# *Modus concessivus, species concessiva* and *species affirmativa* in the Works of Roman Grammarians*

*Vlada A. Chernysheva*

St. Petersburg State University,
7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation; v.chernysheva@spbu.ru

The article aims to analyze the use of the term *concessivus/concessiva* 'concessive' in Latin grammatical texts which make up Corpus Grammaticorum Latinorum and Digital Library of late antique Latin texts, and to consider the concessive meaning as a grammatical category. A number of grammatical sources (Probus, *Ars* of Diomedes, *Victorini sive Palaemoni Ars*, *Ars* of Cledonius, *Explanationes*) place the category of concessivity among the verbal categories, namely *modus* 'mood', while in others this term is not mentioned. The text of Diomedes is also notable for the fact that concessivity is included in the concept of *species*, a term that includes heterogeneous grammatical phenomena among Roman grammarians. At the same time, the grammarian identifies not one meaning of concession, but two, which are defined by the terms — *species concessiva* (describes situations that are undesirable for the speaker in the present and future) and *species affirmativa* (describes situations that did not actually happen). All the three terms in the title of this paper correspond to *coniunctivus concessivus* and indicate the same grammatical form — perfect subjunctive, e. g. *feceris* 'even if you did'. In modern linguistics, the meaning of concession is expressed not only by the perfect subjunctive, but also by the present subjunctive, and, thus, does not have a unique formal expression, as in ancient linguistics. I suppose that concession in the Latin language falls under the scope of covert grammatical category, whereas concession, as it was presented in Roman grammars, can be treated as an overt one.

*Keywords:* Latin, Roman grammarians, covert category, cryptotype, overt category, phenotype, concession, concessive meaning, mood.

In the course of researching the covert categories of the Latin language and linguistic terminology in Roman grammar sources, I came across the term *concessivus/concessiva*, which lies within the scope of verb grammar and refers to Latin perfect subjunctive forms. S. Schad gives the following meaning of this term: "'expressing yielding', of the subjunctive in certain usages; classified by Diomedes as a verbal species, by other grammarians as a mood" (Schad 2007, 79). The list of passages containing the term *concessivus* collected by S. Schad was revised by means of Corpus Corporum[1] and Digital Library of late antique Latin texts[2]. In addition, I have checked whether the verb *concedere*, the noun *concessio*, and the noun and participle *concessus* were mentioned by grammarians.[3]

Regarding Latin grammatical theory, the allocation of concessive meaning into a category was associated with the grammarian Probus, who identified it as a mood. We find a passage concerning this in Servius's commentary on Virgil's *Aeneid*. Moreover, Servius indicates that this category is absent in Latin grammar manuals:

(1) ***neque illos iuveris auxilio***[4] *concessivus est iste modus secundum Probum; namque in artibus non invenitur. Fit autem quotiens taedio contentionis quasi videmur concedere quod tamen nolumus fieri: nam id agit Venus hoc loco, ut Iuppiter magis praestet auxilium.* ***responsa secuti*** *hoc est si non solum prohibiti non sunt, sed eis etiam concessum est.* (III 388. 10–15 Thilo)

***neque illos iuveris auxilio*** 'even if you didn't help them': according to Probus, this mood is concessive; it is not found, however, in grammar manuals. Nevertheless, it occurs every time when, fed up with an argument, we seem to yield, but, in fact, do not want this to happen: for Venus does it here in order to make Jupiter provide more help. ***responsa secuti*** 'having followed the answers' this is if they not only were not prevented, but had also given in.

Here, Servius provides a brief explanation of the term *concessivus* based on word derivation, which employs the infinitive *concedere* 'to yield, to give in' in (1) and the participle *concessum* 'given in' in (2).

The next source is *Victorini sive Palaemoni Ars*[5]. The work concerns six parts of speech and is close in structure to *regulae*-type grammar manual, which means it does

---

[1] Corpus corporum: https://mlat.uzh.ch/browser?path=/14161.

[2] Digital Library of late antique Latin texts: https://digiliblt.uniupo.it (accessed: 20.09.2023).

[3] The noun *concessio*, which is a rhetorical term (s. v. OLD: *Concessio est cum reus non id quod factum est defendit, sed ut ignoscatur postulat.* (Cic. *Inv.* 1.15)), is mentioned once (Pompeius, GL V 260. 35), but is not related to the topic. Neither the word forms of the verb *concedere*, nor the forms of the participle and noun *concessus* are present in the Grammatici Latini database. However, in Digital Library of late antique Latin texts, I have found some examples relevant to the expression of concessive meaning in Latin. They are included into this paper.

[4] *Si sine pace tua atque invito numine Troes*
    *Italiam petiere, luant peccata neque illos*
    *iuveris auxilio; sin tot responsa secuti,*
    *quae superi manesque dabant: cur nunc tua quisquam*
    *vertere iussa potest aut cur nova condere fata?* (Verg. *Aen*. 10, 31–35)
"If without your leave and despite your deity the Trojans have sought Italy, let them expiate their sin, and do not aid them with succour. But if they have followed all the oracles given by gods above and gods below, why is anyone now able to overthrow your bidding or build the fates anew?" (transl. by A. S. Kline).

[5] The text belongs to neither Victorinus nor Palaemon and rather dates back to the early 4th century. It originated in the western part of the Roman Empire. See Digital Library of late antique Latin texts: URL: https://digiliblt.uniupo.it s. v. Palaemon (Ps.). Further digilibLT.

not contain explanations or detailed examples from literature. The text below is a brief grammatical reference given in the form of a catechism:

(2) *modi verborum quot sunt? decem. qui sunt? indicativus, imperativus, promissivus, optativus, coniunctivus, concessivus, infinitivus, impersonalis, gerendi, hortandi. addunt quidam percunctativum. indicativus modus ut lego, imperativus modus ut lege, promissivus modus ut legam, optativus ut utinam legerem, coniunctivus ut cum legam, concessivus ut legerim, infinitivus ut legere, impersonalis ut legitur, gerendi ut legendo, hortandi ut legat, percunctativus ut legisne.* (GL VI 199. 17–23)

How many moods do verbs have? Ten. Which are they? Indicative, imperative, promissive, optative, subjunctive, concessive, infinitive, impersonal, gerund, hortative. Some add an interrogative one. Indicative mood as *lego* '*I read*', imperative mood as *lege* '*read*', promissive mood as *legam* '*I will read*', optative as *utinam legerem* '*if I could read*', conjunctive as *cum legam* '*since I read*', concessive as *legerim* '*even if I read*', infinitive as *legere* '*to read*', impersonal as *legitur* '*they read*', gerend as *legendo* '*while reading*', hortative as *legat* '*let him read*', interrogative as *legisne* '*do you read*'.

The passage given above contains the most extensive list of moods ever compiled by Roman grammarians.[6] The main moods were five: indicative, imperative, optative, subjunctive, indefinite. The rest were added by grammarians in a different way. As we can see, the concept of mood is treated quite broadly and includes forms of gerund and impersonal passive. In this passage, the distribution of subjunctive forms is worth noticing: the present subjunctive coinciding with the future indicative is defined as promissive, the same form with the conjunction *cum* — as subjunctive, the imperfect subjunctive — as optative, and, finally, the perfect subjunctive — as concessive.

In the other passages to be discussed further, the concessive meaning will also be assigned to the perfect subjunctive.

Another grammatical source taken into consideration is *Ars* of Cledonius which is a lemmatised commentary on *Ars Maior* and *Ars Minor* by Aelius Donatus.[7] Here, a remark on *modus concessivus* is placed between the passages discussing the types of Latin verb conjugations and the difference between indicative and promissive moods. The remark could well be an interpolation, since Cledonius takes into account six moods including the promissive.

(3) *octavus modus quidem dicitur concessivus hoc exemplo, ut 'fac quasi dixeris,' quod compendiosa locutio invenit.* (GL V 17. 18–19)

The eighth mood is called concessive in the following example "do as if you would have said", which reveals the abbreviated expression.

Obviously, the abbreviated expression indicates the form *dixeris* itself without *fac quasi* "do as if."

The next grammar source is *Explanationes*, a commentary on the grammars by Aelius Donatus.[8] This passage provides a detailed explanation of the origin of the concessive mood:

> (4) *est etiam concessivus modus, qui ex hac causa natus est, quod plerumque altercationes interrumpit et tollit nobis contentionem, ut puta verum est illud, tu dicis verum non est: orta contentio est. haec uno dissimulante conpescitur et sedatur, dum alter alteri concedit viceris: non concedo verum esse, sed quasi verum, ne contentio procedat in longum. haec et finitiva dicuntur. ista enim omnia conpendium nobis praestant, ne per circuitionem diutius aliquid dicamus, cum possumus habere compendium. melius enim dicis viceris, quam si dicas concedo tibi quoniam vicisti.* (GL IV 505.3–11)

> There is also a concessive mood, which arose for the reason that in most cases it interrupts debate and eliminates our dispute, for example: that is true, while you say "that is false". Thus, the dispute has arisen. When one does not show it, he restrains himself and calms down, while one in turn yields to the other: I do not concede this to be true, but as if it were true, so that the dispute does not drag on". They are also called confining. Actually, they allow us to be concise with the purpose of not saying anything longer than necessary through a paraphrase, when we can have an abbridging. After all, it is better to say "let's say you won" than if you say "I yield to you, since you won".

The passage given above contains the term *compendium* 'abridging', correlating with *compendiosa* 'abridged' in Cledonius' text. It is worth assuming a single source for these two texts, since in both of them, the concessive mood is regarded to be a special way of shortening the speech in order to avoid a circumlocution.

The sources analyzed earlier in this paper were arranged chronologically. Here, I turn to *Ars* written by the grammarian Diomedes[9] as a source where the term *concessivus/concessiva* is applied to different ancient grammar categories. The next passage represents a list of moods that were identified by Roman grammarians:

> (5) *quoniam de generibus quod satis erat dixi, modos quoque subiungam, quos quinque esse omnes fere grammatici consentiunt. nam qui sex voluerunt, vario iudicio alii promissivum, quidam inpersonalem coniungunt; qui septem, utrumque prioribus adiciunt; qui amplius, percontativum adsumunt; qui novem, subiunctivum a coniunctivo separant; qui decem, etiam adhortativum adscribunt. verum ex his, ut ipsa declinatio verborum exposcit, inpersonalis et participialis a quibusdam admittitur, de quibus postea referre placuit. modus itaque verborum sive inclinatio in quinque deducitur partes. aut enim finitivus est modus aut imperativus aut optativus aut subiunctivus aut infinitivus.* (GL I 338. 6–15)

> Since I have said enough about the voices, I will also add about the moods, which, as almost all grammarians agree, there are five. For of those who want six, some, relying

———————
  [8]  See Zetzel 2018, 321–322.
  [9]  *Ars* of Diomedes dates back to the end of the 4th century. The grammarian worked with sources leading to Charisius and Donatus. It seems unclear, however, whether Diomedes consulted Charisius directly (in which case the *Ars* dates from no earlier than 370–380 AD) or consulted his sources, but in contrast Diomedes's grammar shows a more subtle work with grammatical texts. See Zetzel 2018, 285; digilibLT s.v. Diomedes.

on various arguments, add the promissive, others — the impersonal. Those who want seven add both to the previous ones. Those who want more add an interrogative. Those who want nine separate the subjunctive from the conjunctive. Those who want ten also attribute adhortative. Since the conjugation of verbs itself requires, some admit impersonal and participial. So, the mood of verbs, or 'inclination', is divided into five parts: the mood is either indicative, imperative, optative, subjunctive or indefinite.

L. Jeep suggested *'subiunctivum a concessivo separant'* instead of *'subiunctivum a coniunctivo separant'*, since the conjunctive and subjunctive are not distinguished by Diomedes elsewhere[10] (Jeep 1893, 217). In this case, this list of moods corresponds to one given in (3), where the maximum number of moods is one less than in Diomedes, since *modus participialis* is omitted.

However, the term *concessivus* or, to be more pricise, *concessiva*, defines also the term *species*. It should be emphasized that the term *species* is used in different senses. In Sacerdotus, *species* refers to the category of voice and is a synonym for *genus*; in Pseudo-Probus, *species*, being a temporal and aspectual category, denotes the varieties of past tenses.[11] In Diomedes, unlike Sacerdotus and Pseudo-Probus, *species* does not have the status of an *accidentia* and is placed at the end of the verb section:

(6)  *species verborum sunt hae, relativa, usurpativa, affirmativa, concessiva.* (GL I 395.12)
     Forms of verbs are the following: relative, usurpative, affirmative, concessive.

Further, the grammarian Diomedes provides a detailed explanation for each of the mentioned *species*.

To put it briefly, *species relativa* indicates subjunctive forms resulting from *attractio modi*, and *species usurpativa* ('irregular species') — the Latin gerund. As regards *species concessiva,* Diomedes suggests the following:

(7)  *de specie concessiva. concessiva praeterea species est, qua tum demum utimur subiunctivam inserentes qualitatem, cum suadendo cuipiam quod expediat non persuademus et desistentes, dum nos volumus crimine absolvere, concedimus arbitrio eius remittentes quod pertendat facere, ut cum loquimur ne facias sane suadentes, illo pertendente ut magis faciat addimus videris feceris, id est licet tu videas, tu perspicias quid facias. et hoc dicimus sub specie concedendi potius dehortantes. nam cum facere ex animo suademus, non ita loquimur, feceris videris, sed facias videas, exhortativo utentes sermone.* (GL I 396. 29 — 397. 6)

On the concessive form. There is also the concessive form, which is used only when we persuade someone (using the subjunctive mood) to do what is better, but we fail. It is also used in giving in, i. e., when we wish to free ourselves from the accusation and thus yield to someone's decision by allowing what the person intends to do, as, for example, when we persuade someone "don't do it" and they insist even more, we add *videris, feceris*, i. e., let you see, and you'll see indeed what you're doing. And we say this under the

guise of giving in, but rather discouraging them. For when we really persuade someone to do something, we do not say *feceris, videris*, but *facias, videas*, relying on incentive words.

*Species affirmativa* is close in meaning to *species concessiva*, which is described in the passage below:

(8) *enuntiatione igitur eadem adfirmativa et concessiva est species; sensu vero differt, quoniam quae liqueant nobis non esse adfirmantes quasi sint gesta defendimus. item quae nequaquam volumus fieri verbo velut fiant concedimus, quo pertinaciam contendendi evitemus* (GL I 397. 7–10)

Consequently, the affirmative and the concessive forms are the same forms. They differ, however, in meaning, since we defend those things that obviously do not exist, claiming that they are accomplished. In the same way, by means of a verb, we concede those things that we do not want to happen in any way as if they happen, in order to avoid the intransigence in a dispute.

It seems to me that the following assumption can be drawn from this statement. From Diomedes' point of view, the difference between two *species* is that the affirmative indicates the situation that did not happen in the past, while the concessive — the situation that may happen in the present or future. However, both *species* require the same grammatical tense, i. e. the perfect subjunctive, as we can see it in (7) and in the passage below:

(9) *adfirmatiua autem species est huius modi, cum <in> re dubia, in qua parum altercantibus adsentimur, specie subiunctiua quasi sit factum adfirmamus, cum dicimus fecerit dixerit, id est crede eum dixisse uel fecisse quod neque dixerit neque fecerit. nam si factum esse re uera in animum inducimus, finitiuo utimur sermone, id est fecit dixit. hic sermo confitentis est; superior, cum dicimus fecerit legerit dixerit, non confitentis fecisse uel legisse sed adfirmantis, {quod} etiamsi fecerit uel legerit quod nequaquam factum esse constet, nihilo minus nihil esse commissum: quale est apud Ciceronem pro Milone **seruum etiam ut corruperit, Arrius meus amicus dixit**. non ait, seruum corrupit. neque enim confitetur corrupisse sed adfirmat, etiamsi corruperit, nihil criminose admisisse Milonem. et alibi idem in eadem **sit ita factum**, id est credite ita factum esse quod non sit factum. talis est adfirmatiua, quae altercationis tollendae gratia sub simulatione confessionis inducitur.*

The affirmative species is of the following kind. When in a doubtful matter, in which we agree little with quarelling people, we affirm by means of the subjunctive species as if it had happened, when we say that *fecerit* 'he did', *dixerit* 'he said', that is 'believe him to have said or to have done what he neither said nor did'. For if we bring to mind the fact that it was actually done, we use finite speech, that is 'he said', 'he did'. This is the speech of that one who is confessing; the former speech, when we say that *fecerit* 'he did', *legerit* 'he read', *dixerit* 'he said', is of that one who is not confessing that he had done or read, but affirming that even if he had done or read what evidently by no means has been done, it was nevertheless not committed at all. Which is in Cicero's *For Milo: seruum etiam ut corruperit, Arrius meus amicus dixit* (Cic. *Mil.* 46) 'even granted that he bribed his slave, as my friend Arrius said'. He did not say *servum corrupit* 'he corrupted the serve'. For he does not confess that he has been corrupt, but affirms that, even if he had been corrupt, he had admitted nothing criminal to Milo. And elsewhere in the same

oration the same thing *sit ita factum* 'granted that it happened so', that is 'believe that it happened so that it did not'. Such is the affirmative species, which is introduced under the pretense of a confession for the sake of removing the quarrel.

Here, Diomedes illustrates the *affirmativa species* with two quotes from Cicero's *Pro Milone*. They contain the verb forms *corruperit* and *sit factum* which are both perfect subjunctive forms, as *iuveris* in (1), *legerim* in (2), *dixeris* in (3), *viceris* in (4), v*ideris, feceris* in (7). Thus, regardless of whether the concession fits into the concept of *species* or *modus*, it is expressed with the same grammatical form.

From the viewpoint of the Latin scholars of 20th-21th c., the concession manifests itself in different tense forms. In the *Latin Grammar*, D. Panhuis compiled a table of the use of tenses and moods depending on the values expressed in main clauses. A concessive one is interpreted as being a realizable volitive clause. The other volitive clauses express exhortation, command, or prohibition. The clauses which express deliberate question or wish are considered to be either realizable or unrealizable. For all types of meanings except the concessive one, D. Panhuis indicates the tense of the verb (Panhuis 2006, 119). Thus, a concession can be expressed in any subjunctive tense.

The concessive use is covered in more detail in *Lateinische Grammatik* (Hofmann, Szantyr 1972, 332). It is defined as a 'wishing optative', the specific meaning of which is understood from the context or from the words *sine*, *permitto* and others. The concessive is claimed to be still rare in Old Latin. The clauses with present subjunctive forms of *esse* in the beginning are prevailing since Cato, for example, in *sint sane superbi (frg. Gell. 6, 6, 50)*. Perfect subjunctive with past meaning is stated to be missing from the prose before Cicero and in the poetry before Horace. In Late Latin, perfect subjunctive forms are rare and are used more often together with *ut*, *licet* and others. This fact shows the transition from the concession to the condition with imperfect subjunctive forms used in *dares hanc vim M. Crasso…: in foro saltaret* (Cic. *Off.* 3, 75) (Hofmann, Szantyr 1972, 332). Thus, it is assumed that there are two subjunctive tenses in Classical Latin — present and perfect.

According to Pinkster (2015, 509), "concessions with a present subjunctive refer to the time of speaking, those with a perfect subjunctive to a time anterior to the time of speaking". The linguist provides following examples from Cicero: *Sit fur, sit sacrilegus . . . At est bonus imperator . . .* ('Granted that he is a thief, that he is a sacrilegious thief. Yet he is a great commander . . .' Cic. *Ver.* 5.4); *Mihi quidem non videtur, sed dissolverit sane.* ('For my own part I don't think so, but suppose he did refute them.' Cic. *Luc.* 75)". The verb form *sit* indicates simultaneity of the action and the speech act, while *dissolverit* — anteriority of the action.

In Roman grammar treatises (examples 2–9), the present subjunctive is not mentioned as a way of expressing concession. The present subjunctive form which may be considered relevant to the topic of the paper is found in Eugraphius' *Commentum Terentii* (6th century A. D.):

(10) **Habeas** *synchoresis est, quae fit quando concedimus mala importune desiderantibus, ut est etiam illud 'habeat, ualeat, uiuat cum illa'.* (III Wessner 58)

Habeas 'let you have' is a yielding, which occurs when we yield to those who want something bad in a rude way, also as following 'habeat, ualeat, uiuat cum illa' 'Let him possess, be well, live with her'.

Commenting on the lemma *habeas*, which belongs to speech (11), Eugraphius uses the Greek term *synchoresis*, which corresponds to *concessio* in Latin and which is backed up with the verb form *concedimus*, and provides one more example from the same play (12):

(11) CH.*non tibi sat esse hoc solidum visumst gaudium,*
*nisi me lactasses amantem et falsa spe produceres?*
*habeas.* PA.*habeam*? (Ter. *An*. 647–649)

*Charinus:* Did not this joy seem complete to you unless you lured had lured me as a lover and produced false hope? Take/Have her. *Pamphilus:* Me to take/have her?

(12) *an ut pro hui(u)s peccatis ego supplicium sufferam?*
*immo habeat, valeat, vivat cum illa.* (Ter. *An*. 889–890)

Should I suffer punishment for his sins? Let him take, be well, live with her.

However, the verb *habeas* in (11), *habeat*, *valeat*, and *vivat* in (12) do not seem to be interpreted as *coniunctivus concessivus*, since the quotes from Terence do not present either a hypothetical statement or a paratactic relationship to another sentence.[12] I suppose that the present subjunctive forms are used not as a means to dispute, but to express annoyance. *Coniunctivus iussivus* would fit better here from the standpoint of semantics and grammatical tense. My assumption could be confirmed by Pinkster's remark on imperative sentences with a concessive illocutionary force (2015, 361): "Concessions are typical of the argumentative text type. <…> There are, for example, no obvious instances in Early Latin comedies."

Thus, one could conclude that the meaning of concession in antiquity was interpreted in a more narrow sense than in modern linguistics and was assigned to one tense. In my opinion, the latter fact allows us to make the statement that *-eri* is a marker of concecession. In modern linguistics, the concession, which is a complicated linguistic phenomenon,[13] stands out as a grammatical category. For example, in the Kadar language, there is an affix *-ra* which is attached to the conditional form and makes a concessive one. (Mutalov, Vagizieva 2019, 178).[14] The concession is also grammaticalized in the Alyutor language (Maltseva 2016, 63).[15] Therefore, it is plausible to consider concessivity in Roman grammarians' Latin language as an overt grammatical category, or a phenotype.[16] The reason why it was the perfect subjunctive form that was correlated with the concessive meaning may be that the perfect subjunctive began to be used as a concessive form since the time of Cicero,[17] a model author who was studied at school in ancient Rome.

From the viewpoint of Latin linguistics, on the one hand, perfect subjunctive forms can express not only concession, but also prohibition or wish and are used in declarative

---

[12] On hypothetical statement in concessive clauses see Touratier 2013, 219–220.
[13] "'The concept 'concessive meaning' is not a semantic primitive, but is complicated and is formed on the basis of the concepts 'causal meaning', 'conditional meaning' and 'adversative meaning'", see Khrakovsky 2004, 10. (Храковский В. С. *Типология уступительных конструкций.* Санкт-Петербург, Наука, 2004, 10)
[14] Муталов Р. О., Вагизиева Н. А. *Категория наклонения в кадарском языке.* Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. 2019, 12 (10), 175–179.
[15] Мальцева А. А. Алюторский язык, в: Михальченко В. Ю. (ред.) *Язык и общество.* Москва, Азбуковник, 2016.
[16] On overt and covert grammatical categories see Whorf 1945.
[17] See Hofmann, Szantyr 1972, 332.

and interrogative sentences or in rhetorical questions (Panhuis 2006, 119). On the other hand, there is no grammatical marker of the concessive meaning in the Latin language.

The concessive interpretation is based on the context, or a concessive sentence may be followed by a contrasting one (Pinkster 2015, 361). In addition, the following words may indicate a concession: *sane* 'admittedly', *age* 'come', *esto* 'so be it'. Contrasting sentences may contain words *at* 'but, yet', *tamen* 'notwithstanding', *verum tamen* 'but yet, notwithstanding', *enim* 'truly, indeed', *certe* 'yet surely' (Pinkster 2015, 360–361; 509–510). As mentioned above, in Late Latin, the perfect subjunctive forms often come with *ut* 'although', *licet* 'even if, although, notwithstanding'.

Probably, from the point of view of modern linguistics, a concession in Latin language can be considered as a covert category, or a cryptotype. "Covert categories are expressed with words and verbal context. Neither lexical meanings nor syntactic connections themselves, but grammatical verbal signs, formed and combined in a sentence, are exponents of covert categories"[18] (Katsnelson 1972, 83).

## References

Chernysheva V. A. The Concept of Inchoativity in Works of Latin Grammarians. *Tomsk State University Journal* 2021, 466, 47–54 (in Russian).

Chernysheva V. A. *Verbal categories in the works of Roman grammarians*. Master's thesis (a manuscript). 2020 (in Russian).

Corpus corporum. URL: https://mlat.uzh.ch/browser?path=/14161 (accessed: 20.09.2023).

Digital Library of late antique Latin texts. URL: https://digiliblt.uniupo.it (accessed: 20.09.2023).

Glare P. G. W. (ed.) *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1968.

Jeep L. *Zur Geschichte der Lehre von den Redetheilen bei den Lateinischen Grammatikern*. Leipzig, Teubner, 1893.

Hofmann J. B., Szantyr A. *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. München, C. H. Beck, 1972.

Katsnelson S. D. Typology of Language and Speech Thinking. Leningrad, Nauka Publ., 1972 (in Russian).

Keil H. (ed.) *Grammatici Latini*. Leipzig, Teubner, 1855–1880.

Khrakovsky V. S. (ed.) *Typology of Concessive Structures.* St Petersburg, Nauka Publ., 2004 (in Russian).

Maltseva A. A. The Alyutor Language, in: Mikhalchenko V. Iu. (ed.) *Language and Society*. Moscow, Azbukovnik Publ., 2016 (in Russian).

Mutalov R., Vagizieva N. Category of Mood in the Kadar Language. *Philology. Theory & Practice* 2019, 10, 175–179 (in Russian).

Panhuis D. *Latin Grammar*. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 2006.

Pinkster H. *The Oxford Latin Syntax. Volume I: The Simple Clause*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2015.

Schad S. *A Lexicon of Latin Grammatical Terminology*. Pisa and Rome, Fabrizio Serra, 2007.

Thilo G., Hagen H. (ed.) *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina Commentarii*. Bd. 3. Leipzig, Teubner, 1883.

Touratier Ch. *Lateinische Grammatik: linguistische Einfuhrung in der lateinische Sprache*. Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2013.

Wessner P. (ed.) *Aelii Donati quod fertur commentum Terentii, accedunt Eugraphi commentum et scholia Bembina*. Leipzig, Teubner, 1908.

Whorf B. L. Grammatical Categories. *Language*, 1945, 21 (1), 1–11.

Zetzel J. E. G. *Critics, compilers, and commentators. An introduction to Roman philology, 200 BCE — 800 CE*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2018.

---

[18]  Кацнельсон С. Д. *Типология языка и речевое мышление*. Ленинград, Наука, 1972.

# Modus concessivus, species concessiva и species affirmativa у римских грамматиков*

*Влада Александровна Чернышева*

Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет,
Российская Федерация, 199034, Санкт-Петербург, Университетская наб., 7–9; v.chernysheva@spbu.ru

Цель статьи — проанализировать использование термина *concessivus/concessiva* 'уступительный' в латинских грамматических текстах, составляющих Corpus Grammaticorum Latinorum и Digital Library of late antique Latin texts, а также рассмотреть значение уступительности как грамматическую категорию. В ряде грамматических источников (Probus, *Ars* Диомеда, *Victorini sive Palaemoni Ars*, *Ars* Кледония, *Explanationes*) среди глагольных категорий отмечается категория уступительности, а именно *modus concessivus* 'уступительное наклонение', тогда как в других этот термин не упоминается. Текст Диомеда примечателен еще и тем, что уступительность включена в понятие вида — термина, охватывающего разнородные грамматические явления у римских грамматистов. При этом грамматист выделяет не одно значение уступки, а два, которые определяются терминами — *species concessiva* 'уступительный вид' (описывает ситуации, не желательные для говорящего в настоящем и будущем) и *species affirmativa* 'утвердительный вид' (описывает ситуации, которые в реальности не произошли). Все три термина, упомянутые в названии статьи, соответствуют *coniunctivus concessivus* и указывают на форму перфекта конъюнктива, например *feceris* 'даже если бы ты сделал'. В современном языкознании значение уступки выражается не только перфектом, но и презенсом конъюнктива, и таким образом, не имеет однозначного формального воплощения, как в античном языкознании. Предполагается, что уступка в латинском языке подпадает под понятие скрытой грамматической категории (криптотипа), тогда как уступка, как она представлена в римских грамматических источниках, может рассматриваться в качестве явной категории (фенотипа).

*Ключевые слова:* латынь, римские грамматики, скрытая категория, криптотип, явная категория, фенотип, уступка, уступительное значение, наклонение.