

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ANCIENT GREEK LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

Volume 3
P–Z, Index

General Editor
Georgios K. Giannakis

Associate Editors
Vit Bubenik
Emilio Crespo
Chris Golston
Alexandra Lianeri
Silvia Luraghi
Stephanos Matthaios



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2014

Table of Contents

VOLUME ONE

Introduction	vii
List of Contributors	xi
Table of Contents Ordered by Thematic Category	xv
Transcription, Abbreviations, Bibliography	xxi
List of Illustrations	xxiii
Articles A–F	1

VOLUME TWO

Transcription, Abbreviations, Bibliography	vii
Articles G–O	1

VOLUME THREE

Transcription, Abbreviations, Bibliography	vii
Articles P–Z	1
Index	547

Q

Quantifiers

1. DEFINITION AND EXPLANATION

Quantificational expressions are used for discussing the quantity or amount of things, such as dozens of apples or liters of water. They answer questions like ‘How much/many?’ (Cushing 1982:11). This entry discusses only quantifiers over entities, while not taking the A(dverb)-quantifiers into account that quantify over events.

2. CARDINALS

→ Numerals are typically adjective-type modifiers (→ Adjectives (Morphological Aspects of)), inflected and co-indexed with the → Noun Phrase (NP) in the following way: *heís* ‘1’ is fully inflected for → gender, (singular) → number and case (→ Case (*ptôsis*), Ancient Theories of); *dúo* (*dúō*) ‘2’ inflects in Early → Attic in the → dual number (sometimes occurring with the verb’s plural form if it is in the → subject position) and case (with nom. = acc. and gen. = dat.), but later and elsewhere in the plural number or as invariant *dúo/dúō* (cf. Xen. *An.* 3.4.9); *treís* ‘3’ and *téttares* ‘4’ are inflected in gender (with masc. = fem.), plural number and case (whereby nom. = acc.); the cardinals from 5 to 199 are indeclinable if represented as a one-word unit; if the numerals are coordinated, then the cardinals 1 to 4 do inflect, e.g. ‘13’ *treís kai déka* ‘three (inflected) and ten (invariant)’ or, alternatively, as a compound, *treiskaídeka* (invariant).

- (1) *duoîn adelphoîn esteréthēmen*
‘we were robbed of (our) two brothers’
(Soph. *Ant.* 13)

The numeral *heís* retains some lexical or emphatic component, having such readings as ‘single’, ‘(only) one’, ‘alone’, etc. (cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1456), since the number ‘1’ is already unambiguously indexed on the respective NP (and, if the latter is the subject, also on the verb).

The cardinals 18–19, 28–29, 38–39, etc. are usually expressed via a subtraction periphrasis construction based on the → present → active → participle of *déō* ‘lack, need’, which agrees with the quantified NP in case (and number) and having either *henós* ‘one-gen. sg. masc./n.’ / *miás* ‘one-gen. sg. fem.’, (for X9 cardinals) or *duoîn* ‘two-gen. du.’ for X8 (cardinals) as its object argument, e.g.:

- (2) *miás deúsais eíkosi nausín*
‘(They came) with nineteen ships’ (Thuc. 8.17.3)

3. QUANTIFIERS

I distinguish between *regular* and *lexical* quantifiers. The main difference between the two types is that the former are prototypically grammaticalized quantifiers in terms of their meaning and syntactic alignment, while the latter often retain their lexical semantics and pattern syntactically with NPs. However, even some regular quantifiers may still exhibit a somewhat lexical reading, such as ‘whole’ for *pás* (otherwise ‘all, every’). Quantifiers are not lexically restricted to either count or mass nouns.

3.a. Regular Quantifiers

In addition to the adnominal usage, regular quantifiers most frequently occur alone exhibiting a pronominal (→ Pronominal System) function. The referent being quantified is to be understood from the context and is by default a human being, e.g. *olígoi* [few-pl.] ‘few people’, *pántes* [all-pl.] ‘all people’, etc. Regular quantifiers typically align with the quantified NP as adjectives, i.e., agree with their NP in gender/number/case (*adjective-type alignment*, AtA). If the NP is overtly expressed, then the quantifier, as a default, precedes the quantified NP; though, generally, its positioning in the clause is subject to discourse constraints only, and there are no structural limitations.

Unlike in many languages, several quantifiers of Classical Greek may restrictedly co-occur with different kinds of determiners and, semantically, are vaguely pre-defined in terms of (in)definiteness, e.g. with *ho/hē/tó* ‘the’ they are used to refer to a discursively accessible group that is quantified over by the quantifier (cf. (3)) or with the indefinite pronoun *hékastós tis* [each one] ‘every one’ (→ Determiners).

- (3) *hoi pántes horômen*
‘We all see’ (Hdt. 9.58.2)

The singular inflected distributive quantifier *hékastos* ‘each’ allows not only the singular, but also the plural range (cf. (4) and Hdt. 3.158) and is not restricted to the third person only (cf. (5)), Xen. *Symp.* 3.3, as can be observed on the verb:

- (4) *tôn pántôn hoi hékastos óin dôsousi*
‘Each of the(m) all will give him a sheep’
(Hom. *Il.* 10.215)
(5) *dedmémestha hékastos*
‘(We) obey (you) each (of us)’ (Hom. *Il.* 5.878)

Only the singular number of the indefinite pronoun *tis* ‘some-sg.’ allows for the generic, universal-quantifier-reading ‘every(one)’, cf. *tis autôs itô* ‘everyone should come himself’ (Hom. *Il.* 17.254, cf. Soph. *Aj.* 417, Eur. *Bacch.* 346). In this function, it is opposed to *hékastos*, which applies instead to discursively accessible entities (Biraud 1991:202ff.), does not have the generic interpretation, and cannot be anaphorically referred to in the following context. In several contexts, it has the function of distinguishing the ontological

series of other quantifiers, very much like English: *pás tis, hékastós tis* ‘everyone’ vs. *oudén ti* ‘nothing’.

3.b. Lexical Quantifiers

Lexical quantifiers are distinguished from regular ones in that they (i) still have a lexical component in their meaning; (ii) can be additionally modified and quantified by another quantifier; (iii) have nominal alignment, i.e., they require the genitive case on the NP being quantified (partitive alignment, section 4), e.g. noun-like quantifiers (*plêthos* ‘amount’, *méros* ‘part’, etc.) or adverb-like quantifiers (*hádên* ‘enough’, *hális* ‘enough’):

- (6) *tò de pân plêthos tôn hoplitôn*
‘the whole amount of the hoplites’ (Thuc. 8.93.1)

4. PARTITIVE ALIGNMENT

In addition to the AtA between the quantifier/numeral and its NP, there is the *partitive alignment*, which is found in both the *partitive construction* (PC) and the *pseudo-partitive construction* (PPC) (term coined in Selkirk 1977, cf. also Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001, see also Luraghi 2003:60ff.; Napoli 2010). The PC and PPC are both equally encoded by means of a genitive case-marked NP/DP/QP (later also reinforced by the PP *ek(s)* ‘from’ or *apó* ‘from’ with genitive) that is morphosyntactically dependent on the head NP, i.e., the respective quantifier (→ Genitive). Despite their formal identity, the two constructions are semantically distinct: while the PC encodes that only a *subset* of a definite, delimited and temporally established *superset* is affected by the predicate with the remainder (*the complement*) remaining unaffected (cf. English *a cup of that good tea*), the PPC denotes that particular instantiations of a kind or a sub-kind are affected by the event (cf. English *a cup of tea*), whereby the latter does not encode a part-of relation anymore (De Hoop 2003; Kornfilt & Heusinger 2009; Selkirk 1977; Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001; Luraghi 2003:60ff.; Napoli 2010; Seržant 2012a, 2012b). Contrasting with the AtA, the PC and PPC are complex expressions with regard to both their syntax and semantics, consisting of several phrases, and are thus crucially distinguished from languages with quantifiers that assign case, such as Finnish or Russian. Cf.

quantifiers within the PC in (7) and PPC in (9), and cardinal expressions within the PC in (8) and PPC in (10):

- (7) *tines autôn olígoi*
‘Some few (men) from them’ (Xen. *Hell.* 1.1.34)
- (8) *epekheírēsan kai Timoléonti dúo tôn dēmagōgôn*
‘and two of the leaders (of Syracuse) have attacked Timoleon’ (Plut. *Tim.* 37.1)
- (9) *all’ olígoi mèn tôn anthrōpōn dedíasi tôn theón*
‘There are (some) few men that fear the god’, lit. ‘few of the people’ (Plut. *Non posse* 21)
- (10) *tamías dè tōi dēmōi dúo tôn néōn édōken apodeîxai*
‘(He) gave the people (the rights) of appointing two [of the] young men (as) quaestors’ (Plut. *Publ.* 12.3)

Cf. the PPC also in *pās... Hellēnōn* ‘every Greek (man)’ (Soph. *OC* 597, cf. also Xen. *Cyr.* 8.2.24), *panti brotōn* ‘to every mortal’ (Pind. *Ol.* 1.100, cf. also Soph. *Aj.* 682) and *polloi Trōōn* ‘many Trojans’ (see Hom. *Il.* 8.344, 12.226, Hom. *Od.* 4.257, etc.).

In (10), the definite article does not encode definiteness, but rather designates only a generic or a classification, meaning ‘young men’, not the meaning of a particular group of people. The subtle difference between the AtA and the PPC seems to be that, with the latter but not with the former, the classification (that the quantified NP refers to) is represented as a familiar or restricted concept, i.e., ‘the men’ and ‘the mortals’ or ‘the gods’, ‘the Trojans’, ‘the elders’, etc.

5. ADJECTIVE-PARTITIVE ALIGNMENT

A kind of contamination of both strategies, the AtA and the PPC, can only be found with mass nouns, as in (11) and (12). Here the quantifier surfaces morphosyntactically; partly as an adjective-like quantifier in the AtA, as it has gender agreement with the quantified NP, but also partly as a head of the PPC, by assigning the genitive case to that NP (→ Agreement).

- (11) *étemon tēs gēs tēn pollén*
‘they ravaged most (acc. fem.) of the land (gen. fem.)’ (Thuc. 2.56.4)

- (12) *tòn pollòn toû khronou*
‘much (acc. masc.) of the time (gen. masc.)’ (Hdt. 1.24)

Analogous examples are found in Aristoph. *Plut.* 694, Xen. *Cyr.* 3.2.2, and Dem. *Or.* 44.6.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Biraud, Michele. 1991. *La détermination du nom en Grec classique*. Nice.
- Cushing, S. 1982. *Quantifier meanings. A study in the dimensions of semantic competence*. Amsterdam – New York.
- de Hoop, Helen. 2003. “Partitivity”. In: *The second Glot international state-of-the-article book*, ed. by L. Cheng and R. Sybesma, 179–212. Berlin – New York.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria. 2001. “A piece of the cake and a cup of tea: partitive and pseudo-partitive nominal constructions in the Circum-Baltic languages”. In: *The Circum-Baltic languages. Typology and contact. Volume 2: Grammar and typology*, ed. by Ö. Dahl and M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm, 523–568. Amsterdam – Philadelphia.
- Kornfilt, Jacqueline and Klaus von Heusinger. 2009. “Specificity and partitivity in some Altaic languages”. In: *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 58. Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics (WAFSL 5)*, ed. by Ryosuke Shibagaki and Reiko Vermeulen, 19–40. Cambridge.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 2003. *On the meaning of prepositions and cases. The expression of semantic roles in Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia.
- Napoli, Maria. 2010. “The case for the partitive case: the contribution of Ancient Greek”, *TPhS* 108:15–40.
- Selkirk, E. O. 1977. “Some remarks on noun phrase structure”. In: *Formal syntax. Papers from the MSSB-UC Irvine conference on the formal syntax of natural language, Newport Beach, California, June 9–11, 1976*, ed. by Peter W. Culicover, Thomas Wasow and Adrian Akmajian, 285–316. New York.
- Seržant, Ilja A. 2012a. “Pragmatics and semantics of the bare partitive genitive in Ancient Greek”, *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 65(2):113–136.
- . 2012b. “Morphosyntactic properties of the partitive genitive in the subject position in Ancient Greek”, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 117:187–204.
- Tatevosov, Sergej G. 2002. *Semantika sostavljajuščix imennoj grupy: kvantornye slova* [Semantics of the noun phrase constituents: the quantifier]. Moscow.

ILJA A. SERŽANT

Questions

1. INTRODUCTION

The question is a sentence type found in most languages of the world. The function of questions has been derived from commands as well as from statements (see discussion in Lyons 1977:753ff.). Questions fall into two major categories: alternative questions and constituent questions. Yes/