

Lexicographic Bulletin

Vol 27 (2023)

Lexicographic Bulletin

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

KENTRON EPEYNHΣ ΝΕΟΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΩΝ ΔΙΑΛΕΚΤΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΙΔΙΩΜΑΤΩΝ - IANE

ΛΕΞΙΚΟΓΡΑΦΙΚΟΝ ΔΕΛΤΙΟΝ

27-28



ΑΘΗΝΑ 2023

The loss of the partitive genitive in Greek

Dionysios Mertyris

doi: [10.12681/ld.38008](https://doi.org/10.12681/ld.38008)

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

ΚΕΝΤΡΟΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΗΣ ΝΕΟΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΩΝ ΔΙΑΛΕΚΤΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΙΔΙΩΜΑΤΩΝ - ΙΔΝΕ

ΛΕΞΙΚΟΓΡΑΦΙΚΟΝ ΔΕΛΤΙΟΝ

27-28



ΑΘΗΝΑ 2023

ΛΕΞΙΚΟΓΡΑΦΙΚΟΝ ΔΕΛΤΙΟΝ

27-28

ΛΕΞΙΚΟΓΡΑΦΙΚΟΝ ΔΕΛΤΙΟΝ 27-28

© Copyright 2023: Ακαδημία Αθηνών
ΚΕΝΤΡΟΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΗΣ ΤΩΝ ΝΕΟΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΩΝ ΔΙΑΛΕΚΤΩΝ
ΚΑΙ ΙΔΙΩΜΑΤΩΝ-ΙΛΝΕ
ΤΗΣ ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑΣ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ
Αλεξάνδρου Σούτσου 22, 106 71 Αθήνα
<http://www.academyofathens.gr/el/research/centers/greekdialects>
Επιμέλεια έκδοσης:
ΙΩ ΜΑΝΟΛΕΣΣΟΥ, Διευθύνοντας
ΓΕΩΡΓΙΑ ΚΑΤΣΟΥΔΑ, Ερευνήτρια
ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΜΕΡΤΥΡΗΣ, Ερευνητής

LEXICOGRAPHIC BULLETIN 27-28

© Copyright 2023: Academy of Athens
RESEARCH CENTRE FOR MODERN GREEK DIALECTS – ILNE
OF THE ACADEMY OF ATHENS
Alexandrou Soutsou 22, Athens 106 71
<http://www.academyofathens.gr/el/research/centers/greekdialects>
Volume editors:
IO MANOLESSOU, Acting director
GEORGIA KATSOURA, Researcher
DIONYSIOS MERTYRIS, Researcher
ISSN: 0400-9169
e-ISSN: 2945-2759

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

ΚΕΝΤΡΟΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΗΣ ΝΕΟΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΩΝ ΔΙΑΛΕΚΤΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΙΔΙΩΜΑΤΩΝ -ΙΑΝΕ

ΛΕΞΙΚΟΓΡΑΦΙΚΟΝ ΔΕΛΤΙΟΝ

27-28



ΑΘΗΝΑ 2023

ΠΕΡΙΕΧΟΜΕΝΑ

Περιεχόμενα.....	7-8
Πρόλογος.....	9-10
†Peter Mackridge, <i>Αθησαύριστο λεξιλόγιο από τον Σάραχο του Πόντου: από την αυτηκοΐα (δεκαετία του 1980) στα κατάλοιπα του I. Παρχαρίδη (1876)</i>	11-64
Μαρία Βραχιονίδου, <i>Ντε, ντεμέκ, μπάρεμ, εμ ... εμ: Τουρκικά δάνεια ως πραγματολογικοί δείκτες στην κοινή νέα ελληνική και τις διαλέκτους</i>	65-92
Γεωργία Κατσούδα, <i>Αξιοποιώντας το σημασιολογικό κριτήριο στην ετυμολογική έρευνα: επανετυμολογήσεις του κοινού νεοελληνικού λεξιλογίου</i>	93-110
Νικόλαος Κονομής, <i>Ετυμολογικές σημειώσεις του κυπριακού ιδιώματος (μνήμη Κυριάκου Χατζηιωάννου)</i>	111-134
Μαγδαληνή Κωνσταντινίδου, <i>Το ιδίωμα της νήσου Λέρου (Δωδεκανήσου)</i>	135-230
Ιώ Μανωλέσσου & Νικόλαος Παντελίδης, <i>Από την ιστορία της τσακωνικής διαλέκτου: μία νέα άγνωστη πηγή</i>	231-250
Διονύσιος Μερτύρης, <i>The loss of the partitive genitive in Greek</i>	251-282
Σταμάτης Μπέης & Όλγα Πατεράκη, <i>Απόψεις περί ετυμολογίας και κοινωνικές αναπαραστάσεις στη σύγχρονη Ελλάδα</i>	283-298
Ελένη Παπαδοπούλου, <i>Όψεις του διαλεκτικού λεξιλογίου γύρω από την φυχονοητική μειονεξία</i>	299-316
Συμεών Τσολακίδης, <i>Ρηματική υποκατάσταση στις διαλέκτους του εσωτερικού της Μικράς Ασίας.....</i>	317-334
Γεώργιος Τσουκνίδας & Γεώργιος Χαιρετάκης, <i>Η σύνθεση σε ιδιώματα της Φθιώτιδας</i>	335-353

<i>Διαλεκτική λεξικογραφία: ελληνική βιβλιογραφία (II)</i> (Γ. Κατσούδα)	355-379
Νεκρολογίες	
Δικαίος Β. Βαγιακάκος (1915-2016) (Σ. Τσολακίδης).....	381-414
Νικόλαος Γ. Κοντοσόπουλος (1929-2020) (Χ. Καραντζή).....	415-433
Δημήτριος Α. Κρεκούκιας (1919-2019) (Δ. Γκαραλιάκος)..	435-444
<i>Πίνακας λέξεων</i>	445-457

THE LOSS OF THE PARTITIVE GENITIVE IN GREEK

Dionysios Mertyris
Academy of Athens

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Η γενική στην Αρχαία Ελληνική διέθετε τρεις σημασίες, καθώς εκτός από τις κτητικές και μεριστικές (διαιρετικές) λειτουργίες που κληρονόμησε από την Πρωτο-Ινδο-Ευρωπαϊκή γενική, μπορούσε να έχει και αφαιρετική σημασία, την οποία απέκτησε λόγω της απώλειας της αφαιρετικής πτώσης πριν από τον 8ο αι. π.Χ. Ωστόσο, η γενική της Νέας Ελληνικής έχει χάσει τόσο τη μεριστική όσο και την αφαιρετική χρήση της, με την κτήση να είναι η μόνη αρχαία σημασία που έχει διατηρηθεί. Αυτές οι αλλαγές εντάσσονται στην ευρύτερη αναδόμηση του αρχαίου πτωτικού συστήματος στο πλαίσιο της σταδιακής υποχώρησης των σημασιολογικών χρήσεων των πλάγιων πτώσεων εξαιτίας της εκτεταμένης χρήσης των προθετικών φράσεων και άλλων αναλυτικών δομών. Έτσι, το παρόν άρθρο επιχειρεί να ανιχνεύσει την πορεία της απώλειας των μεριστικών λειτουργιών της γενικής στην Ελληνική και να εντοπίσει τους παράγοντες που οδήγησαν σε αυτήν.

Keywords: partitive, pseudo-partitive, diachronic change, morphosyntactic change, Greek

1. Introduction

Due to the fact that Greek is a language with a long documented history, it offers a unique opportunity for the general study of diachronic change and the variation in the marking of partitive constructions in particular. As the Greek case system has undergone several changes through its diachrony, but has not been

completely lost like in other European languages (e.g. Romance), the examination of the diachrony of its partitive constructions is extremely interesting. Table 1 summarizes the major changes in the diachrony of the Greek case system:

Table 1: The diachrony of the Greek case system¹

Proto- Indo-Eu- ropean	NOM	ACC	DAT	LOC	INS	ABL	GEN (+possessive / +partitive)
Ancient Greek	NOM	ACC	DAT			GEN (+possessive/ +partitive/ +ablative)	
Medieval – Mod- ern Greek A	NOM	ACC (+dative)			GEN (+possessive/ -partitive/ -ablative)		
Medie- val/ Modem Greek B	NOM	ACC	GEN (+possessive/ + dative/ -partitive/ -ablative)				

As the Ancient Greek genitive had inherited its possessive and partitive functions from the Proto-Indo-European genitive and the ablative functions from the Proto-Indo-European ablative, it covered a wide range of usages that were based on the cognitive metaphors ‘parts are possessions’ and ‘wholes are origins’ (cf. Nikiforidou 1991).

More specifically, Conti & Luraghi (2014) have identified the following usages of the partitive genitive in Ancient Greek: i) adnominal complement, ii) second argument, iii) subject, iv) third argument, and v) adverbial adjunct. In contrast, the Modern Greek genitive cannot express any of these functions mostly due to the fact that the accusative became both the exclusive prepositional and direct object case², as can be seen in Table 2:

¹ The vocative is not listed here, as it is not considered a true case (Blake 1994: 9). Conventional periodization is as follows: **Ancient Greek** = 8th c. BC – 4th c. AD, **Late Medieval/ Modern A** = North-Eastern Medieval and Modern Greek incl. Asia Minor 11th c. AD-today, **Late Medieval/ Modern B** = South-Western Medieval and Modern Greek incl. Standard Modern Greek 11th c. – today.

² The influence of archaic Katharevousa has led to the reintroduction of structures that allow the use of the genitive in these syntactic domains in higher registers, e.g. λόγω της οικονομίας λόγο tis ikonomías ‘because of the economy’/ προηγείται του αντιπάλου proiyíte tu andipálu ‘s/he is ahead of the opponent’.

Table 2: Partitive constructions in the diachrony of Greek

construction	ANCIENT GREEK	MODERN GREEK
<i>adnominal partitive</i>	<u>genitive</u> πολλοὶ τῶν στρατηγῶν <i>pollōi tō:n strate:gh:n³</i> 'many of the generals'	<u>από αρό</u> 'from' + acc. πολλοί απ' τους στρατηγούς <i>polí apó tus stratiyús</i> 'many of the generals'
<i>adnominal pseudo-partitive</i>	<u>genitive</u> ποτήριον οἴνου <i>poté:rion oínu:</i> 'cup of wine'	<u>juxtaposition</u> ποτήρι κρασί <i>potíri (N/A) krasí (N/A)</i> 'glass of wine'
<i>adverbial second argument</i>	<u>genitive</u> πίνω τοῦ οἴνου <i>pínō: tū: oínu:</i> 'I drink of the wine'	<u>από αρό</u> 'from' or acc. πίνω (από) το κρασί <i>píno (apo) to krasí</i> 'I drink (of) the wine'
<i>adverbial third argument</i>	<u>genitive</u> γεμίζω τὸ ποτήριον οἴνου <i>gemízō: tō poté:rion oínu:</i> 'I fill the cup with wine'	<u>accusative or με me</u> 'with' γεμίζω το ποτήρι (με) κρασί <i>gemízo to potíri (me) krasí</i> 'I fill the glass with wine'
<i>subject</i>	<u>genitive (sporadic use)</u> ἡλθον τῶν στρατηγῶν ἔ:lthon tō:n strate:gh:n 'some of the generals came'	<u>strictly nominative</u> ήρθαν μερικοί από τους στρατηγούς <i>írthan merikí apó tus stratiyús</i> 'some of the generals came'
<i>adjectival complement</i>	<u>genitive</u> ποτήριον πλήρες οἴνου <i>poté:rion plē:res oínu:</i> 'cup full of wine'	<u>accusative or με me</u> 'with' ποτήρι γεμάτο (με) κρασί <i>potíri gemáto (me) krasí</i> 'glass full of wine'
<i>adpositional complement</i>	<u>genitive</u> δι' ὁμίλου <i>di' homílu:</i> 'through the crowd'	<u>accusative</u> μέσα από το πλήθος <i>mésa apó to plíθos</i> 'through the crowd'
<i>adverbial (time)</i>	<u>genitive</u> νυκτός nyktós 'at (some part of) night'	<u>accusative of time</u> τη νύχτα ti níxta 'at night'
<i>adverbial (space)</i>	<u>genitive (limited use)</u> Ἄργους ἦν Árgu:s ē:n 'he was in (some area of) Argos'	<u>σε se</u> "in/ to" ήταν στο Άργος <i>ítan sto Árgos</i> 'he was in Argos'

³ All examples are transcribed phonologically in the IPA unless there is use of brackets ([...]), which indicate a phonetic transcription. The transcription of examples from Hellenistic Greek (323 BC - 4th c. AD) is based on Horrocks (2010). Stress accent is marked by the acute.

Based on what is presented in Table 2, this paper aims to trace the origins of this change and identify the causes that led to the loss of the partitive functions of the Greek genitive. The only usages that will not be discussed in this paper are: i) partitive subjects, due to the fact that these were already rare and sporadic in Ancient Greek (cf. Seržant 2012a; Conti & Luraghi 2014); and ii) adpositional complements, since the accusative became the exclusive prepositional case by the end of the early Medieval Greek period (5th-10th c. AD), which is a change that does not only involve the loss of the partitive functions of the case, but also (and perhaps more importantly) of the ablative ones.

The paper will be organized as follows. The introduction provides the theoretical background of the paper and its methodology. The following sections treat the loss of the partitive genitive in the syntactic domains of adnominal complements (Section 2), adverbial (second and third) and adjectival complements (Section 3) and adverbial adjuncts (Section 5).

1.1. Case, genitives and partitives

This paper adopts the definition of case given by Blake (1994: 1): “a system of marking dependent nouns for the type of relationship they bear to their heads”. Consequently, the genitive is a very common case crosslinguistically, mostly used as an adnominal complement denoting possession. The cognitive interplay between possessors and recipients can occasionally lead to the association of genitives with dative constructions, as can be seen in the languages of the Balkan Sprachbund.

As regards partitive constructions, it was hinted earlier that the partitive meaning of Ancient Greek (and most likely Proto-Indo-European) is based on the cognitive metaphor ‘parts are possessions’. The term ‘true partitive’ refers to structures that involve partitive constructions as selections of subsets out of supersets (Koptjevskaia-Tamm 2001: 527) that are usually expressed by numerals and quantifiers, e.g. *three of these apples/ a few of these apples*. As will also be discussed in Section 3, the main difference between true and pseudo-partitives lies in the fact that the former refer to a known and specific superset.

1.2. Methodology

Part of the diachronic and dialectal data in this paper were included in Mertyris (2014). Diachronic data from the previous stages of Greek have been collected from the electronic corpora of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (Classical, Hellenistic and Medieval Greek texts) and the *Duke Databank of Documentary Papyri* (non-literary papyri of the late Hellenistic Greek period). The data from Modern Greek dialects come from dialectal studies, grammatical descriptions and collections of narratives.

As noted earlier, the major advantage of the Greek language in diachronic studies is its long documented history, but that does not come without its problems. More specifically, the relative absence of the vernacular language due to the use of archaic Greek in the literary texts of late Hellenistic (1st c. AD - 4th c. AD) and early Medieval Greek (5th c. - 11th c. AD) is extremely problematic, as the changes that shaped the medieval and the modern language have not been documented in sufficient detail. Thus, on the one hand the major source for these intermediate stages is the late Hellenistic documentary papyri of Egypt, which nevertheless exhibit the disadvantage that they too imitate archaic patterns and that some of them might have been written by second language speakers, and as such some constructions may not reflect the actual spoken language of the time. On the other hand, the vernacular Medieval and early Modern texts (12th-18th c. AD) are of limited use for the study of partitive constructions in Greek, as the changes shown in Table 2 had already taken place and the intermediate stages are not represented apart from exceptions or clear instances of archaic influence. This methodological impediment is the reason why this study does not include quantitative data.

2. Adnominal true partitives in Greek

The Ancient Greek genitive was essentially the exclusive marker of adnominal partitives, as alternative strategies were quite rare. Structures that could have provided the source of its replacement by prepositional phrases can be traced in constructions that were already in use in Ancient Greek. For instance, the following example exhibits the use of an elative prepositional phrase (*ἐκ* 'out of' + genitive) that depends on the verb rather than on the NP (cf. Bortone 2010: 143):

(1) ἐκ πολέων πίσυρας συναείρεται ἵππους
ek poléō:n písuras sunaeíretai híppo:s
 out.of many:GEN.pl.m four:ACC.pl.m
 take:3sg.MID horse:ACC.pl.m
 'he takes four horses out of many' Hom.*Il.* 15.680

Such structures could potentially lead to a reanalysis that would associate the prepositional phrase with the object instead of the verb: [ADJUNCT *ἐκ πολέων*] [VP *συναείρεται*] [NP *πίσυρας ἐπους*] → [VP *συναείρεται*] [NP *πίσυρας ἐπους*] [PART *ἐκ πολέων*].

The first actual attestations of prepositional phrases replacing the plain genitive come from the Classical period. For instance, in Thucydides the ablative $\alpha\pi\tau\delta$ *apό* ‘from’ (+genitive) is used in three structures with the subset $\delta\lambda\gamma\sigma\zeta$ *oligos* ‘little/ few (pl.)’ and the superset $\pi\lambda\lambda\zeta\zeta$ *polis* ‘much/ many (pl.)’:

(2) ὥλιγοι ἀπὸ πολλῶν ἐπ' οἴκου ἀπενόστησαν
 ólígoi apò pollῶ:n ep' oíku:
 few:NOM.pl.m from many:GEN.pl to home:GEN.sg
 apenóstē:san
 return:3pl.PST.PFV
 'few of many returned home' Th. 7.87.6

These structures are extremely rare, as can be seen by both the low number of attestations and the fact that they occur with specific subsets and supersets. While the ablative and elative prepositions governing the genitive had not been fully grammaticalized as partitive markers at the time, it can be inferred that their use was essentially an attempt to reinforce the partitive meaning of the structure (cf. Bortone 2010: 143), as in some contexts the high polysemy of the plain genitive might have been opaque.

In post-Classical Greek, the use of these structures increases, cf. Mayser (1934: 348–352) on the replacement of the bare partitive genitive by ἀπό *apó* ἐκ *ek* in documentary papyri. Table 3 shows the occurrence of ἀπό *apó* ‘from’ and ἐκ *ek* ‘out of’ with the quantifier πολὺς *polýs* ‘much/ many’ in the *Septuagint* (3rd–2nd c. BC) and the *New Testament* (1st c. AD):

Table 3: Bare genitive vs. ἀπό *apó* / ἐκ *ek* with *πολύς polýs*

	$\pi\circ\lambda\circ\varsigma$ <i>polys</i> + genitive	$\pi\circ\lambda\circ\varsigma$ <i>polys</i> + $\grave{\alpha}\kappa\pi\circ$ <i>apó</i> / $\grave{\epsilon}\kappa$ <i>ek</i> (+gen.)
Thucydides (5 th c. BC)	100%	0%
Septuagint (3 rd -2 nd c. BC)	70%	30%
New Testament (1 st c. AD)	66%	34%

It is safe to assume that this tendency to replace the plain genitive with an ablative/ elative prepositional phrase reached its peak in the early Medieval Greek period (5th-10th c. AD), during which the plain genitive was no longer able to mark partitive functions. What is more, during that period the accusative became the exclusive prepositional case, as the loss of the ablative and partitive functions of the genitive could not support its use as a prepositional complement instead of the more unmarked and frequent accusative.

Thus, in late medieval vernacular texts the Modern Greek structure of *ἀπό apó* + accusative has been solidified (cf. Holton et al. 2019; 1965 & 1993):

(3) εῖς ἀπὸ τοὺς τρεῖς μας
 is *apό* *tus* *tris* *mas*
 one:NOM from the:ACC.pl.m three:ACC.pl 1pl:GEN
 'one of the three of us' *Dig. E 1217*

The early establishment of the structure is also confirmed by the fact that partitive genitive relics⁴ do not exist in dialectal and Common Modern Greek apart from vestiges in superlative structures and when a pronominal clitic is the superset, e.g.:

(4) ο καλύτερος ἀνθρωπος του κόσμου/ στον κόσμο
o kalíteros ánthropos
 the:NOM better:NOM human:NOM
tu kósmu / ston kósmo
 the:GEN world:GEN / in.the:ACC world:ACC
 'the best person of the world/ in the world'

⁴ Note that in Modern Greek (dialectal and common), the syncretic (i.e. morphologically accusative, cf. Mertyris [2014]) pronominal genitive plural can only be used when the subset and the superset are identical, cf. *οι δύο σας i διό sas* ‘the two of you (=both of you)’ vs. *δύο από εσάς διό apό esás* ‘two of you’.

In Pontic Greek the genitive plural óλων ólon (<AG gen.pl ὅλων *hólōn* <ὅλος *hólos* ‘whole’) has been grammaticalized as a superlative marker:

(5) óλων το μικρόν το χαλίν
 ólon to mikrón to xalín
 whole:GEN.pl the small the carpet
 ‘the smallest carpet (lit. the small carpet of all)’
 Parcharidis (1951: 102)

Finally, the influence of the archaic Katharevousa, which was the official language of the Greek state from 1830 till 1976, has reintroduced quantity nouns and fractions that may employ a partitive genitive in mostly higher registers of Standard Modern Greek, while the periphrastic construction can also be used:

(6) a. éνας μικρός αριθμός των φοιτητών / από τους φοιτητές
 énas mikrós ariθmós ton fititón (GEN)/
 énas mikrós ariθmós apó tus fitités (από apó +ACC)
 ‘a small number of the students’

b. το ένα τρίτο των ψηφοφόρων / από τους ψηφοφόρους
 to éna trító ton psifofóron (GEN)
 to éna trító apó tus psifofórus (από apó +ACC)
 ‘one third of the voters’

3. Adnominal pseudo-partitives in Greek

As mentioned in Section 2, the main difference between true partitive and pseudo-partitive constructions lies in the fact that the former involve a definite superset, whereas the latter refer to an abstract superset, usually the type of entity quantified by a nominal quantifier. As regards the diachrony of Greek, it is of great interest that in Ancient Greek both constructions were marked by the same strategy, i.e. the genitive, but in later periods of the language their marking became distinct, which is the case in a few other languages; for instance, in Finnish the elative marks true partitive constructions, whereas the partitive marks pseudo-partitive constructions (Rutkowski 2007). According to Koptjevskaia-Tamm (2009), five main types of adnominal pseudo-partitives can be identified: i) container, e.g. *a cup of wine*; ii) measure, e.g. *two litres of water*; iii) part, e.g. *a piece of snow*; iv) form, e.g. *a pile of books*; and v) quantum, e.g. *a pinch of salt*.

Alexiadou & Stavrou (2020: 724) adopt a slightly different classification⁵: i) classifier nouns, e.g. *a swarm of bees*; ii) cardinal nouns, e.g. *a dozen of bottles*; iii) quantifier nouns, e.g. *a number of people*; iv) measure/ unit nouns, e.g. *two litres of milk*; v) partitive nouns, e.g. *a piece of cake*; vi) container nouns, e.g. *a glass of wine*; vii) group (collective) nouns, e.g. *a team of players*; and viii) consistitive nouns, e.g. *a bunch of books*.

Starting with the marking of pseudo-partitive structures in Ancient Greek, not only was the genitive the exclusive strategy used, but also there is no attestation of alternative structures in Archaic and Classical Greek:

(7) a. *κύπελλα οἴνου* CONTAINER
kúpella *oíno:*
 cup:N/A.pl wine:GEN.sg
 'cups of wine' Hom.*Il.* 4.345-6

b. *δέκα δὲ χρυσοῖο τάλαντα* MEASURE
déka *dè* *khrusoîo* *tâlanta*
 ten ptc gold:GEN.sg talent:N/A.pl
 'ten talents of gold' Hom.*Il.* 9.122

c. *τὰ δὲ ἀέρος τμήματα* PART
ta` *de`* *aéros* *tmé:mata*
 the:N/A.pl ptc air:GEN.sg piece:N/A.pl
 'the fractions of air' Pl.*Ti.* 56e

d. *σωρὸν μέγαν σίτου* FORM
so:ròn *mégan* *sítô:*
 heap:ACC.sg big:ACC.sg grain:GEN.sg
 'a great heap of food' Hdt. 1.22.1

e. *μίνθης δεσμίδα* QUANTUM
mínthes *desmída*
 mint:GEN.sg bundle:ACC.sg
 'a bundle of mint' Hp. *Mul.* i-iii 78.123

Apart from those five types, the AG pseudo-partitive genitive was also used with numerical nouns similarly to Finnic and Balto-

⁵ It should be noted that Alexiadou & Stavrou (2020: 719 & 729) also include relations of duration as pseudo-partitives (e.g. *a journey of three hours*), but such structures in fact constitute non-anchoring possessive relations (cf. Koptjevska-Tamm 2005).

Slavic languages; however, unlike these languages in which the use of partitive constructions occurs with numbers higher than five, in AG the genitive could be used with numerical nouns of nominal origin denoting numbers higher than a thousand both in cardinal and nominal use, e.g. *μυριάς* *myriás* “a group of ten thousand”, *χιλιάς* *khiliás* “millenary”:

(8) εἴκοσι μυριάδες Αἰγυπτίων
eikosi muriádes Aiguptíōn
 twenty ten-thousand:NOM.pl.f Egyptian:GEN.pl.m
 ‘two hundred thousand Egyptians’ Hdt. 2.30.7

The only attestation of the use of juxtapositions in Classical Greek with these numerical nouns comes from the dubious tragedy *Rhesus* that is conventionally attributed to Euripides:

(9) μυριάδας τε πόλεις ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐκένωσεν
myriádas *te* *póle:s*
 ten.thousand.ACC.pl.f and city:N/A.pl.f
andrɔ:n *agathɔ:n* *ekénɔ:sen*
 man:GEN.pl.m good:GEN.pl.m empty:3sg.PST
 ‘and he emptied countless cities of their brave heroes’
Eur. Rh. 913

As this is the only attestation of such a structure in Classical Greek, it is a sign that the text is of post-Classical origin and might not have been entirely produced in the Classical period (cf. Manousakis & Stamatatos 2018). Regardless of the exact date of the example above, similar structures appear more frequently in Hellenistic Greek:

(10) a. πεντακόσιαι χιλιάδες ἄνδρες
pentakósie *khiliádes* *ándres*
 500:NOM.pl.f millenary:NOM.pl.f man:NOM.pl.m
 'five hundred thousand men' 2Ch. 13.17.3

b. δώδεκα χιλιάδες ἐσφραγισμένοι
dodeka *khiliádes* *esphragismény*
 twelve millenary:NOM.pl.f seal:MP.PTCP.NOM.pl.m
 'twelve thousands of sealed men' Apoc. 7.8

Quite clearly, the influence of regular cardinal numerals, which function like adjectives, i.e. agreeing adnominal modifiers, was the driving force behind these structures, e.g.:

(11) a. Classical Greek
 $\chi\acute{\iota}\lambda\iota\alpha\iota\gamma\nu\nu\alpha\iota\kappa\epsilon\varsigma$ *khīliai* (NOM) *gynaikēs* (NOM)
 ‘a thousand women’ vs.
 $\chi\acute{\iota}\lambda\iota\alpha\acute{\delta}\epsilon\varsigma$ *gynaikādēs* (NOM) *gynaikādēs* (GEN)
 ‘thousands of women’

b. Hellenistic Greek
 $\chi\acute{\iota}\lambda\iota\alpha\iota\gamma\nu\nu\alpha\iota\kappa\epsilon\varsigma$ *xīlie* (NOM) *gynēkes* (NOM)
 ‘a thousand women’ vs.
 $\chi\acute{\iota}\lambda\iota\alpha\acute{\delta}\epsilon\varsigma$ *gynaikādēs* (NOM) *gynēkes* (NOM)
 ‘thousands of women’

As regards the other types, their attestation with juxtapositions is quite rare even during the late Hellenistic period (1st c. AD - 4th c. AD), as in the following papyrological example:

(12) $\lambda\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\varsigma$ $\delta\acute{\nu}\omega$ $\pi\omega\rho\phi\acute{\nu}\omega\iota\omega\varsigma$
 $l\acute{\iota}tr\acute{a}s$ $\delta\acute{\nu}\omega$ *porfýrion*
 litre:ACC.pl two purple.dye:N/A.sg
 ‘two litres of purple dye’ *SB* 14.12080, 5-6 (4th c. AD)

These structures do not appear regularly until late medieval sources (cf. Holton et al. 2019: 2019-2020):

(13) a. $\lambda\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\varsigma$ $\kappa\epsilon\omega\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\omega\epsilon\iota\varsigma$
 $l\acute{\iota}tr\acute{a}s$ $\kappa\epsilon\omega\iota\varsigma$ *tris*
 litre:ACC.pl.f wax:N/A.sg.n three:N/A.pl.f
 ‘three litres of wax’
 document from S. Italy, 1086 AD (Minas 1994: 175)

b. $\kappa\omega\kappa\iota\varsigma$ $\kappa\omega\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$
 $kafk\acute{\iota}n$ *krasín*
 cup:ACC.sg wine:ACC.sg
 ‘a cup of wine’ *Ptoch.* 4.136 (12th c.)

c. $\kappa\omega\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\alpha$ $\theta\acute{\nu}\nu\omega\omega\varsigma$
 $komáti\alpha$ $\theta\acute{\nu}\nu\omega\omega\varsigma$
 piece:ACC.pl tuna:ACC.sg
 ‘pieces of tuna’ *Ptoch.* 4.115 (12th c.)

d. $\pi\epsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\omega\iota\varsigma$ $\varphi\acute{\nu}\omega\kappa\tau\omega\varsigma$ $\mu\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma$
 $pepérin$ $f\acute{u}ktan$ *mían*
 pepper:ACC.sg handful:ACC.sg one:ACC.sg
 ‘a handful of pepper’ *Ptoch.* 4.212 (12th c.)

Furthermore, the almost complete lack of pseudo-partitive genitive relics in modern dialects implies that the genitive must have lost its ability to mark these relations in most varieties by the late Medieval period (11th-15th c. AD). The only modern dialect that exhibits such vestiges with specific types of pseudo-partitives is Cappadocian, which was spoken in Asia Minor before the Greece-Turkey exchange of populations in the 1920s.

As in Turkish pseudo-partitives are marked with juxtapositions (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2009), this example most likely does not reflect influence from language contact, but vestiges of an archaic construction.

Finally, it is worth noting that all types of pseudo-partitives apart from conventionalized measure may alternate with prepositional phrases (Mertyris 2014: 60):

(15) a. μια κούπα (*από) (με) κρασί
 miá kípa (*apó) (me) krasí
 one:N/A.sg cup:N/A.sg from with wine:N/A.sg
 'a cup of wine' CONTAINER

b. δύο λίτρα (*από) νερό
 ðýo lítra (*apó) neró
 two litre:N/A.pl from water:N/A.sg
 'two litres of water' MEASURE

c. κομμάτι (από) χαρτί
 kommati (apo) xarti'
 piece:N/A.sg from paper:N/A.sg

⁶ As the supersets of pseudo-partitives in Modern Greek tend to be feminine and neuter nouns which always have identical nom. and acc.sg forms (apart from dialects with final /n/ retention, which distinguish the nom. from the acc.sg of feminines as in Ancient Greek, cf. Cypriot *αρφή arfi* nom.sg # *αρφήν arfin* acc.sg) the use of masculine supersets in the nom. seems to be awkward; this issue needs further investigation. Consider this ex. from Common Modern Greek:
 ?μια γαβάθα χυλός είναι στο τραπέζι 'a bowl of porridge is on the table'
 mia γavátha xilós íne sto trapézi
 a:NOM.sg bowl:NOM:sg porridge:NOM:sg be:3sg at.the table:N/A.sg

‘a piece of paper’	PART	
d. <i>σωρός</i> (<i>από</i>) <i>βιβλία</i>		
<i>sorós</i> (<i>apó</i>)	<i>vivlía</i>	
pile:NOM.sg	from	book:N/A.pl
‘a pile of books’	FORM	
e. <i>τσιμπιά</i> (<i>από</i>) <i>αλάτι</i>		
<i>tsimbiá</i> (<i>apó</i>)	<i>aláti</i>	
pinch:N/A.sg	from	salt:N/A.sg
‘a pinch of salt’	QUANTUM	

While prepositional phrases are not as frequent as juxtapositions, they may indicate that the loss of the adnominal pseudo-partitive genitive could have followed two paths instead of one. However, similarly to juxtapositions, they are attested sporadically in Hellenistic and early Medieval Greek, e.g. *σωροὺς ἀπὸ λίθων sorús apό líthon* ‘piles of stones’ (Polyaenus, *Excerpta* 56.10; 2nd c. BC).

4. Adverbial and adjectival use of the partitive in Greek

4.1. The partitive genitive as a second argument

The use of the partitive genitive as a direct object in AG could occur with verbs that exclusively govern the genitive and verbs that could alternate between the genitive and other cases. The former type mostly involves verbs of low transitivity that do not cause a change of state (Conti & Luraghi 2014: 452). The major subtypes of this diverse group of verbs can be presented as follows (cf. Smyth 1916: 230):

(16) a. Participation:

<i>ποτοῦ κοινωνεῖν</i> ‘to share their drink’		
<i>potū:</i>	<i>koinɔ:nē:n</i>	
drink:GEN.sg	share:INF	X.Mem. 2.6.22

b. Beginning, ending:

<i>τοῦ λόγου δὲ ἥρχετο</i>		
<i>tū: lógu:</i>	<i>dè e:rkhetō</i>	
the:GEN.sg	speech:GEN.sg	ptc start:3sg.MP.PAST
‘he began the speech’	X.An. 3.2.8	

c. Senses

<i>οἴνου γεύεσθαι</i> ‘to taste wine’	
<i>oínu:</i>	<i>geúesthai</i>

wine:GEN.sg taste:MP.INF Pl. *Lg.* 674b

d. Succeeding, failing, trying, aiming at, reaching for:

τιμῶν καλλίστων τυγχάνουσι

tim̄:n kall̄istɔ:n tynkhánu:si

honor:GEN.pl best:GEN.pl chance.upon:3sg

'they enjoy (lit. chance upon) the highest honours'

X. *Mem.* 3.12.4

e. Desire, enjoyment:

τούτου ἐπιθυμεῖ 'he desires this'

tú:tu: epithymē:

this:GEN.sg desire:3sg Pl. *Phlb.* 35b

f. Taking care of:

φείδεο τῶν νεῶν 'spare the ships' Hdt. 8.68A.1

pheídeo t̄:n nē:n

spare:2sg.IMP the:GEN.pl ship:GEN.pl

g. Being full:

αἱ δὲ λήκυθοι μύρου γέμουσι

hai d̄e lé:kythoi myru: gému:si

the ptc jug:NOM.pl unction:GEN be.full:3pl

'the jugs are full of unction' Ar. *Pl.* 811-812

Turning to the latter type, Conti & Luraghi (2014) identify two main subtypes of AG verbs that govern a genitive of partitive meaning that may alternate with other cases, the second of which can be split into two further subtypes, as can be summarised in the table below:

Table 4: Conti & Luraghi's (2014) classification of alternating genitive second arguments in AG

TYPE 1: Non-motivated alternation between the genitive and other cases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The genitive has a partitive origin, but not a synchronic partitive meaning These verbs are low in transitivity The genitive may alternate with other cases without a clear difference in meaning, e.g.: 	
	GEN	ACC
	μνήσεσθαι ... Φιλοκτήταο <i>mnés:sesthai</i> ... <i>Philoktē:tao</i> 'to remember Philoctetes' Hom. <i>Il.</i> 2.724-5	Τυδέα δ' οὐ μέμνημαι <i>Tudéa d'</i> <i>ou mémnē:mai</i> 'I don't remember Tydeus' Hom. <i>Il.</i> 6.222
	GEN	DAT
	τεταρπώμεσθα γόοιο <i>tetarpō:mestha góoio</i> 'we have taken our fill of lamenting' Hom. <i>Il.</i> 23.10	φιλότητι τραπείομεν <i>philóte:ti trapeíomen</i> 'we enjoy love' Hom. <i>Il.</i> 3.441
TYPE 2: Semantically-motivated alternation of the genitive with the accusative	Subtype I: The genitive indicates low transitivity, while the accusative involves high transitivity and change of state (cf. Riaño Rufilanchas 2014: 531-532), e.g.:	
	GEN	ACC
	παιδὸς ὀρέξατο <i>paidōs oreksato</i> 'reaching (not touching) the boy' Hom. <i>Il.</i> 6.466	ὄρεξάμενος χρόα <i>oreksámenos khróa</i> 'reaching (and touching) the flesh' Hom. <i>Il.</i> 23.805
	Subtype II: Both the genitive and the accusative involve a change of state ⁷ ; when the genitive is used only a part of the referent undergoes a change of stage and when the accusative is used, there is total affectedness ⁸ :	
	GEN	ACC
	ὅφρα πίοι οἴνοιο <i>óphra píoi oínoio</i> 'in order to drink some wine' Hom. <i>Od.</i> 22.11	πῖνε τε οἴνον <i>pínē te oínon</i> 'drink the wine!' Hom. <i>Od.</i> 15.391

⁷ For the alternation between genitive and accusative with consumption verbs, see Napoli (2010).

⁸ The same construction can also be used with plural count nouns referring to an unspecified individual, e.g. Ἀδρήστοιο δ' ἔγημε θυγατρῶν *Adré:stoio d'* *ége:me thugatrō:n* 'he married (one) of the daughters of Adrastos' Hom. *Il.* 14.121.

In Type 1, Conti & Luraghi (2014: 449-450) have also included this construction, which has a genitive instead of the regular use of the accusative with *λαμβάνω lambánω*: ‘take’: *λαβομένη τῶν γούνατων τοῦ ἀνδρὸς laboméne: tɔ:n go:náto:n* (GEN) *tô: andrɔs* ‘she laid hold of the man’s knees’ Hdt. 1.112.1. However, this construction, traditionally called ‘genitive of contact’ (cf. Donaldson 1862: 483-484), indicates the starting point of the action of the verb, which is very typical of the ablative meaning of the AG genitive, and as such it is not related to the partitive meaning of the case. In the previous example the action of the middle participle does not take place on ‘some part of the knees’, which would be quite bizarre due to the knees being a small part of the human body that would be difficult to be conceived as having various parts⁹. This can be best shown by the use of the active forms of *λαμβάνω lambánω*: either with the accusative of the part seized and a possessive genitive or with an accusative of a person and an ablative genitive: Hom.*Il.* 24.265 *λαβὲ γούνατα Πηλεύτωνος labē gó:nata Pe:leύ:tos* ‘clasp the knees of the son of Peleus’ vs. Hom.*Od.* 6.142 *γούνων ... λαβὼν ... κούρην gó:nɔ:n labɔ:n kó:re:n* ‘clasping the maid by the knees’.

As regards the transition from the ancient partitive constructions in Table 4 to the modern ones, when the alternation was not semantically motivated and the genitive did not have a synchronic partitive meaning, the shift to the accusative was an easier process in post-Classical Greek (cf. Hatzidakis 1905: 468). Eventually, the accusative, being the unmarked direct object case, began to replace the genitive, even when it was the obligatory second argument:

(17) μηδὲ βελόνης ἔναμμα ἐπιθυμήσῃς
miðé velónis énamma epiθymísis
 not-even needle:GEN.sg thread:N/A.sg desire:PFV.2sg
 ‘covet not a needle’s thread’ Clem.Al., *Strom.* 5.14.119

In terms of expressing partial affectedness, as the plain genitive started to lose its partitive meaning, the use of ablative/ elative prepositions as a reinforcement can be observed in Hellenistic

⁹ The Modern Greek equivalent with the mediopassive form of *πιάνω piáno* ‘grip’ clearly shows the ablative origin of the construction: *πιάστηκε από τα γόνατα του ἀντρα της piástike apó ta gónta tu ándra tis* ‘she latched herself onto (lit. from) the knees of her man’.

Greek. Thus, the accusative became the exclusive prepositional case, as mentioned earlier, and the partitive meaning of the genitive was entirely lost (cf. Bortone 2010: 179):

(18) a. ἔπιεν ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου
 épien ek tu ónu
 drink:PST.3sg out.of the:GEN.sg wine:GEN.sg
 ‘he drank from the wine’ Ge. 9.21

b. νὰ πιῇ ἐκ τὸ νερόν
 na pií ek to nerón
 CMP drink:PFV.3sg from the:ACC.sg water:ACC.sg
 ‘to drink from the water’ Chumnos, Kosmog. 1235

c. ίπιε από το κρασί¹
 ípie apó to krasí'
 drink:PST.3sg from the:ACC.sg wine:ACC.sg
 ‘s/he drank from the wine’ Common Modern Greek

Thus, it is safe to assume that by the end of the early Medieval period the accusative had become the exclusive direct object case. Nevertheless, there are a few partitive genitive second argument relics in southern insular varieties of Modern Greek that are more conservative with regard to the use of the genitive, as it also marks indirect objects after the loss of the dative (c. 10th c. AD). The following examples demonstrate that the maintenance of these relics occurs with roughly the same types of low transitivity verbs that governed partitive genitive second arguments in AG (examples [16a-g]), i.e. desire, sense and memory verbs:

(19) a. ρέεται τ' αππιδκιού
 [réete t appiđcú]
 yearn:MP.3sg the:GEN.sg pear:GEN.sg
 s/he yearns for the pear’ Cyprus (Menardos 1896: 444)

b. μεν εγγίζεις του γλυκού
 men engízis tu yliku'
 NEG touch:2sg the:GEN.sg sweet:GEN.sg
 ‘don’t touch the dessert’ Cyprus (Menardos 1896: 443)

c. του καλοκαιριού μυρίζει
 tu kalokeriu' mirízi
 the:GEN.sg summer:GEN.sg smell:3sg
 ‘it smells like summer’ Andros, Cyclades (Voyatzidis 1956: 173)

d. *αν ἤκουε ο Χριστός των κουρουνών*
an īkue o Xristós ton kurunón
 if heard:3sg the Christ:NOM the crows:GEN.pl
 ‘if Christ listened to the crows’

Santorini, Cyclades (Petala 1876: 91)

e. *εθθυμήθηκά του*
eθθimíθiká tu
 remember:MP.PST.3sg 3sg:GEN.m
 ‘I remembered him’

Chalki, Dodecanese (Tsopanakis 1949: 62)

4.2. The partitive genitive as a third argument

According to Conti & Luraghi (2014), there are two groups of verbs that take the genitive as a third argument: i) legal action verbs, and ii) verbs of filling and commercial transaction:

(20) a. *ἢν ... Λακεδαιμονίους ... τῆς ἔξαπάτης τιμωρησώμεθα*
ē:n ... Lakedaimoníu:s ... tē:s eksapáte:s timɔ:re:só:metha
 if Spartan:ACC.pl ...the trick:GEN punish:SBJV.1pl
 ‘If we punish the Spartans for their trick’ X.An. 7.1.25

b. *καλάμης πλήσαντες πᾶν τὸ πλοῖον*
kalámē:s plé:santes pâ:n tō ploîon
 reed:GEN fill:PTCP.PST.NOM.pl all:ACC the.ACC boat:ACC
 ‘after filling the whole boat with reeds’ Hdt. 1.194.2

However, this analysis is not entirely accurate with regard to legal action verbs. More specifically, the genitive with these verbs is the same that is used with verbs of emotion denoting admiration, jealousy etc, e.g. D. 19.67 (4th c. BC) *Φίλιππον εύδαιμονίσας τῆς τύχης* *Philíppon eudaimonísas tē:s týkhē:s* (GEN) ‘praising Philip for his good fortune’ (cf. Anagnostopoulou et al. [forthcoming]). Quite clearly, this is a genitive of cause and as such it is related to the ablative meaning of the genitive, as Nikiforidou (1991) has shown through the cognitive metaphor “causes are origins”. As to the verbs of commercial transaction, the genitive is traditionally known as ‘genitive of price and value’:

(21) a. *τήν ... ὥραν ἐὰν ... τις ἀργυρίου πωλή τῷ βουλομένῳ*
té:n hɔ:ran eān tis argyriú: pɔ:lē: tɔ:i bu:loménɔ:i
 the:ACC.sg beauty:ACC.sg if someone coin:GEN.sg
 price:ACC.sg

sell:SBJ.3sg the:DAT.sg want:PTCP.DAT.sg
‘if someone sells their beauty for money to whomever
wants it’ X. Mem. 1.6.13

b. εἴπερ γὰρ ἡμᾶς ἀξιοῖ λόγου
eíper gàr hε:mâ:s aksioî lógu:
 if ptc 1pl:ACC think.worthy value:GEN.sg
 'For if my wife holds me in any regard'
 E.Med. 962-3

As can be seen in (21a), the verb *πωλέω* *pɔ:léɔ:* ‘sell’ is construed with an indirect and a direct object, which means that the genitive of price and value is not always a true argument of the verb and could be regarded as an optional adjunct instead. In contrast, as can be seen in (21b), with verbs like *αξιώ* *aksióɔ:* ‘think someone to be worthy of something’ the genitive of value plays a more integral role and is not merely an adjunct. Even though this verb is not used with the same meaning in Modern Greek, the shift to prepositional phrases and the plain accusative instead of the genitive can be observed in Medieval and early Modern Greek texts:

(22) a. εἰς μεγάλην τιμὴν τὸν ἀξίωσε
 is meyálin timín ton aksíose
 in big:ACC.sg honour:ACC.sg 3sg:ACC honour:PST.3sg
 ‘he honoured him with great honours’

Historia Alexandri Magni σ 269

b. πόνους ἀξωσές με
 pónus *áksosés* me
 pain:ACC.pl honour:PST.2sg 1sg:ACC
 'you deemed me deserving of pain'

Chortatssis, *Panoria* B 444

Similarly to the genitive of price and value, the genitive of penalty is also closer to the function of an optional adjunct than to that of a proper argument. The replacement of this genitive by a prepositional phrase took place in post-Classical Greek (21b):

(23) a. ἐάν ... ὅφλωσι θανάτου δίκην
eān ... ophlɔ:si thanatū: dīkē:n
 if be.cast:3pl death:GEN.sg suit:ACC.sg
 'if they have all been condemned on a capital charge'
 Pl.Lg. 9.856d

b. καταδικασθεὶς ἐπὶ θανάτῳ	<i>katadikasthís</i>	<i>epí</i>	<i>thanáto</i>
condemn:PASS.PTCP.NOM.sg	on		death:DAT.sg
‘condemned to death’			D.S. 3.5.2

Turning to verbs of filling, even though the partitive genitive is the main strategy to express the locatum, as shown in (20b), the use of the instrumental dative is also attested in tragic poets:

(24) δακρύοισι γὰρ Ἑλλάδα πᾶσαν ἔπληγσε
dakrýoisi *gàr* *Helláda* *pâ:sa* *néplē:se*
 tear:DAT.pl ptc Greece:ACC all:ACC.sg fill:PST.3sg
 ‘she filled all of Greece with tears’ E.Or. 1363

While this structure is reminiscent of the Modern Greek use of $\mu\varepsilon\;me$ ‘with’ with *fill* verbs, its limited use in Ancient Greek indicates that the latter might not be a direct descendant of the former. In fact, the use of the instrumental preposition $\mu\varepsilon\tau\alpha\;met\alpha$ (+genitive) is not attested until late Hellenistic Greek (25a). The modern structure appears in late medieval texts after the phonological simplification of the preposition and the shift to the accusative, after it had become the exclusive prepositional case in late Medieval Greek (25b and c):

(25) a. γέμισον ... τὰς τρυπὰς μετ' ὄξους
 yémison ... *tas trypás* met' óksus
 fill:IMP.2sg ... the:ACC.pl hole:ACC.pl with vinegar:GEN.sg
 ‘fill the holes ... with vinegar’ Ps.-Galen 29 14.542

b. γεμίζει ἀσκὶν μὲ τὸ νερόν
 yemízi *askín* me to nerón
 fill:3sg bag:ACC.sg with the:ACC.sg water:ACC.sg
 ‘he fills a bag with water’ Chummos, *Kosmog.* 1224

c. γεμίζει το παγούρι (με) νερό
 yemízi *to* *payúri* (me) neró
 fill:3sg the:ACC.sg flask:ACC.sg (with) water:ACC.sg
 ‘s/he fills a flask with water’ Common Modern Greek

Some early signs of reinforcing the partitive meaning of the genitive with an ablative/ elative preposition are also attested in Hellenistic Greek, but this use did not survive for long:

(26) ἐγέμισεν αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς
eyémisen aftón ek tu pyrós
 fill:PST.3sg 3sg:ACC out.of the:GEN.sg fire:GEN.sg
 ‘they filled it (=the censer) with fire’ *Apoc. 8.5*

A possible source of the Medieval and Modern structures in (25b) and (25c) with two accusatives for both arguments could be sought in the use of other “location-locatum” verbs, such as ‘load something onto something’ (Levin 1993; Anagnostopoulou et al. [forthcoming]). More specifically, the next example shows the use of two accusatives, one of which is a cognate object, and it is identical to the structure of the Modern Greek φορτώνω *fortóno* ‘load’, which may also govern two accusatives¹⁰:

(27) φορτίζετε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους φορτία δυσβάστακτα
fortízete tus anθrópus fortía ðysvástakta
 load:2pl the:ACC.pl human:ACC.pl burden:ACC.pl unbearable:
 ble:ACC.pl
 ‘you load men with unbearable burdens’ *Ev.Luc. 11.46*

Such structures could have given rise to the Modern Greek syntax of fill verbs:

(28) a. πάντα τὰ κτήνη γεμίζε. (=γέμιζε) βάκανοι
pánta tā ktíni yémize vákanon
 all:ACC.pl the beast:ACC.pl fill:IMP cabbage:ACC.sg
 ‘fill (=feed) all the beasts (=herd) with cabbage’
P.Fay. 117, l. 13-14 (108 AD)

b. γεμίσαι καμήλους ἄρτους
yemíse kamílus ártus
 fill:INF.PFV camel:ACC.pl bread:ACC.pl
 ‘to fill (=load) camels with bread’
Acts of Philip 93 (4th c. AD)

In turn, the interplay between these structures and adnominal pseudo-partitives could have led to the establishment of the loss of the partitive genitive in either syntactic environment, as can be seen in the following constructed examples ([29a] in Classical Greek and [29b] in late Hellenistic Greek):

¹⁰ E.g. Με φόρτωσες ευθύνες/ενοχές *me fórtoses efθýnes/enoxéς* ‘You loaded me with responsibilities/guilt’.

(29) a. γεμίζω τὸ ποτήριον οἶνου/ πίνω ποτήριον οἶνου
gemízω: *tò* *potérion* *oínu:*
 fill:1sg the:ACC cup:ACC wine:GEN
pínō: *potérion* *oínu:*
 drink:1sg cup:ACC wine:GEN

b. γεμίζω τὸ ποτήριον οἶνον / πίνω ποτήριον οἶνον
gemízo *to potérion* *ýnon* / *píno* *potérion* *ýnon*
 fill:1sg the:ACC cup:ACC wine:ACC /
 drink:1sg cup:ACC wine:ACC
 'I fill the cup with wine / I drink a cup of wine'

4.3. The partitive genitive as an adjectival complement

The use of the partitive genitive as an adjectival complement is discussed here, as it involves *full* adjectives, which are closely related to the *fill* verbs discussed previously:

(30) ποταμόν ... πλήρη δ' ἰχθύων
potamón ... *plé:re:* *d'* *ikhthýɔ:n*
 river:ACC.sg... full:ACC.sg ptc fish:GEN.pl
 'river ... full of fish' X. An. 1.4.9

Similarly to *fill* verbs, in tragic poets there is an infrequent use of the instrumental dative instead of the partitive genitive:

(31) Ἔλλησι βαρβάροις θ' ὁμοῦ πλήρεις ... πόλεις
Hélle:si *barbárois* *t'* *homû:*
 Greek:DAT.pl barbarian:DAT.pl and together
plé:re:s ... *póle:s*
 full:ACC.pl city:ACC.pl
 'cities full of Greeks and barbarians together' E.Ba. 19

The Modern Greek use of the accusative as a complement of the adjective *gemátos* 'full' is unique, as there is no other adjective that has a similar syntax, since most Modern Greek adjectives take prepositional phrases as complements, e.g. *étoiμος για étimos yiá* 'ready for'. Thus, it is likely that the adjective originated from the participle *γέμων gémo:n* of the verb *γέμω gémo:* 'be full' and that at some point during the early Medieval Greek period it shifted to the morphologically simpler suffix *-άτος -átos*, which had been borrowed from vulgar and late Latin *-atus*. After the shift of *fill* verbs to the accusative had been completed, the same

pattern was applied both to the indeclinable gerund that the ancient participles evolved into (31a) and the newly formed adjective (31b and 31c):

(32) a. *χαρτίν τοὺς θρήνους γέμοντα*
xartín tus θrínus yémonda
paper:ACC.sg the:ACC.pl laments:ACC be.full:GER
‘letter full of laments’ Dig. E 227 (p. 12th c.)

b. *χαρτοσάκκουλα γεμάτα τὰ χαρτία*
xartosákula yemáta ta xartía
paperbag:ACC.pl full:ACC.pl the paper:ACC.pl
‘paperbags full of papers’ Ptoch. 3.96 (p. 12th c.)

c. *σακούλες γεμάτες χαρτιά*
sakúles yemátes xartía
bag:N/A.pl full:N/A.pl paper:N/A.pl
‘bags full of paper’ Common Modern Greek

5. Adverbial use of the partitive genitive in Greek

As noted in Section 1, the use of the partitive genitive to indicate parts of an area in which the action of the verb takes place was already very limited in Archaic and Classical Greek:

(33) *ἐπετάχυνον τῆς ὁδοῦ τοὺς σχολαίτερον προϊόντας*
epetákhynon tē:s hodū: tū:s
hastened.on:3pl the:GEN.sg road:GEN.sg the:ACC.pl
proiόntas skholaísteron
advance:PTCP.ACC.pl more.slowly
‘they hastened those that went the slowest on the road’
Th. 4.47.3

A similar construction can be found in the partitive equivalent of the accusative of respect, e.g. *τὸν δάκτυλον ἀλγεῖ tōn dáktylon algē: ‘he has a pain in his finger’ Pl. R. 462d* (cf. Hahn 1954; Romagno 2017). More specifically, the genitive in the following example indicates a part of the noun with respect to which the action of the verb takes place (cf. Seržant 2012b):

(34) *κατέάγη τῆς κεφαλῆς*
kateágē: tē:s kephalē:s
shatter:PASS.PST.PFV.3sg the:GEN.sg head:GEN.sg
‘he wounded his head’ Ar. V. 1428

Despite the rarity of spatial partitive genitives in AG, a bizarre spatial use of the genitive has surprisingly survived in Medieval Greek and some southern dialects of Modern Greek that are more conservative with regard to the use of the genitive, as mentioned earlier (cf. Favis 1948):

(35) a. ὑπάγουν τῆς στερέας
ipáyoun tis steréas
 go:3pl the:GEN.sg land:GEN.sg
 ‘they go by land’ *Chronicle of Morea* H 4235 (14th c.)

b. μπαίνω του χωροκού
 [béno tu xorkú]
 enter:1sg the:GEN.sg village:GEN.sg
 ‘I enter the village’ Cyprus (Menardos 1896: 446)

c. πήγαινα του ποταμιού
 píyena tu potamiiú
 go:PST.1sg the:GEN.sg river:GEN.sg
 ‘I was going along the river’
 Konitsa, Epirus (Rebelis 1953: 74)

It is unclear whether these structures originate directly from the spatial partitive genitive, given the fact that in Classical and Hellenistic Greek such spatial genitives are either extremely rare or completely absent (cf. Soliman 1965). Another possibility is that the occurrence of these constructions in the southern dialects may be related to their use of the genitive as an indirect object after the loss of the dative in early Medieval Greek. Therefore, this is an issue that requires further analysis in a separate study. In contrast, the use of the genitive of time in Classical Greek to indicate that an event took place at an indefinite point in time was not as infrequent:

(36) ὤχετο ἀπιὸν νυκτὸς
 ὅ:ikheto apio:n nyktòs
 depart:PST.3sg depart:PTCP.NOM.sg night:GEN.sg
 ‘he went off at (some point of the) night’ X. *An.* 3.3.5

This function was lost completely and replaced by the accusative of time in Medieval Greek, as in the majority of Modern Greek varieties it does not exist, although it has left some set expressions as relics:

6. Discussion and conclusions

From a typological perspective, the data presented in this study are quite interesting, as most major strategies that mark partitives and pseudo-partitives in European languages have been used in the diachrony of Greek (cf. Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2009): a) possessive strategy (AG genitive); b) separative strategy (ablatival and elative prepositions *ἀπό apό* *ἐκ ek* ‘from’); c) juxtapositional strategy; d) accompaniment (comitative *με me* ‘with’ with containers). A future crosslinguistic study comparing the loss of the partitive functions of the genitive in Indo-European and non-Indo-European languages in Europe would be extremely useful, as according to Seržant (2021: 919): “the original, inherited pattern of Indo-European – the possessive strategy (by means of the genitive case) – is recessive in all branches of this family, albeit to a different degree.” In fact, Seržant (ibid.) considers the replacement of partitive genitives by the separative strategy (ablatival prepositions) to be an areal feature of Eurasian languages, i.e. the result of language contact. More specifically, Seržant (2012b: 134; 2021: 719) mentions a few instances of the competition between the partitive genitive or a partitive case and ablatival/ elative constructions in eastern Europe, e.g.: Serbian (genitive vs. the ablatival preposition *od* + GEN); Russian (genitive vs. the ablatival preposition *iz* + GEN); Latvian (genitive vs. the ablatival PP *no* + GEN); Lithuanian (genitive vs. the ablatival preposition *is* + GEN); Finnish (partitive vs. the elative case).

Furthermore, according to Seržant's (2012b: 133) analysis, the disassociation of the true partitive meaning of the bare genitive and its reinforcement with prepositions can be linked to the need for distinct marking of true partitives and pseudo-partitives, which is also in accordance with Luraghi (2003: 72): "High polysemy was the cause that led to increasing use of prepositions". This perspective can provide an explanation for the early signs of the retreat of the genitive as a true partitive already in Classical Greek (cf. example [2]), as opposed to the relatively infrequent attestation of juxtapositional pseudo-partitives in Hellenistic Greek, as shown earlier. The earlier loss of true partitives compared to pseudo-partitives can be best seen in the following table that summarizes the diachrony of the loss of the partitive genitive based on the data of this study.

	Classical	Hellenistic	Medieval/ Modern
<i>adnominal partitive genitive</i>	rare competition with ἀπό apó / ἐκ ek (+GEN)	competition with ἀπό apó / ἐκ ek (+GEN)	complete replacement by ἀπό apó (+ACC)
<i>adnominal pseudo-partitive genitive</i>	no competition	use of numerical nouns with juxtapositions → limited competition with juxtapositions	complete replacement by juxtapositions
<i>direct object</i>	i. exclusive use ii. alternating use with ACC (usually to show partial affectedness)	i. competition with ACC ii. competition with ἀπό apó/ ἐκ ek (+GEN) to show partial affectedness	i. exclusive use of ACC ¹¹ ii. use of ἀπό apó (+ACC) to show partial affectedness
<i>locatum of fill verbs</i>	rare competition with INS.DAT	i. limited competition with ACC (influence from <i>load</i> verbs) ii. rare competition with μετά metá 'with' (+GEN)	complete replacement by ACC or μετά metá 'with' (+ACC) and extension of this pattern to <i>full</i> adjectives
<i>adjunct (space)</i>	limited use	-	- ¹²
<i>adjunct (time)</i>	in alternation with the ACC of time	competition with the ACC of time	relics of set expressions

¹¹ Apart from the southern insular dialects mentioned earlier.

¹² Note the structures in (35), however.

Table 5: The course of the loss of the genitive partitive functions

The three main strategies and the more peripheral use of *με me* ‘with’ which replaced the partitive genitive can be summarized as follows:

partitive genitive → <i>ἀπό/ ἐκ apó / ek</i> ‘from’	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ablative prepositional phrases were used to reinforce the partitive meaning of the genitive in adnominal true partitive constructions • ablative prepositional phrases were used instead of the partitive genitive as a second argument to indicate that only a part of the referent was affected • ablative prepositional phrases can be used as complements of parts, forms and quanta in pseudo-partitive constructions
partitive genitive → accusative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the accusative became the exclusive direct object case • the accusative became the exclusive prepositional case • the accusative replaced the genitive as the third argument of <i>fill</i> verbs and the complement of <i>full</i> adjectives • the accusative replaced the genitive as a temporal adverbial apart from a few relics
partitive genitive → juxtapositions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • juxtapositions replaced the partitive genitive in adnominal pseudo-partitive constructions
partitive genitive → <i>μετά/ με metá/ me</i> ‘with’	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • prepositional phrases with the instrumental Hellenistic Greek <i>μετά metá</i> late Medieval-Modern Greek <i>με me</i> could be used as a third argument of <i>fill</i> verbs, a complement of <i>full</i> adjectives and as a complement of container pseudo-partitives

Table 6: Main strategies of partitive genitive replacement in Greek

Based on what has been presented in this paper, a few main points can be concluded. The loss of the partitive meaning of the Greek genitive was part of the broader restructuring of the case system, which favored the grammatical use of the cases over their concrete uses (cf. Luraghi 2004: 376). Similar developments took place with the loss of the ablative genitive and the loss of the non-anchoring possessive functions of the genitive (cf. Mertyris 2014). Thus, the genitive marking was considered to be

unnecessary, non-iconic and non-economic, since the case began to lose its partitive meaning in several syntactic environments gradually and to a varying degree depending on the type of construction and dialectal variation.

ABBREVIATIONS

1	first person	m	masculine	pl	plural
2	second person	MID	middle	PST	past
3	third person	MP	mediopassive	PTCP	participial
ACC	accusative	N/A	nominative/accusative	ple	
DAT	dative		cusative	ptc	particle
f	feminine	n	neuter	SBJ	subjunctive
GEN	genitive	NEG	negation	sg	singular
INF	infinitive	NOM	nominative		
		PFV	perfective		

REFERENCES

Alexiadou, A. & Stavrou, M. 2020. “Partitives, pseudopartitives and the preposition *apo* in Greek”. *Linguistics* 58: 713-743.

Anagnostopoulou, E., Macleod, M., Mertyris, D. & Sevdali, C. (forthcoming). “Genitive and datives with Ancient Greek three-place predicates”. In Sevdali, C., Mertyris, D. & Anagnostopoulou, E. (eds.) *The Place of Case in Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Blake, B. 1994. *Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bortone, P. 2010. *Greek Prepositions from Antiquity to the Present*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Conti, L. & Luraghi, S. 2014. “The Ancient Greek partitive genitive in typological perspective”. In Luraghi, S. & Huomo, T. (eds.), *Partitive Cases and Related Categories*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 443-476.

Dawkins, R. M. 1916. *Modern Greek in Asia Minor. A study of the dialects of Silli, Cappadocia and Pharasa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Donaldson, J. W. 1862². *A Complete Greek Grammar for the Use of Students*. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co.

Favis, V. 1948. «Συντακτικὰ παρατηρήσεις εἰς τὸ ἴδιωμα τῶν Φαράσων» [Syntactic observations on the variety of Farasa]. *Ἐπετηρὶς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* [Yearbook of the Society of Byzantine Studies] 18: 173-191.

Hahn, A. 1954. "Partitive Apposition in Homer and the Greek Accusative". *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 85: 197-289.

Hatzidakis, G. 1905. *Μεσαιωνικὰ καὶ Νέα Ἑλληνικά Α'* [Medieval and Modern Greek I]. Athens: P. D. Sakellários.

Holton, D., Horrocks, G., Janssen, M., Lendari, T., Manolessou, I., Toufexis, N. 2019. *The Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Horrocks, G. 2010². *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*. London: Wiley/Blackwell.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. 2001. "A piece of the cake and a cup of tea: partitive and pseudopartitive nominal constructions in the Circum-Baltic languages". In Dahl, Ö. & Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic Languages: Typology and Contact. v. 2. Grammar and typology*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 523-568.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. 2005. "Maria's ring of gold: adnominal possession and non-anchoring relations in the European languages". In Kim, J., Lander, Y. & Partee, B. H. (eds.), *Possessives and Beyond: Semantics and Syntax*. Amherst; Massachusetts: GLSA Publications, 155-181.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. 2009. "'A lot of grammar with a good portion of lexicon': towards a typology of partitive and pseudo-partitive nominal constructions". In Helmbrecht, J., Nishina Y., Shin Y.-M., Skopeteas S. & Verhoeven E. (eds.), *Form and Function in Language Research*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 329-346.

Levin, B. 1993. *English Verb Classes and Alternations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Luraghi, S. 2003. *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases. The Expression of Semantic Roles in Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Luraghi, S. 2004. "The Evolution of Greek Nominal Paradigms from Mycenaean to Modern Greek". *Classica et Mediaevalia* 55: 361-379.

Manousakis, N. & Stamatatos, E. 2018. "Devising Rhesus: A strange 'collaboration' between Aeschylus and Euripides". *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities* 33: 347-361.

Mayser, E. 1934. *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemaerzeit. Band II.2. Analytischer Teil.* Berlin/ Leipzig: de Gruyter.

Menardos, S. 1896. «Ἡ γενικὴ κατὰ Κυπρίους» [The genitive in the speech of the Cypriots]. *Athena* 8: 435-450.

Mertyris, D. 2014. *The loss of the genitive in Greek: a diachronic and dialectological analysis.* PhD dissertation, La Trobe University.

Minas, K. 1994. *Η γλώσσα των δημοσιευμένων μεσαιωνικών ελληνικών εγγράφων της Κάτω Ιταλίας και της Σικελίας* [The language of the published Medieval Greek documents of Southern Italy and Sicily]. Athens: Academy of Athens.

Napoli, M. 2010. “The case for the partitive case: The contribution of Ancient Greek”. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 108: 15-40.

Nikiforidou, K. 1991. “The Meanings of the Genitive: A Case study in Semantic Structure and Semantic Change”. *Cognitive Linguistics* 2: 149-205.

Parcharidis, I. 1951. «Ποντικὰ παραμύθια» [Pontic folktales]. *Αρχεῖον Πόντου* [Archive of Pontus] 16: 80-114.

Petalas, N. 1876. *Θηραϊκῆς γλωσσολογικῆς ὥλης* [Linguistic material of Thera]. Athens: Passaris.

Rebelis, C. 1953. *Κονιτσιώτικα* [On the dialect of Konitsa]. Athens: Epirot Society.

Riaño Rufilanchas, D. 2014. “Differential Object Marking in Ancient Greek”. *Linguistics* 52(2): 513-541.

Rigas, G. 1962. *Σκιάθου λαϊκὸς πολιτισμός*, vol. B [Folklore of Skiathos, vol. B]. Thessaloniki: Society of Macedonian Studies.

Romagno, D. 2017. “The Accusative of Respect in Ancient Greek: Animacy Hierarchy, Semantic Roles and Event Type”, *Studi e Saggi Linguistici* 55: 65-91.

Rutkowski, P. 2007. “The Syntactic Structure of Grammaticalized Partitives (Pseudo-Partitives)”. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 13: 337-350.

Seržant, I. 2012a. “Morphosyntactic Properties of the Partitive Genitive in the Subject Position in Ancient Greek”. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 117: 187-204.

Seržant, I. 2012b. “The Pragmatics and Semantics of the Bare Partitive Genitive in Ancient Greek”. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 65: 113-136.

Seržant, I. 2021. “Typology of partitives”. *Linguistics* 59: 881-947.

Smyth, H. W. 1916. *A Greek Grammar for Schools and Colleges*. New York: American Book Company.

Soliman, A. H. 1965. *Χρήσεις τῆς γενικῆς πτώσεως ἐν τοῖς μεταπτολεμαϊκοῖς παπύροις* [Uses of the genitive case in post-Ptolemaic papyri]. PhD dissertation, University of Athens.

Tsopanakis, A. 1949. *Τὸ ἴδιωμα τῆς Χάλκης* [The variety of Chalki]. Rhodes: [n.p.].

Voyatzidis, I. 1956. *Γλώσσα καὶ λαογραφία τῆς νήσου Ἄνδρου, Γ'* [Language and folklore of the island of Andros: vol. 3]. Athens: Andrian Society.

