Ilja Seržant

Morphosyntactic properties of the partitive genitive in the subject position in Ancient Greek[*]

Abstract: A surprising property of the Ancient Greek bare partitive genitive NP in the subject position is that it behaves morphosyntactically in many ways as a nominative-marked NP: (i) while being in the logical subject position, it triggers semantically driven verbal agreement and, (ii), it may be coordinated with nominatives. This is striking, since obliques typically do not have access to agreement in ancient Indo-European languages including Ancient Greek. To account for this discrepancy, I assume a covert head of the partitive genitive that is filled by *pro* with an arbitrary reference (*pro*_{arb}) by default; else, this position can be filled by any quantifier or determiner. It is this *pro*_{arb} that gets Case and triggers verbal agreement. The presence of the *pro*_{arb} in Ancient Greek explains also why the "independent" partitive genitive is not restricted to structural positions only (as are partitives, e. g., in Finnic languages) but can occur at any position including non-argumental adverbials.

Keywords: partitive, non-canonical subject, verbal agreement, Indo-European, case

Ilja Seržant: Department of Linguistic, Literary and Aesthetic Studies, University of Bergen, P.O. Box 7805, NO-5020 Bergen, Norway, serzant@web.de

1 Introduction

Extensive research on oblique subjects and their relation to canonical ones is taking place (cf., inter alia, Aikhenvald, Dixon & Ōnishi 2001; Bhaskararao & Subbarao 2004; Barðdal 2009). Though the main focus of attention is directed to the lexically driven oblique subjects, i. e. those oblique

subjects that effect from the lexical semantics of the verb. Much less attention has been paid to those oblique subjects that do not result form the verb's lexical entailments but are rather governed by the semantics of the clause.

The present paper aims at investigating the morphosyntactic properties of the independent partitive genitive (henceforth IPG), i. e. a partitive genitive that is not governed by any overt lexical head, in the subject position. The IPG overrides or alternates the structural case-marking of the subject in order to encode what I will refer to in this paper as partitive function without going into detail here (see on partitivity, inter alia, Hoeksema 1996; de Hoop 2003; the partitive function in Ancient Greek has been recently addressed in, inter alia, Luraghi 2003; Conti 2010; Napoli 2010; Seržant 2012). Notably, this phenomenon is somewhat restricted by the semantics of the predicate (see below).

This alternating subject case-marking is an instantiation of the phenomenon referred to in the literature as Differential Subject Marking (DSM) sensu lato (cf. Woolford 2008). I will show that the DSM in Ancient Greek triggered by the partitive function not only inheres in the alternation of the morphological case but also in how the subsequent subject-verb agreement is organized.

In the present paper I will distinguish between the "downstairs" DP/NP or the superset and the "upstairs" position or the subset, cf. the English partitive construction *some of the students*, where *some* encodes the subset or the overall meaning of the partitive construction while *the students* represents its superset (cf. von Heusinger 2002, von Heusinger & Kornfilt 2005; Kornfilt & von Heusinger 2009), sometimes also referred to as *generator* (Barwise and Cooper 1981) or *domain* (Lyons 1999: 100).

There was a long standing tradition in Classical Philology to assume that the IPG in subject position is in fact headed by an NP that has just been omitted via ellipsis, thus, representing a stylistic rather than a grammatical phenomenon. This has even led many philologists to emend the IPG in subject position with some kind of an overt nominative head in their critical text editions neglecting, thereby, the attestation of the (more archaic) manuscripts. The first extensive critical assessment of this approach has been provided in Nachmanson (1942). Nachmanson was one among the first to show that the IPG in the subject position must be regarded as a genuine grammatical phenomenon, basing his argumentation

on abundant data collected from various periods of Ancient Greek (cf., however, already Delbrück 1893: 332). His data collection still represents a point of departure for many scholars working on the IPG subject in Ancient Greek (including myself). The view adhered to by Nachmanson has been recently supported in Conti (2010).

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 I will discuss the agreement properties of the IPG in the subject position and suggest amendments to Conti's (2010) account. In Section 3 I demonstrate that an IPG-marked NP may be coordinated with any other case-marked NP (including nonstructural dative). Section 4 shows that the IPG has no restrictions on the thematic role of the argument it marks, while Section 5 presents examples where the IPG may also override the subject marking of the embedded subjects (such as AcI subjects). In Section 6 I provide an account of these typologically striking properties of the IPG in Ancient Greek.

2 Verbal agreement

I now turn to the agreement properties of the IPG in subject position. Conti (2010) was the first to claim that the IPG in subject position triggers verbal agreement in number and person. While this is generally true, a slight modification of Conti's pioneering claim is necessary. First, I have not found any sufficient evidence for the agreement in person, only for the agreement in number. Secondly, I will try to show below that the IPG in subject position does not trigger formal agreement along the formal properties of the superset/downstairs/embedded NP/DP as originally claimed by Conti; rather I argue for a semantically driven agreement with no regard to the number of the overtly expressed (genitive) NP. It is the logical or semantic value of the subset that controls agreement:

If the logical number of the subset (not superset!) is plural then it triggers the verb plural form, while it triggers the verb singular form if it is singular.

Additionally, in contrary to Conti (2010), I argue that there is no person agreement. The following examples (1)–(10) illustrate the agreement of the IPG. The following example, adopted from Nachmanson (1942: 17), shows that it is the logical number of the subset – singular in this case – that is copied on the predicate:

(1)   *Sigãn epḗ(i)nes'*:
      Be silent!

      hōs ep' exódō(i) klýō   tõn   éndothen
      as   at exit   hear:PRES.1SG the:GEN.PL inside:ADV
      chōroũntos
      go:PARTC.PRES.ACT.GEN.SG

      'Be silent! I hear as (if) [one] of them inside coming out at the
      exit' (S. El. 1322–3)

The example in (1) is somewhat complicated: the verb *klýō* 'I hear' takes
the genitive which is assigned to the present active participle '*the going,
coming out [one]*' that, in turn, predicates a complement clause of which
tõn éndothen 'of the [ones] inside' encodes the logical subject, i.e. the
logical subject of the participle. Syntactically, I take this construction to
be a participial subclause dependent on the matrix verb *klýō* 'I hear', i.e.
it can be compared with the English *raising-to-object* construction such
as *I hear him approaching* in which the logical subject of the participle is
raised into or, alternatively, is controlled by the object of the matrix verb
hear.[1]

   Although formally the embedded subject is marked as plural, its logi-
cal subset number of the IPG is singular '*the one that seems to approach
the exit*'. This is why the participle *chōroũntos* is marked with singular.
Even though, crosslinguistically, it is quite rare for the independent/bare
partitives to have singular subset value which typically remains indefinite
(and hence cannot be one which is definite) – e.g., the IPG in Baltic and
East Slavic cannot have this value at all (cf. Seržant forthcoming – this
is not the case with the IPG in Ancient Greek which may readily assume
this value for its subset. Thus, example (2) with a predicative IPG NP *tõn
ennéa archóntōn* illustrates singular value of the subset, because the pred-

---

1   Here, as in ex. (7) below, one can object that the participle *chōroũntos* is in fact the
    head of the partitive genitive plural *tõn éndothen*. This would imply nominalization
    of the participle. The nominalization of the participle here would require a definite
    article (thus: **toũ chōroũntos* '*the* going [one]'), without the article the construction
    seems odd in Classical Greek given the nominal analysis of the participle. This is also
    why there were different amendments (against the attestation of the mss.!) suggested,
    cf. Nachmanson (1942: 17). Apart from that, analogous semantic considerations as
    with ex. (7) speak against the nominal interpretation of the participle.

icative nouns have to agree with the subject noun in number in Ancient Greek.

(2) *Tí   me   kōlýei klēroũsthai   tõn*
     what me:ACC.SG hinders draw-a-lot:PASS/MID.INF the:GEN.PL
     ennéa archóntōn
     nine   archon:GEN.PL
     'What hinders me to be elected by the lot as [one] of the nine archons?' (Lys. Or. 24.13), adopted from Kühner & Gerth 1955: 375

The AcI (*accusativus cum infinitivo*) type subclause *me … klēroũsthai tõn ennéa archóntōn* is embedded under the matrix predicate *kōlýei* 'hinders'. The accusative singular *me* is the logical subject of the infinitival predicate *klēroũsthai* 'to be elected' extended by the predicative IPG *tõn ennéa archóntōn* 'of the nine archons'. The latter, even though being formally marked as plural, agrees with the embedded subject *me* 'me' in its logical singular number (cf. [one] in the translation above).

The next example is fully parallel: the predicative IPG's subset value agrees in logical singular number with the subject:

(3) *ẽ   tõn   ponērõn   ẽstha   kaì*
     Q.PRT the:GEN.PL villainous:GEN.PL be:IMPF.2SG and
     toichōrýchōn;
     wall-breaking:GEN.PL
     'Is it that you were a villainous [one] and a thief?' (Ar. Plu. 869)

The next example shows an IPG NP agreeing with the main verb along its subset value:

(4) *ẽn   dè toútōn   tõn   stathmõn hoùs pány*
     be:IMPF.3SG but such:GEN.PL the:GEN.PL stop:GEN.PL which very
     makroùs élaunen,   hopóte ẽ pròs hýdōr boúloito diatelésai
     long   go:IMPF.3SG whenever or to water wanted to reach
     ẽ pròs chilón
     or to   fresh fodder
     'And there was [one] of these stages which [he] (*scil.* Cyrus) made very long, whenever he wanted to reach water or fresh fodder.' (X. Anab. 1.5.7)

The verb *ēn* 'was' is singular-marked while the superset of the IPG is plural 'these stages'. On Conti's account (2010) such collocations should not exist. How can this passage be accounted for?

The traditional translation assumes the plural value of the subset, i.e. '*And there were these stages which …*' (inter alia, Brownson 1922, PDL). However, I assume that the verb's number explicitly signals that there has been one particular stage of those many long-distance-ones. And, indeed, in the next sentence the narrator describes one particular stage and what happened during this one particular stage.

> Once in particular, when they came upon a narrow, muddy place which was hard for the wagons to get through, Cyrus halted with his train of nobles and dignitaries and ordered Glus and Pigres to take some of the barbarian troops and help to pull the wagons out. (translated by Brownson 1922, PDL)

Brownson translates *kaì dḗ pote* as 'Once in particular, when' which has to do with how he renders (4). This is, however, not a necessary translation. First, the IPG never introduces its new participant into the discourse model in the sense that this participant can never be anaphorically accessed in the following discourse; in other words, the subset referent of the IPG is never stored in Ancient Greek (Seržant 2012). Thus, Xenophon cannot continue by anaphorically back-referring to the stage that is logically referred to in (3), e.g., with 'at *that time*' or 'during *this stage*'. So he uses *kaì dḗ pote*, which might be translated as 'and once they came …', in order to introduce this particular stage into his narrative. Thus, it seems that our claim with the logical subset being the controller of the verb form explains the singular in (4), whereas Conti's account offers no explanation for that.

The next example from Demosthenes (Ol. 1 26.4–5) illustrates the logical singular subset [*one*] from the plural superset *tõn atopōtátōn* 'of the most awkward things':

(5) *tõn   atopōtátōn   mént-àn*
     the:GEN.PL awkward:SUPERL.GEN.PL IRREAL.PARTICLE
     eíē,
     be:OPT.3SG
     ei hà nỹn ánoian ophliskánōn hómōs ekaleĩ, taũta dunētheìs mè̀ práxei.

'[it] would be, surely, [one] of the most awkward [things], if, having the power, he should lack the will to carry out the threat which today he utters at the risk of his reputation for sanity.' (Vince 1930, PDL)

This example is, however, ambiguous, since the neuter plural in Ancient Greek regularly surfaces as a singular form. In the next quote both the superset and the subset – typically for mass nouns – are singulars (adopted from Nachmanson 1942):

(6) *kaì en hósoisi toũ   liparoũ   enēn*
     and in which the:GEN.SG fat:GEN.SG be inside:IMPF.3SG
     'In which [*scil.* the bones] there was [some] fat inside." (Hp. Carn. 4.7)

The logical plural subset of the IPG *autõn* and, correspondingly, the verb plural form is illustrated in (7), adopted from Lasso de la Vega (1958: 466):

(7) *Eisì   gàr autõn   kaì parà basilḗï tõi Perseõn*
     be:ACT.3PL PRT they:GEN.PL PRT at   king   of the of Persians
     entheũten thēreuthéntes
     there   catch:PARTC.PASS.AOR.NOM.PL
     'Because the Persian king has some of them, which have been caught there." (about exotic ants) (Hdt. Hist. 3.102.2)

One might argue that the passive participle is in fact the head of the IPG autõn. Since scrambling takes place in Ancient Greek frequently, this suggestion cannot be fully ruled out. However, since as early as Delbrück (1893) but also Nachmanson (1942) or Lasso de la Vega (1958) the existence of a syntactically independent partitive genitive in Ancient Greek is beyond any doubts, it seems that bringing together *autõn* and *entheũten thēreuthéntes* under one constituent would violate Occam's razor. Furthermore, there are semantic considerations that make such an analysis less plausible. Thus, a constituent **autõn entheũten thēreuthéntes* would mean 'the caught ones of them' suggesting the wrong presupposition that there were also 'uncaught ones of them'. That is, given the whole sentence: [lit.] **'There are, from them, there-caught ones at the king of Persians' place' or **'The king of Persians has from them the caught-ones',

which is ruled out pragmatically. It makes rather more sense to treat the participle with the adverb as a participial clause. Thus, Godley (1920, PDL) correctly translates: "the Persian king has some of these, which have been caught there".

The next example is parallel to (7) (about birds in the winter time):

(8) *phōloũsi   d' oudèn diakekriménōs   kaì tõn*
     lurk:PRES.3PL PRT no   distinguished:ADV and the:GEN.PL
     gampsōnýchōn   kaì tõn   euthuōnýchōn
     crooked-taloned:GEN.PL and the:GEN.PL wide-taloned:GEN.PL
     'Those with the crooked and those with straight talons, indistin-
     guishably, hide.' (and not fly away) (Arist. Hist. Anim. VIII.16)

Apart from Ancient Greek, the IPG in the subject position has very similar properties in other ancient Indo-European languages, such as Vedic and Avestan: here, it also occurs mostly with unaccusative predicates such as lexical unaccusatives as in (10) or grammatical ones as in (9) and it also supports the agreement analysis shown above for Ancient Greek (exx. from Dahl 2010):

(9) *ákāri   vām   ándhaso*
     make:AOR.PASS.3SG you:DU.DAT soma.juice:GEN.SG
     'Some soma-juice has been prepared for you two' (Vedic, RV VI
     63.3)

(10) *yaṯ hē   stārąm   bayō.dātanąm   aiβi*
     so.that he:DAT stars:GEN.PL set.up.by.gods:GEN.PL round
     raocaiiā̊ṇte
     shine:PRES.SUBJ.3PL
     'So that stars, set up by the gods, shine around for him' (Avestan,
     Vd. 19.23)

3 Coordination and agreement with nominatives

The IPG in Ancient Greek may agree with a nominative participle of an adjoined participial clause, as in (11), adopted from Lasso de la Vega (1958):

(11) *Eisì   gàr autõn   kaì parà basiléï   tõi*
     be:ACT.3PL PRT they:GEN.PL PRT at   king:DAT the:DAT
     Perseõn   entheũten thēreuthéntes
     of Persians there   catch:PARTC.PASS.AOR.NOM.PL

'Because the Persian king has some of them, which have been caught there." (about exotic ants) (Hdt. Hist. 3.102.2)

In the following example adopted from Poultney 1936: 76 the IPG is co-ordinated with a nominative by means of the conjunction *ḗ* 'or':

(12) *kàn gamḗ(i)   pot' autòs   ḕ tõn syngenõn   ḕ*
      if   marry:SUBJ.3SG once he:NOM.SG or relatives:GEN.PL or
      tõn phílōn,   hýsomen tḕn nýkta pãsan …
      friends:GEN.PL we will rain the whole night
      'If he [himself] or [one] of relatives or [one] of friends will ever marry, we will rain the whole night.' (Ar. Nub. 1128f).

Similar example (13) from (Nachmanson 1942: 27):

(13) *Oudè gàr   lýkos   oud(è) tõn²   állōn*
      nor   because wolf:NOM.SG nor   the:GEN.PL other:GEN.PL
      thēríōn   agōnísaito   àn outhéna³ kalòn
      animal:GEN.PL venture:AOR.OPT.3SG PRT none:ACC nice:ACC
      kíndynon
      hazard:ACC
      'Neither a wolf nor [one] of the other wild animals would venture upon any noble hazard.' (Arist. Pol. 1338b)

In the following example from Nachmanson (*loc. cit.*) the participle *symbebēkóta* 'things that have happened' takes the dative experiencer *hautõ(i)* 'to himself' which is the regular government of this verb. The dative experiencer is coordinated with another experiencer that is expressed by the IPG *tõn hautoũ* 'of himself'. Even though the next clause contains an overt indefinite pronoun in the similar coordination context and despite several amendment suggestions by the editors, the witness of the manuscripts should be taken as authentic (Nachmanson 1942: 27):

---

2   Cf. Nachmanson (1942: 27) who rejects any amendment at this place favoring the witness of the mss. As has been mentioned in the introduction, the IPG has very often been amended by the editors with some indefinite pronouns like *tis* 'someone' (*oudèn* 'nothing' in this example), because the IPG has not been considered as compatible with the subject position.

3   *Sic!*

(14)   *hṓst' anamnēsthḗnai toiaũta symbebēkóta*   *ḗ*
       so that remember:INF   such   happen:PARTC.PERF.ACT.N.PL or
       hautõ(i)   ḗ tõn   hautoũ
       himself:DAT.SG or the:GEN.PL himself:GEN.SG
       '(So affected) that he remembers that such (evils) have happened
       either to himself or to (one) of his friends.' (A. Rhet. 1386a1–2)

In general, Nachmanson (1942: 27) argues that any case can be overridden by the IPG in coordination and provides examples also for accusative arguments overridden by the IPG. This is, however, striking, since coordinated NPs have to agree in case in Ancient Greek otherwise. Below, I will suggest that underlyingly there is a covert category *pro* heading the IPG and having an arbitrary reference. This pro_{arb} has the capability to assume case. In (14), it is this pro_{arb} that is assigned the dative case and thereby enables the coordination with the other datives in the sentence.

4 Case and encoding the thematic roles

As stated in, inter alia, Schwyzer (1950: 101), Belletti (1988: 3) (for Finnish), Luraghi (2003: 60) or Bauer (2007: 133–4), there is no restriction for the IPG as to which syntactic position in the surface structure it may occupy. Thus, the IPG does not only override structural case but also datives (Conti & Luraghi 2010), non-argumental accusatives (*accusativus graecus*) as in (15) and accusative case-marked controlled subjects in the *accusativus-cum-infinitivo*-constructions as in (16):

(15)   *Kateágē*   *tēs*   *kephalēs*
       break:PASS/MID[4].AOR.3SG the:GEN.SG head:GEN.SG
       [lit.] 'He was broken with regards to somewhere in his head.' (Ar. Vesp. 1428)

(16)   *éphasan … kai epimignýnai **sphõn***   *te pròs ekeínous kaì*
       say:IMPF.3PL and mix:INF   they:GEN.PL and to   these   and
       ***ekeínōn**   pròs heautoús*
       these:GEN.PL to   themselves
       'They said that some of them [*scil.* Carduchians] did have dealings with these ones [*scil.* people of the plain] and some of these ones did have dealings with the former ones.' (X. Anab. 3.5.16–7) (adopted from Goodwin 1997 [1894]: 231)

However, it seems that it is not attested in the indirect object (IO) function (except for the context where it is coordinated with datives as in (14) above) while it is very frequently attested with the direct object (DO) of ditransitive verbs. The reason for that is, presumably, that the IO outranks the DO in its prominence: the IO is inherently animate while the DO, e. g., of transaction verbs is typically inanimate, which leads to different proportions of Dowty's (1991) entailments. Additionally, the IPG cannot encode an agentive subject while the prototypical patient may occur. I have not found any attestations of the IPG encoding the object of (*apo*)-*kteínein* 'to kill' but the IPG is frequently found with incremental themes (Napoli 2010).

Examples (17)–(22) illustrate the range of the thematic roles that can be encoded by the IPG, cf. patient in (17):

(17) *kaì tễs   kephalễs   katéage   perì líthō(i) pesṑn*
      PRT the:GEN.SG head:GEN.SG break:PERF.3SG on   stone   falling
      [lit.] 'He has broken his head by falling on a stone.' (Ar. Ach. 1178–9)

Example (18) shows a lexicalized partitive genitive, i. e. a partitive genitive that has been generalized by the verb *epithuméō* 'wish, desire' and incorporated into its case frame. In that sense it is no longer the partitive function that governs the case assignment in (18). Though, it seems to be reasonable to assume that the original function of the genitive in (18) must have been the partitive function. Under this assumption, (18) may illustrate an originally independent partitive genitive encoding a Stimulus:

(18) *Pántes gàr ára tõn   agathõn   epithymoũsin*
      all:NOM because the:GEN.PL good:GEN:PL desire:3PL
      'Because all people desire good things' (P. Resp. 438a)

Goal in (19):

(19) *hōs dè mãllon eplēsíadzon   hoi   amphì tòn Kỹron*
      as but more   approach:IMPF.3PL the:NOM.PL around the Cyros
      tõn   ákrōn
      the:GEN.PL top:GEN.PL

---

4   Traditionally glossed as passive despite an evidently middle function of an involuntary agent that this form has.

'But as the people of Cyrus approached closer [to] the heights'
(X. Cyr. 3.2.8)

A less prototypical agent in (16) repeated here as (20) for convenience:

(20) *éphasan … kai epimignýnai sphõn   te pròs ekeínous kaì*
say:IMPF.3PL and mix:INF   they:GEN.PL and to   these   and
ekeínōn   pròs heautoús
these:GEN.PL to   themselves
'They said that some of them [*scil.* Carduchians] did have deal-
ings with these ones [*scil.* people of the plain] and some of these
ones did have dealings with the former ones.' (X. Anab. 3.5.16–7)
(adopted from Goodwin 1997 [1894]: 231)

Beneficiary in (21):

(21) *epimachían   d' epoiḗsanto   tē(i)*
alliance:ACC.SG.F but make:AOR.3PL this:DAT.SG.F
allḗlōn   boētheĩn
each-other:GEN.PL help:INF
'They made a (defensive) alliance in order to help each other by
it.' (Thuc. Hist. 1.44.1)

Location in (22):

(22) *ē̃   ouk Árgeos   ē̃en*
PRT NEG Argos:GEN be:IMPF.3SG
'was he not in Argos?' (Od. 3.251, from Luraghi 2003: 60)

Notably, there are striking correlations between the IPG and the phe-
nomenon of argument incorporation. Consider the universal prominence
hierarchy as in (23) that gives the likelihood of a participant to be incor-
porated (cf. Grimshaw 1990; Alsina (1996)):

(23)   Agent < Experiencer < Goal < Source < Location < Theme

Even though the Recipient is not mentioned here we may assume that this
semantic role will occupy approximately the same position as the Experi-
encer, since it is also restricted to exclusively animate NPs, thus:

(24)   Agent < Recipient < Experiencer < Goal < Source < Location <
Theme

The compatibility of the IPG with different semantic roles generally correlates with the compatibility of the semantic roles that can potentially be incorporated by the verb: prototypical agents and recipients do not allow for IPG while the semantic roles right to the Recipient increasingly allow IPG. Thus, the Experiencer and Beneficiary gets IPG much more seldom[5] than the Theme as can be observed from the examples adduced in the paper. Obviously, both phenomena, the verbal incorporation and the IPG are sensitive to the prominence of the particular semantic role (cf. Grimshaw 1991 and Alsina 1996).

Morphotactically, the IPG surfaces as a case from which it follows that no other case can be assigned to the same NP. As a consequence, the IPG lacks an overt encoding of the thematic role of an argument leaving, hence, the semantic relation it bears to the predicate of the clause unspecified.[6] It is also referentially undetermined (cf. Napoli 2010). Lack of both the specification of the semantic role as well as a determinative specification (the downstairs determiner specifies only the superset, not the subset) reminds of the object-/subject incorporation as, e. g., with Ancient Greek *oinopoiéō* 'to make wine' [lit.] 'to wine-make' or German *radfahren* [lit.] 'to bicycle-ride', i. e. 'to ride a bicycle'.

I have argued elsewhere (Seržant 2012) that the IPG encodes no existential commitments about its referent. It is used to decrease the referentiality properties of the respective NP and to discursively demote its referent. This is the function found with the argument incorporation as well. In addition, the referentiality of the incorporated participant is extremely decreased and only narrow scope interpretations are possible, cf., e. g., object-incorporation in Greenlandic Eskimo discussed in Bittner (1987) and Geenhoven (1998).

---

5   Thus, I have found only the two examples adduced in the present paper: (14) for Experiencer and (21) for Beneficiary. At the same, the vast majority of the examples discussed have Themes marked with the IPG.

6   I believe that nominatives and accusatives do in general show the thematic relation they bear to the predicate in terms of proto-entailments.

5 Subjects of embedded clauses

The IPG can not only encode main clause (nominative) subjects but it can also override the structural case assignment in the embedded clauses such as with the *accusativus cum infinitivo* (AcI). The AcI strategy systematically requires the embedded nominative subject to turn into accusative even if the matrix verb does not assign an accusative case at all. However, – given the presence of the partitive semantics on the subject NP – the IPG can override this subject case-marking as in (16) repeated below as (25) for convenience:

> (25) *éphasan … kai epimignýnai* **sphõn**   *te pròs ekeínous kaì*
>   say:IMPF.3PL and mix:INF   they:GEN.PL and to   these   and
>   **ekeínōn**   *pròs heautoús*
>   these:GEN.PL to   themselves
>   'They said that some of them [*scil.* Carduchians] did have deal-
>   ings with these ones [*scil.* people of the plain] and some of these
>   ones did have dealings with the former ones.' (X. Anab. 3.5.16–7)
>   (adopted from Goodwin 1997 [1894]: 231)

The verb *phḗmí* 'say' (here as impf *éphasan*) is typically an intransitive verb taking the AcI. In (25), the embedded subjects *sphõn* 'they:GEN' and *ekeínōn* 'these:GEN' of the infinitive *epimignýnai* 'to mix' should have been encoded by accusative case. The IPG overrides here the structural accusative in order to encode the partitive function.

6 Summary and Conclusions

I have demonstrated that the IPG has the following morphosyntactic properties while being in the subject position:

(i) the IPG triggers semantically driven verbal agreement along the semantic number of the subset of the IPG. In other words, the verb form is sensitive to whether the subset (the actual participant) is singular or plural in its logical number;

(ii) the IPG can agree with the nominative marked participles;

(iii) the IPG can be coordinated with nominatives while being in the subject position, and

  (iv) the IPG may also encode subjects of embedded clauses overriding the structural case assignment (e. g. with AcI).

All these properties can otherwise be found only with nominative case-marked subjects in Ancient Greek.

Notably, the IPG being in subject position behaves in Ancient Greek very much as if it would have been marked with nominative case. These morphosyntactic properties are not found with partitives in many other languages, e. g., Finnish, Estonian, Lithuanian, Latvian or Russian and are, hence, typologically rare. To account for these facts, I assume that the IPG in Ancient Greek is governed by a covert position that is as a default filled by a *pro*. This *pro* assumes matrix case and number. Unlike the dropped nominative *pro* (in the *pro-drop*) this *pro* lacks the ability to be definite and is typically non-referential.

This covert position can else be filled by a quantifier, determiner or any NP that can serve as the subset of the IPG. It is this position that gets Case to encode the semantic role and can be specified by a determiner or a quantifier and determines the agreement (cf. similar argumentation for Turkish in Kornfilt 1996). Within this account it is expected that as long as this position is empty, i. e. in the case of the bare partitive genitive, the subset is unspecified and discursively back-grounded. With the IPG it is only the superset that is overtly expressed and, hence, can have discourse prominence. Additionally, this account represents both headed and bare partitive genitive as a formally homogenous category which is also expected given that there is semantic coherency between these two.

Abbreviations in glosses

ACC – accusative, ACT – active, ADJ – adjective, ADV – adverb, AOR – aorist, DAT – dative, DU – dual, F – feminine, GEN – genitive, IMPF – imperfect, INF – infinitive, NEG – negation, N – neuter, NOM – nominative, OPT – optative, PARTC – participle, PASS – passive, PL – plural, PRT – particle, PRES – present, Q – interrogative, SG – singular, SUBJ – subjunctive.

Abbreviations

PDL   Gregory R. Crane, ed. *Perseus Digital Library*. Url: `http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/`.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y., Robert M. W. Dixon & Masayuki Ōnishi (2001). *Non-Canonical Marking of Subjects and Objects*. Typological Studies in Language 46. John Benjamins.

Alsina, Alex (1996). *The Role of Argument Structure in Grammar*. Evidence from Romance. Stanford: CLSI Publications.

Barðdal, Jóhanna (2009). "The development of case in Germanic". In: *The Role of Semantic, Pragmatic, and Discourse Factors in the Development of Case*. Ed. by Jóhanna Barðdal & Shobhanna L. Chelliah. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 123–159.

Barwise, Jon & Robin Cooper (1981). "Generalized quantifiers and natural language". In: *Linguistics and Philosophy* 4, 159–219.

Bauer, Brigitte (2007). "The definite article in Indo-European: Emergence of a new grammatical category?" In: *Nominal Determination. Typology, Context, Constraints, and Historical Emergence*. Ed. by Elisabeth Stark, Elisabeth Leiss & Werner Abraham. Studies in Language Companion Series 89. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 103–139.

Belletti, Adriana (1988). "The case of unaccusatives". In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 1–34.

Bhaskararao, Peri & Karumuri V. Subbarao, eds. (2004). *Non-Nominative Subjects*. Typological Studies in Language 60. John Benjamins.

Bittner, Maria (1987). "On the semantics of Greenlandic antipassive and related constructions". In: *International Journal of American Linguistics* 53, 194–231.

Brownson, Carleton L. (1922). *Xenophon*. 7 vols. Cambridge MA, London: Harvard University Press, Heinemann.

Conti, Luz (2010). "Synchronie und Diachronie des altgriechischen Genetivs als Semisubjekt". In: *Historische Sprachforschung* 121, 94–113.

Conti, Luz & Silvia Luraghi (2010). *The Ancient Greek partitive genitive in typological perspective*. A paper presented at the international workshop "Partitives" Organized by S. Luraghi and T. Huumo, Hosted at the 40 of the SLE in Vilnius.

Dahl, Eystein (2010). *Partitive subjects and objects in Indo-Iranian*. Paper presented at the workshop on partitives, SLE 43rd annual meeting, Vilnius.

de Hoop, Helen (2003). "Partitivity". In: *The Second Glot International State-of-the-Article Book*. Ed. by Lisa Cheng & Rint Sybesma. Studies in Generative Grammar 61. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 179–212.

Delbrück, Berthold (1893). *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Vol. 3.1: *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Ed. by Karl Brugmann & Berthold Delbrück. Strassburg: Trübner.

Dowty, David (1991). "Thematic proto-roles and argument selection". In: *Language* 67, 547–619.

Geenhoven, Veerle van (1998). *Semantic Incorporation and Indefinite Descriptions. Semantic and Syntactic Aspects of Noun Incorporation in West Greenlandic*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Godley, Alfred D. (1920). *Herodotus*. With an English Translation by A. D. Godley. In Four Volumes. Vol. 1: *Books I and II*. Cambridge MA, London: Harvard University Press, Heinemann.

Goodwin, William W. (1997 [1894]). *Greek Grammar*. Revised Edition. Bristol: Booksprint.

Grimshaw, Jean (1990). *Argument Structure*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Hoeksema, Jack (1996). "Introduction". In: *Partitives. Studies on the Syntax and Semantics of Partitive and Related Constructions*. Ed. by Jack Hoeksema. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 1–24.

Kornfilt, Jaklin (1996). "Naked partitive phrases in Turkish". In: *Partitives. Studies on the Syntax and Semantics of Partitive and Related Constructions*. Ed. by Jack Hoeksema. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 107–142.

Kornfilt, Jaklin & Klaus von Heusinger (2009). "Specificity and partitivity in some Altaic languages". In: *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics (MWPL)*. 58. Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Formal Altaic Linguistics (WAFL 5). Ed. by Ryosuke Shibagaki & Reiko Vermeulen. Cambridge: MIT, 19–40.

Kühner, Raphael & Bernhard Gerth (1955). *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. Vol. 2.2: *Satzlehre*. 4th ed. Hannover, Leipzig: Hahn.

Lasso de la Vega, José L. (1958). "Genitivo partitivo sujeto en griego". In: *Actas del Primer Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos*. Ed. by Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos. Publicaciones de la SEEC 2. Madrid: Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos, 53–74.

Luraghi, Silvia (2003). *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases. The Expression of Semantic Roles in Ancient Greek*. Studies in Language Companion Series. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Lyons, Christopher (1999). *Definiteness*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nachmanson, Ernst (1942). *Partitives Subjekt im Griechischen*. Göteborg: Elanders boktryckeri aktiebolag.

Napoli, Maria (2010). "The case for the partitive case. The contribution of Ancient Greek". In: *Transactions of the Philological Society* 108.1, 15–40.

Poultney, James W. (1936). *The Syntax of the Genitive Case in Aristophanes*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Schwyzer, Eduard (1950). *Griechische Grammatik*. Auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik. Vol. 2: *Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*. München: C. H. Beck.

Seržant, Ilja A. (2012). "The pragmatics and semantics of the bare partitive genitive in Ancient Greek". In: *STUF – Language Typology and Universals* 65.2, 113–136.

– (forthcoming). "Independent (bare) partitive genitive in Russian, North Russian, Lithuanian and Latvian". In: *Partitivity*. Ed. by Silvia Luraghi & Tuomas Huumo. Mouton de Gruyter.

Vince, James H. (1930). *Demosthenes*. With an English Translation by J. H. Vince, M. A. Quoted from PDL. Cambridge MA, London: Harvard University Press, Heinemann.

von Heusinger, Klaus (2002). "Specificity and definiteness in sentence and discourse structure". In: *Journal of Semantics* 19, 245–274.

von Heusinger, Klaus & Jaklin Kornfilt (2005). "The case of the direct object in Turkish. Semantics, Syntax and Morphology". In: *Turkic Languages* 9, 3–44.

Woolford, Ellen (2008). "Differential subject marking at argument structure, syntax, and PF". In: *Differential Subject Marking*. Ed. by Helen de Hoop & Peter de Swart. Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory Series. Dordrecht: Springer, 17–40.