

## Complementation types in the Greek of non-literary papyri

Mariarosaria Zinzi, Florence

According to Noonan (1985: 42), complementation is “[...] the syntactic situation that arises when a notional sentence of predication is an argument of a predicate”.

Ancient Greek shows three different complement types:

1. infinitive clauses: the verb is in the infinitive form and the subject is either in nominative/not expressed (in case of co-reference of complement subject to matrix agent or experiencer (Noonan 1985: 68)) or in accusative (the so-called *raising*, i.e. the placement of an argument notionally part of the complement proposition (typically the subject) in a slot having a grammatical relation (e.g. subject or direct object to the control predicate (Noonan 1985: 69));
2. participial clauses: the verb is in the participle and the subject behaves as in infinitival clauses;
3. complementizer+indicative clauses: the verb is in the indicative and is introduced by the complementizers  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  or  $\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota$ . As underlined by Cristofaro (1996 and 2008), the distribution of individual complement clause types varies according to the semantic of the verb.

This study aims at analyzing the complementation types in Ancient and Late spoken Greek: for this reason, it focuses on the Greek of private letters on papyri. All the analyzed texts come from Egypt and span nearly nine centuries of history, dating from III BC to VI AD, with the majority dating between III AD and IV AD. This typology of documents has been chosen in order to get as close as possible to spoken Greek, and to analyze and reconstruct the evolution of complementation types in Greek.

In particular, the research mainly focuses on cases of co-reference of subjects.

In Greek private letters on papyri the same complement clause types as in Ancient Greek are found:

1. infinitive clauses;
2. participial clauses;
3. indicative/subjunctive clauses, with or without complementizers: both indicative and subjunctive are used, as they are often confused. In one occurrence no complementizer is used.

When the subject of the subordinate clause is coreferential with the main clause argument, an infinitive clause would be expected: papyri show instead an increasing tendency towards the substitution of the infinitive type with a complementizer+indicative/subjunctive clause type. In particular, along with the usual types introduced by  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  or  $\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota$  (the latter much more attested than the former), a new clause type introduced by  $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$  is found. In Ancient Greek,  $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$  is never attested as a complementizer, since it simply introduces a final clause.

The analysis shows that the choice of a clause type depends on the semantic of the main verb:  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  or  $\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota$  types are mainly found depending on utterance verbs, while the new type (with  $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ ) is used when the subordinate clause reports a command.

In Modern Greek no infinitive mood is found: it is expressed with the group  $\nu\alpha$ +finite verb. As stated by Cristofaro (2008: 577), in Ancient Greek “infinitive complements are also used when the complement sentence does not report a statement, but a command or suggestion”. Thus, the substitution of the infinitive clause with the  $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ +indicative/subjunctive type can be considered as a step forward in the shift of the language towards the loss of the infinitive.

## References

Cristofaro, S. (1996) *Aspetti sintattici e semantici delle frasi complete in greco antico*, Firenze: La Nuova Italia.

(2008) A constructional approach to complementation: evidence from Ancient Greek. *Linguistics* 46, 571-606.

Noonan (1985) Complementation, in Shopen, T. (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*, Cambridge: CUP, 42-140