MAŁGORZATA GÓRSKA

THE LATIN *PROPE*—WHAT PART OF SPEECH IS IT?

It is common knowledge that the division of the lexicon into ten parts of speech, rooted in the Graeco-Roman tradition, is debatable[1] to such an extent that attempts are being constantly made to develop new and better classifications. The main problem encountered in these attempts is the choice of appropriate division criteria (homogeneous and precise, if possible).[2] The semantic criteria, operative in the 19th and early 20th centuries, were abandoned as failing to differentiate between certain lexemes (cf. *biały*, *biało*, and *biel*—the Polish for *white* [adj.], *white/whitely/in white* [adv.], and *white(ness)* [noun]); what appeared instead were proposals to divide the vocabulary according to consistently morphological criteria—the best-known of these in Polish linguistics is Zygmunt Saloni's (1974).[3] Yet, because these classifications cannot encompass indeclinable lexemes, syntactic classifications are more often developed nowadays; those that should be mentioned include, above all, the classifications proposed by R. Laskowski (1984; 1988) and H. Wróbel (2001), as well as M. Grochowski's (1986b;

MAŁGORZATA GÓRSKA, PhD — Assistant Professor in the Department of General Linguistics at the Institute of Classical Studies, the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin; address for correspondence: Al. Racławickie 14, 20-950 Lublin; e-mail address: gorska@kul.lublin.pl

The Polish version of the article was published in *Roczniki Humanistyczne* vol. 57, issue 3 (2009).

[1] See e.g. the entries for "parts of speech" (Pol. *części mowy*) in EJP and in EJO.

[2] See Chapter I: "Criteria for the Classification of Words into Parts of Speech" (Pol. *Kryteria klasyfikacji wyrazów na części mowy*) and Chapter II: "Types of Structure of the System for the Classification of Parts of Speech" (Pol. *Rodzaje struktury klasyfikacyjnej systemu części mowy*) in JODŁOWSKI (1971, 7–69), as well as LASKOWSKI (1998, 52–56) and BAŃKO (2002, 124–133).

[3] See also: SALONI AND ŚWIDZIŃSKI (1985).

1997) division of indeclinable lexemes. Also noteworthy is the morphological-syntactic classification by Zofia Zaron (2003) and the immensely interesting projects by Jadwiga Wajszczuk (e.g. 2005). The syntactic divisions of vocabulary mentioned above are functional classifications—ones in which the point of departure is the analysis of syntactic relationships (more precisely: syntactic dependency relationships) that particular lexemes enter into with other sentence components.[4] Consequently, it is the grammatical (functional) classes of lexemes rather than parts of speech that are currently discussed.

Latin grammars and dictionaries still use the traditional list of ten parts of speech, characterized in terms of mixed criteria: semantic, syntactic, and morphological. While this does usually not lead to significant problems with regard to declinable words, the description of indeclinable lexemes raises doubts. The problem is not even that one feels unsatisfied with the labels proposed by contemporary linguistics. The problem is the often striking incompatibility of the descriptions of lexemes with the functions they perform in texts.[5] It therefore seems necessary to revise the descriptions, particularly those of Latin indeclinable lexemes. At the same time, it is obvious that these changes would make sense only if new classifications were introduced in both lexicographic and grammatical description—a new dictionary would have to appear simultaneously with a new grammar. This task is an extremely difficult one to accomplish, not only because it is not easy to develop a correct classification of indeclinable lexemes. This problem can be solved, for example by using (or adjusting) the classifications proposed by Polish linguistics for describing Latin lexemes (which would seem to be possible thanks to the structural similarity between Latin and Polish). What would probably present much greater problems is the assignment of specific lexemes to appropriate classes. These problems stem not only from the fact that it is impossible to develop a perfect classification of vocabulary, based on criteria that would allow for making this kind of assignment each time, but also from the fact that there are many indeclinable lexemes which are not grammatically unambiguous. These difficulties can be exemplified very well by the Latin lexeme *prope*, whose classification is not at all as obvious as it may seem at first glance. The present paper is an attempt to determine which

---

[4] Apart from syntactic functional classifications, there are also distributive classifications, such as the one proposed by MISZ (1967)—see LASKOWSKI (1998, 55–56).

[5] This refers especially to applying the term "adverb"—which means a word that is an adverbial in a sentence—to lexemes that clearly do not play this kind of role, such as modal particles (*certo*, *sane*) or some conjunctions (for example, the adversative *vero*).

grammatical category *prope* can be classified under. For this purpose, I will apply the criteria used in the functional syntactic classifications proposed by Polish linguistics.

Prope (comparative *propius*, superlative *proxime*) is generally labeled as an adverb in some uses and as a preposition in others. The data provided by dictionaries and grammars differ quite strongly in details, however. What is common is only the fact that when *prope* (*propius*, *proxime*) occurs without a governed element it is labeled as an adverb, and when it occurs in the positive degree with the governed accusative it is labeled as a preposition. But these are only some of the possible uses of *prope* reported by grammars and dictionaries, which also provide other information.

According to the historical grammar by Jan Safarewicz (1950, 49–50), from the beginning of the literary tradition *prope* ("close") has functioned both as an adverb (when it does not govern case) and as a preposition (when it requires the accusative); first, it expressed place and direction, and later also time. Safarewicz adds that, since Cicero's times, *propius* and *proxime* have also sometimes served as prepositions.

Raphael Kühner and Carl Stegmann (1962, 528–529, 577) explore mainly the prepositional use of *prope* in all degrees. Used spatially, temporally, and metaphorically (see examples 34–39 below), it combines with the accusative. When *propius* and *proxime* specify place, they may be accompanied by the dative case, by analogy with *propinquus*. Likewise, *prope* (as well as *propius* and *proxime*), as an antonym of *procul*, sometimes takes *a* (*ab*) with the ablative. Used in this way, however, *prope* is interpreted as an adverb, just like when it does not govern case.

Hermann Menge (2000: 263) also identifies *prope*, as well as *propius* and *proxime*, as prepositions taking the accusative, but he notes that *propius* is found performing this function only once in Cicero (see example 26 below). He adds that *proxime*, by analogy with *propinquus*, can take the dative; *propius* did not follow this case government pattern in classical Latin.[6] He also observes that *prope*, *propius*, and *proxime* are sometimes found as adverbs taking *a* (*ab*) with the ablative case, but he states that this is the case when *prope* is accompanied by a form of the verb *abesse*.[7]

In Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short's Latin–English dictionary (henceforth LDLS) the entry for *prope* is constructed and the examples are

---

[6] *Propius* with the dative does occur in Virgil, though (see example 41 below).

[7] This statement, however, is often not supported (see examples 44–49 below).

selected in such a way that, at first glance, nothing raises any doubts. As an adverb, *prope* occurs there in all three degrees and generally does not govern case, except when it takes *a* (*ab*) with the ablative. As a preposition it governs the accusative, but in the examples of this function it appears only in the positive degree.

All the morphological and syntactic complexity of *prope* is shown in the Latin–Polish dictionary by Marian Plezia (henceforth SŁPP). In this case, too, the division into *prope* as an adverb and *prope* as a preposition is retained, but *prope* occurs in all three degrees in the case of both functions. Moreover, as an adverb it does not govern case, but it may also govern the dative, the accusative, and *a* (*ab*) with the ablative, while as a preposition it governs the accusative or the dative.

Kühner and Stegmann (1962, II, 237–238), LDLS, and SŁPP take account, though in different ways, of the use of *prope* (*propius*) in *prope est/adest/fit quando/cum/ut*.

Thus, as shown by dictionaries and grammars and based on the analysis of the examples provided, it can be concluded that, since Cicero's times, the properties of *prope* (primarily its syntactic properties, because in more recent classifications it is they that determine the assignment to a particular grammatical class) are as follows:

A. *prope* (only in the positive) meaning *almost*, *nearly*, combines with any part of speech (also postpositionally) and does not govern case:

(1) Hor., *Carm*. 4.6.3:   [. . .] Troiae *prope victor* altae / Pthius Achilles [. . .] [8]
(2) Liv. 31.24.2:   [. . .] extemplo profectus *cursu prope* Chalcidem contendit [. . .]
(3) Caes., *Gall*. 5.20.1:   [. . .] Trinovantes, *prope firmissima* earum regionum civitas [. . .]
(4) Liv. 23.49.14:   tum vero *omnes prope* Hispaniae populi ad Romanos defecerunt [. . .]
(5) Cic., *Fin*. 4.15.18:   [. . .] constitutio illa prima naturae [. . .] *his prope* verbis exponitur [. . .]
(6) Cic., *Leg*. 2.64.4:   [. . .] Solonis lege sublata sunt, quam legem *eisdem prope* verbis nostri decemviri in decimam tabulam coniecerunt.
(7) Cic., *Verr*. 2.3.62:   [. . .] eques Romanus annos *prope nonaginta* natus [. . .]
(8) Liv. 23.5.8:   [. . .] cum Samnitibus bellum per *centum prope* annos [. . .] tulerimus.
(9) Liv. 4.32.3:   [. . .] Veientem hostem sexiens victum pertimescant Fidenasque *prope saepius* captas quam oppugnatas.

---

[8] Example 1, as well as examples 19, 21, and 39, which accurately illustrate some uses of *prope*, have been taken from the Polish–Latin dictionary (*Słownik łacińsko-polski*, henceforth SŁPK) edited by Józef Korpanty; I have established the source of each example, which this dictionary does not provide due to its character.

(10) Liv. 2.65.4:   *sic prope* oneratum est sinistrum Romanis cornu [. . .]

(11) Cic., *Epist*. 7.28.1:   [. . .] cum *prope desperatis* his rebus te in Graeciam contulisti [. . .]

(12) Hor., *Carm*. 3.8.7:   [. . .] Libero caprum *prope funeratus* / arboris ictu.

B.   *prope* (*propius*, *proxime*) combines with verbs and does not govern case

B.1. meaning *close* in space:

(13) Cic., *Epist*. 9.7.1:   nam quod antea te calumniatus sum, indicabo malitiam meam: volebam *prope* alicubi *esse* te […]

(14) Cic., *Planc*. 48.7:   num possum magis pedem conferre, ut aiunt, aut *propius accedere*?

(15) Cic., *Font*. 13.10:   qui erant hostes, subegit, qui *proxime fuerant*, eos ex eis agris quibus erant multati decedere coegit […]

B.1.1. *propius* meaning *closer*, i.e. *more thoroughly/carefully*, with *inspicio*, *considero*, *nosco*, etc.:

(16) Sen., *Epist*. 5.6.3:   […] dissimiles esse nos vulgo sciat qui *inspexerit propius* […]

(17) Verg., *Aen*. 1.526:   […] parce pio generi et *propius* res *aspice* nostras.

(18) Plin., *Epist*. 6.16.7:   Magnum *propius*que *noscendum* ut eruditissimo viro visum.

B.2.   *prope* (*propius*, *proxime*) meaning *close* in time — refers both to the near future (*soon*, *before*) and to the past (*recently*, *only just*, *not long ago*):

(19) Liv. 34.33.3:   his dictis in vicem auditisque nox *prope diremit* conloquium.

(20) Ter., *Ad*. 307:   […] partus *instabat prope* […]

(21) Prop. 3.18, 24b (2.28.58): longius aut *propius* mors sua quemque *manet*.

(22) Plin., *Epist*. 5.7.4:   Velim ergo, cum *proxime* decuriones *contrahentur*, quid sit   iuris indices, parce tamen et modeste;

(23) Cic., *Epist*. 5.15.1:   Omnis amor tuus ex omnibus partibus se ostendit in iis litteris quas a te *proxime accepi* […]

C.   *prope* (*propius*, *proxime*) governs the accusative

C.1.   meaning *close to somebody/something* in space:

(24) Liv. 2.46.6:   At ego iniuratus aut victor revertar aut *prope te* hic, Q. Fabi, dimicans cadam.

(25) Cic., *Phil*. 9.15.13:   […] isque, cum iam *prope castra* venisset, vi morbi oppressus vitam amiserit […]

(26) Cic., *Att*. 11.13.2:   atque utinam vel nocturnis, quem ad modum tu scripseras, itineribus *propius te* accessissem!

(27) Caes., *Gall*. 1.46.1:   […] Caesari nuntiatum est equites Ariovisti *propius tumulum* accedere

(28) Caes., *Gall*. 4.28.2:   […] quae insula est *propius solis occasum*.

(29) Sall., *Iug*. 18.9:   […] ei *propius mare* Africum agitabant.

(30) Cic., *Mil*. 59.5:   *Proxime deos* Clodius accessit, propius quam tum cum ad ipsos penetrarat […]

(31) Cic., *Epist.* 5.2.4:   […] tu ipse velim iudices satisne videatur his omnibus rebus tuus adventus, cum *proxime Romam* venisti, mutue respondisse.

C.2.   meaning *close to something* in time:

(32) An., *Bell. Afr.* 42.1.1:   Cum iam *prope* solis *occasum* Caesar exspectavisset […]

(33) Suet., *Claud.* 44.3.2:   Multi statim hausto veneno obmutuisse aiunt ex cruciatumque doloribus nocte tota defecisse *prope lucem*.

C.2.1. metaphorically (usually concerns the closeness of achieving a particular state or is associated with time):

(34) Liv. 1.25.13:   Romani ovantes ac gratulantes Horatium accipiunt, eo maiore cum gaudio, quo *prope metum* res fuerat.

(35) Tac., *Hist.* 3.21.1:   Id vero aegre tolerante milite *prope seditionem* ventum, cum progressi equites sub ipsa moenia vagos e Cremonensibus corripiunt […]

(36) Sall., *Cat.* 11.1.2:   Sed primo magis ambitio quam avaritia animos hominum exercebat, quod tamen vitium *propius virtutem* erat.

(37) Liv. 2.48.6:   ex eo tempore neque pax neque bellum cum Veientibus fuit; res *proxime formam* latrocinii venerat.

(38) Tac., *Ann.* 16.11.5:   quod aspernatus, ne vitam *proxime libertatem* actam novissimo servitio foedaret […]

D. *prope* (*propius*, *proxime*) governs the dative (also in postposition) — it usually means proximity in space or the closeness of achieving a particular state:

(39) Plaut., *Rud.* 229:   Quaenam vox *mihi prope* hic sonat […]

(40) Nep., *Hann.* 8.3.3:   Antiochus autem […] *propius Tiberi* quam Thermopylis de summa imperii dimicasset.

(41) Verg., *Georg.* 1.355:   […] agricolae *propius stabulis* armenta tenerent.

(42) Caes., *Civ.* 1.72.5:   Caesar praesidiis in montibus dispositis omni ad Hiberum intercluso itinere, quam *proxime* potest hostium *castris*, castra communit.

(43) Cic., *Epist.* 11.21.5:   […] cum te conset excellere hoc genere virtutis ut numquam extimescas, numquam perturbere, me huic tuae *virtuti proxime* accedere.

E.   *prope* (*propius*, *proxime*) governs *a* (*ab*) with the ablative case — it denotes proximity in time:

(44) Cic., *Verr.* 2.2.6:   […] tantum civium numerum tam *prope a domo* tam bonis fructuosisque rebus detineri.

(45) Cic., *Verr.* 2.5.6:   At cum esset in Italia bellum tam *prope a Sicilia*, tamen in Sicilia non fuit.

(46) Cic., *Nat. deor.* 1.87.11: […] quinque autem stellae eundem orbem tenentes, aliae *propius a terris* aliae remotius […]

(47) Cic., *Cato* 77.4:   non enim video cur quid ipse sentiam de morte, non audeam vobis dicere, quod eo cernere mihi melius videor quo *ab ea* [sc. *morte*] *propius* absum.

(48) Colum. 1.6.8:   omnes tamen quam *proxime* alter *ab altero* debent habitare […]

(49) An., *Bell. Hisp*. 15.4:　　usque eo ut caedem *proxime a vallo* fecerint.

F.　*prope* (*propius*) is part of the expressions *prope est/adest/fit quando/cum/ut*:

(50) Plaut., *Men*. 985:　　　*prope est quando* erus ob facta pretium exsolvet.

(51) Ter., *Andr*. 152:　　　[…] *prope adest quom* alieno more vivendumst mihi […]

(52) Liv. 40.32.5:　　　iam *prope erat, ut* sinistrum cornu pelleretur Romanis, ni septima legio successisset.

(53) Liv. 25.21.1:　　　quo ubi allatum est hostes adventare, *prope est factum ut* iniussu praetoris signis convolsis in aciem exirent […]

(54) Plaut., *Mil*. 475:　　　Id quidem palam est eam esse, ut dicis; quid *propius fuit*, quam *ut* perirem, si elocutus essem ero?

(55) Cic., *Cluent*. 59.3:　　　nec quicquam *propius est factum* quam *ut* illum persequeretur et collo obtorto ad subsellia reduceret ut reliqua posset perorare.

As can be seen, the syntactic relationships that *prope* is involved in are fairly diverse: when it does not govern case, it combines with various parts of speech (points A and B); when it does, it governs not only the accusative (point C) but also the dative (point D) and *a* (*ab*) with the ablative (point E). What additionally complicates the issue is the fact that in the majority of usages it is gradable.

The identification of grammatical class seems to be the least problematic in the case of *prope* as used in point A, meaning *almost*, *nearly*. Traditionally, lexemes of this kind were classified as adverbs of degree. In more recent classifications, these gradation operators,[9] together with other lexemes, have been excluded from the class of adverbs on the basis of syntactic criteria. This is because the authors of various classifications agree in assuming that adverbs are lexemes that enter into syntactic relations with verbs (some of them also with adjectives) and distinguish them from lexemes that freely combine with various parts of speech, including nouns. At present, the latter lexemes are usually referred to as particles—this is the name they bear in Grochowski's (1997), Wróbel's (2001), Zaron's (2003), and Bańka's (2002)[10]

---

　[9] GROCHOWSKI (2008, 13–14) distinguishes gradation operators, which do not combine with numerals, from approximation operators, which occur together with numeral expressions (it is into the latter category that he classifies *almost*, *nearly,* and *close*).

　[10] In some models, these lexemes have nothing to do with the group of words and morphemes referred to in school grammar textbooks as particles (*by, czy, -li, no, niech, -że*), while in others, such as Bańka's (2002, 119), they occur together with them. The issue of what used to be and what is behind the term "particle" is discussed in detail by Jadwiga WAJSZCZUK (2005, 36–104). See also Chapter VII: Adverbs, Particles, and Related Parts of Speech (Pol. *O przysłówkach, partykułach i im pokrewnych częściach mowy*) in JODŁOWSKI (1971, 97–114).

classifications—or modalizers (Pol. *modalizatory*), as in the highly popular classification proposed by Laskowski (1998).[11] The group of gradation operators classified as particles/modalizers due to their syntactic properties is usually distinguished—Laskowski (1998, 64) refers to them as quantifying modalizers (Pol. *modalizatory kwantyfikujące*)[12]—due to certain semantic limitations imposed on the words they combine with. These are words that denote attributes which are, in some way, gradable.[13]

Whatever we call *prope* when used as in point A (examples 1–12), it is not a preposition (for obvious reasons—it does not govern case), but it is not an adverb either. It differs from an adverb (in the sense defined above, other than the traditional ones) in that it can combine not only with a verb or an adjective (examples 3 and 4, as well as an adjectival pronoun—examples 5 and 6) but also with a noun (examples 1 and 2), a numeral (examples 7 and 8), and an adverb (examples 9 and 10).[14] The particle/modalizer *prope* also differs from the adverb *prope* morphologically: namely, it is non-gradable. Moreover, as a gradation operator, *prope* seems to impose certain semantic limitations on the words it combines with. Because many characteristics and

---

[11] The difference in collocability between particles/modalizers and adverbs, which these divisions are based on, appears to stem from the fact that these are terms, as it were, from different levels of language (see WAJSZCZUK 2005, 36–72). Adverbs are terms with object reference, whereas particles are terms with metalinguistic reference. Adverbs are components of sentences, while particles are comments on actualized utterances. "Adverbs are units involved in the organization of the objective contents of the sentence… Because they more precisely specify the meaning of the main verbal predicate, or in fact of the entire predicate–argument structure based on it, as its determinants" (WAJSZCZUK 2005, 63; "Przysłówki to jednostki uczestniczące w organizacji treści przedmiotowej zdania… dookreślają bowiem znaczenia głównego predykatu czasownikowego, a właściwie całej struktury predykatowo-argumentowej na nim bazującej, jako jej determinanty"). Particles, by contrast, are operators of the theme–rheme structure of the utterance. "The particle combines with that which is the most important in the utterance; it accompanies the word that is stressed and rhematic in the utterance" (WAJSZCZUK 2005, 69–70; "Partykuła łączy się z tym, co w wypowiedzeniu jest najważniejsze, towarzyszy słowu w wypowiedzeniu akcentowanemu, rematycznemu"). In the Polish linguistic literature, metalinguistic lexemes are very often referred to as function words (Pol. *wyrażenia funkcyjne*)—see e.g. GROCHOWSKI (1997; 2008).

[12] In an earlier version of the classification of indeclinable lexemes proposed by GROCHOWSKI (1986b, 58–61), they were excluded from the class of particles and made up a separate class called adnominal–adverbial.

[13] Due to this difference, WAJSZCZUK (2005, 65–67) distinguishes them from particles and identifies them as a separate class of intensifiers.

[14] The fact that they can combine with adverbs is regarded as evidence that gradation operators (intensifiers) are not adverbs (cf. WAJSZCZUK, 2005, 66). The lexeme *very*, traditionally named as an example of an adverb combining with an adverb, is also classified under particles.

states are gradable, however, this is not easily perceptible.[15] Grammars and dictionaries only stress that, when used in this way, *prope* combines with a verb in the perfectum (examples 11 and 12). Combination with the perfective form of a transitive verb is fully understandable from the semantic point of view—in Polish, something may also be "almost done" (Pol. *prawie zrobio-ne*), and only in rare cases is it "almost being done" (Pol. *prawie zrobione*).[16]

What raises much more doubt is the classification of *prope* as used in points B, C, D, and E, because it is not clear when it should be regarded as an adverb and when it should be considered a preposition. As mentioned earlier, authors of grammars and dictionaries agree only about the fact that when *prope* (*propius*, *proxime*) appears without the governed element (point B, examples 13–23) it is labeled as an adverb, and when it appears in the positive case with the governed accusative (point C, examples 24, 25, 32–35) it is labeled as a preposition. *Prope* (*propius*, *proxime*) governing the dative (point D, examples 39–43) is usually identified as an adverb as well—firstly, it is gradable; secondly, Latin prepositions do not take the dative (although in SŁPP the *proxime* from example 42 is identified as a preposi-tion!). *Prope* (*propius*, *proxime*) governing *a* (*ab*) with the ablative (point E, examples 44–49) is also treated as an adverb—it is gradable and it occurs next to *a* (*ab*), which is unquestionably a preposition. Various labels are given to *propius* and *proxime* governing the accusative (point C, examples 26–31 and 36–38). They are identified as adverbs on some occasions and as prepositions on others, and it is unclear on what grounds. Why, for instance, is *propius* in example 28 labeled as an adverb in SŁPP, while the one in 29 is a preposition according to Kühner and Stegmann (1962, 528)? It seems that an arbitrary decision was made, with the morphological criterion pre-vailing in the former case and the syntactic criterion in the latter. The only identifiable criterion for distinguishing adverbs from prepositions given in syntactic classifications developed for the Polish language that could be applied here is that the latter govern case.[17] These classifications do not include adverbs that govern case, although a certain group of Polish adverbs, derived from the what is known as syncategorematic adjectives, show the same case government as their derivational stems, e.g. *podobnie*, *niepo-dobnie*, *stosownie*, *odpowiednio do kogoś/czegoś* (similarly/appropriately to somebody/something, differently from somebody/something) or *przyjaźnie,*

---

[15] Cf. GRZEGORCZYKOWA (1975, 43–44, 69–70).
[16] Cf. GRZEGORCZYKOWA (1975, 69–70) and GROCHOWSKI (1986b, 61).
[17] Cf. GROCHOWSKI (1997, 9–32), LASKOWSKI (1998, 56–59), BAŃKO (2002, 111).

życzliwie, nieprzyjaźnie, wrogo wobec kogoś/czegoś (amicably/towards somebody/something, in a friendly/hostile manner towards somebody/ something). Gradable prepositions are not included in these classifications either. This is understandable, though on the other hand the status of the expressions *bliżej czegoś* (closer to something) and *najbliżej czegoś* (the closest to something) as well as *dalej od czegoś* (further from something) and *najdalej od czegoś* (the furthest from something) in Polish is also unclear.[18] As a result, these classifications will not be useful here and solutions should be sought elsewhere.

If we assume that *prope* (*propius*, *proxime*) governing the dative and *a* (*ab*) with the ablative is an adverb, and if we temporarily ignore the issue of gradability in the case of *prope* governing the accusative, another essential question arises, concerning the grammatical status of *prope* and undermining the legitimacy of the solution adopted in grammars and dictionaries. Namely, the question is whether *prope* that combines with a verb and does not govern case (point B, examples 13, 19, and 20), which is commonly regarded as an adverb, and *prope* governing the accusative (point C, examples 24, 25, 32–35), commonly regarded as a preposition, differ grammatically. The same question concerns the entire group of Latin words that are dually labeled in this way, such as *iuxta*, *supra*, *infra*, *intra*, *extra*, *ante*, *post* , etc.—without case government they are adverbs, with the governed accusative they are prepositions. In both uses, however, they perform the same function—they identify the place or time of an event, indicating how far it is from the point of reference. The difference between them lies only in the fact that when the point of reference can be correctly identified by the recipient, information about it is left out. This happens when the point of reference has been mentioned before or when it is the same as the time or location when the speech act is taking place.[19] Comparing examples 13 and 24, one can conclude that there is no syntactic difference between *prope* in sentence 24 and *prope* in sentence 13. In the latter, it seems that the form *me* next to *prope* was simply left out.

(24) Liv. 2.46.6:   At ego iniuratus aut victor revertar aut *prope te* hic, Q. Fabi, dimicans cadam.

---

[18] M. BAŃKO (2002, 111–113) calls them a classic example of a transitional category, with regard to which only arbitrary decisions can be made. Z. ZARON (2005, 51), by contrast, claims that gradability can be an argument in favor of their adverbial nature.

[19] Cf. ZARON (2005, 49–50).

(13) Cic., *Epist.* 9.7.1:   nam quod antea te calumniatus sum, indicabo malitiam meam: volebam *prope* [*me*] alicubi *esse* te […]

It is more difficult to determine the form of the omitted temporal point of reference in examples 19 and 20:

(19) Liv. 34.33.3:   his dictis in vicem auditisque nox *prope diremit* conloquium.
(20) Ter., *Ad.* 307:   […] partus *instabat prope* […]

There is no doubt, however, that in both cases the meaning is that of closeness in relation to the previously specified time: in example 19, night interrupted the conversation soon after it had begun; in example 20, childbirth was close in relation to the time indicated previously in the tale.

Harm Pinkster (1972, 169–178)[20] discusses the relationship between this kind of Latin adverbs and prepositions. He states that is possible either to adhere to the dual treatment they have been given so far or to adopt the view that they constitute a distinct subclass—one that could be called "adverb-prepositions."[21] Yet, he does not see any syntactic reasons not to identify them as adverbs. Though it goes against tradition, this solution seems to be more convincing for two reasons. On the one hand, as stated above, these words always connote a point of reference in relation to which the location or time of the event is defined. Consequently, even when this information is left out as obvious to both the sender and the receiver, there is no syntactic difference between them—*iuxta* (just like the Polish word *obok* [beside, next to]) always means *iuxta aliquem/aliquod* (*obok kogoś/czegoś* [next to somebody/something]). Despite this, it seems they should not be regarded as

---

[20] Pinkster also presents the opinions of various scholars on the diachronic relationship between adverbs and prepositions. As is known, the most widespread view is that prepositions derive from adverbs—see e.g. SINKO (1932, 49) and KURYŁOWICZ (1964, 171).

[21] A different, extreme position is taken by A. BAŃKOWSKI (2000, XIX–XX), who does not acknowledge the existence of prepositions at all, calling them a "fictitious class." Instead, he proposes his own conception of converbia (Pol. *konwerbia*). What he understands by this term is "those ancient (pre-linguistic) indeclinable wordlets with broad 'directional' meanings, not used on their own and always used together with a verb form (verbum), preceding it in some cases and following it in others. Thus understood, the converbium was (and still is, under the absurd name of preposition) a kind of subspecies of what is known as the verb (verbum)" ["owe pradawne (prajęzykowe) nieodmienne wyrazki o szerokich znaczeniach «kierunkowych,» używane niesamodzielnie, bo zawsze pospołu z formą czasownika (verbum), stawiane raz przed nią, raz po niej". „Tak rozumiane konwerbium było (i jest nadal pod niedorzeczną nazwą przyimka) swoistym podgatunkiem (subspecies) tzw. czasownika (verbum)"].

prepositions because, on the other hand, this group of words essentially differs from prepositions such as *ex*, *ab*, *de*, *sub*, *pro*, or *in*. They can never appear without the governed case form—one can say *in aliquem/aliquod* (*wobec kogoś/czegoś* [towards somebody/something]), but one cannot say, simply, **in* (*wobec* [towards]).[22]

Still, even if we decide not to break with tradition altogether and refuse to go as far as recognizing all those "adverb-prepositions" as adverbs governing the accusative which is subject to contextual ellipsis (although this appears to be precisely what distinguishes them from prepositions), this seems legitimate in the case of *prope*. Both syntactic and morphological properties of the word argue in favor of this solution. Syntactically, *prope* differs from the remaining words in this group in that it governs not only the accusative but also the dative, which is not typical of Latin prepositions, as well as the entire prepositional phrase *a* (*ab*) with the ablative, which excludes its prepositional nature. The morphological difference has also been mentioned many times: as opposed to all other words of this kind, *prope* is gradable.[23] This property—i.e. the gradability of *prope*—is in some way related to one other characteristic indirectly confirming its adverbial nature. Namely, it is known that, in Latin, the comparative and superlative degrees can be used not only relatively, serving the purpose of comparison,[24] but also absolutely. What functionally corresponds to the morphological category of degree in Polish (and not only in Polish) is lexical indicators of degree: the counterpart of the comparative is *dość* (quite) or *zbyt* (too), and the counterpart of the superlative is *bardzo* (very). Gradation operators (particles/modalizers) in turn combine with adverbs, not with prepositions—one can say *bardzo blisko domu* (*proxime domum*) [very close to the house], but one cannot say **bardzo obok domu* (**valde iuxta domum*) [*very next to the house].

In view of the above, it seems legitimate to venture the conclusion that behind the dictionary entry for *prope*[25] there are two parts of speech; they are, however,

---

[22] Cf. PINKSTER (1972, 169–170).

[23] Of course, this perspective on the issue makes sense only if gradation is assumed to be an inflectional phenomenon—cf. e.g. LASKOWSKI (1998, 85–86).

[24] The present article does not address the issue of the additional syntactic and semantic connotation (valence) that adverbs acquire in the comparative and superlative degrees when used relatively: *somebody/something is close to somebody/something*, but *closer to somebody/something than somebody/something else* and *the closest of some other people/things to somebody/something*. This is a typical property of gradable adverbs (as well as adjectives) and has no influence on the issues discussed here. Cf. e.g. LASKOWSKI (1998, 85–86) and GÓRSKA (2002).

[25] The question that remains open is whether this is one polysemous lexeme or two homonyms.

not adverb and preposition, but adverb and particle. The particle is *prope* meaning *almost*, *nearly*—it then occurs only in the positive degree, does not govern case, and enters into syntactic relationships with various parts of speech. In the remaining cases, *prope*, with the most general meaning of *close* (*to somebody/something*), is a gradable adverb that governs the obligatory identification of a point of reference (in the form of the accusative, the dative, or a prepositional phrase consisting of *a* (*ab*) with the ablative), which may nevertheless be subject to contextual ellipsis.

What remains to be discussed is the grammatical status of *prope* (*propius*)[26] in *prope est/adest/fit quando/cum/ut* (point F, examples 50–55). If *prope* was used in these expressions only in the positive degree, it could be regarded as a particle (*almost*, *nearly*). For instance, in sentence 52 it could refer to the implied adverb *ita*: *prope erat* [*ita*], *ut*…,[27] but in the case of sentence 54 this is impossible—one cannot say **quid propius fuit* [*ita*], *quam ut*… This interpretation should therefore be rejected. An alternative that could possibly be considered is the identification of *prope* as a modal predicative (Pol. *predykatyw*). In the functional classifications of vocabulary proposed by Polish linguistics, this term is used to refer to lexemes (treated as homonyms of adverbs) that, like verbs, have a sentence-forming function but differ from verbs in that they do not take a subject in the nominative and, consequently, in that they inflect only for tense and mood; at the same time, they follow a purely analytic inflection pattern (involving forms of the lexeme *być* [to be]), e.g. *miło jest* (*że…*) ["It is nice (that...)"], *dobrze byłoby* (*żeby…*) ["It would be good if..."], *źle było* (*gdy...*) ["It was bad (when)..."].[28] This kind of interpretation of such expressions is often challenged, however—particularly when combinations with other verbal lexemes are also possible, e.g. *zrobiło się miło*, *dobrze się stało* ("it became nice"; "it was fortunate"). Many scholars believe that combinations of this kind consist of two distinct lexemes: verbal and adverbial.[29] This interpretation is more convincing,

---

It is not easy to answer this question because it is not clear so far what polysemy is, what homonymy is, what relationship there is between them, and how these two concepts are related to polyfunctionality—see LYONS (1989, 166–184), GROCHOWSKI (1986a) and (1986b, 30–32).

[26] Grammars and dictionaries provide no examples of *proxime* used in such expressions. Still, because *propius* does occur in them, the use of the superlative, at least absolute, appears not to be impossible.

[27] This seems to be the intuition reflected in KÜHNER AND STEGMANN (1962, II, 237–238), where clauses beginning with *ut* after these expressions are interpreted as consecutive.

[28] See LASKOWSKI (1998, 60–61), cf. BAŃKO (2002, 101–103).

[29] See WIŚNIEWSKI (1994), SZUPRYCZYŃSKA (1995), SALONI (2003). In fact, scholars even speak of a combination of a verbal lexeme and an adjectival one, because, according to Saloni's (1974)

especially as the latter lexemes are gradable. All things considered, it seems legitimate to conclude, consistently with tradition, that *prope* in *prope est/adest/fit quando/cum/ut* is also a (predicative) adverb. Another issue, which needs to be considered separately, is what types of clauses these expressions connote.

The discussion presented in this article concerning the grammatical interpretation of only one lexeme shows what a difficult task it is. The solution proposed here—which differs from the traditional one, most generally speaking, in that in none of the usage patterns is *prope* identified as a preposition—certainly should not be treated as final. The aim of the article is rather to provoke debate on the description of Latin indeclinable words, which, in the future, might result in a more complete characterization of these lexemes, taking account of the valuable solutions developed by contemporary linguistics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BAŃKO, Mirosław. *Wykłady z polskiej fleksji* [Lectures in Polish inflection]. Warsaw: PWN, 2002.

BAŃKOWSKI, Andrzej. *Etymologiczny słownik języka polskiego* [An etymological dictionary of Polish]. Warsaw: PWN, 2000.

EJO: *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego* [An encyclopedia of general linguistics]. Edited by Kazimierz Polański. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1993.

EJP: *Encyklopedia języka polskiego* [An encyclopedia of the Polish language]. Edited by Stanisław Urbańczyk. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1994.

GÓRSKA, Małgorzata. "Właściwości walencyjne łacińskich przysłówków" [Valence properties of Latin adverbs]. *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 50, no. 3 (2002): 83–92.

GROCHOWSKI, Maciej. *Polifunkcyjność jednostek a ich homonimia (z punktu widzenia współczesnej leksykografii)* [The polyfunctionality of units and their homonyms (from the point of view of contemporary lexicography)]. *Prace Filologiczne* 33 (1986a), 35–42.

GROCHOWSKI, Maciej. *Polskie partykuły. Składnia, semantyka, leksykografia* [Polish particles. Syntax, semantics, lexicography]. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1986b.

GROCHOWSKI, Maciej. *Wyrażenia funkcyjne. Studium leksykograficzne* [Functional expressions: A lexicographic study]. Cracow: Wydawnictwo IJP PAN, 1997.

GROCHOWSKI, Maciej. "Założenia ogólne opisu tzw. wyrażeń funkcyjnych w *Wielkim słowniku języka polskiego*" [General assumptions behind the description of the so-called functional expressions in the *Great Dictionary of the Polish Language*]. In *Nowe studia leksykograficzne 2* [New lexicographic studies 2]. Edited by Piotr Żmigrodzki and Renata Przybylska, 11–22. Cracow: Wydawnictwo LEXIS, 2008.

proposal, de-adjectival adverbs are considered forms of the respective adjectives, neutralized in terms of case, number, and gender.

GRZEGORCZYKOWA, Renata. *Funkcje semantyczne i składniowe polskich przysłówków* [The semantic and syntactic functions of Polish adverbs]. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1975.

JODŁOWSKI, Stanisław. *Studia nad częściami mowy* [Studies in parts of speech]. Warsaw: PWN, 1971.

KURYŁOWICZ, Jerzy. *The inflectional categories of Indo-European*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1964.

KÜHNER, Raphael, and Carl STEGMANN. *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache II. Satzlehre*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1962.

LDLS: *Latin Dictionary*. Edited by Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.

LYONS, Johns. *Semantyka 2* [Semantics 2]. Translated by A. Weinsberg. Warsaw: PWN, 1989.

LASKOWSKI, Roman. "Podstawowe pojęcia morfologii" [Basic concepts of morphology]. In *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Morfologia* [A grammar of contemporary Polish. Morphology], edited by Renata Grzegorczykowa, Roman Laskowski, and Henryk Wróbel, part 1, 9–57. Warsaw: PWN, 1984.

LASKOWSKI, Roman. "Zagadnienia ogólne morfologii" [General issues of morphology] *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Morfologia* [A grammar of the contemporary Polish language. Morphology], edited by Renata Grzegorczykowa, Roman Laskowski, and Henryk Wróbel, part 1, 2nd ed., revised, 27–86. Warsaw: PWN, 1998.

MENGE, Hermann. *Lehrbuch der lateinischen Syntax und Semantik*. Völlig neu bearbeitet von Thorsten Burkard und Markus Schauer, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2000.

MISZ, Henryk. *Opis grup syntaktycznych dzisiejszej polszczyzny pisanej* [A description of the syntactic categories of contemporary written Polish]. Bydgoszcz: Bydgoskie Towarzystwo Naukowe, 1967.

PINKSTER, Harm. *On Latin Adverbs*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1972.

SAFAREWICZ, Jan: *Gramatyka historyczna języka łacińskiego*, cz. II: *Składnia* [*A historical grammar of Latin*, part 2: *Syntax*]. Warsaw: Państwowe Zakłady Wydawnictw Szkolnych, 1950.

SALONI, Zygmunt. "Klasyfikacja gramatyczna leksemów polskich" [A grammatical classification of Polish lexemes]. *Język Polski* 54, no. 1 (1974): 3–13; no. 2: 93–101.

SALONI, Zygmunt, and Marek ŚWIDZIŃSKI. *Składnia współczesnego języka polskiego* [The syntax of contemporary Polish]. Warsaw: PWN, 1985.

SALONI, Zygmunt. *Jeszcze o zdaniach typu „Jasne jest, że..." (uzupełnienia artykułu hasłowego „być")* [More on sentences such as *Jasne jest, że...* ("It is clear that...") (a supplement to the entry article on *być* ("to be")]. In *Studia z gramatyki i leksykologii języka polskiego* [Studies in the grammnar and lexicology of the Polish language], edited by Małgorzata Gębka-Wolak, Iwona Kaproń-Charzyńska, and Małgorzata Urban, 157–167. Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK, 2003.

SŁPK: *Słownik łacińsko-polski*, vols. 1–2 [Latin–Polish dictionary], edited by Józef Korpanty. Warsaw: PWN, 2003.

SŁPP: *Słownik łacińsko-polski*, vols. 1–5 [Latin–Polish dictionary], edited by Marian Plezia. Warsaw: PWN, 1959–1979.

SINKO, Tadeusz. *Gramatyka łacińska* [Latin grammar]. Lwów–Warsaw: Książnica Atlas, 1932.

SZUPRYCZYŃSKA, Maria. *Jeszcze o tzw. „predykatywach przysłówkowych"* [More on "adverbial predicates"]. *Polonica* 17 (1995): 173–187.

WAJSZCZUK, Jadwiga. *O metatekście* [On metatext]. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo UW, 2005.

WIŚNIEWSKI, Marek. *Strukturalna charakterystyka polskich wypowiedzeń niezdaniowych* [Structural characteristics of Polish non-sentence expressions]. Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK, 1994.

WRÓBEL, Henryk. *Gramatyka języka polskiego* [A grammar of the Polish language]. Cracow: Wydawnictwo "Od Nowa," 2001.

ZARON, Zofia. "Funkcjonalna klasyfikacja leksemów polskich (kolejna propozycja)" [A functional classification of Polish lexemes (another proposal)]. In *Studia z gramatyki i leksykologii języka polskiego* [Studies in the grammar and lexicology of the Polish language], edited by Małgorzata Gębka-Wolak, Iwona Kaproń-Charzyńska, and Małgorzata Urban, 179–188. Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK, 2003.

ZARON, Zofia. "Wykładnikami lokalizacji—konstrukcje przysłówkowe czy przyimkowe?" [Exponents of location—adverbial or prepositional structures?]. In *Przysłówki i przyimki. Studia ze składni i semantyki języka polskiego* [Adverbs and prepositions: Studies in the syntax and semantics of the Polish language], edited by Maciej Grochowski, 45–55. Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK, 2005.

THE LATIN *PROPE*—WHAT PART OF SPEECH IS IT?

Summary

This paper seeks to revise the description of the grammatical properties of the Latin lexeme *prope*, which are fundamental for its inclusion in specific classes of words (parts of speech). The change proposed here amounts to saying that behind the entry *prope* there are two parts of speech, and that they are not adverb and preposition but adverb and particle. The particle is *prope*, meaning *almost*, *nearly*—it occurs in the positive degree, does not govern case, and is syntactically related to various parts of speech. In the remaining cases, *prope* most generally means *near* (*somebody* / *something*); it is a gradable adverb that governs an obligatory point of reference (in the form of the accusative, the dative, or the prepositional phrase *a* [*ab*] with the ablative). This point of reference may, however, be subject to context-dependent ellipsis when the recipient has an opportunity to reliably reconstruct it.

Key words: parts of speech; grammatical classes of lexemes; indeclinable lexemes; adverbs; particles; prepositions.

Translated by Piotr Czyżewski