

■ **Οργανωτική Επιτροπή Συνεδρίου**
Organizing Committee

Z o e G a v r i i l i d o u
A n g e l i k i E f t h y m i o u
E v a n g e l i a T h o m a d a k i
Penelope Kambakis-Vougiouklis

■ **Γραμματειακή Υποστήριξη**
Secretarial Support

Ioannis Anagnostopoulos
Maria Georganta
Polyxeni Intze
Nikos Mathioudakis
Lidija Mitits
Eleni Papadopoulou
Anna Sarafianou
Elina Chadjirapa

■ **ISBN 978-960-99486-7-8**

■ **Τυπογραφική επιμέλεια**

Νίκος Μαθιουδάκης
Ελένη Παπαδοπούλου
Ελίνα Χατζηπαπά

■ **Σχεδιασμός εξώφυλλου**

Νίκος Μαθιουδάκης

■ **Copyright © 2012**

Δημοκρίτειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θράκης
Democritus University of Thrace

Εργαστήριο Σύνταξης, Μορφολογίας, Φωνητικής, Σημασιολογίας, *+Μόρφωση* ΔΠΘ
Laboratory of Syntax, Morphology, Phonetics, Semantics, *+MorPhoSE* DUTH

Διεθνές Συνέδριο Ελληνικής Γλωσσολογίας
International Conference of Greek Linguistics

www.icgl.gr

THE FORM AND DISTRIBUTION OF SOME NEGLECTED MORPHOSYNTACTIC CATEGORIES IN THE HISTORY OF GREEK

Ioannis Fykias
University
of Salzburg, Austria
ioannis.fykias@sbg.ac.at

Christina Katsikadeli
University
of Salzburg, Austria
christina.katsikadeli@sbg.ac.at

ABSTRACT

In the present paper, we focus attention on the realization of the morphosyntactic Case category: Locative, and the Number (and Gender) category: Collective within the nominal and the pronominal paradigms and we examine their distinctive syntactic distribution in some special contexts and domains (e.g. Locative in connection with prepositional constructions, cf. Fykias 1997, 2003) in the course of the history of the Greek language, as well as some distinctive morphological and semantic properties (in the case of Collective). On the basis of widely accepted criteria, it is argued in favor of including these categories to the inventory of morphosyntactic categories of certain phases of Ancient and Modern Greek.

1. Introduction

From a purely typological point of view, *Case* distinctions such as *Locative* and *Comitative*, and *Number* distinctions like *Collective*, are far from unusual in a wide spectrum of languages. On the other hand, the conditions necessary for unanimously recognizing these morphosyntactic distinctions as a genuine part of the inventory of basic grammatical categories of a particular language seem to involve a) the *grammatical tradition* of the language involved (i.e. whether these distinctions have been established as grammatical categories in influential monumental accounts), and b) their *morphological representation*: one of the most prominent criteria seems to be whether the respective categories are realized – in a maximally distinctive fashion – (e.g. as specialized affixes) within the *nominal* paradigm.

In most standard analyses of Modern Greek, the categories mentioned above have not received special attention. One of the reasons for their exclusion from the set of basic grammatical categories is probably the fact that they are not overtly morphologically realized (as distinctive endings) within the nominal paradigm of Modern Greek (in the strict sense of the term), although there is ample evidence for the existence of those distinctions in Early Ancient Greek as well as in some Ancient Greek dialects (cf. Luraghi 2003, Seiler 1959), provided that we are ready to operate with standard heuristic procedures used by descriptive linguistics.

1.1 Locative and Instrumental in Archaic Greek

Within the framework of historical comparative Indo-European linguistics, the *communis opinio* purports that a limited number of forms attested in Classical Greek documents (as in 1 and 2 below) represent genuine instances of continuation of Indo-European Locative case.

- (1) Attic οἶκος (Dat.): οἶκοι (Loc. “at home”)

The two forms in (1a) are both morphologically and semantically clearly distinct. The locative formatives also occur mainly in association with some place names (e.g. Ἴσθμοῖ “on the Isthmos”).

- (2) Relics of earlier (paradigmatic) locative forms ending in -οι and -εἰ (ποῖ “where”, ἐκεῖ “there”), or respectively instrumental forms ending in -ω, -ᾶ, -ῆ (οὕτως “so”, λάθρα “in secret”, παντὶ “everywhere”). The form ending in -ω also occurs in adverbs that are canonically derived from

adjectives with the addition of -ς, compare κακῶς “badly” (cf. Wackernagel 2009: 371, Lorentzatos 1989, 34-39, Bartonek 2003: 151).

(3) This interpretation has been corroborated by the evidence adduced in connection with the discovery of Mycenaean Linear B tablets. In the Linear B documents, there were identified some dozens of lexical items with the ending -pi, that corresponds to the Homeric -φι. In the Mycenaean, however, this ending has a far more unambiguous function than -φι in Homer. It occurs only as plural ending and has an instrumental meaning. (vs. ἰφι “with force”)

(4) It has been standardly assumed that the case system in Mycenaean Greek consisted of 6 paradigmatic cases (Nom., Gen., Dat.-Loc., Acc., Voc., Instr.-Abl.). This pertains to masculine and feminine nouns in singular (cf. Bartoněk 2003: 160f). Syncretism of dative, locative and instrumental in Ancient Greek is clearly visible from morphology: the endings of the dative case in the various inflectional classes correspond to different endings of all three cases in the other Indo-European languages. The three cases did not merge at the same time: the earliest Greek texts, the Mycenaean tablets (about 1150 BCE), provide evidence for a stage at which the dative and the locative had already merged, but the instrumental was still distinct. (Bartonek 2003: 161-2, Hajnal 2006: 58-62). Later in the history of Greek (i.e. in the historical periods of Classical Greek and Hellenistic Greek) we could claim that there no forms of locative and instrumental attested. But at some point in the stage of Modern Greek we can show that there is a revival of the locative along with some cases.

A key to understanding this development is capturing some parallel developments in the grammatical system which led to a dramatic reorganization in the domain of pronominals. A grammatical phenomenon that has repeatedly been observed in the history of a great number of languages is the remodeling of the *nominal* system under the influence of the *pronominal* system and vice versa. This diachronic process has been documented in the history of many Indo-European languages, among which Greek takes a prominent position, both because of its long history and its documentation (at least as far as some important periods are concerned). The *morphological* dimension of this issue has received much attention in historical and theoretical linguistic studies. The evolution of both nominal and pronominal endings and the development of a separate set of clitic pronouns with distinctive properties belong to the well studied aspects of this issue (Dressler 1966, Seiler 1958). Dressler 1966: 39f offers a diagram outlining the reshaping of the system of personal pronouns of Greek in three successive periods.

(5) distinction full noun-accented pronoun- clitic pronoun

Classical Greek

1P.		2. P.		3. P.	
stressed	unstressed	stressed	unstressed	stressed	unstressed
ἐγώ	--	σύ	--	αὐτός, -ό,-ή	--
ἐμοῦ	μου	σοῦ	σου	αὐτοῦ, ἧς	αὐτοῦ, ἧς
ἐμοί	μοι	σοί	σοι	αὐτῶ, ἧ	αὐτῶ, ἧ
ἐμέ	με	σέ	σε	αὐτόν, -ό,-ήν	αὐτον, -ο,-ην
ἡμεῖς	--	ὑμεῖς	--	αὐτοί, -ά, αἱ	--
ἡμῶν	ἡμων	ὑμῶν	ὑμων	αὐτῶν	αὐτῶν
ἡμῖν	ἡμιν	ὑμῖν	ὑμιν	αὐτοῖς, -αῖς	αὐτοῖς, -αῖς
ἡμᾶς	ἡμας	ὑμᾶς	ὑμας	αὐτούς, -ά, -άς	αὐτους, -α, -ας

B. Imperial Greek

ἐγώ	--	ἐσύ	--	αὐτός, -ό,-ή	--
ἐμοῦ	μου	ἐσοῦ	σου	αὐτοῦ, ἧς	του, της
ἐμέν	με	ἐσέν	σε	αὐτόν, -ό,-ήν	τον, το, την
ἐμεῖς	--	ἐσεῖς	--	αὐτοί, -ά, αἱ	--
ἐμῶν	μων	ἐσῶν	σων	αὐτῶν	των
ἐμᾶς	μας	ἐσαῖς	σας	αὐτούς, -ά, -άς	τους, τα, τες

C. Modern Greek

εγώ --	εσύ --	αυτός, -ό, -ή	--
εμένα μου	εσένα σου	αυτού, -ής	του, της
με	σε	αυτόν, -ό, -ήν	τον, το, την
εμείς--	εσείς --	αυτοί, -ά, -ές,	--
εμάς μας	εσάς σας	αυτών	τους
		αυτούς, -ά, -ές	τους, τα, τις/τες

1.2 The case distinctions of Modern Greek

In this paper, we will set out to pinpoint at some rather neglected aspects of the *purely syntactic* behaviour of tonic and *clitic* pronouns. Focussing on their case behaviour in connection with prepositions and adverbs, we compare the system of cases of Modern Greek (MG) with the case system of Ancient Greek (Classical and Hellenistic). Our working hypothesis is that the case system of clitic pronouns began to develop independently from the case system of lexical nouns and tonic pronouns at some very crucial points at some point after the first centuries A.D. One of the crucial parameters seems to involve the distinction: *structural* vs. *oblique* case (stated in moderately descriptive terms).

In Fykias 1995, 1997, there was presented some evidence supporting the existence of *Locative* and *Comitative* as independent abstract cases of MG in the context of complex PPs with locative or comitative meaning. Those cases are not commonly assumed to constitute a natural part of the case system of MG, partly because they are difficult to detect, since they are not canonically realized as morphological cases in nouns and in tonic pronouns. Their distribution is strictly limited to *clitic pronouns* in morphological *Genitive* in the aforementioned contexts. Nevertheless, specific semantic and distributional properties (see 6-9 below) clearly distinguish the cases instantiated in clitics in these special contexts (e.g. πάνω του, μαζί του) from the homonymous *Possessive Genitive* (e.g. το βιβλίο του).

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| (6) a. πάνω τους | upon them |
| b. μαζί τους | together with them |
| c. εναντίον τους | against them |
| (7) a. * πάνω των σπιτιών | upon the houses GEN |
| b. * μαζί των παιδιών | together the children GEN |
| c. εναντίον των παιδιών | against the children GEN |
| (8) a. * πάνω τους των σπιτιών | upon them GEN the houses GEN |
| b. * μαζί τους των παιδιών | together them GEN the children GEN |
| c. (?)εναντίον τους των παιδιών | against them GEN the children GEN |
| d. * μαζί τους με τα παιδιά | together them GEN with the children ACC |
| e. εναντίον του του Γιάννη | against him GEN the Jannis GEN |
| (9) a. το σπίτι του Γιάννη | the house the Jannis GEN |
| b. το σπίτι του | the house him GEN |
| c. (?)το σπίτι του του Γιάννη | the house him GEN the Jannis GEN |

The special semantic or thematic properties of the prepositional constructions are the relevant factor, as far as case behavior or even the mere availability of the clitic are concerned. In Fykias 1997 it was shown, that there are crucial grammaticality differences distinguishing combinations involving instances of the same preposition depending on whether this lexical item has the genuine locative reading or not, as illustrated in sequences like the following in (10):

(10a) *αυτό είναι το άρθρο/θέμα που η καθηγήτρια έκανε μια διάλεξη πάνω του
This is the article/topic that the professor held a lecture on it

(10bi) * αυτό είναι το άρθρο/ βιβλίο που η Μαρία έγραψε μια κριτική πάνω του
this is the article/ book that the Maria wrote a review on it
(theme reading)

(10bii) αυτό είναι το βιβλίο που πάνω του η Μαρία έγραψε μια κριτική/σημείωση
this is the book that the Maria wrote a review/note on it
(locative reading)

The *πάνω* + *Clitic_{gen}* combination is possible only under a strict locative reading of *πάνω* (7bii). There seems to be a close connection between the presence of what can be interpreted as a genuine locative feature in *πάνω*, and the possibility to obtain the sequence *πάνω* + *Clitic_{gen}*. This fact could not be explained, if a general nominal genitive feature were responsible for the case of the clitic. The hypothesis, that the locative nature of the construction is the decisive factor, receives additional support, if we apply standard substitution tests such as the Question-Answer test by employing the specifically locative *πού* - *wh-question*, as in (11).

(11) πού πάνω έγραψε η Μαρία μια κριτική;
πάνω στο βιβλίο (only locative reading possible)

πάνω σε τί έγραψε η Μαρία μια κριτική;
πάνω στο βιβλίο (both readings are possible)

As soon as a locative interpretation is secured, the P + Clitic combination becomes possible. Under consideration of all those facts, one can arrive at a general comprehensive typology of MG prepositions and preposition-like elements which can be subsumed under (9):

(12) General typology of MG Prepositions

Type I Prepositions are prepositions co-occurring either with a full ‘nominal phrase’ or with a ‘tonic pronoun’ realized as morphological accusative but not with clitics. We can divide Type I Prepositions into the following subtypes:

Type Ia: σε (in, at, to), από (from), με (with), για (for)

Type Ib: (privative) χωρίς (without), δίχως (without), έως / ως (up to), μέχρι (up to), ίσαμε (up to), (concessive) παρά (despite, in spite of), κατά (according to)

Type Ic: (temporal) μετά (after), πριν (before), επί (during), κατά (during), κατά (at/about)

Type II Prepositions are prepositions co-occurring either with a Prepositional Phrase headed by some Type Ia prepositions (like σε, από and με), which take a full nominal phrase or a tonic pronoun in morphological Accusative as a complement, or with a *Clitic Pronoun* morphologically realized as Genitive (e.g. του, της in a combination like μαζί του (with him or accompanying him)). This *prima facie* exotic alternation is their trade mark, as it were.

Type II a. Locative: (ε)πάνω (upon, on), κάτω (under), μπροστά /εμπρός (in front of), πίσω (behind), μέσα (in, inside), έξω (outside, beyond), ανάμεσα (between), δίπλα (beside), πλάι κοντά (near), μακριά (far away from)

Type II b.

Comitative: μαζί (together with)

Type II c. or rather Type IV

Temporal: (+ από) ύστερα, έπειτα, μετά (after), πριν (before)

Manner: σύμφωνα με, ανάλογα με

Type III Prepositions co-occurring either with a full nominal phrase realized as morphological Genitive or a Clitic pronoun also realized as Genitive (e.g. εναντίον του Πέτρου (against Petros-GEN) and also εναντίον του). Apart from εναντίον, ενώπιον, there are less clear cases like κατά (against),

υπέρ (in favour of), μεταξύ (among, between), εξαιτίας (because of), εις βάρος, κατά τη διάρκεια (during).

In Fykias 2003: 656, there was adduced distributional evidence for an additional abstract case, namely *Oblique Accusative* in the context of prepositions assigning morphological Accusative like σε, από but also χωρίς. The distribution of Oblique Accusative is restricted to *tonic pronouns* and lexical nouns.

So the essentials of the analysis proposed can be subsumed as (13a) and (13b):

Assumptions:

(13a) Clitic pronouns cannot manifest all abstract cases available in Modern Greek.

(13b) Lexical nouns and tonic pronouns cannot manifest all abstract cases available in Modern Greek.

Table (14) illustrates a *tentative* sketch of the system of abstract cases in MG as well as their distribution depending on the exact nature of the nominal categories that they are associated with. It is conceived of as an answer to the question of whether the abstract cases under consideration are available or not.

(14)	Lexical nouns	& tonic pronouns	Clitic pronouns
Structural accusative:	yes		yes
<u>Oblique accusative:</u>	yes		no
Dative:	yes		yes
Possessive:	yes		yes
<u>Partitive:</u>	no		yes
<u>Locative:</u>	no		yes
<u>Comitative:</u>	no		yes

The context of Oblique Accusative

(15)a. πήγα με τον Γιάννη

(15)b. *πήγα με τον

(16)a. πήγα χωρίς τον Γιάννη

(16)b. *πήγα χωρίς τον

(17) a. μετά (από) τον Γιάννη

(17) b. *μετά τον

(17)c. μετά *(από) αυτόν

There has been no convincing explanation of the fact that the configuration: (*morphological Accusative* “assigning” preposition + accusative clitic pronoun) is simply not available in MG. The analyses suggested so far fail to account for the fact that the same generalization applies to type Ib and type Ic prepositions as well (see 12). A **clitic-clitic* filter account cannot be the right answer for configurations involving stressed type Ib prepositions like μέχρι, χωρίς, (the trisyllabic!) ίσαμε, έως. On the other hand, there is ample evidence that the **clitic-clitic* filter solution is a far too powerful explanation, as the acceptability of examples like (18) below, involving type II and type III prepositions clearly suggests.

(18) θέλετε τον καφέ με ή χωρίς ζάχαρη;
do you like the coffee with or without sugar?

2. Locating diachronic changes and variation

As mentioned above, reliable morphological evidence shows that the case system of clitic pronouns has developed independently from the case system of lexical nouns. The crucial parameter seems to

involve the distinction *structural* vs. *oblique case*, and this distinction enables us to capture significant descriptive generalizations on structural and oblique abstract cases both in the synchrony and in the diachrony of Greek.

Examples with locative quasi prepositional items of New Testament (NT) Greek like *ἐπάνω*, “upon”, *ὀπίσω* “behind” and *ἐνώπιον* “in the sight of” that are still present in MG (in the case of *ἐνώπιον* in a more formal/learned register of MG) and illustrate that, in NT Greek, there was *no asymmetry* between clitic pronouns on the one hand and lexical nouns and tonic pronouns on the other, as far as case distribution is concerned. Remarkably, we are in the fortunate position to compare the behaviour of the same lexical items in the course of their history and development. Nevertheless, there is a methodological limitation in connection with the second part of the syntagma *preposition + pronominal*: Only in the case of the 1st person singular we can clearly distinguish between tonic pronouns and clitics (in particular *ἐμοῦ* vs. *μου*, *ἐμοί* vs. *μοι*, and *ἐμέ* vs. *με*), as far as AG pronominal data are involved, cf. the following examples (19)

(19a) *ὀπίσω* + full lexical noun in morphological genitive

(i) 1Ti 5:15 ἤδη γάρ τινες ἐξετράπησαν *ὀπίσω τοῦ Σατανᾶ*.

“For some (widows) have already turned *away to follow Satan*. (lit. behind Satan)”

(ii) 2Pe 2:10 μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς *ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μiasμοῦ πορευομένους*

“especially *those who satisfy their flesh* (lit. the ones behind the flesh) by indulging in its passions”

(19b) *ὀπίσω* + tonic pronoun in morphological genitive

(19c) *ὀπίσω* + clitic pronoun in morphological genitive

(i) Mat 3:11 *ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μου ἐστίν*,

“but the one who is coming *after me* is stronger than I am,”

(ii) Mat 4:19 Δεῦτε *ὀπίσω μου*, καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς ἄλλεῖς ἀνθρώπων.

“Come *after Me*, and I will make you fishers of people.”

(20) a. *ἐπάνω* + full lexical noun in morphological genitive

Mat 5:14 οὐ δύναται πόλις κρυβῆναι *ἐπάνω ὄρους* κειμένη

“A city located *on a hill* can't be hidden”

b. *ἐπάνω* + tonic pronoun in morphological genitive

Mat 21:7 καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπ' αὐτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια, καὶ ἐπεκάθισεν *ἐπάνω αὐτῶν*.

“and did put on them their garments, and set *him* upon them”

Mat 23:18 ὃς δ' ἂν ὀμόσῃ ἐν τῷ δώρῳ *τῷ ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ* ὀφείλει:

but whoever may swear by the gift that is upon it--is debtor!

c. *ἐπάνω*+ clitic pronoun in morphological genitive

LXX 2Sa 1:9 Στήθι δὴ *ἐπάνω μου* καὶ θανάτωσόν με.

“Stand, I pray thee, *beside me*, and slay me”

In sharp contrast to the MG-pattern in (15-17 above) there is a remarkable parallelism between (21) to the pattern possessive constructions canonically instantiate. Finally, there are prepositions like *ἐνώπιον* or *ἐναντίον* which have preserved the same pattern (but at least in the case of *ἐναντίον* they have changed their meaning) to our times and which essentially behave like a lexical noun cooccurring with possessive genitive.

(21)

Luc 1:15. ἔσται γὰρ μέγας *ἐνώπιον Κυρίου*,

For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord

Luc 1:17 καὶ αὐτὸς προελεύσεται *ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ* ἐν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει

And he shall go before him in the spirit and power

The following sequences in Mat 3:14 and Luc 1:43 are especially interesting, since they represent some of the very rare known cases of the combination P + accusative Clitic in the history of Greek.

(22)

Mat 3:14 σὺ ἔρχῃ πρὸς με;
comest thou to me (Clitic_{ACC})?

Luc 1:34 εἶπεν δὲ Μαριάμ πρὸς τὸν ἄγγελον
Then said Mary unto the angel

Luc 1.43 ἵνα ἔλθῃ ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ κυρίου μου πρὸς ἐμέ;
that the mother of my Lord should come to me(tonic pronoun_{ACC})?

3. Collective as a morphological and syntactic category of Ancient and Modern Greek

3.1 Ancient Greek

Every student of Ancient Greek is familiar with a rather exotic phenomenon of the Attic dialect, the so-called τὰ ζῷα τρέχει-rule ('the animals are running'), which is very often analyzed in standard grammars as in Smyth 1956: "A neuter plural subject is regarded as a collective and has its verb in the singular: καλὰ ἦν τὰ σφάγια 'the sacrifices were propitious' Xen. A. 4.3.19." with the additional remark: "The neuter plural seems to have been originally in part identical in form with the feminine singular in ā, and to have had a collective meaning". This agreement pattern: subject (neuter plural) + verb (third person singular), was eventually lost. In most of the dialects we have no traces of this pattern. It is preserved most faithfully in Attic Greek, though in the Attic based Koine, it begins to decline, with the result that in the NT and early Christian literature there is considerable variation in its use. Thanks to the progress of Indo-European comparative linguistics it soon became evident, that this usage is not a Greek innovation, since it systematically occurs in Vedic, Avestan and Hittite as well. It is inherited and it reflects the fact that the plural of the neuter does not have the same meaning as the plural of masculine and feminine. Especially important, is Johannes Schmidt's (1889) thesis in his treatise on the plural forms of neuters in Indo-European, regarding the primary relatedness of the neuter plural with certain singular collectives of feminine gender. Wackernagel also adduces a typological argument from languages which make a formal distinction between words for animate and inanimate objects (in Mexicano, for example), only the animate nouns have a plural. (cf. Wackernagel 2009: 136ff). Apart from this most salient rather syntactic feature¹ of collective nouns, it can be shown that they have further traits that are characteristic of this kind of constructions. Among the collective items, we often meet nouns with two plurals like in Hittite (*alpas* 'cloud' *alpes* 'clouds' *alpa* 'cloud-mass') and even in Latin (*locus* 'place' *loci* 'places' *loca* 'places' (Latin / Umbrian Latin *uir* 'man' Latin *uiri* 'men' Umbrian *uuro* 'people'(cf. Clackson 2007 :102). This fact can be illustrated in connection with Greek by means of the following examples:

Nouns with two plurals (cf. Meier-Brügger 2006:116).

Nominative singular	Nominative plural	Collective plural
ἀστήρ 'star'	ἀστέρες	ἄστρα
δεσμός	δεσμοί	δεσμά
ἰός	ιοί	ἰά
κέλευθος	κέλευθοι	κέλευθα
κύκλος 'wheel, circle'	κύκλοι 'circles'	κύκλα 'set of wheels' (of a chariot)
μηρός 'thigh'	μηροί 'thigh-pieces'	μῆρα 'agglomeration of thigh-meat'
οἶκος	οἴκοι	οἶκα-δε
σίτος		σίτα
Τάρταρος		Τάρταρα
μυκ. ka-po=karpós		μυκ. ka-pa=kárpa
μυκ. o-no		μυκ. o-na

¹ Cf. Wackernagel 2009: 139: "The tendency to treat singular nouns with plural meaning as plurals, despite their form, and when, e.g., they are in subject position, to put their verb in the plural (even though this topic really belongs under grammatical agreement). In Greek there are examples already in Homer" and in other poets guided by a *constructio κατά σύνεσιν* principle. Some of the dialects attest in ordinary speech a regular preference for the usage, e.g. Cretan, πόλις, στρατός ('city', 'army') regularly taking a plural verb.

The interpretation of the significance of the original distribution is not always possible. But it appears that what we have called the *-h₂ plural* has more of a collective meaning, and the regular plural has a more distributive meaning; the contrast between these two formations is lexically restricted. Furthermore, it is not difficult to fit a distributive or collective meaning to a certain form according to context, particularly in the case of languages where we only have a restricted corpus (cf. Clackson 2007 :102)

3.2 Collectives in Modern Greek

Is there any justification for assuming collective as a morphosyntactic category: for Modern Greek? If we are ready to categorize as collective constructions that do not fulfill all the criteria but most of the criteria, then we are faced with an interesting situation in Modern Greek. The criterion that is definitely not met is the agreement pattern: subject (preferably neuter plural) + verb (third person singular). For some potential candidates see 22-25 below:

(23)

Nouns occurring only in plural or mainly in a plural form (cf. Triantafyllidis 1991: 224). A great number of common nouns with intrinsically collective meaning: βαφτίσια (baptism ceremony), γένια (beard), γεράματα (old age), εννιάμερα (novena, memorial service held 9 days after a person's death), κάλαντα ((Christmas) carols), λύτρα (ransom), μεσάνυχτα (midnight), μετρητά (cash), παλαμάκια (clapping, applause), παρακάλια (entreaties), παρασκήνια (wings backstage), πεθερικά (in-laws), πρόθυρα (threshold, verge), προικιά (dowry), ρέστα (change), τάρταρα, τρεχάματα (running about, hectic time), χαιρετίσματα (greetings), χαράματα (dawn, daybreak), χειροκροτήματα (clapping, applause) etc.

(24) Words that also belong to this category are a) collective mass nouns par excellence like: ασημικά (silverware), ζυμαρικά (pastry), όσπρια (legumes, pulses), πουλερικά (poultry), χορταρικά (vegetables); b) Words that denote objects which are dual or complex by nature (τα γυαλιά, τα κιάλια) or dvandva compounds like: αμπελοχώραφα (fields and vineyards), γιδοπρόβατα (sheep and goats), γυναικόπαιδα (women and children) etc.; c) Some nominalized adjectives like: ψιλά (small change), ρηγά (shallows), τα οικονομικά (the economic financial situation), and items meaning denoting reward for some work or task: κόμιστρα (fare, transportation charges), ασφάλιστρα (insurance rate); d) Words denoting a language, like: αρβανίτικα, ελληνικά, κινέζικα etc., cf. Triantafyllidis 1991: 224-5.

(25) Triantafyllidis 1991: 225: a) Names of holidays: Χριστούγεννα, (Christmas), Κούλουμα (Shrove Day feast); b) toponyms²: Σέρρες, Σπέτσες, Ουράλια etc; The name of some cities or towns that is usually a singular may also occur in a plural form: Αθήνα - Αθήνες, Θήβα - Θήβες³.

(26) Nouns with double declension/two plurals:

a) With change of gender in plural: ο πλούτος-τα πλούτη (wealth), ο σανός — τα σανά (hay fodder), ο τάρταρος underworld — τα τάρταρα (the bowels of the earth). The noun νιότη has as plural the form τα νιάτα (that do not have a singular form).

b) With a double gender in plural (the two forms of plural sometimes differ in meaning, cf. Meier-Brügger 2006: 116 on Mycenaean *ka-pa*), namely a plural form in distributive function and a plural form (neuter) in collective function:

ο βάτος οι βάτοι — τα βάτα bramble

ο βράχος οι βράχοι — τα βράχια rock

ο δεσμός οι δεσμοί, bond and with an abstract meaning, δεσμοί φιλίας — τα δεσμά

ο γκρεμνος οι γκρεμοί — τα γκρεμνά precipice (Triantafyllidis 1991: 257)

ο καπνός οι καπνοί (smoke) — τα καπνά, tobacco

ο λαιμός οι λαιμοί — τα λαιμά for the surface of the neck or the throat and usually for a neck/throat sickness

ο λόγος οι λόγοι — τα λόγια (genitive των λόγων)

ο ναύλος οι ναύλοι fare) — τα ναύλα expenses

² Symeonides 1992: 59 remarks in connection with toponyms based on Greek loans in the language of Albanian speaking Greeks who allot the diminutive suffix *-za* a new collective meaning, e.g. Βάρκι-ζα, Βελανιδέ-ζα.

³ Toponyms in Pl. like Θήβες occur (mainly) in oblique cases: των Πατρών, των Αθηνών, *οι Αθήνες, *οι Πάτρεις (older forms: Αθήναι, Πάτραι).

The difference reflects a difference in point of view: the singular stresses the nonpersonal collectivity of the group, and the plural stresses the personal individuality within the group. As a last collective subcategory, it is interesting to note that in MG collective in connection with pronominal categories is also expressed as neuter plural.

- (27) Τα θέλω όλα
I want all things
I want everything

4. Final remarks

Wackernagel (2009: 138) remarks in connection with collective on the possibility for several morphosyntactic constructions and phenomena to recur in the course of the history of a language. “In a sense, the Romance languages regressed to an ancient state of affairs when feminine singulars evolved out of Latin neuter plurals, as in *la voile* ('sail') from Lat. *uella*, or *la joie* ('joy') from Lat. *gaudia*”. In the same vein, Kuryłowicz (1964, preface) claims “Such shifts as iterative>durative ... adverb> ‘concrete case’>grammatical case, collective>plural ... recur constantly and independently in all languages. They represent diachronic universals and must be somehow enrooted, directly or indirectly, in the elementary speech situation.” We are convinced that this possibility of regressing can be utilized in connection with Cases. We believe to have shown that Locative Case in the course of the history of Greek followed a life cycle of a kind, as suggested by Blake 2004 :161f., who notes that “there are some languages, including the Indo-Iranian branch of Indo-European, where the development of ‘new’ case markers is attested”. By about 1150 BCE the dative and the locative had already merged, but the instrumental was still distinct. (Bartonek 2003: 161-2, Hajnal 2006: 58-62). In the historical periods of Classical Greek and Hellenistic Greek there no forms of locative and instrumental attested. But at some point in the stage of MG, there was a revival of the locative in connection with clitic pronouns in the restricted domain of locative prepositional expressions.

References

- Blake, Barry J. 2004. *Case. Second Edition*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Bartoněk, Antonin 2003. *Handbuch des mykenischen Griechisch*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Carl Winter.
- Cardinaletti Anna & Michal Starke. 1995. “The Typology of Structural Deficiency”. *FAS Papers in Linguistics*. I ed. by Artemis Alexiadou et al. 1-55. Berlin.
- Clackson, James. 2007. *Indo-European Linguistics. An Introduction*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Corbett, Greville G. 2004 (12001). *Number*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Dressler, Wolfgang. 1966. „Von altgriechischen zum neugriechischen System der Personalpronomina“. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 71: 39-63.
- Eichner, Heiner 1985. “Das Problem des Ansatzes eines urindogermanischen Numerus ‘Kollektiv’”. In *Akten der VII. Fachtagung der indogermanischen Gesellschaft*. Berlin 1983, hrsg. von Schlerath, B. 134-169. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Fykias, Ioannis. 2003. “Modern Greek abstract Cases in prepositional contexts”. In: *Greek Studies. 23rd Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics*. 649-657. Thessaloniki.
- Fykias, Ioannis. 1997. “The case system of Modern Greek: evidence from PP”. In G. Drachman, A. Malikouti-Drachman, C. Klidi and I. Fykias (ed.): *Greek Linguistics* 95, 439-448, Salzburg.
- Fykias, Ioannis 1995. «Οι προθετικές φράσεις της Νέας Ελληνικής». *Studies in Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the 15th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics* 352-359, Thessaloniki.
- Hajnal, Ivo 2006. “Die Tafeln aus Theben und ihre Bedeutung für die griechische Dialektologie”. In Deger-Jalkotzy, Sigrid, Oswald Panagl (eds.): *Die neuen Linear B-Texte aus Theben*. Akten des internationalen Kolloquiums and der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 5.-6. Dezember 2002. 53-69. Wien: ÖAW.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1964. *The inflectional categories of Indo-European*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Lorentzatos, Panagis 1989. *Ιστορικό συντακτικό της Αρχαίας Ελληνικής. Β' Έκδοσις*. Athens: Kakoulidis.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 2003. *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases: The expression of semantic roles in Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Meier-Brügger, Michael. 2003. *Indo-European Linguistics*. Berlin-New York: De Gruyter.
- Meier-Brügger, Michael. 2006. „Sprachliche Beobachtungen“. In: Deger-Jalkotzy, S., O. Panagl (eds.): *Die neuen Linear B-Texte aus Theben*. Akten des internationalen Kolloquiums and der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 5.-6. Dezember 2002. 111-118. Wien: ÖAW.

- Melchert H. Craig. 2011. "The PIE Collective Plural and the 'ζῶα τρέχει-rule'". In Krisch Th., Th. Lindner (eds): *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog*. Akten der VII. Fachtagung der indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Salzburg 2008. 395-400. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Seiler, Hansjakob. 1959. "Zur Systematik und Entwicklungsgeschichte der griechischen Nominaldeklinaton". *Glotta* 37: 41-67.
- Smyth, Herbert W. 1956. *Greek Grammar*. Revised by G. Messing. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Symeonidis, Charalampos P. 1992: *Εισαγωγή στην ελληνική ονοματολογία*. Thessaloniki: Kiriakidis.
- Triantafyllidis, Manolis 1991: *Νεοελληνική γραμματική (της Δημοτικής)*. Thessaloniki: Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών.
- Wackernagel, Jakob 2009: *Lectures on Syntax. With special Reference to Greek, Latin and Germanic*. Edited by David Langslow. Oxford: OUP.