

## 14. The Latin and Ancient Greek Syntax

### (A Note on the Contrastive Linguistic Characterization)

The recent strong activity in the field of modern syntax provoked increased interest in studying also the syntax of Ancient Greek and Latin. A syntactic comparison of both these classical languages confirmed, on the one hand, many conformities, since long expected, but it has revealed, on the other hand, even a number of differences, both in the syntactic evaluation of morphological categories and, particularly, within the area of the Latin and Ancient Greek sentence patterns, including their “semi-sentence” equivalents — in the form of infinitival, participial, gerundial and other nominal constructions.

At the 7th and 8th International Colloquia of Vulgar Latin in Sevilla and Oxford, I read two papers dealing with the constructions of Acc. and Nom. cum Infinitivo and Ablativus or Genitivus Absolutus in Latin and Ancient Greek respectively (A. Bartoněk 2006:81–88, 2008:00–00). In these papers, I started analysing the two of the most important nominal types of the so-called complex condensation in Latin and Greek, where the subordinate clause within a complex sentence has been abbreviated — so to speak — to a nominal construction, by transforming the Verbum Finitum into a Verbum Infinitum. In the end, I set down in Sevilla and Oxford a number of agreements and differences between Latin and Greek, which I am now going first to recapitulate in brief — together with some topical supplementary, and also modifying remarks.

In both Latin and Greek, one can establish a relatively distant origin of the two constructions. Cf. the Mycenaean documentation of Acc. cum Inf. in Greek, and likewise its presence in archaic Latin already (in Plautus), on the one hand, as well as some early indications of the Indo-European origin of the absolute participial constructions, on the other hand, to be concluded from their parallel existence in a number of ancient IE. languages: Loc. (and Gen.) Absol. in Old Indian and Avestan, Gen. and Acc. Absol. in Greek, Abl. Absol. in Latin, Dat. Absol. in Gothic, Old English and Old High German, as well as, e.g., in Old Church Slavonic, Old Czech and Lithuanian, and perhaps also in Old Oscan.

Let us add that the post-Classical Greek and Latin occasionally used the so-called Nom. Absol., i.e. practically a kind of participial construction in nominative instead of a Verbum Finitum. I will quote two instances from later periods: Nom. Absol. in the Latin passage from Fredegar’s Chronicle 2.17 (7th cent. A. D.) “Descriptio Romae dicta, inventa sunt CLXII milia hominum” and a Greek passage from the Chronicle of Malalas (6th cent. A.D.) “καὶ αἰτησάμενος τοῦ κτίσει τὴν πόλιν, ἦλθεν ἀετὸς πάλιν καὶ ἤρπασε ἀπὸ τῆς θυσίης”.

The Indo-European origins of both the Greek Genitivus Absolutus and the Latin Ablativus Absolutus seem to be highly certain. We can find a very ancient

and a quite curious example of the Acc. cum Inf. and another of the Nom. cum Inf. as early as on the Linear B tablet from Pylos Ep 704, 5–6, from about 1200 B.C. (M. Ventris – J. Chadwick 1973:252ff.; cf. also A. Bartoněk 2003:440). One can read there in the Linear B orthography an interesting text “e-ri-ta i-je-re-ja e-ke e-u-ke-to-qe e-to-ni-jo e-ke-e te-o / da-mo-de-mi pa-si ko-to-na-o ke-ke-me-na-o o-na-to e-ke-e...”, which may be pronounced in the contemporary Mycenaean Greek in the following way: “Eritha? /h/ieria ekhei eukhetoi k<sup>w</sup>e e-to-ni-jo ekhe/h/en theō, dāmos de min phāsi ktōinā/h/ōn kekeimenā/h/ōn onaton ekhe/h/en” and may run in the English translation as follows: “The priestess Eritha? is in possession — and maintains that she is in possession (cf. the Nom. cum Inf. “eukhetoi ekhe/h/en”) — of an e-to-ni-jo (i.e. of a plot of land) of the god (or goddess), the community says, however, that she (i.e. Eritha) has the plot from the free-lying lands of community in tenure” (cf. the Acc. cum Inf. “dāmos de min phāsi ktōinā/h/ōn kekeimenā/h/ōn onaton ekhe/h/en”).

The Latin linguists miss, naturally, written documents of a so high age. In any case, one can see quite clearly that in the Archaic and Classical Latin era the infinitival constructions after the *verba dicendi* (and also *sentiendi*) experienced a period of extremely broad expansion, even a monopolization, with a strict prevalence of Accusative (or Nominative) with Infinitive over the subordinate *quod*-clauses, in the written Latin texts at least.

In fact, an early subordinate clause with *quod* appears in Plautus already, *Asinaria* 52–53 “equidem scio iam filius quod amet meus istanc meretricem e proxumo Philaenium” (let us add that J. Herman (1997:105) expressed on this occasion a quite acceptable opinion that such subordinate *quod*-clauses “were never fully absent from the colloquial Latin speech”). In the Latin works of the Classical period, however, the construction of Acc. with Infin. offered a very strong resistance to the above-said *quod*-clauses in general, having not only a clear monopoly after the *verba dicendi et sentiendi*, but prevailing strongly, for example, also after the *verba affectuum* (P. Cuzzolin 1991:201–210).

It is Classical Latin that fully preserved the infinitival constructions after the *verba dicendi*, giving a nearly total preference to them until the 2nd/3rd cent. A.D. The Italian scholar P. Cuzzolin (1994:110–116) established — for the period after Plautus (i.e. after Plaut., *Asin.* 52–53) — only three quite clear instances of the strictly declarative Latin construction “dicere quod, quia + Verbum Finitum” before Tertullianus: 1) the passage from *Bellum Hispaniense* 36.1 /from ca. 43 B.C./: “Dum haec geruntur, legati Carteienses renuntiaverunt quod Pompeium in potestate haberent”, 2) Petron. *Sat.* 46.4 “Ego illi iam tres cardeles occidi et dixi quia mustella comedit”, and 3) Tac. *Ann.* 3.4.4 “at hercule nemo refert, quod Italiae externae opis indiget, quod vita populi Romani per incerta maris et tempestatum cottidie volvitur” — scilicet after the “*verba dicendi veri e proprii*” (P. Cuzzolin 1994:114), i.e. apart from *verba addendi, praetereundi, sciendi* etc.

The Ancient Greek, however, never experienced such extremities:

In the Classical Greek, to be sure, one had always a possibility of choosing a subordinate clause with ὅτι or ὡς instead of the infinitival construction — with ascending values of the ὅτι-constructions from 0 % in the poetical work of Pindaros /died ca. 430/, to some 40 % of the historian Thucydides /died ca. 400/, to ca. 65 % in the dialogues of Plato /died in 347/ and to ca. 95 % in the oratory works of Isocrates /died in 338/; see Duhoux 2000:265.

Such a possibility of choice gave the opportunity of avoiding the ambiguity arising from the well-known double accusative constructions, which were exploited quite successfully, e.g., in the prophecies of oracles. In principle, however, the Acc. with Inf. construction may have had a more subjective semantic shade (H. Kurzová 1968:64).

Nevertheless, in the Chronicle of Ioannes Malalas 6th cent. A.D., e.g., according to P. Helms (1971–72:376f.), we cannot find more than three instances of an infinitival construction after the *verba dicendi et putandi* (together with an introductory ὅτι or ὡς, in addition of that) against ca. 360 instances of ὅτι or ὡς with a Verbum Finitum.

About the spreading of ὅτι-clauses after the Greek *Verba dicendi* at the expense of the infinitive constructions see in particular H. Kurzová (1966:261ff., 1967:101ff., 1968, 1970:83ff., 1986:1–10); cf. also G. Calboli (1997:11ff.; 2002).

In Latin, on the other hand, the position of the Acc. (or Nom.) with Infin. remained strong even in the works of early Christian authors — still in Tertullian, for example, and also in the early works of St. Augustine (except his sermons, however). The proportion of the *quod, quia*-constructions exceeded here the value of 10 % only exceptionally, amounting only in Peregrinatio Egeriae to ca. 20 % (J. Herman 1989).

In any case, it is true that the subordinate *quod*-constructions are more explicit and more in conformity with forms of discourse and were also much clearer and suitable to avoid the possible ambiguity of an Acc. + Inf. construction. These subordinate *quod*-clauses follow usually the introducing finite verb *dicendi* or *sentiendi*, whereas the infinitival constructions may either follow or also precede the governing finite verbal form. The linguistic circumstances determining the development of the interrelations between the two Latin constructions were masterfully treated by R. Coleman 1985, J. Herman 1989:133–152, P. Cuzzolin 1991, 1994, G. Calboli 1997:49ff., 315ff..

Only within the advanced period of Latin literary development did it happen that the construction of Acc. cum Inf. was falling into disuse. According to J. B. Hofmann – A. Szantyr (1965:354), one may find in the collection *Vitae patrum monachorum* /from the 6th cent. A.D./ only 275 instances of Acc. cum Inf. against 530 *quod*-, *quia*-, *quoniam*- clauses.

Let us add, at the end of this paragraph, that there existed a much larger extent of the grammatical differentiation on the side of the Greek infinitive,

when compared with the Latin infinitive (especially as to the verbal diathesis, aspect and also mood /see the infinitive with the particle  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ /) and that even the spectrum of Greek verbs with documented infinitival constructions (as well as of their syntactical case-functions in the sentence) is much more varied than that of the Latin verbs (E. Schwyzer – A. Debrunner 1950:357ff.).

The Accusativus cum Infinitivo after the Verba dicendi does not apparently live in modern languages now, but according to G. Calboli (2003:492f.), some instances of Acc. with Inf. were “reintroduced on the model of Latin” by Giovanni Boccaccio (1313–1375) in the Xth book of his Decamerone within the talk of persons in high position: cf. Dec. 10,8,53 “Ma egli /cioè Gisippo/ sé onesta cosa aver fatto affermava”, and Dec. 10,8,72 “saranno forse alcuni che diranno non dolersi Sofronia esser moglie di Tito, ma dolersi del modo...”.

After the *verba sentiendi*, the Acc. cum Inf. construction was regular in Latin; it occurs also in a number of modern languages, e.g., in German, while the Ancient Greek preferred a participial construction, similarly as English and Russian do it today.

Strange enough, the infinitive as a separate verbal form was totally abolished in Modern Greek (with the exclusion of Modern Greek dialects of Calabria and Apulia in South Italy /but even here the historical infinitive is falling gradually into disuse/, and allegedly also in the Pontic area; cf. E. Schwyzer – A. Debrunner 1950:384, but see E. Banfi’s doubts /2004:91/). Remnants of the infinitival forms have been preserved, in general, even in the fossilized Modern Greek periphrastic forms of the perfect tense of the type  $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega \gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\epsilon\iota$  (from  $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega \gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\psi\alpha\iota$ , i.e.  $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$  + Inf. Aor. Act. from  $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\iota\nu$  “to write”).

\*\*\*

As for the absolute participial constructions, the Latin Ablative Absolute is — as far as the works completely preserved are concerned — sufficiently documented in Plautus already, though quite often within constructions not very distant from a syntactically well-connected Ablativus modi, instrumenti etc.; see e.g., Pl., *Amphitruo* 257 *velatis manibus orant*. The occurrence of the present participle in the construction of Abl. Abs., however, was restricted here, for the most part, to fixed ablatives such as *praesente*, *absente*, *sciente* (see A. Scherer 1975). In Classical Latin, the use of Abl. Abs. was more frequent and semantically much less restricted, reaching often a rather high proportion of occurrence in the works of different authors, but even here its frequency was partly dependent on the literary genre in question, on its stylistic background, as well as on the specificity of its narrative expression.

New lines of development of the Latin (and also the Greek) constructions of absolute case-forms with participles were treated by Robert Coleman 1989, esp. with regard to the results of a further elaboration of the participial system and, in particular, as to the realization and exploitation of its distinctly verbal

potentialities (see, e.g., a syntactic complementation *urbe capta per dolum* already in Plaut. *Bacchides* 1070, or *orante ut ne id faceret Thaide* in Ter. *Eunuchus* 95, as well as, later, even much more elaborated examples, such as *duabus legionibus, quas proxime conscripserat, in castris relictis* Caes. *Gall.* 2.8.5, or *nec Etruscis nisi cogerentur pugnam ituris* Liv. 4.16.6).

A useful statistic survey may be found in the article by J. Müller-Lancé (1998: 413–423) with the following data of occurrence, each time on ten pages of the standardized text of a selected work: Plautus: 2–3 examples on ten pages; Cicero, *In Catilinam*: 6,3 examples; Cicero, *Tusc. disputationes*: 7 examples; Sallustius, *Bell. Iugurthinum*: 14, 9; Caesar, *Bellum Gallicum*: 36,5; Vergil, *Aeneis*: 12,3; Tacitus, *Agricola*: 31,1; *Peregrinatio Egeriae*: 20,5; *Historia Apollonii regis Tyrii*: 34,5; Gregory of Tours, *Vita* (2nd half of the 6th cent.): 87,8; *Vita S. Alexii* (12th cent.): 25 examples. The proportion, thus, strongly increases in Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum* already, while J. Müller-Lancé found no fewer than 87,8 instances of Abl. Abs. on every ten pages of Gregory's standardized text — against only 6 instances of Abl. Abs. within a passage of the same length in the Cicero's *Speech in Catilinam*.

The construction of the Abl. Absol. was very practical for its conciseness, but after the disappearance of Ablative from the Late Latin case-system it is the Abl. Absol., too, that was abandoned in the colloquial speech or merged practically with the somewhat analogous Nominativus Absolutus, occurring rather occasionally in the works of some Late Latin authors, who also treated various mixed constructions, deviating from the standard classical constructions of the Abl. Absol. (see J. Müller-Lancé 1998 and P. Molinelli 2000). All such constructions gave rise later to some analogous more or less fossilized absolute phrases which appeared (and still occur) in modern Romance languages. In the Medieval Latin proper, however, the construction of Abl. Absol. seems to have continued its previous development without apparent interruption. Among the most recent studies about the Abl. Absol., see especially the study by A. Moreno Hernández 1996 as well as that of R. Coleman 1989.

The Greek Gen. Abs. was known in Homer already, even if with some restrictions. In the Classical period, this absolute construction was rather frequent: according to Y. Duhoux 2000:354, no fewer than ca. 10 % of the participles occurring in the first two books of Thucydides are in Gen. Abs., while in the work of Isocrates, the occurrence of the Gen. Abs. reached only the figure of 5,7 %. The proportion of the occurrence of the so-called Acc. Abs. in Greek is much smaller (about 0,4 % in the works of the above two authors).

In 1980, my student A. Dohnalová 1981:97–103 made a comparison of the absolute participle constructions found in a) Monumentum Ancyranum and b) the selected passages of New Testament (St. Matthew's Gospel, The Acts of the Apostles, St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and to the Corinthians I-II) both in Old Greek (Gen. Abs.), and in Latin (Abl. Abs.), and also in Old Church Sla-

vonian (Dat. Abs.). Even if the morphological range of the participial forms was much richer in Greek than in Latin, the proportion of the occurrence in the selected passages much higher on the Latin side: 251 Latin examples of Abl. Abs. against 186 Greek examples of Gen. Abs. and about the same number of Dat. Abs. in Old Church Slavonic. Whereas the Old Slavonic participial constructions — representing a text written in a language *in statu nascendi* — showed a great degree of dependence upon their Greek counterparts, the parallel constructions in Latin are much more independent: Latin actually often creates an ablative absolute of its own, in full conformity with its contemporary Late Latin predilection for the absolute participial constructions.

In 1996, Antonio Moreno Hernández (1996: 471–482) revised an older hypothesis of Veikko Väänänen according to whom the constructions of Abl. Abs. seem to be practically absent in the biblical text of the so-called *Afra Vetus* from the 2nd cent. A.D., while the said constructions are fully alive in the Vulgate of Hieronymus from the 4th cent. — the conclusion of Väänänen being that the *Afra Vetus*, or the *Vetus Latina* in general, might be considered an exponent of the popular and spoken Late Latin, while the Vulgate would reflect a literary level. The result of the revision by Moreno Hernández was a refusal of such a strict division within the Biblical Latin and he proposed a new, less contrasting characterization of both *Vulgata* and *Vetus Latina*, stressing — on both sides — the existence of a certain number of deviations in creating the AA-constructions, as well as an increasing exploitation of the verbal properties of participles, and also a tendency to a greater variegation in transforming the Greek absolute constructions — all of this being syntactical features typical of the majority of the Late Latin texts.

In this matter, Moreno Hernández seems to have been less sceptical about the future prospects of the AA-constructions in the Late Latin development than Robert Coleman was, who entitled his article from 1989 with the words: “The Rise and Fall of the Absolute Constructions”. As to the further development in the Romance languages, on the one hand, Coleman’s title was quite correct — in spite of some more or less fixed absolute phrases, well-known even from non-Romance languages; in the literary texts of Medieval Latin, on the other hand, the construction of the Abl. Abs. remained still in use, as Müller-Lancé has shown in 1998:413–423.

We have dealt here, so far, with two complexes of nominal constructions having remarkably similar features of development, i.e. the Accusative (or Nominative) with Infinitive and the so-called Ablativus or Genitivus Absolutus:

Both of them originated as early as the Indo-European period. In the early stages of both the Greek and Latin development, they were in common use as nominal constructions, but at the same time, the construction of Acc. (or Nom.) with Infin. as well as the Abl. or Gen. Absolutus could also be expressed in the form of a subordinate clause, either a *quod-*, *quia-* complement clause, in the former case, or the respective adverbial clause, in the latter case. Whereas in

Greek the two options, one nominal and the other non-nominal, were rather well-balanced, in Classical Latin the Acc. or Nomin. with Infin. became in the written language the only possible construction after the *verba dicendi*, *putandi* and *sentiendi* for several centuries at least — with even the Abl. Absolute becoming a very favourite means of linguistic expression in the written form of Classical and Late Latin for quite a number of centuries.

On the other hand, in colloquial Latin, which was getting close to the initial stage of separate Romance languages, both the above nominal constructions were gradually abandoned, without direct remnants (or productive examples) in the Romance languages of an Acc. (or Nom.) with Infin. construction after the *verba dicendi* proper and only with a limited number of some participial, syntactically “absolute” constructions.

Such examples of the Classical Latin — so to say — syntactical “excessiveness”, which were later abandoned and are in the area of Romance languages practically non-existent or maybe somewhat marginal, seem to have been more common in Classical Latin. Let us mention, for example, the frequent use of gerundive in Classical Latin, another old Latin nominal construction with a semantic shade of necessity, which, however, was soon gradually replaced by the new modal verb *debere*, or the obligatorily used conjunctive mood in “indirect” questions, later abandoned as well, or the intricate complex of the so-called “second” dependence system in Latin, not surviving the formation of the Romance languages.

This Romance outcome seems to be due to the pragmatism of the Late Latin colloquial speech, but what remains more remarkable is the fact that the Classical Latin apparently struck, at the time of its greatest flowering, a syntactically quite pretentious path, which could not be later kept up, for practical reasons, under the changed conditions.

Nevertheless, a number of examples of absolute participial constructions have survived in many modern languages up to the present, though mostly in passages of a high stylistic level, but sometimes also in purely idiomatic phrases. There are a great many good examples of such constructions in Italian, Spanish, French, English, even in Old Czech; see, e.g., the following Spanish examples “Terminata la guerra, el rey murió” and “Una vez abierta la puerta, entraron en casa”, or the English sentence “My brother being ill, I could not come to visit you”, but also the English idiom “all thing considered”. And I remember that, several years ago, I saw an example of correct Genitivus Absolutus in a trolley-bus announcement in Athens.

Thus, within the area of the participial and infinitival constructions, the Classical Latin evidently struck a way of its own at first, a separate, original and consistent one. In its later phases, Latin, however, abandoned this path more or less within the course of time, especially in the area of the infinitival constructions, whereas Greek, on the other hand, seems to have avoided any extremities

from the very beginning, continuing its traditional way of admitting various possibilities of development for a rather long time.

Apart from the infinitives and participles, however, there is another type of nominal constructions that may be taken up for comparison; these are the verbal nouns and verbal adjectives proper. The problem is that there is sometimes only a rather uncertain border between the verbal adjectives proper and the regular participles, which are, too, verbal adjectives in principle. One can see this when comparing the Greek verbal adjective παιδευτός “educable” with the Latin Participle Perfecti Passivi “educatus”, both of these forms being of the same origin. Or the English words “writing” or “reading” may be understood as No. 1) an ordinary noun or adjective (see, e.g., the expressions “reading and writing” and “a reading matter”), or No. 2) as the Part. Praes. Act. (e.g., a “reading school-boy”), or No. 3) as the so-called “gerund” (e.g., a “master in writing short epigrams”).

Certainly, even the infinitives are case-forms of verbal nouns by origin: the Latin active infinitive *legere* “to read” was originally a locative from a defective (i.e. not fully documented) *s*-stem verbal noun \**legos*, *legeses* (later > *legeris*), inflected like *genos*, *geneses* (later > *generis*), and the Latin passive infinitive *legi* “to be read” was originally a final dative in the form of *legei*, while the Greek active infinitive λέγειν “to speak” was a contracted form of the locative \**leg-es-+-en*, cf. the above-said Mycenaean *ekhe(h)en* for the alphabetical ἔχειν “to have”. The active infinitives aoristi activi or passivi παιδεῦσαι and παιδεύασθαι seem to have been final datives of other sigmatic verbal abstracts (see E. Schwyzer – A. Debrunner 1950:358).

In addition to infinitives, we have two so-called supines in Latin, i.e. two other isolated case forms, derived from the defective *u*-stem verbal nouns: namely supine I. in *-tum* (i.e. an isolated accusative, which may be found also in e.g. Old Slavonic *-тъ*), denoting the destination or an intended aim after the verbs of motion /“ibimus ludos spectatum”/, and supine II. in *-tū* or also *-tuī* (i.e. an isolated ablative or dative), expressing a semantic specification after certain adjectives /“horribile auditu”/.

By the above-said term “verbal nouns and verbal adjectives proper”, however, I mean in Latin the following two concrete nominal categories: gerundium and gerundivum, whose mutual relation is still a matter of vivid discussion.

1) The Latin “gerundium”, being more frequent than gerundivum in the Old Latin texts, was a specific verbal noun of the type *laudandi*, *-o*, *-um*, *-o*, disposing of these four case-forms, while the non-existing forms of the nominative and the non-prepositional accusative were replaced by the active infinitive. The Latin gerundium, thus, showed a remarkably higher degree of verbal appearance from the syntactical point of view, when compared, e.g., with a quite regularly declinable verbal nouns of the German type “das Schreiben”, or also of the English expression “writing No. 1” (i.e. the English verbal noun).

(By the way, the English gerund is a verbal form of an extremely broad functional range, reaching from an English genuine verbal noun in *-ing* of the above-said type No. 1, across the regular present participle in *-ing* up to the English gerund proper in *-ing*, which surpasses within the extent of its abundant scope any kind of similar morphological structure in other European languages, including the participle-loving Ancient Greek. The latter was, however, able to compete with English in several participial constructions at least (cf., e.g., the English phrases “keep smiling!” or “keep walking!” with the Ancient Greek quite synonymous “διατέλει γελῶν” or “διατέλει βαίνων”).

2) A typical Latin verbal adjective, on the other hand, is the so-called “gerundivum”, possessing a specific shade of urgent verbal activity and being frequent especially in the texts of Classical period (one may find 2048 gerundiva against 1020 gerundia in the speeches of Cicero, according to J. B. Hofmann – A. Szantyr 1965:369). The majority of modern European languages express this shade of necessity by means of modal verbs of the English “I must” or of German “ich muß”, or of the modal verb *debeo* in Late Latin and *devo* (it.) or *je dois* (fr.) in its Romance successors, or by means of impersonal praedicatives of the English type “it is necessary”, Russian “нужно” or “надо” without copula, German “es ist nötig”, or of the Ancient Greek impersonal verb δεῖ or χορή with Infinitive, or Latin “necesse est”.

Nevertheless, there is only the Classical Latin that was able to manage it even in a quite different way, preferring in such cases — for a number of centuries — a periphrastic construction of the type “laudandus sum, es, est”, the form *laudandus* standing here semantically not very far from the adjectives of the type “laudabilis”, but it became incorporated into the said construction “laudandus sum”, denoting urgent necessity, and was quickly grammaticalized. It is worth stressing that the Modern Italian developed a rather synonymous, but formally quite different alternative option, while using instead of the modal verb “dovere” in the sentence “loro devono essere puniti” a periphrastic construction “loro vanno puniti”, containing the verb of motion “andare”.

What is still more important is the fact that the Latin gerundival constructions served as substituting parallels for gerundial constructions with transitive verbs, transforming them into rather elaborate syntactic products (instead of “scribendo epistulas discimus” the gerundival constructions of the type “epistulis scribendis discimus” were preferred, which, too, had very little hope of remaining in use in Romance languages — similarly as the Acc. with Inf. had it after the Verbs of *dicendi*, or the once extremely high proportion in using absolute participial constructions).

Even Ancient Greek had two verbal adjectives, both of them being documented in Mycenaean times already. The first of them, the type παιδευτός “educable”, i.e. a verbal adjective with a semantic shade of ability, is not very common in Greek, far less common than its morphological counterpart “educa-

tus”, which became a very important and frequent participle perfecti passivi in Latin.

The second verbal adjective of the type παιδευτέος, which bore a shade of urgent necessity in Greek, similarly as the Latin gerundivum “educandus”, was a very rare form in Greek (six times less frequent than παιδευτός) and definitely much less frequent than the above-said Latin “educandus”; the verbal adjectives in -τέος, besides, occurred mostly (in 85 %) within impersonal constructions of the παιδευτέον (ἔστί) type, whereas the Latin transitive verbs created impersonal gerundival constructions only rarely.

In Greek, we have neither verbal nouns nor gerunds of the Latin-Romance-English type nor such well declinable verbal nouns of the German sort. Nevertheless, one can find a very remarkable substitute of verbal nouns in Greek, cf. the substantivized infinitive (of various tenses and voices), fully declinable with the help of the preceding definite article.

The substantivized infinitive was a very practical construction, owing to several reasons (E. Schwyzer – A. Debrunner 1950:368ff.):

- a) It is only the definite article that is declined (in singular only).
- b) The indirect case forms are transparent prepositional constructions, for the most part.
- c) Supplementary participial data, even short dependent adverbial clauses, may be rather simply (i.e. attributively) integrated into these, mostly prepositional constructions.
- d) Apart from the (more or less facultative) definite article τὸ + Inf. in Nominative (or in Accusative), one could use also the plain Gen. τοῦ + Inf. in the sense of a final clause and the plain Dat. τῷ + Inf. in the function of a Dativus commodi or of a Locativus respectus).

The archaic Greek epic poetry, however, knows only peripheral cases of this construction (standing on the border between the demonstrative pronoun and an article); safe instances of a substantivized infinitive may be not found until in the Lyric poetry and in the early Drama (Aeschylus has 19 instances of the definite article τὸ + Inf. in the function of a Nom. and 27 instances of an Acc., and only two by two instances of the τοῦ or τῷ in Gen. or Dat. respectively, while Sophocles is the first who has already several instances of prepositional constructions. The infinitives perfecti and the medio-passive infinitives are documented rather seldom, starting from the 5th cent. B.C. (τοῖς ὀλβίοις καὶ τὸ νικᾶσθαι πρόπει A. A. 941); still less frequent and of a later age (from Thucydides) were the infinitives futuri.

In the Ptolemaic papyri, we find rather many instances of the substantivized τοῦ in Gen. or τῷ in Dat. or of the prepositional infinitival constructions. Starting from Septuaginta, the genitive form τοῦ can stand before any infinitive, whatever its function may be, similarly as nowadays in the case of the English

preposition “*to*” or German “*zu*” with infinitive (E. Schwyzer – A. Debrunner 1950:372).

Let us add that Ioannes Malalas used in the Book XIII of his Byzantine Chronicle 48 final clauses with the subordinating conjunctions ἵνα, ὅπως, but no fewer than 83 final infinitive constructions of διὰ τό, εἰς τό, ἐπὶ τό, ἔνεκα τοῦ, πρὸς τό and some 30 instances of the non-prepositional Genitiv τοῦ + Inf., according to K. Loudová (2006:116; cf. P. Helms 1971–1972:378). Nevertheless, even this highly practical way of substituting verbal abstracts in Greek was shut down by the total elimination of infinitive during the Byzantine Era.

Latin did not possess infinitive of this kind, because it did not possess definite article. Latin used gerundium here, but also some specific participial constructions of the type “*ab urbe condita*”, in the sense “*since/after the foundation of the city*”; cf. “*Sicilia amissa Hannibalem angebat*”, i.e. “*the loss of Sicily tormented Hannibal*”.

Thus, if I may conclude this chapter, the Latin Syntax was characterized, within the area of the nominal branch of the substitute sentence pattern, by a remarkable tendency:

1. to create new, quite specific nominal forms of verbal abstracts (esp. the gerundium and gerundivum), against the more simple, but very practical substantivized infinitives in Greek;
2. to enforce the spread of the Indo-European nominal construction of Part. Abs. to an extremely great extent of Abl. Abs. in Late Latin (against a moderate application of the Gen. Abs. in Greek);
3. to force through a practically unlimited usage of the old IE. construction of Acc. cum Inf. in Classical Latin (as contrasted with Greek, where such construction was always a matter of choice).

These tendencies were abandoned gradually in Late colloquial Latin on its way towards the early phases of arising Romance languages, where it is especially the construction of Acc. cum Inf. that after the *verba dicendi* disappeared in the course of time, the Latin Abl. Abs. being transformed on his way to Romance languages into analogous participial constructions, which were used to a limited extent only, mostly in the written forms of the Romance language in question — apart from some set idiomatic phrases. The Latin gerundium either disappeared totally or its Abl. Sing. ending in *-ndo* assumed the function of the present participle, e.g. in Spanish (while the Greek present participle developed into an undclinable form ending in *-οντας*).

And the Latin abundance of conjunctives in depending clauses got reduced to a limited — or better — a qualitatively somewhat modified extent here, expressing uncertainty after specific conjunctions, for the most part.

The Latin Syntax, thus, seems to have been characterized by a series of nominal experiments in the course of the antiquity, which were later abandoned to a considerable extent. The development of the Greek Syntax, on the contrary,

was less dramatic in the antiquity, one of the most conspicuous events being here the loss of optative at the end of this period. The major changes happened as late as during the advanced Byzantine era, when some concrete traits of the so-called Balcan linguistic grouping (“Sprachbund”) became evident (e.g., the loss of infinitive, which afflicted the Greek syntax in a degree hardly imaginable before — or also a steady decline of participle, or the elimination of dative).

Most recently, however, scholars who are dealing with general questions of the Latin and Greek Syntax by means of modern linguistic methods, started investigating quite new fields of research which enjoy increasing scholarly interest. I mean, for instance, the research into the problems of the linguistic modality, mainly within the dimension of the so-called deontic modality, concentrating on the semantic area of necessity, possibility and intention, as well as of the epistemic modality, analysing the character and extent of certainty of the statement and dealing with the linguistic devices expressing various degrees of the certainty (F. R. Palmer 1986, S. Núñez 1991, B. Heine 1995).

We can notice a rather different spectrum of such linguistic devices both between the Classical and the main modern languages; these are more variable and flexible, for the most part, especially when compared with Latin, where we often miss short useful adverbs like “perhaps”, “vielleicht, wohl”, “peut-être”, “forse” (the Latin “fortasse” is relatively rare), and we can see that the Latin authors — while wanting to say “the father will probably come”, or “he is likely to come”, or “er wird wohl kommen” — have to rely on more complicated sentence phrases like “haud scio an pater veniat”, “fieri potest, ut pater veniat”, “patrem venturum esse puto”, “pater venturus esse videtur”, “haud dubito, quin pater venturus sit” etc. (See A. Bartoněk 1979, 1980, H. Reichová 1980, 1982 and 1997, P. Peňáz 1983ab, D. Tenorová-Peňázová 1983, D. Tesařová 1980/1983.)

Even Greek seems to be more flexible than Latin with its short adverbs (nearly particles) *ποῦ*, *ἴσως* expressing uncertainty — beside its much broader spectrum of modality devices, starting from the morphological means (future, optative, conj., ind. with *ἄν*) and the lexical ones (modal verbs and modal praedicatives) and arriving at the syntactical devices of the type of dependent clauses — similar to those above-mentioned in Latin (see K. Pořízková 2001, 2006, as well as the Chapter No. 12 of this book, written about the epistemic modality by the same autor.)

Even though these reflections are of a preliminary character at this time, they may contribute to a certain extent to the characterization of the syntax of Classical languages in the not too distant future, and this is why I have tried to draw your attention to them at the end of my present chapter.

After an interval of some 80 years (F. Sommer 1921, J. Wackernagel 1926–28) we have tried now to put together a comparative study dealing with both the Ancient Greek and the Latin syntax within the area of their sentence pattern, i.e. that of the declarative, volitive and relative subordinate clauses, including their nominal semi-sentence equivalents, i.e. the infinitival, participial or (in Latin) gerundial-gerundival constructions. In a similar way, a profound comparative analysis of the so-called deontic and epistemic modality in Greek and Latin has been done, esp. the latter being specifically analysed for the first time within the area of Ancient Greek by K. Pořízková.

The difference between the Greek and the Latin syntactical sentence pattern is rather striking. Latin preferred very strongly several syntactical features, e.g., the construction of Acc. + Inf., from Plautus (ca. 200 B.C.) to Tertullian (3rd cent. A.D.), or used the subjunctive mood in almost all subordinate clauses, whereas the Ancient Greek people liked participia and were able to invent the phrase “keep smiling” ca. 2500 years before the English, while using their own synonymous idiom *diatelei gelón*.

In this study, Greek and Latin are primarily confronted, But also the Romance languages are compared with Latin, if necessary (they threw off a good many useless features inherited from Latin, as the subjunctives in indirect questions), in fact even the Germanic languages are dealt with here (both in English and Ancient Greek one can say: “I see him coming”) — not to mention Modern Greek as well as the Slavonic languages: Czech and Russian.

