**Pietro Bortone**

# THE STATUS OF THE ANCIENT GREEK CASES

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ
Σύμφωνα μὲ τὴν παραδοσιακὴ ἄποψη, τὸ κλιτικὸ σύστημα τῆς ᾿Αρχαίας ῾Ελληνικῆς περιλαμβάνει δύο κατηγορίες· γραμματικὲς πτώσεις καὶ σημασιολογικὲς πτώσεις. ῾Ωστόσο, ἡ ἑρμηνεία αὐτὴ παραλείπει πλῆθος ἐξαιρέσεων. Στὴν παροῦσα μελέτη προτείνεται πὼς ὅλες οἱ πτώσεις (ἐκτὸς τῆς κλητικῆς, ποὺ κατ᾿ οὐσίαν δὲν εἶναι πτώση) εἶχαν καὶ γραμματικὲς χρήσεις καὶ συγκεκριμένη ἢ τοπικὴ σημασία (ἡ ὀνομαστικὴ ἀπὸ τὴν ἄποψη αὐτὴ εἶναι ἡ προβληματικότερη πτώση). ῾Υποστηρίζω πὼς ὑπάρχουν σοβαροὶ λόγοι γιὰ νὰ θεωροῦμε τὸ πτωτικὸ σύστημα τῆς ῾Ελληνικῆς συνεχὲς καὶ ἀδιάσπαστο, καὶ πὼς ἡ παραδοσιακὴ διάκριση εἶναι παραπλανητικὴ καὶ ἀνεπαρκής.

## 1. THE TRADITIONAL VIEW OF THE GREEK CASES
Scholars have traditionally split the case inventory of Ancient Greek into:

(a) 'grammatical' cases (also called 'syntactic' or 'abstract' cases)
(b) 'semantic' cases (also called 'local' or 'concrete' cases)

This division is not unlike the one made in Generative Grammar (Chomsky 1986:194) between (a) 'structural cases' (the nominative and the accusative) and (b) 'inherent cases' (presumably, in Ancient Greek, the genitive and the dative), that depend also on θ-roles – that is, on semantics and not only on syntax.

The *dichotomic* (rather than *unitary*) view of the Greek case system – like the related distinction between 'direct' and 'oblique' cases – presents a number of problems. Even if we concede that cases do fall into two groups, we cannot be sure of where to draw the dividing line[1]. So, although the division of cases into two categories (grammatical and semantic) is standard practice, we then find that scholars assign the same case to different categories – and why a given case is assigned to one set rather than to another is usually not explained. The commonest view of the Greek (and Latin, and Indo-European) cases[2] is as follows:

a) The nominative and the accusative are just grammatical cases;

b) The status of the dative is 'uncertain' (cf. Kuryłowicz 1964:179ff.; Hübschmann 1875:131; Brugmann 1900:374). The dative is also seen as grammatical by some (Barone 1926:69; Hofmann/Szantyr 1965:22), but as not grammatical by others (Kuryłowicz 1949:146; 1964:193) – although it marks indirect objects[3].

c) The genitive is more often classified as grammatical (Hübschmann 1875:131; Barone 1926:82, Kuryłowicz 1949:145, 1964:184), but the decision is often based on

dubious grounds: typically (Kuryłowicz, ibid.), it is said that the genitive (which can be 'objective' or 'subjective') is related transformationally to the nominative subject or to the accusative object. This does not take into account verbs taking cases other than the accusative – a common oversight, which I will discuss further in §6.1. Furthermore, the 'subjective' and the 'objective' genitive may also be regarded as stemming from possessive uses (Watkins 1967:2198).

The main problem is that cases of (allegedly) one type show uses of the other type. Some scholars (e.g. Kuryłowicz 1964:179ff., Blake 1994:35), explained away such exceptions by saying that for some cases (nominative, accusative, genitive) grammatical functions are *primary*, whereas for other cases (lost in Greek: instrumental, ablative, locative) the primary functions are the semantic ones. The criterion for classification, however, should not be statistical: the most frequent type of meaning need not be the original sense psychologically or historically. Most Greek accusatives are syntactic – more than 80% mark direct objects (López Facal 1974:54ff.) – but this does not prove that the local meaning of the accusative is a derivative of the object-marking sense, as it is then claimed (López Facal 1974:59).

## 2. THE ALTERNATIVE VIEW OF THE GREEK CASE INVENTORY

A very different (but not uncontroversial)[4] interpretation of the Greek cases is the 'localist' view: cases are posited to have an original[5] or primary spatial sense. Radical localists (cf. J.M. Anderson 1977:111), theorising on 'language' in general, postulate a local basis for all cases, including those with (synchronically) only grammatical meanings such as subject or object. Some Classical philologists (Bopp 1833:136; Ahrens 1852:9; Brugmann 1900:374) explicitly *assumed* that some (or even all) grammatical cases had had a spatial origin, but they did not explain why one should believe so. A localist approach undoubtedly gives us a unitary picture of the Greek case inventory – but it remains to be seen whether the data warrant it. Lyons (1979:301) pointed out that the relationship between grammatical and concrete cases, and their overlaps, have long awaited a theoretical examination firmly based on philological data. Let us see what data there are that might suggest that the distinction between semantic and grammatical cases is questionable.

## 3. 'SEMANTIC' USES OF THE GREEK OBLIQUE CASES

'Concrete' or 'semantic' uses are clearly attested for all Greek *oblique* cases, (regardless of word order), which makes the syntactic v. semantic distinction doubtful. We are leaving aside the nominative, accepting it (for the moment) as a grammatical case – we will see later why this is compatible with a unitary view.

We will not focus on diachrony, but it is interesting to note that Greek cases were more frequently and specifically concrete in Homer, the *oldest* form of alphabetic Greek (cf. Fritz 1997:26). Let us now see usage in the Greek of the Classical period.

### 3.1  The Classical Greek genitive

What we call 'the Classical Greek genitive' is the merger of two Indo-European cases: the genitive and the ablative[6]. When it was used as a genitive proper, the Classical 'genitive' was a *partitive* case (cf. Chantraine 1948:I:58):

τῆς δὲ Ἰωνίας … αἰσχρὸν νενόμισται (Pl.Sym.182b)
'in Ionia… it is considered opprobrious'

τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμέρας   'during the same day'[7] (Lys.22.12)

The genitive was also used as *ablative*:

ἡ γὰρ Αττικὴ πρὸς νότον κέεται πολλὸν τῆς Λήμνου
'Attica lies northwards, a long (distance) from Lemnos' (Hdt. 6.139)

εἴκουσι τῆς ὁδοῦ  'they retreat from the road' (Hdt.2.80)

### 3.2   The Classical Greek dative

What we call the Greek 'dative' continued the Indo-European dative, locative and instrumental – semantically as well as morphologically: -εσι is an old locative, -οις an old instrumental, -ῳ an old dative. The 'semantic' functions (= concrete senses) of the Classical dative are clear. One is to express direction (*pace* Barone 1926:48):

ποίοις οὐ χρὴ θηρίοις πελάζειν (X.Cyr.1.4.7)
'which sort of wild animals one must not go near *to*'

ἐμοῖς ἱκέτης προσῆλθες δόμοις (Aes.Eum.473ff.)
'you have come *to* my house, as a suppliant'

πέμπω σοὶ χρήματα (X.Cyr.6.2.1) 'I am sending goods *to* you'

The directional sense of the dative here is confirmed by synonymous costructions with directional prepositions: πέμπω + εἰς/ἐπί/παρά. With verbs like κατατείνω 'to stretch across', the dative is also said to be prosecutive (López-Facal 1974:167). It could be argued that even the dative of indirect objects is directional, as it marks prototypical recipients. The directional image underlying indirect objects was renewed and made clearer postclassically, when the dative was replaced by εἰς+accusative.

Finally, the Greek dative also retained, amongst others, a *locative* sense:

τῶν τε Μαραθῶνι μαχεσαμένων (Pl.Menex.241b)
'of those who fought at Marathon'[8]

### 3.3 The Classical Greek accusative

The accusative, commonly used as the direct object case, is also occasionally used to express spatial extension (as *allative*)[9] – as well as temporal extension, and the extent to which any predication applies:

Θρώσκει δόμους (Soph.Tr.58) 'rushes to the house'
ἄγειν στενὰς ὁδούς (X.Cyr.1.6.43) 'lead over narrow streets'
ἔμεινεν ἡμέρας ἑπτά (X.An.1.2.6) 'he remained for 7 days'
τὸν δάκτυλον ἀλγεῖ (Pl. Rep.462d) 'hurts in his finger'

It is not easy to pin down when a phrase has 'syntactic object' status (cf. Collinge 1984:10ff., J.M. Anderson 1984:40,46). There are, synchronically, intermediate stages between adverbial status and objecthood (cf. Sanders 1984:221ff.). Adverbs, in their prototypical form, are syntactically freer than objects; objects can be seen as adverbials turned into predicates: they become less optional and enter the sphere of verbal valency. They are (in every sense) more 'syntactic' and less 'semantic'.

In the case of the Greek accusative, it is also worth pointing out that the Indo-European accusative (for animate nouns) has, etymologically, only one ending for each number, so the fact that it has both spatial and grammatical senses cannot be written off as due to mergers of some quondam distinct forms. Given that the accusative constitutes one single marker syntactically, morphologically, and historically, it is reasonable for us seek a unitary value also semantically.

### 3.4 The Classical Greek cases in prepositional syntagms

The spatial sense of the Greek genitive, dative and accusative is also clear in syntagms with prepositions – such as ὑπό or παρά:

παρά+GENITIVE 'from near' = ablative sense
ἀγγελίη ἥκει παρὰ βασιλέος (Hdt.8.40)
'a message came from (at the court of) the king'

παρά+DATIVE 'at near' = locative sense
σιτοῦνται…παρὰ τῷ διδασκάλῳ (X.C.1.2.8)
'they eat beside their teacher'

παρά+ACCUSATIVE 'to near' = allative sense
παρὰ τὴν γέφυραν πέμψαι (X.An.2.4.17)
'send to the bridge'

The old spatial sense of the plain cases is highlighted also by the very *choice* of cases added to prepositions: ἀπό and ἐκ, expressing motion-away, only took the

genitive (= the ablative) in Attic Greek; likewise, the sociative preposition σύν took only the dative; the directional εἰς took the accusative, and so forth.


## 4. 'SYNTACTIC' USES OF ALL THE CASES

We saw that all the Greek oblique cases were synchronically (also) semantic. Now, conversely, let us consider whether there are syntactic/grammatical uses of all cases. Besides the recognised grammatical uses of the accusative and the nominative, are there parallel uses of the dative and the genitive?

The object of a Greek verb may indeed appear in the genitive or dative. This contradicts the idea that there are two distinct types of cases – unless, as it has been claimed, (a) the genitive/dative marking in such instances is just a syntactic or morphological quirk, or (b) objects in cases other than the accusative are not really objects. Let us examine these two possibilities.


### 4.1  The choice of genitive and oblique objects

The fact that the object of a Greek verb can be in a case other than the accusative is normally (and quite categorically) dismissed by Indo-European scholars like Kuryłowicz (1949:138/9; 1964:193), who claim that the genitive and the dative, if governed by a verb, are semantically empty allomorphs of the accusative: pure syntactic markers of objecthood. This contradicts Kuryłowicz's own assertion that the use of oblique cases with verbs is secondary, because it is limited to verbs that are 'semantically defined' (1964:184) and that it is therefore lexically-assigned rather than syntactically-assigned. Clearly, if *semantically* defined verbs take genitive and dative objects, the choice of case in their object must be semantically significant. Moreover, many Greek verbs have several arguments, each in a different case. How can this be semantically void? Indeed, when Greek verbs can take more that one case, the choice usually marks a semantic difference (Chanet 1994:47ff.) – which further disproves Kuryłowicz's idea of case selection being meaningless:

ἡγοῦμαι+genitive = 'to command, to dominate'
ἡγοῦμαι+dative = 'to direct, to guide'

κέχρημαι+genitive = 'to lack, to need, to yearn for'
κέχρημαι +dative = 'to enjoy, to treat'

κοινωνέω+genitive = 'to partake of '
κοινωνέω+dative = 'to have dealings with'

The use of cases other than the accusative (and the choice of a *particular* case) after certain verbs is often explicable on semantic grounds, as we now see.

In Greek, the dative, which has locative/comitative sense, is required by verbs such as ἐρίζω 'to contend with', ἀκολουθέω 'to follow' or διαλέγομαι 'to converse with'. Given its benefactive meaning, the dative is also required by verbs like βοηθῶ 'to help'. The case is governed *and* has meaning; it is syntactic *and* semantic.

Other Greek verbs require their object to be in the genitive. These verbs (like those requiring datives) belong, in the main, to a few specific semantic areas. While the accusative object is ὁλόκληρόν τι καὶ ἀκέραιον ἤ πρόσωπον ἤ πρᾶγμα – as Glykas said in the 14<sup>th</sup> century (Hübschmann 1875:24) – the genitive is partitive, and expresses a limited degree of affectedness of the object. Therefore it is used with ὀρέγομαι 'to reach for; to crave', ἐπιθυμέω 'to wish', ἐράω 'to long for', τυγχάνω 'to achieve', στοχάζομαι 'to strive for', ἅπτω 'to touch', ἥκω 'to have plenty of', μετίσκω 'to partake of', ἔχομαι 'to hold onto'. Thus genitive objects cannot be dismissed as a verb-valency peculiarity – also because they do occur with verbs that take accusatives:

τῆς γῆς ἔτεμον 'they ruined (parts of) the land' (Thuc.1.30.2)
ἔτεμον τὸ πεδίον 'they ruined the plain' (Thuc.2.55.1)

Such minimal pairs disprove Lyons' (1979:303) claim that the distinction between grammatical and local cases cannot be abandoned because, while cases traditionally labelled 'concrete' often *can be swapped*, it is not possible to substitute one 'abstract' case-inflection for another (without altering the sentence in other ways).

The Ancient Greek genitive, as we saw in §3.1, was also ablative (or abessive: denoting remote position or absence). This must be why it is required by verbs such as ἀπέχω 'to be distant', ἀπογίγνομαι 'to be away', εἴργω 'to exclude', χωρίζω 'to separate', εἴκω 'to withdraw', ἀπαλλάσσω / ἐλευθερῶ 'to free from', φείδομαι 'to refrain from', στερέω 'to deprive', δέομαι 'to lack' – although, admittedly, not with others, e.g. λείπω, φεύγω, ἐκπλέω (cf. De Boel 1988:14 and counterarguments in Barone 1926:22ff.). Post-classical Greek reinforced this use of the genitive with the use of ablative prepositions (confirming its original partitive/ablative function):

ἵνα λάβῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ (Mark 12.2) 'to take fruit'
πίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος (John 4.13) 'drinking water'<sup>10</sup>

Note that, as the object becomes increasingly grammaticalised, it may come to be expressed by the most grammatical object case: the accusative. So, in Greek, βοηθῶ (once [+ dative]) and ἐπιθυμῶ (once [+ genitive]) have come to take the accusative.

## 4.2 Can genitives and datives be true objects?
It has been claimed that the fact that the genitive and the dative are selected by some

verbs for semantic reasons is *ipso facto* a proof that they are not really governed (as the accusative is). It is taken as given that a case like *genitiuus neque Graecè nec Latinè à verbo regi potest* (Brocensis 1587:46; cf. also Kuryłowicz 1964:185). This idea is based on the dogma that semantic and grammatical case functions are mutually exclusive.

In transformational terms, the difference between a 'structural' case like the accusative and the 'inherent' cases was said to be shown by the fact that inherent cases cannot be passivised – passivisation being the standard test to prove verbal transitivity (cf. Chomsky 1965:103, Langacker 1991:229ff. and 301).

However, Greek genitive and dative objects can be passivised into a nominative subject in the same way in which a 'normal' accusative object can. Observe the passive use of ἄρχω 'to rule over; to dominate', or καταψηφίζω 'to vote against; to condemn', which required *genitive* objects:

ἐκείνος κατεψηφίσθη (X. Hell.4.2.36) 'he was voted against'

πολλοὶ ἡμῶν ἦρχον μὲν οὐδενός, ἤρχοντο δέ (X.Hist.8.4.1)
'many of us dominated nobody[GEN], but are dominated'

And the same can happen with Classical Greek verbs taking the *dative*, like βοηθῶ 'to help', πιστεύω 'to believe in', φθονῶ 'to envy':

διὰ σοφίαν φθονηθείς ὑπὸ τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως (X.Mem.4.2.33)
'he was envied by Odysseus on account of his wisdom'

βοηθεῖσθαι παρὰ τῶν ἧττον εὐπόρων (Arist.Rh.1383b28)
'to be helped by those less able to afford it'

ἐγὼ… ἐπιστευόμην δὲ ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων (X.An.7.6.33)
'I was trusted by the Lacedaemonians'.


## 5. SEMANTIC CONTIGUITY OF CASES

When two concepts come to be expressed, diachronically, by the same case, the reason (if it is not a phonological change) is likely to be a similarity in meaning. There are indications that in pre-historical Greek, semantic syncretism preceded morphological levelling (Rizzi 1985:86ff.). In Mycenean, for example, although ablative *forms* were still current (alongside genitive forms), they were all used, semantically, in the same way as genitive endings (Morpurgo-Davies 1960:61). Similarly, if, synchronically, two concepts are *ab initio* expressed by the same form, this must be due to a semantic affinity. This is how we should explain the overlap between instrumental and agentive senses in the Ancient Greek dative, and the (less

often noticed) coincidence between cases (and adpositions) with locative and comitative senses. There is also a frequent overlap between comitative and instrumental expressions (e.g. in σύν and in Modern Greek μέ), and between expressions of instrumental functions and expressions of manner. These overlaps are consistent cross-linguistically. If the co-occurring functions are charted side by side, a continuum becomes apparent, linking concrete and more abstract meanings[11]: *locative / comitative / instrumental / modal*.

This chain can be extended to syntactic cases. Blansitt (1988:177) posited a cross-linguistic continuum for allative prepositions: any two (or more) functions can be expressed in the same way (in transitive clauses) only if contiguous in the schema: *direct object / indirect object / motion-to / static location*. Reading Blansitt's schema backwards, the link between semantic and grammatical markers becomes clear: *location / direction / indirect objecthood / direct objecthood*. Diachronically, this is, for instance, the history of Latin *ad*. As Lyons (1979:302) noted, there is a

> ′coincidence across genetically-unrelated languages…so striking…
> [as to] demand an explanation in general syntactic theory′.

In Greek too, the locative had merged into the dative – which, in some functions, is synonymous with the accusative. Fritz (1997:23) maintains that the Homeric dative meant location (*Ortsruhe*) and goal (*Ziel*), while the accusative expressed direction (*Richtung*) or extent/extention (*Ausdehnung*/*Erstreckung*). But the Homeric dative, when used directionally, is allative like the accusative. It only has a more 'emotional' connotation – the *dativus* (*in*)*commodi*. The sense of goal-motion in the Greek dative and accusative probably differed (Conti Jiménez 1994:29) in pre-historical times (Vedic Sanskrit suggests so), but in Homer they are equivalent. In some abstract uses too, the dative started replacing the accusative – e.g. the 'accusative of respect' (Brugmann 1900:§444) – although the dative was dying out.

The idea of a continuum of case meaning also coincides, broadly, with many posited (controversial) case-inflection hierarchies. One such hierarchy indicates which cases a language must have in order to have some other particular case (cf. Blake 1994:89); a second is a hierarchy of role choice for subjects (Blake 1994:92, Fillmore 1968:33), and a possible third is the hierarchy of role choice for objects:

1) nominative <accusative (or ergative) <genitive <dative  <locative
2) agent <patient <recipient <beneficiary <instrument <location
3) (no agent) <patient <recipient <beneficiary <instrument <location.


## 6.  RE-EXPLAINING THE DIFFERENCES AMONGST CASES

It is undeniable that the Greek nominative (most of all) and the accusative are more

grammatical in sense than the dative and the genitive. However, Greek (as we saw) made also use (but *less*) of cases other than the accusative to mark verb objects and passivised them. Cross-linguistically (Blansitt 1984:145), datives becoming passive subjects are not frequent, and they only occur in languages that passivise accusatives too. In Homer, accusative objects are by far the most common type, dative objects are rarer, and genitive are the rarest (De Mauro 1960:220). This reflects what Lallot terms (1994:14) a 'degradation progressive de la transitivité'.

The accusative, conversely, has also concrete meanings – but only on occasion. It is also true that it became an increasingly 'meaningless' government-marking case, with both verbs and prepositions. But this is because all cases get more and more grammaticalised[12]. Indo-European languages (W.P. Lehmann 1976:445) also show a steady increase in the use of subjects, the most 'grammatical' function (which may explain why the nominative has no obvious spatial sense).

Thus, amongst cases, there are indeed differences in syntactic and semantic capabilities, but such as to constitute *a graded continuum, not two isolated and internally uniform sets*. This disproves another traditional tenet:

'aucun des cas concret n'est par lui-même plus central ou plus marginal qu'un autre'
Kuryłowicz (1949:146).

Positing that Greek cases form a *scale* according to degree of grammatical-ness (the order of genitive and dative being debatable) may also help explain various phenomena, such as diachronic syncretism.

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

a) Synchronically, all the Ancient Greek cases (possibly with the exception of the nominative) had concrete meanings – to a varying degree, as we would find in a hierarchy. The nominative is the most grammatical(ised) case and as such is 'entitled' (without problem for the theory) to having no clear concrete sense;

b) Synchronically, all the Ancient Greek cases had also grammatical meanings (albeit to a varying degree, as a scale would require). Thus some cases are more grammatical than others, but syntactic and concrete meanings can co-exist (e.g. the 'concrete' partitive genitive marks also verb objects and, marginally, subjects);

c) All Greek cases (except the nominative) can be seen as having been more clearly spatial at the earliest stages. Cross-linguistic evidence (in itself inadequate for Greek) shows that *all* cases can be linked diachronically. For Greek too there is abundant cross-linguistic evidence that concrete cases become grammatical in time. Local cases presuppose the other ones, because items expressing local meanings – as the history of Greek prepositions shows (cf. Bortone 1997) – are younger.

Thus *all Greek cases, in principle, are both grammatical and semantic, and the extent to which they are places them on a continuum rather than in distinct (and*

*homogenous) groups*. The status of cases like the dative is not 'uncertain' but intermediate. Drawing a dividing line would be artificial, and the point where one would place it could only be language-specific. *All this proves as inadequate and misleading the traditional and ubiquitous dichotomy between 'grammatical cases' and 'semantic cases'.*

This does not just lead to a formal rectification of a long-held assumption in Greek philology. It also suggests a different approach for future research on the use and history of the Greek cases – not a new assumption, but a better working hypothesis. It also allows us to analyse Greek cases in the light of what we know from Cognitive Linguistics, from studies of Greek adpositions, from cross-linguistic studies of case markers, from studies on the Localistic Hypothesis, on functional hierarchies, on metaphorisation, on iconicity, and on grammaticalisation.

---

**ENDNOTES**

[1] Whether a linguist assigns a given case (as a general cross-linguistic category) to one group or to the other, depends on which languages (s)he is familiar with. Mel'čuk (1986:72) classifies as grammatical cases genitive and dative, claiming that 'as a rule they do not express meaning'. This is obviously untenable for Greek.

[2] Throughout this paper, the term 'case' is to be taken to refer to *morphological* case (except when indicated otherwise). The case inventory of Classical Greek is here assumed to be as traditionally described (nom./gen./dat./acc. plus the remnants of the loc.). I have ignored the (limited) occurrences of obsolescent cases in non-classical texts, such as the Delphic ablative Ϝοίκω or the Homeric instrumental -φι.

[3] 41% of Herodotus' datives are indirect objects (López-Facal 1974:177).

[4] For invectives against a localist interpretation of cases, see Danielsen (1979:478ff.) 'nonsensicality… hopeless… yes, it is that bad', or De Mauro (1959:235ff.): 'one must radically object to this and similar delusions plaguing the field'.

[5] My use of 'origin(al(ly))' refers to an earlier stage in the history of the language, with the assumption that linguistic elements are periodically renewed. I do not refer to an *Ursprache* – an absolute beginning – which is an absurd concept, and I do not presuppose a stage at which other basic categories were not represented. De Boel (1988:37) attacks the idea that the accusative was originally spatial on the grounds that Pre-Indo-European could not have been without a case for grammatical objects. This is not what I suggest; some other accusative could have existed before.

[6] There are different interpretations of case syncretism in Ancient Greek (it has also been argued that different dialects syncretised case differently). For a summary of the problems see Morpurgo-Davies (1985:98ff.).

[7] Cf. parallel phrases with the accusative: ταύτην τὴν ἡμέραν 'for the duration of that day' (Th. 8.103.1) and dative: ταύτῃ τῇ· ἡμέρᾳ 'in that day' (X.An.1.7.4).

[8] Place terms (δόμῳ, πόντῳ) disambiguate the polysemic dative as locative.

[9] De Boel (1988:9ff., 159) lays huge emphasis on the fact that the spatial accusative implies that a goal is aimed at, whereas the accusative of direct objects implies that the object is reached. He therefore sees the accusative of direct objects as not derivable from the spatial one. However, prepositions of motion nearing but not reaching the object (e.g. παρά, πρός), also take the accusative. Moreover, prepositions such as εἰς may be both illative and terminative.

[10] Traditionally, a sharp distinction is made between partitive and ablative functions of the Greek genitive because it continues two distinct Indo-European cases. However, partitive and ablative/elative senses are also *semantically* related.

[11] The opposite view was held by many (e.g. De Boel 1988:13). The unitary approach to polysemy is well explored by Cognitive Linguistics.

[12] Out of the case chain, a further stage of grammaticalisation is also incorporation: λογογραφέω, ἀγαλματοποιέω, καραδοκέω, καρατομέω (some taking objects).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahrens, H.L. 1852. *Griechische Formenlehre des Homerischen und Attischen Dialektes*. Göttingen.

Anderson, J.M. 1977. *On case Grammar*. London.

Anderson, J.M. 1984. 'Objecthood'. Plank, F. ed. *Objects: towards a theory of grammatical relations*. 29-54. London.

Barone, M. 1926. *Studi sul significato fondamentale dell'accusativo e sulla teoria localistica*. Rome.

Blake, B. 1994. *Case*. Cambridge.

Blansitt, E.L. Jr. 1984. 'Dechticaetiative and dative'. Plank, F. ed. *Objects: towards a theory of grammatical relations*. 127-150. London.

Blansitt, E.L. Jr. 1988. 'Datives and allatives'. Hammond, M. /Moravcsik, E.A./ Wirth, J.R. *Studies in syntactic typology*. 173-191. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Bopp, F. 1833. *Vergleichende Grammatik des Sanskrit, Zend, Griechischen, Lateinischen, Gothischen und Deutschen*. Berlin.

Bortone, P. 1997. 'Greek prepositions and the Localistic Hypothesis'. *Oxford Working papers in Linguistics, Philology and Phonetics* 2: 7-16.

Brocensis, Franciscus Sanctius [Francisco Sánchez de las Brozas] 1587. *Minerva, seu de causis linguae latinae*. Salamanca.

Brugmann, K. 1900. *Griechische Grammatik*. 3rd ed. Munich.

Chanet, A-M. 1994. 'Sème négatif et génitif grec'. Jacquinod, B. ed. *Cas et prépositions en grec ancient*. 45-62. Saint-Étienne.

Chantraine, P. 1948. *Grammaire homérique*. Paris.

Chomsky, N.A. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge Mass.

Chomsky, N.A. 1986. *Knowledge of language*. New York.

Collinge, N.E. 1984. 'How to discover direct objects'. Plank, F. ed. *Objects: towards a theory of grammatical relations*. 9-27. London.

Conti Jiménez, L. 1994. 'Dativo homérico y locativo indoeuropeo para la expresión del punto final del movimiento'. Macía Aparicio, L.M et al. eds. *Quid ultra*

*faciam?* 25-31. Madrid.

Danielsen, N. 1979. 'A short note on the nonsensicality of Localistic Hypothesis theories'. *Sprachwissenschaft* 4 sect.4: 478-479.

De Boel, G. 1988. *Goal accusative and object accusative in Homer : a contribution to the theory of transitivity*. Brussels.

De Mauro, T. 1959. 'Accusativo, transitivo, intransitivo'. *Atti dell' Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei – Rendiconti* 14: 233-258.

De Mauro, T. 1960. 'Frequenza e funzione dell'accusativo in greco'. *Atti dell' Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei – Rendiconti* 15: 209-230.

Fillmore, Ch. J. 1968. 'The Case for Case'. Reprinted (edited) in Dirven, R./Radden, G. 1987. *Fillmore's Case Grammar – a reader*. 21-33. Heidelberg.

Fritz, M.A. 1997. *Die syntaktische und semantischen Relationen von Lokalpartikeln mit drei Kasus bei Homer*. Free University of Berlin, Doctoral dissertation.

Hofmann, J.B./Szantyr, A. 1965. *Lateinische Grammatik*. Munich.

Hübschmann, H. 1875. *Zur Casuslehre*. Munich.

Kury¬owicz, J. 1949. 'Le problème du classement des cas'. *Bulletin de la Société Polonaise de Linguistique* 9: 20-43.

Kury¬owicz, J. 1964. *The inflectional categories of Indo-European*. Heidelberg.

Lallot, J. 1994. 'La syntaxe des cas obliques chez Apollonius Dyscole'. Jacquinod, B. ed.. *Cas et prépositions en grec ancient*. 1-19. Saint-Étienne.

Langacker, R.W. 1991. *Foundation of Cognitive Grammar. Vol. 2*. Stanford.

Lehmann, W.P. 1976. 'From topic to subject in Indo-European'. Li, C. ed. *Subject and Topic*. 445-456. New York.

López Facal, J. 1974. *Los usos adverbales del acusativo, dativo y genitivo en la lengua de Heródoto*. Madrid.

Lyons, J. 1979. 'Knowledge and truth: a localistic approach'. Allerton, D.J./Carney, E./Holdcroft, D. *Function and context in linguistic analysis*. 111-141. Cambridge.

Mel'čuk, I.A. 1986. 'Towards a definition of Case'. Brecht, R.D./Levine, J.S. edit. *Case in Slavic*. 35-85. Columbus Ohio.

Morpurgo-Davies, A. 1960. 'Il genitivo miceneo e il sincretismo dei casi'. *Atti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei - Rendiconti* 15: 33-61.

Morpurgo-Davies, A. 1985. 'Mycenaean and Greek language'. Morpurgo-Davies, A./Duhoux, Y. eds. *Linear B: a 1984 survey*. 75-125. Louvain-la-Neuve.

Rizzi, E. 1985. 'Note sul sincretismo dei casi in greco antico'. *Studi italiani di linguistica teorica e applicata* 14: 85-105.

Sanders, G. 1984. 'Adverbials and objects'. Plank, F. ed. Objects: towards a theory of grammatical relations. 221-241. London.

Watkins, C. 1967. 'Remarks on the genitive'. *To honor Roman Jakobson - essays on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*. 3: 2191-2198. The Hague.

**KEYWORDS**