One of the greatest challenges in teaching Latin and Ancient Greek to university students of the 21st century is the necessity to introduce all the principles of grammar. It is no longer remarkable to find in a class of beginners Latin or beginners Ancient Greek students who have never learned what a verb is, or even a noun, and genuinely have no concept of ‘case’, ‘voice’, or ‘person’. The need to teach English grammar alongside the ancient languages is made even more crucial by the fact that ancient languages are usually not taught orally (there being a dearth of fluent speakers of Latin or Ancient Greek); and whereas a student of French or German can learn set phrases about the weather and what foods to eat, the Latin or Ancient Greek student is usually exposed to literary texts right away. The ability to read such literary texts (even adapted ones from Lysias, Aristophanes, Plautus or Cicero) relies more on the recognition of morphology, syntax and style than on the accumulation of vocabulary.

The purpose of this article is to offer teachers a practical outline of explanations that can be offered in class for the semantics of morpho-syntactical elements of the ancient languages that are commonly difficult for English speakers: specifically voice, adverbial uses of nouns in oblique cases without prepositions, and Ancient Greek conditions. Behind these explanations are some basic principles of language-learning that I use every year when instructing Latin and/or Ancient Greek at beginners level.¹

Preliminaries: Textbooks and Approaches

There is no such thing as the perfect textbook for Latin or Ancient Greek, and every textbook in which a teacher invests must inevitably be supplemented. Every textbook adopts a particular approach to learning language, and this must be compatible with the teacher’s aims and abilities.² Jones & Sidwell’s Reading Latin, JACT’s Reading Greek and Balme & Lawall’s Athenaze, for example, use a reading comprehension approach; much like modern language instruction, students read passages of connected text with new vocabulary glossed in each section, and the grammar is taught gradually alongside it. Students therefore will often read set phrases before learning the syntax, and will also encounter many different forms of

---

¹ A large portion of this material comes from years of experience as a graduate student at the University of Michigan, lecturing in Latin under the supervision of Dr Deborah Pennell Ross with the textbook Latin For Reading by Glenn Knudsvig, Gerda Seligson and Ruth Craig. Deborah Ross shared with her staff all her tricks of the trade, including the starting points of many of the exercises reproduced here, which are nowhere else in print. Other material comes from research I conducted during a sabbatical at the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, in 2008 on the topic of best practice in teaching ancient languages, generously supported by Universitas 21.

² There are many other reasons for choosing a particular textbook: price (students want the cheapest!); some Classics programs are part of a department or school that includes Religion, so that students want a textbook that includes some Koine Greek or Ecclesiastical Latin; some teachers want a textbook that introduces ancient culture, including lots of pictures and digressions on daily life; other teachers want students to have a multi-media learning experience and therefore choose a textbook that is also marketed with a workbook, or a CD-Rom, or its own website with online tutorials.
nouns and verbs in a reading passage before being formally introduced to their morphology. A good example is the very first passage of Reading Greek (2nd edition), Section 1A, which includes ω-verbs, an ε-contract verb, an α-contract verb, and nouns of all three declensions in almost all cases, including prepositional phrases. Yet students do not formally learn the morphology of contract verbs until Section 1E, second declension nouns until 1G, and third declension nouns until 3A. In Reading Latin, Section 1A includes nouns and adjectives of all three declensions, introduces all six cases (including the vocative), and showcases all the persons of verbs of all four conjugations in the present active indicative, including the irregular sum. Some teachers find it advantageous for students to encounter morphology before they learn it, so when they do learn it formally, they feel they are ‘remembering’ it. Others disagree. This reading comprehension approach is often the most successful at introducing students to aspects of daily life in the ancient world, since the reading passages are tailored to such topics. Reading Greek and Reading Latin have also remained the most commonly used beginners textbooks in Australian and New Zealand universities in the past two decades.3

In contrast, Wheelock’s Latin, Mastronarde’s Introduction to Ancient Greek, and Luschnig’s Introduction to Ancient Greek: A Literary Approach adopt the more traditional approach, a kind of grammar-primer. Students learn elements of grammar sequentially and translate sentences that highlight what they have just learned and review what they learned in previous weeks. All three textbooks include passages of unaltered Latin or Ancient Greek for students to read, and Luschnig ends each chapter with a brief discursus (in English) on a topic from ancient daily life. But the explanations of grammar are extremely thorough, especially in Mastronarde’s textbook, which includes all the dual forms, labelled as optional. Many students have told me that they keep their copy of Mastronarde as a reference grammar when they progress to intermediate courses, since the textbook makes most sense to them once they have finished the entire thing.

Saffire & Freis’ Ancient Greek Alive adopts the rarer conversational approach, on the principle that students remember most what they have said aloud in the first two weeks of classes. I have tried this myself and it works fairly well, until students argue about how we know what Ancient Greek ‘really’ sounded like, and why we can’t just use a Modern Greek pronunciation. Latin classes can encounter a similar problem when the occasional student will insist on the ecclesiastical pronunciation of Latin.4

My own approach, however, is influenced by Knudsvig, Seligson & Craig’s Latin for Reading (1986), which emphasises syntax in the context of a ‘linguistic’ approach. Instead of jumping into connected text, Latin for Reading requires students to explain the grammar of the sentence with the terminology of structural linguistics (‘morphology’, ‘syntax’, ‘semantics’, ‘clause’, ‘modifier’, ‘connector’, etc.). In the words of Knudsvig & Ross, ‘clear distinctions between morphology, syntax, and semantics illuminate the relationships between form, function, and meaning’.5 This approach has influenced my own teaching of Ancient Greek, so that regardless of what textbook I use, I supplement the material with the terminology of structural linguistics; this provides students with a framework for describing language and facilitates quicker discussion of grammar points.6 I would therefore unabashedly describe my

3 As attested by Horsley, Minchin & Lee (1995), 82, and O’Sullivan & Maitland (2007), 117. 4 My own practice is to stick to one pronunciation for use in class whenever I ask students to read passages aloud with me; what students choose to do outside of class is their own business. 5 Knudsvig and Ross (1998), 25f. 6 Seligson’s Greek for Reading (1994) is the Ancient Greek equivalent of Latin for Reading, but unfortunately has too many errors to be useful. John P. Given, Assistant Professor in Classical Studies at
preference of approach as more ‘grammarians’ than ‘reader’, but ideally a combination of both. My ultimate goal in beginners-level language teaching is to enable the student to read previously unseen connected text with comprehension, and to achieve this through a familiarity with syntax (how the words in the sentence fit together).

However, even with the best intentions, there are always some morpho-syntactical features of the ancient languages which need clever explanation for English speakers who are being exposed to grammar for the first time. University students come from a wide variety of backgrounds with varying degrees of language experience; my classes are usually a mix of language majors, history majors who want just enough Greek or Latin to read Thucydides or Tacitus, biomedicine majors who want to improve their scientific vocabulary, theology students who want to study the New Testament, and mature-age students whose interests are more idiosyncratic. I therefore begin with the assumption that students know no grammar of any language at all, and I build from there. The following three sections outline my own in-class demonstrations, at an early point (usually after the first couple of weeks) when students have already been introduced to the basic concepts of ‘sentence’, ‘subject’, ‘verb’, ‘direct object’, ‘clause’, and ‘prepositional phrase’.

### Teaching Voice

I write two English sentences on the board:

\[ \text{Phaedra loves Hippolytus.} \quad \text{Hippolytus is loved by Phaedra.} \]

I ask, do these sentences describe the same event, or different events? Students think about it, and the answer is ‘the same event’. One can even draw a picture of two stick figures with a heart between them, and a big arrow pointing from Phaedra in the direction of Hippolytus. The more crude the drawing, the bigger the laughs from the students.

I then introduce two new grammatical terms: the AGENT, who is the doer of an action or event; and the PATIENT, the sufferer or endurer of an action or event. I then ask, in the above sentences, who is the AGENT? The answer is: Phaedra. She is the person who has feelings of love. And who is the PATIENT? Who is ‘enduring’ this love? The answer is: Hippolytus. The sentences say nothing about Hippolytus’ opinion on the matter of Phaedra’s love. He may have no romantic interest in Phaedra whatsoever (and in Euripides’ and Seneca’s plays, he most certainly does not); the sentences give information only on Phaedra’s affections.

I then ask, what is the SUBJECT of the sentence \textit{Phaedra loves Hippolytus}? Answer: \textit{Phaedra}. What is the VERB of the sentence \textit{Phaedra loves Hippolytus}? Answer: \textit{loves}. Is there a DIRECT OBJECT in the sentence \textit{Phaedra loves Hippolytus}? Answer: yes, \textit{Hippolytus}. I then ask, what is the SUBJECT of the sentence \textit{Hippolytus is loved by Phaedra}? Answer: \textit{Hippolytus}. What is the VERB of the sentence \textit{Hippolytus is loved by Phaedra}? Answer: \textit{is loved}. Is there a DIRECT OBJECT in the sentence \textit{Hippolytus is loved by Phaedra}? Answer: No. Some students might think \textit{Phaedra} is the direct object, but in fact the preposi-

---

7 I first learned this technique from Deborah Ross of the University of Michigan. I think she chose a more violent sentence, however, like ‘Bill struck John’.

---

East Carolina University, continues to use \textit{Greek for Reading}, but has written his own extensive supplement.
tional phrase *by Phaedra* is a separate unit which does not function as a direct object. The sentence *Hippolytus is loved by Phaedra* has no direct object.

Now we introduce the concept of VOICE: it is a term describing a verb and the nature of its subject.

- For an ACTIVE VOICE VERB, the SUBJECT is the AGENT.
- For a PASSIVE VOICE VERB, the SUBJECT is the PATIENT.

Students will now realize that the grammatical term *subject* does not always mean ‘the person/thing that does the action’. In fact, *subject* merely refers to ‘the person/thing that the verb is about’. The ‘subject’ of a verb is not necessarily ‘doing’ the action. Furthermore:

- In a clause with an ACTIVE VOICE VERB, the PATIENT (if any) is expressed as a DIRECT OBJECT.
- In a clause with a PASSIVE VOICE VERB, the AGENT need not be expressed. If it is expressed, it is usually with a prepositional phrase (Latin *a/ab* + ablative, Ancient Greek ὑπό + genitive). Occasionally the agent can be expressed in the dative without a preposition when the passive verb expresses obligation (see below).

Active verbs and passive verbs have different morphology; in English, the active ‘loves’ and the passive ‘is loved’ are examples of the 3rd person singular indicative. I now introduce the Latin/Ancient Greek morphology, and translate the sample sentence:

Phaedra loves Hippolytus. 
*Phaedra Hippolytum amat.*

Hippolytus is loved by Phaedra. 
*Hippolytus a Phaedra amatur.*

Φαίδρα Ἱππόλυτον φιλεῖ. 
*Φαίδρα ὑπὸ Ἱππόλυτος φιλεῖται.*

**ACTIVE VERB** 
**PASSIVE VERB**

The lesson continues with reading some simple Latin/Ancient Greek sentences of this type with vocabulary that the students have learned, followed by some composition from English into the ancient language. The latter really makes sure that the students have understood the concept!

Throughout these activities, students are asked to outline how each word in the sentence functions (is it the verb? is it the agent? is it the patient? How do I know?)

**Teaching the Middle Voice in Ancient Greek**

In Ancient Greek, teaching the semantics of the middle voice is a bit trickier. First, one must decide when to do it. Mastronarde’s textbook, with forty-two units, introduces the active

---

8 As students progress through Latin or Ancient Greek, they can be reminded that the ‘subject’ is the person/thing in the nominative case for finite verbs, or the accusative case for subjects of infinitives; or, in participial clauses, the subject matches the participle in case, number and gender.

9 Mind you, I never ask students to imitate an ancient author’s style. For a vehement argument against the usefulness of prose composition in teaching Latin and Ancient Greek, see Ball & Ellsworth (1989).

10 Some linguists would argue that even teaching a ‘middle voice’ in Ancient Greek is misleading, since it is only in the aorist and future tenses that Ancient Greek verbs have separate forms for the
voice in Unit 8 and waits until Unit 11 to teach the middle and passive together. Ellsworth’s *Reading Ancient Greek: A Reasonable Approach* (1997), with 78 lessons with readings from Palaephatus’ *Peri Apiston*, introduces all the tenses and participles of the active voice from Lesson 11 onwards, but waits until Lesson 52 (in the second semester) to begin teaching the middle and passive voices together. JACT’s *Reading Greek* introduces the active voice first (Section 1B), the middle voice (mostly deponents) several readings later (Section 2A), and postpones the passive voice until second semester (Section 11, out of twenty sections), even after students have learned the optative!

My preference, however, is to teach all three voices together (as does Luschnig’s textbook in the very first lesson), or at least within the same week, so that students have a concept of *voice* as soon as possible, since they will be grappling with it for as long as they read Ancient Greek. In principle, a verb in the middle voice is an action in which the AGENT is benefited or acts upon some part of her/himself. A middle-voice verb can have a direct object that often *belongs* to the subject. For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVE</th>
<th>MIDDLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἄγω τὰ δῶρα.</td>
<td>ἄγομαι τὰ δῶρα.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I bring the gifts.</td>
<td>I bring my own gifts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some middle verbs can be reflexive, like the often-used λούω and παύω.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVE</th>
<th>MIDDLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>λούω τὸν νεκρόν.</td>
<td>λούομαι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wash the corpse.</td>
<td>I wash myself/I bathe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παύω τὸν πόλεμον.</td>
<td>παύομαι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I stop the war.</td>
<td>I stop myself/I cease.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worth noting that not many verbs have reflexive meanings in the middle voice; only verbs describing an action that ‘normally’ is considered reflexive in ancient culture do this. Edward Jeremiah expresses this phenomenon clearly and concisely:

> Since people do not, as a general socio-cultural rule, kill themselves, then Greek will say κτείνω ἐμαυτόν rather than *κτείνομαι.* (This is also the reason why, cross-linguistically, we don’t find forms such as *κτείνομαι* ‘I kill myself’, *δρόμω* ‘I see myself’, *μισοῦμαι* ‘I hate myself’ as deponents. In the case of Greek, a further fact results: where these forms do exist alongside a present form, they cannot be interpreted reflexively and so are interpreted passively.) On the other hand, since grooming and motion are often self-directed, Greek will often use the middle for these events: λούομαι ‘I wash’, ἀλείφομαι ‘I anoint myself’, τρέπομαι ‘I turn.’

‘middle’ and ‘passive’. And indeed, some future middle forms (like ἄκοινομαι ‘I shall hear’) are often used with a passive meaning (‘I shall be heard’) as an alternative form of the proper future passive ἄκοινοθησαμαι ‘I shall be heard’. However, the ‘middle voice’ is such a standard of Ancient Greek grammar that all textbooks continue to teach it, and all teachers still need to grapple with it.

Furthermore, students should learn from the beginning that not all Ancient Greek verbs appear in all three voices:

- Some verbs only appear in the active voice (e.g. μένω ‘remain’, ἐθέλω ‘wish’, ἀποκτείνω ‘kill’).
- Other verbs have only active and passive forms, but no middle forms (νικάω ‘conquer, prevail’, ἐγκατάστασις ‘love, greet with affection’).
- Still other verbs are deponent and only have middle forms in all tenses (δέχομαι ‘receive’, αἰσθάνομαι ‘perceive’, πυνθάνομαι ‘learn’, ἀφικνέομαι ‘arrive’, κτάομαι ‘acquire’).

As time goes on, students will learn other configurations of voice in the mysterious Ancient Greek verbal system. However, when first introducing students to the concept of the middle voice, it is worth giving rough English translations in the present tense for common verbs that do occur in all three voices (bearing in mind that the morphology for the middle and passive is the same in the present tense):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVE</th>
<th>MIDDLE</th>
<th>PASSIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἄγει leads/brings/does</td>
<td>ἄγεται takes with her/himself</td>
<td>ἄγεται is led/brought/done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄρχει begins (+ genitive) rules (+ genitive)</td>
<td>ἄρχεται begins to do (+ participle)</td>
<td>ἄρχεται is ruled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γράφει writes</td>
<td>γράφεται indicts; takes notes</td>
<td>γράφεται is written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔχει holds, has</td>
<td>ἔχεται clings to (+ genitive)</td>
<td>ἔχεται is possessed/owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λείπει leaves</td>
<td>λείπεται leaves behind (as a memorial)</td>
<td>λείπεται is left behind</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 For example, as soon as students encounter the future tense, they will learn that some verbs have only active morphology in the present, aorist and perfect tenses, but middle morphology in the future (ἀποθνῄσκω ‘die’, φεύγω ‘flee’, τυγχάνω ‘happen, chance upon’, πάτω ‘fall’). Some deponent verbs (βούλομαι ‘wish’, ἐδύναμαι ‘be able’, ἔπισταμαι ‘understand’) confusingly have middle forms in the present, future and perfect tenses, but in the aorist have passive forms (ἐβουλήθην, ἐδυνήθην, ἠπιστήθην). Yet other verbs (ἐράω ‘love’, χαίρω ‘rejoice’) do not have middle forms at all, but have active forms in the present, and deponent passive aorists (ἡράσθην, ἐχάρην). And then there’s ἔρχομαι ‘come, go’ which is middle in the present and future, but active in the aorist and perfect; ἀλέκτωμαι ‘be captured’ which (technically) has passive morphology in the present tense, middle morphology in the future tense, and active morphology (with passive meaning) in the aorist and perfect; and γίγνομαι ‘become, be born, be’ which is middle in all tenses, but also has an active perfect γέγονα ‘I am’, and in later Greek develops a deponent passive aorist ἐγενήθην ‘I came into being’. Similarly μάχομαι ‘fight’ has middle morphology in all tenses, but in later Greek develops a deponent passive aorist ἐμαχώθην.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>English Equivalent</th>
<th>English Equivalent</th>
<th>English Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>λούω</td>
<td>washes</td>
<td>λούεται washes him/herself</td>
<td>λούεται is washed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λύει</td>
<td>releases</td>
<td>λύεται ransom</td>
<td>λύεται is released, broken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παιδεύει</td>
<td>educates</td>
<td>παιδεύεται has someone educated</td>
<td>παιδεύεται is taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πείθει</td>
<td>persuades</td>
<td>πείθεται trusts, obeys (+ dative)</td>
<td>πείθεται is persuaded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πέµπει</td>
<td>sends</td>
<td>πέµπεται sends for, summons</td>
<td>πέµπεται is sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τύπτει</td>
<td>beats/strikes</td>
<td>τύπτεται mourns/laments</td>
<td>τύπτεται is struck/beaten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φέρει</td>
<td>carries</td>
<td>φέρεται brings with oneself;</td>
<td>φέρεται is carried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teaching Adverbial Uses of Oblique Cases without Prepositions**

There comes a time in every textbook when students discover that Latin and Ancient Greek can express with a single word a concept that must be translated into English with the addition of a preposition. These are those bothersome words like *gladio* ‘with a sword’ or *λίθοις* ‘with stones’. This section addresses concepts of adverbial modification, including Instrument, Time When, Manner, Accompaniment, Agent, Cause, and Comparison.

What is an ‘adverbial use’, some might ask? This is where the linguistic approach of *Latin For Reading* is extremely useful. Basically an ‘adverbial modifier’ is a word or phrase which describes a verb, adjective, or other adverb in a sentence. Typically, an adverbial modifier explains *how, when, why,* or *where* an action happens, or *to what degree* something is the case. In the words of Knudsvig & Ross in their discussion of Latin pedagogy:

> Syntactic categories allow the reader to interpret the information conveyed by morphology before assigning semantic roles. [...] The ablative case indicates an adverbial relationship between the ablative noun and some other element of the sentence, but does not *per se* indicate whether the semantic nature of that relationship is means, time, or cause. Only consideration of the semantics of the ablative noun, coupled with the semantic information of its head (i.e., the word modified), can allow this latter discrimination.¹³

To illustrate this, I begin my lecture on this topic by writing an English sentence on the board:¹⁴

> Menelaus killed Alexander.

Then I add a series of nouns with a blank ____ in front:

---

¹⁴ Once again, Deborah Ross first demonstrated this procedure to me; I have since then adapted it for use in both Latin and Ancient Greek.
Menelaus killed Alexander ___ a rock ___ midday ___ the fountain ___ speed ___ Helen

Then I ask students to use their own intuition to supply English prepositions that ‘make sense’ in front of each noun. I remind them that English prepositions can often contain more than one word (e.g., ‘next to’ or ‘on account of’). Students will often say, ‘Menelaus killed Alexander with a rock’, ‘by a rock’, ‘on a rock’, ‘at a rock’, ‘next to a rock’, ‘because of a rock’, etc.

I then explain that (perhaps unconsciously) they have chosen prepositions based on their assumptions about the semantics of the word rock. ‘With’ and ‘by’ (in the sense of ‘by means of’) treat rock as an INSTRUMENT; ‘on’, ‘at’, ‘next to’ and ‘by’ (in the sense of ‘beside’) treat rock as a PLACE WHERE; and ‘because of’ treats rock as a CAUSE (perhaps Menelaus and Alexander were fighting over a favourite pet rock?). Therefore rock (because of what a rock is) can fall into three semantic categories which English specifies using prepositions before the noun rock.

Then I ask students about ‘___ MIDDAY’. Students give answers like ‘at midday’, ‘during midday’, ‘throughout midday’, ‘after midday’, ‘before midday’, and ‘around midday’. I then ask students to explain the semantics of midday, and all will agree it is a TIME word. The English prepositions express different shades of time: ‘at’ for TIME WHEN, ‘during’ and ‘throughout’ for EXTENT of TIME, etc. I will also point out that some prepositional phrases don’t make sense (e.g., ‘because of midday’, ‘next to midday’, ‘by means of midday’) because these prepositions are not used with nouns whose semantics are TIME. Conversely, some English prepositions (e.g., ‘at’) can be used for multiple semantic categories (‘at’ can be used with both PLACE WHERE and TIME WHEN; ‘by’ can be used with both INSTRUMENT and PLACE WHERE).

For ‘___ THE FOUNTAIN’, students come up with ‘at the fountain’, ‘in the fountain’, ‘next to the fountain’, ‘beside the fountain’, etc. Most students will agree that fountain is a PLACE, and not usually an instrument or cause, and certain not a time word (given the nature of fountains).

For ‘___ SPEED’ results are limited to ‘with speed’, ‘without speed’, and ‘in speed’. I explain that speed is an abstract noun indicating the MANNER in which Menelaus killed Alexander. Once again, some English prepositions won’t make sense (‘next to speed’ and ‘before speed’ are nonsensical) because MANNER in English has a restricted set of prepositions. But some prepositions (especially ‘with’) appear in more than one semantic category (‘with’ can be used with both INSTRUMENT and MANNER).

‘___ HELEN’ produces the most laughs. Menelaus killed Alexander ‘because of Helen’, ‘next to Helen’, ‘over Helen’, ‘with Helen’, etc. ‘Because of’ treats Helen as a CAUSE; ‘next to’ treats Helen as a PLACE; ‘over’ treats Helen either as a place (perhaps Menelaus throws Alexander over Helen’s head?) or as a CAUSE (‘over’ means the same as ‘because of’). ‘With Helen’ can mean that Helen is helping Menelaus kill Alexander (she is Menelaus’ ACCOMPANIMENT), or that Alexander and Helen are killed together (she is Alexander’s ACCOMPANIMENT), or that Menelaus picks up Helen and brandishes her as a weapon (Helen is Menelaus’ unlikely INSTRUMENT). Drawings make this clear (and hilarious).

After explaining how English works, it is now time to explain Latin/Ancient Greek. I reveal that the ancient language can express the semantics of INSTRUMENT, TIME WHEN
and MANNER with a noun in the ablative case (Latin) or dative case (Ancient Greek) without a preposition. There are, however, a few caveats:

(1) INSTRUMENT: the noun is usually inanimate, like *rock*. But if ‘Menelaus kills Alexander with Helen’ by flinging her body into Alexander, the ancient language would use some kind of preposition to indicate that Helen—a person—is being used as an instrument.

(2) TIME WHEN: perhaps more appropriately named ‘time at which’. The ancient language uses prepositions to indicate ‘before’ and ‘after’. Furthermore, Ancient Greek uses the dative without (sometimes with) preposition for ‘time when’, but the genitive without preposition for ‘time within which’.

(3) MANNER: the noun is usually abstract.

In Latin, if the ablative noun is modified by an adjective, then expressing it without a preposition is optional (e.g., *summo studio*, but *summo cum studio* is also possible). Before an unmodified ablative noun, a preposition is often omitted in Latin poetry, but is retained in prose (e.g., *cum studio*).

In Ancient Greek, the dative without a preposition is common when expressing manner (described in some books as “the dative of accompanying circumstance”); but equally common are *μετά* + genitive, *ἐπί* + genitive, or *σὺν* + dative.

In both languages, there are common words used adverbially without modifiers or prepositions, such as the Latin *fraude, iniuria, silentio,* and *iure*, and the Ancient Greek *δόλῳ, βίᾳ, σιγῇ,* and *δίκῃ,*

Examples of the above uses then follow:

1) INSTRUMENT. Menelaus killed Alexander with a rock.

   Menelaus Alexandrum *saxo* interfecit.

   Μενέλεως Ἀλέξανδρον λίθῳ ἀπέκτεινεν.  

2) TIME WHEN. Menelaus killed Alexander at midday.

   Menelaus Alexandrum *meridie* interfecit.

   Μενέλεως Ἀλέξανδρον ἡμέρας μέσης ἀπέκτεινεν.

3a) MANNER (without preposition).

   Menelaus killed Alexander with the greatest/all zeal.

   Menelaus Alexandrum *summo studio* interfecit.

   Μενέλεως Ἀλέξανδρον πάση σπουδῆς ἀπέκτεινεν.

But contrast:

15 The difference between the two is very slight and often ambiguous. E.g., τῆς ἡμέρας ‘during the day’, τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ‘on/at the day’; νυκτός ‘by night’, (ἐν) νυκτί ‘at night’.

16 The following sentences use the Attic Greek form Μενέλεως instead of the Homeric Μενέλαος.

17 summo cum studio is also possible.

18 σὺν πάση σπουδῆς and μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς are also possible.
3b) MANNER (with preposition).

Menelaus killed Alexander with zeal (zealously).
Menelaus Alexandrum cum studio interfecit.

In Latin, when a noun without an adjective is used to express manner, Latin often uses a preposition in prose. But in Ancient Greek, both with- and without-preposition are possible.

Менелейс Ἀλέξανδρον σὺν σπουδῇ/ μετὰ σπουδῆς/ σπουδῇ ἀπέκτεινεν.

In both languages, several nouns that lend themselves to adverbial semantics are used without a modifier and without a preposition:

Menelaus killed Alexander with justice (justly).
Menelaus Alexandrum iure interfecit
Менелейс Ἀλέξανδρον δίκῃ ἀπέκτεινεν.19

Usually this is enough for one lesson; but as a course progresses, students will be introduced to some other semantic categories.

AGENT is a concept that students encountered when learning voice. With an active voice verb (and Ancient Greek active and middle voice verbs), the agent is the subject. With a passive voice verb, the AGENT is usually expressed with a preposition (Latin a/ab + ablative, Ancient Greek ὑπό + genitive). But, if the verb is future passive periphrastic (Latin, often called a category of the ‘gerundive’) or a verbal adjective expressing obligation (Ancient Greek, ending in –τέος, τέον), the agent is expressed in the dative without a preposition. In Ancient Greek, perfect passive participles also pattern with the dative of agent. E.g.:

AGENT with preposition:
Alexander was killed by Menelaos.
Alexander a Menelao interfecit est.
Αλέξανδρος ὑπὸ Μενελαοῦ ἀπέθανεν.

AGENT in DATIVE without a preposition (Latin):
Alexander must be killed by Menelaos (or, Menelaos must kill Alexander).
Alexander Menelao interficiendus est. (Menelao is dative)

AGENT in DATIVE without a preposition (Ancient Greek):
The river is to be crossed by Helen (or, Helen must cross the river).
ὁ ποταμός Ἐλένη ἐστὶ διαβατέος.

The things done by Helen
tà Ἐλένη πεπραγμένα

19 σῶν δίκη and μετὰ δίκης are also possible.
Students should be reminded that an AGENT is usually animate, often a person. Inanimate objects that create action are INSTRUMENTS, not agents, and are expressed without prepositions in Latin and Ancient Greek. Students can therefore distinguish between the role of Helen and the rock in the following:20

Alexander was killed by Menelaos with a rock.
Alexander a Menelao saxo interfectus est.

Alexander killed Menelaos with Helen.
Alexander Menelaum cum Helene interfectus est.

Alexander killed Menelaos on account of Helen.
Alexander Menelaum propter Helenam interfectus est.

CAUSE can be expressed in both ancient languages with or without a preposition. In Ancient Greek, the dative of cause without a preposition is usually an abstract noun; it can express the motive of an action (e.g., ὀργῇ ‘out of/in anger’), or the occasion for a verb of emotion (e.g., τοῦτος ἠσθη, ‘he was pleased at/because of these things’). Ancient Greek can also express cause in the genitive without a preposition, as in Sophocles’ Elektra 1027: ζηλῶ σε τοῦ νοῦ, τῆς δὲ δειλίας στυγῶ (‘I envy you for your prudence, but I hate you for your cowardice’). Nor is it unheard of to express cause with ὑπὸ + genitive, ἐπὶ + dative, or διὰ + accusative.

In Latin, the ablative of cause without a preposition often patterns with passive participles or verbs of emotion (e.g., miles uictoria gaudet, ‘the soldier rejoices because of the victory’, uictoria being ablative). But Latin can also express cause with a prepositional phrase, such as de, e/ex, or a/ab + ablative, or per + accusative (e.g., per iram, ‘in anger’).

In both languages, if the CAUSE is an animate noun (like Helen), it is invariably introduced by a preposition (such as in ἐνεκα after the genitive in Ancient Greek, propter + accusative in Latin)

For example:

Menelaus has rejoiced in/ because of his victory.
Menelaus uictoria gauisus est.

Menelaus killed Alexander on account of Helen.
Menelaus Alexanderum propter Helenam interfectus est.

CAUSE can be expressed in both ancient languages with or without a preposition. In Ancient Greek, the dative of cause without a preposition is usually an abstract noun; it can express the motive of an action (e.g., ὀργῇ ‘out of/in anger’), or the occasion for a verb of emotion (e.g., τοῦτος ἠσθη, ‘he was pleased at/because of these things’). Ancient Greek can also express cause in the genitive without a preposition, as in Sophocles’ Elektra 1027: ζηλῶ σε τοῦ νοῦ, τῆς δὲ δειλίας στυγῶ (‘I envy you for your prudence, but I hate you for your cowardice’). Nor is it unheard of to express cause with ὑπὸ + genitive, ἐπὶ + dative, or διὰ + accusative.

In Latin, the ablative of cause without a preposition often patterns with passive participles or verbs of emotion (e.g., miles uictoria gaudet, ‘the soldier rejoices because of the victory’, uictoria being ablative). But Latin can also express cause with a prepositional phrase, such as de, e/ex, or a/ab + ablative, or per + accusative (e.g., per iram, ‘in anger’).

In both languages, if the CAUSE is an animate noun (like Helen), it is invariably introduced by a preposition (such as in ἐνεκα after the genitive in Ancient Greek, propter + accusative in Latin)

For example:

Menelaus has rejoiced in/ because of his victory.
Menelaus uictoria gauisus est.

Menelaus killed Alexander on account of Helen.
Menelaus Alexanderum propter Helenam interfectus est.

CAUSE can be expressed in both ancient languages with or without a preposition. In Ancient Greek, the dative of cause without a preposition is usually an abstract noun; it can express the motive of an action (e.g., ὀργῇ ‘out of/in anger’), or the occasion for a verb of emotion (e.g., τοῦτος ἠσθη, ‘he was pleased at/because of these things’). Ancient Greek can also express cause in the genitive without a preposition, as in Sophocles’ Elektra 1027: ζηλῶ σε τοῦ νοῦ, τῆς δὲ δειλίας στυγῶ (‘I envy you for your prudence, but I hate you for your cowardice’). Nor is it unheard of to express cause with ὑπὸ + genitive, ἐπὶ + dative, or διὰ + accusative.

In Latin, the ablative of cause without a preposition often patterns with passive participles or verbs of emotion (e.g., miles uictoria gaudet, ‘the soldier rejoices because of the victory’, uictoria being ablative). But Latin can also express cause with a prepositional phrase, such as de, e/ex, or a/ab + ablative, or per + accusative (e.g., per iram, ‘in anger’).

In both languages, if the CAUSE is an animate noun (like Helen), it is invariably introduced by a preposition (such as in ἐνεκα after the genitive in Ancient Greek, propter + accusative in Latin)

For example:

Menelaus has rejoiced in/ because of his victory.
Menelaus uictoria gauisus est.

Menelaus killed Alexander on account of Helen.
Menelaus Alexanderum propter Helenam interfectus est.

COMPARISON between two nouns can be expressed by putting the second element in an oblique case (ablative in Latin, genitive in Ancient Greek) without a preposition. E.g.:

20 Knudsvig & Ross (1998), 29, also argue that ‘categorizing [Latin] nouns as animate or non-animate enables the reader to determine whether an ambiguous noun form is more likely to be dative or ablative.’
Menelaus is richer than Alexander.
Menelaus diuitor Alexander est.
Μενέλεως ἐστι πλουσιότερος Ἀλέξανδρου.21

DEGREE OF DIFFERENCE in comparisons (often called a subset of MANNER) is also expressed in an oblique case (ablative in Latin, dative in Ancient Greek) without a preposition. E.g.:

Menelaus is much richer than Alexander.
Menelaus molto diuitor Alexandro est.
Μενέλεως ἐστι πολλῷ πλουσιότερος Ἀλέξανδρου.

RESPECT is a similar subset of MANNER, denoting that in respect to which anything exists or is done. Latin uses the ablative, Ancient Greek the dative, without a preposition. E.g. (from Euripides’ Alcestis 339):

For they were friends in word, not in fact.
nomine enim amici erant, non re.
λόγῳ γὰρ ἦσαν οὐκ ἔργῳ φίλοι.22

The Latin ablative absolute and the Ancient Greek genitive absolute can also be described as adverbial modifiers without prepositions, in so far as a noun and (usually) a participle together appear in an oblique case without a preposition and describe when, how, why, or under what conditions an action occurs. Also, a separate lesson can easily be written on adverbial uses of the accusative without prepositions (e.g., extent of space and time, respect, double accusatives, and the Ancient Greek accusative absolute).

While students are gradually introduced to these concepts, they are asked to translate simple sentences in Latin/Ancient Greek that include a noun in an oblique case without a preposition, and they must decide which English preposition to supply. Students are encouraged to think about what clues exist in a sentence regarding what semantic category Latin/Ancient Greek is trying to express, after which they consider how English expresses that same category. E.g.:

pretio iudicibus persuadet.
χρήμασι πείθει τοὺς δικαστάς.

21 Comparison in both ancient languages can also be expressed with a conjunction (quam or ἢ) connecting two things in the same case. Latin: Menelaus divitior quam Alexander est. Ancient Greek: Μενέλεως ἐστι πλουσιότερος ἢ Ἀλέξανδρος.

22 Ancient Greek also uses the accusative without a preposition to indicate the respect in which something is true. The canonical explanation of Smyth is that the dative denotes the particular point of view from which a statement is made; the accusative denotes a thing in respect to which a verb or adjective is limited, especially with parts of the body, qualities and attributes, and indefinite relations. See Smyth (1959), §1516, 1600f. Practically speaking, both oblique cases without prepositions are used with regularity.
How do we explain *pretio* in the ablative without preposition, and *χρήμασι* in the dative without preposition? (By the way, in the Latin, *iudicibus* is the dative object of *persuadet*). The most important clues are that *pretio* and *χρήμασι* are inanimate, not time-words, and not abstract nouns or emotions. Since no comparison is being made, the most likely use of *pretio* and *χρήμασι* is as INSTRUMENTS, or the means by which someone persuades the judges. The next step for students is to decide how English expresses the concept of INSTRUMENT. As Deborah Ross often stated, there is NO one-to-one correspondence between Latin/Ancient Greek and English. Rather, readers should consider what core concept the Latin or Ancient Greek is trying to express, and then think about how English expresses that same concept. In this case, ‘with a bribe’ or ‘by means of a bribe’ or even ‘through a bribe’ are all acceptable ways for English to translate *pretio* and *χρήμασι* to express the core concept of INSTRUMENT.23

**Teaching Ancient Greek Conditions**

Ancient Greek offers a special challenge to teachers when it comes to conditions (‘if-clauses’). In Latin, conditions are traditionally divided into simple, future more-or-less vivid, and contrary-to-fact (or ‘unreal’), and the subjunctive mood is used in many of these. But Ancient Greek has an additional kind of condition (the ‘general’), not to mention an additional mood of verbs (the ‘optative’). Mastronarde’s textbook has two separate units on conditions (Unit 34 on simple, general and future; Unit 36 on contrary-to-fact). Luschnig, in contrast, devotes only three pages to their syntax; she wisely, in my opinion, teaches contrary-to-fact conditions early in the book, soon after the aorist indicative is learned.

Shelley Reid of the University of British Columbia offered me her explanation of Ancient Greek conditions, which I adapted for use in my own beginner’s class in second semester; this is near the end of the course, after students have been introduced to subjunctive and optative verb morphology. Put simply, General Conditions are what the Queen of England would say; Future Conditions are what Camilla Parker-Bowles (the Duchess of Cornwall) would say; and Contrary-to-Fact Conditions are what I would say:

**The QUEEN:**
Present General: ‘If (ever) I carry the sceptre, I rejoice.’
Past General: ‘If (ever) I carried the sceptre, I rejoiced.’

**CAMILLA:**
Future More Vivid: ‘If I carry the sceptre, I will rejoice.’
Future Less Vivid: ‘If I should carry the sceptre, I would rejoice.’

**ME:**
Present Contrary-To-Fact: ‘If I were carrying the sceptre, I would rejoice.’

23 Equally important as the syntax and semantics of the Latin noun-in-the-ablative-without-preposition (or the dative equivalent in Ancient Greek) is the expectation that such a construction raises. As Markus & Ross have argued, ‘A NOUN in the ABLATIVE or DATIVE raises an expectation of a verb, adjective, or rarely an adverb to modify or pattern with’ [Markus & Ross (2004), 93]. In other words, the existence of *pretio* and *χρήμασι* should alert the reader that a verb like *persuadet* or *πείθει* is likely to be head of its modification.
Past Contrary-To-Fact: ‘If I had carried the sceptre, I would have rejoiced.’

General clauses refer to circumstances that actually happen with some regularity. The Queen can say ‘If (ever) I carried the sceptre, I rejoiced’ because she actually did carry the sceptre on many occasions (such as when opening Parliament). Camilla can talk about carrying the sceptre in the future, since she may indeed someday be queen. But I (and anyone else) can only talk about carrying the sceptre in an unreal sense, since we will never be king or queen of England (as much as we might aspire to be!). The Ancient Greek equivalents of these sceptre-carrying musings are as follows (‘Prot.’ indicates the protasis or ‘if-clause’ of the condition, ‘Apod.’ indicates the apodosis or ‘then-clause’):

The QUEEN:
Present General: ‘If (ever) I carry the sceptre, I rejoice.’
ἐὰν φορῶ τὸ σκῆπτρον, χαίρω. [Prot. εἰ + ἄν + subjunctive, Apod. present indicative]

Past General: ‘If (ever) I carried the sceptre, I rejoiced.’
εἰ φοροῖν τὸ σκῆπτρον, ἔχαιρον. [Prot. εἰ + optative, Apod. imperfect indicative]

CAMILLA:
Future More Vivid: ‘If I carry the sceptre, I will rejoice.’
ἐὰν φορῶ τὸ σκῆπτρον, χαίρω. [Prot. εἰ + imperfect indicative, Apod. imperfect indicative + ἄν]

Future Less Vivid: ‘If I should carry the sceptre, I would rejoice.’
εἰ φοροίην τὸ σκῆπτρον, χαρέην ἄν. [Prot. εἰ + optative, Apod. optative + ἄν]

ME:
Present Contrary-To-Fact: ‘If I were carrying the sceptre, I would rejoice.’
εἰ ἔφόρουν τὸ σκῆπτρον, ἔχαρον ἄν. [Prot. εἰ + imperfect indicative, Apod. imperfect indicative + ἄν]

Past Contrary-To-Fact: ‘If I had carried the sceptre, I would have rejoiced.’
εἰ ἔφορησα τὸ σκῆπτρον, ἐχάρην ἄν. [Prot. εἰ + aorist indicative, Apod. aorist indicative + ἄν]

When students read Greek conditions, the choice of which verbal mood is appropriate has already been made by the ancient author. If they see ἔαν + subjunctive, it can be translated into English like the present indicative [ἐὰν φορῶ = if I carry], regardless of the type of condition. But if they see εἰ + optative, students need to look at the apodosis to decide what translation is appropriate. Ask the student, ‘Is this the Queen, Camilla, or Me?’

24 Shelley Reid’s original sentences in her demonstration were, ‘If I am queen’, ‘If I were queen’, etc. I have decided that carrying the sceptre is more useful, since it describes a habitual activity—at least, for the Queen. As for ‘carry the sceptre’ in Ancient Greek, I choose φορέω τὸ σκῆπτρον, based on Iliad 1.238.

25 It is important for students to remember that there is an ἄν in the protasis with the subjunctive in the Present General and Future More Vivid constructions. They tend to forget it is there, since εἰ + ἄν is usually contracted to ἔαν or ἤν.
εἰ + optative, followed by the imperfect indicative is a ‘Queen’ clause and describes something that actually happened.

εἰ + optative, followed by the optative + ἀν is a ‘Camilla’ clause; to remember that it is a ‘should-would clause’, think of the optative as a new ‘mood’, and Camilla as a ‘moody’ person.

To round out this lecture on conditions, I remind students that the ‘tense’ (present or aorist) of the subjunctive or optative moods indicate aspect, and that an author makes a choice whether the action implied in the verb is continuous or a process (for which the present tense is used), or a simple action (the aorist tense). But with contrary-to-fact conditions, the ‘tense’ (imperfect or aorist) of the indicative mood actually does refer to time (imperfect for what would be the case in present time, aorist for would have been the case in past time).

A separate lecture on adverbial relative clauses grows organically from this. Ancient Greek can also substitute other clause connectors, such as ὅτε ‘when’, ὅτι ‘whatever’ or ἧνα ‘where’, for εἰ to create adverbial relative clauses. For example:

She’ll be coming round the mountain when she comes.

ἐλεύσεται περὶ τὸ ὄρος ὅταν ἔλθῃ.

The sentence is the equivalent of the future more vivid condition; but with the ὅταν (a merging of ὅτε + ἀν), the clause ὅταν ἔλθῃ becomes a new kind of clause that goes by various names in textbooks. Mastronarde would call this a ‘temporal clause with future more vivid force’, and Luschnig would say that it introduces a ‘future more vivid relative condition’; but my students know this affectionately as the ‘she’ll be coming round the mountain when she comes’ clause.

Conclusion

The above exercises are lectures designed to engage English-speaking students with the grammar of their own language and become familiar with linguistic concepts as they embark upon learning how these same concepts are conventionally expressed in an ancient tongue. Of course, these concepts cannot be introduced merely in the abstract; terminology can lack concreteness for students who have no prior sense of the systematic nature of grammar. It is therefore important to give students as much context as possible, e.g., showing how a concept like ‘respect’ is important for raising expectations about how the words in a sentence on the page might fit together. Real and unadapted Ancient Greek and Latin, even in small doses, do wonders in the early stages. Hence my use of Euripides’ Alcestis 339, λόγῳ γὰρ ἦσαν οὐκ ἔργῳ φίλοι, when I lecture on the semantics of ‘respect’ and the use of the dative without preposition to express it. The sentence is brought to life when I explain that it is spoken by a king, Admetos, in reference to his own parents, whom he blames for not having volunteered to die in his place; and he makes this statement to his wife on her deathbed, since she alone has agreed to die for him. What is the relationship of λόγῳ (word) and ἔργῳ (fact/deed) to one’s parents not being φίλοι? And how would English express that relationship?

The methods illustrated in this paper are grounded on the pedagogical principle that teaching Latin and Ancient Greek for reading is best achieved when students are shown the interconnections of all the systems of language—not only vocabulary, but more importantly mor-
phology, syntax and semantics. Such an approach ultimately leads to more accurate reading and translation, and students will spend less time stumped by what they see on the page.
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