


MORPHOSYNTACTIC CONTACT IN TRANSLATION: GREEK *ÍDIOS* AND LATIN
PROPRIUS IN THE BIBLEBy MARINA BENEDETTI AND CHIARA GIANOLLO 
Università per Stranieri di Siena and Università di Bologna

(Submitted: 18 July, 2023; Accepted: 5 October, 2023)

ABSTRACT

We investigate the possibility that contact with Greek through the translation of biblical texts may have played a role in the development of Latin *proprius* ‘personal’, ‘peculiar’ into a reflexive possessive adjective. A few centuries earlier, post-Classical Greek witnesses a similar development with the adjective *idios* ‘private’, ‘personal’: we determine that in the New Testament this adjective has innovative uses as a reflexive possessive, and we argue that this is a system-internal development triggered by the loss of the reflexive possessive forms of Classical Greek. The comparison between the Greek original and the Latin *Vulgata* translation of the New Testament furthermore shows that Latin *proprius* was used, with just one exception, as a translation equivalent of Greek *idios*. We conclude that contact through translation acts as a catalyst for a change that, also in Latin, responds to the system-internal pressure created by the loss of an unambiguous 3rd person reflexive possessive.

RIASSUNTO

Esploreremo la possibilità che il contatto con il greco attraverso la traduzione dei testi biblici abbia rivestito un ruolo nello sviluppo del latino *proprius* ‘personale’, ‘peculiare’ come aggettivo possessivo riflessivo. Alcuni secoli prima, il greco post-classico sperimenta uno sviluppo simile con l’aggettivo *idios* ‘privato’, ‘personale’: dimostreremo che nel Nuovo Testamento questo aggettivo ha utilizzi innovativi come possessivo riflessivo, e proporremo che si tratti di uno sviluppo interno al sistema innescato dalla perdita delle forme possessive riflessive del greco classico. Il confronto tra l’originale greco e la traduzione latina *Vulgata* del Nuovo Testamento, inoltre, mostra che il latino *proprius* viene usato, con un’unica eccezione, come equivalente traduttivo del greco *idios*. Concluderemo che il contatto attraverso la traduzione funziona come catalizzatore di un mutamento che, anche in latino, va incontro alla pressione interna al sistema creata dalla perdita di forme non ambigue per il possessivo riflessivo di terza persona.

[Italian]

1. INTRODUCTION

During the post-classical stages of both Greek and Latin, a restructuring of the system of personal pronouns and adjectives takes place in each language. In both cases, a relevant outcome of this process is the creation of a new possessive reflexive adjective (‘one’s own’), as a development of the adjectives *idios* ‘private’, ‘personal’ and *proprius* ‘personal’, ‘peculiar’ respectively.

The suffixed form (*i*)*dikós* of Greek *idios* survives into the possessive construction *dhiko* + genitive of personal pronoun of contemporary Greek (Alexiadou 2005), as well as into

the emphatic modifier *idhios* ‘own’ (Iatridou 1986). Latin *proprius* develops into a possessive reflexive adjective in Romance languages such as Spanish (*propio*), French (*propre*) and Italian (*proprio*), replacing or reinforcing *suus* ‘his, her, its’ in this function (with different properties in each language, cf. Giorgi 1984, 2007; Pierluigi 2005, 2007; Charnavel 2010, 2011, 2020).¹

The grammaticalisation path from adjectives with full lexical meanings to reflexive possessive adjectives poses interesting – and largely unexplored – challenges to the diachronic investigation of Greek and Latin and, more in general, to historical linguistic research. Greek *ídios* and Latin *proprius* – though differing both in their etymological origin and in their lexical denotation – show parallel developments. This raises the following questions: are the two processes totally independent or are they – at least partly – an effect of language contact? More specifically, can we detect the effects of contact through translation when comparing the Greek New Testament (first century CE) to its most influential Latin translation that is the *Vulgata* (fourth century CE)?

The contact hypothesis deserves being explored. A clearly perceived equivalence between *proprius* and *ídios*, in their full lexical meanings, is attested already in Classical Latin: in learned loan translations, Greek derivatives from *ídios* are rendered in Latin by derivatives from *proprius*: for instance, *proprietas* ‘property’ is a calque from Greek *idiótēs* (Walde & Hofmann 1938 s.v. *proprius*; Spitzer 1942; Ernout-Meillet 1985 [1932] s.v. *proprius*). Furthermore, Greek *ídios* offers a translation equivalent of Latin reflexive possessive *suus* in totally different contexts: in papyri of Roman Egypt, the unusual presence of *ídios* in epistolary introductory thanksgiving formulas (*praescripta*), combined with the title of the addressee (e.g. *idiōi eparkh(ōi)* ‘to his own superintendent’) is modelled on usual formulas of Latin epistolary stile (*praefecto suo*), as shown by Cuvigny (2002).

The issue is, therefore, whether the contact hypothesis is viable for the development of the grammatical meaning ‘one’s own’ for *proprius*. A type of text in which Greek *ídios* and Latin *proprius* conspicuously come into contact are translation texts, and this is particularly evident in biblical translations. In the Latin versions, both of the Old and of the New Testament, *proprius* may translate – as an alternative to (classical) *suus* – Greek *ídios*.²

(1)

a. Greek:

ho	aph’	heautoû	lalôn	tên	dóksan
ART-NOM.SG	from	himself-GEN	speak-PRS.PTCP.NOM.SG	ART-ACC.SG	glory-ACC.SG
tên	idían	zēteî			
ART-ACC.SG	OWN-ACC.SG	seek-PRS.3SG			

b. Latin:

qui	a	se-met	ipso	loquitur
who-NOM.SG	from	he-ABL.SG-PTCL	himself-ABL.SG	speak-PRS.3SG
gloriam	propriam	quaerit		
glory-ACC.SG	OWN-ACC.SG	seek-PRS.3SG		

‘He who speaks from himself seeks his own glory’ (Jn 7.18)

The role of translation for the rise and spread of grammatical change is widely acknowledged in the literature, as well as the particular status of translated sacred texts, on which see the contributions

¹ Actually in both languages further developments of the lexemes are observable besides those in the possessive–reflexive grammatical domain. Modern Greek, for instance, has *o idhios* ‘the same’ as a discourse anaphor, requiring a non-local discourse antecedent (Varlokosta & Hornstein 1993). In Romance, Latin *proprius* is also continued by adjectives with a lexical meaning, which developed through mechanisms of semantic change independent of the grammaticalization process investigated here (e.g. French *propre* ‘appropriate’, ‘clean’; Italian *proprio di* ‘typical of’). Furthermore, Italian has the adverbial focus particle *proprio* ‘precisely’, ‘really’. In this contribution, we will deal exclusively with the grammaticalization process yielding reflexive–possessive adjectives.

² Glosses are according to the Leipzig Glossing rules.

in Cornillie & Drinka (2019), Lavidas & Bergs (2020), Bianconi (2021), Drinka (2011), Gianollo (2011, 2014) and van der Louw (2007).

Various almost overlapping denominations to designate the effects of indirect, asymmetric language contact through a literary model, known mostly or exclusively in written form, are found in the literature: literacy contact (Verkholtantsev 2008; Rabus 2014; Mendoza & Birzer 2022), learned contact (Thomason 2001), contact effects of translation (Taylor 2008) and written language contact (Lavidas 2021). A general concern when dealing with this kind of contact has to do with the sociolinguistic contextualisation of the role of translation: does contact take place through (biblical) translation, or does it rather act at a more general level in (bilingual) communities? In the latter case, the translation of sacred texts would simply represent an occasion for the effect of language contact to emerge in the written language, rather than a trigger to contact per se. This question is typically difficult to answer on the basis of the extant documentation, and this is particularly true in the case of the Latin of the fourth century CE, due to the general conservative nature of the written record and to the partial information we have on the broader sociolinguistic settings.

In this contribution, we lay the groundwork to address this broader issue, by establishing the precise extent of the phenomenon in biblical translations and by singling out the conditions governing the innovative uses of Greek *ídios* and Latin *proprius* in these texts. For both languages, biblical texts are among the chronologically first documents in which the innovative uses of *ídios* and *proprius* are extensively recorded. We investigate the distribution and the semantic contribution of *ídios* and *proprius* in biblical texts, showing that they behave as reflexive possessives, thus diverging considerably and in a parallel way from their lexical sources. We compare the occurrences of *ídios* in the Greek New Testament with the Latin *Vulgata* translation, demonstrating that the use of *proprius* is dependent on the use of *ídios* in the original. We furthermore single out a systemic factor – different in each language – that invites the recruitment of a new functional element into the possessive–reflexive grammatical domain. On the basis of our findings, we conclude that contact through translation plays a significant role in the grammatical development of the new Latin reflexive. We also argue that, given the existence of independent systemic pressures motivating the grammaticalisation process, biblical translations can be understood as catalysts for the change, rather than as original triggers for it.

The discussion is organised in the following way: Section 2 presents the system of Classical Greek possessives and its reorganisation in New Testament Greek. Section 3 introduces the data on *ídios*, showing its original distribution in Classical Greek and the post-Classical developments. Section 4 presents the data from the Greek New Testament and provides an analysis for the innovative uses of *ídios*, showing that it behaves as a possessive reflexive. Section 5 proceeds to analyse the Latin data, focusing on the *Vulgata* translation. In section 6, we draw our conclusions concerning the comparison and the role of contact.

2. THE SYSTEM OF POSSESSIVES IN GREEK

2.1. Classical Greek

Classical Greek employs two strategies to express pronominal possessors within a nominal phrase: adjectival possessives (2.a) or genitive forms of the personal pronouns (2.b).

(2.a)

Telamón,	sòs	patèr	emós	th'	háma
Telamon-NOM.SG	your-NOM.SG	father-NOM.SG	my-NOM.SG	and	together

‘Telamon, your father and also mine’ (S. *Aj.* 1008)

(2.b)

tà tók̄sa **mou** / hierà lab̄ôn
 ART-ACC.PL bow-ACC.PL me-GEN.SG sacred-ACC.PL take-AOR.PTCP.NOM.SG

‘having taken my sacred bow’(S. *Ph.* 942 s.)

Adjectival possessives are forms agreeing in gender, number and case with the head of the nominal phrase. Their stem varies according to person and number of the entity they refer to. Genitive forms come, for the 3rd person, from the deictic-anaphoric pronoun *autó-* and, for the 1st and 2nd person, from the personal pronominal stems.

In both strategies, Classical Greek shows a morphological distinction between reflexive and non-reflexive forms. Reflexive forms are anaphors that necessarily require an antecedent in a structurally local configuration. Typically, although not necessarily (cf. section 4), the antecedent is the clausal subject. Non-reflexive forms, instead, establish their reference by means of the strategies that apply to personal pronouns in general, that is, either deictically or anaphorically, with no locality constraints.³

An overview of the system of possessives in Classical Greek is sketched in Table 1, distinguishing between adjectival and genitive forms, as well as between forms occurring in reflexive contexts and forms occurring in non-reflexive contexts.⁴ Adjectival forms are followed by (A), genitive forms by (G). The forms highlighted in bold are marked for reflexivity (they belong to the so-called reflexive anaphors).

A further relevant dimension of classification concerns the clitic versus non-clitic nature of the forms (cf. the clitic nature of the non-reflexive genitive singular forms for 1st and 2nd person). This has consequences for their interpretation, since only non-clitic forms can be used contrastively.

With the exception of *sphéteros* and archaic *heós*,⁵ the forms encoding reflexivity are morphologically complex units, resulting from the combination of the pronominal possessive stem with the genitive of *autó-*. As mentioned earlier and shown in Table 1, *autó-* is the pronoun used for 3rd person reference; it also ‘functions outside of the pronominal system as an “emphatic” predicate of identity’ (Kiparsky 2012: 88), with the meaning ‘self’ (cf. Latin *ipse*), according to a widespread pattern relating intensifiers and reflexivity (König & Siemund 2000; Puddu 2005; Kiparsky 2012; Mocchiari 2013a, 2013b).

As Table 1 shows, the encoding of reflexivity is sensitive to the category of person.

In the 1st and 2nd person reflexivity is only optionally marked. As shown in (3)–(4), e.g. the 1st person possessive reflexive form *emautoû* competes with unmarked *emós* in similar syntactic environments: in both, the antecedent is the clause subject (in (4) *emautoû* may be favoured by the emphatic context, as it concerns the charge of parricide).

Table 1. The system of possessives in Classical Greek

	Reflexive	Non-reflexive
1st person	Sg. <i>emós</i> (A)/ emautoû (G) Pl. <i>héméteros</i> (A)/ héméteros autôn (G)	Sg. <i>emós</i> (A), <i>mou</i> (G) Pl. <i>héméteros</i> (A), <i>hémôn</i> (G)
2nd person	Sg. <i>sós</i> (A)/ seautoû (G) Pl. <i>huméteros</i> (A)/ huméteros autôn (G)	Sg. <i>sós</i> (A), <i>sou</i> (G) Pl. <i>huméteros</i> (A), <i>humôn</i> (G)
3rd person	Sg. heautoû (<i>hautôû</i>) (G) Pl. heautôn (<i>hautôn</i>) (G) sphéteros (<i>sphéteros autôn</i>) (A) (Archaic heós (<i>hós</i>)) (A)	Sg. <i>autoû</i> (G) Pl. <i>autôn</i> (G)

³ Following a.o. Kiparsky (2012), ‘anaphor’ is used as a collective term for any referentially dependent expression, and ‘reflexive anaphor’ for a referentially dependent expression that requires a structurally local antecedent.

⁴ Based on reference grammars; cf. Schwyzer (1950: 186–207); Van Emde Boas et al. (2019: 89–92, 345–51).

⁵ On which see Schwyzer (1950: 192), Kiparsky (2012: 86–7).

(3)
 tón te paída tòn **emòn** parédōka basaníesai
 ART-ACC.SG and son-ACC.SG ART-ACC.SG my-ACC.SG give-AOR.1SG torture-AOR.INF

‘I gave up my slave to be tortured’ (And. *De myst.* 64.5)

(4)
 tòn patér’ hōs apékton’ egō tòn **emautoû**
 ART-ACC.SG father-ACC.SG that kill-PRF.1SG I-NOM.SG ART-ACC.SG myself-GEN.SG

‘[accusation] that I have killed my own father’ (Dem. *Adv. Androt.* 2.2)

By contrast, reflexivity is necessarily marked in 3rd person possessives: *heautoû* (reflexive) and *autoû* (non-reflexive) do not freely alternate, but occur in complementary contexts, as shown in (5)–(6): *heautoû*, in (5), is bound to the clause subject, whereas *autoû*, in (6), anaphorically refers to a previously introduced entity different from the subject.

(5)
 Perdíkkas dè hústeron Stratoníkēn tēn
 Perdikkas-NOM.SG PTCL after Stratonice-ACC.SG ART-ACC.SG
heautoû adelphēn dídosī Seithēi
 himself-GEN.SG sister-ACC.SG give-PRS.3SG Seuthes-DAT.SG

‘And Perdikkas afterwards gave his own sister Stratonice to Seuthes’ (T. 2.101.6)

(6)
 basileûs dé, hōs légetai, ethaúmaze te **autoû**
 king-NOM.SG PTCL how say-PRS.PASS. 3SG marvel-IPFV.3SG also he-GEN.SG
 tēn diánoian
 ART-ACC.SG purpose-ACC.SG

‘The King, it is said, marvelled at his [i.e. Themistocles’] purpose’ (T. 1.138.1.1)

2.2. New Testament Greek

The picture sketched earlier underwent impactful changes in post-Classical Greek. The language of the New Testament, which is the focus of our investigation, clearly attests a general retreat of the reflexive pronouns in favour of the unmarked forms (cf. Blass et al. 1961 [1896]: 146–7; Moulton & Turner 1963: 189–92). Also this diachronic development is sensitive to the category of person, namely:

- in the 1st and 2nd person, the reflexive forms disappear in favour of the unmarked forms;
- in the 3rd person, the reflexive forms *heautoû*, *heautôn* persist, but they enter in competition with *autoû*, *autôn*, which, as we saw, were specifically non-reflexive in Classical Greek, and now extend to also cover reflexive contexts.

The neutralisation of the contrast between reflexive and non-reflexive anaphors in the 3rd person, as a consequence of the overextension of *autoû*, *autôn*, is a remarkable innovation with respect to Classical Greek.

The passage in (7) illustrates this phenomenon. The genitive of *autó-* (the originally non-reflexive form) occurs twice within the same clause, with a reflexive and with a non-reflexive interpretation: the linearly first form refers to the subject (Mary), whereas the second form refers to Jesus, which

has been introduced (as a possessor) in the previous sentence. There is however no ambiguity in tracking the antecedent, owing to gender agreement (*autês* points to a feminine possessor, Mary, and *autoû* to a masculine possessor, Jesus, as in the English translation, *her/his*).⁶

(7)

êleipsen	toûs	pódas	toû	Iēsoû	kaì	
anoint- AOR.3SG	ART-ACC.PL	foot-ACC.PL	ART-GEN.SG	Jesus-GEN.SG	and	
exémaksen	taís	thrixìn	autês	toûs	pódas	autoû
wipe- AOR.3SG	ART-DAT.PL	hair-DAT.PL	she-GEN.SG	ART-ACC.PL	foot-ACC.PL	he-GEN.SG

‘(Mary) anointed Jesus’ feet and wiped his feet with her hair’ (Jn. 12.3)

Crucially for our case study, the Latin translation must introduce a formal distinction, since Latin obligatorily distinguishes the realisation of reflexive and non-reflexive 3rd person possessives: in the Latin (*Vulgata*) translation in (8), reflexive *suis*, referring to Mary, contrasts with non-reflexive *eius*, referring to Jesus. Antecedent tracking, which in the Greek original is facilitated by gender agreement between the possessive and the possessor, is here supported by the alternative realisation *eius/suis*, pointing to the different syntactic status of the antecedents.

(8)

unxit	pedes	iesu	et	extersit
anoint-PFV.3SG	foot-ACC.PL	Jesus-GEN.SG	and	wipe-PFV.3SG
capillis	suis	pedes	eius	
hair-ABL.PL	her-ABL.PL	foot-ACC.PL	he-GEN.SG	

‘(Mary) anointed the feet of the Lord and wiped his feet with her hair’ (Jn. 12.3)

3. GREEK *ÍDIOS*

3.1. Overview

Against the background presented in section 2, in this section we introduce the adjective *ídios*. This element, which originally has a descriptive–denotational meaning (section 3.2), during its diachronic development gains the grammatical function of reflexive anaphor and, therefore, interacts with the functional items seen in section 2. As we will show (section 3.3), this development takes place in post-Classical Greek and is, therefore, chronologically close to the restructuring of the system of possessives discussed in section 2.2.

3.2. Etymology and original meaning

A widely accepted etymology relates *ídios* to the Proto-Indo-European reflexive **swe* (Frisk 1954–1972; Chantraine 1999 [1968]; Beekes 2010 s.v.); hence, the historical development into a reflexive adjective would appear consistent with the prehistoric point of departure.

In its more ancient use, since the Homeric poems, *ídios* is an adjective meaning ‘private’ (as opposed to ‘public’, cf. *démios* in (9)), ‘personal’ (as opposed to ‘someone else’s’, cf. *allótrion* in (10)), ‘peculiar’ etc.

(9)

prêksis	d’	héd’	idíē ,	ou	démios
action-NOM.SG	PTCL	DEM-NOM.SG	private-NOM.SG	not	public-NOM.SG

‘this business is private, not public’ (Hom. *Od.* 3.82)

⁶ A philological caveat is necessary, of course: in principle, textual corruption might be responsible for *autês* in the place of the unambiguously reflexive form *heautês*. In the specific case, however, *autês* is the form consistently transmitted.

(10)			
háima	allótrion		ōphélimon,
blood-NOM.SG	belonging-to-another-NOM.SG		useful-NOM.SG
háima	idíon		ōphélimon
blood-NOM.SG	OWN-NOM.SG		useful-NOM.SG

‘Blood of another is useful, one’s own blood is useful’ (Hipp. *De alim.* 40.1)

3.3. The development of *ídiós* into a reflexive possessive (‘one’s own’)

The starting point for the use of *ídiós* as a possessive is represented, according to reference grammars (Schwyzer 1950: 201), by contexts in which it occurs as a reinforcer of a possessive genitive or of a possessive adjective (cf. 11). This would be in line with the cyclic development from intensifiers to reflexives observed for Latin *ipse*, English *-self* etc. (cf. König & Siemund 2000): intensifiers (a subclass of focus particles) first optionally combine with a possessive element to express emphasis; subsequently, they become part of the possessive expression itself, with reflexive function.

(11)				
eì deì	toumòn		idíon	eipeîn
if be_necessary-3SG	ART-ACC.SG+my-ACC.SG		OWN-ACC.SG	speak-AOR.INF

‘if I may speak my own mind’ (Isocr. *Arch.* 8.1)

The following step, i.e. the use of *ídiós* standing alone as possessive (as an alternative to the possessive genitive *heautoû* etc.), has been observed in Attic inscriptions since the first century BCE, in papyri and also in literary texts (frequently in Polybius, second century BCE); cf. Meisterhans (1990: 235); Mayser (1934: 73–4); Green (1903). Two examples are presented in (12) and (13):

(12)				
kálliston	hupódeima	tês	idías	
excellent-ACC.SG	example-ACC.SG	ART-GEN.SG	OWN-GEN.SG	
philagathías	apoleípontes			
benevolence-GEN.SG	leave-PRS.PTCP.NOM.PL			

‘leaving to their people an excellent example of their benevolence’ (IG II² 1011. 72.81; Attic 106/5).

(13)				
parageílas	toís	idíois	plērômasin	
order-AOR.PTCP.NOM.SG	ART-DAT.PL	OWN-DAT.PL	crew-DAT.PL	
hépethai	toís	hēgouménois		
follow-PRS.INF	ART-DAT.PL	leader-DAT.PL		

‘Ordering his crews to follow the leaders, [...]’ (Pol. 1.25.1.4)

We must observe, however, that in cases like (13) it is not easy to decide whether *ídiós* is used as a possessive or with its original adjectival meaning ‘peculiar’. This uncertainty is to be expected, since semantic change typically proceeds through the expansion into bridging contexts (Heine 2002), that is, contexts that are compatible both with the old and with the new interpretation.

The possessive use is unambiguously clear in the New Testament. According to reference grammars (Blass et al. 1961 [1896]: 149; Moulton & Turner 1963: 191 ff.), *ídiós* in the New Testament is essentially an equivalent of *heautoû* ‘(his) own’. The classical use (‘peculiar’, ‘private’)

persists when *ídios* is combined with a possessive genitive, as in (14). In these cases, *ídios* behaves like a simple non-reflexive adjective (cf. English *own*, German *eigen*, both from Proto-Indoeuropean **aik-* ‘be master of, possess’), and it has an intensifying function with respect to the overt possessive genitive.

(14)

kai	pôs	hēmeîs	akoúomen	hékastos	téi
and	how	we-NOM	hear-PRS.1PL	each-NOM.SG	ART-DAT.SG
idíai	dialéktōi	hēmôn	en	hêi	egennēthēmen
OWN-DAT.SG	language-DAT.SG	US-GEN.PL	in	REL-DAT.SG	generate-AOR.PASS.1PL

‘And how is it that we hear, each of us, in our own native language?’ (Act. 2.8)

In this adjectival use, *ídios* may also occur in subject position (15), clearly showing that the syntactic distribution does not obey the restrictions of a reflexive anaphor:

(15)

eípén	tis	eks	autôn,
say-AOR.3SG	INDEF-NOM.SG	from	them-GEN.PL
ídios	autôn	prophētēs	
OWN-NOM.SG	them-GEN.PL	prophet-NOM.SG	

‘One of themselves, a prophet of their own, said’ (Tit. 1.12)

Since we are particularly interested in the situation that we can reconstruct for New Testament Greek, in the next section we present our corpus study of *ídios* in the New Testament, in order to show its functional extension, and we analyse the contexts in more detail, in order to support an analysis of the innovative uses of *ídios* in terms of a reflexive anaphor.

4. *ÍDIOS* IN THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

4.1. *The distribution of possessive idios in the New Testament*

In our corpus study, the occurrences of *ídios* in the New Testament (the four Gospels; the Acts of the Apostles; the Epistles; John’s *Book of Revelation*) have been collected through the electronic resource [TLG](#). The text in the [TLG](#) follows the second edition of the Greek New Testament by Aland et al. (1968), which is superseded by Nestle & Aland (2012). We systematically compared the [TLG](#) results with the current Nestle & Aland edition, finding only one discrepancy with respect to the occurrence of *ídios*, in a passage (Mk. 15.20) that we eliminated from the total count (though we will discuss it in section 4.2.2). Our research is limited to the New Testament, because an investigation of the Old Testament data would require a close analysis of the Hebrew source text; here, instead, we are concerned with the relationship between the Greek original and its Latin translation.⁷

Of the 104 occurrences of *ídios* in our corpus, we treat separately instances in which – in our view – *ídios* is not a possessive reflexive, that is a grammatical element, but has some other non-grammatical function, more directly connected with the original lexical meaning. This happens in twenty-nine cases. Namely, we single out:

a adverbial idiomatic expressions (for a total of twenty-two instances):

kat’idían, idíai ‘by oneself’, ‘privately’; *kairôi idíoi, kairoîs idíois* ‘in due time’;

⁷ The pursuit of the broader research question concerning contact through translation will necessarily require an extension of the investigation to the Old Testament, taking into account also the Hebrew text; for some preliminary results, see Benedetti et al. (2023).

- b cases in which *ídios* acts as a reinforcer of a genitive pronoun, according to a pattern which was already found in Classical Greek (cf. 14, 15) (for a total of six instances). As seen in section 3.3, this use is relevant for the development of *ídios* as a reflexive possessive, according to a well-studied grammaticalisation cycle, but it is not reflexive per se, therefore we treat it separately;
- c *ídios* as a nominal predicate, with the meaning ‘own’ (one instance).

(16)

ho	misthōtòs	kai	ouk	òn	poimén,
ART-NOM.SG	hired-NOM. SG	and	not	be-PRS.PTCP.NOM. SG	shepherd-NOM.SG
hoû	ouk	éstin	tà	próbata	ídia
REL-GEN.SG	not	be-PRS.3.SG	ART-NOM.PL	sheep-NOM.PL	OWN-NOM.PL

‘He who is a hired hand, and not a shepherd, who is not the owner of the sheep’ (lit. ‘and the sheep are not his own’) (Jn. 10.12)

In what follows, we shall focus on the remaining seventy-five examples, where *ídios* appears to offer an innovative alternative to ‘canonical’ possessives.

Evidence for the behaviour of *ídios* as a possessive is provided, first of all, by its alternation with ‘canonical’ possessives, which shows that it has a comparable function.

For instance, *ídios* may alternate with ‘canonical’ reflexive possessives in pragmatically and structurally comparable passages; cf. ‘to his own town’ in (17) and (18):

(17)

kai	embàs	eis	ploïon	diepérasen	kai
and	embark-AOR.PTCP.NOM.SG	in	ship-ACC.SG	cross-AOR.3SG	and
êlthen	eis	tên	ídian	pólin	
come-AOR.3SG	to	ART-ACC.SG	OWN-ACC.SG	city-ACC.SG	

‘Getting into a boat, Jesus crossed over the sea and came to his own town’ (Mt. 9.1)

(18)

kai	eporeúonto	pántes	apográphesthai,	
and	go-IPFV.3PL	all-NOM.PL	register-PRS.INF.PASS	
hékastos	eis	tên	heutoû	pólin
each-NOM.SG	to	ART-ACC.SG	himself-GEN.SG	city-ACC.SG

‘And all went to be registered, each to his own town’ (Lk. 2.3)

Moreover, *ídios* may co-occur with ‘canonical’ possessives within the same passage, in a sort of stylistically motivated *variatio* in expressions whose rhetorical force relies on semantic and structural parallelism.

(19)

hékastos	tên	heutoû	gunaïka	ekhétō,	
each-NOM.SG	ART-ACC.SG	himself-GEN.SG	wife-ACC.SG	have-IMP.3SG	
kai	hekástē	tòn	ídion	ándra	ekhétō
and	each-NOM.SG	ART-ACC.SG	OWN-ACC.SG	man-ACC.SG	have-IMP.3SG

‘each man should have his own wife and each woman her own husband’ (Cor. I 7.2)

(20)

hoi	dè	amelésantes	apêlthon,
they-NOM.PL	PTCL	be_neglectful-AOR.PTCP.NOM.PL	go_away-AOR.3PL

hòs	mèn eis tòn	ídiōn	agrón,
the_one-NOM.SG	PTCL to	ART-ACC.SG OWN-ACC.SG	farm-ACC.SG
hòs	dè epì tèn	emporían	autoû
the_one- NOM.SG	PTCL to	ART-ACC.SG business-ACC.SG	him-GEN.SG

‘But they paid no attention and went off, one to his farm, another to his business’ (Mt. 22.5)

These paradigmatic relations enable us to tentatively treat *ídiōs* as part of the functional lexicon in its possessive use: in the seventy-five relevant instances, *ídiōs* behaves as a grammatical element realising a pronominal argument and receiving a thematic role by the head noun. In section 4.2, we will investigate these instances more closely, in order to single out the grammatical conditions under which possessive *ídiōs* appears.

4.2. Analysis of the contexts for *ídiōs* in the Greek New Testament

4.2.1. Criteria for annotation

Our analysis of the distribution of *ídiōs* in the New Testament aims at establishing if the innovative uses of *ídiōs* are those of a reflexive possessive adjective. If we can show that the distribution is indeed compatible with the structural conditions licensing reflexives, we support a diachronic motivation for the recruitment of *ídiōs* as a grammatical element into the functional lexicon: given that the old reflexive possessive adjectives of Greek are increasingly vanishing in post-Classical Greek (cf. section 2.2), we can interpret *ídiōs* as a functionally equivalent substitute.

Note that, due to the incipient nature of the phenomenon and to the characteristics of our corpus, we are only able to state if the contexts in which *ídiōs* appears are compatible with an analysis as a reflexive. We do not, in fact, expect *ídiōs* to appear in all contexts where it could occur according to a reflexive analysis. That is, at this stage we expect *ídiōs* to co-exist, in reflexive contexts, with the strategies seen for post-Classical Greek in section 2.2. In our analysis, we will indicate which factors, in our opinion, favour the choice of *ídiōs* over other strategies to express reflexivity.

In testing whether *ídiōs* can be characterised as a reflexive possessive anaphor, we apply Kiparsky's (2012: 86) definition: ‘The reflexives require a subject antecedent (overt or null) within the same finite domain, either in the same clause [...] or across an infinitive clause boundary, either ECM [...] or object control’. Kiparsky (2012: 86) notes that this definition applies to the archaic Greek reflexive adjective *heōs* seen in section 2.1.

In our annotation of the context of occurrence for the seventy-five relevant possessive examples of *ídiōs* in our corpus, we focus on various aspects: the domain of the referential dependency; the syntactic function of the constituent containing *ídiōs*; the features of the antecedent; the presence of pragmatic factors such as contrast or emphasis.

First of all, we single out the syntactic domain in which *ídiōs* finds its antecedent. Kiparsky (2012: 89), in his study of Greek anaphors, distinguishes four successively larger domains for referentially dependent expressions, shown in (21), according to where the anaphor's antecedent can be located.

(21) coarguments > clause-internal > finite > discourse

If the antecedent is a co-argument, it is an argument directly selected by the same predicate that also selects the referentially dependent argument; hence, antecedent and referentially dependent expression co-occur in the same clause, and the relevant domain is the narrowest argumental core. This is a canonical context for the appearance of reflexive anaphors.

Potentially, possessive anaphors have an even smaller domain, represented by the nominal phrase of which they are part (Giorgi & Longobardi 1991: Chapter 1). In a structure like ‘John's picture of himself’, the antecedent of the reflexive is the subject (i.e. the syntactically most prominent argument) of the nominal phrase, realised by ‘John's’.

If the antecedent is clause internal, instead, this means that the referentially dependent expression does not belong to the narrowest argumental core, but is found in the successive larger domain within the same clause: this includes, in Kiparsky's classification, adjuncts, resultative complements, ECM constructions and conjoined phrases. In Classical Greek, the marking of reflexivity is obligatory in this context for 3rd person anaphors, whereas it is optional with 1st and 2nd person ones (cf. section 2.1).

The relevant domain is finite when the antecedent is found across a clause boundary, but still within a finite clause: this happens, for instance, when the anaphor is the argument of an infinitival verb, but the antecedent is the argument of the matrix finite verb. The finite context is still a local context compatible with the appearance of reflexive anaphors: in Classical Greek it is possible to find 3rd person reflexive anaphors there, but not 1st and 2nd person ones (Kiparsky 2012: 90).

Finally, the domain is the discourse when the anaphoric expression can find its antecedent across clauses, for instance when it refers back to a discourse topic. Discourse anaphors are non-reflexive referentially dependent expressions (which however can have a reflexive function under some specific circumstances, cf. Kiparsky 2012: 88–9).

The second parameter we consider concerns the syntactic function of the constituent containing *ídios*: we annotate whether it is a direct object, an indirect object or an adjunct.

Furthermore, we consider the characteristics of the antecedent: we annotate its syntactic function and its person features.

The last parameter we annotate is the presence of pragmatic factors that may influence the formal realisation of the anaphor: in particular, we single out contrast and emphasis as possible relevant factors.

4.2.2. The reflexivity of *ídios*

In the most straightforward cases, reflexives find their antecedent in the subject within the finite clause. In our New Testament corpus, with *ídios* the finite clause is the most frequent domain within which co-reference is established. Within the finite clause, we can distinguish smaller domains: *ídios* can occur not only in a nominal phrase which is a co-argument of the subject (22) (Kiparsky's co-argument domain), but also in a nominal phrase with the function of adjunct (23) (Kiparsky's clause-internal domain).

(22)

ei dé	ti	matheîn	thélousin,		
if PTCL	INDF-ACC.SG	learn-AOR.INF	want-PRS.3PL		
en oíkōi	toùs	ídious	ándras	eperōtatōsan	
in home-DAT.SG	ART-ACC.PL	OWN-ACC.PL	husband- ACC.PL	ask-IPV.3PL	

‘if they desire to learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home’ (Cor. I 14.35)

(23)

zētēmata	dè	tina	perì	tês	ídias
disagreement-ACC.PL	PTCL	INDF-ACC.PL	about	ART-GEN.SG	OWN-GEN.SG
deisidaimonías	eikhon	pròs	autón		
religion-GEN.SG	have-IPFV.3PL	towards	him-ACC.SG		

‘but they simply had some points of disagreement with him about their own religion’ (Act. 25.19)

With finite verbs, we find twenty-one cases of co-arguments and thirty-nine cases of clause-internal antecedents. The remaining cases are represented by instances in which the verb is non-finite, to which we turn later. When *ídios* is found in a co-argument, co-arguments are most frequently direct objects marked by accusative case, but there are also direct objects marked by genitive case (four cases) and dative indirect objects (two cases). When *ídios* is found in a

constituent that is not a co-argument (clause-internal domain), it is most frequently found in locative and directional adjuncts and in distributive complements.

Antecedents of *idios* are in all but two cases subjects, and they show no person restriction. They are most frequently 3rd person (singular or plural), but we also find 1st person plural (four cases, one shown in 24); 2nd person singular (one case) and 2nd person plural (three cases).

(24)

kai kopiōmen ergazōmenoi taīs **idiai** khersin
and toil-PRS.1PL work-PRS.PTCP.NOM.PL.M art-DAT.PL own-DAT.PL hand-DAT.PL

‘and we toil, working with our own hands’ (Cor. I 4.12)

In our corpus there are four cases in which *idios* is co-referent with the unexpressed (PRO) subject of an infinitive. Crucially, an example of object control like (25) shows that *idios* does not ‘skip’ the unexpressed subject of the infinitive (2nd person plural) to co-refer with the subject of the finite matrix verb (1st person plural).

(25)

parakaloūmen de humās, adelphoi, perisseuein mallon,
urge-PRS.1PL PTCL you-ACC.PL brother-VOC.PL be_superior-PRS.INF more
kai philotimeisthai hesukhazein kai prassein
and desire-PRS.INF live_quietly-PRS.INF and do-PRS.INF
ta **idia** kai ergazesthai taīs khersin humon
ART-ACC.PL own-ACC.PL and work-PRS.INF ART-DAT.PL hand-DAT.PL you-GEN.PL

‘But we urge you, brothers, to do this more and more, and to aspire to live quietly, and to mind your own affairs, and to work with your hands’ (Thess. I 4.11)

Examples like (25) suggest that the co-reference domain of *idios* is very local: it is restricted to the smallest domain containing a hierarchically superior subject, independently of the finite or non-finite nature of the verb.

In some cases the precise analysis depends on broader theoretical considerations, as in (26).

(26)

ei de tis tou **idiou** oikou
if PTCL INDF-NOM.SG ART-GEN.SG own-GEN.SG home-GEN.SG
prostēnai ouk oiden
manage-AOR.INF not know-PRF.3SG

‘but if a man does not know how to manage his own household’ (Tim. I 3.5)

In principle, in (26) two analyses are possible: we can consider the antecedent of *idios* to be the unexpressed (PRO) subject of the infinitive clause, co-referring with the matrix subject *tis* through a relation of control; alternatively, we can suppose that a verb like ‘to know’ behaves like a restructuring verb creating a monoclausal raising structure (cf. Benedetti & Gianollo 2023). Also under this scenario, with a different technical implementation, the antecedent of *idios* is the matrix subject *tis* ‘someone’. Hence, both analyses lead to the same conclusion that *idios* is bound by the closest available antecedent. In this respect, it behaves as is to be expected of a reflexive anaphor.

Additionally, *idios* can co-refer with (unexpressed) subjects of participles, as in (27):

(27)

Dauíd	mèn	gár	idíai	geneâi	
David-NOM.SG	PTCL	PTCL	OWN-DAT.SG	generation- DAT.SG	
hupêretêsas	têi	toû	theoû	boulêi	ekoimêthē
serve- AOR.PTCP.NOM.SG	ART-DAT.SG	ART-GEN.SG	god-GEN.SG	will-DAT.SG	fall.asleep-AOR.3SG

‘Now when David had served God’s purpose in his own generation, he fell asleep’ (Act. 13.36)

Examples with adverbial adjunct participles represent many of the cases which we annotated as finite domains, since the participle’s subject co-refers with the subject of the main finite verb, and co-reference can be argued to be established across a clause boundary. However, also in this case the precise analysis depends on theoretical choices: we believe that it would be legitimate to consider, alternatively, the participial clause as the relevant co-reference domain, with no need to appeal to inter-clausal mechanisms. The subject of adverbial adjunct participles can be fully referential, hence can act as a proper antecedent for a reflexive within the participial clause (cf. discussion in Benedetti & Gianollo 2020: 39–44).

As we saw, the antecedent of *ídios* is in the great majority of cases a subject. In our corpus there are only two cases in which *ídios* appears to be co-referential with a non-subject antecedent. Both are found with an indirect object antecedent and involve the distributive quantifier *hékastos* ‘each’. In (28), *ídios* is referentially dependent on the distributive quantifier with recipient function and co-varies with it.

(28)

kài	hôi	mèn	édōken	pénte	tálanta,
and	DEM.REL-DAT.SG	PTCL	give-AOR.3SG	five	talent-ACC.PL
hôi	dè	dúo,	hôi	dè	hén,
DEM.REL-DAT.SG	PTCL	two	DEM.REL-DAT.SG	PTCL	one-ACC.SG
hekástōi	katà	tèn	idían	dúnamin	
each-DAT.SG	according_to	ART-ACC.SG	OWN-ACC.SG	ability-ACC.SG	

‘To one he gave five talents, to another, two, and to another, one, each according to his own ability’ (Mt. 25.15)

Distributive quantifiers are known also from other languages to build their own referential domain in which they are co-indexed with anaphoric expressions, pointing to a certain syntactic autonomy (cf. Bortolussi 2013: 20–21 for Latin *quisque*). The distributive quantifier is in general a frequent antecedent (most typically as a subject) of *ídios* (fourteen cases); we will come back to this when discussing Latin.

A further instance of a non-subject antecedent is encountered in the variant reading of the passage of Mark that is found in the TLG results (29). As discussed in section 4.1, this passage had to be excluded because Nestle & Aland (2012) print a different text, *tà himátia autoû*. The variant originally chosen by Aland et al. (1968), however, belongs to the Majority text and is particularly interesting from our perspective. It features a double object construction where the antecedent is the accusative-marked object (*autón*) expressing the Recipient role and *ídios* is found in the accusative-marked object expressing the Theme role.

(29)

exédusan	autòn	tèn	porphúran	kài	
take_off-AOR.3PL	him-ACC	ART-ACC.SG	purple_robe-ACC.SG	and	
enédusan	autòn	tà	himátia	tà	ídia
put_on-AOR.3PL	him-ACC	ART-ACC.PL	garment-ACC.PL	art-ACC.PL	own-ACC.PL

‘they took the purple robe off him and put his own garments on him’ (Mk. 15.20, Aland et al. 1968)

This example shows that, within the minimal domain represented by the smallest constituent containing a subject, *ídios* chooses the closest antecedent, which in this case is the Recipient argument. The use in (29) is connected to the strong contrast established contextually between *tên porphúran* ‘the purple robe’ and Jesus’ own clothes. Similar cases are known from Latin (Bertocchi 1989; Pierluigi 2007; Mari 2016 a.o.). The distribution is also in this case compatible with that of a reflexive anaphor.

Concerning the pragmatic factors, as just shown we sometimes observe emphasis on the possessive relation or contrast with respect to other potential possessors when *ídios* is used. According to our annotation, fifty-five of the seventy-five relevant occurrences of *ídios* are contrastive or emphatic. We annotated the use of *ídios* as contrastive (thirty-seven cases) when its function is to highlight the contrast with another entity in context (as is always the case when a distributive quantifier is used, cf. 28). We annotated it as emphatic (eighteen cases) where there is no explicitly contrasted entity in the discourse, but the reflexivity of the possessive relation is particularly salient for the conveyed message (cf. 30.a). Since these factors appear to be even more relevant for Latin, we discuss them further in section 5.

4.2.3. Conclusions on distribution

To sum up, the analysis of the data on possessive *ídios* in the New Testament shows that *ídios* finds its antecedent in a very local domain, under structurally determined conditions: co-reference takes place with the closest available antecedent in the minimal domain containing a subject. We can thus treat *ídios* as an (incipient) reflexive possessive.

In this function, as seen in section 4.1, *ídios* can alternate with the old possessive reflexive forms. We also find alternation with the forms unmarked for reflexivity: the examples in (30) show parallel passages from the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Mark where we observe that *ídios* and *autoûs* can appear under the same structural conditions.

(30.a)

autòs	gàr	Iēsoûs	emartúresen	hóti	prophētēs	
himself-NOM.SG	PTCL	Jesus.NOM	testify-AOR.3SG	that	prophet-NOM.SG	
en	têi	idiai	patrīdi	timèn	ouk	ékhei
in	ART-DAT.SG	OWN- DAT.SG	country- DAT.SG	honor-ACC.SG	not	have-PRS.3SG

‘For Jesus himself testified that a prophet has no honor in his own country’ (Jn. 4.44)

(30.b)

kaì	élegen	autoîs	ho	Iēsoûs	hóti
and	say-IPFV.3SG	they-DAT.PL	ART-NOM.SG	Jesus.NOM	that
Ouk	éstin	prophētēs	átimos	ei	mè
not	be-PRS.3SG	prophet-NOM.SG	unhonoured-NOM.SG.M	if	not
en	têi	patrīdi	autoû		
in	ART-DAT.SG	country- DAT.SG	he-GEN.SG		

‘And Jesus told them: A prophet is honored everywhere except in his own country’ (Mk. 6.4)⁸

We can conclude that in New Testament Greek *ídios* starts to be added to the inventory of functional items expressing reflexivity.

⁸ Interestingly, for this passage the Nestle-Aland edition reports variants from witnesses that have the reflexive (*patrīdi heautoû*) or *ídios* as a reinforcer (*idiai patrīdi autoû*).

5. LATIN *PROPRIUS*

5.1. Overview

The aim of this section is to establish to what extent the use of *proprius* in the Latin *Vulgata* translation of the New Testament is related to the use of *idios* in the Greek original. In post-Classical Latin, the adjective *proprius* undergoes a semantic and syntactic development that shows many similarities with the development we described for Greek *idios*. Let us now see whether by comparing the distribution of Greek *idios* to the distribution of Latin *proprius* in the *Vulgata* we can assess contact effects of translation.

Before presenting the data from the biblical translation, in section 5.2 we shortly introduce the system of Latin possessives and its general reorganisation starting in post-Classical Latin. In section 5.3, Latin *proprius* is presented. The evidence from the *Vulgata* is analysed in section 5.4, focusing on the structural and pragmatic conditions under which *proprius* appears. Section 5.5 summarises the conclusions.

5.2. The system of possessives in Latin

Classical Latin had possessive adjectives to express pronominal possession, i.e. forms agreeing in gender, number and case with the head of the nominal phrase, built from a pronominal stem that varies according to person and number of the referent. A formal distinction between the reflexive and the non-reflexive function is found only in the 3rd person (31): adjectival possessive forms are only used in reflexive contexts, and their stem does not distinguish between singular and plural antecedents; in non-reflexive functions, genitive forms of the anaphoric and demonstrative pronouns (*is, ille*) appear, reflecting number, and in the plural also gender, of the antecedent (cf. Sznajder 1981; Fruyt 1987; Bertocchi 1989; Pierluigi 2005, 2007; de Melo 2010; Pieroni 2010; Mari 2016).

(31)

vix	homines	odium	suum	a	corpore
scarcely	man-NOM.PL	hatred-ACC.SG	their-ACC.SG	from	body-ABL.SG
eius	inpuro	atque	infando		represserunt
he-GEN.SG	foul-ABL.SG	and	abominable-ABL.SG	repress-	PFV.3PL

‘men could scarcely help wreaking their hatred upon his [i.e., Clodius’] foul and abominable person’ (Cic. *Sest.* 117)

Table 2 lists the relevant forms.

Table 2. The system of possessives in Classical Latin

	Reflexive	Non-reflexive
1st person	Sg. meus Pl. noster	Sg. meus Pl. noster
2nd person	Sg. tuus Pl. vester	Sg. tuus Pl. vester
3rd person	Sg., Pl. suus	Sg. eius, illius Pl. eorum/earum, illorum/illarum

In addition, Latin could use the genitive of personal pronouns (*mei, tui, sui*, etc.) in reflexive function under specific structural and pragmatic conditions, on which see Baldi & Nuti (2010: 325).

The system undergoes profound restructuring from Latin to the Romance languages, and signs of the ongoing changes are observed in post-Classical Latin at least from the fifth century CE. The

most important development concerns the possessive adjective *suus*, which in Romance is generalised to non-reflexive contexts. In some languages (e.g. Spanish) it can refer to both singular and plural antecedents, as it did in Latin for the reflexive contexts. In other languages (e.g. French, Italian, Romanian), instead, it loses plural reference, and in plural contexts it is substituted by the outcome of the Latin genitive plural form *illorum* of the demonstrative pronoun *ille*, e.g. French *leur*, Italian *loro* and Romanian *lor*. The forms of the anaphoric pronoun *is* are not continued.

5.3. The role of Latin *proprius*

Given the system outlined earlier for Classical Latin and the general direction of the change in the encoding of reflexivity, where does *proprius* fit in this system and in this diachronic trajectory?

Clearly, the developments affecting *proprius* have an impact on 3rd person reflexive reference. In some Romance languages, *proprius* becomes a new reflexive possessive for the 3rd person, with no distinction reflecting the antecedent's number (replicating, in this respect, a feature of Latin *suus*). (32) is a straightforward example from Italian: in (a) *proprie* enforces a reflexive reading; in (b), instead, *loro* is compatible both with a reflexive and a non-reflexive reading, to be disambiguated in context.⁹

(32) Italian

- a. I ricercatori_i hanno raccontato le **proprie** esperienze
'The researchers told their own experiences'
- b. I ricercatori_i hanno raccontato le **loro**_{i/j} esperienze
'The researchers told their experiences', i.e. their own or someone else's experiences

In other Romance languages, *proprius* becomes a grammaticalised reinforcer of possessive expressions. In Italian, besides the use as a 3rd person reflexive, *proprio* can be used as a reinforcer of 1st and 2nd person possessive adjectives. In French it forms a complex possessive combining with the possessive adjectives of all persons; it can also occur as the reinforcer of a nominal possessive (33).

(33) French (Charnavel 2011: 53, 55)

- a. Cécile a invité **son propre** frère.
'Cécile invited her own brother'
- b. le **propre** chien de Jean
'John's own dog'

Also in these uses as reinforcer, the Romance continuations of *proprius* have the function of disambiguating between a reflexive and a non-reflexive interpretation, since a reflexive co-reference relation is imposed. For this reason, often the continuations of *proprius* maintain a contrastive flavour that, as we will see, characterised the first possessive uses also in Latin.

In the case of Latin *proprius*, as in the case of Greek *ídios*, we are dealing with a process of grammaticalisation from a lexical to a functional element. In Classical Latin, *proprius* is an adjective with descriptive–denotational content, meaning 'personal' (opposed to *communis* 'common' and *alienus* 'of another'), 'peculiar'. Its etymology is reconstructed by de Vaan (2008), based on Forsman (2004), as going back to PIE **priH-o* 'dear', 'own', finding parallels in Sanskrit *priyá-*, Sanskrit *pṛítá-* 'pleased, satisfied', Avestan *friia-* 'dear, own', Old High German *fī-* 'free' < 'dear', Old High German *friunt* 'friend', Old Church Slavonic *prijatelъ* 'friend, beloved'.

The meaning 'personal' encompasses the notion of possession and justifies the occasional use of *proprius* as the reinforcer of a reflexive expression in Classical Latin, as in (34).

⁹ For the structural conditions determining the interpretation of Italian *proprio* see Giorgi (1984, 2007), Pierluigi (2005, 2007).

(34)

ut	nulla	sua	propria	regni-que
so.that	no-ABL.SG	his-ABL.SG	personal-ABL.SG	realm-GEN.SG-and
sui	clade	moveri	magis	potuerit
his-GEN.SG	misfortune-ABL.SG	move-PRS.INF.PASS	more	can-PRF.SBJV.3SG

‘so that he could not have been more upset by any misfortune overtaking himself or his own realm’ (Liv. XII.37.2)

According to Pierluigi (2005, 2007), the frequency of *proprius* with the reinforcer function as an emphatic predicate of identity increases in post-Classical Latin (late first century BCE–second century CE), and leads to occasional plain possessive uses, starting in the second century CE. From the fourth century CE on, *proprius* is increasingly found as a substitute for *suus* in reflexive function. Since biblical translations are among the first texts in which this behaviour is consistently observed, we explore the possibility that contact through translation with Greek may have played a role.

5.4. *Proprius* in the *Vulgata*

In order to compare the use of Latin *proprius* with the use of Greek *ídios* in the New Testament, we collected all instances of *proprius* in the New Testament, according to the *Vulgata* translation. We used the Stuttgart critical text (Weber & Gryson 2007 [1969]), which tries to faithfully reconstruct Jerome's original version.

In the Latin text, we find twenty instances of *proprius*: in all but one case *proprius* translates Greek *ídios*. The exception is Tit. 3.11, shown in (35), where *proprius* renders *auto-* in the Greek compound *autokatákritos* ‘self-condemned’.

(35)

sciens	quia	subversus	est	qui
knowing- PRS.PART.NOM.SG	that	warped-NOM.SG	be-PRS.3SG	who-NOM.SG
eiusmodi	est	et	delinquit	proprio
such	be-PRS.3SG	and	sin-PRS.3SG	OWN-ABL.SG
iudicio	condemnatus			
judgment-ABL.SG	condemned-NOM.SG			

‘knowing that such a person is warped and sinful; he is self-condemned’ (Tit. 3.11)

The relatively low number of Latin instances is to be compared with 104 cases of *ídios* found in the Greek original (of which seventy-five in reflexive contexts). This already tells us that the Latin translator uses *proprius* parsimoniously. When used, *proprius* regularly translates *ídios*, but *ídios* is not always translated by *proprius*. In most cases, *ídios* is rendered by Latin *suus*, or by the other possessive adjectives for 1st and 2nd person. We found no clear-cut complementarity between different solutions in translations, which is to be expected, since *proprius*, like *ídios*, emerges in the language as a variant of the canonical reflexive, and in biblical translations we are observing an early stage of this phenomenon. We take the fact that *proprius* alternates with *suus* in translating *ídios* to be a sign of their incipient equivalence.¹⁰

¹⁰ This alternation is also confirmed by a survey of the Gospel of John in the *Vetus* corpus of older translations preceding the *Vulgata*, which we consulted using Burton et al.'s (2010) electronic edition: for each example with reflexive *proprius* in the *Vulgata*, we find variants involving *suus* or the reinforced form *suus proprius* in the *Vetus*. The same largely holds also for the remaining passages of the *Vulgata* in which *proprius* is found: the witnesses collected in the *Vetus Latina Database (VLD)* show variation between *proprius*, *suus proprius*, *suus*, though passages where *proprius* finds its antecedent in the distributive quantifier *unusquisque* (e.g. Cor. I 7.7, Cor. II 5.10) seem to more consistently display *proprius*. The use of *proprius* in the *Vetus* corpus shows that its equivalence with Greek *ídios* was already attested in texts chronologically preceding the *Vulgata*.

We focus here on the cases in which *proprius* is used because we are interested in understanding the structural and pragmatic conditions that invite this innovative realisation.

Starting with the structural conditions, since *proprius* overlaps with Greek *ídios* in the original, it comes as no surprise that in nineteen of twenty cases it is distributed according to conditions that overlap with those of reflexive possessives; hence, it can be argued to be felt as a reflexive possessive itself by the Latin translator.

The domain in which the referential dependence is established is the clause, with a finite verb except in three cases of co-reference with subjects of participial forms. In the (admittedly small) Latin corpus, there are no cases in which *proprius* finds its antecedent in the (realised or non-realised) subject of an infinitive; three cases where we have this configuration with Greek *ídios* are rendered with *suus*, the fourth one is rendered with a finite clause.

The antecedent of *proprius* is most typically the subject, but there are also two cases in which the antecedent is the distributive pronoun *unusquisque* as an indirect object, parallel to the cases seen in Greek (section 4.2.2) and conforming to a behaviour seen with *suus* and distributive quantifiers in Early and Classical Latin.

The single instance that does not show reflexive distribution is the one in (36), where we find *proprius* as a reinforcer of the possessive *ipsorum*, in a parallel fashion to the Greek original (shown in 15). As seen in section 4.1, these cases, in which *proprius* acts as an emphatic identity predicate, are subject to different distribution constraints and were also found in Classical Latin.

(36)

dixit	quidam	ex	illis	proprius
say-PFV.3SG	someone-NOM.SG	from	that-ABL.PL	OWN-NOM.SG
ipsorum	propheta			
themselves-GEN.PL	prophet-NOM.SG			

‘One [of the Cretans], a prophet of their own, said...’ (Tit. 1.12)

The fact that the use of Latin *proprius* follows the Greek original becomes apparent also by looking at the order with respect to its head noun: the Latin order always reflects the Greek one. We predominantly find a prenominal order (37.a), but the order is postnominal in the two cases that are postnominal in Greek (37.b).

(37.a)

et proprias	oves	vocat	nominatim
and OWN-ACC.PL	sheep-ACC.PL	call-PRS.3SG	by.name
et educit	eas		
and lead.OUT-PRS.3SG	them-ACC.PL		

‘and he calls his own sheep by name and leads them out’ (Jn. 10.3), cf. Greek τὰ *íδια* *próbata*

(37.b)

qui	a	se-met	ipso	loquitur
who-NOM.SG	from	he-ABL.SG-PTCL	himself-ABL.SG	speak-PRS.3SG
gloriam	proprium	quaerit		
glory-ACC.SG	OWN-ACC.SG	seek-PRS.3SG		

‘He who speaks from himself seeks his own glory’ (Jn. 7.18), cf. Greek τὸν *dóksan* τὸν *ídian* (ex. 1)

Concerning the person features of the antecedent, in all but one case *proprius* refers to 3rd person antecedents, either singular or plural. This seems to foreshadow the Romance situation and to represent an important difference with respect to Greek, where, as we saw, there is no restriction on person with *ídios*. However, some aspects of the evidence invite to caution in this respect. First,

there is indeed one example in the *Vulgata*, shown in (38), where the antecedent is 2nd person plural (parallel to the Greek original).

(38)

vos _i	igitur	fratres	praescientes	custodite
you-VOC.PL	therefore	brother-VOC.PL	know.beforehand- PRS.PTCP.NOM.PL	take.care-IMP.2PL
ne	insipientium	errore	transducti	(pro _i)
not lest	foolish-GEN.PL	error-ABL.SG	carry.away-PFV.PTCP.NOM.PL	
excidatis	a	propria _i	firmitate	
fall.out-SBJV.2PL	from	OWN-ABL.SG	stability-ABL.SG	

‘You therefore, beloved, knowing this beforehand, take care that you are not carried away with the error of foolish people and lose your own stability’ (Petr. II 3.17)

Second, reference to antecedents different from 3rd person is found also in coeval non-translated texts: see (39) from Augustine's sermons.

(39)

Vide	quam	perversus	es,	o
see-IMP.2SG	how	perverse-NOM.SG	be-PRS.2SG	PTCL
homo	[. . .]	tu _i	contra	propria _i
man-VOC.SG		you-NOM.SG	instead	OWN-ABL.SG
perversitate,	ubi	bonum	aliquid	facis
perversity-ABL.SG	where	good-ACC.SG	something-ACC.SG	do-PRS.2SG
tibi	imputas,	ubi	aliquid	mali
you-DAT.SG	attribute-PRS.2SG	where	something-ACC.SG	bad-GEN.SG
deo	imputas			
God-DAT.SG	attribute-PRS.2SG			

‘See, man, how perverse you are [. . .] you, instead, for your own perversity, when you do something good you attribute it to yourself, when you do something bad you attribute it to God’ (Aug. *Serm.* 16B.2)

It might therefore be the case that the person restriction develops only later.

Coming now to the pragmatic factors inviting the translation by means of *proprius*, we observe that in almost all cases (eighteen of twenty) a special pragmatic effect emerges: *proprius* conveys contrast with other referents, or expresses emphasis on the identity of the possessor. Contrast can be explicitly marked by discourse particles like *autem*, *neque*. . .*sed*, cf. (40)–(41).

(40)

qui	a	se-met	ipso	loquitur
who-NOM.SG	from	he-ABL.SG-PTCL	himself-ABL.SG	speak-PRS.3SG
gloriam	proprium	quaerit	qui	autem
glory-ACC.SG	OWN-ACC.SG	seek- PRS.3SG	who-NOM.SG	instead
quaerit	gloriam	eius	qui	misit
seek- PRS.3SG	glory-ACC.SG	he-GEN.SG	who-NOM.SG	send-PFV.3SG
illum	hic	verax	est	
that-ACC.SG	this-NOM.SG	true-NOM.SG	be-PRS.3SG	

‘The one who speaks on his own authority seeks his own glory; but the one who seeks the glory of him who sent him is true’ (Jn. 7.18)

(41)

neque	per	sanguinem	hircorum	et
and.not	through	blood-ACC.SG	goat-GEN.PL	and
vitulorum	sed	per	proprium	sanguinem
calf-GEN.PL	but	through	own-ACC.SG	blood-ACC.SG
introivit	semel	in	sancta	
enter-PFV.3SG	once	in	holy-ACC.PL	

‘he entered once for all into the holy places, not by means of the blood of goats and calves but by means of his own blood’ (Hebr. 9.12)

A further contrastive environment is found when the distributive pronoun *unusquisque* is an antecedent, which in the Latin sample happens in six cases: distributivity necessarily involves alternatives which are evaluated at the discourse level, hence can be considered inherently contrastive.

5.5. Summary of comparison

The most relevant results emerging from the comparison between *proprius* and *idios* can be summarised as follows: *proprius* is distributed in nineteen of twenty cases according to conditions that overlap with those of reflexive possessives; hence, it can be argued to be felt as a reflexive possessive itself. The fact that it follows the Greek original becomes apparent also by looking at the order with respect to its head noun, since the Latin order always reflects the Greek one. In almost all cases (eighteen of twenty), a special pragmatic effect emerges: *proprius* conveys contrast with other referents, or expresses emphasis on the identity of the possessor.

6. THE ROLE OF CONTACT: CONCLUSIONS

6.1. Externally and internally caused change with *idios* and *proprius*

By means of our corpus study, we established that there is a principled correspondence between the use of *proprius* in the Latin New Testament (fourth century CE) and the use of *idios* in the Greek original (first century CE).

The use of *proprius* seems to be less advanced in Latin, more tightly linked to a clearly perceived contrastive environment. The data from the *Vulgata* reflect the situation observed in coeval native texts of a similar register by Pierluigi (2007), who finds that innovative uses compatible with a reflexive distribution, which are responsible for a rise in frequency of *proprius*, co-exist with conservative adjectival uses. In the Latin New Testament, we only find reflexive uses and one case of emphatic reinforcer, i.e. only innovative uses, which can be directly linked to the presence of *idios* in Greek.

In the Greek New Testament, the use of *idios* is more widespread: next to conservative uses, which are often observed in idiomatic expressions, we find uses as reinforcer of reflexive possessive expressions or as downright reflexive possessive adjective.

In the stage of Greek represented by the New Testament, a plausible triggering condition favouring the change is the simultaneous loss of the old forms for possessive reflexive adjectives: the recruitment of *idios* in the grammatical system creates a new unambiguous reflexive possessive that can be used with antecedents of all persons. Hence, we can hypothesise an internal cause for the change.

In the stage of Latin represented by the *Vulgata* (and by coeval non-translated texts), instead, no triggering condition is established yet. We know that *proprius* diachronically fills the gap left by the

shift of *suus* from reflexive to pronominal behaviour. However, the expansion of *suus* into the domain of pronominal possessives (*eius/eorum* etc.) gains momentum at a later stage in Latin, starting from the fifth century CE. The *Vulgata* translation of the New Testament shows a ‘Classical’ distribution of reflexive *suus* and pronominal *eius*, apart from occasional slips. Hence, an external trigger for the use of *proprius*, in terms of contact through translation, seems reasonable in this context. At the same time, coeval non-translated texts show that the possibility of a reflexive use of *proprius* is attested there as well.

6.2. Conclusions

We conclude that contact through translation is a plausible catalyst of the parallel change observed in Greek and Latin with the development of *idios* and *proprius* as reflexive possessive adjectives. However, it is safe to assume that the translation of biblical texts is not the trigger itself for the change in Latin; rather, it represents an occasion for the innovative uses of *proprius* to emerge in the written language. Further research on non-translated texts will have to establish if it is possible to detect a broader effect of everyday language contact between Greek and Latin in this respect.

The two languages ultimately converge on a similar solution (the addition of *idios* and *proprius* as reflexive possessives to the functional lexicon), starting from differing original conditions but reacting to a similar systemic gap: the loss of a reflexive possessive. The New Testament data show that Latin starts developing *proprius* as a reflexive before the systemic change takes place. We argue that this development is facilitated by the Greek model. The condition leading to the further expansion and systematisation of the change is, however, rooted in language-internal systemic pressures.

Correspondence

Chiara Gianollo

Alma Mater Studiorum - Università di Bologna

Dipartimento di Filologia Classica e Italianistica

Via Zamboni 32, 40126 Bologna

Tel. +39 051 2098562

Email: chiara.gianollo@unibo.it

REFERENCES

- ALAND, KURT, MATTHEW BLACK, CARLO M. MARTINI, BRUCE M. METZGER & ALLEN WIKGREN, 1968. *The Greek New Testament* (2nd ed.). Stuttgart: Württemberg Bible Society.
- ALEXIADOU, ARTEMIS, 2005. ‘A possessive adjective in the Greek DP’, in Melita Stavrou & Arhonto Terzi (eds.), *Advances in Greek Generative Syntax: In Honor of Dimitra Theophanopoulou-Kontou*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 127–151.
- BALDI, PHILIP & ANDREA NUTI, 2010. ‘Possession’, in Philip Baldi & Pierluigi Cuzzolin (eds.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*, Volume 3 Constituent Syntax: Quantification, Numerals, Possession, Anaphora. Berlin: de Gruyter. 239–388.
- BEEKES, ROBERT, 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, 2 vols. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- BENEDETTI, MARINA & CHIARA GIANOLLO, 2020. ‘Criteria for subjecthood and non-canonical subjects in classical Greek’, in Bridget Drinka (ed.), *Historical Linguistics 2017: Selected Papers from the 23rd International Conference on Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 30–48.
- BENEDETTI, MARINA & CHIARA GIANOLLO, 2023. ‘Modal uses of knowledge verbs in Ancient Greek’, in Camille Denizot & Liana Tronci (eds.), *Building Modality with Syntax*. Berlin: de Gruyter. 25–49.
- BENEDETTI, MARINA, CHIARA GIANOLLO & VLADIMIR OLIVERO, 2023. ‘Parallel innovation or contact through translation? Reflexive possessives in the Greek and Latin Bible’, presentation at the Workshop “Translations in the history of languages: From their position in historical corpora to their effects on language change”, 56th Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea, Athens, August 29, 2023.
- BERTOCCHI, ALESSANDRA, 1989. ‘The role of antecedents of Latin anaphors’, in Gualtiero Calboli (ed.), *Subordination and Other Topics in Latin: Proceedings of the Third Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*, Bologna, 1–5 April 1985. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 441–461.
- BIANCONI, MICHELE, 2021. ‘Translation strategies in the *Vetus Latina*: A pilot study on the book of Genesis’, *Studi e Saggi Linguistici* 59(2). 51–79.

- BLOSS, FRIEDRICH, ALBERT DEBRUNNER & ROBERT W. FUNK, 1961 [1896]. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- BORTOLUSSI, BERNARD, 2013. 'Latin *quisque* as a "floating" quantifier', *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 12(1). 5–26.
- BURTON, PHILIP H., JON BALSERACK, HUGH A. G. HOUGHTON & DAVID C. PARKER, 2010 [2007]. *Vetus Latina Iohannes*. The Verbum project. The Old Latin manuscripts of John's Gospel, version 1.7. <http://www.iohannes.com/vetuslatina/index.html>
- CHANTRAINE, PIERRE, 1999 [1968]. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- CHARNAVEL, ISABELLE, 2010. 'Anaphoricity, logophoricity and intensification: The puzzling case of *son propre* in French', in Sonia Colina, Antxon Olarrea, & Ana Maria Carvalho (eds.), *Romance Linguistics* 2009, Selected Papers from the 39th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL). Amsterdam: Benjamins. 187–202.
- CHARNAVEL, ISABELLE, 2011. 'On French possessive *son propre* ('his own'): Evidence for an interaction between intensification and binding', in Olivier Bonami & Patricia Cabredo Hofherr (eds.), *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics*, Volume 8. 53–74. <http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss8/charnavel-eiss8.pdf>
- CHARNAVEL, ISABELLE, 2020. *Locality and Logophoricity: A Theory of Exempt Anaphora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CORNILLIE, BERT & BRIDGET DRINKA (eds.), 2019. 'Latin influence on the syntax of the languages of Europe', *Special Issue of Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 33(1/2). 1–10.
- CUVIGNY, HÉLÈNE, 2002. 'Remarques sur l'emploi de *idios* dans le praescriptum épistolaire', *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 102. 143–153.
- DE MELO, WOLFGANG D. C., 2010. 'Possessive pronouns in Plautus', in Eleanor Dickey & Anna Chahoud (eds.), *Colloquial and Literary Latin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 71–99.
- DRINKA, BRIDGET, 2011. 'The sacral stamp of Greek: Periphrastic constructions in New Testament translations of Latin, Gothic, and Old Church Slavonic', in Eirik Welo (ed.), *Indo-European Syntax and Pragmatics: Contrastive Approaches*, Oslo Studies in Language, Volume 3. 75–101.
- ERNOUT, ALFRED & ANTOINE MEILLET, 1985 [1932]. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- FORSSEMAN, BERNHARD, 2004. 'Lateinisch *proprius, propriare*', in Adam Hyllested, Anders Jørgensen, Jenny Larsson, & Thomas Olander (eds.), *Per Aspera ad Asteriscos. Studia indogermanica in honorem Jens Elmegård Rasmussen*. Innsbruck: IBS. 131–138.
- FRISK, HJALMAR, 1954–1972. *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- FRUYT, MICHÈLE, 1987. 'Interprétation sémantico-référentielle du réfléchi latin', *Glotta* 65(3–4). 204–221.
- GIANOLLO, CHIARA, 2011. 'Native syntax and translation effects. Adnominal arguments in the Greek and Latin New Testament', in Eirik Welo (ed.), *Indo-European Syntax and Pragmatics: Contrastive Approaches*, Oslo Studies in Language, Volume 3. 75–101.
- GIANOLLO, CHIARA, 2014. 'Competing constructions for inalienable possession in the Vulgate Gospels: Translator's choices and grammatical constraints', *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 13(1). 93–114.
- GIORGI, ALESSANDRA, 1984. 'Toward a theory of long distance anaphors: A GB approach', *The Linguistic Review* 3(4). 307–359.
- GIORGI, ALESSANDRA, 2007. 'On the nature of long-distance anaphors', *Linguistic Inquiry* 38(2). 321–342.
- GIORGI, ALESSANDRA & GIUSEPPE LONGOBARDI, 1991. *The Syntax of Noun Phrases: Configuration, Parameters and Empty Categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GREEN, EDWIN L., 1903. 'ἴδιος as a possessive in Polybius', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 34. iv–v.
- HEINE, BERND, 2002. 'On the role of context in grammaticalization', in Ilse Wischer & Gabriele Diewald (eds.), *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 83–102.
- IATRIDOU, SABINE, 1986. 'An anaphor not bound in its governing category', *Linguistic Inquiry* 17. 766–772.
- KIPARSKY, PAUL, 2012. 'Greek anaphora in cross-linguistic perspective', *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 12(1). 84–117.
- KÖNIG, EKKEHARD & PETER SIEMUND, 2000. 'Intensifiers and reflexives: A typological perspective', in Zygmunt Frajzyngier & Traci Curl (eds.), *Reflexives: Forms and Functions*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 41–74.
- LAVIDAS, NIKOLAOS, 2021. *The diachrony of written language contact. A Contrastive Approach*. Leiden: Brill.
- LAVIDAS, NIKOLAOS & ALEXANDER BERGS (eds.), 2020. 'Historical language contact in English', *Special Issue of Linguistic Vanguard* 6(S2).
- VAN DER LOUW, THEODORUS A. W., 2007. *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*. Leuven: Peeters.
- MARI, TOMMASO, 2016. 'Third person possessives from early Latin to late Latin and Romance', in James N. Adams & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Early and Late Latin: Continuity or Change?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 47–68.
- MAYSER, EDWIN, 1934. *Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, II-2. Berlin & Leipzig: de Gruyter.
- MEISTERHANS, KONRAD, 1990. *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*, Dritte, vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage, besorgt von Eduard Schwyzler. Frankfurt: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- MENDOZA, IMKE & SANDRA BIRZER (eds.), 2022. *Diachronic Slavonic Syntax. Traces of Latin, Greek and Church Slavonic in Slavonic Syntax*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- MOCCIARO, EGLE, 2013a. 'Intensifiers', in Georgios K. Giannakis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*. https://doi.org/10.1163/2214-448X_eagll_COM_000036
- MOCCIARO, EGLE, 2013b. 'Reflexives', in Georgios K. Giannakis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*. https://doi.org/10.1163/2214-448X_eagll_COM_00000397
- MOULTON, JAMES H. & NIGEL TURNER, 1963. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Volume III, Syntax*. London, New York: T&T Clark.
- NESTLE, EBERHARD & KURT ALAND, 2012. *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 28. rev. Auflage. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

- PIERLUIGI, SABRINA, 2005. 'From Latin into Romance: A diachronic analysis of third-person possessives', in *Proceedings of the University of Cambridge Third Postgraduate Conference in Language Research (CamLing 2005)*. Cambridge: Cambridge Institute of Language Research. 63–70.
- PIERLUIGI, SABRINA, 2007. 'Latin third-person possessives in a GB approach', in Gérald Purnelle & Joseph Denooz (eds.), *Ordre et cohérence en Latin*. Librairie Droz: Genève. 143–152.
- PIERONI, SILVIA, 2010. 'Deixis and anaphora', in Philip Baldi & Pierluigi Cuzzolin (eds.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax, Volume 3 Constituent Syntax: Quantification, Numerals, Possession, Anaphora*. Berlin: de Gruyter. 389–501.
- PUDDU, NICOLETTA, 2005. *Riflessivi e intensificatori: greco, latino e altre lingue indoeuropee*. Pisa: ETS.
- RABUS, ACHIM, 2014. 'Siblings in contact: The interaction of Church Slavonic and Russian', in Juliane Besters-Dilger, Cynthia Denmarkar, Stefan Pfänder, & Achim Rabus (eds.), *Congruence in Contact-Induced Language Change: Language Families, Typological Resemblance, and Perceived Similarity*. Berlin: de Gruyter. 337–351.
- SCHWYZER, EDUARD, 1950. *Griechische Grammatik*. München: C. H. Beck.
- SPITZER, LEO, 1942. 'Milieu and ambiance: An essay in historical semantics', *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 3 (1). 1–42.
- SZNAJDER, LILIANE, 1981. 'Y a-t-il 'un' réfléchi en latin? Etude sur les conditions d'emploi de *se* et *suus*', *L'information Grammaticale* 10(1). 17–22.
- TAYLOR, ANN, 2008. 'Contact effects of translation: Distinguishing two kinds of influence in Old English', *Language Variation and Change* 20(2). 341–365.
- THOMASON, SARAH G., 2001. *Language Contact. An introduction*. Baltimore: Georgetown University Press.
- TLG: Pantelia, Maria C (ed.), 2014. *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae – A Digital Library of Greek Literature*. Irvine, CA: University of California, Irvine. <http://www.tlg.uci.edu>
- DE VAAN, MICHIEL, 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*. Leiden: Brill.
- VAN EMDE BOAS, EVERT, ALBERT RIJBSBARON, LUUK HUITINK & MATHIEU DE BAKKER, 2019. *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- VARLOKOSTA, SPYRIDOULA & NORBERT HORNSTEIN, 1993. 'A bound pronoun in Modern Greek', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11(1). 175–195.
- VERKHOLANTSEV, JULIA, 2008. *Ruthenica Bohemica: Ruthenian Translations from Czech in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Poland*. Wien: LIT.
- VLD, 2021. *The Vetus Latina Database*. Version 02/08/. Turnhout: Brepols.
- WALDE, ALOIS & JOHANN BAPTIST HOFMANN, 1938. *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (3e Auflage). Heidelberg: Winter.
- WEBER, ROBERT & ROGER GRYSO, 2007 [1969]. *Biblia Sacra Vulgata* (Editio quinta). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.