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ABSTRACT

A Syntactic Account of Split DPs in Herodotus

Allison Kirk

In Herodotus’ Histories one finds instances of nominal elements which seem to form cohesive phrases but which are separated from one another by other intervening material. These interrupted phrases are referred to as ‘discontinuous’ or ‘split’ constructions. The presence of these discontinuous expressions makes the syntax of Herodotus’ Greek seem radically different from that of languages like English. This paper intends to show that although Herodotus’ Greek had certain freedoms of syntactic movements which are not overt in languages like English, the dialect in question displays a hierarchy of phrase structure. We will show that Herodotus’ DP was richly discourse-oriented and that discourse related factors allowed for freedoms of movement which are not available in languages like English. The goal is to account for split sequences of DPs containing adjectives, quantifiers, demonstratives and WH- words, while at the same time restricting the possibilities of syntactic movements in order to account for constructions which are unattested in the text and are predicted to be ungrammatical by the theory here constructed.
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CHAPTER 1 - Introduction

When an English speaker reads an Ancient Greek (AG) text, perhaps the most remarkable thing s/he notices is the freedom available with regard to word order. That is, there is no rigid order of arguments and one can therefore see many different possible permutations of subject, verb and object; (S)VO, V(S)O, OV(S), VO(S), O(S)V and (S)OV. Aside from the various possible orders of arguments in AG, other possibilities were available concerning word orders which are not available to speakers of languages like English. Particularly, items which seem to belong together, i.e. various types of ‘modifiers’ of nouns may be found separated from their nouns. In the following example, the noun is found pre-verbally while an adjective modifying it is found post-verbally.

(1) καί θυμόν εχε ἀγαθόν
cai thumon eche agathon
and heart.acc.sg. hold.2sg.pres.impv.act. valiant.acc.sg.

‘and keep good heart’

Her.1.120.3

The order of the elements in (1) seems radically different from that which is available to a speaker of English, and other languages showing rigid word orders. Because of the freedom available in the various dialects of AG with regard to the ordering of arguments as discussed above, as well as to the ‘discontinuous’ or ‘split’ constructions as seen in (1), AG has been referred to as a ‘free word order’ language. However, it is well-known that AG does not have complete freedom with regard to the ordering of words, as there are many elements in AG which have fixed positons in clauses such as WH- words, particles and conjunctions, as well as in phrases, such as the definite article with respect to nominal elements (sequences of A(djective)- N(oun)- D(eterminer), and NAD are not
found). Because of these elements which do show fixed positions, the term ‘free word order’ is taken to mean that the order is ‘relatively free’, in comparison to strict word order languages such as English (Dover, 1960). The rich inflection of the language (which allows arguments to be properly interpreted regardless of their positions with respect to the verb) has been seen as a sort of mechanism which allows for the relatively free ordering of words\(^1\). However, this lacks explanatory power of the syntactic mechanisms by which various order permutations may arise, and therefore suggests a lack of syntactic structure in the language.

Aside from the rich morphology present in AG, freedoms (both with regard to the ordering of arguments as well as to the split constructions seen in ‘free word order’ languages such as AG have been accounted for through discourse-related factors (see Dik, 1995). That is, the notions of topicalization and focusing have been suggested to have greater importance for languages such as AG than they have for languages like English. It has been assumed that elements may be freely\(^2\) topicalized and focused through ‘preposing’ of these elements, rather than solely through intonation. Although discourse-related factors are indeed crucial to the analysis presented in this paper, the

---

\(^1\) An attempt was made by Dunn (1988) to show that AG has ‘syntactic norms’ and therefore that the order is not free. In this study the frequencies of orders of heads and modifiers in Herodotus I were examined and converted to a statistical test. The outcome showed that although there are apparent trends which Dunn considers to be of a syntactic nature, ‘in some of the combinations tested modifier/head ordering has been shown to be random. Given the inflectional structure of ancient Greek the existence of some randomness in modifier/head placement is not surprising’ (pg. 78). So, although Dunn is attempting to prove the existence of syntactic rules in AG and therefore to show that its order was not free, the claim is still made that rich inflection allows word order variation.

\(^2\) Although it has not been explicitly claimed that the topicalization and focusing of elements is entirely free, there has been no adequate analysis which can explain which elements may be topicalized or focused and how. This suggests intrinsically that the topicalization and focusing of elements is free. Dik (1997) does specify that adjectives will be preposed if they are contrastive or particularly salient in the NP. This provides a certain amount of restriction on the preposing of elements, however a mechanism by which the preposing of elements is achieved is not specified.
story cannot end here. There must be a mechanism which determines which elements may be topologicalized or focused. If there were no such mechanism, one would expect that any element could be possibly focused or topologicalized, and therefore that every possible (continuous and split) construction were grammatical. For example, we would expect to find the above mentioned non-attested sequences of AND and NAD as well as determiners split from their nouns, which we have not. These restrictions suggest that there is more hierarchy in the syntax of AG than has been previously assumed, i.e. that AG had more in common with languages like English than it appears to. This is not to say that discourse factors were not at play in the syntax of AG, and as will be seen, they are very important to the analysis presented in this paper. Furthermore, as we will see, certain parts of a DP may be separated from one another, and can relate to the discourse independently from one another, accounting for the split nominal constructions seen. However, to account for the restrictions on word orders in AG, a hierarchy of phrase structure which incorporates discourse functions will be presented. The hierarchical structure assumed by the framework employed in this paper imposes certain confines on the movement of elements. These confines determine which elements may be separated from one another, and therefore help to account for the restrictions on word orders seen in AG.
CHAPTER 2 - The Data

The data pool for this study is one text, Herodotus' *Histories*. The purpose for limiting the data base to one text/author is to try to avoid mixing different dialects, different genres of writing and different periods of AG, in other words to examine a single idiolect. We are therefore not attempting to provide a syntactic analysis of AG DPs, but of Herodotus' DP.

There are several types of words which occur with nouns in split constructions in Ancient Greek with which we are concerned: adjectives, quantifiers, demonstratives and WH-words. Although when used with nouns, all of these agree in gender, number and case with them (except some of the numerals, which are indeclinable), at this point we are not sure about the syntax of these types of words, and so will not refer to them as modifiers, but as X-words. Our data will consist of constructions, split and continuous, which contain nouns and the above categories of X-words. Many of the categories of X-words may appear in constructions with and without definite articles. In fact, the only ones which cannot occur in both (definite and indefinite) constructions are WH-words, which have not been found in constructions with definite articles.

This chapter is organized into several sections, according to the type of X-word which can co-occur with nouns in Herodotus. Moreover, each section is further divided into a part that presents data on what I will call 'continuous structures', i.e. nominal constituents made up of a noun and an X-word occurring together, and a part presenting data on

---

3 The Loeb edition (based on Stein’s text) is used as a main source, with consultation with Hude’s OCT edition on the examples taken.
‘split constructions’, i.e. constructions in which the Noun and the X-word do not occur together, and in which there is some intervening (verbal) material between the two.

2.1 - Adjectives

2.1.1 - Adjectives in DPs with no articles

2.1.1.1 - Continuous Constructions

Both possible orders ([AN] and [NA]) were found in the text we examined.

(1) NA leukos, ‘white’

\[
\text{στήλας, estēsē, δύο ἐν', αὐτοῦ λίθου leukou} \\
\text{pillar.acc.pl set.3sg.aor.ind.act. two beside it.gen.sg. stone.gen.sg white.gen.sg.}
\]

‘he set up two pillars beside it of white stone’

Her.4.87.1

(2) AN leukos, ‘white’

\[
\text{τὰ δὲ ἄλλα ἡμιπλίνθια leukou χρυσοῦ} \\
\text{ta de alla hēmiplinthia leukou chrusou} \\
\text{the.nom.pl PART other.nom.pl half-brick.nom.pl white.gen.sg gold.gen.sg.}
\]

‘the others were alloys of white gold’

Her.1.50.2

2.1.1.2 - Split Constructions

Splits with Adjectives are possible in both orders (A...N, and N...A).

(3) A...N megas, ‘large’, ‘great’

\[
\text{hortazousi megalas anagontes thusias} \\
\text{keep-festival.3pl.pres.ind.act. great.acc.pl. lead-up.nom.pl.pres.part.act. sacrifice.acc.pl.}
\]

‘they keep festival, leading in great sacrifices’

Her.2.60.3

(4) N...A mega, ‘large’, ‘great’

\[
\text{δόρατα τε ἐφόρεσθαι megala} \\
\text{dorauta te ephoreson megala}
\]

5
dorata te⁴ ephoreon megala
spear.acc.pl. PART carry.impf.ind.act. long.acc.pl.

‘they would carry long spears’

Her.1.79.3

(5) N...A agathos, ‘valiant’

ἐπ’ ἄνδρας στρατευόμεθα
against men.acc.pl. fight.lpl.pres.ind.mid.

ἀγαθός
valiant.acc.pl.

‘we are fighting against valiant men’

Her 7.53.2

2.1.2 - Adjectives in DPs with articles

2.1.2.1. Continuous Constructions

A definite noun phrase contains a definite article and a noun. The ones which concern us here also contain adjectives. We will not be interested in the sequences of DNA and ADN, where the adjective is in ‘predicative position’, meaning that the adjective is a predicate of a copulative verb, or an elided one⁵. That is to say these sequences have the distribution of clauses, not phrases. See examples (6) and (7).

(6) DNA: clause

ὁ τε χαρακτήρ τοῦ προσώπου προσφέρεισθαι ἐδόκει
ho te charakter tou prosopou prosterointhai edokei
the.nom.sg both.manner nom.sg. the.gen.sg face.gen.sg apply-to.pres.ind mid. seem.3sg.impf.ind.

ἐσ ἐσούτον καὶ ἡ ὑπόκρισις ἐλευθερώτερη εἶναι
to himself.acc.sg. and the.nom.sg. reply.nom.sg. more-free.nom.sg. be.pres.inf.

‘The manner of his countenance seemed resemble his own, and the reply to be more free’

Her.1.116.1

⁴ All second position clitics and particles will not be treated as intervening material, as we assume that they cluster in 'second position' (Wackernagel, 1892) on account of their lack of phonological stress. We assume that these clitics begin in a position higher in the tree.

⁵ We have found no sequence of ADN or DNA which may possibly be interpreted as a phrasal constituent, i.e. which together acts as an argument of a non-copulative verb.
(7) ADN: clause

οὔτε ψυχροῦ τοῦ χώρου ἔστιν;
oute psuchrou tou chorou contos
nor cold.gen.sg. the.gen.sg. land.gen.sg. be.gen.sg.pres.part.

'nor is the country cold'

Her.4.30.1

We will instead focus on adjectives within DPs. The data will show that such adjectives always follow the definite article. However, the noun can be found preceding or following the article/adjective complex. Also, in some cases where the noun precedes the article and adjective, the noun is also preceded by a matching form of the definite article to form DNDA. Interestingly, the converse, DADN, with the noun and adjective both carrying a definite article where the adjective precedes the noun, has not been found. However, the order DAD(poss.)N is attested, where a possessive intervenes between the second article and the noun. Examples of the four found constructions are given here:

(8) [DAN] nautikos, 'of sea'

τὸν ναυτικὸν στρατὸν κυνδυνεύει· βασιλέως ἀποβαλεῖν
ton nautikon straton kinduneusei basileus apobalein

'The king will be in danger of losing his sea army'

Her.8.65.3

(9) [DAN] pezos, 'of foot'

σὺν δὲ οἱ ὁ πεζὸς στρατὸς
sun de hoi ho pezos stratos
with PART him.dat.sg. the.nom.sg. of-foot.nom.sg army.nom.sg.

'his land army with him'

Her.7.57.2

(10) [NDA] pezos, 'of-foot'

στρατίῳ δὲ τῇ πεζῇ ἄλλοι ἡγεύονται ἠγον
stratioi de te piizi alloi heguyontai egon

7
stratiēn de tēn pezēn alloi hēgemones ēgon
army.acc.sg. PART the.acc.sg. of-foot.acc.sg. other.nom.pl. captain.nom.pl. lead.3pl.impf.ind.act.

‘and the other captains led the land army’

Her.6.43.2

(11) [DNDA] thermos, ‘warm’

καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ θέρμων τότε ἐπέκαν
kai to hudōr to thermon tote epékan
and the.acc.sg. water.acc.sg. the.acc.sg. warm.acc.sg. then turned.3pl.aor.ind.act.

ἐπὶ τὴν ἐσοδον
epi tēn esodon
to the.acc.sg. pass.acc.sg.

‘and then they turned the warm water toward the pass’

Her.7.176.3

(12) [DNDA] hiros, ‘sacred’

μετὰ δὲ οἱ τε ἵπποι οἱ ἱροί
meta de hoi te hippoi hoi hiroi
after PART the.nom.pl. and horses.nom.pl. the.nom.pl. sacred.nom.pl.

καὶ τὸ ἀρμα τὸ ἱρών
kai to harma to hiron
and the.acc.sg. chariot.acc.sg. the.acc.sg. sacred.acc.sg.

‘and after them (came) the sacred horses and sacred chariot’

Her.7.55.2

(13) [DADposs.N] nautikos, ‘of-sea’

τὸν μὲν νῦν ναυτικὸν τὸν ξέρξων στρατὸν οὐκ
ton men nun nautikon ton Xerxeō stratōn ouk
the.acc.sg. PART now of-sea.acc.sg. the.acc.sg. Xerxes.gen.sg. army.acc.sg. not

ἐπείδον διόξαντες μέχρι Ἀνδροῦ
epideion diōxantes mechri Androu
see.3pl.aor.ind.act. pursue.nom.pl.aor.part.act. until Andros.gen.sg.

‘although they pursued the sea army of Xerxes up to Andros, they did not see it’

Her.8.108.1

2.1.2.2 - Split Constructions

(14) DA...N patrios, ‘ancestral’
'it was customary to worship only the ancestral gods'

Her.1.172

(15) DA...N allos, 'other'

ες τε ἄν ὑν τὰς ἄλλας ἐπεμπε σομμαχίας
es te de on tas allas epempe summachias
to both PART and-so the.acc.pl. other.acc.pl send.3sg.impf.ind.act. ally.acc.pl.

'and so he sent to the other allies'

Her.1.82.1

(16) N...DA kalos, 'beautiful'

τοῦτο δὲ κτήνεα ἔστευσεν ἐξευρίσκοντες
touto de khtenea esteuen6 exeuriskontes
on-the-other-hand PART7 animal.acc.pl. fatten.3pl.impf.ind.act. find-out.nom.pl.pres.part.act.

τιμής τὰ καλλιστα
timhes ta kallista
price.gen.sg. the.acc.pl. finest.acc.pl.

'moreover they fed the finest cattle that money could buy'

Her.7.119.2

(17) DN...DA allos, 'other'

ὁι βαρβαροὶ πρὸς φυγήν τε ἐρμηντο
hoi barbaroi pros phughen te eremeto
the.nom.pl. foreigner.nom.pl. to flight.acc.sg. and urge.3sg.plpf.ind.mid.

ὁι ἄλλοι πλῆν Περσῖων
hoi alloi plen Persioin
the.nom.pl. other.nom.pl. except Persians.gen.pl.

'the other foreigners except the Persians took to flight'

Her.9.102.3

No example of a DA...DN split construction has been found, just as no continuous DADN sequence. Concerning split constructions containing adjectives in orders of

6 The OCT edition gives στιωνικον (the Ionic imperfect form).
7 τοῦτο δὲ picks up from τοῦτο μεν in the preceding clause.
A...DN and DN...A, we notice that these do not constitute DPs. Rather, similarly to continuous sequences of ADN and DNA, these are clauses with copulative verbs. These orders have not been found in situations where there was no copulative verb, or an elided one. In other words, sequences of ADN, DNA, A...DN and D...NA have not been found as constituents, i.e. subjects or objects of non-copulative verbs.

(18) DN...A: clause

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{oí} & \quad \text{de}\quad \tau \iota\pi\nu\omicron\omicron\iota \\
\text{hoi} & \quad \text{de} \quad \text{hippoi} \\
\text{the.nom.pl.} & \quad \text{PART} \quad \text{horse.nom.pl.} \\
\text{hoi} & \quad \text{potamioi} \\
\text{the.nom.pl.} & \quad \text{of-river.nom.pl.} \\
\text{νομῖοι} & \quad \text{μὲν} \\
\text{nomiói} & \quad \text{tò} \\
\text{province.dat.sg.} & \quad \text{PART} \\
\text{τò} & \quad \text{Paprèmitéi} \\
\text{tò} & \quad \text{hiroi} \\
\text{the.dat.sg.} & \quad \text{sacred.nom.pl.} \\
\text{Παπρεμίτη} & \quad \text{hiroi} \\
\text{eisi} & \quad \text{be.3pl.pres.ind.act.} \\
\text{ìploi} & \quad \text{ìioi}
\end{align*}
\]

'river horses in the province of Papremis are sacred'

Her.2.71.1

(19) A...DN: clause

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{λινω} & \quad \text{δοκέσει} \\
\text{lineon} & \quad \text{eínai} \\
\text{of-linen.acc.sg.} & \quad \text{be.pres.inf.act.} \\
\text{τò} & \quad \text{heima} \\
\text{to} & \quad \text{the.acc.sg.} \\
\text{ìmoa} & \quad \text{garment.acc.sg.}
\end{align*}
\]

'he will think that the garment is of linen'

Her.4.74.1

2.2 - Quantifiers

At this point we will not make a distinction among the various quantifiers employed in Herodotus. The quantifiers\(^8\) we look at are:

-(ha)pas, pasa, pan, ‘every, all’

-polus, pollè, polu, ‘much, many’

-oligos, -è, -on, ‘few, little’

-numerals

\(^8\) For full paradigms of the quantifier (ha)pas, pasa, pan, which is somewhat ‘irregular’, see appendix 1.
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2.2.1 - Quantifiers in DPs with no articles

2.2.1.1 - Continuous constructions

(20) [QN] (ha)pas, pasa, pan, ‘every, all’

εφορεῖε  σοῦ  ἀνα  πᾶσαν  ἡμέρην
ephorei  sou  ana  pasan  hemerēn
carry.3sg.impf.ind.act.  her.acc.sg.  for  all.acc.sg.  day.acc.sg.

'she carried her every day’

Her.6.61.3

(21) [QN] (ha)pas, pasa, pan, ‘every, all’

πᾶσαν  πόλιν  καὶ  πᾶν  ἔθνος
pasan  polin  kai  pan  ethnos
all.acc.sg.  city.acc.sg.  and  all.acc.sg.  nation.acc.sg.

'every city and every nation’

Her.5.2.2

(22) [QN] oligos, ‘little, few’

ἐπισθών  δὲ  ὀλίγων  χρόνων  ἀποφέρεται
episthōn  de  oligon  chronon  apopheretai
hold-up.nom.sg.aor.part.act.  PART  little.acc.sg.  time.acc.sg.  carry-away.3sg.pres.ind.mid.

ὁ  δῦσας  τὰ  κρέα
ho  thusas  ta  krea
the.nom.sg.  offer.nom.sg.aor.part.act.  the.acc.pl.  flesh.acc.pl.

'having waited for a little while, the sacrificer carries away the meat’

Her.1.132.3

(23) [QN] pente, ‘five’

μήκος  ὁδοῦ  ἐξήκονος  ἀνδρὶ  πέντε  ἡμέραι
mēkos  hodou  euzēkonos  andri  pente9  hemerai
length.acc.sg.  journey.gen.sg.  well-girt.dat.sg.  man.dat.sg.  five.INDCL  days.nom.pl.

ἀνασιμοῦνται
anaisimountai
spend.3pl.pres.ind.mid.

9 pente, ‘five’ is indeclinable in AG and therefore does not show explicit gender/number/case agreement with the noun.
'five days are spent in the length of the journey for a man traveling light'

Her.1.72.3

(24) [NQ] (ha)pas, pasa, pan, 'every, all'

ἐν τῷ γῆς ἡπασές περιόδος ἐνετέμητο καὶ en toī gēs ἡπασές periodos enetetimēto kai in which.dat.sg. land.gen.sg. all.gen.sg. map.nom.sg. engrave.3sg.plpf.ind.mid. and

θαλάσσα τῇ πάσῃ καὶ ποταμοῖς πάντες thalassā te pasa kai potamois pantes sea.nom.sg. and all.nom.sg. and river.nom.pl. all.nom.pl.

'on which a map of the whole world was engraved and all the sea and all the rivers'

Her.5.49.1

(25) [NQ] polus, 'much, many'

ἐπείτα δὲ χρόνου πολλοῦ διεξελθόντος epeita de chronou pollou diezelthontos when PART time.gen.sg. much.gen.sg. pass.gen.sg.aor.part.act.

'then after much time had passed'

Her.2.52.2

(26) [NQ] oligos, 'little, few'

αἰτοῖοι δὲ ὀλίγοις χρέονται aitoi̇oi de oligoi̇s chréontai food.dat.pl. PART little.dat.pl. use.3pl.pres.ind.mid.

'they use little food'

Her.1.133.2

(27) [NQ] pente kai tessarakonta, 'forty-five'

στάδιοις δὲ πέντε καὶ τεσσαράκοντα διακομίσαντες ἀπίκοντο stadions de pente kai tessarakonta diakomisantes apikononto stades.acc.pl. PART five and forty.INDCL drag.nom.pl.aor.part.act. arrive.3pl.aor.ind.mid.

ἐς τῷ ιρόν eś to hiron to the.acc.sg. temple.acc.sg.

'and having dragged it forty-five stades they arrived at the temple'

Her.1.31.2

2.2.1.2 - Split constructions
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(28) Q...N polus, 'much, many'

ὁ ἀν πολλοῦς ἀποδείξῃ παῖδας
who.nom.sg. an many.acc.pl. show.3sg.aor.act. son.acc.pl.

'whoever might show many sons'

Her.1.136.1

(29) N...Q polus, 'much, many'

χρήματα λαβῶν πολλαὶ
property.acc.pl. seize.nom.sg.aor.part.act. many.acc.pl.

'seizing much property'

Her 6.17

(30) N...Q oligos, 'little, few'

γῆν γὰρ ἐκτήμεθα ὀλίγην
land.acc.sg. for aquire.1pl.perf.ind.mid. little.acc.sg.

'for we possess a small land'

Her.9.122.2

(31) N...Q polus, 'much, many'

θεραπεῖ ἔντι όφι ὀπίς ἐπεται πολλῇ
therapei PART swi opishe hepetai many.nom.sg.
retinue.nom.sg. them.dat.pl. behind follow.3sg.pres.ind.mid. much.nom.sg.

'and a large retinue follows them from behind'

Her.1.199.1

(32) N...Q duo, 'two'

στήλας ἐστήσει δύο ἕν' αὐτοῦ λίθου λευκοῦ
pillar.acc.pl. set.3sg.aor.ind.act. two beside it.gen.sg. stone.gen.sg. white.gen.sg.

'he set up two pillars beside it of white stone'

Her.4.87.1

2.2.2 - Quantifiers in DPs with articles
2.2.2.1 - Continuous constructions

Quantifiers may be found preceding articles and nouns, i.e. QDN.

(33) [QDN] *(ha)pas, pasa, pan,* ‘every, all’

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{όι} & \quad \text{μὲν} \quad \text{νῦν} \quad \text{ἐχόνται} \quad \text{kata} \quad \text{πᾶσαν} \quad \text{τὴν} \quad \text{γῆν} \quad \text{ἐσὶ} \\
\text{hai} \quad \text{men} \quad \text{nun} \quad \text{echidnai} \quad \text{kata} \quad \text{pasan} \quad \text{ten} \quad \text{gen} \quad \text{eisi}
\end{align*}
\]

the.nom.pl. PART now viper.nom.pl. on all.acc.sg the.acc.sg land.acc.sg. be.3pl.pres.ind.act.

‘vipers are in every land’

Her.3.109.3

(34) [QDN] *(ha)pas, pasa, pan,* ‘every, all’

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{προσβάντων} & \quad \text{δὲ} \quad \text{υφήων} \quad \text{oυτω} \quad \text{δὴ} \quad \text{Βόρδιας} \quad \text{τε} \\
\text{prosbanon} & \quad \text{de} \quad \text{suchnon} \quad \text{houto} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{Sardis} \quad \text{te}
\end{align*}
\]

step-upon.gen.pl.aor.part.act. PART numerous.gen.pl. thus PART Sardis.nom.sg. PART

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἐλακτισαν} & \quad \text{kai} \quad \text{πᾶν} \quad \text{τὸ} \quad \text{ἀστυ} \quad \text{ἐπορθεύτω} \\
\text{elaktisan} & \quad \text{kai} \quad \text{pan} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{astu} \quad \text{eportheeto}
\end{align*}
\]

be-taken.3pl.plpf.ind.act. and all.nom.sg. the.nom.sg. city.nom.sg. sack.3sg.impf.ind.pass.

‘Many having ascended, Sardis was taken and the whole city sacked’

Her.1.84.5

(35) [QDN] *(ha)pas, pasa, pan,* ‘every, all’

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἐμοὶ} \quad \text{δὲ} \quad \text{παρὰ} \quad \text{πάντα} \quad \text{τὸν} \quad \text{λόγον} \quad \text{ὑπόκειται} \\
\text{emoi} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{para} \quad \text{panta} \quad \text{ton} \quad \text{logan} \quad \text{hupokeitai}
\end{align*}
\]

me.dat.sg. PART through all.acc.sg. the.acc.sg. history.acc.sg. be-advised.3sg.pres.ind.mid.

‘to me it is fitting through the whole history (that I write the things told to me by everyone on hearsay)’

Her.2.123.1

(36) [QDN] *duo,* ‘two’

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{δύο} \quad \text{δὲ} \quad \text{οὶ} \quad \text{τελευταῖοι} \quad \text{ἐσὶ} \quad \text{ὁ} \quad \text{μὲν} \quad \text{καταργωρμοῦνοις} \\
\text{duo} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{hoi} \quad \text{teleutaloi} \quad \text{eisi} \quad \text{ho} \quad \text{men} \quad \text{katarguromenous}
\end{align*}
\]

two PART the.nom.pl. last.nom.pl. be.3pl.pres.ind. the.nom.sg. PART silver.acc.pl.pres.part.mid.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ὁ} \quad \text{δὲ} \quad \text{καταχροσμοῦνος} \quad \text{ἐχὼν} \quad \text{τοὺς} \quad \text{προμαχεῖνας} \\
\text{ho} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{katakehrusomenous} \quad \text{echon} \quad \text{tous} \quad \text{promacheonas}
\end{align*}
\]

the.nom.sg. PART gild.acc.pl.perf.part.mid. have.nom.sg.pres.part.act. the.acc.pl. bastion.acc.pl.
‘there are two\textsuperscript{10} final ones (circles), one bearing silver bastions, one golden’
Her.1.98.6

However, they also commonly follow the article and noun, i.e. DNQ.

(37) [DNQ] (ha)pas, pasa, pan, ‘every, all’

Λυδῶν μέντοι λογάδας καὶ τὸ κυνήγιον πᾶν
Lydian.gen.pl. but chosen.acc.pl. and the.acc.sg. hunt.acc.sg. all.acc.sg.

συμπέμψω
sumpempso
send.1sg.fut.ind.act.

‘but I will send chosen men of the Lydians and all the hunt’
Her.1.36.3

(38) [DNQ] (ha)pas, pasa, pan, ‘every, all’

τὰς δὲ ὀμάζοντα ἐν τῇσι πῆι διαιτῶ τὰ
tas de hamaxas en teisi sphi diaitato ta
the.acc.pl. PART wagons.acc.pl. in which.dat.pl them.dat. live.3sg.impf.ind.midd. the.nom.pl.

τέκνα καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες πάσας καὶ τὰ πρὸβατα πάντα
tekna kai hai gunaikes pasas kai ta probata panta
child.nom.pl. and the.nom.pl. wife.nom.pl. all.acc.pl. and the.acc.pl. flock.acc.pl. all.acc.pl.

‘and all the wagons in which their children and wives lived, and all the flocks’
Her.4.121.1

(39) [DNQ] polus, ‘much, many’

ὁ τε λόγος πολλὸς ἐν Σπάρτῃ ὡς
ho te logos pollos en Spartai hos
the.nom.sg. PART word.nom.sg. great.nom.sg. in Sparta.dat.sg. that

‘The word is great\textsuperscript{11} in Sparta that...’
Her.6.68.3

\textsuperscript{10}This example could be interpreted as an existential construction (as it is translated), rendering \textit{duo hoi teleuteioi} a DP, however, \textit{duo hoi teleuteioi} could also be interpreted as itself being a clause, i.e. ‘the last ones are two: one bearing silver bastions, the other, gold’. This will be discussed in chapter 5, section 3.

\textsuperscript{11}The construction in (41) could be taken as a clause with an elided copula, i.e. ‘the word is great’ or as an existential construction where a predication relation exists between the noun and adjective, i.e. ‘there is great word’. This will be taken up in chapter 5, section 3.
Another possibility is for the quantifier to appear between the definite article and noun.

(40) [DQN] *(ha)pas, pasa, pan, ‘every, all’*

καί πρόκατε δὴ κατ’ ὁδὸν πυθάνομαι τὸν
cai prokate de kat' hodon punthanomai ton
and soon PART by road.acc.sg. hear.1sg.pres.ind.mid. the.acc.sg.

πάντα λόγον θεράπουντος
panta logon therapontos
all.acc.sg. word.acc.sg. servant.gen.sg.

‘and soon on the way I heard the whole story from a servant’

Her.1.111.5

(41) [DQN] *(ha)pas, pasa, pan, ‘every, all’*

ἐἰ γὰρ δὴ τὸν πάντα σερπόντα σερπόντα ἵντεταμένα ἕι
ei gar de ton panta chronon entetamena ei
if for PART the.acc.sg. all.acc.sg. time.acc.sg. string.nom.pl.perf.ind.mid. be.3sg12.pres.subj.act.

‘for if they (the bows) were strung the whole time’

Her.2.173.3

(42) [DQN] *polus, ‘much, many’*

ὅσος ὅ πολλὸς ὅμιλος τί ταῦτα
houtos ho pollos homilos ti tauta
this.nom.sg. the.nom.sg. great.nom.sg. throng.nom.sg. why these-things.acc.pl.

πολλὴν σπουδὴν ἐργάζεται;
polei spoudei ergazetai?
great.dat.sg. eagerness.dat.sg. work.3sg.pres.ind.mid.

‘this great thron, why they working on these things with great zeal?’

Her.1.88.2

(43) [DQN] *duo, ‘two’*

ὅς δὲ τὰς δύο μιν μοίρας διοδοποιήκεσαν
hös de tas duo men moiras diodoiropèkesan
when PART the.acc.pl. two PART part.acc.pl. traverse.3pl.plpf.ind.act.

‘when they had traversed two parts’

Her.8.129.2

12 The reason for the apparent mismatch in number of the periphrastic verbal construction is that the subject of the verb is a neuter plural form, and so agrees with a singular (finite) verb, i.e. eiē. The participle, however, is plural.
(44) [DQN] *duo* (\textit{two})

\begin{verbatim}
εν τῇ χώρῃ ὁι δύο θεοὶ εγένοντο
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
in which.dat.sg. land.dat.sg. the.nom.sg. two gods.nom.pl. become.3pl.aor.ind.mid.
\end{verbatim}

the land in which the two gods were born'

Her. 6.97.2

Quantifiers may also be found in constructions involving two definite articles, in the sequence DNDQ. This construction and the one immediately preceding it (DQN) are reminiscent of the patterning of adjectives. As is the case with adjectives, *DQDN has not been found.

(45) [DNDQ] *hapas, pasa, pan* (\textit{every, all})

\begin{verbatim}
tάς μὲν δὲ νέας τάς πάσας ἀπίκομενας
tas men dè neas tas pasas apikomenas
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
the.acc.pl. PART PART ship.acc.pl. the.acc.pl. all.acc.pl. arrive.acc.pl.aor.part.act.
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
ὅς Δορίσκον
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
at Doriskon
\end{verbatim}

all the ships having arrived at Doriskus'

Her. 7.59.2

(46) [DNDQ] *hapas, pasa, pan* (\textit{every, all})

\begin{verbatim}
ἐν τοῖς αὐτὸς τῷ Ὁμασίῳ καὶ
en toïs autos te ho Amasis kai
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
in which.dat.sg. himself.nom.sg. both the.nom.sg. Amasis.nom.sg. and
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
ὅι δαιμονεῖς οἱ πάντες
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
the.nom.pl. feaster.nom.pl. the.nom.pl. all.nom.pl.
\end{verbatim}

in which both Amasis himself and all those feasting'

Her. 2.172.3

2.2.2.2 - Split constructions

---

\(^{13}\) Apollo and Artemis
Quantifiers are fairly frequently found in hyperbaton in Herodotus. There are a couple of varieties of split constructions in which the quantifier precedes the noun with material intervening. The quantifier may be separated from the article and noun (Q..DN), or the article and quantifier may be separated from the noun (DQ..N).

(47) Q...D(A)N (ha)pas, pasa, pan, ‘every, all’

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{πᾶς} & \text{ἐκ} & \text{Φοινίκων} \\
\text{pas} & \text{ek} & \text{Phoinikón} \\
\text{all.nom.sg.} & \text{from} & \text{Phoenician.gen.pl.}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{ἐρέττω} \\
\text{ἐρέττω} \\
\text{EVENT-3SG.PLF.IN.D.MID.}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{ὁ} & \text{ναυτικός} & \text{στρατός} \\
\text{ho} & \text{nautikos} & \text{stratos} \\
\text{the.nom.sg.} & \text{of-sea.nom.sg.} & \text{army.nom.sg.}
\end{array}
\]

‘The whole sea army depended on the Phoenicians’

Her.3.19.3

(48) DQ...N (ha)pas, pasa, pan, ‘every, all’

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{στρατηγοί} & \text{γε} & \text{ὁ} & \text{τὸ} & \text{πᾶν} & \text{ἔχοντες} \\
\text{stratēgoi} & \text{ge} & \text{ho} & \text{to} & \text{pan} & \text{echontes}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{κράτος} \\
\text{kratos} \\
\text{power.acc.sg.}
\end{array}
\]

‘the generals, those holding all the power’

Her.7.96.2

There are also a variety of split constructions where the noun precedes the strong quantifier with material intervening. As is the case with the split constructions above, the definite article may appear in front of the noun or the quantifier, i.e. DN...Q, or N..DQ. Also, we have found one example of a split construction with (ha)pas, pasa, pan, ‘every, all’ where there are two definite articles, i.e. DND...Q.

(49) DN...Q (ha)pas, pasa, pan, ‘every, all’

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{ὁι} & \text{ἐὰς} & \text{Βάρκαιοι} & \text{αὐτοί} & \text{ὑπεδέκοντο} & \text{πάντες} \\
\text{hoi} & \text{eas} & \text{Barkaioi} & \text{autoi} & \text{hupedekonto} & \text{pantes}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{πάντες} \\
\text{pantes} \\
\text{all.nom.pl.}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{δὲ} & \text{αὐτοί} & \text{ὑπεδέκοντο} & \text{πάντες} \\
\text{de} & \text{autoi} & \text{hupedekonto} & \text{pantes}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{πάντες} \\
\text{pantes} \\
\text{all.nom.pl.}
\end{array}
\]

'all the Barcaeans admitted it was them'

(50) DN...Q (ha)pas, pasa, pan, 'every, all'

τού γαρ δή Λυδών δήμου αἱ θυγατέρες
tou gar de Lydwn demou hai thugateres
the gen.sg. for PART Lydians. gen.pl. people.gen.sg. the.nom.pl. daughter.nom.pl.

πορνεύονται πᾶσαι
porneuontai pasai
prostitute.3pl.pres.ind.act. all.nom.pl.

'all the daughters of the common people of Lydia prostitute themselves'

Her.1.93.4

(51) N...DQ (ha)pas, pasa, pan, 'every, all'

ἀριθμὸς δὲ ἔγενετο ὁ πᾶς τῶν νεόν παρεῖ
arithmos de egeneto ho pas tōn neōn parei
number.nom.sg. PART be.3sg.aor.ind. the.nom.sg. all.nom.sg. the.gen.pl. ship.gen.pl. besides

τῶν πεντήκοντάρων τριήκοσια καὶ ἰδικήκοντα καὶ ὀκτώ
tōn pentekontarōn triekosiia kai ἵδιkēkonta kai oktō
the.gen.pl. 50-oared-bark.gen.pl. three-hundred.nom.pl. and seventy.INDCL and eight.INDCL

'the whole number of the ships, besides the fifty-oared barks, was three hundred and seventy-eight'

Her.8.48.1

(52) DND...Q (ha)pas, pasa, pan, 'every, all'

τῶν δὲ ἐπιθαλασσίων τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ
tōn de epithalassion tōn en tē Asiā

This example may be interpreted in a number of ways. Because all of the nominals are in the nominative case, from a grammatical perspective it is possible that the example contains one clause with all nominals as the subject of the verb and an elided pronoun object. It may also be interpreted as containing two clauses with the verb of the second clause being an elided copula. If it contains two clauses, there are still a couple of possible interpretations; the quantifier may be interpreted as part of the DP with autoi being the object of the elided copula, as is suggested by the translation given. The quantifier may also be interpreted as a part of the predicate of the elided copula, as is suggested by translation in the Loeb edition: the Barcaeans answered that it was the deed of the whole city (Godley, 1920-1925). Looking only at the grammar it is not possible to tell which interpretation was intended by Herodotus, and therefore if this example is in fact an example of DN...Q. The context of the example lends itself more easily to a bi-clausal interpretation with pantes acting as the object of the elided copula, as it was taken by Godley (see Her. 4.200 which suggests that the deed in question, i.e. the slaying of Arcesilaus was indeed the doing of the whole city). Due to the many possible interpretations of this example from a strictly grammatical perspective, and to the suggestion of the context, this particular example will not itself play a role in the construction of our analysis of split constructions. However, it is clear from the example in (50) above that orders of DN...Q were grammatical in Herodotus’ dialect, as this example is unambiguously uni-clausal.
tòν d’ epithalassiôn tòν en tēi Asianē

ἀρχεῖν πάντων
archei pantôn
rule:3sg.pres.ind.act. all.gen.pl.

‘he governs all the sea-coast people in Asia’ Her.5.30.5

2.3 - Demonstratives

There are three fully declining demonstratives in Classical Greek which we will examine. Two of them, houtos, hautê, tutto, and ekeinos, -ē, -on, may correspond to “this” and “that”, respectively. It is often claimed that houtos, hautê, tutto is used with deictic function to refer to objects close to the speaker, and that ekeinos, -ē, -on is used with deictic function to refer to objects far from the speaker (and hearer). However, houtos, hautê, tutto is also often used with anaphoric function. The third, hode, hède, tode, ‘this/that’ has a variety of meanings; it may be used in cataphora, deixis, or anaphora. The uses of the three demonstratives will be discussed in more detail in chapter (6). For now we will show only the distributional facts.

2.3.1 - Demonstratives in DPs with no articles

2.3.1.1 - Continuous constructions

Demonstratives are found pre- and post-nominally.

(53) [DemN] hode

λέγεται δὲ καὶ οὗτος λόγος
legetai de kai hode logos
say:3sg.pres.ind.pass. PART also this.acc.sg. story.acc.sg.

‘and this story is also told:’ Her.3.3.1

(54) [DemN] houtos

20
ταύτην δίκην Ἀπολλωνίηται τῆς ἐκτυφλώσιος
tauitēn dikēn Apolloniētai tēs ektuphlosios

ἐκτίνουσιν τοι
ektinousi to i
pay-off.3pl.pres.ind.act. you.dat.sg.

‘this penalty the Apollonians pay to you for your blinding’

Her.9.94.3

(55) [NDem] hode

tοῦτοις δὲ πρόσοψι Κιλικες κατέκοντες
toutois de prosoi pro各单位 Kilikes katēkontes
these.dat.pl. PART neighbour.nom.pl. Cilician.nom.pl. reach.nom.pl.pres.part.act.

ἐπὶ θαλάσσαν τῆν ἐσ
epi thalassan tēn de
to sea.acc.sg. that.acc.sg.

‘the neighbours to these are the Cilicians, reaching to that sea’

Her.5.49.6

(56) [NDem] hode

καὶ τοῖς σκυτάλοισι ἔπαιν καὶ Πέρσας
cai tois skutaloisi epaion tois Persas
and the.dat.pl. stick.dat.pl. beat.3.pl.impf.ind.act. the.acc.pl. Persian.acc.pl.

προσεχομένως, ἔπεα τάδε
proischomenous, epēa tade
put-forward.acc.pl.pres.part.mid. words.acc.pl. these.acc.pl.

‘and with the sticks they beat the Persians, who put forward these words:’

Her.3.137.2

(57) [NDem] houtos

γυναῖκι δὴ ταύτη τῇ νῦν συνοικεῖς
gynaikī de tautē tēi nun sunoikēies
wife.dat.sg. indeed this.dat.sg. who.dat.sg. now live-with.2sg.pres.ind.act.

‘with this wife with whom you live now’

Her.9.111.2

2.3.1.2 - Split constructions

As is expected both types of splits, i.e. Dem...N and N...Dem were found in Herodotus.
(58) Dem...N hode

τήνος  ἔχο  γνώμην
tēnōs  echō  gnōmēn
this.acc.sg.  hold.1sg.pres.ind.act.  opinion.acc.sg.

'I hold this opinion'  Her.2.27.1

(59) Dem...N hode

τώνε  ἔξεφαίνε  λόγον
tonē  exephaine  logon
this.acc.sg.  reveal.3sg.impf.ind.act.  word.acc.sg.

'he revealed this word'  Her.7.160.1

(60) N...Dem hode

μισθός  δέ  οί  ἕν  εἱρημένος  ὧδε
mìsthos  de  hoi  en  eirēmenos  ὧδε
reward.nom.sg.  PART  him.dat.sg.  promise.3sg.plpf.ind.mid.  this.nom.sg.

ὑπὸ  τῶν  Σαμίων
hypo  tōn  Samiōn
by  the.gen.pl.  Samians.gen.pl.

'this reward was promised to him by the Samians'  Her.6.23.5

2.3.2 - Demonstratives in DPs with articles

2.3.2.1 - Continuous constructions

Demonstratives in definite DPs may also be found pre- and post-nominally. However, demonstratives have not been found between the article and noun as adjectives and quantifiers were.

(61) [DemDN] hode

τῆς  δὲ  γῆς  τῆς  περὶ  ὧδε  ὦ
tēs  de  gēs  tēs  peri  ὧδε  ho
the.gen.sg.  PART  land.gen.sg.  which.gen.sg.  about  this.nom.sg.  the.nom.sg.
λόγος  ὀρμηται  λέγεσθαι
logos  hormētaī  legesthai
word.nom.sg.  begin.3.sg.perf.ind.m.  say.pres.inf.mid.

'As for the land of which my history has begun to speak'

Her.4.16.1

(62) [DemDN] houtos

ἐν δὲ ταυτῇ τῇ μάχῃ Ἐλλήνων ἐρίστευσαν
en de tautei tei machēi Ellēnōn eristēusan
in PART this.dat.sg. the.dat.sg. battle.dat.sg. Greeks.gen.pl. be-best.3pl.aor.ind.act.

'Αθηναίοι
Athēnaioi
Athenians.nom.pl.

'in that battle the Athenians fought best of the Greeks'

Her.9.105.1

(63) [DemDN] houtos

ἐν δὲ ταυτῇ τῇ μάχῃ Ἐλλήνων ἐρίστευσαν
en de tautei tei machēi Ellēnōn eristēusan
in PART this.dat.sg. the.dat.sg. battle.dat.sg. Greeks.gen.pl. be-best.3pl.aor.ind.act.

'Αθηναίοι
Athēnaioi
Athenians.nom.pl.

'in that battle the Athenians fought best of the Greeks'

Her.9.105.1

(63) [DemDN] houtos

οὗτος ὁ ὁ ὁταύς πρώτος ὑποστευεῖ τὸν
houtos ho Otanēs prōtos hupōsteuei ton
this.nom.sg. the.nom.sg. Otanes.nom.sg. first suspect.3sg.aor.ind.act. the.acc.sg.

Μαγοὺ
Magon
Magian.acc.sg.

'this Otanes first suspected the Magian'

Her.3.68.2

(64) [DemDN] ekeinos

ἐμοί ἐκεῖνος μᾶλλα τυγχάνει εὖν
emoi ekeinos malista tunchanei eōn
me.dat.sg. friend.nom.sg. most happen.3sg.pres.ind.act. be.nom.sg.pres.part.act.

τῶν περὶ ἐκεῖνος τοὺς χώρους οἰκεῖμένων
tōn peri ekeinos touς chōrous oikeiμένων
the.gen.pl. around those.acc.pl. the.acc.pl. lands.acc.pl. live.gen.pl.pres.part.mid.

'he happens to be my best friend of those living around those lands'

Her.9.76.3

(65) [DemDN] ekeinos
'if he had intercourse with her that night'  
\(\text{Her.2.181.4}\)

(66) [DNDem] *hode*

\[\begin{align*}
\text{καλέσας} & \quad \text{τόν} & \quad \text{βουκόλον} & \quad \text{τόνδε}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{call.nom.sg.pres.part.act.} & \quad \text{the.acc.sg.} & \quad \text{cowherd.acc.sg.} & \quad \text{that.acc.sg.}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{παραδιδόμι} & \quad \text{τό} & \quad \text{παιδίον}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{give-over.1sg.pres.ind.act.} & \quad \text{the.acc.sg.} & \quad \text{child.acc.sg.}
\end{align*}\]

'Having called that cowhed I gave\(^{15}\) over the child'  
\(\text{Her.1.117.4}\)

(67) [DNDem] *houtos*, 'this'

\[\begin{align*}
\text{τὰ} & \quad \text{μὲν} & \quad \text{χρηστέρια} & \quad \text{ταῦτα} & \quad \text{αἱ} & \quad \text{ἐκρήσθη}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{the.nom.pl.} & \quad \text{PART} & \quad \text{oracle.nom.pl.} & \quad \text{this.nom.pl.} & \quad \text{them.dat.} & \quad \text{be-furnished.3sg.aor.ind.pass.}
\end{align*}\]

'this oracle was given to them' (already described)  
\(\text{Her.9.94.1}\)

(68) [DNDem] *houtos*, ‘this’

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ἐκ} & \quad \text{δὲ} & \quad \text{τὴν} & \quad \text{Σέστον} & \quad \text{ταύτην}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{at PART} & \quad \text{the.acc.sg.} & \quad \text{Sestos.acc.sg.} & \quad \text{this.acc.sg.}
\end{align*}\]

'at this (same) Sestos'  
\(\text{Her.9.115.1}\)

2.3.2.2 - Split constructions

Demonstratives are frequently found in split constructions of the forms Dem...DN and DN...Dem.

\(^{15}\) The tense of the verbal form *paradidōmi* is the ‘historical present’ tense, thus used to describe events in the past.
(69) Dem...DN hode

τῶν  τάδε  φασί  εἰπέων  τὸ  ἔπος
ton  tode  phasi  eipein  to  epos
who.acc.sg.  this.acc.sg.  say.3pl.pres.ind.act.  say.pres.inf.act.  the.acc.sg.  word.acc.sg.

‘whom they say to have said this word’

(70) DN...Dem hode

τὰ  δὲ  γράμματα  ἔλεγε  τάδε
ta  de  grammata  eleges  tode
the.acc.pl.  PART  writing.acc.pl.  read.3pl.impf.ind.act.  these.acc.pl.

‘He read these writings’

2.4 - WH- words

In Herodotus tis, ti, ‘who, what’ (for full paradigm and variant forms Appendix 1) is often employed. Koios, -e, -on, ‘of what sort’, which is the Ionic form of Attic poios, -e, -on, is also employed frequently. The WH- words may be bare or may occur with nouns.

2.4.1 - Bare WH-

(71) bare WH- tis

τί  γὰρ  παθομένοι  μὴ  βουλομένων  οἱ  ὑμεῖς
ti  gar  pathomen  me  boulomenon  ois  humeis
what.acc.sg.  for  suffer.1pl.aor.subj.act.  if-not  wish.gen.pl.pres.part.mid.  you.gen.pl.

τιμῷσθεν;  
timorousin?
aid.pres.infin.act.

“for what will we suffer if you are not willing to aid?”

(72) bare WH- tis

τί  σφέως  ἀπαίρησοι;
ti  spheas  apairisei?
what.acc.sg.  them.acc.pl.  deprive.2sg.fut.ind.mid.
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'what will you deprive them of?'

(73) bare WH- kóthen, 'whence', teu, 'of whom'

κόθεν ἤμιν ἢ ἐλευθερίῃ ἐγένετο καὶ
kóthen hēmin hē eleutheriē egeneto kai
whence us.dat.sg. the.nom.sg. freedom.nom.sg. become.3sg.aor.ind.mid. and

τεῦ δόντος;
teu dontos
who.gen.sg. give.gen.sg.aor.part.act.

'from where did our freedom come and from whom was it given?'

(74) bare WH tis

νησιῶται δὲ τί δοκεῖς εὐχεσθαι ἄλλο
nēsiōtas de tī dokēi̇s euchèsthai allo
islanders.acc.pl. and what.sg. think.2sg.pres.ind.act. hope.pres.inf.mid. other

ἡ ἐπείτε τάχιστα ἔπιθυμοντο σε μέλλοντα
ē epēite tachistā épithymonton se mēllonta
than when quickly learn.3pl.aor.ind.mid. you.acc.sg. be-about-to.acc.sg.part.act.

ἐπὶ οἵνις ναυπήγεσθαι νέας λαβεῖν ἀρρώσειν
epi phisi nauphegesthai ne-as labei̇n arro-sinoi
against them build.pres.infin.mid. ships.acc.pl. seize.aor.infin. pray.nom.pl.pres.part.mid.

Λυδός ἐν ἐν θαλάσσῃ ἵνα ὑπὲρ τῶν
Lydoς en en thalassēi hina huper tōn
Lydian.acc.pl. on sea.dat.sg. so-that because-of those.gen.pl.

ἐν τῇ ἡπείρῳ οἰκημένων 'Ελλήνων τίσονται
en tē epēi̇ro oikēmenōn 'Ellēnωn tisontai

σε τοὺς σὺ δουλῶσαις ἔχεις;
se tous su doulosas echei̇s;

'And the islanders, what do you think they will hope for, other than praying to seize the Lydians on the sea that they may avenge you because of the Greeks living on the mainland whom YOU hold captives, once they quickly learn that you are about to build ships against them?'

Her.1.71.3
Her.3.82.5
Her.1.27.4
2.4.2 - WH- words in full DPs

2.4.2.1 – Continuous constructions

WH- words in constructions with nouns were found only preceding the nouns in Herodotus.

(75) [WH-N] tis

tóς  τέω  τρόπω  περήσουσιν;
them.acc.pl.  what.dat.sg.  way.dat.sg.  go-past.1pl.fut.ind.act.

'the guards'

(76) [WH-N] tis

'Αρπαγε  τέω  δή  μόρω  τόν  παιδα

κατεχρήσαο  τόν  τοι  παρέδωκα  ἐκ
katechrēsao  ton  toi  parēdōka  ek
pu-to-death.2sg.aor.ind.mid.  who.acc.sg.  you.dat.sg.  give.1sg.aor.ind.act.  from

θυγατρός  γεγονότα  τής  ἐμῆς;
thugatros  gegonota  tēs  emēs;

“Harpagus, how (in what manner) did you kill the boy, born from my daughter, whom I gave to you?”

Her.1.117.1

(77) [WH-N] teos, koiō

ουαξ  ἐγὼ  μὲν  ἠλθον  παρά σε
Lord.voc.sg.  I.nom.sg.  PART  come.1sg.aor.ind.act.  to  you.acc.sg.

χρησάμενος  περὶ  τῆς  φωνῆς  σὺ
inquire.nom.sg.aor.part.  about  the.gen.sg.  voice.gen.sg.  you.nom.sg.

καὶ  μοι  ἄλλα  ἀδύνατα  χρῆς
de  moi  alla  adunata  chrēs
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PART me.dat.sg. other.acc.pl. impossible.acc.pl. give-oracle.2sg.pres.ind.act.
λεύνων Liβóyn apoikízein teōi dėvāmi koίρ ἵμαρι;
dunami, koíēi cheirí?
power.dat.sg. what-sort.dat.sg. hand.dat.sg.

“Lord, I came to you inquiring about my voice, but you desire for me other impossible things, ordering me to colonise Lybia, by what power, by what sort of hand?”

Her.4.155.4

2.4.2.2 - Split constructions

WH- words are quite commonly found split from their nouns, in this case, always preceding the noun with material intervening.

(78) WH-...N tis

dėspota tina legeis logon ouk ígyiā;
despotα τίνα λέγεις λόγον οὐκ ἴγια;
master.voc.sg. what.acc.sg. say.2sg.pres.ind.act. word.acc.sg. not healthy.acc.sg.

“master, what pestilent word do you say?”

Her.1.8.3

(79) WH-...N koios

Πρήξασπες koion me tina 16 νομίζουσι
Prexaspes, koion me tina nomizousi
Prexaspes.voc.sg. what-kind.acc.sg. me.acc.sg. some.acc.sg. think.3pl.pres.ind.act.

Πέρσαι einai andra tinas te logous peri eme
Persians.nom.pl. be.pres.inf. man.acc.sg. what.acc.pl. and word.acc.pl. about me.gen.sg.

ποιεύουσι;
opelauntai?
make.3pl.pres.ind.act.

16 In the Hude (1908) edition of the Histories this line is written with different accentuation than the Godley (1921) text, used above shows. Hude gives: κοῖν μὲ τινα…

28
“Prexaspes, what kind of man do the Persians think me to be, and what words do they make about me?”

(80) WH-...N koios

βασιλεῦ κοῖνον ἐφθέγξαο ἔπος;
basileu koion ephthenxao epos?
king.voc.sg. what-kind.acc.sg. utter.2sg.aor.ind.mid. word.acc.sg.

'king, what word do you utter?'

(81) WH- ...N tis

tέοισι με χρή ὁμμασί εἶς τε ἀγορῆν
teoisi me chrê ommasi eis te agora
what.dat.pl me.acc.sg is-necessary.3sg.pres.inctl. eye.dat.pl to both agora.acc.sg

καὶ εἶ ἀγορῆς φοιτεοῦσα φαίνεσθαι;
kai eis agoraes phoiteonta phainesthai?

'with what face do I have to appear going to and coming from the agora?'

Her.3.34.2
Her.5.106.3
Her.1.37.2
### 2.5 – Summary Table

#### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>+/- definite</th>
<th>X...N</th>
<th>N...X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X=A</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AN, NA)</td>
<td>Yes, Yes</td>
<td>A...N</td>
<td>N...A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One D</td>
<td>DAN,</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDA</td>
<td>DA...N</td>
<td>N...DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Ds</td>
<td>DNDA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*DADN(^{17})</td>
<td>*DA...DN</td>
<td>DN...DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X=Q</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(QN, NQ)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Q...N</td>
<td>N...Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One D</td>
<td>DQN,</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QDN,</td>
<td>DQ...N</td>
<td>N...DQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DNQ</td>
<td>Q...DN</td>
<td>DN...Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Ds</td>
<td>DNDQ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*DQDN</td>
<td>*DQ...DN</td>
<td>DND...Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X=Dem</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DemN, NDem)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dem...N</td>
<td>N...Dem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DemDN, DNDem</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dem...DN</td>
<td>DN...Dem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X=WH-</td>
<td>WH-N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*NWH-</td>
<td>WH...N</td>
<td>*N...WH-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this thesis we seek to analyze the split constructions which are documented in the above table. However, given this table, we will also need to explain why certain constructions, split and continuous, are not employed in Herodotus, i.e. DADN, DA...DN, DQDN, DQ...DN, NWH- and N...WH-. This table also leaves open the

\(^{17}\) * is used in this table to refer to constructions which have not been found in the *Histories*. At this point we are not making claims as to the grammaticality of these missing constructions.
question of why WH- words are the only X-words which cannot be employed with the
definite article.
CHAPTER 3 - Theoretical Assumptions

We will now prepare to provide our analysis of Herodotus’ DP, as well as the split constructions we saw in the previous chapter. In the following chapters we will provide an analysis of each of the situations summarized in the table at the end of the previous chapter. For each of the possible constituents that can occur with a nominal head, we will first offer some details about the syntax and semantics of the respective constituents (Adjectives, Quantifiers, Demonstratives, and WH-elements), and then proceed to propose an analysis of the DPs containing such elements in Herodotus’ Greek, both in continuous and split constructions. First we will present the theoretical background of this thesis, focusing on the functional categories that are active both at the clausal level and at the level of nominal constituents.

3.1 - Theoretical background

In syntactic theory all languages have lexical and functional categories. Lexical categories, which are “open-class” categories, include words such as verbs, nouns and adjectives. Functional categories, on the other hand, represent a “closed-class” and often express information about tense, aspect, evidential status, (number and gender) agreement, definiteness or affectedness. Languages demonstrate relationships between lexical and functional categories, whether or not the functional categories are instantiated through bound or free morphemes. In the case of the former, affixes which are semantically related to nominal elements (gender, number, definiteness) are attached to the nominals, while affixes which relate to verbal elements (tense, aspect, evidential status, durativeness) are attached to verbal elements. In the case of the latter, there are often functional categories which are related to specific lexical categories, i.e. pronouns
to nouns, auxiliaries to verbs, determiners to adjectives, etc. Regardless of the status of
the functional category in question i.e. bound or free, a lexical projection and a functional
projection together form an Extended Projection (Grimshaw, 1991).

3.2 - Topic and Focus

3.2.1 - in the CP

The structure of a clause is made up of three structural layers; the lexical layer (vP),
where theta assignment takes place, the inflectional layer (IP), which serves to license
inflectional features like case and agreement, and the complementizer layer (CP), which
hosts operator elements with clausal scope such as interrogative and relative pronouns.

(1) CP
    ...
    IP
    ...
    vP

Rizzi (1997) has shown that the complementizer layer includes discourse-oriented
projections. The fully extended left periphery of a clause, as conceived of by Rizzi, is
given in (2) below.

(2) ...Force...(Topic)...(Focus)...(Topic)...Fin IP

The two projections at the two edges of the complementizer layer, Force and Fin,
represent the force-finiteness system of a clause. Force, which appears at the left edge of
the CP interacts with the structure above CP. The ‘specification of Force’ (Chomsky,
1995) refers to information that a complementizer expresses about a clause, i.e. whether it
is a declarative, interrogative, exclamative, relative, et cetera. Fin, on the other hand,
looks down at the structure below CP, i.e. IP. It is well accepted that there are
‘agreement’ rules between C and I (accounting for the co-occurrence of that and a tensed
verb, and of for and an infinitive in English). This relationship between CP and IP is instantiated in Fin. The other two projections in (2), the two Topic Phrases and the single Focus Phrase are of particular interest for us. These phrases are relevant to Topic-Comment and Focus-Presupposition articulation. In general, any sentence can be divided into old vs. new information. However, sometimes this division is syntactically encoded. Thus, if a Top(ic)P is projected in the syntax, the material attracted to the specifier of TopP will be syntactically marked as old information, and the rest will be the comment.

(3) your book, you should give t to Paul (not to Bill)

Similarly, if a Foc(us)P is projected, the constituent attracted to the specifier of the FocP will be syntactically marked as new information, whereas the rest will be presupposed, or old information.

(4) YOUR BOOK, you should give t to Paul (not mine)

These Topic and Focus projections will be crucial to our analysis of split DPs in Herodotus.

3.2.1 - in the DP

There has been a lot of discussion in the literature about the parallelism between CPs and DPs (Szabolcsi 1992, Abney 1987). Just as the architecture of the clause contains three layers, a lexical one, an inflectional one and a discourse oriented one, the structure of a nominal constituent contains a similar three-way division.

(5) LP (Left Periphery)
   ...
   DP
   ...
  NP
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Much of the claims for this parallelism are grounded in the semantic and syntactic similarities between CPs and DPs, including possessors. Thus, the possessor within a DP is structurally parallel to the subject of a clause, and the part of the DP corresponding to the possessed is parallel to the finite predicate of a clause (Szabolcsi, 1992). This parallelism is reinforced by the observation that complementizers and determiners have a similar semantic contribution: they are both subordinators in that they serve to enable a “proposition” to act as an argument of a higher predicate (Szabolcsi, 1992). Further parallelisms between CP and DP are examined in Cinque (1994), Longobardi (1994) and Bennis, Corver and Den Dikken (1997).

Our analysis follows suggestions by Ntelitheos (2002), Ihsane and Puskas (2001), Haegeman (2000), Karanassios (1990), Stavrou (1996), Tsimpli & Stavrakaki (1999), Alexiadou & Stavrou (1997), Alexiadou (1999), Giusti (1996), Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Giusti (1998), and further extends this parallelism. The proposal is that like CPs, DPs in Herodotus’ Greek can relate to the discourse in a clause-like way, and that the left periphery of nominal constituents contains two possible Topic positions and a Focus positions, as indicated in (T1).

(T1)

```
  TopP  FocP
     /    /
    /     /
   Top  Foc D P
    *    *  *  NP
```
CHAPTER 4 - X=(A)jective (Phrase)

In order to account for split constructions in Herodotus’ Greek, our strategy will be to first propose a structure for the continuous sequences and from there propose an analysis of split constructions. As mentioned in chapter (2), we will not consider sequences of DNA and ADN, since they only occur with an overt copula or an elided one, and as such they have the distribution of clauses, not phrases. As shown in the table in chapter (2), a continuous definite DP with an adjective may show up with a single determiner as DAN or NDA. A definite DP may also contain two determiners in the order DNDA, however, the reverse order, i.e. with the adjective showing up pre-nominally, DADN, was not found. Also, while splits in sequences of DN...DA, N...DA and DA...N are attested, the split sequence DA...DN is not. Although the attested split constructions, DA...N, N...DA and DN...DA appear to be built upon the base structures of the attested continuous constructions, DAN, NDA and DNDA, respectively, at this point we cannot assume that they necessarily are.

The facts compiled in chapter 2 indicate that our analysis of DPs containing adjectives should be able to address the following issues:

(i) How can we account for both relative orders of N and A that occur in continuous sequences?

(ii) How can we account for the presence of two Ds in some nominal sequence? And correlatively, why is there no attestation of the sequence DADN, as opposed to DNDA?
(iii) How can we account for the restrictions on splitting, in other words why is it that only some splits occur, i.e. DN...DA, but not DA...DN? Also, why are there no attestations of D...AN, N...AD, A...ND, etc.).

4.1. Previous Analyses of Adjectives

The previous literature on the syntactic position of adjectives in continuous DPs is divided. One type of proposal assumes that adjectives are syntactic heads in the extended projection of the noun, as illustrated in (T1) (Androutsopoulou, 1996).

(T1)

Another type of analysis proposed for adjectives is that they are maximal projections (XPs), merged either as specifiers, or as complements of nominal heads. There are several variants of the proposal that adjectives are XPs, including:

(T2)
The configuration in (T2) is an extension or generalization to the nominal domain of the idea that the modifiers occupy Specifiers (Spec-) of functional projections. This idea was worked out in detail for the clausal domain, i.e. for adverbial modifiers, by Cinque (1999). The configuration in (T3) is a variant of that in (T2) in which a (M)odifier Phrase occupies the Spec- of a functional projection, and the AP is in the extended projection of MP. The trees in (T4) and (T5) demonstrate predication relations, where the subject of predication is the NP, and the predicate, AP. These structures therefore contain projections similar to those in clausal structures, in (T4), the S(mall) C(clause) Phrase,
and in (T5) the C(omplementizer) Phrase. These figures are structurally very similar to one another, the only difference being that the CP in (T5) represents a relative clause type structure, i.e. a 'reduced relative clause', while the SCP in (T4) represents only the predication relation between the NP and AP. Thus the base structure of a DP containing an adjective such as 'the big man' corresponds to a structure which may be paraphrased as 'the man who is big' in the configuration in (T5), while in the configuration in (T4), it would be paraphrased as 'the man is big'.

Some of the above proposals distinguish between two types of adjectives; pre-nominal and post-nominal, and assume that the same language can simultaneously use two strategies, for example (T2) for pre-nominal ones and (T5) for post-nominal (Alexiadou and Wilder, 1998). Crucially the distinguishing properties of these two types of adjectives are at the same time structural and semantic; in Alexiadou and Wilder's view, non-intersective\(^\text{18}\) adjectives can only be pre-nominal, while intersective adjectives can be pre- or post-nominal. Thus Alexiadou and Wilder (1998) propose two structures for adjectives- the one in (T5) and the one in (T2). However, these two structures don't necessarily correspond to pre- and post-nominal adjectives. Rather, the reduced relative structure, as shown in (T5), corresponds to post-nominal adjectives as well as to pre-

\(^{18}\text{An intersective adjective is normally defined as one for which the set of things denoted by the adjective-noun compound is the intersection of the set of things denoted by the adjective and the set of things denoted by the noun. The contrasting category is often 'non-intersective', however some authors further divide non-intersective adjectives into 'subsective' and 'intensional' adjectives. Subsective adjectives share properties with intersectives and the two may be referred to as 'extensional', in contrast to intensional adjectives. However, unlike intersectives, subsectives do not denote a set of things which may be identified independently of the nouns they modify. For instance, 'scalar' adjectives may be considered subsective. Notice then, that both subsective and intersective adjectives may be used as predicates, however their truth values differ. Finally, intensional adjectives do not select a subset of the properties denoted by the nouns they modify, independently of the nouns or not. Examples of these types of adjectives are 'former' and 'alleged', which may not be used as predicates.}
nominal adjectives which have an intersective reading, while the "direct modification" analysis as shown in (T2) corresponds to pre-nominal adjectives which have non-intersective readings. In contrast to Alexiadou and Wilder, Kayne (1994) argues for a unified analysis of all adjectives, intersective or non-intersective, and proposes that all adjectives have the structure of reduced relative clauses, as in (T5). In this model, pre-nominal adjectives are obtained by movement of the predicate AP. This is shown in (T6), where the predicate AP is raised across the subject to Spec-CP. According to this model, the pre-nominal placement of all adjectives results from raising of the predicate to a pre-nominal position.

(T6)

4.2 - Our proposal

We adopt a unified base (post-nominal) position for all adjectives as put forth by Kayne (1994). This is based on the fact that we have found many adjectives in Herodotus which occur both pre and post-nominally. This leads us to the conclusion that pre- and post-nominal adjectives do not correspond to two different semantic categories of adjectives. Devine and Stephens (2000) do make the claim that the unmarked word order for
restrictive adjectives in AG is post-nominal, and that this is particularly so for intersective adjectives, which denote colour, shape, sex, material, nationality and that ‘scalar’ adjectives more commonly than intersectives, are pre-nominal. However, we did not find this to be the case for adjectives in Herodotus. More importantly, the frequency of appearances of pre- and post-nominal adjectives is not of great importance in this paper, as we are aiming to provide a syntactic analysis of DPs in Herodotus’ Greek, and since the existence of even one philologically assured example of a particular construction shows its grammaticality, this construction must be accounted for. The following adjectives, which include intersectives and subsets, i.e. ‘scalars’, were found both pre- and post-nominally. Many of these examples are taken from the data chapter and their corresponding numbers are listed as (DC: X).

(1) *pezos* “of foot”/“land”

(a) DAN (DC: 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>σὺν</th>
<th>δὲ</th>
<th>ὁ</th>
<th>πεζὸς</th>
<th>στράτος</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sun</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>ho</td>
<td>pezos</td>
<td>stratos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with PART him.dat.sg. the.nom.sg. of-foot.nom.sg. army.nom.sg.

‘his land army with him’

Her.7.57.2

(b) NDA (DC: 10)

| στρατιῶν | δὲ | τὴν | πεζῆν | ἄλλοι |
| stratiōn | de | tēn | pezēn | alloi |

army-acc.sg. PART the.acc.sg. of-foot.acc.sg. other-nom.pl.

*γεμόνες*  *γον*  
hēgemones  ēgon

---

19 Restrictive adjectives are those which restrict their referents. This category of adjectives is often contrasted with a class of ‘non-restrictive’ adjectives, which are believed to provide information which is irrelevant to the denotation of the modified phrase. In Devine and Stephens (2000), restrictive adjectives form an opposing class with ‘descriptive’ adjectives, which appear to be those which are normally referred to as ‘non-restrictive’.
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'and the other captains led the land army'

Her.6.43.2

(c) DNDA


'm the Greeks, seeing the land army remaining on the land'

Her.8.108.1

(2) archaios “old”

(a) DAN


'and some even say that the original stream was entirely dried up'

Her.1.75.5

(b) NDA


'these eleven are the old Aiole cities'\textsuperscript{20}

Her.1.149.1

\textsuperscript{20} Since the verb in this construction is an elided copula, a couple of possible interpretations are available. The adjective can be analyzed as a part of the DP, as the translation above suggests, or it may be analyzed as the predicate of the clause. Since all our other examples of NDA sequences constitute DPs, or in other words together act as arguments of non-copulative verbs, while sequences of ADN and DNA have only been found with copulative verbs, the above interpretation/translation of this example is taken.
(3) mega “big”

(a) DAN

ἐν τῷ τὰ μέγιστα ἀεθλα τίθεται
en toī ta megista aethla titheTai
in which.dat.sg. the.nom.pl. greatest.nom.pl. prize.nom.pl. put.3sg.pres.ind.pas.

‘in which the greatest prizes are offered’

Her.5.8.1

(b) NDA

εἰ βασιλεὺς γε ὁ μέγας μονοὶ οἱ ὑμῖν
ei basileus ge ho megas monoisoi hiμin
if king.nom.sg. PART the.nom.sg. great.nom.sg. alone.dat.pl. you.dat.pl.

‘if the great king for you alone (of the Greeks is willing to forgive the offences and to be friends)

Her.8.140B.4

(c) DNDA

τῶν χειρῶν παρὰ τοῦς δακτύλους τοὺς
ton cheirona para tous daktylous tous
the.gen.pl. hand.gen.pl. by the.acc.pl. fingers.acc.pl. the.acc.pl.

μεγάλους ἐπιτάμνει
megalous epitamnei
big.acc.pl. cut.3sg.pres.ind.act.

‘he cuts (the interior) of the hands by the thumbs’

Her.3.8.1
(4) **hiros** “sacred”

(a) **DAN**

εἰ ἄλλεις ὁι Φοίνικες εξήγαγον
ei alitheos hoi Phoinikes exegagon
*if truly the Phoenicians.nom.pl. carried away.3pl.aor.ind.act.*

tας ἱρας γυναικας
tas hiras gunaiikes
*the.acc.pl. sacred.acc.pl. women.acc.pl.*

‘If truly the Phoenicians did carry away the sacred women’
Her.2.56.1

(b) **DNDA (DC: 12)**

μετὰ δὲ οἱ τε ἐπί τοι οἱ ἱροὶ
meta de dei te epis toi oii hiroi
*after PART the.nom.pl. and horses.nom.pl. the.nom.pl. sacred.nom.pl.*

cαι τὸ ὁρμα τὸ ἱρών
kai to harma to hiron
*and the.acc.sg. chariot.acc.sg. the.acc.sg. sacred.acc.sg.*

‘and after them (came) the sacred horses and sacred chariot’
Her.7.55.2

(5) **chruseos** “golden”

(a) **DAN**

ἐπὶ γὰρ τοῦ χρυσέου βωμοῦ οὐκ ἔξεστι
epi gar tou chruseou bomeou ouk exesti
*on for the.gen.sg. golden.gen.sg. altar.gen.sg. not can.3sg.pres.ind.act.*

θύειν ὧτι μὴ γαλαθήναι μοῦνα
thein hoti me galathena mouna
*sacrifice.pres.inf.act. that if-not suckling.nom.sg. only.nom.sg.*

‘for on the golden altar, it is only possible for a suckling to be sacrificed’
Her.1.183.2

(b) **DNDA**

ἐν δὲ Ἡφαίστῳ αἱ τε βάσεις
en dei Hefastuo ai te baseis
en de Ephesōi hai te boes
in PART Ephesus.dat.sg. the.nom.pl. both oxen.nom.pl.

ai chri̱seai
hai chruseai
the.nom.pl. golden.nom.pl.

'in Ephesus there are the golden oxen'\footnote{This example is taken to have an existential reading, excluding the possibility that this sequence is a clause with an elided copula. This is based on the context of the example. Herodotus is giving a list of the offerings of Croesus in Hellas, one of which consists of the golden oxen.}

Her.1.92.1

(6) \textit{xulinos} 'wooden'

(a) DAN

\textit{ος κατηφυουν \ vο to \ ξυλινον teichos}
\textit{hος kataephugon es to xulinon teichos}
as 3pl.aor.ind.act. to the.acc.sg. wooden.acc.sg. wall.acc.sg.

'as they fled to the wooden wall'

Her.9.70.1

(b) DNDA

\textit{ες το \ στρατεπεδον \ το \ ίκουτων και ες}
\textit{es to stratopedon to eouton kai es}
to the.acc.sg. camp.acc.sg. the.acc.sg their.gen.pl and to

\textit{το \ τειχος \ το \ ξυλινον}
\textit{to teichos to xulinon}
the.acc.sg wall.acc.sg the.acc.sg wooden.acc.sg

'to their own camp and to the wooden wall'

Her.9.65.1

(7) \textit{Hellenikos} 'Greek'\footnote{Note that this is an 'ethnic' adjective, or adjective of nationality, i.e. an intersective adjective. When all instances of this word in this paradigm were examined, there was no tendency towards post-nominal placement. In indefinite constructions, 7 instances of AN (2.41.3, 4.108.2, 3.130.3, 7.93.1, 4.78.1, 2.91.1 and 9.37.1) and 3 of NA (4.180.3, 7.91.1 and 7.170.3) were found. In definite constructions 5 instances of DAN (1.46.3, 1.90.4, 1.56.2, 8.15.2 and 7.48.1), 5 of NDA (9.106.3, 7.89.1, 5.54.2, 1.60.3 and 4.78.4) and 4 of DNDA (8.81.1, 9.17.3 and two from 9.49.2) were found.}

(a) DAN

\vspace{1cm}
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(b) NDA

πεποιημένος τρόπων τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν

'having been made in Greek fashion'

Her.7.89.1

(c) DNDA

dιεξῆλθε μὲν διὰ τοῦ στρατοπέδου
go-through.3sg.aor.ind.act. PART through the.gen.sg. army.gen.sg.

tοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ
the.gen.sg. Greek.gen.sg.

tou Hellēnikou

'these things went through the Greek army'

Her.9.17.3

(8) boreios, 'northern'

(a) DAN

κατήκοντες ἐπὶ τὴν βορείην ἡθαλασσαν

'reaching to the northern sea'

Her.4.37.1

(b) NDA

ἀνὴρ ἄνδρος ἀσάμενος τῆς χειρὸς
anēr andros hapsamenos tēs cheiros
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'a man touching the hand of a man, they reach from the northern sea to the southern'  

Her.6.31.2

(9) *agrios*, 'wild, savage'

(a) DAN, NA

οἱ ἀγριοὶ ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες ἀγραὶ
hoi agrioi andres kai gunaikes agria
man.nom.pl. wild.nom.pl. man.nom.pl. and woman.nom.pl. wild.nom.pl.

'the wild men and women'  

Her.4.191.4

(b) DNDA

τὰ δὲ δένδρα τὰ ἀγρία αὐτῶθι
the.nom.pl. PART tree.nom.pl. the.nom.pl. wild.nom.pl. there

φέρει καρπὸν
pherei karpon
bear.3sg.pres.ind.ac fruit.acc.sg.

'the wild trees there bear fruit'  

Her.3.106.3

(10) *proteros*, 'former'

(a) DAN

τεκεῖν γὰρ ὁὶ καὶ τὰς προτέρας γυναῖκας
tektein gar an hoi kai tas proteras gunaikas

'that his former wives would have brought children into the world'  

Her.6.68.3

(b) DAN

μετείς τὴν προτέρην γυνώμην
There does not seem to be a difference in semantics when the adjectives are pre- vs. post-nominal (leaving *proteros*, ‘former’ aside for the moment). In cases where an extensional (intersecutive or subjective) adjective is found only pre- or post-nominally, as is the case with *nautikos* “of sea”, which is only found pre-nominally, and *eleutheros* “free”, which is only found post-nominally in Herodotus, we have no choice but to say that the distribution is accidental, as the instances of these words are far fewer than those which were found in both positions. Also, it seems implausible that *pezos* “of foot”, which was found in both positions, would be semantically different from *nautikos* “of sea”, which is only found pre-nominally, as both adjectives are usually modifiers of the same noun, i.e. *stratos*, ‘army’. Based on this data we discard the possibility of generating pre- and post-nominal adjectives in two different positions. The one intensional adjective listed, however, in example (11), was also only found in sequences of DAN. Since this adjective may not be compared to any of the other (extensional) adjectives on the list (as *nautikos* was compared with *pezos*), we cannot assume that intensional adjectives will have the same syntax as extensional ones have. We could either assume that the lack of post-nominal placement of *proteros* is coincidental and that all adjectives have the same syntax, or that this lack of data indicates that post-nominal placement of *proteros* was ungrammatical, and that intensional and extensional (which includes intersecutive and subjective) adjectives have different structures in this dialect. The first scenario would be compatible with Kayne’s (1994) account of all adjectives, including intensionals, as
reduced relative clauses, while the second would be compatible with Alexiadou and Wilder’s (1998) account, which distinguishes the (pre-nominal) base position of intensional adjectives from the (reduced relative) structure of extensionals. The evidence is not very strong for either case, and so a stand as to the status of intensional adjectives will not be taken.

We are left with two possibilities for extensional adjectives: we could analyze them all as heads (Androutsopoulou 1996), or as XPs which are generated in the same base position. If we assume adjectives are heads, either the A head is higher than N or lower than N. Either way, head movement is required, over the other head to get the other possible order, i.e. if A heads are generated below N, the A head has to move over the N head to get DAN. Since head movement is local and has been shown to be unable to target a “distant” head over another realized head, such a position is not tenable. For these reasons, we adopt Kayne’s (1994)/ Alexiadou and Wilder’s (1998) reduced relative account of surface post-nominal and pre-nominal (extensional) adjectives, which places these adjectives (XPs) in the same base position, as predicates of reduced relative clauses. This is shown in (T7) for ton pezon straton, ‘the land army’.

(T7)
4.3 - Sequences of Two Determiners

Let us now address the question of how two determiners can occur with one nominal, in sequences of DNDA. As mentioned above, adjectives are analyzed as reduced relative clauses that encode a predication relation between the adjective and a DP. Notice that this DP contains a possible D position that is in addition to the already existing D position in the main DP, allowing for two determiners. This is shown in (T8).

(T8)

The second D position (the head of DP2) may be full or null. In cases where it is full, the sequence will show two overt Ds. However, when it is null, only the D in the main DP (DP1) will be instantiated. We assume that the difference in realizations of full vs. null Ds is directly contingent upon two facts:

(i) The semantics of the adjective. We believe that the occurrence of two Ds is sensitive to the type of adjective that is involved. In particular, we assume that only non-intensional adjectives can be affected by D spreading. It is well known that intensional adjectives combine with common nouns, i.e. nominal predicates, rather than with DPs. Thus the nominal within the reduced relative clause cannot be a DP when the adjective is intensional. Rather, it must be an NP. This accounts for the fact that *proteros*, ‘former’, was not found in sequences of DNDA.
(ii) There is a semantico-pragmatic difference between null and full Ds. In particular, we assume that full Ds are linked to the discourse, or are D(iscourse)-linked (see Comorovski 1996, Pesetsky 1987 for D-linked WH-phrases). Although the idea of D-linking is normally associated with WH-phrases, we believe it to be relevant with regard to D heads as well. A nominal headed by a D-linked, i.e. full D is one which is a familiar individual in the discourse, while a nominal headed by a non-D-linked, i.e. null D lacks this specification for familiarity. We assume that this pragmatic disparity between nominals, or between the Ds which head nominals is borne out in the syntax in that full Ds are specified with a [+ familiar] feature, i.e. (T10). Heim (1982) defines definiteness in terms of familiarity, or more formally, in terms of identity of the indices of card files for NPs, as defined in (11), and illustrated by (12)-(13):

(11) Heim’s Familiarity Condition:

An NPi in a sentence \( \psi \) with respect to a file D and the Domain of filenames \( \text{Dom}(D) \) is:

(i) \([+ \text{ definite}] \) if \( i \in \text{Dom}(D) \), and it is

(ii) \([- \text{ definite}] \) if \( i \notin \text{Dom}(D) \)

Heim (1982) reconstructs definiteness with respect to the already established discourse. Every NP comes with an index \( i \), which represents the discourse referent (or Heim’s “file card”) associated with that NP. If the discourse referent \( i \) is already introduced in the discourse - or more formally, if the index \( i \) is an element of the set of all established discourse referents \( \text{Dom}(D) \) - then the NP must be definite. If, however, the discourse referent \( i \) is not among the already established discourse referents, i.e. if \( i \notin \text{Dom}(D) \),
then the NP must be indefinite. Definiteness signals the familiarity of the discourse referent associated with the NP.

(12) a. A man1 meets a woman2.
   Dom(D) = \{1, 2\}

   b. The man1 talks to her2.
   1, 2 \in Dom(D)

(13) a. A man1 meets a woman2.
   Dom(D) = \{1, 2\}

   b. A man3 talks to a woman4.
   3, 4 \in Dom(D)

In (12a) the two indefinite NPs introduce new file cards or discourse items, which we indicate by the two indices 1 and 2. These indices form the domain of filenames (Dom(D)) and they are accessible for the evaluation of the definite NPs in (12b). The two indices in (12b) can be linked to the already established indices in the domain for indices (or the domain of established discourse items), which licenses the definiteness of the two NPs. In contrast, in (13b), the two NPs are indefinite, which means that their indices cannot be linked to already established indices or discourse items. Therefore, the indefinite NPs introduce new discourse items. (T9) shows a DP2 with a full D head carrying the [+fam] feature.
In contrast, null Ds are unspecified with respect to this feature, or are [+/- familiar], as shown in (T10).

Although full Ds are [+ familiar], note that this does not mean that null Ds are necessarily [- familiar]. Rather, they can be [- familiar], as is the case in English, or they can be [+ familiar] in languages like Chinese, Russian and Hindi (Dayal, 2002). See the following examples.

(14) kuch bacce andar aaye. bacce bahut khush the
some children inside came children very happy were

"Some children came in. The children were very happy."
(Hindi)

(15) Neskol'ko devochek I malchikov byli v komnate.
Several girls and boys were in room
Mal’chiki igrali v karty. Devochki chitali knizhki  
Boys played in cards girls read books  

“Several boys and girls were in the room. The boys were playing cards. The girls were reading books”. (Russian)  

(16) Wo kanjian yi-zhi mao. Mao zai huayuan-li  
i see one-CL cat cat at garden-inside  

‘I see a cat. The cat is in the garden’. (Chinese)  

Let us now return to the question of how sequences of DNDA are produced. We build our DP starting from Kayne’s (1994) reduced relative account of adjectives in English and French, while trying to account specifically for the data from Herodotus. The structure proposed above in (T9) immediately gives a word order of DADN, which has not been found in the text. The question of why this construction is absent is difficult to answer. Because all of the data comes from a single text and there are no possible informants, it is difficult to make the judgement whether the DADN order was ungrammatical in Herodotus’ dialect, or just not employed in the Histories. Presently we will work with the construction which we know to have been grammatical, i.e. DNDA, and from there attempt to make a judgement as to the grammaticality of the absent DADN. Because DNDA constructions have two overt Ds, it is given that both Ds have a [+fam] feature. For this reason we assume that DP2 always moves to Spec- DP1. This happens through checking of the [+ fam] feature which D1 head carries, and which full D2 heads also carry. When a [+ fam] feature on a full D head attracts another full D it produces an order of DNDA as in (T11) for tou stratou tou pezou, ‘the land army’, as in example (1c) above.  
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(T11)

With Spec-DP1 always being filled with an overt DP, the resulting word order is DNDA in constructions with two Ds. In the case that D2 does not contain an overt D, or in other words, if DP2 contains the null D head, which is thus unspecified for [familiarity], DP2 will nonetheless be attracted to Spec-DP1 as the feature [+/- familiar] still matches the [+familiarity] feature on D1 head, and can enter into a checking relation with the latter. This is shown in (T12) for *straton ton pezon*, ‘the land army’.

(T12)

4.4 - Functional Projections (FPs) in the DP

The idea of functional projections in the CP domain was introduced in chapter (3). Particularly, (at least one) Top(ic) Phrase and a Foc(us) Phrase were identified in between the projections representing Force and Finiteness in Rizzi (1997). Other literature was shown to have extended this idea to the DP, proposing Top and FocPs within DPs. Topic
is generally defined as that part of the sentence the speaker wants to give some information about.

(17) Pavarotti is the best tenor of the last century.

Two tests used to identify Topic are 'as for' constructions in English, and 'aboutness'. In the first, a constituent is a Topic if it can be detached and preceded by 'as for' without introducing an informationally different structure from the input sentence.

(18) As for those Tosca recordings with Carreras, I would never buy (any of) them.

The second test, 'aboutness' refers to the fact that in the following dialogue, X must be the topic of speaker B's assertion; speaker A: Tell me about X, speaker B: ...X...

(19) A: Tell me about John.
    A': Tell me about Mary.
    B: John invited Mary to dance.

The examples in (19), the sentence uttered by speaker B can be understood to be about Mary or about John since it can naturally follow the requests made both by speaker A and by speaker A'. The relation between a Topic and its predicate is referred as 'Topic-Comment'. Formally, predication is a one-place function that maps topics to propositions, assigning them truth values.

This contrasts Focus-Presupposition, where the Focus of a sentence S = the constituent c of S which the speaker intends to direct the attention of his/her hearer(s) to, but uttering S. Traditionally, Focus has been identified as the constituent which answers a WH-question. The Topic in the answer must already be introduced in the question, since it would make little sense for the question to be about one thing and the answer about another.
(20)  
a. What did the children do? The children ate the candy.
   TOP                      FOC

   b. What did the children eat? The children ate the candy.
   TOP                      FOC

   c. Who ate the candy? The children ate the candy.
   FOC                      TOP

In (20a) the Focus and the predicate co-incide and complement the Topic while in (11b), the Focus constituent, the candy, is included in the predicate (ate the candy) since the predicate is the complement of the Topic. Similarly in (11c), (in which the candy is the Topic), the Focus the children is part of the predicate. Example (21) demonstrates presupposition, where the complement of the Focus is presupposed.

   (21)  
   A: Who did you give the book to?

   B: I gave the book to Mary
   TOP                      FOC

It is not always the case that an analysis in terms of Topic, Focus and presupposition ‘covers’ the whole sentence. In (22) only the subordinate clause has a Focus structure. The matrix is used merely to qualify the assertion.

   (22) I think that John fell asleep.
   TOP                      FOC

The matrix in this sentence is not presupposed. It is therefore possible to have a sentence in which constituents are ‘left out’: they function neither as Topic or Focus, and they are not presupposed.

Generally speaking, Topic refers to old or given information. This can come about in a couple of ways. The Topic may have been mentioned as such previously in the discourse; this could be an exact repetition of the word, or a repetition of the root of that word.
Another situation which implies givenness in the discourse, and therefore Topic assignment is referred to as associative anaphora (Christophersen, 1939). This means that the topicalized material is linked to information which is found earlier in the discourse. This material, i.e. the Topic, is interpreted as though the link to the discourse is explicit, and anaphoric. An example of such a situation is shown in (23).

(23) Mary is having a party this evening. The guests are arriving at 8:00.

In this example ‘party’ is the anchor to which ‘the guests’ is linked; thus ‘the guests’ is interpreted as ‘the guests of the party’, as the idea of a party normally includes guests.

The notion of Topic brings to mind the idea of familiarity in the sense of Heim (1982), discussed above in section (4.3). At first glance it seems that Topic material corresponds to material which is familiar, and Focus to material which is not familiar. This would lead one to conclude that full Ds would correspond to Topic and null Ds to Topic or Focus, since full Ds are [+familiar], while null Ds are [+/- familiar]. However, despite the similarities between the notions of familiarity and Topic, the two are not exactly the same. Particularly, the notion of familiarity is tied to definiteness, while Topic is not. This is proved by the fact that Topic material does not need to be a definite DP. This is true cross-linguistically and in Herodotus. Indefinites are often topicalized, as the following examples from English (24) and Japanese (25), the latter which shows the Topic particle wa.

(24) As for apples, red ones are my favourite.

(25) Sakana wa tai ga ii
    fish TOP red snapper NOM excellent
'As for fish, red snapper is excellent' (Krifka, 2005)

In Herodotus, we see many other items besides definite DPs in Topic positions. For example, nouns without definite articles may be topicalized, as in (26). Also, demonstratives may be topicalized as in (27).

(26) ὁσα δὲ ἄνθρωπότα πράγματα, ὡδὲ ἔλεγον
    hosā de anthrōpōtā prāgmata, hōde elēgon
    how-much.acc.pl. PART human.acc.pl. matters.acc.pl. thus say.3.pl.impf.

'As far as human affairs, they said thus'

(27) ταύτα μὲν νῦν καὶ ἄλλα πρὸς τούτοις
    tauta men nun kai alla pros toutois
    this.acc.pl. PART now and other.acc.pl. besides them.dat.pl.

'As for these (customs) and others besides them'

Similarly, the notion of Focus is not identical to the notion of 'non-familiar'. This is proved by the fact that familiar elements may be focused in a number of ways. This is shown for identificational focus (see Kiss, 1998) in the following example.

(28) A man met a woman. It was THE WOMAN who introduced herself first.

For this reason, we may not propose an analysis where full Ds carry a feature which can be matched with a [Top] feature on the Top head (of the DP-internal TopP), and where null Ds carry a feature which can be matched with a [Foc] feature on the Foc head. Instead, we will assume that the DP-internal Top and Foc projections have respective [Top] and [Foc] features, and that when the FPs are projected their specifier positions must be filled by some nominal material, as they exist in the left periphery of the DP. There is a large degree of freedom as to which of these projections are present on a DP.
Because two TopPs have been identified, surrounding a single FocP (Rizzi, 1997), the order of the FPs present may vary, i.e. TopP may be higher or lower than FocP. The purpose for these projections can be seen as a division of the material within the DP into material which may possibly be topicalized within a clause from material which may possibly be focused in a clause. We assume that this division of labour must exist in all DPs. For this division to be explicit, however, only one of the FPs need be present, i.e. the higher TopP, a FocP, or the lower TopP. Material picked up by Top or Foc is considered ‘topicalizable’ or ‘focusable’, respectively, and material which is left in the DP is not. If two of the FPs are present, i.e. one of the TopPs and FocP, then all material in the DP will undergo movement. This movement will commence with the first available XP, which will move from Spec-DP to the Spec- of the lower FP, and terminate with remnant movement of the DP to the Spec- of the higher FP. The four possible organizations of FPs are shown in (T13)-(T16). If only TopP is projected, as in (T13), then a DP will be attracted to Spec-TopP, and the entire DP will be divided into potential Topic material and material which will be unable to be topicalized in the clause. If it is the main DP (DP1) which is attracted to Spec-TopP, then all material in the DP may be topicalized at the clausal level. If however, it is only DP2 which is attracted to Spec-TopP, then only the noun will be able to be seen by the higher Top head, i.e. the clausal Top head.
If, on the other hand, only a FocP is projected (T14), then a DP will be attracted to Spec-FocP. This will divide all the material in the DP into material which may be Focus and that which may not. If it is the case that the main DP is the one which is attracted to Spec-FocP, then all of the material in the DP will be considered potential Focus, however, if only DP2 undergoes this movement, only it will be ‘focusable’, and the remaining contents of DP1, ‘non-focusable’.

If both TopP and FocP are projected, then the DP is explicitly divided into two parts, i.e. potential Topic and potential Focus, since the Specifiers of the FPs must be filled. The FPs may be organized in either order, i.e. TopP>FocP, if the higher TopP is present, or FocP>TopP, if the lower TopP is present.

First we will consider the situation where the higher TopP is present, along with FocP below it. In (T15), each DP must move to one of the Spec- positions, since both of these
positions must be filled. Since if DP1 moves, DP2 will move along with it (leaving the other Spec-FP empty), in these cases movement commences with DP2 moving (to Spec-FocP), and terminates with the remnant of DP1 moving (to Spec-TopP). In this case, the remnant of DP1, i.e. the determiner and adjective, is considered possible 'topicalizable' material.

(T15)

(T16) shows the converse ordering of FPs, i.e. the lower TopP is present below FocP. Just as in the last case, DP1 may not move first, as this will leave no material to be picked up by the DP-internal FocP. Instead, DP2 would move first, to Spec-TopP, with the remnant DP1 moving subsequently to Spec-FocP. This will allow the determiner and adjective to be picked up by the clausal FocP, and therefore to be focused in the clause.

(T16)
This paper assumes derivation by phase. A phase is a unit of syntactic computation that exhibits independence at interfaces (it can be sent to spell-out and to Logical Form (LF)). Phases are transferred to the interfaces when the next higher phase is completed (Chomsky, 2001). This idea is formalized in the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC) given in (29).

(29) In a phase $\alpha$ with a head $H$, the domain of $H$ is not accessible to operations outside $\alpha$, only $H$ and its edge (=specifiers/adjuncts) are accessible to such operations.

Initially, Chomsky proposed that vP and CP are phases and left the possibility of other XPs being phases open. However, there are arguments that DPs are plausible phases. These arguments are based on the Phonetic Form (PF) independence of DPs:

Starting with the first, one observation is that DPs can be PF isolated, just like vPs (examples from Matushansky, 2003).

(30) a. (Can you teach lexical semantics?) – Me teach lexical semantics?
    (transitive)

b. (How about arriving early for once?) – Me arrive early?
    (unaccusative)

c. (Lexical Semantics?) – Me?
    (DP)

Another observation supporting PF independence is found in movement.

(31) a. Goneril said she would pluck Gloster’s eyes, and [vP pluck out his eyes] she did.

b. Regan is called the villain of the play and [DP the villain of the play] she is.
Finally, the fact that the Nuclear Stress Rule (NSR), given in (32), applies to DPs is also taken to be evidence that DPs have PF independence. Since the rightmost element in the object DP in (33) is assigned primary stress, the NSR clearly applies to DPs.

(32) Nuclear Stress Rule: NS is assigned to the rightmost stress-bearing element in a cyclic fashion.

(33) Balthasar disliked the book about Justine.

4.4.1 - DPs with one full D

Starting with DPs which contain a full D1 and a null D2, under the assumption above, i.e. that the main D head has a [+fam] feature, DP2 must move to Spec-DP1. After movement of AP to Spec-CP, and DP2 to spec-DP1, the order is NDA, as shown in (T17).

(T17)

As mentioned above, at least one left periphery projection must be projected. First we will consider the possibility that both functional projections are present. Recall that the order of the FPs is left free. That is, TopP may be higher or lower than FocP. DP2 would be attracted to the first (lower) of the two FPs, whether it is Top or Foc. Subsequently, the remnant of DP1 may be attracted to the Spec- of the higher FP. This sequence of movements will produce DAN (T18), as in example (34), which is (8) in chapter (2).
(T18)

(34)

τὸν ναυτικὸν στρατὸν κινδυνεύει Βασίλειος ἀποβαλεῖν

ton nautikon straton kinduneusei basileus apobalein

‘The king will be in danger of losing his sea army’

Her.8.65.3

However, another possibility is that DP2 moves to Spec-Top/FocP, in the case that only one is present. This will produce an order of NDA, corresponding to the order seen in example (35), which was (10) in chapter (2). This is shown in (T19). From this structure, the noun may be either topicalized or focused within the clause, depending upon whether TopP or FocP is projected in the DP.

(T19)
Thus, we assume that both orders, DAN and NDA can potentially be interpreted as containing a determiner and adjective which are topicalizable and a noun that is not. However, both orders may also show the converse, i.e. determiner and adjective are focusable and the noun is not, given that a TopP can optionally be projected above or below FocP, and may attract the N, i.e. DP2, or the determiner and adjective, i.e. the remnant of DP1, depending upon the ordering of these FPs.

4.4.2 - DPs with two full Ds

Let us now see what happens if both Ds are overt. First we will consider the situation where only one FP is present. The result before movement to Spec-FP is as in (T20).

(T20)

There are two possible movements with this configuration. The first is that all of DP1 moves to Spec-FP. This results in the attested DNDA, with no heads intervening between
DN and DA, as in (T21). This corresponds to the order in example (36), which is (11) in chapter (2).

(T21)

(36)

καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ θέρμων τότε
kai to hudôr to thermon tote
and the.acc.sg. water.acc.sg. the.acc.sg. warm.acc.sg. then

ἐπέκαν εἰπὶ τὴν ἔσοδον
epêkan epi tên esodon
turned.3pl.aor.ind.act. to the.acc.sg. pass.acc.sg.

'And then they turned the warm water toward the pass.'

Her.7.176

However, the Top/Foc head may also attract DP2. This divides the material into material which may be topicalized/ focused at the clausal level, i.e. DP2, and material which may not, i.e. DP1. This also results in a surface order of DNDA, but with the Top/Foc head intervening between DN and DA, as in (T22).
If, however, both FPs are present in the DP, we must assume that it was possible for DP2 to move to the Spec- of the lower FP and for the remnant of DP1, i.e. D and A to move to the Spec- of the higher FP, as is shown in (T18) above for a construction with a null D. This would produce an order of DADN, which as stated above, was not found in the text. This brings up the issue of attestation and grammaticality. The lack of attestation of a particular construction in a text could mean that it was ungrammatical in the dialect in question, or it could mean that it was simply not employed in the text. We have built a theory based on the positive evidence, i.e. the found DAN, NDA and DNDA constructions. This theory predicts that unfound orders such as AND, DNA, NAD and ADN were ungrammatical and that is what we assume. However, the theory does not provide any structural reason why DADN would be ungrammatical. For this reason we predict that this construction was in fact grammatical in this dialect but was not used in the text.

Recall from the data section that although no sequences of DADN were found, examples of DAD(poss.)N are found in Herodotus. Example (37) is taken from chapter (2), number (13).
(37)

τὸν μὲν νῦν ναυτικὸν τὸν Ἴρξιον στρατὸν

ton men nun nautikon ton Xerxeo straton


οὐκ ἔπειδον διὸξαντες μέχρι Ἄνδρου

ouk epeidon diooxantes mechri Androu

not see.aor.inf.act. pursue.nom.pl.aor.part.act. until Andros.gen.sg.

'although they pursued the sea army of Xerxes up to Andros, they did not see it'

Hcr.8.108

Cases of DAD(poss.)N are somewhat different from other determiner doubled constructions. This is because we need to assign a syntactic analysis to the possessive. Should the possessive be analyzed as part of DP2 or DP1? We propose that it is part of DP2 in this case, as it appears between the second article and the noun, and that possessives should be treated on par with adjectives and other predicates. We shall generate them as complements of I head in a structure like (T23). (T23) is not a representation of the whole DP (DADpossN), but only of a subpart of it, namely the DP in Spec-IP of the relative clause, or what we have called DP2.

(T23)

Since DP2 contains a predicate (the possessive), it will contain a CP (the specifier of which will be occupied by the possessive/adjective, as in (T24)). The presence of this projection makes DP2 containing possessives different from the other instances of DP2
we have looked at so far. Crucially, if there is no predicate within DP2, and therefore no CP, the structure of the DP2 simply contains the D head and its NP complement. The presence of a Topic of FocusP will not have any impact on the relative order of the D head and its NP complement, since the NP will never be attracted to Spec-DP, as the former lacks the relevant [familiar] feature. For this reason we leave out the FPs present on DP2. Since we assume that DPs are phases, and therefore that only material at the edge of the DP is visible to higher FPs, the NP will never be dissociated from the D head, and the order will always remain D+NP. In contrast, the presence of a CP within DP2 allows for different potential re-orderings of the constituents within DP2. The main reasons are first the fact that the predicate is attracted to Spec-CP, and also that Spec-IP hosts a DP, rather than just an NP, and DPs are attracted higher to the edge of the DP. From here, they will be visible for higher heads that can potentially engage them in syntactic operations.

(T24)

After raising of the possessive to Spec-CP of DP2, all of DP2 must move to Spec-DP1 to satisfy the [+fam] feature on the D head. Also, the adjective within the projection of DP1 will move to Spec-CP of DP1. This creates an order of D(poss.)NDA, shown in (T25).
By adding the FPs present on DP1, a few possible scenarios arise, the first of which accounts for the DADpossN construction examined. Particularly, if both a TopP and a FocP are projected (in either order), DP2 may move to the Spec- of the lower FP, with subsequent remnant movement of DP1 to the Spec- of the higher FP, reversing the orders of the DPs. These movements are shown in (T26).

We would also expect that if only one of the two left periphery projections, either Top or Foc, is present in DP1, that the order DpossNDA is also possible. This could result if DP2 moved to either Spec-FocP or Spec-TopP in DP1, and the contents of DP1 would
remain in their place. This order (D(poss)NDA) could also result if TopP is projected in DPI, and all of the contents of DPI moved to the specifier of this TopP.

This predicts that D(poss)NDA was grammatical in Herodotus’ dialect but was not employed in the *Histories*. Again, we follow the theory which has been built from the examples which we have found, and this theory predicts the above orders to be grammatical in Herodotus’ dialect. In fact, it would be quite surprising if Herodotus employed every single grammatical construction which was available in his grammar in the *Histories*. The lack of attestation of the split varieties of DAD(poss.)N and D(poss.)NDA is not alarming either, since split constructions are on the whole less frequent than their continuous counter-parts, and considering that instances of DAD(poss.)N are not as common as continuous DAN/ NDA or DNDA constructions, the lack of attestation of this type of split is not enough to change the theory, so deeming this construction ungrammatical.

**4.5 - Split DPs**

Now that we have shown how the continuous word orders are generated, we must account for the split constructions which occur. One way to think of it is to assume that the restrictions on splitting are related to the interpretation of the adjectives. By this view only certain adjectives can be part of a split DP, while others can’t. Devine and Stevens (2000) claim that descriptive adjectives cannot be part of a split DP in AG. Similarly, Mathieu and Sitaridou (2002) point out that only predicative, i.e. intersective adjectives can be split in Modern Greek (MG). One problem with this view is that it is not clear what the definition of a descriptive adjective is, or how one can test whether a certain
adjective is predicative or not in Herodotus. In this thesis, we propose that the restrictions regarding the splitting of DPs are purely structural, and follow from independent principles that regulate movement, rather than from the semantics of adjectives. In keeping with previous proposals about split constructions, we assume there is a TopP and a FocP at the clausal level which attracts the material to be topicalized/ focused, respectively, within the clause. What determines the possibility of topicalization/ focusing in the clause is the division of material with in the DP, i.e. material in (the higher) Spec-TopP of the DP has been selected as ‘topicalizable’ material within the clause. Similarly, material in Spec-FocP (if FocP is higher than TopP) has been selected as ‘focusable’ material within the clause. Thus the DP-internal (higher) TopP feeds the clausal TopP, as the DP-internal FocP (if it is the highest projection in the DP) feeds the clausal FocP. Notice that because there are two potential Topic positions in the DP, which ‘surround’ FocP, there is a degree of freedom as to what may be topicalized or focused in the clause. For example, if the higher TopP is present, then material which moves to Spec-TopP in the DP may be topicalized within the clause. However, if it is the lower TopP which is present, then the material in Spec-FocP of the DP may be focused in the clause, as FocP will be the highest FP in the DP. The two possible orderings of the FPs and the mechanism for split constructions are shown in (T27) and (T28).
Let us show how our schema of splits can account for the possible word order variation among split constructions in Herodotus. Beginning with DPs with one full D, we can generate both types of split constructions, i.e. with pre- and post-nominal adjectives (DA...N and N...DA), as either (the remnant of) DP1, or DP2 was able to move to Spec-TopP/FocP in the DP.

If it was the remnant of DP1 that raised to the higher Spec-FP, in this case Spec-FocP of the main DP to produce DAN (as in (T18) above), pre-nominal adjective hyperbaton is possible, i.e. the DA...N example in (38). The context immediately preceding this example reads ἵδρυθέντων δὲ σφί ἱραῖν ξενικῶν, μετέπειτα ἄξις σφί ἀπέδοξε, 'certain
foreign rites of worship were established among them; but presently when they were otherwise minded…’. In this example τοίοι πατρίοις, ‘the ancestral’ is contrasted with ξεινικών, ‘foreign’, which is discussed with regard to ἱρών, ‘rites of worship’, and therefore is taken to be focused in the clause. This is depicted in (T29).

(38)

εδοξε de tois patrioi soi mounon chrōsai theoi
seem.3sg.impf.ind. PART the.dat.pl. ancestral.dat.pl. only be-subject-to.aor.inf. gods.dat.pl.

‘it was fitting to them to worship only the ancestral gods’ Her.1.172.2

(T29)

If DP2 raised to Spec-TopP or Spec-FocP in the DP (as in (T19) above), post-nominal adjective hyperbaton, i.e. N...DA is possible (see (T30). This structure corresponds to the order of words seen in example (39) here, which is example (17) in the data chapter. The context preceding example (39) is τὸ γάρ δείπνου τοιόνδε τι ἐγίνετο, οἶα ἐκ πολλοῦ χρόνου προειρημένον καὶ περὶ πολλοῦ ποιεμένων· τούτῳ μὲν, ὡς ἐπήθεντο τάχιστα τῶν κηρύκων τῶν περιαγγελλοντων, διασαμενοὶ ὅτιν ἐν τῇ πόλει οἱ ἅστοι ἀλευρα τε καὶ ἄλφιτα ἐποίειν πάντες ἐπὶ μήνας συχνοὺς, ‘the dinner was somewhat on the wise since
the command for it had been given long before, and the matter was esteemed a weighty one: As soon as the townsfolk had word from the heralds’ proclamation, they divided corn among themselves in their cities and all of them for many months ground it to wheaten and barley meal’. Notice that the τούτο μέν … τούτο δὲ contrastive structure is used here, the second half of which begins the example in (38). The clause beginning with τούτο μέν speaks of the making of bread for the dinner, i.e. grinding corn (-visible) into wheat flour (αλευρά) and barley meal (αλφίτα), while the clause beginning with τούτο δὲ contrasts this in discussing the preparation of the meat, i.e. the feeding of the animals for the dinner. For this reason κτήμεα, ‘animals’ is taken to be under Focus.

(39) τούτο μέν … τούτο δὲ

\[\begin{align*}
\text{toute} & \quad \text{de} \\
\text{ktínea} & \quad \text{ésiteuon}
\end{align*}\]

on-the-other-hand \quad PART \quad animal.acc.pl. \quad fatten.3pl.imperf.ind.act.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{εξευρίσκοντες} & \quad \text{τιμήσ} & \quad \text{tà} & \quad \text{kallista}
\end{align*}\]

exeuriskontes \quad price.gen.sg. \quad the.acc.pl. \quad finest.acc.pl.

‘they fed the finest cattle that money could buy’

Her.7.119.2

(T30)
We turn now to DPs with two Ds. Recalling (T21) and (T22), where DP1 and DP2, respectively, raise to the Spec- of the highest FP in the DP, we see that it is possible for both to move higher to the corresponding clausal Spec-FP. If DP1 in fact moved to the Spec- of the highest FP in the DP, and subsequently to clausal Spec-FP, the result will be a continuous order DNDA. However, if DP2 raised to Spec-FP in the DP, and subsequently to clausal Spec-FP, a discontinuous order results (see tree (T31)), namely DN...DA, as in example (40), which corresponds to example (18) in the data chapter. In this example, οἱ βάρβαροι ‘the foreigners’ is given information, i.e. Topic, as the whole chapter in which this passage appears discusses the battle between the Greeks and the foreigners. The Greeks and the foreigners are explicitly mentioned at the end of the preceding chapter (9.101), before the battle is fully described. This passage reads οἱ μὲν δὲ Ἑλληνες καὶ οἱ βάρβαροι ἔστειλον ἐς τὴν μάχην, ὡς σφί καὶ οἱ νῖμοι καὶ ὁ Ἑλλησπόντος ἔθελα προέκειτο, ‘the Greeks and the foreigners were eager for battle, since the islands and the Hellespont were the prizes of victory’. Although the line just given, which contains the actual words in question (οἱ βάρβαροι, ‘the foreigners’) appear many lines before the example in (40), the entire contents of chapter (9.102) describe this battle between the Greeks and the foreigners, making both of them given information in the discourse.

(40)

οἱ
 hoī
the.nom.pl.

βάρβαροι
barbaroi
foreigner.nom.pl.

πρὸς
pros

φυγήν
to flight.acc.sg.

τε
and

ὁρμέατο
set-in-motion.3pl.plpf.ind.

οἱ
 hoī
the.nom.pl.

ἄλλοι
alloi
other.nom.pl.

πλὴν
except

Περσῶν
Persians.gen.pl.

77
'the other foreigners except the Persians took to flight'

(T31)

Concerning cases of DAD(poss.)N, we also expect that the split DA...D(poss.)N should be possible, since the remaining contents of DP1 (the determiner and adjective) were able to be attracted to Spec-TopP of the DP, (see (T26) above), however examples of these sequences were not found in the Histories. Because DAD(poss.)N is not very commonly found continuously, this is not surprising, given that all continuous sequences, i.e. DAN, NDA and DNDA are more commonly found than their split counterparts were.

4.6 - Indefinites

As the reader may have noticed, we have not yet addressed the indefinite constructions; that is, continuous sequences of AN and NA, as well as the splits A...N and N...A. We analyze these constructions very similarly to definite constructions, and all assumptions about DPs in Herodotus are kept constant, i.e. that DPs have internal left periphery projections and therefore constitute phases. Also, the assumption that all adjectives begin as predicates of reduced relative clauses is maintained. The difference between indefinite and definite DPs which contain adjectives (in continuous and split constructions) is that
in indefinite constructions the D head of the main DP is null, and thus the main D head carries the [+/– familiarity] feature. Since the head of DP2 is also null and hence [+/– familiar], DP2 will move to Spec-DP1, as always. This movement, along with predicate raising of the AP is shown in (T32).

(T32)

4.6.1 - Continuous sequences of AN, NA

The possible movements of DPs to Specifiers of the functional projections are the same for indefinites as for definites, i.e. either DP can move to either Spec-FocP or Spec-TopP, depending on which is projected. Also, the idea that one or both of the functional projections must be present in the DP and that if a functional projection is projected it must attract a DP to its specifier is kept constant for indefinite DPs. Thus, all of the contents of the indefinite DP are divided into material which may possibly be topicalized within the clause and material which may not, as is the case for definites. The first possibility is that only one of the functional projections, either FocP or TopP is present on the DP. Within this scenario, a couple of different movements may take place. One possibility is for the main DP to be attracted to Spec-Foc/TopP. This produces an NA order, as seen in example (1) in chapter (2).
Another possibility with one functional projection projected is for DP2 to move to Spec-
Top/FocP. This will produce an order of NA as well, but with the possibility for a split
N...A construction. This means that DP2, i.e. the noun may possibly be topicalized or
focused in the clause, while the remnant of DP1, i.e. the adjective may not.

The final possibility is for both functional projections to be present on the main DP. This
will produce an order of AN, such as the one in (41), example (2) in chapter (2), with the
possibility for an A...N split. This is shown in (T35). Notice that the FPs may be ordered
either TopP>FocP or FocP>TopP, depending upon whether the higher or lower TopP is
projected.
4.6.2 - Split Constructions

The same means of splitting DPs is assumed for indefinites as for definites. That is, material in Spec-FP of the DP may be attracted to the clausal Spec-FP, if this FP is the highest projection in the DP. The structure in (T36) shows one FP in the DP, a FocP which attracts the noun. This noun is then focused in the clause to produce N...A. The example in (42), example (5) in chapter (2) is used in the illustration. That is, we propose that δόρατα, ‘spears’ is focused in the clause while μεγάλα, ‘long’ is not, meaning that the focus is particularly on the spears, and the fact that they were long is not emphasized.

The chapter where this example is taken from tells of Cyrus’ plan to attack the Lydians at Sardis. Herodotus states that the Lydians were the most valiant in war of all the nations in Asia. The line of text which precedes the example in (42) reads: ἤ δὲ μάχη ὁφέων ἦν ἀπ' ἱππων, ‘their manner of fighting was on horseback’. Here δόρατα, ‘spears’ is being...
emphasized and serves to exclude all other possible manners of fighting on horseback, such as with bows and arrows.

(42) δόρατα τε ἑφόρεον μεγάλα
dorata te ephoreon megalà
spear.acc.pl. PART carry.impf.ind.act. long.acc.pl.

‘they would carry long spears’

Her.1.79.3

(T36)

Split A...N constructions are built from constructions like the one in tree (34), where DP2, i.e. the noun raises to the Spec- of the lower FP and the remnant DP1, i.e. the adjective raises to the Spec- of the higher FP. From here DP1 can move to the clausal Spec-TopP, as shown in (T37).

(43)

hortazousi megalas anagogon
keep-festival.3pl.pres.ind.act. great.acc.pl. lead-up.nom.pl.pres.part.act.

‘they keep festival, leading in great sacrifices’

Her.2.60.3
(T37)

```
(FocP
  DPK1
  DPK2
  CP
  (DAP: megalax)
  C
  -DPK3
  (NP [+fam])
  I
  AP)

(FocP
  Foc*)

(TopP
  DP2j
  thetas
  Top*)

...DP2...
```
CHAPTER 5 - X=Q(uantifier) (P)hrase

5.1 - A Reminder of the Facts:

Our data includes examples of constructions with the following quantifiers: *pas, pasa, pan*, “all, every, the whole” *polus, pollē, pollu*, “many, much”, *oligos, oligē, oligon*, “few, little”, as well as numerals such as *pente*, “five”. Quantifiers can be found in constructions with the definite article, or without. If an overt determiner is present, quantifiers may be found outside the DN pair, either preceding or following it, i.e. in QDN (examples (33)– (36) in chapter (2)), or DNQ (examples (37)– (39) in chapter (2)). They may also be found between D and N, i.e. DQN (examples (40)– (44) in chapter (2), or in constructions with two overt Ds, i.e. DNDQ (examples (45)– (46), in chapter (2). Split constructions with quantifiers where an overt D is present are common in Herodotus in the following orders: Q...D(A)N ((47) in chapter (2)), DN...Q ((49)– (50) in chapter (2)), N...DQ ((51) in chapter (2), DQ...N ((48) in chapter (2)) and DND...Q ((52) in chapter (2)).

If there is no definite article present, quantifiers may either precede (examples (20)– (23) in chapter (2)) or follow (examples ((24)–(27) in chapter (2)) nouns in continuous constructions. They are also frequently found in Herodotus in split constructions of Q...N (example (28) in chapter (2) and N...Q (examples (29)– (32) in chapter (2)).

5.2 - Classifying Quantifiers

In the literature it is well established that there are different varieties of quantifiers, which behave differently from each other, and which have very different semantics. Particularly, quantifiers are divided into categories which are often referred to as strong and weak
quantifiers (Milsark 1977, Barwise and Cooper 1981), or as non-existental and existential (Keenan 1987). Keenan’s existential quantifiers correspond to Milsark’s weak quantifiers, and his non-existental to Milsark’s strong quantifiers. One main difference between the two types of quantifiers is that strong ones are considered to be quantificational, while weak ones are considered to be cardinal (Milsark 1977). The following tests serve to distinguish quantificational (strong) quantifiers from cardinal (weak) ones.

(i) Only weak quantifiers may appear after the verb be in there constructions:

(a) There are some /two/many/few/several/no */the/*/these/
*a/all/*/most/
*both/*(n)either cats in the garden. (Milsark 1977)

(ii) Q N is a N/ are Ns: because (a) will always be true, (b) will always be false, and the truth of (c) is dependent on the given model, all is considered positive strong, neither negative strong, and some weak.

(a) All unicorns are unicorns.
(b) Neither unicorn is a unicorn.
(c) Some unicorns are unicorns. (Barwise, Cooper 1981)

(iii) D N XP exist: if the two sentences are true in the same conditions, the quantifier is existential.

(a) Some unicorns are white. Some white unicorns exist.
(b) All unicorns are white. All white unicorns exist. (Keenan 1987)

Although different scholars use different tests to determine the status of quantifiers, there is a general consensus that indefinite articles, cardinal numbers, and many, few, several,
no are weak quantifiers, while the definite article, demonstratives, universals\(^1\), as well as most, both, (n)either are strong.

This divides the list of contexts in the preceding section into two. Greek *pas, pasa, pan* “all, every, the whole” is strong. All other quantifiers which we examine are classified as weak, i.e. *polus, pollê, polu* “much, many”, *oligos, oligê, oligon* “(a) few, little”, and numerals.

### 5.3 - Strong Quantifier

Because of the wide variety of word orders which occur with the strong quantifier (see the examples with *pas, pasa, pan* in chapter (2), we believe that there is a lexical ambiguity within the strong quantifier. Also, because some of the surface distributions of the strong quantifier match those of adjectives, we believe there is a version of the strong quantifier which is equivalent syntactically to an adjective. For example, DAN and the split DA...N matches DQN and the split DQ...N. Also, NDA and the split N...DA matches NDQ and the spit N...DQ. The continuous DNDQ is also comparable to DNDQ, however no example of a split DN...DA was found with a quantifier. However, the other similarities are very striking. Aside from the similarities in surface distributions between some of the instances of strong quantifiers and adjectives, it would be very difficult to propose an analysis of the strong quantifier which would account for all its possible surface orders. For these reasons we believe that the version of the strong quantifier

---

\(^1\)Determinerless plurals and mass nouns can be interpreted either universally or non-universally (Milsark 1977).
which appears in orders of DQN, DNDQ, DQ...N and N...DQ is an adjective, and is thus generated as a predicate in a reduced relative clause, and attracted to Spec-CP as in (T1).

(T1)

We believe that the strong quantifier which shows up in orders such as QDN, and the split Q...DN, DNQ and the split DN...Q as well as DND...Q is syntactically different from the strong quantifier which we analyze as an adjective. There is an interesting dichotomy concerning the declension of viśva, ‘all’ in Vedic Sanskrit which may be seen to parallel what we propose for Herodotus’ Greek. In Vedic viśva may be found employing the pronominal or nominal declension pattern, the former which is more commonly found (Macdonnel, 1916). The possibilities are shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Nominal declension</th>
<th>Pronominal declension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dat. sg.</td>
<td>viśvāya</td>
<td>viśvasmai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl. sg.</td>
<td>viśvāt</td>
<td>viśvasmād</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc. sg.</td>
<td>viśve</td>
<td>viśvasmin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This different declensions of viśva could indicate that an ambiguity within the strong quantifier as we propose for Herodotus’ Greek was present also in Vedic Sanskrit. The
viśva found with pronominal inflection would correspond to the quantifier version, while that found with nominal inflection would correspond to the adjectival version. Because the dichotomy within the strong quantifier in Vedic Sanskrit is shown overtly in the morphology, while it is not in Herodotus’ Greek, the evidence from the former may be used to support the existence of two versions of the strong quantifier in Herodotus’ Greek.

5.3.1 - Strong Quantifiers as Adjectives (PasAdj): DQN, NDQ, DNDQ

There are two possible realizations of the nominal, i.e. NP or DP. In other words, the second D may be full or null, as was the case for all other adjectives. Of course, the main D may also be full or null, as there are some examples of the strong quantifier with no overt D. As we stated in the previous chapter, full Ds carry a [+familiar] feature. Thus, if DP2 is headed by a full D, the D head hosts a [+familiar] feature, and if DP2 is headed by a null D, the D head hosts a [+/-familiar] feature. The difference is shown in (T2) and (T3).

(T2)
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Keeping this in mind, we will now go through the possible movements of XPs with nominals headed by null and full Ds.

5.3.1.1 - Nominals headed by null Ds

As was stated above, pasøj, originates as the predicate of a small clause, and is attracted to Spec-CP. DP2 will also undergo movement and be attracted to Spec-DP1, as the [+/-fam] feature on D2 head will be matched with the [+fam] feature on D1 head, producing an order of NDQ as in (T4).

(T4)

If only one of the functional projections is present on the main DP, either TopP or FocP, there are a couple of possible movements of DPs. First, DP2 may be attracted to Spec-Top or Spec-FocP, as in (T5). This produces an order of NDQ. This order was not found in the Histories, however the split N…DQ construction was found. We take the lack of
continuous NDQ sequences to be accidental, as within our theory, splits do in fact arise from continuous sequences, i.e. N…DQ is formed from NDQ. Note that this is the only continuous construction which was predicted to be found and was not.

(T5)

From either of the above scenarios a split of the variety N…DQ may result, if the material in Spec-FocP or Spec-TopP in the DP is attracted to the clausal Spec-FocP or Spec-TopP, respectively. This is shown in (T6), accounting for example (51) in chapter (2). The context preceding this example (beginning at 8.43) consists of a count of triremes furnished by the people of various different places. The fact that certain numbers were being listed makes the word arithmos, ‘number’ given information in the discourse, making arithmos, ‘number’ a Topic.

(T6)
Another possibility if only TopP or FocP is solely projected in the DP is for DP1 to move to Spec-Top/FocP. This, of course, leaves the order NDQ, as in (T7). No split can arise from this configuration, however, as no head intervenes between the two DPs.

(T7)

The final possibility is that both FPs are projected, and the DPs are divided into 'topicalizable' and 'focusable' material through movement (of both DPs). If this is the case, DP2 may be attracted to the Spec- of the lower FP, either Top or Foc, with the remnant of DP1 (the D and the Q) moving to the Spec- of the higher FP, as shown in (T8). This accounts for the DQN orders seen in examples (40) – (41) in chapter (2).

(T8)
This could possibly give rise to a split construction of the form DQ...N, if the material in (the higher) Spec-FP of the DP is attracted to clausal Spec-FP as shown in (T9). This accounts for the DQ...N example in (48) in chapter (2).

(T9)

5.3.1.2 - Nominals headed by full Ds

Just as is the case with adjectives in constructions with two full Ds, DP2 obligatorily moves to Spec-DP1 because of the [+fam] feature on the two D heads. This movement, along with that of QP, i.e. AP, to Spec-CP gives the attested DNDQ, as in (T10).

(T10)

First we will show the structure when either TopP or FocP is projected in the DP. Either DP may move to either FP, depending on which is present. In the case that DP1 moves to Spec-Top/FocP, the order will remain DNDQ, as in (T11), with no chance for a split as
no head intervenes between DN and DQ. This configuration accounts for the examples in (45) – (46) in chapter (2).

(T11)

However, if DP2 moves to Spec-TopP or Spec-FocP of the DP, as in (T12), then a head intervenes between DN and DQ, which could lead to the split DN...DQ as in (T13). Although we have not found a split such as this in Herodotus, we predict it to be grammatical in Herodotus’ dialect but not employed in the Histories. Notice that sequences of DNDQ in Herodotus are not very commonly found and it is not surprising that a split built off this structure was not found.

(T12)
5.3.2 - Strong Quantifiers in QDN and DNQ

Strong quantifiers also occur in contexts that seem to be different from those in which adjectives occur, namely QDN and DNQ. As mentioned in chapter (2), when ADN and DNA occur they seem to have the distribution of clauses. However, this is not the case for strong quantifiers. That is to say these orders have the distribution of phrases when they exist with quantifiers. The structures in section (5.3.1.1) above cannot account for these orders. Also, the splits DN...Q and Q...DN are not accounted for. We will suggest that quantifiers which occur in these orders are not syntactically equivalent to adjectives, and so are not generated as predicates in reduced relative clauses. Rather, these quantifiers are generated in the Spec- of a Q(quantifier) Phrase, which is directly above DP. This radically changes the configuration of the DP. For instance, DP is headed by a D which takes an NP as a complement, rather than a CP. This follows from the fact that unlike the case with adjectives, there is no property assigned to the noun with quantifiers. Therefore, there exists a lexical ambiguity between the two types of *pas, pasa, pan*, the
first being pas_adj, and the second being pas_Q, which is the true quantifier. The DP which contains pas_Q is shown in (T14).

(T14)

![Diagram](image)

We will now go through the possible movements of QP and DP to the (DP) left periphery projections to produce DNQ, DN...Q, QDN and Q...DN. If only a TopP or a FocP is projected within the QP, QP may move there, as quantifiers may be either old or new information. In either case, an order of QDN results (T15), with the possibility of a split Q...DN construction (T16), the latter which has not been found in the Histories[^23]. The QDN structure accounts for example (33) – (35) in chapter (2).

(T15)

![Diagram](image)

[^23]: An order of Q...DN was not found alone, but example (47) in the chapter (2) shows Q...DAN. We assume that this structure contains pas_Q. The only difference is that this DP also contains a CP that represents a predication relation between the noun and the adjective.
Another possible movement in this case is for only TopP or FocP to be projected in the DP, and for QP in the projection of DP as well as all the contents beneath it, to move to Spec-TopP/ Spec-FocP, leaving the word order QDN with no chance for a split. This is shown in (T17).

Another possibility is for both a TopP and FocP to be projected in the DP, in either order. QP may move to the Spec- of the lower FP, with subsequent movement of DP to the Spec- of the higher FP. This also produces a DNQ order (T18), with the possibility of a split DN...Q order (T19). The examples in (37) – (38) and (50) respectively in chapter (2) may be accounted for with these structures.
Recall example (52) of chapter (2). At first sight it appears that this construction arose from a continuous order of DNDQ, thus deeming this a quantifier of the form $\text{pas}_{\text{adj}}$. However, the theory does not expect that this structure will split in this way. Rather, it predicts that splits will be of the form DN...DA. Aside from that, we have not found an instance where a determiner is split (by a verb) from its noun, adjective, quantifier or demonstrative in Herodotus. Because this type of split is not predicted from the theory, and because we have found no other instances of this type of split, other possibilities of analyzing this construction will be considered. What primarily comes to mind is the possibility that the second D is not referring to the strong quantifier, but to the
prepositional phrase directly following the D. Articles are often found in Herodotus referring to whole PPs and to genitive constructions, having a demonstrative-like function. In these cases, the article is not found split from the PP or genitive, supporting the claim that Ds (regardless of their function) may not be split from their referents. This kind of interpretation of this example causes it to fall into the category of DN...Q, as in (T19) above. This is what we assume. However, the question remains open as to the status of prepositional phrases which are found headed by Ds with demonstrative functions.

5.4 - Weak Quantifiers

5.4.1 - Reminder of Facts

Recall that all other quantifiers we examine besides *pas*, “all, the whole” are weak. Thus in this section we will provide an analysis of quantifiers such as *polus*, ‘much, many’, *oligos*, ‘few, little’ and numerals. As mentioned above, they often appear without definite articles and commonly precede and follow nouns, i.e. QN (examples (22) – (23) in Chapter (2)) or NQ (examples (25) – (27)) in chapter (2). Splits of the form Q...N (example (28) in chapter (2)) and N...Q (examples (29) – (32) in chapter (2)) are also common. Weak quantifiers may also be found (less commonly) with the definite article in a DQN order (examples (42) – (44) in chapter (2)). The following split was also found with a weak quantifier.

(1) Q...NDA *polus*, ‘much, many’

σύνοι δὲ *pente* σφί μαντευομένος άγωνος τοὺς
houto dé pente sphi manteuomenos agonas tous
thus PART five them.dat.pl. divine.nom.sg.pres.part.mid. battle.acc.pl. the.acc.pl.

μεγίστοις
megistous

greatest.acc.pl.

‘thus divining for them, (he aided them to win) the five greatest battles’

Her.9.35.1

5.4.2 - Weak Quantifiers Without Ds

Because weak quantifiers are considered to be a different class of quantifiers than strong, we will need to assign a different syntactic position to weak quantifiers than we have for strong ones. Also, because weak quantifiers have not often been found with definite articles, we assume that they are indefinite (at least in constructions with no definite articles present). Weak quantifiers are generated in the specifier of a Number Phrase (NumP) which sits above NP. Thus the base order of weak Qs and Ns is QN (T20).

(T20)

All previous assumptions about the FPs internal to DPs (or in the case of indefinites, NumPs) are kept constant, such as the presence of either a FocP or a TopP, or both, in either order. Note, however, that since no property is being ascribed to the noun, we do not assume a reduced relative clause structure for simple constructions involving only a weak quantifier and a noun. If a FocP or a TopP is projected in the DP, QP may be attracted to Spec-FocP (or Spec-TopP), and an order of QN will remain (T21), as in the first sequence in examples (22) – (23) in chapter (2), with the possibility of a Q...N split (T22), as seen in example (28) in chapter (2).

24 The situation of a definite article with a weak quantifier and noun will be discussed in (5.4.3).
Another possibility is for NumP to be attracted to Spec-FocP (or Spec-TopP) keeping the order QN (T23), with no chance of a split construction; if any material is picked up by a clausal FP it will be the whole NumP, which contains the quantifier and the noun.

Another possibility is for NP to move to Spec-FocP or Spec-TopP (T24), if only one of the two is projected. Notice that NP movement is allowed in constructions with weak quantifiers, as NumPs do not constitute phases. This movement accounts for the NQ
orders in examples (25) – (27) in chapter (2). There is also the possibility of an N...Q split (T25), as in examples (29) – (32) in chapter (2).

(T24)

(T25)

If both a TopP and a FocP are projected, the same orders, i.e. NQ or QN and both splits are possible. The only difference is that in this case, both parts of the construction, i.e. Q and N are explicitly divided into topicalizable and focusable, meaning that both parts, Q and N, undergo movement to FPs. If QP is attracted to the Spec- of the lower FP, and the rest of the DP to the Spec- of the higher FP, NQ results, as in (T26).

(T26)
If, on the other hand, NP is attracted to the Spec- of the lower FP and the rest of the DP to the Spec- of the higher FP, QN will be the result (T27).

(T27)

5.4.3 - Weak Quantifiers with Ds (DQN)

In the literature it is claimed that weak quantifiers which occur with the definite article are in fact adjectival (Partee, 1989). The fact that the order in consideration here, i.e. DQN with *polus*, “much, many”, or with numerals, is consistent with that of *passadj*, supports Partee’s (1989) claim that quantifiers which are weak when they have no definite article are adjectival when they occur with the article. This is what we will assume. Thus, our DP will consist of a predication relation between a DP and an AP, with the predicate moving across the subject to Spec-CP as in (T28).

(T28)

Since in all cases of “weak” quantifiers with definite articles which we have found, there is only one D in the construction, we will only demonstrate the structure in which D2
head is null. We do, however, predict that “weak quantifiers”, i.e. adjectives may be found in constructions with two overt Ds. In the case that D2 head is null, DP2 will nonetheless raise to Spec-DP1, as the [+fam] feature on D2 head matches the [+fam] feature on D1 head. This is shown in (T29).

(T29)

One possibility is for a TopP and FocP to be projected in the DP, with DP2 moving to the Spec- of the lower FP and the remnant of DP1 to the Spec- of the higher FP. This produces the attested DQN (T30) shown in example (42) in chapter (2). A split of the form DQ...N is also predicted to be grammatical (T31), but has not been found with numerals, polus, or oligos. Recall, however, example (15) from chapter (2). This example contains allos, ‘other’, which, as mentioned in the preceding footnote is normally analyzed as a weak quantifier. This example may therefore be used as an attestation of a split DA...N construction containing a weak quantifier, i.e. an adjective.

— Although the weak quantifiers we have examined have not been found in constructions with two determiners, recall example (17) from chapter (2). This example contains allos, ‘other’. This may be analyzed as a weak quantifier, or as an adjective. We have analyzed it as an adjective. However, since we analyze all weak quantifiers occurring with determiners as adjectives, this example may be used as an attestation of a (split) construction containing a weak quantifier, i.e. an adjective, occurring with two Ds.
Recall examples (36) and (39) in chapter (2), repeated here as (2) and (3). These examples have orders of QDN and DNQ. If weak quantifiers with overt Ds are indeed adjectives, we would expect instances of these orders to be not phrases, but clauses. Since the first three words of these examples could both be taken as DPs with quantifiers, or as clauses, we will assume that they are clauses, as this is what the theory predicts.

(2) QDN duo, ‘two’

δύο δι' οἱ τελευταῖοι εἰσὶν ὁ μὲν καταργουρώμενος
duo de hoi teleutaioi eisı ho men katargurōmenous
two PART the.nom.pl.last.nom.pl. be.3pl.pres.ind. the.nom.sg.PART silver.acc.pl.pres.part.midd.
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Now we will account for the order seen in example (47) in chapter (2), of Q...NDA. The NDA results from normal movements involved in constructions with adjectives. First, AP moves to Spec-CP, and DP2 moves to Spec-DP1 as in (T32). The numeral, being a weak quantifier, is generated in Spec-NumP.

(T32)

Then QP moves to Spec-TopP or Spec-FocP, depending on which one is projected. This is shown in (T33). QP may then move to the relevant clausal Spec-FP to produce the split Q...NDA, as in (T34). Although this order is not found continuously, we must assume that it was grammatical, based on our theory of split constructions, namely that material
in the specifier of a functional projection within the DP moves to the specifier of a clausal functional projection.

(T33)

(T34)
CHAPTER 6 - X- Demonstrative

6.1 - Ancient Greek Demonstratives

As was mentioned in the data chapter, there are three demonstratives commonly employed in Herodotus, hode, houtos and ekeinos. The three-way demonstrative system in AG has been analyzed in various ways. Some consider hode, ‘this’ to be the “first person” (Ich-deixis), used to refer to things close to the speaker, houtos, ‘this’ to be the “second person” (Du-deixis), used to refer to things close to the hearer, and ekeinos, ‘that’ to be the “third person” (Jener-deixis), used to refer to things distant from the speaker and hearer (Humbert, 1945, Smyth, 1956). Manolessou (2001) provides a summary of other scholars’ classifications of the demonstrative system in AG, which differ from the traditional account. According to Manolessou (2001), Biraud (1991) and Ledesma (1987) claim that the difference among the demonstratives is entirely based on whether they are proximal or distal; therefore the tendency to use hode for things close to the speaker follows from its proximal nature, while the tendency to use ekeinos stems from its distal nature. The third demonstrative, houtos, is claimed to be neutral to this distinction and is used mostly in anaphora, where the exact area in space is irrelevant (Biraud, 1991). Slightly different is Ledesma’s (1987) categorization, which divides the three demonstratives into those denoting nearness, i.e. hode, houtos, and distance, i.e. ekeinos. Still different is Martin-López’s (1994) description of the AG demonstratives. In this schema there are two poles; the proximal/distal pole, which separates hode from ekeinos, and the deixis/anaphora pole, which separates hode and ekeinos from houtos. As many scholars have noticed, (Humbert, 1945, Smyth, 1956), hode is often used cataphorically, which contrasts the anaphoric houtos. Martin-López (1994) considers
cataphora a kind of "anticipatory" deictic function. Thus, the notion of deixis is extended to all instances of "non-givenness" in the context, which includes the specification of something to a precise location, as well as cataphora. This contrasts anaphora, which requires "givenness" in the linguistic or extra-linguistic context (Manolessou 2001). The apparent difference in functions of the three demonstratives makes one wonder if they should be analyzed differently.

Looking at the functions of demonstratives in Herodotus, we notice that instances of *houtos*\(^{26}\) in Herodotus do seem to correspond most commonly to anaphora, however *houtos* may also be cataphoric. *Hode* seems to have cataphoric, deictic, as well as anaphoric functions. Powell (1977) gives the following uses of *hode*: deictic (arthrous and anarthrous\(^ {27}\)), referring back (only arthrous), and referring forward (arthrous and anarthrous). For *houtos* Powell gives 'referring back' (arthrous and anarthrous), 'referring forward' (only arthrous), and 'deictic, or with general reference to the context' (arthrous and anarthrous). Finally, *ekeinos* may have a deictic function used to refer to things far from the speaker and hearer, but may also be found with an anaphoric function. For this demonstrative Powell gives the following definitions: *ekeinos* may be used to mean the former, it may imply a contrast of persons, it may be 'merely emphasized anaphora'. Examples of the "anomalous" uses of the three demonstratives are provided here.

\(^{26}\) It has been claimed that *houtos* originated from *ho autos*, 'the same', which lends to anaphoric usage (Horrocks, 1977). Some claim that the extension to the 2\(^{nd}\) person usages is the result of pragmatics; namely that what has already been mentioned in discourse is often spoken by the interlocutor (Manolessou 2001). However, it is more commonly assumed that this demonstrative originated from the definite article (*ho, hé, to*) followed by a deictic particle –*u*, followed by *ta-ltá* (Chantraine 1999). Regardless of the origin of this demonstrative, it will be analyzed in this paper according to its use in Herodotus.

\(^{27}\) Arthrous refers to a construction involving a definite article, and anarthrous to a contraction with no definite article.
(1) *hode* used anaphorically (DC: 61)

τῆς δὲ γῆς τῆς περὶ ὤθεν hode ἥο
the.gen.sg. PART land.gen.sg. which.gen.sg. about this.nom.sg. the.nom.sg.

λόγος ὁρμηται λέγεσθαι
word.nom.sg begin.3.sg.perf.ind.mid. say.pres.infin.mid.

'as for the land of which my history has begun to speak'

Her.4.16.1

(2) *houtos* used cataphorically

ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τοῖς νομοῖς τούτοις ἐπὶ ἑμευ
egenetο de en toιs nomoi toutoi28 ep emeu
be.3sg.aor.ind. PART in the.dat.sg. province.dat.sg. this.dat.sg. at me.gen.sg.

touτο to τέρας
touto to teras
this.nom.sg. the.nom.sg. porei.te.nom.sg.

'in this province in my time this thing happened' (the following thing)

Her.2.46.4

(3) *ekeinos* used anaphorically (DC: 64)

ὁς εἰμι ξίνος μάλιστα τυγχάνει ιὼν
hos emi xinos malista tunchanei ion
who.nom.sg. me.dat.sg. friend.nom.sg. most happen.3sg.pres.ind.act. be.nom.sg.pres.part.act.

τῶν περὶ έκεινως τοὺς χῶρους οἰκήμενον
the.gen.pl. around those.acc.pl. the.acc.pl. land.acc.pl. live.gen.pl.pres.part.mid.

'he happens to be my best friend of those living around those lands'

Her.9.76.3

Context: Γιώναι, θάρσει καὶ ὡς ἰκετικός καὶ εἰ δὴ πρὸς τούτῳ τυγχάνεις ἀλλήλα δέχοσα καὶ εἰς θυγάτηρι Ὑγιτούδεω τοῦ Κόου

---

28 this instance of *houtos* is anaphoric, as the province which he speaks of (the Mendesian province) has just been mentioned.
'be of good cheer, lady, for that you are my suppliant, 
and for your tale withal, if you be verily daughter to 
Hegetorides of Cos'²⁹ (Godley, 1920-1925).

Because each of the three demonstratives employed in Herodotus do not correspond 
neatly to one particular demonstrative function, but tend to overlap frequently, we will 
not discuss each of them separately, or assume that their syntaxes are divergent based on 
some differing range of functions. Now we will focus on any possible differences 
between pre- and post-nominal uses of the demonstratives.

6.2 - A Reminder of the Distributional Facts

Demonstratives in Herodotus are found modifying nouns with and without the definite 
article. When the definite article is present with a noun, the demonstrative does not 
intervene between these two (D and N). Rather, the demonstrative is found preceding or 
following a sequence of DN, i.e. DemDN (examples (61) – (65)) in chapter (2) or 
DNDem (examples (66) – (68) in chapter (2). Examples of split constructions when the 
definite article is present are quite common in Herodotus, i.e. Dem...DN (example (69) in 
chapter (2)) and DN...Dem (example (70) in chapter (2)). Demonstratives may also refer 
to nouns with no definite article present, in both DemN (examples (53) – (54) in chapter 
(2)) and NDem (examples (55) – (57) in chapter (2)). Discontinuous examples (Dem...N, 
N...Dem) are also found with no definite articles, (examples (58) – (59) and (60), 
respectively, in chapter (2)).

6.3 - The Syntax of Demonstratives

6.3.1 - A Unified or Non-unified Analysis of Pre- and Post-nominal Demonstratives?

²⁹ Cos is the land which the demonstrative refers to.
It is clear that in Herodotus’ Greek demonstratives may either precede or follow (D)N. This fact is not typologically odd, as many languages also have this freedom, such as Spanish and Romanian. To account for this fact one could either assume that the difference in word orders of demonstratives in relation to nouns corresponds to different base positions of the demonstratives, or assume that pre- and post-nominal demonstratives share the same syntactic position, essentially to provide a unified analysis for pre- and post-nominal demonstratives.

If one tried to provide a non-unified analysis of pre- and post-nominal demonstratives, it would be expected that the distribution of demonstratives, i.e. pre- vs. post-nominal, corresponded to a difference in semantics between the two. In what follows, we will investigate demonstratives in each of the following semantic contexts, looking for any differences between pre- and post-nominal demonstratives. As we will see, pre- vs. post-nominal demonstratives do not seem to correspond to a difference in semantics. That is, in each of the following three semantic functions, pre- and post-nominal demonstratives were found.

(i) Cataphora:

(4) DemN (DC: 53)

\[
\text{λέγεται de kai ὅσε λόγος}
\]
\[
\text{legetai de kai hode logos}
\]
\[
\text{read.3sg.pres.ind.pass. PART also this.acc.sg story.acc.sg}
\]

'And this story is also told' (a new story follows)  

Her.3.3.1

(5) NDem (DC: 56)

\[
\text{kai τούς skutállois ἐπαινεῖ τοὺς Πέρσας}
\]
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kai toisi skutaloisi epaion tous Persas
and the.dat.pl. stick.dat.pl. beat.3.pl.impf.ind.act. the.acc.pl. Persians.acc.pl.
προίσχομενος ἔπεα τάδε
proischomenous ephe tade
put-forward.acc.pl.pres.part.mid. words.acc.pl. these.acc.pl.

'and with the sticks they beat the Persians, who put forward these words'
(the words are following)

Her.3.137.2

(ii) Anaphoric:

(6) DemDN (DC: 62)

ἐν δὲ ταύτῃ τῇ μάχῃ Ἑλλήνων ἐρίστευσαν
in PART this.dat.sg. the.dat.sg. battle.dat.sg. Greeks.gen.pl. be-best.3pl.aor.ind.act.

'Αθηναίοι
Athenians.nom.pl.

'in that battle (just described), the Athenians fought best, of the Greeks'

Her.9.105.1

(7) DNDem (DC: 67)

τὰ μὲν χρηστηρία ταύτᾳ αὐτῷ ἐχρῆσθη
ta men chrēstēria tauta sphi echrēsthē
the.nom.pl PART oracle.nom.pl this.nom.pl to-them be-furnished.3sg.aor.ind.pass.

'this oracle was given to them' (already described)

Her.9.94.1

(8) DemDN (DC: 63)

ὁ ὤν ὁ Ὀτάνης πρῶτος ὑπώπτευσα τὸν
houtos ho Otanes protos hupōpteuse ton
this.nom.sg. the.nom.sg. Otanes.nom.sg. first suspect.3sg.aor.ind.act. the.acc.sg.

Μάγον
Magon
Magian.acc.sg.

'This Otanes first suspected the Magian'

Her.3.68.2
context: 'Οταν υἱὸν Φαρνάσπεος μὲν πάις γένει ἐδὲ καὶ χρήματι ὁμοίος τῷ πρῶτῳ Περσέων

‘there was an Otanes, son of Pharnaspes, as well-born and rich a man as any Persian’

(9) DNDem (DC: 68)

εἰς δὲ τὴν Σηστὸν ταύτην
es de tēn Sēston tautēn
at PART the.acc.sg. Seston.acc.sg. this.acc.sg.

‘at this (same) Sestos’

Her.9.115.1

context: οἱ μὲν δὲ ἀπέπλευσαν Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ἐκ τῆς Ἀβύδου διαβάντες ἐς τὴν Χερσονήσου Σηστὸν ἐπολιορκοῦν

‘So the rest sailed away, but the Athenians crossed over to the Chersonesus and laid siege to Sestos’.

(iii) Deixis:

(10) NDem (DC: 55)

τούτοις δὲ πρόσουροι Κιλίκες κατέκομπτες
toutois de prosouroi Kilikes katékompites
these.dat.pl. PART neighbour.nom.pl. Cilician.nom.pl. reach.nom.pl.pres.part.act.

ἐπὶ θαλάσσαν τὴνθέ
epi thalassan tendē
to sea.acc.sg. that.acc.sg.

‘The neighbours to these are the Cilicians, reaching to that sea’

Her.5.49.6

(11) Dem(A)N

ἐν τῇ ἡδὲ Κύπρῳ νῆσῳ κεῖται
en tēi hēde Kypros nēsos keitai
in which.dat.sg. that.nom.sg. Cyprian.nom.sg. island.nom.sg. lie.3sg.pres.ind.act.

‘in which that Cyprian island lies’

In this case we can be fairly certain this is a deictic use of ἡδὲ as it is direct speech, and it has been specified in the text that the speaker (Aristogoras) is physically showing the hearer (Cleomenes) the regions he speaks of on a map.
It would be very difficult to tease apart pre- and post-nominal demonstratives on semantic grounds, since all three functions of demonstratives mentioned above are expressed with both pre- and post-nominal demonstratives. Therefore, we will go with a unified analysis of pre- and post-nominal demonstratives, as Brugè (2001) does for Spanish demonstratives.

6.3.2 - The Syntactic Status of Demonstratives

First, concerning the status of demonstratives, we will assume that they are maximal projections. The idea of demonstratives as maximal projections is well supported in the literature, (Giusti 1993, Brugè 2002). Giusti (1993) claims that Romanian demonstratives are generated in the Specifier of AgrP (accounting for the post-nominal demonstratives), immediately dominated by the DP projection, and may or may not raise to Spec-DP (accounting for the pre-nominal demonstratives). Giusti assumes head movement of the noun to D head, where the enclitic article appears. This means that the noun moves over the demonstrative. Because the demonstrative allows this movement, it may not be analyzed as a D head or an intermediate functional head. Assuming that demonstratives in Herodotus’ Greek are maximal projections, we must assign a base position for them. Because our analysis of Herodotus’ Greek DPs is quite different from Giusti’s (1993) analysis of Romanian DPs, i.e. we do not have reason to assume N-to-D movement as the Greek articles are not enclitic, thus it would not help us to assume that demonstratives are generated in the specifier of a functional projection which is below DP to account for the post-nominal demonstrative orders. Even if we assigned a base position for

31 This example follows the previous one directly in the text, so the context is the same.
demonstratives in the Specifier of a functional projection below DP, we would still not be able to generate the post-nominal demonstrative in the absence of N-to-D movement. Instead, we would expect to see orders of DDemN, which are unattested in Herodotus. For this reason, we assume that demonstratives in Herodotus’ Greek are generated in Spec-DP (see (T1), i.e. pre-nominally.

(T1)

6.3.3 - Topic and Focus

Since our DP contains a Foc and/or Top projection(s), we expect that movement of DemP and/ or DP to Spec-TopP or Spec-FocP will take place. We assume that NP is not a candidate for movement to either of these slots as such a movement would violate the Phase Impenetrability Condition (Chomsky, 2001). As the reader can see from (T1) of this chapter, NP is not at the edge of the DP phase, and hence is not visible to the higher FPs. Since there is no possible slot to which it can move to place it at the edge (as there was in the case of adjectives, i.e. Spec-DP), since demonstratives are base-generated in Spec-DP. This means that NP must stay in its base position within the DP.

Concerning movement of DemP and DP to Spec-TopP and Spec-FocP, we assume that the movement is quite free as is true of other XPs within our schema. It is intuitive to consider anaphora and cataphora in a discussion about topic and focus, as a
demonstrative with an anaphoric use seems to have the status of old material, i.e. Topic, and one with a cataphoric use seems to have the status of new, i.e. Focus material. It becomes tricky, however, to assign the demonstratives as well as the nouns in the DP a particular discourse status. That is, if a noun has been mentioned or represents something salient in discourse, and a demonstrative is used anaphorically with this same noun (or with a noun which makes the concept which is salient in the discourse explicit), it seems intuitive to consider the noun Topic material. However, as the following examples show, it cannot be the noun which dictates its own status as old or new material.

(12) There was a cat in the garden. The this cat walked over.

There was a cat in the garden. A cat walked over.

It is the demonstrative or definite article that dictates the interpretation of the noun as old or new. This suggests that movement of (at least) DemP to Spec-TopP corresponds to an anaphoric use of the demonstrative and an interpretation of the noun as old, i.e. Topic material. Conversely, movement of DemP to Spec-FocP can correspond to a cataphoric use of the demonstrative and an interpretation of the noun as new, i.e. Focus material. These movements explain the orders of Dem(D)N in anaphoric and cataphoric/deictic uses of houtos and hode, respectively.

However, the above explanation of anaphoric and cataphoric demonstratives (as Topic and Focus respectively) represents only one possibility of the division between Topic and Focus. Focus may correspond to new information, but there is nothing that precludes old material from being focused in a DP, and by extension, in a clause. It may be focused for the purpose of emphasis, or for the purpose of excluding all other possible entities within
the set of contextually given elements for which the predicate may hold, i.e. identificational Focus (Kiss, 1998), or (similarly) it may be contrastively focused. This means that an anaphoric demonstrative may indeed be focused.

(13) I once lived in a town called Springfield too. THIS Springfield was dirty. (emphasis)

(14) My brother lived in a town called Springfield too. It was THIS Springfield that won the “Best Springfield Competition” (identificational focus)

Similarly, demonstratives with deictic function may also be focused, either contrastively, exhaustively, or for emphasis, or may be topicalized. For these reasons we expect that movement of DemP to Spec-FocP or Spec-TopP is quite free in anaphoric, cataphoric and deictic functions.

6.3.4 - Derivations

Let us now show how the orders Dem(D)N, (D)NDem, Dem…(D)N and (D)N…Dem are formed. If only a FocP or a TopP is projected in the DP, DemP may move to Spec-FocP or Spec-TopP, producing an order of Dem(D)N, as in (T2). This structure corresponds to the examples in (53) – (54) and (61) – (65) in chapter (2).

(T2)

A split construction of the form Dem…(D)N (as seen in examples (58) – (59) and (69) in chapter (2)) is possible from the above configuration, as a head intervenes between DemP...
and DP. Since the demonstrative in example (69) of chapter (2) is introducing a story, it is likely that the FP which attracts DemP to its Spec- is FocP.

(T3)

Another possibility is for all of the DP to be attracted to Spec-Foc/TopP. This gives an order of Dem(D)N, with no chance for a split construction as in (T4).

(T4)

If both a TopP and a FocP are projected in the DP, orders of (D)NDem (as in examples (55) – (57) and (66) – (68) in chapter (2)) are possible. If this is the case, all the material in the DP is explicitly divided into topicalizable and focusable material. For this division to be achieved, DemP must be attracted to the Spec- of the lower FP, with remnant movement of the DP to the Spec- of the higher FP (T5).
A split of the form (D)N...Dem, as seen in examples (60) and (70) in chapter (2) could result from the configuration in (T6), if the material in the Spec- of the higher FP in the DP is attracted to the relevant clausal Spec-FP. The context of example (70) indicates that τὰ γράμματα, ‘the writings’ is Topic. For one, at the point where this example appears we already know that Harpagus had written a message to Cyrus on the paper which he placed inside the hare, as ὡς δὲ ἔχει οὕτω ἐσθῆκε βυβλίον, γράψας τὰ οἱ ἔδοκες, ‘he put inside it a paper, having written what he saw fit’ appears soon before example (70) in chapter (123). The line of text immediately preceding the sequence in example (70) reads εὑρὼν δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ βυβλίον ἐνεὼν λαβὼν ἔπελεγετο, ‘finding the paper inside it, he grabbed it and read it’. Here τὸ βυβλίον, ‘paper’, as well as ἔπελεγετο, ‘he read’ provide an anchor for the nominal τὰ γράμματα, ‘writings’. Because of the givenness and salience of τὰ γράμματα, ‘writings’ it is taken to be Topic, rendering the higher DP-internal FP in (T6) a TopP.
CHAPTER 7 - X=WH-

7.1 - Three Facts about WH- words

We consider two WH- elements frequently found in Herodotus: *tis, ti* "who, what", and *koiōs, koiē, koion*, "of what sort". Three facts about the distribution of WH- words are given here.

7.1.1 - Bare WH- and WH- with Nouns

WH- elements in Herodotus may be alone or followed by a noun which agrees with the WH- in gender, number and case. We will refer to the former as bare WH- words, and the latter as WH- words in full DPs. We are more concerned with WH- words in full DPs, i.e. [ðrWH- N], as these are the constructions which may be split. Examples (71) – (74) in chapter (2) show bare WH- elements, and (75) – (77), WH- elements in full DPs.

(1) WH- (DC: 71)

\[ \text{ti} \quad \gamma\acute{a}r \quad \pi\acute{a}θωμεν \quad \mu\acute{h} \quad \betaουλομένων \quad \upsILON\epsilon\omegaν \]

\[ \text{ti} \quad \text{gar} \quad \text{pathōmen} \quad \text{mē} \quad \text{boulomenōn} \quad \text{humeōn} \]

\[ \text{what.acc.sg. for} \quad \text{suffer.1.pl.aor.subj.act. if-not} \quad \text{wish.gen.pl.pres.part.mid. you.gen.pl.} \]

τιμορεέειν;

τιμορεείν?

aid.pres.inf.act.

“for what will we suffer if you are not willing to aid?”

Her.4.118.3

(2) WH-N (DC: 75)

\[ \text{tās} \quad \text{tā} \quad \text{tropōi} \quad \text{perēρομεν;} \]

\[ \text{tas} \quad \text{tebi} \quad \text{tropōi} \quad \text{perēρομεν?} \]

\[ \text{them.acc.pl. what.dat.sg. way.dat.sg. go-past.1.pl.fut.ind.act.} \]

“how will we get past them (the guards)”

Her.3.72.1

7.1.2 - Pre-posed WH-
In Herodotus WH- elements always seem to be pre-posed to the left periphery of the clause both when they are bare and in full DPs. This means that in full DPs, the order is never *NWH-*. Although in many Ancient Greek texts WH- elements in full DPs appear both pre- and post-nominally, only the former order was found in Herodotus.

(3) Bare WH- pre-posed (DC: 71)

\[\text{τί γὰρ πάθωμεν (t) μὴ βουλομένων υμέων}\\\text{ti gar pathōmen (t) mē boulomenōn humēôn}\\\text{what.acc.sg for suffer.1pl.aor.subj.act. if-not wish.gen.pl.pres.part.mid. you.gen.pl.}\\\text{timōreēin;}\\\text{aid.pres.inf.act.}\\\text{“for what will we suffer if you are not willing to aid?”}\\\text{Her.4.118.3}\\\]

(4) Bare WH- pre-posed (DC: 74)\(^{32}\)

\[\text{ὅσιώτατος δὲ τί δοκεῖς (t) εὐχεσθαι}\\\text{nēsōtatas de ti dokeis (t) euchesthai}\\\text{islanders.acc.pl. and what.acc.sg. think.2sg.pres.ind.act. hope.pres.inf.}\\\text{‘And the islanders, what do you think they will hope for?’}\\\text{Her.1.27.4}\\\]

(5) WH-N pre-posed (DC: 76)

\[\text{Ἀρπαγεῖ τίω δὲ μόρῳ τὸν παιδα}\\\text{Harpage teōi dē morōi ton paida}\\\text{Harpagus.voc.sg. what.dat.sg. PART way.dat.sg. the.acc.sg. boy.acc.sg.}\\\text{κατεχρίσαι (t) τὸν τοῖς παρέδοκα ἐκ}\\\text{katechērīsai (t) ton toi paredōka ek}\\\text{put-to-death.2sg.aor.ind.mid. whom.acc.sg. you.dat.sg. give.1sg.aor.ind.act.from}\\\text{θυγατρὸς γεγονότας τῇς ἐμῆς;}\\\text{thugatros gegonota tēs emēs;}\\\text{daughter.gen.sg. born.acc.sg.perf.part. the.gen.sg. my.gen.sg.}\\\]

\(^{32}\) For the full example see chapter (2), example (74).
"Harpagus, how (in what manner) did you kill the boy, born from my daughter, whom I gave to you?"

Her.1.117.1

Example (6) shows a possible counter-example to the claim that all WH- words must be pre-posed.

(6) WH-N (DC: 77)

"Ωναξ ἔγινε μὲν ἥλθον παρὰ σε ὃναξ, ἐγὼ μὲν ἠλθόν παρὰ σε \[Lord.voc.sg. l.nom.sg. PART come.1sg.aor.act to you.acc.sg.\]

χρησάμενος περὶ τῆς φωνῆς σὺ χρησάμενος περὶ τῆς φωνῆς σὺ \[inquire.nom.sg.aor.part. about the.gen.sg. voice.gen.sg. you.nom.sg.\]

δὲ μοι ἀλλὰ ἀδύνατα χρᾶς de moi alla adunata chrais \[PART me.dat.sg. other.acc.pl. impossible.acc.pl. give-oracle.2sg.pres.ind.act.\]

κελεύων Λιβυῆν ἀποικίζων τεῖαν keleúon Lībuēn apoikizein teiān \[order.nom.sg.pres.part. Libya.acc.sg. colonise.pres.inf.act. what.dat.sg.\]

δυνάμι κοίη χειρὶ; dunami, koīē cheiri? \[power.dat.sg. what-sort.dat.sg. hand.dat.sg.\]

"Lord, I came to you inquiring about my voice, but you desire for me other impossible things, ordering me to colonise Libya, by what power, by what sort of hand?"

Her.4.155.4

However, the question part of example (6) seems to constitute its own clause with an ellipted verb, i.e. “by what power, by what hand will I do these things”. It also could be taken as a rhetorical question, therefore a question not expecting an answer, therefore not a true question. However, it is unclear from the text whether this is the case. What follows in the text is given here:
Thus spoke Battus, but the god not being won to give him another oracle and ever answering as before, he departed while the priestess yet spake, and went away to Thera. (Godley, 1920-1925).

The text following the example in (6) suggests that perhaps Battos was indeed waiting for a reply, but when he did not get one that answered his question, he left. However, even if this was a true question seeking an answer, the WH- words together with their nouns do not constitute an argument of any of the verbs in the passage given in (6), suggesting that they are syntactically separate from the preceding discourse, and constitute questions of their own. Therefore example (6) will not be considered as a counter-example to the preposing of WH- phrases.

7.1.3 - WH- Split from the Noun

Thirdly, if followed by a noun, the WH- element may stick to the noun, and raise to a left periphery position of the clause together with the noun, or may raise out of the nominal constituent to a left periphery position of the clause and leave the noun in-situ, i.e. the split WH- construction, as shown in examples (7) and (8), the latter, which also has a continuous sequence of WH-N.

(7) WH-...N (DC: 78)

δεσποτα τίνα λέγεις λόγον οὐκ ύγιέσι;
master.voc.sg. what.acc.sg. say.2sg.pres.ind.act. word.acc.sg. not healthy.acc.sg.

"Master, what pestilent word do you say?"

Her.1.8.3

(8) WH-...N (DC: 79)

Πρέξασπες κοιόν με τινὰ νομίζουσι
Preexaspes.voc.sg. what-kind.acc.sg. me.acc.sg. think.3pl.pres.ind.act.
The above data raises some questions about Herodotus' WH- words. First, what is the analysis of splits, and correlatively, are splits optional (given that a [WH-N] sequence can be dislocated either as a whole or it can be split)? Second, the WH- elements are the only category of words which we have examined thus far which have not been found post-nominally. Recall that quantifiers and demonstratives can either precede or follow nouns, and may be split both ways, i.e. Dem...N and N...Dem. This makes us wonder if the lack of NWH- and N...WH- orders in Herodotus is coincidental, rendering these orders grammatical but unattested, or ungrammatical.

7.2 Towards an Analysis of Split WH- Constructions

7.2.1 - WH- and Focus

There is a lot of literature equating Focus movement to WH- movement. This seems intuitive because of the fact that WH- elements are always interpreted as new information. It has been shown that in languages with WH- movement, the WH- phrase usually appears in a Focus position (Croft 1990, Givon 1990, Horvath 1986). This is supported by two observations:
(i) In question answer pairs the WH-expression is interpreted as unknown, therefore new information, and this corresponds to an expression in the answer that is under Focus.

(9) WHY did John marry Joan?

John married Joan BECAUSE HE WANTS A BABY.

(ii) There is evidence from languages in which Focus is marked in a specific syntactic position that the displacement of a WH-phrase appears to target the same position as Focus movement (Rochement, 1986). Looking back to examples (3) and (4) above, repeated here as (10) and (11), we assume that the WH-words raise to Spec-FocP of the clause.

(10) Bare WH- pre-posed to Focus

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{τί} & \quad \text{γάρ} \quad \text{πέθωμεν (t)} \quad \text{μὴ} \quad \text{βουλομένων} \quad \text{ὑμέων} \\
\text{tī} & \quad \text{gar} \quad \text{pathōmen (t)} \quad \text{mē} \quad \text{boulomenōn} \quad \text{humeōn}
\end{align*} \]

\( \text{what.acc.sg. for suffer.1pl.aor.subj.act. if-not wish.gen.pl.pres.part.mid. you.gen.pl.} \)

\[ \text{τιμωρεῖν;} \]

\( \text{timōreein?} \)

\( \text{aid.pres.inf.act.} \)

"for what will we suffer if you are not willing to aid?"

Her.4.118.3

(11) Bare WH- pre-posed to Focus

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{νησιώτας} & \quad \text{δὲ} \quad \text{τί} \quad \text{δοκεῖς (t)} \quad \text{εὐχηθαι} \\
\text{νησιῶtaς} & \quad \text{de} \quad \text{tī} \quad \text{dokeis (t)} \quad \text{euchesthai}
\end{align*} \]

\( \text{islanders.acc.pl. and what.acc.sg. think.2sg.pres.ind.act. hope.pres.inf.mid.} \)

‘And the islanders, what do you think they will hope for…?'

Her.1.27.4

In (10), the WH-word is the sentence initial constituent, whereas in (11) it is preceded by \( \text{νησιώτας}, \) ‘islanders’. When the context of example (11) is considered, it is clear that the
first word of the utterance, ἰσλαέτας, 'islanders', is Topic, i.e. old material. The context immediately preceding the question is provided here.

"Ω βασιλεῦ προθύμως μοι φαίνεται εὐξοθαν ἰσλαέτας ἐπευομένους λαβεῖν ἐν ἴπτερῳ ὀίκοτα ἐλπίζων"

"King, it seems clear to me that you wish to catch the islanders riding horses on the mainland, hoping for this naturally."

Thus, it seems natural to assume that WH- elements move to Spec-FocP of the clause, and that it is possible also for another element of the clause to be topicalized so that it precedes the WH- word, as in (11). If no such element is topicalized, Spec-TopP will not be filled, and the WH- word will be the first word of the clause, as in (10).

7.2.2 - WH- Words in Full DPs

We assume that WH- words in full DPs are generated in Spec-DP, the same position that demonstratives are generated in. Since our analysis of Herodotus’ DP includes functional projections, TopP and FocP, it is reasonable to assume that the WH- elements move to Spec-FocP of the DP, by analogy with the clause. For the following trees, the examples in (8), split and continuous, will be used.

(T1)
From Spec-FocP within the DP, the WH- element may be further attracted by Foc head in
the clause, resulting in a split construction, WH-...N. In this case, the WH- word is part
of the Focus of the clause, while the noun remains unfocused as shown in (T2).

(T2)

At this point we can answer the first question raised by the data, that is, whether splits are
optional or not. In (T2) above, the WH- is attracted to Spec-FocP of the DP. However, all
of the contents of the DP may also be focused within the DP. This is shown in (T3).

(T3)

If this movement takes place, then the whole DP will be focused within the clause,
leaving the construction continuous, as shown in (T4). The apparent optionality
concerning splitting stems from the fact that either the whole DP or just part of it can be
interpreted as new, i.e. focused information.
7.3 - Account of the Contrast Between WH- and Q/Dem

The second question which was raised from the data was why WH- elements pattern differently from other types of nominal constituents such as demonstratives and quantifiers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(WH-N)</th>
<th>(DemN)</th>
<th>(QN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unattested [NWH-]</td>
<td>[NDem]</td>
<td>[NQ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WH...N)</td>
<td>(Dem...N)</td>
<td>(Q...N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unattested [N...WH-]</td>
<td>[N...Dem]</td>
<td>[N...Q]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This contrast is surprising given that both WH- elements and demonstratives/quantifiers occupy similar syntactic positions within the DP. More specifically, both WH- words and demonstratives are generated in Spec-DP (T5), but the way they may split is different.
Demonstratives may be focused in the DP, producing an order of DemDN, with the possibility of a split Dem...DN order (T6).

In the case that both functional projections are present, demonstratives may move to Spec-FocP of the DP with remnant movement of DP to Spec-TopP, producing the order DNDem, with the possibility of a split DN...Dem construction. This is shown in (T7).
Since we assume both a TopP and a FocP may be projected in the DP, one might think that if both were projected, DP or NP would be able to undergo remnant movement to Spec-TopP after movement of the WH- word to Spec-FocP. As we saw in the previous chapter concerning demonstratives, NP was not a candidate for movement to Spec-FocP or Spec-TopP, as it is not at the edge of the DP phase, i.e. DP or Spec-DP. However, movement of DP to Spec-TopP would not violate the Phase Impenetrability Condition, as DP itself, as well as the material in Spec-DP is at the edge of the DP phase. So it cannot be a violation of the PIC which blocks movement of DP to a higher FP. We claim that a Topic Phrase is never projected within the DP which contains the WH- word for the following reason. A WH- word has to have scope over its variable, i.e. the noun in these cases. This means that the WH- always has to c-command or precede the noun. We do not claim that this is necessarily a requirement on the WH- by virtue of its being an operator because we have examples with other operators (quantifiers) that do show up in orders of NQ, where the operator does not c-command its variable. Rather, the reason that WH- words have to precede their variables is due to a requirement imposed by an interrogative or WH- feature hosted by the head that attracts the WH-, i.e. on the clausal Foc head. The WH- feature on the DP must be visible to that of the Foc head. If it's at the edge, i.e. higher than the noun, it will be visible, while if the noun raises higher than the WH-, the WH- feature is no longer visible. Therefore, we predict that sequences of NWH-, as well as split constructions of N...WH- are ungrammatical in Herodotus' dialect, and that their absence is not simply the result of a lack of positive evidence.
CHAPTER 8 - Conclusions

Let us now go back to the example shown at the beginning of the paper, repeated here. In this paper we hope to have shown that this construction may be accounted for within a generative framework.

καὶ θυμὸν  ἐχε  ἀγαθὸν
kai thumon eche agathon
and heart.acc.sg. hold.2sg.pres.impv.act. valiant.acc.sg.

'and keep good heart'

Her.1.120.3

The benefit of the analysis presented is that while it allows certain freedoms of movement which allow us to generate the attested word orders examined, such as the construction above, it also provides certain confines on the movement of elements. Restrictions on movement are essential for an analysis of Herodotus’ DPs, as they are for any syntactic analysis of AG. With respect to the latter, there are certain elements of the AG clause which do not display freedom of movement, i.e. WH- words, conjunctions and connectors. If a ‘free word order’ approach, with no restrictions on topicalization and focusing of elements is taken for AG, these restrictions are not accounted for. As for the focus of this paper, DPs in Herodotus, we have observed certain word orders in continuous DPs containing adjectives, quantifiers, demonstratives and WH- words from which we have built our analysis. We have also observed certain glaring absences of word orders, which indicates that there was a hierarchical structure in Herodotus’ DPs. We will now present general conclusions we have come to about Herodotus’ DP, and summaries of DPs containing each X-word we have examined.
8.1 – Summary of facts about Herodotus’ DP

The purpose of this study was to discover the motivation for split constructions where nouns are dislocated from adjectives, quantifiers, demonstratives and WH- words in Herodotus’ *The Histories*. In so doing we have discovered two major things about DPs in Herodotus.

(i) The DP is very discourse oriented in Herodotus’ Greek, and contains functional projections, a TopP and/ or a FocP. This itself is not a new idea, and it has been suggested that the internal structure of the DP is very much comparable to that of the clause (Szabolsci 1992, Abney 1987). We have suggested for Herodotus’ Greek that all material in DPs is divided into possible Topic and Focus material. This can be done explicitly, if a TopP and a FocP is projected, or it may be done less overtly if only one of the FPs is projected. In this latter case, a part of the DP will be assigned either Topic or Focus status, depending on which FP is projected, and the rest will be taken as the other one, by default.

(ii) The definite DP in Herodotus’ Greek is a phase, and therefore is subject to the Phase Impenetrability Condition. This means that only material at the edge of the DP, i.e. the material in Spec-DP or DP itself is subject to movement to the higher functional projections.

8.2 - Conclusions about As, Qs, Dems and WH- words

8.2.1 - Adjectives

We have analyzed all adjectives as predicates in a “reduced relative clause” structure, drawing from Kayne (1994). It has been suggested that only certain adjectives in Modern Greek, i.e. intersective adjectives (Alexiadou and Wilder, 1998) have this structure. We
did not make a stand as to the status of non-intersective, i.e. intensional adjectives. With regard to intersective and subsective adjectives, i.e. extensional adjectives, we have not found constructions with two determiners, i.e. sequences of DNDA, to be semantically different from those with one, i.e. sequences of DAN and NDA. We have found many adjectives which are found in all three of these constructions, with no apparent semantic difference in Herodotus. Therefore, we stated that all (extensional) adjectives begin as predicates in reduced relative clauses, and raise to Spec-CP in the DP. In constructions involving adjectives and nouns, i.e. in DPs which contain CPs, we have claimed that there are always two D heads: the main D which heads DP1 and is always fully realised, and the D which heads DP2 (the subject of the predication relation where the noun appears). This D head may be full (in constructions with two Ds), or it may be null (in constructions with one D). In both cases, DP2 obligatorily moves to Spec-DP1 to satisfy the [D] feature on D1 head. After these preliminary (obligatory) movements, the contents of the DP are divided into Topic and Focus material by the method described above in section 4.1. In this way all attested continuous orders, i.e. DAN, NDA and DNDA are possible.

8.2.2 - Quantifiers

8.2.2.1 - Strong Quantifiers

Recall from the data chapter that there are many attested orders of the strong quantifier in DPs, i.e. DQN, NDQ, DNDQ, QDN and DNQ. Because the first three orders correspond to orders found with adjectives, and the latter two do not, we assume a lexical ambiguity among the strong quantifier. Pasadj. is found in sequences of DQN, NDQ and DNDQ, and is generated in the same way as all other adjectives, as the predicate in a reduced relative
clause structure. *Pasq*, on the other hand, is generated in Spec-QP, the XP which appears directly above DP. The quantifier may be focused or topicalized thus assigning all of the contents of the DP as either Focus or Topic material.

8.2.2.2 - Weak Quantifiers

We have claimed that weak quantifiers are generated in Spec-NumP, which sits directly below DP. From here, weak quantifiers may move to Spec-TopP or Spec-FocP, and the division of labour between Topic and Focus will result. When weak quantifiers are found with definite articles, we analyze them similarly to adjectives (Partee, 1989). Thus they are generated in the same way as all other adjectives, as predicates in reduced relative clauses. Although we have not found all orders with the weak quantifier which we have found with other adjectives, i.e. NDQ and DNDQ, the theory predicts that these structures were also grammatical in Herodotus’ dialect. It is not at all surprising that all of these orders were not found, considering that weak quantifiers in combination with definite articles are not very common in Herodotus.

8.2.3 - Demonstratives

Demonstratives in Herodotus appear only in (continuous) orders of Dem(D)N and (D)NDem. This sets them apart from adjectives, strong quantifiers of the variety *pasadj*, and weak quantifiers. We have opted for a unified analysis of the three varieties of demonstratives employed in Herodotus, as well as a unified analysis of the demonstratives in pre- and post-nominal positions. We have claimed that all demonstratives originate in Spec-DP, and may move to either Spec-TopP or Spec-FocP based on discourse-related factors. A demonstrative with anaphoric function will likely be assigned to the Topic domain, and a demonstrative with cataphoric, therefore also
deictic function, (Manlessou 2001) will likely be assigned to the Focus domain. However, all demonstratives may be focused, regardless of their status as old or new. This explains why demonstratives may be found pre- and post-nominally in anaphoric, cataphoric and deictic functions.

8.2.4 - WH- words
We have stated that WH- words in full DPs are generated in Spec-DP, as are demonstratives. Based on literature equating WH- elements to Focus, we claimed that WH- elements always raise to Spec-FocP of the DP. They may raise there alone, from Spec-DP, or the whole DP may raise to Spec-FocP. This accounts for why WH- words may be found with their nouns or may be split from them. The fact that WH- elements have to c-command their variables precludes the nouns in these constructions from ever raising to a higher position than the WH- element, i.e. Spec-TopP. That is to say TopP is not projected in DPs containing WH- elements. This suggests that the lack of *NWH-sequences in Herodotus is an indication of their ungrammaticality, and not a lack of positive evidence.

8.3 - Split constructions
Split constructions concerning all of the syntactic categories mentioned above arise by the same syntactic operation. Material in the specifier of TopP or FocP of the DP can raise to the clause-external Spec-TopP or Spec-FocP. Split constructions arise when one part of the DP moves to the specifier of an FP, and the other remains in the DP, or moves to the specifier of the other FP. Therefore, when all of the contents of the DP move to the same FP, no splits will arise. In this way, the clausal FPs also account for continuous DPs which occur at the beginning of clauses.
8.4 - Syntactic Analysis of a Dead Language

Providing an analysis of a dead language is a difficult task. The difficulty does not arise in providing an analysis of the data which can be found, but rather in providing an analysis of the data which is not found. Because of the lack of negative evidence, one cannot be certain if absent constructions were ungrammatical or just not used in the text(s) from which one draws his/her data. One would think, perhaps, that drawing data from numerous sources would lower the likelihood that unfound constructions were possibly grammatical simply because the data base would be larger. However, this strategy would not aid in providing an analysis of one particular dialect of Ancient Greek at one period in time, therefore invalidating the study. The strategy that we have adopted concerning the lack of negative evidence is therefore to let the theory that we have built based on the positive evidence decide whether certain constructions were ungrammatical in this dialect or just not employed in the text. In cases where our analysis appears to over-generate constructions (for example in the case of weak quantifiers with definite articles), we have assumed that the constructions were grammatical and not employed in the text. Again, one would not expect that every possible grammatical construction would be found in the text. The following is a summary of all attested grammatical, unattested grammatical and unattested ungrammatical word orders, the first of which we have found in the text, the second of which our theory predicts to be grammatical but was not found in the text, and the third, which were not found in the text, and which our theory predicts to be ungrammatical. Note that the adjective column includes instances of the strong
quantifier *pasad*[^33], while the heading Qstrong refers to the ‘true’ quantifiers, i.e. *pasq*. The weak quantifiers which are adjectives, i.e. weak quantifiers with Ds, are shown in the weak quantifier column. The orders DQ…N and DN…DQ are not listed under ‘unattested grammatical’ as the adjective/weak quantifier *allos*, ‘other’ was found in these constructions (examples (15) and (17) in chapter (2)).

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As</th>
<th>Qstrong</th>
<th>Qweak</th>
<th>DemS</th>
<th>WH-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>attested grammatical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(D)A, (D)AN, DNDA</td>
<td>QDN</td>
<td>QN</td>
<td>(D)NDem</td>
<td>WH-N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>split</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N…(D)A (D)A…N DN…DA</td>
<td>Q…D(A)N DN…Q N…DQ</td>
<td>Q…N, N…Q</td>
<td>(D)N…Dem, Dem…(D)N</td>
<td>WH…N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>unattested grammatical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D(poss.)NDA DADN</td>
<td>NDQ</td>
<td>NDQ, DNDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>split</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA…D(poss.)N, D(poss.)N…DA, DN…DQstrong DA…DN</td>
<td>N…DQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>attested ungrammatical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>unattested ungrammatical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADN, DNA, NAD, AND</td>
<td>NQD, QND, DNQ</td>
<td>QDN, DNQ, QND, NQD</td>
<td>NDDem, DemND, DDemN, NDemD</td>
<td>NWH-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>split</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all splits built off the above continuous structures</td>
<td>N…WH-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^33]: These patterns exactly the same way except for the lack of attestation of DN…DQstrong which is noted in the table.
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APPENDIX 1

(i) *pas, pasa, pan*, 'all, every, the whole'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th></th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom</td>
<td>pas</td>
<td>pasa</td>
<td>pan</td>
<td>pantes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen</td>
<td>pantos</td>
<td>pasês</td>
<td>pantos</td>
<td>pantôn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat</td>
<td>panti</td>
<td>pasêi</td>
<td>panti</td>
<td>pasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc</td>
<td>panta</td>
<td>pasan</td>
<td>pan</td>
<td>pantas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) *houtos, hautê, touto*, 'this'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th></th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom</td>
<td>houtos</td>
<td>hautê</td>
<td>touto</td>
<td>houtoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen</td>
<td>toutou</td>
<td>tautês</td>
<td>toutou</td>
<td>toutôn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat</td>
<td>toutôi</td>
<td>tautêi</td>
<td>toutôi</td>
<td>toutois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc</td>
<td>touton</td>
<td>tautên</td>
<td>touto</td>
<td>touso</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iii) *hode, hède, tode*, 'this, that'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th></th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom</td>
<td>hode</td>
<td>hède</td>
<td>tode</td>
<td>hoide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen</td>
<td>toude</td>
<td>têsde</td>
<td>toude</td>
<td>tônde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat</td>
<td>tôide</td>
<td>tôide</td>
<td>tôide</td>
<td>toisde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc</td>
<td>tônde</td>
<td>tênde</td>
<td>tode</td>
<td>tousde</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) *tis, ti*, 'who, what'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th></th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom</td>
<td><em>tis</em></td>
<td><em>ti</em></td>
<td><em>tines</em></td>
<td><em>tina</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen</td>
<td><em>tinos, tou, teu</em></td>
<td><em>tinos, tou, teu</em></td>
<td><em>tinôn, teôn</em></td>
<td><em>tinôn, teôn</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat</td>
<td><em>tini, tôi, teôi</em></td>
<td><em>tini, tôi, teôi</em></td>
<td><em>tisi, teoisi</em></td>
<td><em>tisi, teoisi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc</td>
<td><em>tina</em></td>
<td><em>ti</em></td>
<td><em>tinas</em></td>
<td><em>tinas</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>