Adpositions (Prepositions)

1. THE DEVELOPMENT OF ADPOSITIONS

The historical morphology of Greek adpositions is rather problematic, even if we can trace back to Indo-European almost all of the Greek lexemes traditionally termed 'proper' Greek prepositions (→ Indo-European Linguistic Background). Thus (Bortone 2010:140–142) Greek *antí* is clearly related to Latin *ante*; Greek *katá* and the prefix *kati-* in *kasígnētos* (Thess. *katígn*[*eitos*]) match Hittite *katti* and *katta*; Greek *en* matches Lat. *in*, Osco-Umbrian *en*, Old Irish *in*, and Gothic *in*; Greek *epí* matches Sanskrit *api* and (probably) Hitt. *appa*; Greek *hupó* corresponds to Sanskrit *upa*, Gothic *uf* and, somehow, Lat. *sub*. Very few → Attic prepositions have no clear Indo-European etymon; *diá* is probably a Greek innovation, but perhaps based on the root **dis* (attested in Latin, Germanic and Albanian, but

as a prefix), and possibly with the ending of *metá*, *aná*, and *katá* (cf. Wackernagel 1928:155).

At least some Greek prepositions appear to have derived from inflected nouns. Both within Greek and in languages related to Greek, we find formally similar prepositions whose meanings are very similar or identical, and whose morphological differences match case endings: Greek *antí* and *ánta* (or *ántēn*) have endings that look like the locative and accusative; the same alternation recurs in *perí* and *péran*, to which we can add *péra*, possibly an old → instrumental. Suggestions have long been made (Giles 1895:291, 300) that *amphí*, *ení*, *epí*, *perí*, and *prós* are old locatives, and *aná*, *diá*, *metá*, *katá* (to which we might add *háma*) old instrumentals. Likewise, *katá* is probably an inflected noun (see Morpurgo Davies 1983:304ff.) and it obviously has a link with *kátō*, which was perhaps originally an ablative. This line of interpretation may also explain alternations such as:

a. *prós* vs. *protí*
b. *en* vs. *ení* vs. *entós* (ablative, like Latin *intus*, cf. *ektós*)
c. *hupér* vs. *hupó* (Latin *super* vs. *sub*)
d. *paraí* (Oscan *prai*, Lat. *prae*) vs. *pará* (probably acc.) vs. *páros* (gen.) vs. *perí* (Sanskrit *pári*, Latin *per*, perhaps loc.) vs. *pró* (abl.)

In Ancient Greek we also occasionally have constructions like *kúklōi* + gen., lit. 'in-circle-of', i.e., 'around', in which an inflected noun functions as a preposition – probably a repetition of the history behind its older synonym *perí* + gen. The → Aeolic Greek preposition *pedá*, attested also as → Mycenaean *pe-da*, corresponds morphologically to the Latin nominal acc. *pedem* 'foot', and therefore attests the creation of Greek prepositions from inflected nouns. We also know that Greek used, although very marginally, complete prepositional phrases as prepositions: *ekpodṓn* (*ek* + *poús* 'foot') was so used, as was its counterpart *empodṓn* (*en* + *poús* in the gen. by → analogy with *ekpodṓn*). An etymological link between Greek adpositions and body-part nouns is further confirmed by evidence from Old Hittite: the Hittite noun *ha-an-za*, which goes back to *$h_2$ent-* 'face/forehead', corresponds to Greek *antí* 'facing'. The same root recurs in more complex Greek adverbial/prepositional forms such as *én-ant-a* and *én-ant-i* (originally, perhaps, *en* governing the acc. and locative of **ant-*) and in

the verb *ant-áō* 'to face'. So we can posit that *antí* is a noun **ant-* 'face' in the locative; the gen. that follows was initially adnominal. This also means that a 'proper' preposition such as *antí* was once (Humbert 1960:301) an 'improper' preposition.

2. THE SEMANTICS OF GREEK ADPOSITIONAL SYNTAGMS

When interpreting the semantics of Greek adpositional syntagms, it is helpful to remember that Greek oblique cases once had 'concrete', spatial meanings (cf. Bortone 2002:70–72), something still noticeable especially in Homeric Greek. The genitive case could have partitive sense, besides indicating possession (parts of an object are understood as belonging to it, as if owned by it); the genitive expressed partitive location, i.e., a relatively specific or circumscribed area, and was more likely to suggest an internally differentiated referent than the accusative did. Similarly, verbal objects could be in the genitive to indicate that they were only partly affected by the action described by the verb (*esthíousi ártou* 'they eat bread', like Fr. *ils mangent du pain*). The Greek genitive historically continued the Indo-European ablative case as well, and could therefore also express ablatival meaning (→ Case, including Syncretism), although such usages had largely faded by the Classical period.

The dative on its own could still, at least in Homer, occasionally express direction: a limited movement ending in a location; above all, it could express spatial position and comitation, since it continued, semantically and morphologically, not only the older dative case but also the Indo-European locative, as well as the instrumental, which had comitative sense.

The accusative could mark spatial direction (mostly implying no contact with the referent, unlike the dat.) or extension, the latter meaning including pluridirectional motion, i.e., expressing location or movements all over a referent (unlike the partial affectedness expressed by the gen.).

This explains the choice of case in Greek prepositional syntagms, which was semantically motivated: the prepositions *ek* 'out of', *apó* 'from', or *áneu* 'away from' required the abl.-gen.; *en* 'in' required the dat.; *sún* and *háma* 'with' also both required the dat. since this case also had comitative sense; *eis* '(in)to' and *hōs* 'up to' required the acc. The addition of adpositions

to case-marked nouns therefore was originally meant either to strengthen the intended meaning of the plain case (thereby also disambiguating it, if the case was polysemous), or to add a new shade of meaning. This is particularly clear in prepositional phrases with *pará* and *hupó*; the case contributes its own autonomous meaning to the overall phrase, e.g.:

– dat.(locative): ***hupò possì** méga stenakhízeto **gaîa*** (Hom. *Il.* 2.784) 'the earth resounded greatly under [his] feet'
– gen.(ablative): *híppous mèn lûsan **hupò zugoû*** (Hom. *Il.* 8.543) 'they loosed [the] horses from under [the] yoke'
– gen.(partitive): ***hupò stérnoio** tukhḗsas* (Hom. *Il.* 4.106) 'having hit [somewhere] under the breast'
– acc.(allative): ***hupò te spéos** élase mêla* (Hom. *Il.* 4.279) 'he drove the flock under (= into) the cave'

In some instances, however, combining a preposition with different cases had limited semantic impact, e.g. *epí* + dat. could be very similar in meaning to *epí* + gen. and to *epí* + acc.

The range of meanings evinced by each of the Greek adpositions consists in a network of metaphors; they follow a logic which is often transparent and usually has ample cross-linguistic parallels. Some conceptualizations implied by Greek adpositions are common to many unrelated languages, including English (see also Bortone 2010:43–45, 58–60, 74–79). Such conceptualizations include:

– situations are described as defined spaces that someone is *in* (so for Greek *en*)
– comitative expressions also describe circumstances or concomitant events, as well as instruments and the manner of performing an action (Greek *metá*)
– expressions of source-motion often come to indicate causes or agents (Greek *ek*, *apó*)
– adpositions locating an area (i.e. 'about') commonly indicate also a *topic* area, or a cause, or what is at stake (Greek *perí, amphí*)
– a purpose is portrayed as an allative motion, and so is a beneficiary or a recipient of concrete objects or of something abstract, like information (Greek *eis*)
– time is pictured as a course (Greek *ek* and *eis*)

– position under someone denotes being in someone's protective or domineering power (Greek *hupó* and, conversely, *hupér, epí*)

Semantic shifts usually have a specific direction, e.g. from company to instrument. Nonetheless, the meaning of adpositions is not automatically clear because semantic shifts are not predictable. The syntagms [preposition + case] often developed meanings that cannot be readily guessed from those of the preposition and the case: to take but one example, *aná* 'up' with the acc. could mean 'on average'. Furthermore, a given meaning can be arrived at from different earlier meanings, e.g. an instrumental meaning can be derived not only from a comitative but also from a perlative preposition (Greek *diá*, English *through*). Even prepositions that were originally antonyms could become synonyms: *katá* 'down' could be synonymous with *aná* 'up', in the spatial sense of 'through(out) an area' (George 2006:85), and in the abstract sense of 'in groups of' (Bortone 2010:41).

3. The Classical Greek Adpositions in Homer

Although Homeric Greek is not an earlier stage of Attic Greek but a literary creation integrating features of different periods and dialects, a comparison of Homeric Greek with Classical Greek (6th–4th c. Attic-Ionic) can tell us much about the development of the Greek adpositional system (→ Prepositions in Homer; → Epic Diction). In Homeric Greek, there is little distinction between adverbial, adpositional, and preverbal uses of the local → particles that have clear adpositional status by the Classical period. The adverbial use, e.g. *gélasse dè pâsa perì khthṓn* (Hom. *Il.*19.362), lit. 'laughed then (the) entire around earth', is likely to be the origin of the adpositional and of the preverbal use. The chronological sequence is likely to have been: optional particle/adverb > adverb linked to a noun phrase > prepositional phrase.

Scholars disagree as to whether this last stage was reached only in Classical Greek or already in Homer; some deny that Homeric Greek had fully-fledged adpositions: Horrocks (1981:19) saw the noun as the head of the phrase, and the 'adposition' as an adverb with preposition-like tendencies. Hewson and Bubenik (2006:4–9,

56–57) concur that what we see in Homer are adverbial particles, although the first steps towards adpositional phrases can be detected. Others (e.g. Pompeo 2002:92) believe that in Homer there are, besides independent particles and adverbs with inflected nouns, also true adpositions, albeit not such a generalized system as in Classical Greek.

In Homer, the local particle could precede the noun or vice versa, so the development of both prepositions and postpositions seemed possible. In most Indo-European languages, cognate forms came to precede the noun, while in a few others (Indic, Iranian, Tocharian) they followed it. In Greek, already by Mycenaean times, prepositions were the rule and postpositions were obsolescent and stylistically marked. Postpositional use is attested mainly in Homeric Greek (which shows that Homeric usage is a literary archaism reflecting, in part, an *état de langue* older than Mycenaean), e.g. *neôn ápo* (Hom. *Il.* 2.91) 'from [the] ships' (Greek postpositions were normally autotonic, and appear accented on the first syllable; prepositions were proclitic and a grave accent on the last syllable indicated unaccented pronunciation).

Postpositioning is used only sporadically in Classical Greek, as a rare variant of the customary prepositional use; both can occur within the same author: *sophías péri* (Pl. *Phlb.* 49a) = *perí sophías* (Pl. *Hp. mai.* 283a) 'about wisdom'. Ancient grammarians called this usage *anastrophe* 'turnaround', because they saw it as the reversal of the unmarked [preposition + noun] order. In Classical Greek it was not only uncommon but totally artificial, as Aristotle (*Poet.* 22.14) explicitly tells us.

Morphologically, the inventory of the local particles/adpositions of Homeric Greek virtually matches the prepositional inventory of Attic; peculiar to Homer are some phonological variants: *amphís/amphí, protí/potí/prós*. Homer, however, also joins forms more frequently than Classical Greek: *parék* 'past', *apopró* 'away from', *hupék* 'escaping', *diék* 'out through'. Homer also makes use of a wider range of case combinations: *aná, amphí*, and *metá* in Attic take virtually only either the genitive or accusative, but in Homeric Greek (and later in elevated poetry) they may also take the dative. Moreover, in Homer, plain cases are used even in contexts where Attic would require a prepositional phrase. Homer, furthermore, also combines prepositions with a case ending not used in Classical Greek: *-phi*, a relic of the Indo-European instrumental plural *-bhis* (Mycenaean *-pi*). Even in Homer this is artificial (Chantraine 1948 I:235) and employed *metri causa; -phi* appears there with most available prepositions, even with those that required different cases: *sún, prós, amphí, en, apó, pará, ek, katá, hupó, diá*. Homeric Greek, much more than Classical prose, also linked adpositions with other case-like endings such as *-then* (of ablatival meaning) and *-thi* (of locative meaning), e.g. *apò Troíēthen* (*Il.* 24.492) 'from Troy', *Ilióthi pró* (*Il.* 8.561) 'in front of Troy'. Also noteworthy is the Homeric morpheme *-de* (of allative meaning), because it is debatable whether it is an ending or postposition. A postpositional status is suggested by the fact that it appears only after accusative endings: *oíkonde, pólinde*. On the other hand, its status as an ending is suggested by its occurrence also on agreeing possessives: *hónde dómonde* 'to-his [to-]house' (*Od.* 1.83, *Il.* 16.445); it looks like a postposition in the process of becoming a case-ending (Bortone 2010:70–72), an unparalleled, unique sighting in the history of Greek. In Homer, finally, some prepositions (*têle, ektós, hekás*) occur both as prepositions and compounded with a prepositional phrase: *ektós klisíēs* (*Il.* 14.13) = *ektós apò klisíēs* (*Il.* 10.151) 'outside (the) hut'.

4. GREEK ADPOSITIONS WITH THEIR CASE-COMBINATIONS

Since Greek adpositions could express different meanings according to the case-marking of their object (some could take either gen. or acc., others gen., acc., or dat.), it is opportune to list adpositions with their case-combinations. The indications given below aim to convey some of the main meanings, not to provide an exhaustive translation.

amphí + gen./dat. (Homeric)	on both sides; around; concerning; for the sake of
amphí + acc.	moving along on both sides; around; during/ throughout the time of; concerning; for the sake of
aná + gen. (Homeric)	onto somewhere
aná + dat. (Homeric and verse)	position onto

aná + acc.	up (along), up(on), with movement or with the result thereof, e.g. placed on; distributed around, all over, the length and width of; all through a time; in groups of, every x	*epí* + gen.	position (up)on/over or movement onto (part of an object); position or end of a movement on an object, also horizontally; in charge of; at the time of; on the basis of
antí + gen.	instead of, in exchange for	*epí* + dat.	position on; onto (endpoint of movement); position or end of a movement, also horizontally (cf. English *on the wall*), often with hostile intent; meant for a use or aim; being in charge/control; being up to, or in the power of someone; feeling about; on a condition
apó + gen.	away from; from time; cause; agent (marginally)		
diá + acc.	position or movement through, all over, across (all Homeric only); on account of (reason, from cause to finality – Humbert 1960:304); with the aid of		
diá + gen.	crossing or straight through/along; position through/among; through a time; after; each (time); through/by means of (conduit, instrument, interagent, agent); cause or manner	*epí* + acc.	directed motion (on) to, often horizontally; extended motion onto/ over; going after (seeking something/ someone, also in a hostile sense); against; location along/extended; time extended or until; for a time; in quest of; depending on
eis + acc.	(in)to a place (often with contact); towards/until a time; up to a number; pursuing an aim; with respect to	*katá* + acc.	movement downwards/ down along, or the result thereof; motion or location here and there, among the referents or around inside a referent, through[out], sparsely in an area; in pursuit of; during; according to an opinion, measure, or categorization criterion
ek + gen.	out of (a defined area); originating in; after or since; on the . . . -hand side; done by (rarely); ensuing, caused by		
en + dat.	in (a defined area); into (indicating movement but stressing the trajectory's endpoint – rare, mostly verse); amongst/amidst (with pl.); at/in a time or situation; by means of (rare, usually referring to sensory perception)	*katá* + gen.	if the gen. is ablatival: down from (Homeric; rare in Attic); if the gen. is partitive: down on(to)/ in(to), also horizontally; against (in a hostile sense); concerning
		metá + dat.	amidst (in Homer); together with

Preposition	Meaning
metá + gen. (covering also Homer's *metá* + dat., no longer used in Classical Greek)	between/amidst (rarely); with (company); concomitant situation; manner; instrument
metá + acc.	into the midst of; together/following (Homeric); across/beyond; after (time)
pará + acc.	to the side/to the presence of; along (with extended referents); bypassing/past (with non-extended referents)
pará + gen.	from beside/from the presence of; by an agent
pará + dat.	at the side (without contact)/next to/*chez*; according to
perí + acc.	movement around; extension all round/all over; by; *chez*/owned by; around a time; pertaining; dealing with
perí + gen.	around (Homeric); concerning a stake; about a topic; being worth
perí + dat. (rare after Homer except in Ionic; absent in the NT)	placed around; concerning a stake
pró + gen.	in front of; ahead; shielding, in defence, for the benefit of; before a time (most commonly); instead of, in exchange for, of the value of
prós + dat.	location facing/near, onto (often with contact); besides, in addition to
prós + gen.	if referring to person/god, the gen. is ablatival: from the presence of, *de chez*; done/said by (origin or agent); if referring to a thing, the gen. is partitive, not very dissimilar to *prós* + acc.: somewhere near/towards; in the presence of; (swearing) by a deity; appropriate for
prós + acc.	in the direction of, riented towards, located somewhere near/towards (place/time); against or in favor/support of; movement to/against a person; speaking/looking to; in reference to or in proportion with
sún/*xún* + dat.	comitative; with the help of; modal, temporal concomitance; instrument
hupér + gen.	position or movement above/over; position or movement beyond; covering/protecting, in defence of, for the sake of, on behalf of, for the benefit of; on account of; regarding
hupér + acc.	going above/over; (also horizontally, hence) beyond; exceeding/transgressing; all over/covering
hupó + gen.	from underneath (with gen. as abl., almost exclusive to Homer); somewhere underneath (with gen. as partitive, not unlike the dat.); by an agent or a prevailing force, by a cause
hupó + dat. (especially Homeric)	position underneath (also with limited motion and final rest); position at or movement to the base of; covered by, behind; under the power of; by an agent or a prevailing force
hupó + acc.	movement to under; extension under; position at or movement to the base of; under circumstances; coming under the power; around the time of

5. 'Improper' Prepositions

The Greek adpositional inventory comprised a second group of items as well. These, however, could not also be used as prefixes (cf. English *inside* vs. *in*), and are traditionally given the infelicitous name of 'improper' (German *unechte*) prepositions. Despite the growing importance they had in Greek, they are neglected in most accounts of Greek prepositional usage (e.g. Horrocks 1981, Luraghi 1996, 2003). A comparison between Homeric and later Greek shows 'improper' prepositions being increasingly used in lieu of the 'proper' ones, e.g. pre-Classical *ek béleōn* (Hom. *Il.* 11.163) = Classical *éxō belôn* (Xen. *Cyr.* 3.3.69) 'out of (reach of the) darts'. They constituted a later layer in the inventory (Schwyzer & Debrunner 1950:533; Chantraine 1948:147): less grammaticalized, usually polysyllabic, even polymorphemic, frequently intransitive. The majority governed only the genitive, with few exceptions. The commonest 'improper prepositions', with some of their commonest meanings, are:

antikrú + gen., 'opposite'	*engús* + gen., 'close to'
ektós + gen., 'outside'	*émprosthen* + gen., 'in front of'
enantíon + gen., 'opposite; against'	*héneka* + gen., 'because of'
entós + gen., 'within'	*éxō* + gen., 'outside'
háma + dat., 'with'	*héōs* + gen., 'as far as'
makrán + gen., 'far from'	*metaxú* + gen., 'between'
mékhris/ákhris + gen., 'as far as; until'	*ópisthen* + gen., 'from behind'
péra(n) + gen., 'beyond, across'	*périx* + acc./gen./dat., 'all round'
plḗn + gen., 'except'	*plēsíon* + gen., 'near'
pórrō + gen., 'far inside'	*prósthen* + gen., 'before'
khárin + gen., 'for the sake of'	*khōrís/áneu* + gen., 'away from, without'
hōs + acc., 'up to (a person)'	

Some 'improper' adpositions (*khárin, khōrís, enantíon*), like the 'proper' ones, could also be post-posed, but for them too (except *héneka*) pre-positioning was more common: *martúrōn enantíon* (Dem. *Or.* 27.18) = *enantíon martúrōn*

(Isocr. 9.12.4, 30.27.2), 'in the presence of witnesses'.

Only a few 'improper' adpositions (notably the late *ópisō* 'behind') expressed a meaning that no 'proper' preposition in Greek conveyed unambiguously. Nonetheless, even largely synonymous 'proper' and 'improper' prepositions rarely had a total and exact semantic overlap, including in their spatial meaning, because the 'proper' adpositions had wider semantic range (Skopeteas 2006:476–8): *en* was 'in' and *endon* 'inside', so that 'in the house' could be rendered both with *en* and *endon*, but 'in the street' only by the former.

6. Diachronic Trends in Ancient Greek Adpositional Usage

These include:

– *An increase in the use of adpositions* (a clear trend across the whole history of Greek, starting from Mycenaean); conversely, the use of plain cases for spatial meanings decreases.
– *Adpositional syntagms with the dative appear to be on the wane* (mostly replaced by preposition + gen.): e.g. *metá* took the dat. in Homer but no longer did in Attic, and in late Attic *perí* too ceased to take the dat.
– *Semantic differences between several prepositions fade*. So *apó* was abessive or ablative ('away from'), while *ek* was elative ('out of'), and they mirrored, in the expression of source-motion, the functions of *prós* ('to[wards]') and *eis* ('into') for goal-motion. But in Classical Greek we can see the distinction between *apó* and *ek* blurring. Similarly, *hupó* was originally subessive, while *katá* was sublative (i.e., directional); then the directional distinction faded. Among the prepositions that could mark location in the upper area of the referent object, *aná/epí/hupér*, in principle *epí* was superessive (indicating rest on a place), while *aná* was superlative; but *aná* + dative was also superessive and *epí* + acc. also directional, and *aná* became very rare. As for *hupér*, it denoted, unlike *epí*, lack of contact – but with exceptions (Fritz 2005:104): *epí* + gen., both when expressing location and movement, could also indicate contact. Furthermore, as noted above, *epí* and *hupér* could be used to indicate not only vertical but also *horizontal* movement or position, thus effacing

another semantic distinction. The preposition *amphí* initially meant 'on both sides of', but quickly developed the more diffuse sense of 'around' that was specific to *perí* (cf. also *metá*, which first meant 'between' two items but was extended to mean 'among' several items); in the Classical period *amphí* was gradually replaced by *perí*. In other synonymous pairs, one preposition took over the meaning of the other entirely: *antí* originally meant 'in front of'; but it lost its spatial sense very early on, which was then expressed by *pró*. The preposition *sún* appears comitative already in our earliest records: according to Conti (2003:219–20) *sún* + dat. denoted association in space and time of two independent entities, as well as indicating equipment (*Ausstattung*), and especially helpers, means, and manner; *metá*, on the other hand, was initially interessive: 'between/amongst', not 'with' (as Myceneaen *me-ta*; cf. also *metaxú* 'between'); later *metá* + gen. started to indicate comitation and to compete with *sún* (and with *háma*, which denoted spatio-temporal co-occurrence, company, and equipment, but not manner or instrument); from Classical Greek on, we see *sún* slowly declining.

In the expression of abstract meanings too we see various synonymous constructions coexisting, and some, in the long run, being discarded. For example, → agency in Greek was expressed by a range of constructions, mostly of ablatival or perlative meaning, as in many languages; *hupó* (+ dat., besides + gen.) marks agents already in Homer, particularly with verbs denoting subjugation or action imposed on others (a common metaphor; cf. Bortone 2010:75). As George (2005:102–3, 108–9, 266–8) noted, *hupó* + gen. is the most frequent expression for agency in Classical texts; if an agent physically sent or gave an object, prepositions with a clearer ablatival sense were used: *ek* and *prós* + gen. in Homer (and in Attic tragedy too, *metri causa*, for all types of actions), and *pará* + gen. in Attic prose; otherwise, *pará* + dat. (often for the agent of thinking). In → Koine, the main agency-marking construction was still *hupó* + gen.; the main replacement of *hupó* + gen. as agency marker was first *pará* + gen. (George 2005:222, 262–263), around the 6th c. CE. Despite few occurrences in Classical texts (and in Biblical Greek, as a literal translation of the Hebrew *min/mē* 'from'), *apó* prevailed only

in Medieval Greek (→ Developments in Medieval and Modern Greek).

7. Trends in Hellenistic Greek

These include:

a. Further increase in prepositional use. In Hellenistic Greek we often see prepositional phrases where Attic could have used plain cases, particularly the dat. but also gen. and acc.: *esthíousin apò tôn psikhíon* 'they eat [some of the] crumbs' (Mark 7:28).

b. The cases governed by a preposition often become fewer. In the more vernacular parts of the → New Testament, such as the Gospel of Mark, *perí*, *prós*, and *hupó* had stopped taking the dative, as had *metá*, already by the Classical period. Nowhere in the New Testament (cf. Luraghi 1996:108) do *metá* or *perí* govern a dative, while *epí, pará, prós*, and *hupó* take it more rarely. For some prepositions, notably *prós*, in the Koiné period there is also a stark reduction in the use of the genitive (some prepositions, such as *aná* and *amphí*, had genitives virtually only in Homer and in poetry). The accusative remains consistently in use: no preposition ceases to govern it. Already in Homer the acc. is, for most prepositions, the most frequent case, and the only case used with all prepositions governing two cases.

c. Increased frequency of the 'improper' prepositions. This is found in all Koiné styles, from Polybius to informal papyri – not only in Biblical Greek (where the very frequent 'improper' prepositions are also due to calques on Semitic prepositional expressions of similar meaning and structure, especially Hebrew *li-fney*, lit. 'to the face of' and *bəˤeiney* lit. 'in the eyes of') (→ Greek and Semitic Languages).

d. More 'improper' prepositions combine with a prepositional phrase. So the same author can use *makrán* + gen. (Polyb. 3.50.8) and *makrán* + *apó* + gen. (Polyb. 11.20.1) 'far from'.

e. New prepositions are appearing. What is noteworthy is that they are all of the 'improper' variety; indeed, some of them had already been long attested as adverbs. They include: *apénanti, katenṓpion, énanti/katénanti* 'in front of'; *apánōthen, huperánō* 'above'; *kuklóthen* 'around', *opísō* 'behind'.

f. The 'improper' prepositions appear to be predominantly or entirely spatial, especially at

earlier stages in their history. Conversely, several 'proper' prepositions are clearly used less in their spatial sense. Spatial meanings decrease, while abstract ones increase (Bortone 2010:169–170).

g. The semantic differences between cases used after a preposition diminish. The use of the three cases with their original spatial senses was already restricted primarily to *hupó, pará*, and *prós*, while other prepositions (e.g. *perí*) could indicate position or movement with all three cases. In this period this trend spreads further. In Koiné we find, for example, *pròs humâs ésomai* (Mark 9:19) 'will I be with you?' in which the acc. with *prós* has lost its allative sense. Prepositions combining with different cases without semantic difference occur also in syntagms with non-spatial senses. The main exception is *metá*, whose case-combinations are specialized: *metá* + acc. 'after'; *metá* + gen. 'with' (in the Middle Ages, this would be resolved by producing two different forms of the preposition, both governing the accusative).

h. The blurring of semantic distinctions between pairs of prepositions continues. Both *en* and *eis* derived from variants of the same form: **en/*ens* (**ens* developed into /e:s/, spelled εἰς or ἐς), like *ek/ex*, and (Hewson and Bubenik 2006:73) *pró/prós*. In Attic Greek *en* and *eis* had diverged semantically, owing to the different cases they governed: *en* + dat. was only inessive (i.e., position inside), while *eis* + acc. was illative (motion into). Other dialects (notably → Arcado-Cypriot, Boeotian, → Thessalian) had retained a single form with two combinations: *en* + dat. 'in' and *en* + acc. '(in)to'. Given the semantic bleaching of cases within the prepositional phrase and the fading of the distinction [±motion] between pairs of prepositions (*eis/en, katá/hupó, aná/epí*), motion was increasingly expressed by the verb instead of the preposition (cf. Skopeteas 2008:62–4).

i. Some prepositions obsolesce. So *amphí* was largely replaced by *perí; sún* lost ground to *metá* (also because *sún* required a dat.); *aná* disappeared except with (the acc. of) *mésos*, creating *anà méson* 'between, amidst'; *ek* still outnumbered *apó* in Biblical Greek, but *apó* was often used with the elative meaning of *ek*; *en* was still extremely common, but *eis* was becoming synonymous with it, paving the way for *en* (which required the dative) to disappear in the Middle Ages.

It should be noted, however, that Koine Greek also has usages unique to that period. Such usages are not limited to the Hebraisms of Biblical Greek, but include native constructions not used before or after (e.g. *hupér* introducing the second term of → comparison, *katá* + gen. indicating the possessor). Hellenistic Greek, therefore, should not be conceptualized as a linear evolution between Classical and Medieval Greek.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bortone, Pietro. 2002. "The status of the ancient Greek cases", *Studies in Greek linguistics* 22(1):69–80.
——. 2010. *Greek prepositions from antiquity to the present.* Oxford.
Chantraine, Pierre. 1948. *Grammaire homérique.* Paris.
Conti, Luz. 2003. "Die Bezeichnung instrumentalischer Bezüge bei Homer", *Indogermanische Forschungen* 108:195–222.
Fritz, Matthias. 2005. *Die trikasuellen Lokalpartikeln bei Homer – Syntax und Semantik.* Göttingen.
George, Coulter. 2005. *Expressions of agency in Ancient Greek.* Cambridge.
——. 2006. "The spatial use of ἀνά and κατά with the accusative in Homer", *Glotta* 82:70–95.
Giles, Peter. 1895. *A short manual of comparative philology for classical students.* London – New York.
Hewson, John and Vit Bubenik. 2006. *From case to adposition. The development of configurational syntax in Indo-European languages.* Amsterdam – Philadelphia.
Horrocks, Geoffrey. 1981. *Space and time in Homer. Prepositions and adverbial particles in the Greek epic.* New York.
Humbert, Jean. 1960. *Syntaxe grecque.* Paris.
Luraghi, S. 1996. *Studi su casi e preposizioni del greco antico.* Milan.
——. 2003. *On the meaning of prepositions and cases: the expression of semantic roles in Ancient Greek.* Amsterdam – Philadelphia.
Morpurgo Davies, A. 1983. "Mycenaean and Greek prepositions: o-pi, e-pi etc." In: *Res Mycenaeae – Akten des VII. internationalen mykenologischen Colloquiums in Nürnberg vom 6.-10. April 1981*, ed. by A. Heubeck and G. Neumann, 287–310. Göttingen.
Pompeo, F. 2002. *Dall'avverbio localistico alla preposizione in Omero.* Rome.
Schwyzer, Eduard and Albert Debrunner. 1950. *Griechische Grammatik – auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns griechischer Grammatik, II: Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik.* Munich.
Skopeteas, Stavros. 2006. "Prepositions and adverbs in Classical Greek". In: *Word classes and related topics in Ancient Greek*, ed. by E. Crespo, J. De La Villa, and A. R. Revuelta, 471–485. Louvain-la-Neuve.
——. 2008. "Encoding spatial relations: language typology and diachronic change in Greek", *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 61(1):54–66.
Wackernagel, Jacob. 1928. *Vorlesungen über Syntax, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*, vol. 2. 2nd ed. Basel.

PIETRO BORTONE