

PARTICIPIAL COMPLEMENTATION IN ROMAN AND BYZANTINE
DOCUMENTARY PAPYRI: ἐπίσταμαι, μανθάνω, εὕρισκω

Patrick James

Jesus College, Cambridge, UK

Introduction

This paper is derived from part of a comprehensive study of complementation, particularly participial constructions, in the Koine of the Roman and early Byzantine periods. It will focus on some verbs of cognition or perception, namely: ἐπίσταμαι, μανθάνω, and εὕρισκω. Some observations on the usage of these verbs will be made and then some tentative conclusions on the issues which they raise will be offered.

Participial complementation in the Koine is of particular interest because it is the one aspect of participial syntax which has not survived, even fossilized, into Modern Greek. Circumstantial participles (temporal, concessive, etc.), describing the subject of the sentence, are the origin of the Modern Greek gerund, (1):¹

- (1)
ο Γιάννης ἦρθε τρέχοντας
'John came running.'

Adjectival participles, often substantivized (e.g. ὁ προκείμενος, ὁ δηλούμενος; cf. English 'the aforementioned'), are well-attested in the documentary papyri and account for the survival of a few adjectives in

1. G.C. Horrocks, *Greek: A History of the Language and Its Speakers* (London: Longman, 1997), pp. 122-24; F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (trans. R.W. Funk; Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1961) [= BDF], §136. The example given here was taken from D. Holton, P. Mackridge and I. Philippaki-Warbuton, *Greek: A Comprehensive Grammar of the Modern Language* (London: Routledge, 1997) [= HMP], p. 234.

-ων, a largely unproductive formation, and of a few nouns, often agentival, in -σας.² However, in Modern Greek, complement clauses are introduced either by conjunctions, *ὅτι*, *πώς* or *που*, or by the particle *να*.³ The former introduce propositions, the latter introduces the state of the object or the sense ‘how to’, (2):

(2)

έμαθα *ὅτι* πήρες το πτυχιο σου
‘I learned that you got your degree.’

έμαθα πια *να* μην περιμένω πολλά
‘I finally learned not to expect too much.’

άκουσα *ὅτι* η Μαρία κλαίει συχνά
‘I heard that Maria cries often.’

άκουσα τη Μαρία *να* κλαίει
‘I heard Maria crying.’ (lit. that she cries)

η Μαρία ξέρει *να* κρατάει μυστικά
‘Maria knows how to keep a secret.’

τον βρήκα *να* κάθεται στον κήπο
‘I found him sitting in the garden.’

It is hoped that an examination of the use of complementary participles in the documentary papyri will help to explain in detail the situation which led to their decline and elimination.

The advantages of *ὅτι* with an indicative over infinitival or participial complements are obvious from a grammatical perspective and contribute to an explanation of the popularity of this construction. This is especially true in the context of every-day communication and of non-native speakers. First, the construction simplifies complementation considerably.

2. HMP, pp. 84-85, where *παρών*, ‘present’, and *μέλλων*, ‘future’, are cited as examples. Both are found often in the papyri. Note also substantive formations, such as *τα υπάρχοντα* ‘property’, a term which occurs frequently in business documents (e.g. *P.Oxy.* VIII 1121.19 [1st CE], I 133 [6th CE], and *P.Cair.Isid.* 81.9 and 89.10 [late 3rd CE]). For fossils from the aorist participle, see HMP, p. 166. See also O. Eleftheriades, *Modern Greek: A Contemporary Grammar* (Palo Alto, CA: Pacific Books, 1985), pp. 163-64.

3. HMP, pp. 450-57, the source of most of the examples in (2), and Eleftheriades, *Modern Greek*, pp. 500-502. The particle, *να*, comes from the conjunction *ἵνα*, whose use was extended in the Koine. See A. Debrunner and A. Scherer, *Geschichte der griechischen Sprache II: Grundfragen und Grundzüge* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969), §198.

It gives one construction which can be used after several semantic categories of verb, performing all of the functions divided between both the infinitival constructions and the participial construction.⁴ Secondly, the use of a finite verb removes the need for the writer to be able to inflect participles for number and gender (numerous violations of concord are attested in the papyri⁵ and in some early Koine literary texts, such as the book of Revelation in the New Testament).⁶ Thirdly, the content of direct speech, of a declaration or of a discovery can be expressed using a ὅτι clause without having to modify the syntax of the original utterance: the so-called ὅτι *recitativum*.⁷ The ὅτι construction provided a simplified complement structure available for widespread use to the detriment of other means of complementation.

Further, such a development is paralleled in the other languages in use in Roman and Byzantine Egypt. Even classical Latin texts occasionally have *quod* with an indicative instead of an accusative and infinitive.⁸ In later Latin, both *quod* and *quia* were used frequently as an alternative to the accusative and infinitive. Such a construction became the Romance standard (e.g. French *je pense que, on a constaté que*, ‘it has been found that...’).⁹ In Coptic,¹⁰ *je* functions in a very similar way. This conjunction

4. The availability of these options was not semantically governed. The verbs λέγω and δηλόω, which do or can convey speech, can be followed either by an accusative and infinitive or by ὅτι, but only δηλόω can be followed by a participial construction.

5. B.G. Mandilaras, *The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri* (Athens: Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sciences, 1973), §§877-79.

6. Examples are given in BDF, §§136 and 137 (3).

7. See BDF, §397 (5); it is the most common form of complement with verbs of speech.

8. B.L. Gildersleeve and G. Lodge, *Latin Grammar* (London: Macmillan, 1895), §525.1 n. 7, in which the cited examples (with verbs of speech and feeling) are regarded with suspicion.

9. See, e.g., J. Herman, *Vulgar Latin* (trans. R. Wright; University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000), pp. 87-88; and, for examples, M.S. Smith, *Petroni Arbitri Cena Trimalchionis* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), pp. 118, 224. In Greek texts related to the Roman administration, the accusative and infinitive may be assumed to have supported the equivalent construction in Greek. Cf. Horrocks, *Greek*, pp. 73-78, for other examples of features of Latin and Greek which were mutually reinforcing.

10. M.A. Uhlemann, *Linguae Copticae Grammatica* (Leipzig: Weigel, 1853), §43; J.M. Plumley, *Introductory Coptic Grammar* (London: Harrison & Sons,

is used to introduce causal clauses and so is equivalent to *quod* and to ὅτι, but also introduces direct (like ὅτι *recitativum*) and indirect speech and complement clauses after verbs of perception (seeing and hearing) and of declaration. This parallel feature in the three languages probably assisted the spread of ὅτι clauses instead of complementary participles, which in turn probably strengthened the use of *quod* in Latin.

The usage of a verb of cognition or perception, like μανθάνω, in the papyri illustrates the spread of the ὅτι construction. The three constructions, the participle, the infinitive and the ὅτι clause are all attested, but tend to be associated with particular types of document. So, the accusative and infinitive is found rarely and principally seems to have been a feature of the language of edicts (e.g. *P.Oxy.* XII 1405 [3rd CE], XXXIV 2704 [3rd CE]) and of petitions (e.g. *P.Oxy.* VII 1032 [2nd CE]).¹¹ The participle construction occurs very occasionally in petitions and correspondence (e.g. *P.Oxy.* XXXIII 2672 [3rd CE]; XII 1587 [late 3rd CE], XVIII 2200 [early 2nd CE]). However, clauses introduced by ὅτι, by far the most common, are found mainly in business and personal letters throughout the period:

Business	<i>P.Oxy.</i> VIII 1107	5th/6th CE
	<i>P.Oxy.</i> VIII 1157	late 3rd CE
	<i>P.Oxy.</i> VIII 1158	3rd CE
	<i>P.Oxy.</i> XLI 2985	2nd/3rd CE
Personal	<i>P.Oxy.</i> VII 1067	3rd CE ¹²
	<i>P.Oxy.</i> XLI 2986	2nd/3rd CE
	<i>P.Oxy.</i> LI 3644	3rd CE
	<i>P.Oxy.</i> LVI 3853	3rd CE

Therefore, it seems that ὅτι clauses were a feature of lower registers of writing and hence probably closer to spoken Greek. This observation is confirmed by the survival of this construction in Modern Greek. The

1948), §337; C.C. Walters, *An Elementary Grammar of the Sahidic Dialect* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1976), §§120-21.

11. Note, however, *P.Oxy.* XLIX 3506 (?2nd CE), a private letter, and an official letter of complaint to an *amphodogrammateus* (a district secretary), XLIII 3096 (3rd CE).

12. This text was described as ‘very ungrammatical’ by A.S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, VII (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1910), p. 221.

other two means of complementation seem to have been associated with the more official or bureaucratic registers of language.

The Decline of Infinitival Complementation

The papyri attest syntactic and semantic developments of verbs of cognition and perception which illuminate the decline of infinitival complements and of the accusative and infinitive construction.

My survey¹³ of the use of *μανθάνω* and *ἐπίσταμαι* also illustrated the factors contributing to the elimination of the classical infinitival complement meaning ‘how to x’.¹⁴ Both verbs are often found with a direct object, instead of an infinitive, indicating the area of competence. For example, when reference is made either to knowing how to write or to learning how to write, not only in the familiar formulas ‘because he does not know letters’,¹⁵ but also in non-formulaic expressions, such as *γραμματα μανθανει* (*P.Oxy.* XVIII 2190, a private letter [late 1st CE]), the accusative, *γράμματα*, is employed in preference to the infinitive, *γράφειν*. Abstract nouns are also employed as direct objects even in higher register texts, such as the early third-century CE edict preserved in *P.Oxy.* VIII 1100: *μανθάνω τη[ν δι]α των εργαων επανορθ[ωσιν]*,¹⁶ ‘learning of the correction through the works’ or ‘that there has been...’. Here the abstract noun conveys the substance of what was learned, not the area of competence. Similarly, in *P.Ant.* II 94.2 [6th CE] a text whose erratic orthography and awkward and redundant phrasing were noted by its first editors, a direct object after *μανθάνω* relates a fact or something tantamount to one: that the addressee was in good health, (3):

13. A search of the following collections of papyri was conducted using the PHI 7 CDROM (abbreviations follow J.F. Oates *et al.*, *Checklist of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*, <http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/clist.html>): *BGU*, *P.Abinn.*, *P.Ant.*, *P.Dura*, *P.Eleph.*, *P.Fam.Tebt.*, *P.Fay.*, *P.Fouad*, *P.Genova*, *P.Gen.*, *P.Hib.*, *P.Köln*, *P.Lond.*, *P.Masada*, *P.Oxy.*, *P.Petr.*, *P.Ryl.*, *P.Sakaon*, *P.Sarap.*, *P.Select* and *P.Tebt.*

14. For this use of the infinitive, see H.W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (rev. G.M. Messing; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956), §§2129 (3), 2136, 2139.

15. F.X.J. Exler, *A Study in Greek Epistolography* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1923), pp. 124-27; H.C. Youtie, ‘Because They Do Not Know Letters’, *ZPE* 19 (1975), pp. 101-108.

16. This is the reading of line 7 after corrections (deleting *κα* and adding *την* above the line) were made.

(3)

περιχαρης εγενομην μαθων την υγειαν

‘I was very glad when I learned of your health’ or ‘that you are healthy’.

(P.Ant. II 94.2 [6th CE])

The use of εὐρίσκω confirms these trends. In the Koine, the meaning, ‘to be able to x’, emerges (LSJ⁹ s.v. I.3, citing Epictetus) in competition with the classical meaning, ‘to find how to x’. Then, εὐρίσκω frequently is used with a direct object, specifically with εὐκαιρίαν or with ἀφορμήν, ‘to find the opportunity’. These expressions could be extended with an infinitive to give the meaning, ‘I find the opportunity to x’. Then, the infinitive was also used epexegetically with these verbs or in a limiting function, as in (4), a private letter of the third century:

(4)

ουχ ευρ[ο]ν κρεας σοι πεμψαι

‘I did not find meat to send to you.’

(P.Oxy. XIV 1674 [3rd CE])

An exceptional example of the accusative and infinitive is found in an official letter from a prefect to the *dux Aegypti* (5) and can probably be explained by the influence of Latin:¹⁷

(5)

οιας δη | ποτε επισ]κευης η ανανεωσαιως λιπειν τινα καστρα
ευροιμι

‘...whatever repair or renewal I found that any camp lacked...’

(P.Oxy. LV 3793.7 [4th CE])

The ‘how to’ sense of the infinitive construction was challenged further by πῶς, as in (6):

(6)

ουκ ευρον πως ελθω προς υμας

‘I did not find out how to come to you.’

(P.Oxy. XIV 1773.8 [3rd CE])

17. The subscription, in the third hand, contains a personal greeting from the prefect, *opto bene valeas per multos ann[os]*. Note also the Latin loanword, κάστρα. The editors suggest that the active infinitive, λιπεῖν, with the meaning ‘to be without, to lack’, is a mistake for the middle (cf. H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, H.S. Jones and R. McKenzie, *A Greek–English Lexicon* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 9th rev. edn, 1940], s.v. B.II.4). This use of the active cannot easily be explained by the influence of *relinquo*. It is closer in meaning to the *carere*.

This alternative construction occurs in a text full of orthographic errors (note, particularly, the psilotic spelling of οὐκ εὔρον), giving further corroboration to the association of overt markers of complementation with other indicators of a less complete command of the Greek language or less concern for ‘proper’ or ‘correct’ usage.

Idiosyncrasies: εὐρίσκω

However, the usage of εὐρίσκω in this period violates one of the tendencies observed with the other verbs of cognition. The participial construction survived throughout the period in texts of various registers.¹⁸ Examples of the ὅτι and indicative construction in the papyri are rare and late (see Table 1 below, p. 167). At present, I am aware of only two examples in business letters from the sixth or seventh centuries (*P.Oxy.* XVI 1840, in which the verb is almost entirely a restoration, and XVI 1853), (7). The New Testament contains one possible example of εὐρίσκω followed by ὅτι, (8) Rom. 7.21, if Wright’s proposal is accepted.¹⁹ However, this is usually (e.g. NIV, NASB) translated as an accusative and infinitive (with εἶναι understood) and ὅτι is taken to introduce the content of the νόμος. The Apostolic Fathers have one instance (*Barn.* 16.7); Epictetus has two, (9). The construction is slightly better attested in the Septuagint, but most of the examples occur in one passage in *1 Esdras* (2.22),²⁰ and its parallel in *2 Esd.* 4.19, (10).²¹

18. This is consistent with brief and unillustrated comments of Mandilaras, *The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri*, §916.

19. N.T. Wright, ‘Romans’, in *The New Interpreter’s Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002), X, pp. 395-770 (569), who bases his argument on BDAG, p. 412, that is, on the meaning of the verb rather than its syntax. However, the article in BDAG translates this passage as ‘I find it to be the rule’. See W. Bauer, F.W. Danker, W.F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich, *A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 3rd edn, 2000).

20. This passage is the only example cited by E.A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (from BC 146 to AD 1100)* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1870), s.v.

21. Cf. 2 Macc. 2.1, εὐρίσκεται δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἀπογραφαῖς Ἰερεμίας ὁ προφήτης ὅτι ἐκέλευσεν τοῦ πυρὸς λαβεῖν τοὺς μεταγενόμενος, ‘One finds in the records that Jeremiah the prophet ordered those who were being deported to take some of the fire’. This clearly relates the content of a piece of information about Jeremiah found in the records. Note that the subject is outside the ὅτι clause. This is possible here because of the (impersonal) passive.

(7)

εαν] μη ε[υρω] οτι σπουδην πολλην εποιησαι εις την απαιτησιν (read: εποιησαν)

‘If I do not find that they have shown much zeal in collecting...’

P.Oxy. XVI 1840

ευρισκω οτι ... οι απο Πινυρεως εχουσι φυλακη[ν

‘I find that...the people of Pinuris have a guard.’

P.Oxy. XVI 1853

(8)

εύρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον, τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ κάλον, ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ κακὸν παράκειται

Rom. 7.21

(9)

ζήτει καὶ εὐρήσεις, ὅτι ἄλλω διαφέρει.

‘Ask the question and you will conclude that a man differs [from a stork] in another way.’

Epictetus 1.28.20

σκέψαι πρῶτον μὴ εἰκῆ αὐτὸ ποιεῖν. εἴτ’ ἂν εὕρης, ὅτι ἀναφέρεις, σκέψαι, εἰ ἐφ’ ὃ δεῖ.

‘First, see to it that you are not acting without a fixed purpose. Then, if you find that you are using a standard of judgment, see whether it is the one you should use.’

Epictetus 3.23.6

(10)

καὶ εὐρέθη ὅτι ἐστὶν ἡ πόλις ἐκείνη ἐξ αἰῶνος βασιλεῦσιν ἀντιπαρατάσσουσα

‘and it was found that from long ago that city has been hostile to kings.’

1 Esd. 2.22

καὶ εὔραμεν ὅτι ἡ πόλις ἐκείνη ἀφ’ ἡμέρων αἰῶνος ἐπὶ βασιλεῖς ἐπαίρεται

‘We made an examination and found that from long ago the city has exalted itself against kings.’

2 Esd. 4.19

In classical Greek, both the participial and the subordinate clause complements were available, but with syntactic and semantic restrictions on their use. The participial construction was used to relate the act or state in which a person or an object was found, but ὅτι (or ὡς) was used when referring to intellectual perception of a proposition (‘to discover the fact that...’). However, when εὐρίσκω introduces indirect speech,

the participle could also be used in reference to the discovery of facts. Hence, there was some ambiguity.²²

In the examples cited in (7), (8) and (10), ὅτι introduces the proposition or conclusion reached. In both of the Epictetus passages, the construction occurs in the context of the examination of a question, not of a person or of an object, whose conclusion is then related by εὐρίσκω. In *I Esdras*, the clause, which could be thought of almost as a quotation, follows a search of the royal archives to substantiate a piece of information.

Both papyri in (7) use ὅτι to introduce facts (as in classical Greek and similar to Modern usage).²³ In *P.Oxy.* XVI 1840, the means of discovery, by which the official will find out whether his administrators have shown much zeal, is not mentioned. However, it is the question of their past zeal that is under investigation, not the state of their present conduct. *P.Oxy.* XVI 1853 could refer to immediate perception, but it is not necessary to conclude that its author had visited the village himself. A propositional interpretation is perfectly acceptable and consistent with his status: a land lord's agent informed by someone else.

On the other hand, papyri (11) and Epictetus (12) present examples of participles employed to describe the state of a person or object, when the thought easily, or even more appropriately, could have been expressed as a proposition introduced by ὅτι. Two petitions (first and second century), which use the participial construction, illustrate this.²⁴

(11)

ευρον τους...ποιμενας κατανενεμηκοτας δι ων νεμουσι προβατ(ων)
περι δραγματα [...]κϚ
'I found that the shepherds... had caused the sheep which they tend to
feed on twenty-six sheaves.'

P.Ryl. II 132 (32 CE; editor's trans.)

22. K. Hult, *Syntactic Variation in Greek of the 5th Century AD* (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia, LII; Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 1990), p. 162; Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §2113; for ambiguous examples, see Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §2114.

23. In Modern Greek, the content of the ὅτι clause may or may not be true; HMP, III.5.3.4.1.

24. For further examples of participial complements after verbs of finding (εὐρίσκω and καταλαμβάνω), see *P.Oxy.* XLI 2997 (aorist passive), a third-century CE petition, and the petitions *P.Ryl.* II 138 and 139 (perfect passive).

ευρον την οικιαν μου σεσυλημενην τε και παντα τα ενδον αποκει-
μενα βεβασταγμ[ε]να

‘I found both my house robbed and everything stored inside carried off.’

P.Tebt. II 330 (2nd CE)

In the first of these, *κατανέμω* is used transitively and causatively of the shepherds. Consequently, the editors translated the sentence with the conjunction ‘that’, suggesting the discovery of a fact. The significant discovery was not the shepherds themselves, whose state happened to be feeding the sheep on twenty-six sheaves, as if that information were incidental. Instead, the *fact* of them causing the sheep to feed on twenty-six sheaves is the petitioner’s main point. He does not specify any other basis for complaint.

In the second example, although the state in which the house was found—burgled and empty—could be expressed in classical Greek with a participial construction, such a comment could also be expressed as a fact, ‘I learned that my house had been burgled and all its contents carried off’:

(12)

ἡμεῖς δὲ περὶ τῶν κοινῶν γάμων καὶ ἀπεριστάτων ζητοῦμεν καὶ
οὕτως ζητοῦντες οὐχ εὐρίσκομεν ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ καταστάσει προηγού-
μενον τῷ Κυνικῷ τὸ πρᾶγμα.

‘But we are inquiring about ordinary marriages apart from special circumstances and inquiring in this way we do not find that in this state the matter is of prime importance for the Cynic.’

Epictetus 3.22.76

In (12), the grammatical object τὸ πρᾶγμα stands for the concept of marriage, which cannot be found in the same way that a person or an object can be found in a particular condition. Further, there has been an enquiry about marriage, conducted through reasoned argument, rather than an examination using the senses; hence, ‘we find that’ or ‘conclude that’.

Therefore, the participial construction, at least with εὐρίσκω, was the standard in the Roman period for expressing discoveries, both those made physically with the senses and those made with the intellect through argument.

It is clear that in these two petitions (11), the participial construction was a feature of language associated with a better quality of Greek or, at least, a desire to display one’s ability. Both texts show more correct orthography. In this regard, *P.Ryl.* II 132 may readily be compared with

P.Ryl. II 135 (an almost contemporary petition). The use of the aorist, εὔρον, not the perfect, εὔρηκα, may also reflect a better command of Greek. It was the perfect that survived, supplanting the aorist, to supply the Modern Greek past, βρήκα. Further, the entire sentence is a more elaborate way of expressing the grounds for complaint than simply stating the facts by writing ‘the sheep had eaten twenty-six sheaves’ or ‘my house had been burgled’ (cf. *P.Ryl.* II 146). Indeed, contemporary petitions (*P.Ryl.* II 124-152)²⁵ from the same location, Euhemeria, indicate that the convention was to state the situation directly, not in a clause introduced by a verb like εὔρον. In *P.Ryl.* II 132, also note the somewhat redundant relative clause, δι ὧν νεμουσι. Therefore, the use of participial complementation and, indeed, the use of the verbs that could be followed by participles seem to have been features of a higher and more official register of Koine Greek.

ὅτι vs. *Participial Complements*

The question of why ὅτι was not used more widely with εὔρίσκω, especially when the propositional sense of the construction was appropriate to the context, can now be addressed.

The ὅτι construction was an option in classical Greek for expressing a proposition after εὔρίσκω, but it does not appear to have been used widely. A selection of classical fifth- and fourth-century BCE prose texts (The Ten Orators, Thucydides, Plato and Xenophon) contain only one example of the conjunction used on its own, (13):

(13)

ἠύρηκαμεν ἄρα, ὡς ἔοικεν, ὅτι τὰ τῶν πολλῶν πολλὰ νόμιμα καλοῦ τε πέρι καὶ τῶν ἄλλων μεταξύ που κυλινδεῖται τοῦ τε μὴ ὄντος καὶ τοῦ ὄντος εἰλικρινῶς.

‘So, we have, it seems, concluded that the many conventions of the majority about both the fair and the honourable and about other things are tumbled about in the mid-region between that which does not exist and that which does exist in the pure sense.’

Plato, *Rep.* 479d

Since this is the only example in this selection of classical prose texts, the conjunction may not have been sufficiently well established with this verb to have found its way into Koine usage.

25. Excluding those listed in n. 24.

However, given both the clear advantages of this construction and its widespread use after verbs of the same semantic category (cognition and perception) and of other semantic categories (e.g. speech and declaration),²⁶ it is still necessary to explain why ὅτι with εὐρίσκω was not introduced by analogy. Further, we would have to explain not only its re-emergence in the sixth century and its use in Modern Greek, but also the persistent use of the participle in texts of various registers. The conjunction and finite verb construction could not have found its way into documentary texts from texts of more classical registers, since it was not the more prestigious variant.

Instead, the resilience of participial complementation should be examined against a larger picture of how participles were used in Koine texts. Circumstantial participles relate the manner of an action and/or report an action anterior to or contemporaneous with the main action of the subject. That is, they are verbal adjectives describing the subject or the object. Later, the circumstantial participle became indeclinable and so was limited to referring to the subject and to its action, as in (1). The later limitation on circumstantial participles referring only to the subject shows that there was a reluctance to construct any sort of subordinated clause with a participle in an oblique case, principally the accusative. There is, then, a tension between the participle as an adjective and as a circumstantial adjunct. What appears to be a continuation of the classical use of a participle in indirect discourse is really a survival of the participle as an adjective rather than as a subordinated participial complement. The widespread use of adjectival and substantival participles also should be recalled at this point as confirmation that participles were well established in their adjectival function. A solution may be put forward from this and on the basis of observations made above about verbs of cognition and perception more generally.

The infinitival and participial complement constructions were in competition with two others: actual clauses introduced by an overt marker, that is, by a conjunction or a direct object. Since the most common use of a verb of perception was with nothing more than a direct object (either a person or a concept), when it was necessary to add a comment or qualification to that object which could not be conveyed by an adjective or by a prepositional phrase, the participle, considered essentially to be an adjective, would be the most logical choice of comple-

26. These categories have been differentiated on syntactic grounds; see n. 4.

ment. It was more logical, certainly, and better established than the infinitive, which was increasingly used in its expegetic function, as in (4), rather than to mean ‘how to x’ or in the accusative and infinitive. For example, it would be easier to extend ‘I found him’ with an adjective, ‘running’, than with an infinitival complement, ‘that he was running’. It is clear that a direct object, which supplied a head noun for the participle, was understood to be the normal, if not mandatory, syntactic building block from the scarcity of bare accusative participial complements. One example with εὕρισκω has been found in an official letter from a prefect to a *strategos*, (14):

(14)

φροντισον ει αληθευον|τ]α ευροις το αζημιον | αυτ]ω φυλαξαι

‘Take care, if you find him telling the truth, to guard him from loss.’

P.Oxy. XLIII 3129 [4th CE]²⁷

Even here, an accusative pronoun can be understood from αυτ]ω in the main clause where it might be thought to be more necessary. Consequently, it would seem to be the case that participial complementation was understood to require a direct object because the participle, as an adjective, needed a noun on which to depend.

It would be possible, of course, to comment on a direct object using an accusative and infinitive construction, if it had not become obsolescent in less formal, less official language. Alternatively, a ὅτι clause could still be used after an accusative, as in Jn 5.42 (15):

(15)

ἔγνωκα ὑμᾶς ὅτι τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς

Yet, such a construction seems to occur seldom in the papyri, at least with εὕρισκω,²⁸ μανθάνω, ἐπίσταμαι and πυνθάνομαι.

However, these considerations, as we have seen, apply equally to the other verbs of perception and explain the use of ὅτι with them in Modern Greek. Instead, the rarity and exact details of the use of the ὅτι construction with εὕρισκω in Classical Greek are very important in ex-

27. This text could also be construed as a proposition, ‘that he is telling the truth’. Unless we accept E. Turner’s unlikely supplement (see *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, XLIII [London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1975], p. 100), this letter also contains a nominative and infinitive construction after ἔφησ[εν]. Such constructions seem to have been marginalized by the increased use of pronouns in the accusative direct objects. Therefore, its use here indicates a more classical register of Greek.

28. However, cf. the example in n. 21.

plaining its particular situation. A direct object was preferred even with ὅτι clauses (Aeschines, *Tim.* 17.4; Demosthenes, *Andr.* 55.2, *In Timocr.* 76.1, 163.3). The basic construction, at least in the selection of classical texts referred to above, was τοῦτο...ὅτι, ‘I find/conclude this, namely that...’.

Therefore, it seems that the survival of complementary participles was dependent on the participle being understood as an adjective rather than a complement structure and the most common or standard construction after a verb of perception being a direct object. The latter was reinforced in the case of εὐρίσκω because, even when it introduced a proposition, a direct object was usually present and then explained in a ὅτι clause.

Conclusions

The accusative and infinitive construction in particular was marginalized as a result of changes in the meaning of verbs, the emergence of conventional phrases and concomitant syntactic changes. Simple infinitival complementation, ‘how to x’, was replaced by a direct object expressing what was known, so, ‘letters’ instead of ‘how to write’. In effect, a different accusative and epexegetic infinitive construction emerged and supplanted the indirect statement construction.

It should be noted that while trends can be observed and supported by considering their advantages in grammatical terms, the usage of each verb shows its own peculiarities which require individual treatment. The resilience of participial complementation, especially with εὐρίσκω, can only partially be explained in sociolinguistic terms. The use of participles virtually as adjectives qualifying an explicit direct object, rather than as complements in their own right, helps to explain the idiosyncratic development of the verb εὐρίσκω (see Table 1 below, p. 167).

Table 1: Constructions used after εὐρίσκω by date and by genre/register:

	Classical Greek (5th/4th BCE)	Septuagint	1st CE	2nd CE	3rd CE	4th CE	5th CE	6th CE	Modern Greek
ὅτι	! Oratory, philosophy	! (Historical books)	! New Testament	! Epictetus				! B	(propositions)
Participial construction	Oratory, philosophy, history	<i>passim</i>	O, P, New Testament	O, P, Epictetus	O, P	B, O, P	P	P, O	
Accusative + Infinitive	Oratory, philosophy, history				O		O		
Infinitive ‘to be able to x’			P	Epictetus	P	P		B	(expressed by <i>να</i>)
<i>να</i>									(states)

- B Documentary texts with commerce and business administration (contracts, receipts, letters)
O Documentary texts of an official nature / related to imperial administration (including petitions)
P Personal Letters
! (very few examples are attested)