

Time for a revision? The syntax of the simple sentence in *Latin Grammar*, by Gortan et al.

Šime Demo

University of Zagreb
Center for Croatian Studies
sime.demo@hrstud.hr

Key words: Gortan, Veljko; Latin grammar books; Latin syntax

Latinska gramatika [1] by Veljko Goran, Oton Gorski and Pavao Pauš, was composed as a textbook for secondary schools in the tumultuous years following World War Two when changes in political systems and social trends produced a new context in which the teaching of Latin was threatened by ever more severe reductions in the classes allocated to the language (cf. Smerdel 1956). As in other fields, the public demanded a new textbook, suitable and modern, which would not remind them of the passed monarchical period as did the grammar book published by Golik in 1910, which was received negatively as reactionary in the very year of its first appearance.

Latinska gramatika was published in 1954 and has continued to be used ever since. Compendious, but also encompassing and convenient for combining with manuals of various kinds, it remained polyvalent as a hybrid between a school textbook and a reference work. [2]

Given the intensive use of this grammar book, not only in Croatia but also in neighbouring countries, and the fact that for more than five decades it has presented to many the gate into any serious pursuit related to Latin and the grammatical basis for the design of other teaching materials, thus shaping our view of Latin and other languages, it seems worthwhile to examine this grammar not only from the passive standpoint of learners but also from the point of view of modern linguistics.

The fact that *Latinska gramatika* was first published in 1954 obviously means it was not informed by linguistic theories of functional, cognitive, typological, transformational and other types that originated later. That the authors did not successively modify the text is probably the consequence of their professional focus on other themes. Indeed, *Latinska gramatika* and the other manuals put together by the same authors were more *ad hoc* tasks conditioned by post-war needs — a step outside their regular work rather than a logical stage in their respective careers.

These circumstances, among others, caused a somewhat unusual situation; namely, that at the time of its publication *Latinska gramatika* already belonged methodologically more to the past than to the present. It has been shown that *Latinska gramatika*, through Golik's grammar book, adopted the model of linguistic description introduced in the Croatian grammaticography of Latin by Ivan Pavec, and which can be traced, with certain modifications, to Marijanović's syntactic manual published in 1823.[3]

In this manner the whole of Saussurian synchronical structural linguistics is excluded from the hypothetical sources of influence on *Latinska gramatika*, and its origins can be narrowed down to the traditional grammar of Grigelyan and the post-Grigelyan type, as well as to early Indo-European studies.

However, historical contingencies produced even further-reaching influence of the 19th century grammars. *Latinska gramatika* remains even today the most comprehensive Latin grammar book used in Croatia and some neighbouring areas, having outgrown the school framework for which it had been initially designed to become a reference work – thanks to its formal features such as an absence of school readings, illustrations and exercises, as well as the existence of an exhaustive index.

This paper will examine *Latinska gramatika* with regard to the description of simple sentence structure, a central portion of any grammatical description. A number of inconsistencies, inaccuracies and errors that do not belong either in a reference work or a textbook will be pointed out. These details will be singled out because they are to be treated with caution and reconsidered in future editions. The functionality of the grammar book itself, as well as its scope and the selection of the matter included, will not be reviewed; only the *manner* in which grammatical phenomena are dealt with will be addressed. [4] After that, certain linguistic models will be presented that are suitable in their theoretical and empirical apparatus for satisfactory treatment of the problematic topics observed in *Latinska gramatika*.

The structure of the simple clause

In its treatment of Latin grammar at the highest level, *Latinska gramatika* is comparatively sparing of definitions, explicit divisions and explanations. Rather it is limited to the description of linguistic phenomena from a selected viewpoint, only rarely putting them into mutual relations, not to speak of ordering them hierarchically or in any other way. For example, the syntactic part, and consequently the account of simple sentence structure, does not have any introductory text but simply begins with examples of the predicate (*Latinska gramatika*, 167). While such an approach might be perceived as pedagogically advantageous, it does lead to some difficulties.

The reduction of the explicative apparatus is the result of the wish to achieve a direct practical application in teaching, bearing in mind the other manuals written by the same authors which offer additional elucidations to the teacher. [5] Therefore, some divisions and definitions, most frequently those that are introductory, can be assessed only by means of the inspection and study of the hyperstructure and the minor auctorial remarks. [6]

According to the structure of the paragraph, whose title suggests an explicit treatment of the simple sentence structure ('Parts of the sentence', *Latinska gramatika* 167–174), the Latin sentence is composed of:

1. a predicate
2. a subject

3. an attribute

4. an apposition

Such a division does not imply the existence of objects and adverbial complements or the possibility that sentences are introduced or connected by certain connective devices.

Additionally, no reference is made of the hierarchical nature of the sentence structure, in which linguistics distinguishes between primary parts – the predicate and its arguments – and secondary extensions – those that are dependent on primary parts: attributes, appositions and adverbials. The grammatical description itself often shows this lack of distinction between syntactical levels. For example, the dative dependent on an adjective ('*omnibus necessarius*', *Latinska gramatika* 200) is put under the heading of the dative of object, and in the ablative of separation (*Latinska gramatika* 214–216) there is no hint as to the difference in the structural status between ablative appearing with verbs and ablative accompanying adjectives.

After this first part, two mostly unsystematic paragraphs interrupt the presentation of sentence parts, which is resumed under the heading 'The Syntax of Cases' as the central part of the simple sentence description. At the highest level, the description is distributed according to case forms, and at the second level according to functions. Within individual cases, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic criteria are randomly commingled: generally, a syntactic notion of the object is introduced, and after its presentation remaining uses are distributed according to the semantic relations, with sporadic mention of the expressive meaning ('Accusative of Exclamation', *Latinska gramatika* 197; 'Ethical Dative', *Latinska gramatika* 201).

Such a system drives users toward arbitrary categorisations and encourages inaccurate impressions about the primacy of individual syntactic choices instead of others. For instance, the genitive receives an unwarranted priority over the ablative with *de* within the account of the 'genitive of guilt', probably for the sake of saving space (*Latinska gramatika* 211), and over the ablative in the part about 'adiectiva relative' (*Latinska gramatika* 210).

Owing to the strict fundamental separation of morphology and syntax, the structural positions of numerals, pronouns, determiners, participles and verbal nouns remain unspecified. According to their type and use, they can occupy argumental (nominal) or predicative (adjectival) positions.

Parts of the simple sentence

Predicate

The predicate, a dominant constituent of a typical sentence, often of compound structure itself and exerting a strong influence on the other constituents, receives less attention *Latinska gramatika* than other parts of the sentence. Nevertheless, even such a short account presents some difficulties, methodological as well as terminological.

First of all, it is not clear whether ‘predicate name’ (with copulas) is the same thing as ‘predicate complements’ (not with copulas) (*Latinska gramatika* 167–169). If it is the same, the treatment is unduly separated and the unity is not accounted for. If not, there should be an explanation of the difference and of the position ‘predicate complements’ have in sentence structure. The absence of such a definition is a potential source of confusion, particularly for those who are learning Latin from *Latinska gramatika*: the co-occurrence of a noun ‘designating a professional rank’ (*Latinska gramatika* 169) and a copulative verb is not uncommon. *Latinska gramatika* itself provides the following example:

‘*Cicero consul creatus est.*’ (1)

But there are also more puzzling cases; namely, those open to double or triple interpretation:

‘*Cicero consul vocatus est.*’ (2)

Due to the lack of definition, the reader cannot determine from the grammatical explanation itself whether the structure in (2) contains a copulative verb (‘*Cicero was called a consul.*’), or a complement (‘*Cicero is summoned as a consul / during his consulate.*’), or a regular apposition (‘*Consul Cicero is summoned.*’).

In the account of the predicate there is also at least one terminological inaccuracy. The verb *sum* is firstly called a copula (‘*spona*’, ‘a link’, *Latinska gramatika* 167), and then a copulative verb, along with some other verbs (‘besides *esse*, copulative verbs can be also...’, *Latinska gramatika* 168; see also *Latinska gramatika* 204). In the same section, the copula is identified with the auxiliary verb used as a part of the predicate (‘The auxiliary verb as a part of the nominal predicate is called a copula.’ *Latinska gramatika* 167), and it is later said that all copulative verbs are parts of the nominal predicate (*Latinska gramatika* 168); therefore, it is not clear whether there are two kinds of nominal predicates or if all copulative verbs are auxiliaries. The first possibility calls for an explanation in *Latinska gramatika* itself. The second is unproblematic for *sum*; however, the implicit assertion that Latin has a greater — and undefined — number of auxiliary verbs contradicts not only modern descriptions but also traditional accounts.

There is another problem with determining the accompanying elements. It is stated that with such verbs the ‘first’ of the two nominatives is the subject, the ‘second’ one being part of the predicate (*Latinska gramatika* 168). The user is not informed as to what is the ‘first’ and what is the ‘second’ in this case, nor how to distinguish between them. Since the linear order in the text, as applied in the medieval and Alvarian grammatical tradition (see, for example, Seidel 1982 and Babych 1972, 105), is out of the question here, the user is left with no clue as to this very important differentiation apart from a few contrived examples indirectly related to the definition in question.

Complex predicates and verbs of incomplete meaning are not treated explicitly in *Latinska gramatika*; as will become evident from the following, they are arranged within other categories.

Subject

In the book's short survey of the subject, only one of its properties is plainly stated: 'a subject can be any part of speech, even the entire clause' (*Latinska gramatika* 170); however, the momentous distinction between metalinguistic and ordinary use is not made. [7]

In accordance with tradition, *Latinska gramatika* recognizes two types of subject: grammatical and logical (*Latinska gramatika* 170; cf. Pavec 1881, 105). This tradition, regardless of its antiquity (or precisely thanks to it), is highly questionable and confusing. In fact it blends logic and grammar, disciplines that can and should cooperate but which can only work well if clearly distinguished. In logical analysis, the subject is understood as a logical phenomenon, in grammar as a grammatical one. In the context of Latin grammar it cannot be anything but grammatical and it must be marked by nominative (if it is expressed as a noun) (cf. Lazard 1998, 97–104). Moreover, the term 'logical' as used in the tradition actually refers to the semantic sentence structure, not to the logical one.

Even if such terminology is accepted, the statement that 'Sometimes the Latin grammatical subject corresponds to our logical subject' (*Latinska gramatika* 170) — accompanied by the following example:

'*Sunt homines. Ima ljudi.*' (3)

— leads one to suspect that the authors do not recognise the fact that in the nominative subject with active verbs the conflation between the 'grammatical' and the 'logical' subject takes place. On the Latin side of (3) there is a 'grammatical' as well as a 'logical' subject, but they are expressed in a single word.

In cases like *Omnibus descendum est. Piget me. Sunt homines*, the underlined constituents are categorised as logical subjects (*Latinska gramatika* 170). I can see no other criterion applied here for distinguishing the subject from other constituents than their intuitive grading according to protoagentivity (described by Dowty 1991), i.e., the constituent with the highest degree of protoagentivity is understood as the subject. This is, obviously a completely semantical characterisation, which has its effects in grammar but is outside of it. Such a definition is possible and legitimate, perhaps didactically justifiable, but it is best carried out unambiguously, consistently and correctly regarding the theory.

Object and adverbial

The most extensive part of the description of the simple sentence deals with what are usually called objects and adverbials. Like other concepts, they are not defined and the criteria for their identification are not given.

'Direct object' is not defined, though it is said — by means of a circular definition — that it 'is found next to transitive verbs' (*Latinska gramatika* 188), which are also not defined. The lack of a definition or at least of directions for recognition leaves readers having to resort to other sources which might help them make their way through the sentence. Furthermore, if we take a look at the internal division of objects, we do not find out whether 'outer' and 'inner' objects belong under direct objects (*Latinska gramatika* 188–195). If they do, they should not contain intransitive and deponent verbs, which do not satisfy conditions for passivisation on p. 188 (*transgredior, valeo*). If they do not belong under direct objects, the inclusion of verbs invariably requiring direct objects (*iuvo, spero*) is out of place. If only some belong to the group, the difference between the direct and this other object and why the concepts are necessary remains ambiguous.

The obscurity of the notions and concepts leads to infelicitous and inconsistent characterisation of the dative as a case of the 'indirect object' (*Latinska gramatika* 197). Apart from the fact that it is not clear what an indirect object is, [8] this definition causes many difficulties in demarcating borders between concepts because this slot in the syntactic structure can be occupied by other cases (e.g. by the genitive and accusative with verbs of memorial and judicial verbs) and prepositional phrases (e.g. with verbs of separation and distance).

Distinguishing objects from adverbials is not unproblematic, either. Although some apprehension of the differences between object and adverbial uses is hinted at (accusative: *Latinska gramatika* 188, dative: *Latinska gramatika* 197, genitive: *Latinska gramatika* 394), *Latinska gramatika* never draws a dividing line between them. One or two examples for each case will suffice.

Accusative. In 'two accusatives' (*Latinska gramatika* 191–193) the syntactic status of the 'accusative of person' and the 'accusative of thing' is not clear — that is to say, whether they are both (direct) objects or their functions are different. Moreover, in the 'accusative of the object with the accusative of the predicate' (*Latinska gramatika* 193–194) it is not explained how to determine which accusative is 'of the object' and which 'of the predicate' (especially in those cases when there are two entities involved, not an entity and a property).

Dative. Since the 'dative of interest' (*Latinska gramatika* 200–201) is included in the sentence structure in the same way as the dative 'of the object' (*Latinska gramatika* 197–200), it is not clear why they are separated from each other.

Genitive. 'Objective (passive) genitive' with adjectives (*Latinska gramatika* 209) suggests by its very name that it is of the same type as the 'objective genitive' with nouns. However, the characterisation of nouns accompanied with the 'objective genitive' by analogy with the 'subjective (active) genitive' (*Latinska gramatika* 205) is not sound with adjectives; apart from that, interchangeability with the verb is not workable with some of them (e. g. *plenus, rudis*).

Ablative. In the 'ablative of separation' (*Latinska gramatika* 215) there is a promiscuous list of objects ('*se abdicare magistratu*', '*desistere conatu*') and adverbials ('*movere aliquem senatu*', '*egredi castris*'). If the separation of objects and adverbials is

made in the description of other cases (no matter how imperfectly), an equivalent structure in the ablative would raise the level of consistency and organisation of the account.

Problems of a similar kind appear outside of the so-called syntax of cases. The infinitive is claimed to be sometimes used 'as an object' (*Latinska gramatika* 231). Although the notion of the object is not defined in *Latinska gramatika*, one could ask whether it is the same type of object as in nouns. Is this object direct or indirect? Or perhaps inner? All these questions cannot receive the right answer because they are based on a false premise. Given that the infinitive with modal verbs is not an object at all – as is now universally recognised – (and what is more, the modal verb is semantically marginal with respect to the infinitive), modal complexes call for a completely different type of analysis, not unproblematic in itself (see Ágel 2000; Barbiers 2006).

In addition to the ambiguous and inconsistent categorisation of phenomena, some terminological inaccuracies can be perceived in this part of *Latinska gramatika*. For example, if uses of the dative – except for the dative of the object – are distributed according to semantic criteria, it is not evident why 'moderor linguae' or 'timeo libertati' would be classified as datives *commodi* (*Latinska gramatika* 201), or 'honori esse' as a final dative (*Latinska gramatika* 203), or 'officio fungi' as a dative of means (*Latinska gramatika* 221). Moreover, verbs and adjectives of state ('vaco', 'careo', 'liber', 'orbis') cannot signify an 'act of separation' (*Latinska gramatika* 214–215) but only a state of separation. If terms are too vague or too general, semantically motivated names introduced as a didactical/mnemotechnical aid can be counterproductive, forcing the user to associate them mechanically and unreflectingly with the uses, with the outcome being a too rigid (and sometimes misguided) approach to the unexpected situations encountered in original texts.

Modern linguistics and the description of Latin syntax

Methods of linguistic research and description have changed considerably since the time when the grammaticographical model which served as the basis for *Latinska gramatika* originated. Various theoretical models have been developed, complementary or mutually incompatible, that have brought about more or less satisfying solutions for individual segments of linguistic description. Some modern linguistic proposals have become generally accepted among linguists. In the first place, drawing a clear distinction between linguistic levels, even when they are taken as a part of a holistic mechanism, is a methodological imperative. Furthermore, linguistic and logical principles are segregated, which is linked to the recognition of the contextual influence on linguistic usage, as well as of the fact that without taking into account the pragmatical dimension, linguistic structure can be at best be only partially described. Finally, there is an establishment of unequivocal relations between linguistic units and between language and the extralinguistic world.

In this section we shall briefly survey some directions in modern linguistics which could be of assistance in resolving the difficulties which traditional grammar, exemplified by *Latinska gramatika*, runs into.

Students of Latin grammar in the 21st century have the benefits, but also the burden, of abundant literature — too copious to be completely graspable by any individual — which approaches specific problems in different ways and opens paths to their solutions. The inherited grammaticographic model, sanctioned by tradition, will not lose its assets if it selects and makes use of some of the modern proposals for its own improvement.

Considering *Latinska gramatika* as basically a didactical project, one could object that calling for the overload of too precise definitions and divisions is not sound. But this objection should be relativised when we deal with this particular case. For, if *Latinska gramatika* were designed so as to avoid the terms, applying some of the ‘natural’ learning methods, the elaboration of abstractions would not be sensible. However, the situation is different: *Latinska gramatika* employs a great number of terms, but they are defined imperfectly and introduced unsystematically and sometimes wrongly. In cases when a term is not defined, the user has to make conclusions about its extensive applications from one or two examples (which are usually not original, but invented). All this significantly contributes to the moulding of the user's competence within the frame of descriptive or normative grammar — which is too narrow for any language — necessarily constrained by the physical space and contemporary knowledge about the language. For example, the statement that the ‘genitive is frequently found at the place of an adjective’ (*Latinska gramatika* 203) implies a priority of adjectives over genitives, although none of the two attributive devices is always (synchronically) derivable from the other: on the contrary, they are equal and each of them is suitable in its own contexts. [9] Modern linguistics (and one need not go much farther from Saussurean structuralism, which even gained the status of a classical, if not dogmatic, paradigm) operates with precise definitions and divisions that cannot be implanted into a manualistic and didactic discourse without losing some of its vital exactness. Classical and more recent structuralist approaches have been extensively applied to Latin, especially in the last thirty years, by scholars like G. Serbat, M. Lavency, C. Bodelot, S. Mellet, G. Calboli, and others. [10]

As already shown, in describing various possibilities of expressing individual semantic relations *Latinska gramatika* usually gives loose and often inaccurate terms (further examples may be added: ‘something living’ and ‘something non-living’, *Latinska gramatika* 188; ‘something that stirs up emotions’, *Latinska gramatika* 191; ‘person’ and ‘thing’, *Latinska gramatika* 192, 210). Today linguistics possesses an elaborated ontological apparatus, which can meet the needs of such divisions (cf. DeLancey 2001, 38–41). Moreover, research into the linguistic expression of ontological concepts is today so developed that a new discipline has been established called ontolinguistics (see Schalley and Zaefferer, ed. 2007). Therefore, every modern description of Latin grammar should at least partly take into consideration the possibilities of more accurate ontological representations.

During the 20th century, syntactic theory, either by itself or in cooperation with research in other linguistic domains, proposed numerous and diverse ways of distinguishing between objects and adverbials, obligatory and optional constituents,

adjuncts that are semantically determined by the verb and those that are not, etc. Among these are, for example, structuralistic tests of substitution, which precede *Latinska gramatika* (see Bloomfield 1933, 247–263), and, later, valency theory methods (see, for example, Helbig 1969; they have been applied to Latin as well, in Happ 1977). However, if we wish to stay closer to the tradition (which, paradoxically, drives us toward post-structuralism, cf. DeLancey 2001, 10), the classification can be made on semantic grounds by giving priority to function over form and looking at the language mainly as a device of human communication, not as an abstract structure. This view would help avoid cases such as the infelicitous classification of ablative expressions of quality under ‘the genitive of quality’ (*Latinska gramatika* 207). This functionalistic view of language has been used in the description of Latin (see, for example, the work of H. Pinkster, A. M. Bolkestein and others, who use S. Dik’s model).

Although it distributes the account of objects and adverbials following the form, *Latinska gramatika* scatters prepositional phrases all over the syntax of the cases, thus undermining the principle of distribution set by the authors. Consequently, the reader can hardly perceive the functional equality of prepositional phrases and (some) cases. Even though their origin is historically common, these forms are mostly complementary, not subsidiary (e.g. in the ‘genitive of the charge’ many expressions with ablative were introduced under the heading of the genitive, *Latinska gramatika* 211). This marginalisation of prepositional phrases hinders the awareness of their importance. One of the most obvious examples is the ablative of space and time, where prepositional phrases, though more central and more distinctly employed for expressing these relations, are utterly marginalised with respect to statistically minor noun phrases (*Latinska gramatika* 217–220). Valency theory, which is duly concerned with the relations between prepositional phrases and the verb (cf. Samardžija 1987, 102), could here be put into action in the description of Latin.

Oversimplification in semantic description can seriously mislead the user. For example, the guideline for recognition of the inner object is determined by the fact that ‘it expresses what is already contained in the meaning of the verb itself’ (*Latinska gramatika* 194). It is not said in which way these shared components are determined and what part of the signification of individual words they occupy. The problems this looseness creates can be illustrated by an example. According to such definition, segment ‘... *lex Papia* ... *quattuor* ... *libertinas tutela patronorum liberaret*...’ (Gaius, *Institutiones* III.44) can be argued to contain an inner object, because *libertinas* expresses what is contained in *liberaret*, namely the concept of freedom or, more specifically, manumission. This is certainly not among the desired effects of the definition. Modern semantic theory is able to resolve these difficulties and to remove vagueness — for example, by componential analysis. Many linguists have applied modern semantics to the account of meaning in Latin (e. g. M. Baratin, C. Moussy and others).

A significant part of meaning is dependent on context. Some linguists maintain that it has been shown that grammar and semantics cannot be practically applied without taking actual usage into account. This aspect of the language has been systematically investigated by pragmatics. Its achievements are especially applicable to the description

of elements that have deictic, expressive, modal and axiological value. As for Latin, serious research spans over more than three decades (see, for example, the work by A. Bertocchi, C. Bodelot, C. Kroon, R. Risselada and others). [11]

Conclusions

The study of *Latinska gramatika* has shown that even at the level of hyperstructural divisions its account of simple sentence structure does not give a theoretically accurate picture. Some parts are provided with their respective headings, others being unreasonably merged into them. It has been found that in some cases omitting definitions can have negative effects in the use of the book as a reference work as well as a didactic tool. Many cases of confusing the levels of analysis (first of all syntactic and semantical, especially in the basic division under the so-called syntax of cases), ambiguous and inconsistent categorisations within neighbouring concepts (e. g. between 'predicate name' and 'part of the predicate', or 'object accusative' and 'predicate accusative', or 'inner' and 'outer' object), as well as inaccurate or counterintuitive terminology (in copulative and auxiliary verbs and various semantic causal functions), have been observed.

The preliminary search for solutions to the reported problems has led to some modern linguistic theories that could potentially be of use in the description of Latin grammar. Their results are, in one or another way, available as a useful and above all necessary addition and correction to what *Latinska gramatika* contains. Beginning with classical structuralism and the generally accepted principles of modern semantics which can refine concepts and terminology, to various forms of functionalism and valency theory which bring about some crucial distinctions, to specific pragmatic and ontolinguistic findings that will certainly not be accepted soon as a basis for a unified grammatical model but which in their respective areas open the path to the data inaccessible to other, especially traditional approaches — all these are branches of the immensely fertile tree of modern linguistics, which can productively be used to improve the existing language description.

Finally, it should be pointed out that this paper has viewed *Latinska gramatika* in the first place as a manual which has been re-published unaltered and used as the most widespread reference work and university manual in Croatia, and — with regard to syntax — has been a model for more recent textbooks. This reduces tolerance for its flaws, which has to exist in some degree, seeing that it was written more than half a century ago. In other words, this is not a criticism of the book *per se* but an examination of those parts that are believed to need improvements *now*. Therefore, if the use of *Latinska gramatika* were to be discontinued in the meantime, it should be surveyed only in historical dimensions, with indispensable credits for all its qualities. However, in the present situation it is natural that the enterprise of Gortan et al., like every book, can gain, in the course of time, a historical value and a symbolic meaning, but that it simultaneously loses its practical use and scientific grounds. Analysis of the description of the simple sentence structure in *Latinska gramatika* has shown this to be so.

Notes

- [1] A short version of this paper was presented at the conference 'IV. Dani Veljka Gortana' in Zagreb, on 8 May, 2010.
- [2] In my analysis I use the 12th edition from 2005 (Zagreb: Školska knjiga), identical to the 1st edition of 1954.
- [3] See Demo (2007).
- [4] Some remarks from this paper are based on research carried out during work on my doctoral thesis (Demo 2008), whose main argument overlaps considerably with the investigation of the structure of the simple sentence in Latin.
- [5] In other words, *Latinska gramatika* makes a whole together with those manuals and its use without them is, at least according to the the original design, partially thwarted.
- [6] The hyperstructure of *Latinska gramatika* is very problematic and deserves a study on its own.
- [7] Metalinguistic uses have been noticed since long ago, and their most systematic treatment (with new, somewhat radical theoretical proposals) can be found in Cappelen and Lepore (2007). The paragraphs in *Latinska gramatika* that survey cases with complement clauses in subject function ('factic' *quod* and(/or?) *quod* 'with *verba affectuum* and verbs of similar meaning', *Latinska gramatika*, 292–293) do not make any mention of their syntactic status.
- [8] Though it can be conjectured from the examples that it is implicitly perceived as a constituent which expresses the second argument (the first one is expressed by the subject) if there is no accusative object, and the third argument if such an object exists.
- [9] Of course, equal status belongs to the remaining attributive devices – other cases, prepositional phrases, appositions, subordinate clauses; cf. Beccaria (ed.) (1994), 104.
- [10] See particularly the series *Papers on Grammar* (1980–) and papers from the International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics (1981–).
- [11] A survey of general pragmatic theory can be found in Horn & Ward (eds.) (2005).

Bibliography

- Ágel, V. (2000) *Valenztheorie*, Tübingen: Narr.
- Babych, T. (1712) *Prima grammaticae institutio pro tyronibus illyricis accommodata a p. f. Thoma Babych*, Venetiis: Per Bartolo Occhi.
- Barbiers, S. (2006) 'The Syntax of Modal Auxiliaries', in: Everaert. M., H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, Vol. 5, Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 1–22.
- Beccaria, G. L. (ed.) (1994) *Dizionario di linguistica, e di filologia, metrica, retorica*, Torino: Einaudi.
- Bloomfield, L. (1935) *Language*, London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Cappelen, H., E. Lepore (2007) *Language Turned on Itself : The Semantics and Pragmatics of Metalinguistic Discourse*, Oxford–New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cruse, A. (2000) *Meaning in Language. An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*, Oxford–New York: Oxford University Press.
- DeLancey, S. (2001) 'Lectures on Functional Syntax', (*Scott DeLancey's Linguistics Homepage*), Available:www.uoregon.edu/~delancey/sb/functional_syntax.doc (Accessed: 7 May 2010).
- Demo, Š. (2007) 'Od Latinske slovnice do Latinske gramatike: nastanak 'moderne' gramatike latinskoga u Hrvatâ', *Filologija* 49, 37–49.
- Demo, Š. (2008) *Valentnost glagolâ u hrvatskim gramatikama latinskoga* (PhD thesis, University of Zagreb, Faculty of Philosophy).
- Dowty, D. (1991) 'Thematic proto-roles and argument selection', *Language* 67, 547–619.

- Gortan, V., O. Gorski, P. Pauš (2005) *Latinska gramatika*, 12th ed., Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Happ, H. (1976) *Grundfragen einer Dependenz-Grammatik des Lateinischen*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Horn, L. R., G. Ward (eds.) (2005) *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, Malden–Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Lazard, G. (1998) *Actancy*, Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Pavec, I. (1881) *Latinska slovnica*, Zagreb: troškom i nakladom Kr. hrv.-slav.-dalm. zemaljske vlade.
- Samardžija, M. (1987) 'Četiri pitanja o biti valentnosti', *Radovi Zavoda za slavensku filologiju* 22, 85–105.
- Schalley, A. C., D. Zaefferer (eds.) (2007) *Ontolinguistics : how ontological status shapes the linguistic coding of concepts*, Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Seidel, K. O. (1982) "Quid sit dictionem regere dictionem". Aspekte der Verbvalenz in Grammatiken des 12. bis 17. Jahrhunderts', Greule, A. (ed.) *Valenztheorie und historische Sprachwissenschaft*, Tübingen: Niemeyer, 270–287.

Tempus renovandi? Descriptio syntactica propositionis simplicis in *Grammatica Latina* a Gortan et al. conscripta

SUMMARIUM

Šime Demo

Universitas Studiorum Zagradiensis

Centrum Studiorum Croaticorum

sime.demo@hrstud.hr

Vocabula praecipua: Gortan, Veljko; Latina lingua – libri grammatici; Latina lingua – syntaxis

Librum grammaticum a V. Gortan et O. Gorski et P. Pauš exaratum et anno 1954 primum in lucem editum paene omnes grammatici recentes Croatici in adumbrandis canonibus grammaticis tamquam quoddam fundamentum sequuntur. Qui liber grammaticus eam ob rem in informandis cognitionibus primis linguae sermonem Latinum discentium plurimum valet. In hac symbola ratio describendae propositionis simplicis, a grammaticis libris traditis – quos Gortan et al. amplecti sunt – exulta, examinatur tum per definitiones suas tum per rationem propriam regulas exhibendi. Quaedam difficultates ad methodos ac vocabula pertinentes, quae ratione ordineque a glottologis modernis facile persolvi solent, explicantur. Agitur primo de partibus linguae in descriptione parum discernendis; deinde, de notionibus immerito in decribendo confundendis; porro, de nominibus rerum ab auctoribus inepte usurpandis; postremo,

de definitionibus et explanationibus necessariis immerito omittendis, quo omnia quae explanari debent minus intellegibilia lectoribus redduntur. Cum isto libro grammatico et aliis ab eo quoad methodum progenitis in errorem induci possint lectores, emendationes quaedam necessariae videntur. Accedunt aliquot proposita glottologica novella (quae dicuntur ontolinguistica, structuralismus, functionalismus, theoria valentialis, analysis componentialis, pragmatica linguistica), quorum adminiculis singula descriptionis traditae vitia elui possint. Quae quidem fere omnia iam usurpata esse a multis grammaticam Latinam noviter describentibus demonstrantur; qui quoniam in quibusdam civitatibus Europae occidentalis studiis suis operam dant, opus est legantur et usurpentur in aliis regionibus.