expected to be possible in non-verbal contexts like (12):

(12) Atque ut   aliquando   de   rebus   **ab   isto**
      and   that finally   about thing.ABL.F.PL by   this.ABL.SG
      cognitis   *iudicatis*=que   et de
      know.PERF.PTCP.ABL.F.PL   judge.PERF.PTCP.ABL.F.PL=and and about
      iudiciis   *datis*   dicere desistamus.
      decision.ABL.N.PL give.PERF.PTCP.ABL.N.PL say.INF desist.PRES.SUBJV.1PL
                                                      (Cic. Verr. 2, 2, 118).
      'And that we may at last give up speaking of the investigations made, and the judicial proceedings conducted, and of the decisions given by that man.' (C. D. Yonge, 1903, Perseus site)

One could claim that the following examples in (13) and (14) do show that a "dative of agent" can appear in a context that lacks a verb. However, these subordinate contexts can be claimed to involve an (otherwise typically) elliptical verbal form depending on the main verb *putare* 'think': cf. [*esse*] below.

(13) is   **sibi**   nefarium   bellum   contra
      this.NOM.SG   himself.DAT   nefarious.ACC.N.SG   war.ACC.N.SG   against
      patriam   *suscipiendum*   [*esse*]
      country.ACC.F.SG undertake.GERNDV.ACC.N.SG be.INF
      putaret?   (Cic. Sul. 58)
      think.IMPF.SUBJV.3SG
      'he (...) should think it possible himself to undertake a nefarious war against his country?' (C. D. Yonge, 1856, Perseus site)

---

[5] See the following quote from Baldi (1981: 22): "If the more familiar dative of agent were used here, the resulting surface structure would be a perceptual muddle, viz.: **De mercenariis testibus suis civitatibus notandis*. However we choose to theorize our syntactic framework, we must have some functional mechanism for blocking such sentences from occurring in Latin. Since it is the surface confusion of cases and the parsing and decoding difficulties brought about by this confusion, we should place the burden on the surface morphological form of the sentence".

[6] Accordingly, the dative *iis* could only be licensed as a beneficiary in that sentence (i.e. '*for* those ones who…').

(14) Consilii   nostri   (...) **nobis** *paenitendum*   [*esse*]
     policy.GEN.N.SG our.GEN.N.SG   us.DAT repent.GERNDV.ACC.N.SG be.INF
     putarem.   (Cic. fam. 9.5.2).
     think.IMPF.SUBJV.1SG
     'I would think that we ought to repent of our policy.'

2. "Datives of agent": conceptual agentivity vs. structural possession

The relevant diathetic opposition between *mihi esse* 'me_DAT be' and *habere* 'have' (cf. the famous Benveniste-Freeze-Kayne line of thought) applies not only to the "dative of possession" (aka "dative with *sum*"), but also to the "dative of agent": e.g. cf. (15) and (17a), on the one hand, and (16) and (17b), on the other, which can be taken as evidence for the structural parallelism between these two datives.[7] Examples like (15) and (16) involve adjectival resultative participles (see Section 4 for their analysis).[8]

(15) praesertim   cum **mihi** *deliberatum*   et
     especially   when me.DAT deliberate.PERF.PTCP.NOM.N.SG   and
     constitutum   *sit*   ita   gerere
     resolve.PERF.PTCP.NOM.N.SG be.PRES.SUBJV.3SG so   conduct.INF
     consulatum...
     consulship.ACC.M.SG   (Cic. leg. agr. 1, 25)
     'especially when I have determined and resolved so to conduct myself in my consulship…' (C. D. Yonge, 1856, Perseus site).

---

[7] See Allen & Greenough (1903/2014: 233), i.a.: "The Dative of the Agent is either a special use of the Dative of Possession or a development of the Dative of Reference". See also Bauer (2000), Suárez-Martínez (2001), and Hernández-Cabrera & Roca-Alamá (2005) for relevant discussion on these parallelisms between both types of datives and the diathetic opposition between *mihi esse* and *habere*.

[8] See Lavency (1985: 165): "On notera la différence entre *Mihi consilium captum est* (présent correspondant à: *Mihi consilium captum fuit*) et *A me* (ab+Abl) *consilium captum est* (passé correspondant à: *A me consilium capitur*)". E.g. cf. (15) with (i), where the "dative of agent" *tibi* coappears with the perfect form *fuerunt*; cf. (i) with *quos tu ad caedem constitutos habuisti;* see Halm (1856: 40) on ex. (i): "*habuisse* Catilinam senatores ad caedem *constitutos* (non *constituisse* tantum) Cicero significat."

(i) omnes   consulares   qui   **tibi**   persaepe   ad caedem
   all.NOM.PL ex_consul.NOM.PL rel.NOM.PL you.DAT.SG very.often   to slaughter.ACC.SG
   constituti   *fuerunt*   (Cic. Catil. 1, 16)
   decide.PERF.PTCP.NOM.PL   be.PERF.3PL
   'all the men of consular rank, who had often been marked out by you for slaughter' (C. D. Yonge, 1856)

See also Frerichs (1997) on (i): "The combination of perfect form of *esse* and perfect participle as a predicate **adjective** emphasizes the completion of the action. In other words, Catiline designated certain Roman citizens for death many times already, but he failed to have them killed; thus, he presumably no longer poses that sort of threat" (emphasis mine: JM). Similarly, following Haverling (2010: 419-420), the use of *fuerunt* in (i) can be shown to indicate a situation which no longer holds.

(16) **Tu**   (...)   sic   *habuisti*   *statutum*   cum animo
     you.NOM.SG   so   have.PERFV.2SG fix.PERF.PTCP.ACC.N.SG with mind.ABL.SG
     ac   *deliberatum*,   omnis   qui
     and   deliberate.PERF.PTCP.ACC.N.SG all.ACC.PL   REL.PR.NOM.PL
     habitarent   in   Sicilia,   (...)   iudices
     inhabit.IMPF.SUBJV.3PL in   Sicily.ABL.SG   judge.ACC.PL
     reicere…   (Cic. Verr. 2, 3, 95)
     reject.INF
     'had you so deliberated and fixed it in your own mind as an invariable rule, to reject as judges every one who dwelt in Sicily, …' (C. D. Yonge, 1903, Perseus)

(17) a.   Mihi   est   liber.
           me.DAT   be.PRES.3SG book.NOM.SG
     b.   Habeo   librum.
           have.PRES.1SG book.ACC.SG
           'I have a book.'

Similarly, in gerundi(v)al constructions with *esse,* the "dative of agent" can be claimed to be structurally interpreted as a possessor as well: e.g. cf. (18a) and (18b). The use of the more classical impersonal construction in (18b) would have led to an ambiguity between the "dative of agent" *mihi* and the dative verbal complements *imperatori* and *patri*. As for the examples in (18c) and (18d), the more classical construction in (18d) would probably be discarded in favor of the attested example in (18c) because the "dative of agent" must be [+human] (see Bolkestein [1980: 138] on the ill-formedness of examples like **arboribus crescendum est* 'the trees must grow').

(18) a.   *Pugnandum*   *habebam*   non   imperatori
           fight.GERND(V).ACC.N.SG have.IMPF.1SG not   emperor.DAT.SG
           sed   patri.   (Sen. contr. 10, 2, 4)
           but   father.DAT.SG
           'I had to fight not for the emperor but for my father.'
     b.   **Mihi** *pugnandum*   *erat*   non   imperatori
           me.DAT fight.GERND(V).NOM.N.SG be.IMPF.3SG not   emperor.DAT.SG
           sed   patri.
           but   father.DAT.SG
           'I had to fight not for the emperor but for my father.'
     c.   **Cariotae**   cum ficis   *certandum*   *habent*.
           date.NOM.PL with fig.ABL.PL fight.GERND(V).ACC.N.SG have.PRES.3PL.
           (Plin. Ep. 1.8)
           'Dates have to fight with figs.'
     d.   #**Cariotis** cum ficis   *certandum*   *est*.
           date.DAT.PL with fig.ABL.PL fight.GERND(V).NOM.N.SG be.PRES.3SG
           'Dates have to fight with figs.'

3. Apparent examples of "datives of agent"

In this section I discuss some apparent counterexamples to the syntactic claim made in the previous section: so-called "datives of agent"[9] cannot appear in non-verbal contexts. The first example I would like to discuss is the following one found in Pinkster (1990, 2015, 2021): see (19).[10] This author appears to analyze the datives *sibi* and *mihi* as "datives of agent" depending on the so-called "dominant participles" *gestae* and *conservatae*, respectively. Note that this analysis goes against my claim above that "datives of agent", unlike ablatives of agent, are not expected to be found in dominant participle constructions (cf. ex. [9] *post civitatem a Lucio Bruto liberatam*).

(19) **Sibi** enim bene gestae, **mihi**
himself.DAT really well govern.PERF.PTCP.GEN.F.SG me.DAT
conservatae rei publicae dat testimonium.
save.PERF.PTCP.GEN.F.SG state.GEN.F.SG give.PRES.3SG testimony.ACC.N.SG
(Cic. *Att.* 2.I.6)
'He testifies that the state has been governed well by him, but saved by me.'
(Pinkster 1990: p. 79; ex. [27])

There is an alternative interpretation of these two datives, namely, to consider them as dependent on the collocation *dare testimonium* 'to bear testimony'. In this sense, it is worth noting that Shackleton Bailey's (1965: 199; [*Letters to Atticus*, CUP]) translation 'acknowledging himself as a good servant of the state but me as its saviour' is more compatible with this second analysis, which, in my opinion, is the correct one. See (20) and (21) for a very similar structure.[11]

(20) An in senatu facillime de me
INTERR.PART in senate.ABL.SG easy.SUPERL.ADV from me.ABL
detrahi posse credidit? qui
detract.PASS.INF be_able.INF believe.PRFV.3SG REL.NOM.SG
ordo **clarissimis** **civibus** bene
order.NOM.SG illustrious.ABL.PL citizen.ABL.PL well
gestae rei publicae testimonium **multis**,
govern.PERF.PTCP.GEN.F.SG state.GEN.F.SG testimony.ACC.SG many.DAT.PL
mihi uni conservatae dedit (Cic. Phil. 2, 2, 5)
me.DAT alone.DAT.SG save.PERF.PTCP.GEN.F.SG give.PRF.3SG
'Is it in the Senate he believed he could most easily depreciate me, an order that has borne its testimony to illustrious citizens —for their administration of the State to many, to me alone for its preservation?' (Walter C.A. Ker, Loeb, 1926)

(21) **Mihi togato** senatus non ut **multis**
me.DAT wearing_a_toga.DAT.SG senate.NOM.SG not as many.DAT.PL
bene gesta, sed ut **nemini** conservata
well govern.PERF.PTCP.ABL.F.SG but as nobody.DAT.SG save.PERF.PTCP.ABL.F.SG
re publica, singulari genere supplicationis
state.ABL.F.SG singular.ABL.N.SG class.ABL.N.SG supplication.GEN.SG
deorum immortalium templa patefecit. (Cic. Pis. 6.6)
god.GEN.PL immortal.GEN.PL temple.ACC.PL open.PERFV.3SG
'Though I was only clad in the garb of peace, the senate, by an unprecedented sort of supplication, opened the temples of the gods in my honour; not because I had successfully governed the republic, that being a compliment which had been paid to many, but because I had saved it, that being an honour which has never been conferred on any one.' (C. D. Yonge, 1891, Perseus site).

---

[9] As argued in Section 2, since the "dative of agent" analyzed in this paper is structurally related to the "dative of possession" (aka "the dative with *sum*"), both are expected to be syntactically licensed only with the verb *esse* (see Suárez-Martínez 2001). In this sense, it should be noted that the descriptive label of "dative of agent" is misleading since it is often applied to an heterogeneous set of datives: e.g. besides the apparent ones discussed in this section, see the ones that are licensed in *infectum* forms with other verbs (e.g. recall the ex. (i) in footnote 2, repeated below) and the ones that are licensed in non-verbal contexts like (ii), which are basically found in poetry. Both types have been said to be traced back to Greek (see the references in footnote 2 for relevant discussion) and I leave them out of consideration here. In order to provide a homogeneous account of "datives of agent", I have decided to base it mostly on examples from Cicero's prose, drawing on Audouin's (1887) and Lebreton's (1901) very useful corpus studies on this author.
(i) ne=que *cernitur* **ulli**. (Verg. Aen. 1, 440)
not=and distinguish.PRES.PASS.3SG somebody.DAT.SG
'nor is he seen by anybody.'
(ii) adde preces castas inmixtaque
add.IMPER.2SG prayer.ACC.F.PL chaste.ACC.F.PL in-mix.PERF.PART.ACC.N.PL=and
vota timori, // nunc quoque te salvo
vow.ACC.N.PL fear.DAT.SG now also you.ABL.SG safe.ABL.SG
persoluenda **mihi**. (Ov. epist. 6, 73-74)
through-solve.GERNDV.ACC.N.PL me.DAT
'Add chaste prayers and vows mixed with fear, which now I must fulfill, since you are safe.'

[10] Cf. also Pinkster's (2015, 2021) more recent translations of this example, which are all consistent with a(n incorrect) dative-of-agent analysis of *sibi* and *mihi*: 'He gives witness to his good service to the state, but to my preservation of it' (Pinkster 2015: page 1222; ex. [b]); 'He bears witness to the state having been by him well served, by me saved' (Pinkster 2021: page 31, ex. [z]); 'He testifies to the Republic being well served by himself, but saved by me' (Pinkster 2021: page 451, ex. [a]).

[11] See also (i) and (ii) for two additional variants of this Ciceronian construction. As expected, no "dative of agent" can be said to be involved in any of them:
(i) **Ceteris** enim semper bene gesta, **mihi uni** conservata re publica gratulationem decrevistis. (Cic. Catil. 4, 20)
'For you have passed votes of congratulation to others for having governed the republic successfully, but to me alone for having saved it.' (C. D. Yonge, 1856, Perseus site).
(ii) Tu idem **mihi** supplicationem decrevisti **togato**, non, ut **multis**, re publica bene gesta sed, ut **nemini**, re publica conservata. (Cic. fam. 15, 4, 11)
Lit.: 'You yourself voted a thanksgiving to me as a civilian, not, like to many, because of having governed the state but, like to nobody else, because of having preserved it.'

In the Ablative Absolute (hence a non-verbal context) in (22) the dative *vobis omnibus* is not to be regarded as a "dative of agent" but rather as a "dative of interest".[12]

(22)   Sed   cum   viderem,   ne   **vobis** quidem   **omnibus**
       but   when   see.IMPF.SUBJV.1SG   not   us.DAT indeed   all.DAT.PL
       re   etiam   tum   *probata*   si …
       thing.ABL.F.SG even   then   prove.PERF.PTCP.ABL.F.SG if… (Cic. Catil. 2, 2, 4)
       'But as I saw that, since the matter was not even then proved to all of you, if (...)'
       (C.D. Yonge, 1856, Perseus site).

In (23), *multis civitatibus* is not a "dative of agent" either: the passive construction *mihi aliquid expetitur* 'lit. something is sought for me' has an active variant *mihi aliquid expeto* 'lit. I seek something for myself', whereby no "dative of agent" is involved here but a beneficiary one is.[13]

(23)   nos   hunc   Heracliensem   **multis**   **civitatibus**
       we.NOM   this.ACC.M.SG Heracliesian.ACC.M.SG many.DAT.PL   city.DAT.PL
       expetitum,   in hac   autem   legibus
       seek.PERF.PTCP.ACC.M.SG   in this.ABL.SG advers.part   law.ABL.PL
       constitutum   de   nostra   civitate   eiciemus?
       constitute.PERF.PTCP.ABL.M.SG from   our.ABL.SG   city.ABL.SG   eject.FUT.1PL
                                                 (Cic. Arch. 22).

---

[12] In contrast, the dative-of-agent reading of the dative *omnibus* is possible in the verbal context (*probatum esse*) in (i). Cf. the appropriately different translations of the datives in (i) and (22) provided by C. D. Yonge. Note, incidentally, that the example in (i) also contains two ablatives of agent (*a vobis* and *ab eo*).
(i)   quae de causa pro mea consuetudine breviter simpliciterque dixi, iudices, ea confido *probata esse* **omnibus**; quae a foro aliena iudicialique consuetudine et de hominis ingenio et communiter de ipso studio locutus sum, ea, iudices, **a vobis** spero *esse* in bonam partem *accepta*, **ab eo** qui iudicium exercet certo scio (Cic. Arch. 12)
     'The things which, according to my custom, I have said briefly and simply, O judges, I trust have been approved by all of you. Those things which I have spoken, without regarding the habits of the forum or judicial usage, both concerning the genius of the man and my own zeal in his behalf, I trust have been received by you in good part. That they have been so by him who presides at this trial, I am quite certain.' (C. D. Yonge 1856, Perseus site)

[13] This use of datives is, of course, not only typical of Cicero but of many other authors. E.g. *popularibus* in the Sallustian example in (i) can be understood as the very same dative that can be found in an adjectival context (see *carus* 'dear') like the one in (ii). Accordingly, a more literal translation of (ii) would be 'he was yet *dear to all*'. Ditto for the translation of the apparent "dative of agent" in (23).
(i)   His difficultatibus circumventus ubi videt neque per vim neque insidiis opprimi posse hominem tam *acceptum* **popularibus**, quod erat Iugurtha manu promptus et appetens gloriae militaris, statuit eum obiectare periculis et eo modo fortunam temptare (Sall. Iug. 7,1).
     'Surrounded by such difficulties, and seeing that a man, so popular among his countrymen, was not to be destroyed either by force or by fraud, he resolved, as Jugurtha was of an active disposition, and eager for military reputation, to expose him to dangers in the field, and thus make trial of fortune.' (Rev. John Selby Watson, 1899, Perseus site)
(ii)   **omnibus** tamen *carus* esse (Sall. Iug. 6,1).
     'he was yet beloved by all' (Rev. John Selby Watson, 1899, Perseus site)

'and shall we reject from our city a man of Heraclea, a man sought by many cities, and made a citizen of ours by these very laws?' (C. D. Yonge, 1856)

(24)   ad   eorum   voluntatem   **mihi**   *conciliandam*
       to   this.GEN.PL   favor.ACC.F.SG me.DAT   win_over.GERNDV.ACC.F.SG
       maximo   te   mihi   usui   fore   video.
       great.SUPERL.DAT.SG you.ACC.SG me.DAT   use.DAT.SG be.FUT.INF see.PRES.1SG
       'To win me their favour I see that I shall want you very much.' (Evelyn S. Shuckburgh, 1908, Perseus site).   (Cic. Att. 1, 2).
       NB: cf. *ut conciliemus* **nobis** *eos qui audiunt* (Cic. de orat. 2, 115).

4. On the different analysis of ablatives of agent and "datives of agent" in participial and gerundival constructions

- Present participle: *claudens, -ntis* 'closing'
- Perfect passive participle: ***clausus, -a, -um*** 'closed'
- Future active participle: *clausurus, -a, -um* 'going to close'
- "Future passive participle"/ gerundive: ***claudendus, -a, -um*** 'to be closed'

Bauer (2000: 299): "in Latin the primary opposition between the participle in -***nt***- and the one in -***to***- is not active vs. passive, but rather **imperfective** vs. **perfective**".

Joffre (1995: 322): "le participe en –***tus*** est simplement pourvu d'un signifié aspectuel, celui de l'**accompli***"*. The forms with -***nd***- are "**dynamique en devenir**" (p. 378).

Pinkster (2015: 62): "The gerundive (…) was indeed described as a future passive participle by Latin grammarians but was not used as such before the third century AD".[14]

(25)   Porta   clausa   est.
       door.NOM.F.SG   close.PERF.PTCP.NOM.F.SG   be.PRES.3SG
       1) 'The door {has been/was} closed'/'The door closed' (eventive reading)
       2) 'The door is closed' (resultative reading)

Similarly, Longrée (2014: 370-371) claims that an Ablative Absolute construction like *clausā portā* is ambiguous between a process/"verbal" reading and a state/"adjectival" reading: cf. 'once the door was closed' and 'with the door closed', respectively.

Verbal passive reading of (25):
   [IP porta_i [I est [AspP *t*_i [Asp clausa [VoiceP Voice [vP clau-v [SC [DP *t*_i] √CLAU-]]]]]]]

Adjectival passive reading of (25):
   [IP porta_i [I est [SC [*t*_i] [AspP OP_i [Asp clausa [vP clau-v [SC [DP *t*_i] √CLAU-]]]]]]]

---

[14] See Pinkster (2015: 289/295): "In <(i)>, the ablative gerundival clause (included in curly brackets) can only be understood in an active sense, and no obligation is involved (…) interpretation of a gerundive as passive or (more frequently) active depends on contextual and sometimes on extralinguistic information.
(i) … placet …   contra   gaudere   nosmet   {*omittendis*   *doloribus*}...
    please.PRES.3SG otherwise rejoice.INF ourselves.ACC.PL   omit.GERNDV.ABL.PL pain.ABL.PL
    ' . . . but on the other hand one is glad to lose a pain.' (Cic. fin. 1, 56)"

Cf. Bruening's (2014: 391) OP(erator)-movement involved in the formation of adjectival passives.[15]

Embick's (2004) triple distinction among eventive passive, resultative, and stative participles can be derived syntactically from the category selected by Asp(ect): Voice, v(erbalizer), and Root, respectively (cf. Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 2008; Crespí 2020; i.a.). As depicted in (26), eventive passive participles have two "verbal" layers (Voice and v), resultative participles have only one (v), and stative participles have none.

(26) Eventive passive: [AspP Asp [VoiceP Voice [vP v [Root Root]]]]
     Resultative: [AspP Asp [vP v [Root Root]]]
     Stative: [AspP Asp [Root Root]]

(27) bellum   **ab istis   civitatibus** cum populo   Romano
     war.ACC.N.SG by this.ABL.PL city.ABL.PL with people.ABL.SG Roman.ABL.SG
     esse   susceptum.   (Cic. Flacc. 58)
     be.INF undertake.PERF.PTCP.ACC.N.SG
     '(...) war was undertaken by those cities against the Roman people.' (C.D. Yonge, 1856, Perseus site)

(28) ... [IP bellum_i [I esse [AspP t_i [Asp susceptum [VoiceP ab istis civitatibus Voice [vP √CAP-v [SC t_i √SUB-]]]]]]][16]

(29) omnes   consulares   qui   **tibi**   persaepe   ad
     all.NOM.PL ex_consul.NOM.PL rel.NOM.PL you.DAT.SG very.often to
     caedem   *constituti*   *fuerunt* (Cic. Catil. 1, 16)
     slaugther.ACC.SG decide.PERF.PTCP.NOM.PL be.PERF.3PL
     'all the men of consular rank, who had often been marked out by you for slaughter' (C. D. Yonge, 1856, Perseus site)

(30) [ApplP tibi [vP fuerunt [SC [DP qui_i] [AspP OP_i [Asp constituti [vP √STAT-v [SC t_i √CON-]]]]]]][16] (cf. *quos **tu** ad caedem constitutos habuisti : Tu habuisti [SC quos [constitutos ad caedem]]; see footnote 8)

---

[15] Bruening (2014: 385-386): "The internal argument in the adjectival passive (but not the verbal passive) is a null operator, essentially just a lambda-abstractor, which abstracts over the category it adjoins to, forming a predicate of individuals. This is an appropriate type to combine with, say, nouns (…). The actual noun that the adjective modifies is external to the AP so formed, so there is no evidence that it ever started out as an internal argument (e.g., Belletti and Rizzi 1981; Levin and Rappaport 1986; Horvath and Siloni 2008; Meltzer-Asscher 2010b, 2011; McIntyre 2012). At the same time, however, there is an internal argument, namely, the null operator, accounting for why resultative secondary predicates are possible with adjectival passives (Embick 2004a), when they are normally only allowed with underlying direct objects (Simpson 1983; Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995): *a. The river appears frozen solid. b. This metal looks hammered flat.* The resultative secondary predicate is predicated of the null operator, which is a direct object in the proposed structure".

[16] See Acedo-Matellán & Mateu (2016) for arguments for a Small-Clause analysis of the inner predication involved in Lat. prefixed verbs like *suscipere* 'undertake'.

(31) post   civitatem   **a Lucio   Bruto**   *liberatam*
     after city.ACC.F.SG by Lucius.ABL.SG Brutus.ABL.SG free.PERF.PTCP.ACC.F.SG
     'after the liberation of the city by Lucius Brutus'   (Cic. Phil. 5,17)

(32) [PP post [SC [civitatem_i] [AspP OP_i [Asp liberatam [VoiceP a Lucio Bruto Voice [vP liber-a [SC [DP t_i] [√LIBER-]]]]]]]]

Oniga (2014: 306) puts forward the plausible proposal that Ablative Absolute structures like *Cicerone consule* involve a Small Clause ([SC [DP *Cicerone*] [NP *consule*]] 'with Cicero as consul'; see also Suñer [1988], Mateu [2017], i.a.), whose proposal can be extended to predicative constructions such as [*post* [SC [DP *Ciceronem*] [NP *consulem*]]] (cf. *post consulatum Ciceronis* 'after Cicero's consulship'). Cf. Ernout & Thomas (1964: 103): "L'ablatif dit absolu <est> une *proposition raccourcie.*"

(33) quo   tandem animo   **tibi**   [hoc]
     interrog.ABL.SG at_last feeling.ABL.SG you.DAT.SG this.ACC.N.SG
     ferendum   [*esse*]   putas?[17]
     bear.GERNDV.ACC.N.SG be.INF   think.PRES.3SG   (Cic. Catil. 1, 16)
     'With what feelings do you think you ought to bear this?' (C. D. Yonge, 1856, Perseus site).

(34) ... [ApplP tibi [vP ESSE [SC [DP HOC_i] [MoodP OP_i ferendum [vP √FER-v t_i]]]]][18]

Danesi, Johnson, and Barðdal (2017) have claimed that Latin gerundival constructions with *esse* involve a "dative subject". *Tibi* in (33) is indeed the most prominent constituent in the syntactic representation in (34) but this does not mean that this dative pronoun must be regarded as the subject of the sentence. However, I agree with their claim that the

---

[17] Quid, quod adventu tuo ista subsellia vacuefacta sunt, quod omnes consulares qui **tibi** persaepe ad caedem *constituti fuerunt*, simul atque adsedisti, partem istam subselliorum nudam atque inanem reliquerunt, quo tandem animo **tibi** *ferendum* putas? (Cic. Catil. 1, 16)
'Is it nothing that at your arrival all those seats were vacated? that all the men of consular rank, who had often been marked out by you for slaughter, the very moment you sat down, left that part of the benches bare and vacant? With what feelings do you think you ought to bear this? (C. D. Yonge, 1856, Perseus).

[18] Cf. Bolkestein (2001: 277): "It is attractive but speculative to view <(i)> as originally having the structure of <(iib)> with the NP *haec tangenda* as Subj with a so-called dominant modifier, the modifier later being reanalyzed as Subj complement in a copular pattern".
(i)   tibi   haec   tangenda   est
       you.DAT.SG this.NOM.F.SG touch.GERNDV.NOM.F.SG is
       'She has to be touched by you/you have to touch her.'
(ii)   a.   puero   liber   carus   est
             boy.DAT.M.SG book.NOM.M.SG cherished.NOM.M.SG is
             'The boy has a cherished book.'
       b.   {EXIST} (x_1:liber:carus)_0 (x_2:puer) 'Poss'

dative's semantic role is a property of the construction as a whole.[19] In my terms, the dative *tibi* in (33)/(34) is not an argument of the inner lexical verb (*ferre* 'to bear') but rather of the upper possessive structure.

(35) Sed   tamen et   Crassus   **a   consulibus** meam
      but   still and   Crassus.NOM.SG by   consul.ABL.PL my.ACC.F.SG
      causam   *suscipiendam*   esse   dicebat.   (Cic. Sest. 41)
      cause.ACC.F.SG undertake.GERNDV.ACC.F.SG be.INF say.IMPF.3SG
      'But still Crassus said that my cause ought to be undertaken by the consuls.' (C. D. Yonge, 1891, Perseus site)

(36) … [vP esse [SC [DP meam causami] [MP OPi suscipiendam [VoiceP a consulibus Voice [vP √CAP-v [SC ti √SUB-]]]]]]

(37) De   provinciis   **ab   iis**   qui
      about   province.ABL.F.PL by   this.ABL.M.PL   REL.NOM.M.PL
      obtinerent   *retinendis*…   (Cic. fam. 12, 22, 1).
      obtain.IMPF.SUBJV.3PL back-keep.GERNDV.ABL.F.PL
      'On the retention of provinces by those who would obtain them…'

(38) [PP de [SC [provinciisi] [MP OPi retinendis [VoiceP ab iis Voice [vP √TEN-v [SC [DP ti] [re-]]]]]]]

5. Concluding remarks

Ablatives of agent in verbal and non-verbal contexts are introduced *within* the aspectual/gerundival (AspP/MP) structure, whereas "datives of agent" are *external* to the participial/gerundival structure (see footnote 9 on page 9). A particular verbal context is required for the licensing of the latter, i.e. unlike ablatives of agent, "datives of agent" require the syntactic representation of the verb *esse* in adjectival resultative passives with perfect participles and in gerundival constructions.

The ablative of agent is grammatically interpreted as an agent (via the *Voice* head; Kratzer 1996), whereas the "dative of agent" can only be interpreted as an agent conceptually. However, it is the syntactic context (the verbal one in the relevant syntactic structure) that allows this dative to be conceptually interpreted as an agent (in *non*-verbal contexts "datives of agent" cannot be licensed). Structurally speaking, "datives of agent" are *not* arguments of the lexical verb but are better interpreted as possessors/holders of the participial/gerundival eventuality.

More generally, the present study of "datives of agent" has been shown to offer a nice piece of evidence for the important distinction between grammatical vs. conceptual meaning (see Hale & Keyser 1993; Bouchard 1995; Baker 1997; Mateu 2002; Moreno Cabrera 2004; Borer 2005; Ramchand 2008; Harley 2011; Marantz 2013, i.a.).

---

[19] Besides Danesi, Johnson, and Barðdal (2017), see also Bauer (2000), Mariani (2002), and Luraghi (2016) for other approaches to the "dative of agent" construction in different Indo-European languages.

Selected references

Acedo-Matellán, V. & J. Mateu (2016). Argument structure and satellite-framedness in Latin: Evidence from unselected object constructions. In P. Poccetti (Ed.), *LATINITATIS RATIONES. Descriptive and Historical Accounts for the Latin Language* (pp. 149-169). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Alexiadou, A. & E. Anagnostopoulou (2008). Structuring participles. In C. B. Chang & H. J. Haynie (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* (pp. 33-41). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Audouin, E. (1887). Sur l'emploi de l'ablatif avec *ab* comme complément d'un participe en *–ndus*. *Revue de Philologie, de Littérature et d'Histoire Anciennes*, 11, 69-74.

Baldi, P. (1983). Speech perception and grammatical rules in Latin. In H. Pinkster (Ed.), *Latin Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* (pp. 11-26). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bauer, B. L. M. (2000). *Archaic Syntax in Indo-European: The Spread of Transitivity in Latin and French*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bolkestein, A. M. (1980). *Problems in the Description of Modal Verbs. An Investigation of Latin*. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Bolkestein, A. M. (2001). Possessors and experiencers in Classical Latin. In I. Baron, M. Herslund & F. Sørensen (Eds.), *Dimensions of Possession* (pp. 269-284). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bruening, B. (2014). Word formation is syntactic: adjectival passives in English. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 32 (2), 363-422.

Calboli, G. (2009). Latin syntax and Greek. In P. Baldi & P. Cuzzolin (Eds.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax. Volume 1 Syntax of the Sentence* (pp. 65-194). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

Danesi, S., C. Johnson & J. Barðdal. (2017). Between the Historical Languages and the Reconstructed Language: An Alternative Approach to the Gerundive + "Dative of Agent" Construction in Indo-European. *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 122 (1), 143–188.

Embick, D. (2004). On the structure of resultative participles in English. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 35 (3), 355-392.

Ernout, A. & F. Thomas (1964). *Syntaxe latine*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Haverling, G. (2010). Actionality, Tense, and Viewpoint. In P. Baldi & P. Cuzzolin (Eds.), *Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*; chap. 4, vol. II (pp. 277-524). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hernández-Cabrera, T. & Mª J. Roca-Alamá (2005). Sobre el *dativus auctoris*. *Fortunatae: Revista canaria de Filología, Cultura y Humanidades Clásicas*, 16, 99-109.

Joffre, M. D. (1995). *Le verb latin: voix et diathèse*. Louvain/Paris: Peeters.

Kratzer, A. (1996). Severing the external argument from its verb. In J. Rooryck & L. Zaring (Eds.), *Phrase structure and the lexicon* (pp. 109-137). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Kühner, R. & C. Stegmann. (1912/1982). *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre* (2 vols). Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung.

Lebreton, J. (1901). *Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron*. Paris. [Olms, 1979].

Longrée, D. (2014). *Demisso capite*: ablatif absolu ou épithète détachée? Réflexions sur la description d'un syntagme à deux constituants obligatoires. In C. Cabrillana & Ch. Lehmann (Eds.), *Acta XIV Colloqui Internationalis Linguisticae Latinae* (pp. 361-372). Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas.

Luraghi, S. (2016). The Dative of Agent in Indo-European Language. *STUF – Language Typology and Universals*, 69 (1), 15–47.

Mariani, M. (2002). The Latin and Greek *Dativus agentis*: Inheritance, convergence, or interference. *Glotta*, 78, 116-135.

Miller, D. G. (2000). Gerund and gerundive in Latin. *Diachronica*, 17 (2), 293-349.

Oniga, R. (2014). *Latin. A Linguistic Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pinkster, H. (1990). *Latin Syntax and Semantics*. London: Routledge.

Pinkster, H. (2015). *The Oxford Latin Syntax. Vol I: The Simple Clause*. Oxford: OUP.

Santos Guzmán, P. (2004). El adjetivo verbal de obligación —*nd*— y la expresión del agente. *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica. Estudios latinos*, 24 (2), 225-238.

Serbat, G. (1996). *Grammaire fondamentale du latin, VI: L'emploi des cas en latin*. Leuven: Peeters.

Suárez Martínez, P. M. (2001). Le datif d'agent (*datiuus auctoris*). Un fantôme dans la syntaxe latine. In C. Moussy (Ed.). *De Lingua Latina Novae Quaestiones. Actes du Xè Colloque International de Linguistique Latine* (pp. 597-607). Louvain/Paris/Sterling,Virginia: Peeters.

Vester, E. (1991). Reflections on the gerund and gerundive. In R. Coleman (Ed.), *New Studies in Latin Linguistics* (pp. 295-310). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.