



This is an offprint from:

Susan C. Herring, Pieter van Reenen and Lene Schøsler (eds)

*Textual Parameters in Older Languages*

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Amsterdam/Philadelphia

2000

(Published as Vol. 195 of the series

CURRENT ISSUES IN LINGUISTIC THEORY,

ISSN 0304-0763)

ISBN 90 272 3702 6 (Hb; Eur.) / 1 55619 973 2 (Hb; US)

© 2000 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form,  
by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means,  
without written permission from the publisher.

# Textual Authenticity: Evidence from Medieval Greek\*

Brian D. Joseph  
*The Ohio State University*

## Abstract

Three constructions from Medieval Greek are examined here with regard to the question of their authenticity, i.e. whether their use corresponds to actual spoken language usage and to some part of the grammar internalized by native speakers/users of the language, or instead is merely a conventional element of a restricted written or literary register. All three constructions involve the Medieval Greek infinitive: an adverbial usage known as the "Circumstantial Infinitive", a periphrastic future with *thelo*: 'want' as an auxiliary, and a periphrastic perfect with *ekho*: 'have', and therefore the authenticity issue has a bearing on the status of the infinitive in this stage of the language. I adduce evidence for the authenticity of these constructions from several sources, including statements by contemporary grammarians, assumptions about intended audience, evidence from the modern continuation of the construction, and general principles governing language change and the development of full paradigms. Deciding the authenticity of these constructions helps to settle the question of the status of the infinitive in Medieval Greek. Moreover, the evidence presented demonstrates the range of methodologies one can employ to decide matters of authenticity, and the value of drawing on basic principles of historical linguistic development.

### 1. Methodological Preliminaries

One problem that repeatedly faces any scholar examining a language through the medium of written texts is what may be called the "authenticity" question. Of specific concern is whether a feature found in a given text or corpus corresponds in some way to a linguistically real and linguistically significant generalization about the language and about its speakers' competence, thereby qualifying as an "authentic" feature. By contrast, an inauthentic feature would have no basis in actual usage and would instead be an artificial aspect of the language of a given text.

Problems of this sort are found with data from all levels of linguistic analysis. For example, when one notes that in Greek papyri from the Hellenistic period, covering roughly 300 BC to 300 AD, the letter upsilon (< Y >) occurs in some words in which Classical Greek has a diphthong of omicron plus iota (< OI >), a question immediately arises as to what, if anything, this spelling means regarding the pronunciation of Greek. Is it just a misspelling and nothing more, with no more significance than a typographical error in a journal article today, to take a clearly inauthentic feature?

Two examples involving morphology come from Latin. The verb 'to be' in Latin does not have a synchronically available present participle, since the inherited participle *sons* became divorced from the 'be' paradigm, and took on the meaning 'guilty'. Julius Caesar, however, is reported<sup>1</sup> to have created a participle *ens* for this verb, but, since it is restricted to him, its authenticity has been considered suspect. Similarly, the Latin grammarian Varro states (*Lingua Latina*. 9.100) that a first person singular present indicative form *esum*, of the verb 'to be', once occurred in the language, even though the only form otherwise attested in Latin is *sum*, raising questions as to its authenticity.

In the domain of syntax, a comparison of the English encountered in literature with that found in transcripts of actual conversations would reveal the occurrence in the former but not the latter of subject-verb inversion in quotative structures, as in (1):

- (1) a. "The test", said the teacher, "will now begin."  
 b. "The test will end in 10 minutes", announced the teacher.  
 c. "The eclipse", added Kim, "should begin any minute now."

This comparison would lead to the question of whether such quotative inversion is really a part of the grammar of English, or instead just a conventional

literary device. This same sort of question arises frequently with regard to texts that are translations. For instance, Lightfoot (1988:319–20) has suggested that accusative-plus-infinitive constructions (i.e. subject-to-object raising or exceptional case marking, in other terminology) could have first entered English through Medieval scribal imitation of parallel constructions in Latin texts, implying that the earliest Middle English occurrences of such sentences were not authentic colloquial English usage.

When confronted with such cases, the investigator must look for some form of corroboration, some indication that the textual feature in question is a real linguistic feature. Perhaps the most readily available corroborative evidence is frequency and systematicity: if the feature is widespread and not haphazard in its distribution or realization, then it most likely reflects a real feature of some sort, and is not, for instance, an error, the written equivalent of a slip of the tongue. In the case of both upsilon for omicron-iota in early Post-Classical Greek and English quotative inversion, such evidence is to be found. Both are widespread in their respective textual traditions and show some degree of regularity in their distribution: upsilon in this period in Greek, for instance, is not used in place of other vowels, only for omicron-iota. Caesar's *ens*, however, fails on this criterion, for it is unique in Latinity, with no support from any usage elsewhere in Latin; Caesar's form is generally taken to be an artificial creation, a nonce-form created analogically (based on present forms such as 3SG *es-t*) and thus actually an inauthentic Latin form.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, *esum* fails this criterion and so would appear also to be inauthentic in Latin. The usual explanation<sup>3</sup> is that *esum* is an analogical creation of Varro's (with the initial *e-* added to *sum* as a result of the influence of the 2SG *es(s)* and 3SG *est*) which never had any currency in Latin usage, and indeed Varro is not always the most reliable reporter on early Latin.

However, such evidence often is not sufficient and one must develop any and all available sources of potentially corroborating, or disconfirming, evidence. In the case of the Post-Classical Greek use of upsilon, the phenomenon of "reverse spelling" provides some corroboration, for omicron-iota is found where Classical Greek has upsilon (see Tonnet 1993:39–40 for some examples); this evidence confirms that the usage must be taken seriously. It shows further that the sounds represented by < Y > and < OI > in Classical Greek have merged in the Post-Classical period, most likely to front rounded [y], since at this period they show such interchanges with one another but not with other vowels. The status of *esum* is interesting in this regard, for it shows

how external evidence can be brought to bear on the authenticity question. Recent finds have shown that in Oscan and South Picene, two Italic languages closely related to Latin, the form *esum* occurs as the first person singular of 'be'. Therefore, it is reasonable to posit a Proto-Italic form \**esom*, with the result that *esum* may have had some legitimacy in at least some dialects of Latin, providing some vindication for Varro.<sup>4</sup>

Also with regard to syntactic constructions found in texts, further testing of claims of authenticity can come from many sources. For instance, both quotative inversion in English and possibly early Middle English accusative-plus-infinitive sentences could, as noted above, turn out to be simply a literary convention or the like, and thus an instance of a textually restricted or genre-specific construction without general currency in the language at large. Therefore, another type of question that is appropriate in such cases is whether in fact the construction or feature corresponds to a real element of speakers' competence, i.e. of the grammar internalized by native speakers/users of the language, and further, even, whether it corresponds to actual spoken language usage. Relevant evidence can take several forms. Where native speakers are available as a control, they can verify that a given construction is fully acceptable, even if restricted to literary usage. Such is the case with the English quotative inversion, for though it has no direct correspondent in spoken usage, it must be taken as a real feature of speaker competence because native speakers have no trouble identifying the construction as natural and can produce, judge, and respond to novel instances of it. This result means further that linguistically authentic constructions can be register-specific, and possibly limited just to textual occurrence.

Still, it is most often the case when dealing with texts, and certainly so with texts from languages no longer spoken, whether ancient or not, that native speakers are not available for consultation, so that other types of corroboration are needed. One strategy has been to accord greater weight to the evidence of prose texts over poetic ones for showing "real" features of the spoken language, the assumption being that part of the poetic process involves stretching grammatical and lexical boundaries (which in itself can be an important delimiting case for exploring the grammar of a language, but not necessarily for validating the status of a given feature or construction). In a similar vein, Jamison (1991), who addresses quite cogently the general problems associated with determining authenticity for Vedic Sanskrit, an ancient language known through the "highly wrought poetry of the Rig-Veda [and

the] technical discourse, clearly honed for stylized scholarly exegesis and debate" of Vedic prose (p.95), has used quoted direct speech in the Vedic corpus as a further window into nonliterary spoken usage for an ancient language.

Occasionally also, statements by contemporary grammarians can be useful, as can assumptions about the audience for a given text. Hock & Pandharipande (1976:116) use the former type of evidence in support of the claim that Sanskrit was a spoken language, noting that there are many rules in the codified grammatical tradition for Sanskrit "which make sense only in a language which has a truly colloquial register and is genuinely spoken, such as rules concerning the pronunciation in a monotone (rather than with the normal pitch accentuation) in calls from a distance". They also use the second type of corroboration, again applying it to Sanskrit, pointing to "the mutually intelligible use of Sanskrit and Pra:krit [a sibling sociolect of Sanskrit] in classical drama, as well as the fact that both Sanskrit and Pra:krit must have been mutually intelligible to the audiences of classical drama". Admittedly, the issue Hock and Pandharipande were addressing, of whether an ancient textually attested language such as Sanskrit was ever used as a spoken, colloquial language, is a bit different from judging the status of a particular construction or feature. Importantly, though, both concern linguistic authenticity in some way, and these examples from Sanskrit do demonstrate further sources of corroboration.

One final source that can be instructive with regard to the authenticity question is evidence from the modern continuation, or lack thereof, of the construction under consideration. In such a case, however, it is essential for one to consider as well the question of the relationship between the language of the earlier text and the modern language in which the continuation occurs, for sometimes the modern evidence can be based on a different dialect from that found in the earlier texts.

## 2. Authenticity in Medieval Greek Usage

With this general discussion as background, attention can now turn to some specific cases that raise problems with regard to authenticity, for which various of these types of corroborating evidence, and others as well, can be called into service. In particular, there are several constructions from Medi-

eval Greek of the thirteenth to sixteenth centuries that, although widespread and quite well represented in the available texts, nonetheless show some aspects that suggest an artificial quality to them. Still, through the careful consideration of all the available evidence, it can be demonstrated that these constructions pass the tests for authenticity of some sort, as developed below.

The constructions in question all involve the somewhat restricted Medieval Greek infinitive as a continuation of the Ancient Greek infinitive, and must be viewed against the backdrop of the long process by which the earlier infinitive came to be replaced by finite verb forms in virtually all its uses by the late-Medieval/early-Modern period in Greek, that is, by roughly the seventeenth century. This replacement process was eventually so extensive that Modern Greek is a language now that has only finite complementation and no productive living infinitive. This process is discussed in detail in Joseph (1983, 1978/1990), where arguments are presented that the relevant forms are indeed infinitives, on formal grounds (e.g. absence of person and number marking) and functional grounds (e.g. their use in complementation). The Medieval constructions in question that involve the Medieval infinitive are what has been called the "Circumstantial" or "Temporal" Infinitive in which an infinitive serves as an adverbial to locate the circumstances under which the action of a sentence occurs, and two periphrastic formations involving auxiliary verbs combining with an infinitive: a future tense with the verb *thelo*: 'want', and a perfect-tense system involving forms of the verb *ekho*: 'have'.

Examples illustrating these constructions are given in (2), the Circumstantial Infinitive in (2a), the future in (2b), and the perfect in (2c). All are taken from the mid-fourteenth century *Chronicle of Morea* (line numbers in parentheses are from the edition of Schmitt 1904), and are given in a conventional transliteration of the Greek spelling:<sup>5</sup>

- (2) a. k' ego:, to akousei to, eutus ethlibe:ka  
 and I/NOM ART hear/INF it at-once be-aggrieved/1SG  
 tosouto:s (6066)  
 so-much  
 'And on hearing it, I was at once greatly aggrieved'
- b. sumbouleuontai to po:s thelousin praksei (829 (H))  
 discuss/3PL ART how will/3PL act/INF  
 'They discuss the (question of) how they will act'



- c. to skamni ... opou to eikhen khasei (6223 (H))  
 the-throne which it had/3SG lost/INF  
 '... the throne which he had lost'.

Questions about the authenticity of these constructions have been raised, especially with regard to their relation to colloquial spoken Greek of the Medieval period. Burguière (1960:219), for instance, has called into question the authenticity of the *thelo*: plus infinitive future. This infinitival future was just one of several future types found in Medieval Greek (see below §4), and the only one with an infinitive, the others showing combinations of *thelo*:, in some instances reduced to *the*, together with a finite verb, optionally preceded by the (subordinating) subjunctive marker *na*.<sup>6</sup> These noninfinitival futures coexisted with the *thelo*: plus infinitive future, and in fact they derive historically from a reanalysis of the infinitive with *thelo*:. It was from one of these combinations of *thelo*: 'want', most likely in an invariant 3SG form *thelei*, in combination with *na* and an inflected verb, e.g. *thelei na po* 'I will say' (literally: "it-will that I-say"), that the widespread Modern Greek future marker *tha* developed. Thus, Burguière argued, the Medieval Greek *thelo*: plus infinitive future is not directly continued in the Modern Greek vernacular and so most likely was not an authentic future for all of Medieval Greek. Rather, he says, it represents an artificial usage of at least late Medieval writers, even if it may have had some currency at an earlier stage, before it gave rise to the noninfinitival futures with *thelo*:.

As for the other infinitival constructions, Tonnet (1993) has suggested that they show the effects of French influence on the language of the *Chronicle of Morea*. There is an early French version of the Chronicle (*Livre de la conquête de la princée de l'Amorée*, edited by Longnon 1911), leading some scholars (e.g. Beck 1971) to claim that the Greek version is based on the French, while others instead see the French version as based on a Greek original (e.g. Schmitt 1904; see Politis (1973:28) for discussion and references). Still, apparently taking the view that the French has at least influenced the Greek, Tonnet states concerning the Circumstantial Infinitive that "ce type d'infinitif ... est peut-être une formule commode pour rendre les infinitifs du modèle français: 'à entendre...'" The situation with the *ekho*: perfect system is a bit more complicated. As (2c) indicates, there are clear instances of a past perfect with the past tense of *ekho*: (e.g. 3SG *eikhen*). There are also what appear, from a structural standpoint at least, to be present perfect forms, e.g.:

- (3) eipasin ... oti ... na        me: tous        ekhoun  
 said/3PL that SUBJUNC not them/ACC have/3PL.PRES  
 noe:sei (3850 (H))  
 notice/INF  
 'They said ... that ... they will not notice them'

However, such formations do not appear to have a perfect sense; rather they are more like a future, as indicated by the translation in (3). For these, Tonnet (p. 77) suggests that "nous n'avons pas affaire à des parfaits ... mais à des périphrases verbales peut-être inspirées à l'origine par des locutions françaises du modèle; *ekho: noe:sei* équivaldrait, par exemple, à 'avoir/prendre connaissance'". If that were the case, so that the occurrence of this construction in Medieval Greek was in origin a matter of translation syntax or at least quite recent influence from a foreign language, then these constructions would not necessarily be particularly authentic or representative of spoken Medieval Greek of that period. The issue of the recency of the external influence matters, because borrowed or calqued features can of course become assimilated and nativized. No one, for instance, would doubt the presence of an "accusative plus infinitive" construction in Modern English, even if it may have had its origins in translation syntax from Latin. And indeed, Modern Greek now has a fully productive perfect tense (see below §5) with *exo* 'have' (from earlier *ekho:*) plus a continuation of the earlier infinitive. Still, the question can be asked as to how representative this construction was at the time it first began to appear in Medieval Greek.

The importance of the authenticity of these constructions, quite apart from the general issue of how to deal with ancient texts, lies in the fact that collectively they represent the vast majority of occurrences of an infinitive in Medieval Greek. As noted above, the infinitive was in wide use in Classical Greek, but ultimately receded to such an extent that Modern Greek is a language with no infinitive. This process of the loss of the infinitive and its replacement by finite verbal forms clearly began in Hellenistic Greek, e.g. Greek of the New Testament, where finite complementation is found in many constructions where Classical Greek had an infinitive. However, determining the endpoint of the loss of the infinitive depends to a large extent on how one treats the traces of the infinitive in Medieval Greek. In particular, if the rather extensive use of the infinitive in Medieval texts, e.g. in constructions such as the Circumstantial Infinitive and a future formation with *thelo:*, represents authentic usage that corresponds to and is representative of spoken Medieval Greek, then clearly

one must conclude, as Joseph (1983, 1978/1990) and Mackridge (1993:332) have, that the infinitive was a real part of the grammar in that period. If not, then the loss of the infinitive can be dated to much earlier; Mirambel (1961:46), for instance, has stated that "les infinitifs ... disparaissent totalement et définitivement de l'usage courant au Xe siècle", clearly excluding the constructions in question as revealing anything about the status of a category of infinitive in the grammar of Medieval Greek.

In support of the authenticity of these constructions with the infinitive, one can cite some of the by now familiar types of corroboration. For one thing, all three constructions are amply represented in a wide variety of Medieval Greek literature, including historical chronicles, romances, and vernacular poetry. Moreover, they show internal consistency in their form and syntax, for example with regard to the placement of clitic object pronouns. For instance, Joseph (1978/1990:Ch. 5, 9) and Mackridge (1993:332) argue that clitic placement with the *thelo*:-future can for the most part be subsumed under the general principles of clitic placement in Medieval Greek, and clitics regularly, and expectedly, follow the Circumstantial Infinitive. Such extensive and consistent usage provides corroborating evidence for authenticity, as does mention, for instance of the *thelo*:-plus-infinitive future, in contemporary grammars of Medieval Greek (e.g. the sixteenth century grammar of Nikolaos Sophianos (Papadopoulos 1977)).

Moreover, an argument can be made from the nature of the texts and the intended audience. As Browning (1983:5-6), concerned that the language of Medieval Greek texts might be thought to reflect the archaizing and largely artificial "purist" Greek of the sort that led to the high-style *katharevousa* of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries,<sup>7</sup> asserts for Medieval Greek: "There is a large body of literature, mostly poetry, written in a linguistic form which is clearly not that of contemporary purist literature ... no single line of any of these poems could possibly be supposed to be intended as purist Greek. And certain of them are written in a dialect whose forms are often remote from those of the literary [i.e. learned, purist] language". Since many of these texts were pieces of popular literature, intended for a general audience, and were not aimed just at a relatively small class of highly educated Greek speakers, it must be assumed that the forms and constructions in them were generally accessible to the audience. Consequently, just as Hock & Pandharipande (1976) could argue from the evidence of Sanskrit drama for the existence of Sanskrit as a spoken language, so, too, can the nature of the vernacular texts

found in the Medieval Greek corpus argue for the authenticity of the language contained therein.<sup>8</sup>

Despite this evidence — in part, perhaps, because it is not substantially different from the types of corroboration typically summoned forth in support of claims of authenticity of ancient texts — some doubts remain, so that further corroboration is needed. Each construction, moreover, presents a few special problems, so that each needs to be examined more carefully. Thus in what follows, a more detailed look is taken at these constructions and the question of their authenticity, with an eye to exploring other types of possible supporting evidence. It emerges that there is indeed such additional corroborating evidence. Moreover, of particular interest is the fact that it comes from a consideration of general principles of language change together with the historical origins of these constructions.

### 3. The Circumstantial Infinitive

The Circumstantial Infinitive raises a question because it seems to be restricted just to the Medieval period; it has no descendant at all in Modern Greek, and thus it is a rather short-lived phenomenon that arose and died within the span of a few centuries in Medieval Greek. Also, recognizing this usage as authentic and colloquial would require one to recognize a limited reversal of the long-term demise of the infinitive, inasmuch as this use has no direct Ancient Greek counterpart.<sup>9</sup> Such a reversal would run counter to the general trend towards the retreat of the infinitive in Medieval times. However, to mitigate such an objection, it can be noted first that long-term linguistic trends are not necessarily unidirectional in the way they unfold through time. Each generation of language learners can only work with the “raw material” presented to them from which they learn their language; they cannot know, for instance, that they are part of a centuries-long trend toward the elimination of a particular category. If there are sufficient examples of a category present in the synchronic data they work with, it should not be unexpected to find at least some speakers exploiting that category and putting it to novel uses. The long demise of case-endings in English, for instance, has not prevented the creation of what some analysts (e.g. Smith 1981) have taken as a new non-subject case form, *inwhich*, of the relative pronoun in the written usage of some native speakers of English.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, there are other signs of “revival” for the

infinitive in Medieval Greek: a new form, *eistai*, of the infinitive of the verb 'to be', replacing Ancient Greek *einai*, arose in Medieval Greek as early as the twelfth century and seems to have had some influence over other Medieval infinitival forms as well (see Joseph 1978/1990:37; 1983:68, 76). Considered in such a light, the development of a new function for the infinitive is not such an unusual or unnatural occurrence.

Furthermore, the chronology of the Circumstantial Infinitive provides a strong counter to Tonnet's suggestion of translation influence from French, and points to a non-French, Greek-internal origin for this construction. Despite its wide use in the *Chronicle of Morea* — a text for which, as Tonnet notes, there is a suggestion of French influence — this use of the infinitive predates any period of contact with French, which began in the thirteenth century with the Crusades, and occurs in earlier non-translation texts. The earliest example, according to Mihevc-Gabrovec (1973), occurs in the tenth century *Book of Ceremonies* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus:

- (4) kai to anelthein auton kratousi  
and the/NTR return/INF him/ACC hold/3PL  
tas kheiras autou (1.148.11)  
the-hands/ACC of-him/GEN  
'And on his return, they hold his hands'

An example is also to be found in the twelfth century vernacular poems of Theodoros Prodromos:

- (5) euthus to brasein to thermon . . . (IV.50(g))  
at-once the/NTR boil/INF the-warm/NTR  
'As soon as the warm (water) boiled . . .'

In addition, the path by which this construction arose is quite natural. Ancient Greek used the neuter definite article to nominalize infinitives, a construction generally known as the "articular infinitive", and this process continued into Post-Classical Greek, being common with the infinitive as the object of prepositions in papyri, for instance, up through the sixth century AD, and on a much more limited basis into the Medieval period. Moreover, Ancient Greek used the dative case for 'time at which', and with the loss of the dative from colloquial Greek (see Humbert 1930) by the tenth century, later Greek came to use the accusative, as in Modern Greek:

- (6) tin tetarti, as pame s to parko  
 the-Wednesday/ACC HORT go/1PL to the-park  
 '(On) Wednesday, let's go to the park!'

The Circumstantial Infinitive, which is most often used to indicate the time at which some subsequent event occurs, as in (2a), (4), and (5) above, is a natural extension of the dative/accusative of time to the articular infinitive.<sup>11</sup> Thus even though the Circumstantial Infinitive has no exact counterpart in Ancient Greek, it does have a straightforward path of development out of antecedents in earlier Greek.<sup>12</sup> Finally, the Circumstantial Infinitive construction ultimately falls in line with the strong general trend away from nonfinite complementation, and it too appears in a form in which the infinitive has been replaced by a finite verb with the subjunctive marker *na*, as in this example from the fourteenth century poem *Pulologos*:

- (7) to na s' idoun ... sphazontai (492-3)  
 the/NTR SUBJ you/ACC see/3PL slaughter/3PL.PASS  
 'On seeing you ... they will be destroyed'.

All of these additional indications, therefore, suggest that the Circumstantial Infinitive had a real place in the grammar of Medieval Greek. At worst, given the absence of a direct continuation in Modern Greek, one might have to admit that it is restricted to textual (i.e. literary) occurrence only, but then it would simply be parallel in nature to Quotative Inversion of Modern English, i.e. a real but register-specific construction.

#### 4. The *thelo*:-Futures

The next construction to be examined is the future tense periphrasis consisting of the verb *thelo*: 'want' with an infinitive. As noted above, though it occurs quite extensively and systematically in the Medieval Greek corpus, one reason to question its authenticity is Burguière's objection that the future in colloquial Modern Greek derives not from the *thelo*:-plus-infinitive future but rather from a combination of a form of *thelo*: followed by a finite verb. Thus Burguière is essentially using the evidence of the modern continuation, or in this case, the lack thereof, as an argument concerning the status of a construction attested earlier. Expanding on this point somewhat, one might develop a further objection to the authenticity of the infinitival future by noting that there

is great diversity in the future tense formations to be found in Medieval Greek texts; the variety might well be taken to suggest that some other expression for the future tense was the "real", i.e. colloquial and thus authentic, future in that period.

However, neither Burguière's argument *per se* nor its extension is really very compelling. First, undermining Burguière's objection is the fact that various scholars, e.g. Thumb (1912) and Pernot (1946), have reported *thelo:* plus an infinitive-like (i.e. uninflected) form as a future type among older speakers at the turn of the century in a few outlying regional dialects; thus the widespread use of the future with the prefixed marker [θa] in Modern Greek can be viewed as a relatively recent phenomenon that does not in itself speak against the *thelo:*-plus-infinitive future being a real part of Medieval Greek.

Second, it is certainly true that there is great diversity regarding the expression of the future in Medieval Greek. Leaving aside the use of other auxiliaries, e.g. *ekho:* 'have' in Byzantine and early Medieval Greek (see §5), of the present tense, and of the bare subjunctive, for the future tense, it is still possible to find five future types, and developments therefrom, with *thelo:* 'want' alone, with no obvious semantic or functional differentiation among them evident at all, although there were undoubtedly nuances of meaning distinguishing them from one another:<sup>13</sup>

- (8) a. *thelo:* + infinitive (i.e. inflected auxiliary with uninflected verb)
- b. *thelo:* + *na* + finite verb (i.e. inflected auxiliary with subordinating marker *na* plus fully inflected verb)
- c. *thelei* + *na* + finite verb (i.e. invariant third person singular form of auxiliary with subordinating marker *na* plus fully inflected verb; this type shows a truncation of auxiliary to *the*, and this *the* + *na* + finite verb ultimately (via *thena* → *thana* → *than*) gives the [θa] future of Modern Greek)
- d. *thelo:* + finite verb (i.e. like (b) but with no subordinating marker)
- e. *thelei* + finite verb (i.e. like (c) but with no subordinating marker; like (c) also, in that the auxiliary truncates giving *the* + finite verb)

However, even though various of these future types do co-occur in one and the same text, there is a chronological progression to their first attestations. Bănescu (1915) found that type (8a) first appears before the tenth century,

whereas type (8b) appears first only in the tenth century; type (8c) is not directly attested, but can safely be inferred through the truncated type (*the na* + finite verb) which is attested first in the twelfth to fourteenth centuries. Type (8d) is first found in the fifteenth century and type (8e) in the sixteenth century.

More important than the absolute chronology of these types is the fact that the diversity conforms to a basic progression that might be expected based on general principles of language change. That is, taking *thelo:* plus the infinitive as the starting point gives the creation of type (8b) for free, as it were, through the regular replacement of the infinitive by finite verb forms marked for subordination when preceded by the marker *na* (as exemplified above in (7) for the replacement of the Circumstantial Infinitive); the type of (8c) seems to have arisen from the (8b) type then through the elimination of what could be interpreted as redundant person/number marking for the subject, which was encoded twice in the (8b) future type, on the auxiliary *thelo:* and on the finite verb marked with *na*. The type of (8d) has generally been regarded as the result of a reinterpretation of the (8a) type in the third person singular; since the third person singular present ending and the infinitival ending had fallen together through a series of sound changes, a sequence of 3SG *thelei* plus an infinitive as in (9a) was susceptible of being interpreted as a sequence of third person forms, as in (9b), from which unambiguous instances of type (8d) could arise:

- (9) a. *thelei graphei*  
will/3SG write/INF  
'He/She will write'
- b. *thelei graphei*  
will/3SG writes/3SG  
'He/She will write'
- c. *thelo: grapho:*  
will/1SG write/1SG  
'I will write'.

Finally, the type of (8e) could have arisen from the (8d) future by the same elimination of redundant person/number marking that gave rise to the (8c) type. Thus all the diversity seen in the form of the *thelo:* futures in Medieval Greek can be explained as natural developments, either direct or indirect, from the *thelo:*-plus-infinitive type as starting point. Moreover, as noted in §2



above and in (8c), one of these offshoots of the *thelo*:-plus-infinitive future is the basis for the modern future with [θa], so that indirectly, the infinitival future actually does have a continuation in Modern colloquial Greek. These facts show that the diversity is quite orderly and not, as might be expected if the starting point were an artificial creation of a literary register, completely haphazard.

All in all, therefore, despite suggestions to the contrary, there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the *thelo*:-plus-infinitive future of Medieval Greek. Its authenticity is corroborated by modern evidence and by the evidence of how perfectly natural processes of language change could have led to the modern situation from a Medieval Greek configuration of futures that included the construction in question.

### 5. The Perfect System

As noted in §2, certain aspects of the set of periphrastic formations with *ekho*: 'have' plus an infinitive give reason for questioning the authenticity of some members of the set. Despite the clear pluperfects with a past tense of *ekho*: (e.g. (2c)), it is not clear what to make of the instances of the Medieval formations consisting of a present tense of *ekho*: with an infinitive. In Byzantine Greek of the sixth to eleventh centuries, this periphrasis was an expression of the future tense (Browning 1983:64), and the corresponding past tense of *ekho*: with an infinitive was a past future, or conditional, meaning something like 'would VERB' or 'would have VERB-ed'. By the time of the *Chronicle of Morea* in the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries, the past of *ekho*: with the infinitive had become a true pluperfect. However, the present periphrastic formation, as noted above, was definitely not a present perfect, being instead somewhat like a future, as Tonnet (1993) observes, but not clearly a true future either, for it is subject to a seemingly strange restriction. As Browning (1983:80-1) puts it, "the old future periphrasis with *ekho*: + infin. still occurs in the Chronicle, but significantly almost entirely in subordinate clauses introduced by *na*". He suggests that this usage represents "an interesting conflation of two future periphrases [finite verb marked with *na* and *ekho*: plus infinitive] belonging to different stages of the language". For Tonnet (1993:77n.), this is an "explication qui ne convainc pas", and he instead, as noted above, suggests translation influence from a French original.

In a sense, then, the question about the authenticity of the present of *ekho:* with an infinitive becomes one of whether a future with the present of *ekho:* that is restricted to occurring just in subordinate clauses has some claim to authenticity, or whether this restriction in itself is evidence of a lack of authenticity for the construction. Moreover, it is fair to ask whether a pluperfect can develop before a present perfect and thus whether a language can in fact have a perfect "system" that contains just a past perfect but not the structurally parallel present perfect counterpart. As in the previous cases examined above, here, too, a consideration of the origin of the construction and some general principles of language change can shed light on these questions.

As to the question of whether a past perfect formation of a certain type presupposes a present perfect of the same type, Greek provides an answer. The seventeenth century grammarians Girolamo Germano (1622) and Simon Portius (1638) give *eikha grapsei* 'I had written', a past tense of *ekho:* with an infinitive, as the equivalent of a past perfect, but list the simple past (corresponding to the Ancient Greek aorist) *egrapsa* 'I wrote; I have written' as the equivalent of a present perfect, and Modern Greek usage confirms this distribution (see Thumb 1912:§229). Thus the present perfect is a later development than the past perfect, and the situation found in Modern Greek, with a full set of perfect system forms (present perfect, past perfect, future perfect, and conditional (i.e. past future) perfect, along with an imperative and gerundive, all in both active and mediopassive voice), is an amplification and filling out of a once defective "paradigm" that had only a past perfect. Moreover, although it is certainly true that languages often provide full paradigms with no gaps in them, it is also true that defective paradigms do exist and are not necessarily ever filled out. For instance, there is an Ancient Greek verb 'say' that has only first person and third person singular present and imperfect forms (*e:mi* 'I say', *e:si* '(s)he says', *e:n* 'I was saying', *e:* '(s)he was saying') and no others. Moreover, the etymology of this verb, from a root \*e:g- (compare Latin *ad-ag-ium* 'saying'), indicates that only the 3SG imperfect form *e:* is directly inherited (from \*e:g-t) and thus that the other forms were built on this inherited form re-analyzed as the new root for the verb. Therefore, in the process of reconstituting a paradigm for this verb, only a partial paradigm was created, yielding the attested Ancient Greek defective set of forms for this verb. Thus positing what is tantamount to a defective paradigm for the *ekho:* perfects in early Medieval Greek, with a past perfect but no present perfect, is

in keeping with what is known about the way in which paradigms can emerge in a language.

Furthermore, the source of the *eikha*-plus-infinitive past perfect provides a pathway that would lead first to a past perfect, thereby lending some authenticity to the continued occurrence of a nonperfect infinitival formation with the present of *ekho*:. The most likely starting point for the periphrastic perfect is the periphrastic future with *ekho*:. of early Medieval Greek. In the past tense, this periphrasis formed a past future or conditional, so that *eikhon kausai* meant 'they would have burned'. As described in Joseph (1983:63), such conditionals "are semantically quite close to nonmodal pluperfects, in that they indicate an action that is 'out-of-time', in the sense of being irrealis, with respect to a past-time action, just as pluperfects indicate an action that is 'out-of-time' in the sense of being anterior, with respect to a past-time action". The present perfect use of *ekho*:. with an infinitive, under such a view, is the result of a back-formation from the past perfect (see also Thumb 1912: §227.1). The continued use of the older function in a subordinate clause is consistent with the view (e.g. expressed in Givón 1976; see also Lightfoot 1979:144) that syntactic changes will be realized in main clauses before subordinate clauses.

Thus both the source of the *ekho*:. perfect, deriving in a natural way from the *eikha* past perfect, and general patterns of language change, which lead one to expect change in main clauses before change in subordinate clauses, favor Browning's assessment of the subordinate *ekho*:-plus-infinitive, arguing against Tonnet's view that it represents a translation effect from French. These factors, then, suggest the authenticity of this usage as representative of a real Medieval Greek usage.

## 6. Conclusion

Despite the questions that have been raised about them, each of these infinitival constructions has a good claim to legitimacy and authenticity, based on evidence that goes beyond consideration of systematicity and audience, the two main tools available to the researcher interested in an ancient language attested only through texts. While for the Circumstantial Infinitive, the evidence may point towards an assessment as a register-restricted construction, the parallel case of English Quotative Inversion allows for a decision in favor

of authenticity nonetheless, and the other two constructions examined give indications of being part of the colloquial usage of their period. Collectively, these decisions about these constructions permit an important inference about the vitality of the infinitive in Medieval Greek, up to the late Medieval/early Modern period when, in the case of the *thelo*:-future and the Circumstantial Infinitive, they yield to finite replacements. As Joseph (1983:81) notes, at that point, when the perfect tense system with *ekho*:, which has survived and been expanded somewhat in Modern Greek, was all that was left of systematic usage for the infinitive, there was no longer any reason to establish a category of "infinitive" for the grammar of Greek; indeed, Joseph (1983:80) argues that in the formation with *ekho*:, the old infinitive is now best treated as a type of participle, so that Modern Greek truly has no infinitive. All of this analysis, particularly with regard to the precision with which one can date the loss of the infinitive from the grammar of Greek, depends crucially on the authenticity of the Medieval Greek constructions that made systematic, and in some instances innovative, use of the infinitive.

The examples discussed here, while making a point about a detail of the historical grammar of a single language, Greek, nonetheless have a message of wider import. In particular, they show how a range of methodologies and different types of corroborating evidence can — and in some cases, must — be brought to bear in deciding matters of authenticity. Moreover, they demonstrate the utility of bringing basic principles of historical linguistic development into play. While it cannot be guaranteed that these types of evidence will always be available in considering other specific questions of authenticity, they show that the investigator must be open to all possible avenues for exploration. As is so often the case in historical research of any kind, here, too, one must make the best use possible of quite imperfect data, and exploit any and all potential leads.

### Notes

- \* I gratefully acknowledge the support of a grant from the Joint Committee on Eastern Europe of the American Council of Learned Societies and a sabbatical leave from the College of Humanities of The Ohio State University, which together gave me the freedom to pursue the thinking and research necessary for this article and the time to write it up. The editors of this volume, Nick Nicholas (University of Melbourne), Peter Mackridge (Oxford University), and Rex Wallace (University of Massachusetts) also deserve thanks for numerous useful comments on and suggestions for an earlier version of the paper.

1. By the grammarian Priscian (III.239 K).
2. Sommer (1902:636) gives the standard view of *ens*, which he labels a "künstliche Formation".
3. See Sommer (1902:575) for this account of *esum*.
4. See Joseph & Wallace (1987:684n.27) for this suggestion, which has been embraced by Sihler (1995).
5. The following abbreviations are used in the glosses: ACC = Accusative, ART = (Definite) Article, GEN = Genitive, HORT = Hortative, INF = Infinitive, NOM = Nominative, NTR = Neuter, PL = Plural, PRES = Present, SG = Singular, SUBJ = Subjunctive, 1 = First person, 2 = Second person, 3 = Third person.
6. See Joseph (1983: passim; 1978/1990: Chapter 4) for discussion and details.
7. See Ferguson (1959) concerning *katharevousa* and diglossia in 20th century Greece, and more recently, Mackridge (1990).
8. As Nick Nicholas (personal communication, November 13, 1995) has reminded me, the value of this argument depends in large part on who read in the Medieval Greek world and why they read, and in any case, passive competence is not the same type of linguistic ability as active usage. These valid objections notwithstanding, the evidence of the nature of the texts cannot be entirely discounted, for there was certainly some audience for these texts.
9. But see note 13 and accompanying discussion.
10. However, see Montgomery & Bailey (1991) for a more comprehensive study of this innovative use of *in which*; they ultimately argue for a different account of it, considering it not to be a new case form of the pronoun *per se*.
11. Note also that the dative and accusative singular forms of the definite article, though spelled differently, *to:i* versus *to*, fell together in pronunciation in early Post-Classical Greek, as [to].
12. Xanthoudidis (1914) has argued that the Circumstantial Infinitive originated with a dative articular infinitive used as the object of the preposition *en* 'in', e.g. *en to:i akousein* 'in the hearing' (literally). He suggests that *en to:i* was reduced to [to] and was then re-analyzed as a bare accusative form of the article together with the infinitive, giving rise to the pattern seen with the Circumstantial Infinitive. Even if he is right, and his account does require an *ad hoc* assumption about the phonological development of *en to:i* into [to], rather than [do] as would be expected by regular sound changes, the reanalysis he invokes means that there is still not a direct path from the earlier preposition-plus-articular infinitive to the innovative Medieval usage, though it gives a different earlier starting point from the one advocated here. I thank Nick Nicholas for bringing this account to my attention.
13. See Pappas (1999) for a quantitatively based examination of the distribution of the past-tense future formations (involving the imperfect past-tense form of *thelo*: and used in counter-factuals) in texts from the late Medieval to early Modern Greek period. The differences he finds among various counter-factual formations are suggestive of differences in the formally parallel future tense constructions.

## References

- Bănescu, N. 1915. *Die Entwicklung des griechischen Futurums von der frühbyzantinischen Zeit bis zur Gegenwart*. Bucharest: Königliche Hofbuchdruckerei R. Göbl Söhne.
- Beck, Hans-Georg. 1971. *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Volksliteratur*. Munich: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Browning, Robert. 1983. *Medieval and Modern Greek*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (First ed., 1969.)
- Burguière, Paul. 1960. *Histoire de l'infinitif grec*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Ferguson, Charles. 1959. "Diglossia". *Word* 15.325–340.
- Germano, Girolamo. 1622. *Grammaire et vocabulaire du grec vulgaire publiés d'après l'édition de 1622*. (ed. by Hubert Pernot, 1907.) Paris.
- Givón, Talmy. 1976. "Topic, Pronoun and Grammatical Agreement". *Subject and Topic*, ed. by Charles Li, 149–188. New York: Academic Press.
- Hock, Hans Henrich & Rajeshwari Pandharipande. 1976. "The Sociolinguistic Position of Sanskrit in Pre-Muslim South Asia". *Studies in Language Learning* I (no. II), 105–138.
- Humbert, Jean. 1930. *La disparition du datif en grec du Ier au Xe siècle*. Paris.
- Jamison, Stephanie. 1991. "The Syntax of Direct Speech in Vedic". *Studies in Sanskrit Syntax. A Volume in Honor of the Centennial of Speijer's Sanskrit Syntax*, ed. by Hans Henrich Hock, 95–112. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- Joseph, Brian D. 1978/1990. *Morphology and Universals in Syntactic Change: Evidence from Medieval and Modern Greek*. Harvard University Ph.D. Dissertation (printed and distributed by Indiana University Linguistics Club, 1978; published in updated version by Garland Publishing, Inc., New York, 1990).
- Joseph, Brian D. 1983. *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive. A Study in Areal, General, and Historical Linguistics* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, Supplementary Volume 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Joseph, Brian D. and Rex E. Wallace. 1987. "Latin *sum* / Oscan *súm, sim, esum*". *American Journal of Philology* 108.675–693.
- Lightfoot, David. 1979. *Principles of Diachronic Syntax* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 23). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lightfoot, David. 1988. "Syntactic Change". *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey. Volume I. Linguistic Theory: Foundations*, ed. by Frederick Newmeyer, 303–323. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Longnon, Jean. 1911. *Livre de la conquête de la princée de l'Amorée*. Paris: Librairie Renouard.
- Mackridge, Peter. 1990. "Katharevousa (c. 1800–1974): An obituary for an official language". *Background to Contemporary Greece*, ed. by Marion Sarafis and M. Eve, 25–51. London: Merlin Press.
- Mackridge, Peter. 1993. "An Editorial Problem in Medieval Greek Texts: The position of the object clitic pronoun in the Escorial *Digenes Akrites*". *Arxetis neolinikis logotexnias (Proceedings of the 2nd International Congress "Neograeca medii aevi")* Volume 1, 325–342. Venice.
- Mihevč-Gabrovec, Erika. 1973. "L'infinitif temporel en grec du moyen-âge et en slovène". *Linguistica* 13.219–228.

- Mirambel, André. 1961. "Participe et gérondif en grec médiéval et moderne". *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 56.46-79.
- Montgomery, Michael & Guy Bailey. 1991. "In Which: A New Form in Written English?". *American Speech* 66.147-163.
- Papadopoulos, Thanases, ed. 1977. *Nikolaou Sophianou. Grammatiki tis kinis ton elinon glosis*. Athens: Kedros.
- Pappas, Panayiotis. 1999. "The Development of Counterfactuals with *Thélo*: 'Want' in Early Modern Greek". *Historical Linguistics. Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics* 52, ed. by Brian Joseph, 15-40. Columbus: Ohio State University Department of Linguistics.
- Pernot, Hubert. 1946. *Études de linguistique néo-hellénique II. Morphologie des parlers de Chio*. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres".
- Politis, Linos. 1973. *A History of Modern Greek Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Portius, Simon. 1638. *Grammatica Linguae Graecae Vulgaris* (ed. by Wilhelm Meyer, 1889). Paris: F. Vieweg.
- Schmitt, John, ed. 1904. *The Chronicle of Morea*. London: Methuen & Co. (Reprinted 1967 by Verlag Bouma's Boekhuis N.V., Groningen.)
- Sihler, Andrew L. 1995. *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Jo R. 1981. "In which: A New Case Form?". *American Speech* 56.310-311.
- Sommer, Ferdinand. 1902. *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre. Eine Einführung in das sprachwissenschaftliche Studium des Lateins*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- Thumb, Albert. 1912. *Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular. Grammar, Texts, Glossary* (Translated from the Second Improved and Enlarged Edition (1895) by S. Angus). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark (reprinted 1964, Argonaut Publishers, Chicago).
- Tonnet, Henri. 1993. *Histoire du grec moderne*. Paris: L'Asiathèque.
- Xanthoudidis, Stamatios. 1914. "Lekseis Erotokritou". *Athena* 26.181ff.