LINGUISTIC THEORY AND THE GREEK CASE SYSTEM

by J. P. Louw
(University of the Orange Free State, Bloemfontein)

There is a vast literature on the cases in Indo-European languages—especially the Classical languages. These cases are traditionally treated more or less as individual entities, as items on a list: one case after the other is discussed and with each a number of its usages is mentioned, so that it has become customary to speak of different kinds of accusatives, datives, etc. In this respect the genitive is favoured with no less than 30 kinds: possessive genitive, genitive of quality, partitive genitive, etc. Practically speaking there is sense in this procedure as long as one remembers that these names are merely appellations to distinguish the different contextual variations of usage, and that they do not serve to explain the case itself. I prefer to call this method of approach grammatical.

This method of describing the various usages has, however, mutatis mutandis, been employed to explain the case system itself. Consequently the idea emerged that at least one of these usages must derive the original function of the case. Grammar books often contradict one another as to the original function of a case. Besides, the question is often put: is it possible to discover a single principle, or even meaning, underlying the various usages of each case?

Under the influence, no doubt, of the idea of progressive evolution, it has been supposed that the cases denoted, in the first instance, relations of space, and were afterwards gradually extended to the expression of more intellectual and abstract relations. This so-called ‘local theory’ has been proved inadequate to explain all the cases and their different usages. The inexplicable residue—one may almost say—was then included under the name grammatical. Cases were then not only divided into local and grammatical cases, but at least one case, the accusative, was assigned both

7. The locative, instrumental and ablative were regarded as local cases, the nominative, genitive and dative as grammatical.
local and grammatical uses. Where this method failed to explain all the examples, categories like free uses, occasional uses or exceptional uses were added. This reminds one of the aphorism wrongly applied, and fatally nursed, by some grammarians: the exception proves the rule.

As matters stand today, classical philologists usually content themselves with saying that a particular dative, for example, is a 'dative of respect', and when, a paragraph or two further on, we find an 'accusative of respect', we describe it as such—without questioning our conception of the particular usage of the case. Smyth comments in this connection that they are nearly equivalent, but we seek in vain for any allusion to the meaning of these terms. Many other grammars—even the monumental Griechische Grammatik by Schwyzer and Debrunner—never investigate these rival constructions.

To note the implications of the foregoing statements, one need go no further than K. Brugmann's Griechische Grammatik, 1913, in which he denies the possibility of arriving at a 'Grundbedeutung der Kasusformen', but prefers the term 'Gebrauchsumfang' as being the oldest denotation(s) of a case we can possibly arrive at. Although many grammarians have endeavoured to establish a definition of the 'Gebrauchsumfang' of a case, the crux of the problem has always been to correlate it with the various usages—undoubtedly because diachronic material was employed to account for synchronic facts. The result of this method was a grouping of the usages of a case, not an explanation of its meaning. Consequently it is at least comprehensible that, although Schwyzer and Debrunner take the idea of 'Gebrauchsumfang' into consideration, they conclude that it is impossible to find any system in the uses of, for example, the accusative.

The eminent French scholars Chantraine and Meillet—Vendryes maintain that the accusative is on the whole the case of the object. 'On the whole'

---


11. Although basic works such as Schwyzer—Debrunner as well as Szantyr's recently revised edition of Leumann—Hofmann: Lateinische Grammatik quote, e.g., in their bibliographical sections modern linguistic analyses like Hjelmslev's La catégorie des cas (1935–37), no attention in their treatment of the cases is given to these far-reaching modern approaches. No wonder that L. H. Gray (Foundations of Language, p. 460) as far back as 1939 lamented the fact that the average Classicist is relatively unsympathetic to, and unaffected by, linguistics.


shows that they resort to the most obvious usage as a starting-point, and
that they intend to give a description, not a definition. Humbert says that
it is impossible to find a definition for the accusative which will account
for all its uses. He nevertheless continues: ‘Il rend sans spécification
particulière la relation de verb à nom’. But this statement is in itself an
effort—and a positive one—to define the accusative in terms of the semantic
value. Humbert is here in line with the modern structural linguistic approach
—a method unfortunately overlooked by most Classical scholars, at least
in their persistent adherence to stereotyped formulas. On the other hand
the structural linguistic approach has perhaps often gone too far in rigor­
ously denouncing ‘traditional grammar’, although many nonsensical
patterns have been exposed. Modern linguistic theories can be success­
fully employed (as far as each goes) to solve or to understand many prob­
lems in defining the case system in Greek.

Although modern structuralists have their differences of opinion, they
share two basic conceptions: 1. Synchronistic and diachronistic ap­
proaches must be kept neatly apart; 2. A case has one fundamental
meaning which may be actualized in different ways.

The notion of a fundamental meaning is, within the scope of the struc­
tural approach, not to be confused with the method hinted at by Brugmann
and followed by Schwzyzer — Debrunner, viz. to trace the ‘gemeinsame
Gebrauchsumfang’ of a case. They understood ‘Gebrauchsumfang’ as a
more proper term for ‘Grundbedeutung’ or ‘Grundbegriff’; that is, they
arrived at the ‘original’ meaning through the comparative-historical
method based on an analysis of the contextual variations of usage. The
structural method understands by ‘fundamental meaning’ the essential
semantic function of a case which is not the source of its various contextual

Hjelmslev: La Catégorie des cas, Etude de grammaire générale, Aarhus 1925–37; A. W. de
Groot: ‘Classification of the uses of a case illustrated on the genitive in Latin’, Lingua VI,
la Société Polonaise de Linguistique IX, 1949, pp. 20–43. Extreme structuralism which
would regard any historical discipline as unscientific, is justly rejected by O. J. L. Szeme­

17. Explicitly by their method of separating the non-linguistic moments from the
linguistic, thus exposing ‘semantic notions’ derived from contextual matters.
19. M. Ivić: ‘O problemu padežne sisteme u vezi sa savremenim shvatanjima u ling­
vističkoj nauči’, Južnoslovenski Filolog XX, 1953–54, pp. 191–211 (with a French summary)
rejects this method. We must admit with Ivić that the two approaches cannot be kept
absolutely apart, but they are definitely to be acknowledged. Me indicis a sound basis is
to differentiate without separating.

20. Ivić prefers to speak of a bundle of meanings. Cf. L. R. Palmer: The Latin Language,

75
usages, but which comprises its connotation, its potentiality. This method by no means discards or replaces the comparative-historical method (almost traditional among Classicists), but actually encompasses it, defining the essence of a case in terms of a principle or a conception within the range of which the various usages (being contextual applications thereof, or rather allowing various contextual applications) can be explained, either in their synchronic occurrence, or in their historical development, or in their fusion with the usages of other cases. This ‘essence of a case’ is not a meaning of the case, but its semantic function in the sentence.

The explanation of the Greek case system among Classical scholars is traditionally purely contextual (-syntactic), although the definitions proposed were usually represented as semantic notions of the case itself. In reality, however, they were merely contextual common denominators. Thus we read in Schwyzer—Debrunner that the nominative is the case of the grammatical subject. This is not at all a semantic definition, but a contextual one—and as a contextual definition it merely states the most usual contextual role of the nominative. For the subject is not always nominative, and the nominative is not always the subject. The same applies to the accusative when denoting space and time relations or the object; it also applies to the genitive denoting the partitive relation and that of ‘belonging to’; and so on. It all becomes clear when we read at the end of Schwyzer—Debrunner’s list: ‘... der freie (absolute) Gebrauch einzelner Kasus ist ebenfalls eine nachträgliche Entwicklung, die nichts über die ältere konstruktionselle Anwendung hinaus lehrt’. The structural approach is mainly interested in the semantic values which it finds by separating the linguistic moments from the non-linguistic. The structural method, however, in no way discards, or overlooks, the syntactic functions. Already in 1939, De Groot wrote: ‘Les cas peuvent avoir des fonctions syntaxiques et des fonctions sémantiques’. As suggested by the words ‘peuvent avoir’, the range of the syntactic and the semantic

22. Syntactic in so far as adnominal and adverbal (usually wrongly termed adverbial) constructions are distinguished.
23. We need not seek better proof than the term ‘Gebrauchsumfang’.
25. Here lies the reason why we read on p. 89: ‘Aber die vielen und verschiedenartigen Gebrauchsweisen des “echten Genitivs” des Indogermanischen liessen sich wieder nur durch willkürliche Definitionen auf einen Nenner bringen’.
26. The italics are mine. Is ‘konstruktionselle Anwendung’ the only matter to be judged as important in understanding a case?
27. ‘To separate linguistic facts from among a body of data means to detect the form of expression (the phonemes and their relations) behind the substance of expression (the speech sounds), and to derive from the substance of content (the things meant) the underlying form of content (the meaning).’—C. L. Ebeling: op. cit., p. 130.
functions is not absolute. De Groot\textsuperscript{29} assigns to the nominative, accusative and genitive only syntactic functions, while the dative and ablative may have a semantic function. This distinction was suggested as a criticism of the theories proposed by Hjelmslev\textsuperscript{30} and Jakobson\textsuperscript{31} who gave a semantic explication of every syntactic use.\textsuperscript{32} Kurylowicz\textsuperscript{33} agrees with De Groot as far as the nominative is concerned; for the other cases he assumes both syntactic and semantic functions, but then one of these is primary, the other secondary. The accusative and genitive, according to Kurylowicz, may have a semantic function, although secondary; the dative and ablative have a primary semantic function, and a secondary syntactic function. We need not enter upon a criticism of the foregoing theories, for which much can be said pro and contra, as this has been competently done by Ebeling, to whom the reader is referred.

One thing remains certain: there are a semantic and a syntactic aspect. The purpose of this paper is to propose a tenable application of these aspects in defining the Greek case system. The semantic and syntactic functions are to be regarded, and employed, as two basic notions, not to be identified,\textsuperscript{34} nor to be separated,\textsuperscript{35} but only to be differentiated in so far as they operate in a particular context of usage. Three levels are thus to be recognised in determining the meaning: semantic, syntactic, contextual. In a sentence the semantic level\textsuperscript{36} indicates the connotation embodied in the case itself, on its own, and thus denotes its potentiality to be in a position in the constructional chain; the syntactic level indicates its position in the structure of the sentence, and the constructional role it fulfils; the contextual level indicates the specific denotation. It is important to note that these levels are, with regard to each other, neither inclusive nor exclusive. In the one-word sentence the syntactic level is not active, and the contextual level functions only in its widest application, viz. within the passage in which the one-word sentence occurs.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{29} Idem, p. 127. He employs the syntactic distribution as a basis of classification.
\textsuperscript{30} L. Hjelmslev: La catégorie des cas, 1935-37. His system is on the whole semantic.
\textsuperscript{31} R. Jakobson: 'Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre, Gesamtbedeutungen der Russischen Kasus', Travaux du cercle linguistique de Prague, VI, 1936. He nevertheless selects among the special meanings a Hauptbedeutung along with a primary syntactic role.
\textsuperscript{32} A. Heinz: Genetivus w. indoeuropejskim systemie przypadkowym, Warszawa 1955, also rejects the identification of the two systems. His exposition amounts, according to Ebeling (op. cit., p. 137), to a merely syntactic basis.
\textsuperscript{33} J. Kurylowicz: 'Le problème du classement des cas', op. cit., 1949.
\textsuperscript{34} Because the semantic function refers solely to the case abstracted as such, while the syntactic is coupled with the substantive.
\textsuperscript{35} Naturally owing to the case-form being an inherent part of the substantive.
\textsuperscript{36} The reader will note that my term semantic level has nothing in common with semantic category—the latter is a matter of classification.
\textsuperscript{37} Cf. K. Bühler: Sprachtheorie, Jena 1934, p. 155 ff. on the term 'Umfeld.'
Problems found on the contextual level are of the following nature: A 9 Λητοῦς καὶ Δίς υἱός, A 496 κύμα θαλάσσης—genitive of possession or of origin, auctoris (thus being ablative)? 1 421 ei tiv' ἐταῖροις ϑεαντῶν λύσιν ἢ δ' ἐμοὶ αὐτῷ εὔροιμην—subjective genitive or ablative? Instances like these also illustrate the syncretism of cases—an occurrence usually found on the contextual level.

On the syntactic level one may note the following: α 274-6 μνηστήρας μὲν ἐπὶ σφέτερα σκίδνασθαι ἄνωθεν, μητέρα δ'—ei oi thymos ἐφορμάται γαμέσθαι, ὡς ἦν εἰς μέγαρον πατρός μέγα δυναμένου. The accusative μητέρα is constructed absolutely\(^\text{38}\), but nevertheless as adjunct to ἦν, and by implication also to ἄνωθεν. Its position in the constructional chain thus creates an affective nuance giving a lively colloquial effect. The nominative μήτηρ (grammatically and metrically possible) would have been an adjunct to ἦν only—and so without the above implications.

The semantic level is by far the most difficult to define. Here one is in a dilemma, because on the semantic level it is necessary to gain an insight into the very nature of the case; here the case speaks alone, on its own. In order to determine and to define the semantic level, cases should be studied comparatively, with special attention to constructions where the cases compete: λ 96 αἴματος δέρα πίω and two lines further on δ δ' ἐπει πίναν αἷμα; or in prepositional phrases such as Xen. An. 2,4,5 ἐννοώ δ' ὅτι, ei νῶν ἀπιμεν, δόξομεν ἐπὶ πολέμῳ ἀπιέναι and Thuc. 6,74 ἀπέστειλαν ἐπὶ χρήματα, or Soph. O.T. 371 τυφλὸς τά τ' δίκα against Xen. An. 2,6,9 τῇ φανῇ τραχὺς etc. The semantic notion of a case explains its potentiality to occur in such competitive constructions, even if, practically speaking, the 'meaning' is the same.

The contextual and syntactic levels are restricted to a particular instance, the semantic level not. The old Indian grammarians, noted for their minutely formulated observations, undoubtedly noticed this characteristic for they begin their exposition of the usages of the case-forms not with the case-forms themselves (as we do), but with relations to which the cases—except the nominative (and vocative\(^\text{39}\))—correspond.\(^\text{40}\)

Pāṇini defined the nominative as the case used when nothing is to be

\(^{38}\) Not to be confused with the term accusativus absolutus, but rather to be thought of in a syntactic function which is more or less on the same plane with the nominativus pendants.

\(^{39}\) The vocative is not actually a case, but the stem of the substantive used as a sentence on its own. It belongs, more properly, to the sentence structure.

\(^{40}\) Cf. B. Delbrück: Vergleichende Syntax der Indogermanischen Sprachen, Strassburg 1893, Vol. I, parr. 55, 56, 62. It is noteworthy that the Stoic grammarians also differentiated between the nom. on the one hand and the rest as a group on the other hand by distinguishing between the nom. as πτώσις ὁρθή (casus rectus) and the others as πτώσις πλαγιά (casus obliqui).
expressed other than the mere nominal stem: arthamātre (the nominative) expresses only the meaning (of the nominal stem). The nominative is thus in Jakobson’s terminology ‘merkmallos’. The semantic notion of the nominative in Greek fully corresponds to these definitions. Not only is the frequently contextual function of the nominative as subject thus explicable, but also the ‘absolute’ uses, viz. in citation, address, and in the so-called ‘hanging’ nominative (nominativus pendens): Dem. 18,88 τὸ δὲ ὑμεῖς ὅταν λέγω, λέγω τὴν πόλιν. E 403 σχέστιος, ὁμιμοεργός, δεσ βοής αἰσυλα ἱέϊον. Xen. An. 2,5.41 Πράξενος δὲ καὶ Μένων, ἐπεξεργασίας ὑμέτεροι εἴεργέται, ... πέμψατε αὐτοὺς δὲ ἔρθο. These ‘absolute’ uses are usually explained, on a contextual-syntactic level, by anacoluthon or by elision (a shortened sentence) or by applying the term ‘independent’, thus suggesting that the nominative is used ‘without construction’. This type of elucidation does not interpret the function of the nominative, but is merely harmonizing the construction with stereotyped syntactical formulas. In the examples quoted above, the nominatives on the semantic level connote the mere nominal idea. On the syntactic level they function as adjuncts qualifying the force of other words, and on the contextual level they refer to the ‘things’ concerned as object or subject. The word or words to which these notions are applicable function on the contextual-syntactic level in an affective position which brings it into relief. The semantic notion of the nominative expressing the mere nominal idea here perfectly fits the case of words serving as labels.

In exclamative contexts the essence of the nominative, as defined above, explains the so-called nominativus pro vocativo: Plato Symp. 172A οὗτος Ἀπολλόδωρος, οὗ περιμενεῖς; Actually the nominative is never used instead of a vocative. For addressing or calling upon a person the vocative is by no means the usual construction in the sense that others are unusual. The nominative and accusative, in such exclamative contexts, are perfectly

41. (The ancient Greek grammarians applied the term ἡ ὄνομαστικὴ πίθος to the nominative). Cf. J. Gonda: ‘Defining the Nominative’, Lingua V, 1955–56, p. 292 referring to Pāṇini 2, 3, 46; L. Renou: Terminologie grammaticale du sanskrit, and La grammaire de Pāṇini. Cf. also L. R. Palmer: The Latin Language, London 1961, p. 285 defining the nominative as the naming case. (The Sanskrit grammarians saw the agents in the personal suffix of the verb, viz. the man: he walks. Delbrück, op. cit., par. 64 rejects this view on the ground that the nom. is thus not the case of the subject. He confuses the contextual and semantic levels; v. supra in the text of this article between notes 24 and 25.)
42. R. Jakobson: op. cit., p. 249.
regular. The nominative, in contradistinction to the vocative, is less exclama­tive, less direct, more reserved and formal because it merely states the nominal idea.\textsuperscript{45} Therefore it is clear why the nominative is often found in a context where the speaker does not expect any answer.\textsuperscript{46} In address the accusative may also be used: sōph. Ant. 441/2 σὲ δὴ, σὲ τὴν νεόουσαν ἐς πέδουν κάρα, φῆς ἦ καταρνή μὴ δεδρακέναι τάδε; On the semantic level the accusative denotes relation to the constructional chain without defining the relation. The accusative is the \textit{casus indefinitus}. 'Der Akk. ist ursprünglich das Wort ohne weitere Bestimmung und Bezeichnung'.\textsuperscript{47} This definition of the semantic notion of the accusative is by now more than a century old, and has unfortunately escaped the notice it deserves. It was accepted by Hirt in 1934\textsuperscript{48} and restated by Gonda in 1957.\textsuperscript{49} It explains fully the striking characteristic of the accusative to compete with the other cases. Thus the appositional phrase, originally nominative,\textsuperscript{50} is also found in the accusative: Eur. \textit{Heraclidae} 71/2 βιωζόμεσθα καὶ στέρη μιαίνεται, πόλει τ’ ὅνειδος καὶ θεον ἕτιμια. Ω 735 ὢ τις Ἀχαῖων ὤψε χειρος ἐλών ἐπὶ πόργου, λγρόν ὀλεθρον. On the syntactic-contextual level these two examples are on a par as far as the appositional nominatives and accusatives are concerned, and are traditionally termed adverbial uses. On the semantic level the mere nominal idea is stated by the nominative without relation to the sentence, while the accusative, denoting a relation, is non-defining. This distinction is indeed subtle and need not be stressed. It, however, explains the potentiality of the cases to be in a position in the constructional chain.

In the oldest Sanskrit we find the accusative competing with the dative in the same constructional chain: \textit{grāmam gacchati}—he goes to town. The same English translation is usually given to the dative \textit{gramiya gacchati}. Contextually we are in the habit of calling the first accusative of direction (sometimes: terminal accusative) and the second dative of direction (even: dative of interest); but does it explain the usage? Indeed not. The terms used merely name the contextual construction. \textit{Gacchati} comprises the idea of motion. Semantically the accusative is non-defining, therefore \textit{grāmam}
gacchati, he goes (to) town, is a proposition stated as such without any detail added. The dative gramāya specifies the relation, and may be paraphrased as follows: he is on his way, and his going has town in mind—the action is done with town in view. The dative is more explicit. In Homeric Greek the dative with verbs of motion is common: μ 257 χείρας έμοι δρέγοντας, stretching out their hands to me, i.e. to reach me. Note the accusative in α 332 ἡ δ' ὃτε δὴ μνηστήρας ἄφικε, and when she came to the suitors, i.e. when she reached them; Soph. O.T. 35 δ' γ' ἔξελσας κατ' Καμέτων μολὼν ... , when you came to the town of Cadmus. The accusative is non-defining, it is silent on the details; the dative explicitly states the object in view.

It is a matter of surprise that Kühner—Gerth, although defining the accusative as the case of the object, nevertheless add the following note to the paragraph in which they discuss the examples (quoted above) of the usage of the accusative: 'Da der Akkusativ nur ganz allgemein den Ort angiebt, auf den die Bewegung gerichtet ist, so hat die nach grösserer Bestimmtheit des Ausdrucks strebende Prosa diesen Gebrauch des Akkusatives aufgegeben und überall dem Akkusative eine Präposition hinzugefügt, durch welche die durch den Akkusativ bezeichnete Beziehung näher bestimmt wird ...' Two important facts should be added to the foregoing statements:

(a) The accusative on its own does not denote (as is often said) 'motion towards'. (b) Prepositions are employed with the accusative not only in prose but also in poetry—as well as with the dative: Ο 371 εὐχετο, κεφ' ὄργανον εἰς οὐδαμὸν ἀπερόφητα. Contrast E 174 ἡλ' ἄγε τοῦ δ' ἔφες ἄνδρι βέλος, Δι' χείρας ἀνασχόν. The preposition εἰς emphasizes the direction, the dative Δι' refers to the object in view. A preposition often precedes a dative. Note the following competitive constructions: Xen.

51. Cf. J. Gonda: 'The Unity of the Vedic Dative', Lingua XI, 1962, p. 142: '... it refers to the object in view. This does not necessarily imply a conscious intention on the part of the subject.' The nature of the dative, however, is such as to allow a variable amount of 'final' connotation—at least by implication: edhebhyii gacchati, he goes for fire-wood, i.e. to fetch fire-wood. Cf. Mycenean Greek wo-ro-ne-ja pa-wei-sti, woollen cloths for making cloaks. Thuc. III, 82 τή τοῦ κατάλευκον κακόσα αἱ εἰκάρια ἐκομίζει, this external assistance was obtained for the annoyance of their opponents. Cato Agric. 5, 3 satui semen, seed to sow. In Greek ἔπι + dative became the usual construction to emphasize purpose. Cf. J. Gonda: 'Gr. ἔπι + Dative' Mnemosyne X, 1957, pp. 1–7. A. Hoekstra agreed with this view, 'A Note on the Dative of Purpose in Greek', Mnemosyne XV, 1962, pp. 15–23.

52. For other examples cf. Kühner—Gerth: op. cit. Π; p. 406. In prose cf. Thuc. 1, 61 ἡδ' ὃτας Ἀθηναίοις ἀγγέλα, the message came to (i.e. for) the Athenians.

53. Ib., p. 291, pertaining to the contextual (-syntactic) level.

54. Ib., p. 312.

55. The accusative, however, is the most frequent case with verbs of motion, but this is so simply because it is usually not necessary to add detail or specification to illustrate the relationship more fully.
An. II, 4,5 ἄννωδ δ’ ὅτι, εἰ νῦν ἄπιμεν, δόξομεν ἐπὶ πολέμῳ ἀπείναε, I consider that if we go away now, we will appear to have war in mind. Thuc. VI, 74 ἀπέστειλαν ἐπὶ χρήματα, they sent for money. The dative states the intention more explicitly. This does not mean that we ought to stress as far as possible the explicitness of the dative in every context of usage. On the whole we have here two ways of expressing a thought, thus constituting two ways of looking at an occurrence. In Hdt. III, 119, 2 συλλαβόν δὲ σφαεῖ στήσει τῆν (sc. δέσιν) ἐπὶ θανάτῳ, chained them as condemned criminals, the employment of the dative stressing the intention is quite clear. But the same force is suggested by the context of Hdt. III, 14,6 καὶ μαθὼν τὸν παύδα ἡγεσίμενον ἐπὶ θάνατον, and learnt that his son was leading the way to death. The accusative is used because there is no need to stress the intention, as this has been stated a few lines earlier. The accusative thus avoids ‘Übercharakterisierung’. Such competitive constructions give us an insight into the ‘background’ of the encroachment of cases upon the usages of each other.

The semantic notion of a case embodying its connotation, i.e. denoting its potentiality to stand there, affords us on the contextual data to understand something of the fusion of cases: ε 374 αὐτὸς δὲ προήνομα ἀλλ’ κάπεπσα, χείρε πετάσσας, νηχεμένας μεμαός. Is ἀλλ’ dative or locative? With verbs of motion it depends on how it is regarded: he plunged into the sea—the sea may be regarded as the object which the action had in view (so Kühner—Gerth), or as the localisation of the action. The same applies to Β 89 πέτοντας ἐπ’ ἄνθεσιν, fly on to the flowers. On the other hand, the contextual level clearly shows that verbs of motion may be constructed specifically with the locative: Δ 251 ἠλθε δ’ ἐπὶ Κρήτεσσι, 273 ἡλθε δ’ ἐπ’ Αἰάντεσσι.

The accusative also competes with the locative: Λ 12 ἠλθε ἐπὶ νῆς, he arrived at the ships; Δ 251 ἠλθε δ’ ἐπὶ Κρήτεσσι, he came to where the Cretans stood. Cf. Sanskrit patati bhumau (loc.), he falls on to the ground and (there he lies); patati bhūmin (acc.), he falls on to the ground. In Greek prepositions are used to increase the precision of the statement. Δ 425 ἐν κοινήσιν πεσῶν—said of those who fell in war: falling in the dust, i.e. to rise no more (cf. Liddell and Scott, ad loc.). Rarely without preposition Ε 82 πεδίῳ πέσε—an arm was severed and fell on to the ground. Λ 722 ἔστι δὲ τις ποταμός Μυσηής εἰς ἄλα βάλλαν—said of a river that disembogues into the sea. The accusative is undefined; it perfectly suits the context in which one cannot indicate where the water of the river lies—nor does the water remain there. The preposition εἰς denotes the direction. Cf. Thuc. I, 56 τὸ ἐξ Παλλήνης τεῖχος—facing Pallene.

The Greek dative also represents the instrumental case which (on the semantic level) not necessarily denotes the instrument but rather expresses the idea of togetherness: 58 Xen. Hell. I,4,11 'Ἀλκιβιάδης ... κατέπλευσεν εἰς Πάρον ναυσίν ἔκκοσιν, Thuc. 2,98 ἐπορεύοντο τῇ δήδῃ ἦν πρότερον αὐτῶς ἐποιήσατο. Examples like Lys. 1,20 ὡς ἐκκινή τῷ χρόνῳ πεισθείη, Eur. I.A. 640 ὁ πάτερ, ἐδείδον σ' ἄσφαλέον πολλῷ χρόνῳ, ὃς 34 νυκτὶ δ' ὄμος πλείστην etc. illustrate contexts in which the dative may be either locative or instrumental according to a particular point of view, thus affording another indication of the fusion of cases. Constructions expressing time also clearly illustrate the Greek dative (as locative or instrumental) versus the accusative. The locative denotes time at which, i.e. point of time at which: τῇ ἔστεραίᾳ—a particular point of time of the following day. The instrumental denotes the amount of time used, i.e. how much time anything takes: ἐν τρισιν ἡμέραις—it lasted three days. 59 The accusative denotes time in general without specifying anything, and is thus often employed when numerals, pronouns, etc. are added as terminations: ἐμεῖναι ἡμέρας ἐπταί, πολλάς ἡμέρας, ταύτην τὴν ἡμέραν etc. Cf. Xen. An. IV, 8,8 οὐ βρέθην τα ἔν ἄπαντι τῷ χρόνῳ πραξάντα τὴν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ δηλοῦνει, it is not easy to set forth in a single day the acts of all time. The instrumental emphasises how much time is involved. The accusative does not denote the exact length of time although we traditionally speak of accusative of time 'how long'. It merely states an extension of time without defining its range. Thus λ. 190 χεῖμα εἰδει—in the winter. Xen. Hell. I,1,14 ταύτην μίαν τὴν ἡμέραν αὐτῶ δειμείναι, τῇ ἔστεραίᾳ κ.τ.λ., that day they waited there, but on the following . . . Note even in the English: that day . . . on the following. The locative denotes a specific point of time.

Time may be also expressed by the genitive: Hdt. III, 117 τὸν μὲν γὰρ χείμαραν ωἰ ... τοῦ δὲ θέρεος χρησκοῦντα τῷ ὀδατι, in winter it rains, but they need the water during the summer. On the semantic level the genitive comprises the idea of restriction 60—not the summer as a whole,

58. The old-fashioned contextual-analytical method of defining a case (as, for example, represented by K. Brugmann: Griechische Grammatik, Müncheln 1913, par. 474 f.), distinguishes three functions for the instrumentalis: Soziativ oder Komitativ, Prosekutivus (des Ortes und der Zeit), Instrumental. W. Schulze in Philologische Wochenschrift 1896, p. 1336, contended that we have two functions: Komitativ (including Prosekutivus der Zeit) and Instrumental (including Prosekutivus des Ortes). So Schwyzzer—Debrunner, op. cit., II, p. 159 ff. includes the Prosekutivus as a whole under Komitativ, and applies the term Instrumental in engerem Sinne to the so-called Instrumental. These distinctions in reality concern the semantic level. Cf. the neat definition given by Kühner—Gerth: op. cit., II, p. 430: ' ... als Vertreter des Instrumentalis bezeichnet der Dativ ... die Person oder Sache mit der zusammen ... eine Handlung vor sich gehe.'

59. ἐν is rarely omitted in prose. Cf. Thuc. VI, 27 μὴ νυκτὶ, in one night's time. The genitive is used with ἔν of uninterrupted duration. The genitive here is actually an ablative, and the 'meaning' is: through and out of. Thus Xen. An. IV, 6, 22 ἐγρηγόρεσαν καὶ ἔκαινον παρὰ πολλὰ διὰ νυκτὸς.

60. V. infra.
but on different occasions during the summer. The accusative merely points to the winter as an extent of time, the genitive specifies the summer as 'time within the boundary of which'. It stands to reason that the rain may fall during the winter on different occasions, but the writer has no reason to stress this point. His choice of cases expresses his viewpoint in looking at the facts, and need not coincide strictly with reality. This is an important factor in distinguishing between the semantic and contextual levels. Therefore we read in Hdt. IV,48 Ἰστρος ... Ἰσος αἰεὶ αὐτὸς ἄουτη ἑσεὶ καὶ θέρες καὶ χειμῶνος, but in IV,50 Ἰσος δὲ αἰεὶ ἑσεὶ ἐν τε θέρει καὶ χειμῶνι ὁ Ἰστρος (locative or instrumental?). Thucydides neatly observes the cases in expressions of time: IV,130 τῇ δὲ ὀστερᾳὶ ὅι μὲν Ἀθηναῖοι τό τε προἀστειον εἴλον καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν ἀπασαν ἐδήσουν τὴν γῆν, οἱ τε τριακόσιοι τῶν Σκιαναλων τῆς ἐπιοσθης νυκτὸς ἀπεχώρησαν, on the next day the Athenians captured the suburb and laid waste the land for that entire day (note ἀπασαν), while the three hundred Scioneans departed in the course of the following night. IV,90 ἡμέρῃ δὲ ἀρξάμενοι τρίτῃ ὡς οἴκοθεν ὀρμήσαν, ταυτίν τε εἰργάζοντο καὶ τὴν τετάρτην καὶ τῆς πέμπτης μέχρι ἄριστον, beginning on the third day after their departure, they continued their work this day and the fourth, and on the fifth until the midday meal.

The various definitions of the genitive offered by grammar books are all within the scope of the contextual and syntactic levels. No wonder that Chantraine⁶¹ concluded: 'Les emplois du genitif sont particulièrement difficiles à analyser.' On the syntactic level we have explications of the function(s) of the genitive following more or less the method employed by Delbrück, viz. listing the various occurrences according to their adnominal or adverbal usages.⁶² On the contextual level the usages of the genitive are classified as (a) partitive, and (b) the rest—either ad adnominal genitives (syntactical) or as genitives of 'pertaining to'⁶³ (contextual!). The essence of the genitive, however, lies on the semantic level. It connotes the idea of restriction.⁶⁴

---

⁶² B. Delbrück: op. cit. I, par. 69. Also H. Hirt: op. cit. VI, par. 67, 71.
⁶⁴ K. Brugmann: op. cit., p. 441 proposed 'the sphere of the action' as the 'Grundbedeutung' of the genitive. This is a semantic definition, but unfortunately it does not account for all the uses of the genitive. The same applies to 'nähere Bestimmung' in Kühner—Gerth, op. cit., Vol. II, par. 408. The partitive notion, to quote only one example, cannot be explained by these definitions. In an article on the Homeric language in A. J. B. Wace and F. H. Stubbings: A Companion to Homer, London 1962, p. 131–32, L. R. Palmer follows Brugmann, although in his Latin Language, 1961, p. 294, he defined the genitive as follows: 'a noun in the genitive defines and delimits the range of reference of another noun or verb.' This definition is near the mark, but only as far as the adjectival implication of the genitive is concerned. (V. note 65, infra.).
In many Indo-European languages the genitive is popular with verbs of eating or drinking in contexts denoting that the action affects the object only in part: Sanskrit sāmasya pibā—drink soma (a drug), i.e. not all soma, but some of it. So Lithuanian ąš vālgau duonos—I eat bread; Russian daite mne xėba—give me bread; Gothic maţip hiābīs—he eats bread; oţov πίεαν— to drink wine. Grammatically the genitive in expressions like these is called partitive genitive, because the genitive itself, i.e. the genitive per se, connoting the idea of restriction and functioning syntactically as the object concerned, in contexts like these limits the range of reference of the object. The partitive notion belongs to the contextual level as an application of the semantic connotation of restriction. It is of great importance to distinguish these levels very carefully because the semantic connotation of restriction (cf. Plato Rep. 459B τί δὲ ἵππων οἶς; what do you think about horses, i.e. in connection with horses, restricted to horses?) obviously need not indicate in every context that the object is affected only in part. Compare also Thuc. VI, 60 τῶν διαφυγόντων θάνατον καταγώντες—having condemned the fugitives to death; i.e. having decided on death as a penalty restricted to the fugitives. διαφυγόντων and θάνατον are both syntactic adjuncts to καταγώντες indicating that with which καταγώντες is concerned. Semantically the genitive denotes restriction—a principle which in its contextual application denotes that the action is restricted to διαφυγόντων.

The same explication applies to the so-called possessive genitive: Lysias 3,32 ὑ σίκια Ὁ Σίμωνος. Here the notion of restriction suggests almost adjectival force: the Simon’s house.65 Note the similar application of the idea of restriction in Lysias 30,20 ἑρᾶ τριῶν τολάντων (gen. of value/price) or Thuc. VII, 2 δικτω στοδίων τείχος (gen. of measure). The same applies to all other ‘kinds’ of genitives.

From the above it is plain that we have in the genitive a sort of bisection insofar as the notion of restriction can be applied with reference to the object itself (partitive) or to its adjunct (pertaining to). Obviously we have here two planes of reasoning coinciding in principle with the double function assigned to the usages of the genitive by traditional grammar (v. notes 61 and 62, supra). Therefore: on the semantic level we can define the genitive as connoting restriction, but this connotation has two planes of application on the contextual level. Thus the question arises as to which is the oldest—the more because we have the precedent offered by Brugmann’s Grundriss66 regarding the adverbial usages as being ‘on the whole’ original, and the fact that the partitive notion is more strongly developed in the adnominal

usages, because the partitive notion resembles the ablative very closely. The French *du vin*, for example, goes back to *de vino* in Latin.

It now becomes tempting to reason that the true application of the idea of restriction refers to the adjunct, and that restriction with reference to the object itself has affinity with the ablative. We can, however, go no further than to acknowledge a mere affinity, because in those languages which formally distinguish genitive from ablative, the partitive notion is a function of the genitive and is already fully represented in the oldest texts. Thus we cannot decide which usage is the older without finding ourselves on slippery ground.

Owing to the fact that traditional grammar uses the above-mentioned data, acquired on the contextual level, to draft a definition of the genitive, the following conclusion is inevitable: ‘die vielen und verschiedenartigen Gebrauchsweisen des “echten Genetivs” des Indogermanischen liessen sich wieder nur durch willkührliche Definitionen auf einen Nenner bringen.’ This is true for the Gebrauchsweisen which belong to the contextual (and syntactic) levels. The structural approach has shown that the semantic level offers the data for a proper definition. The method employed by the ancient Indian grammarians in discussing the case system gives us an insight into the structure of the Greek genitive, thus affording us with data to overcome the above-mentioned problem in defining the genitive. If we follow the ancient Indian grammarians who begin their exposition of the usages of the case-forms with the relations they express, and not with the formal case forms themselves, we can explain the ‘double’ application of the notion of restriction as follows: The relations, defined as partitive and pertaining to, are in Greek expressed by one case-form, viz. the genitive—and this is comprehensible because both relations reply to the connotation of restriction, being itself a notion which functions on the semantic level, while partitive and pertaining to are the notions of the contextual application of restriction. This method of defining cases is, in reality, the reverse of the method of reasoning employed by ‘traditional grammar’.

The Greek genitive also represents the ablative case which connotes separation: *ε 397 τὸν γε θεοί κυκότητος ἐλέυσαν—delivered him from evil, Dem. 19, 146 τῶν κτημάτων ἀπόστασιν—loss of property. In A 496 κοιμήθη θαλάσσης we may have a (possessive) genitive or an ablative (genitivus auctoris). A 9 Ληστοὺς καὶ Διός υἱός may be possessive genitive or genitivus originis (i.e. ablative). A 5 Διός . . . βουλή can be explained as possessive genitive or subjective genitive: Zeus’ counsel or the counsel Zeus gave.

68. *Idem*, p. 89. The fusion between gen. and abl. in Greek is treated further on.
70. Schwyzer—Debrunner: *op. cit.* II, p. 89.
71. Vide note 40, *supra.*
The subjective genitive here may just as well be ablative: the counsel that came from Zeus. The same applies to Xen. An. 1.2.17 τῶν βαρβάρων φόβος the fear of the barbarians—subjective genitive, or ablative: i.e. fear restricted to, pertaining to the barbarians, or fear which has the barbarians as its source. Fusion between genitive and ablative is clear from these examples. It is noteworthy that, although restriction and separation are, on the semantic level, by no means synonymous, their contextual application may be so.

The accusative can also compete with the genitive: λ. 96 αἰματος διφρα πίω, so that I can drink the blood. But two lines further on ο̣ δὲ ἐπει πίεω αἷμα, and when he drank the blood. The genitive specifies that not all the blood is intended, the accusative is non-defining: it merely states that he drank the blood—logically only the quantity he scooped. With verbs of remembering the genitive is the usual construction: ο̣ 29 μνήσεως . . . Αργείθοιο, remembered A.—i.e. a number of facts about A. But one finds the accusative in Z 222 Τυδέα δ' ο̣ ἔμνησεμαι, I have no recollection of Tydeus. The negative in Z 222 makes it pointless to hint at certain characteristics. Similarly Eur. Hipp. 603 σήμησαν, ο̣ ποιητή τιν' αἰσθάνομαι βοής, hear the cry; Eur. Hel. 653 ἡλίους δὲ μυρίους μᾶλς διελθὼν ἣσθημην τὰ τῆς θεόν, I perceived the Goddess’ guile.

It should be clearly kept in mind that the distinctions given above serve to explain the usage of the cases. In other words they should be taken as linguistic reasons for the employment of a case, and are not to be stressed too far. In fact, a language usually offers more than one way of expressing a particular idea. These expressions, which actually belong to the subtlety of the language, amount ‘on the whole’ to a more or less synonymous ‘meaning’, although each expression views the facts from another angle. This angle, or point of view, is indicated on the semantic level. For example: with verbs of ruling the genitive, dative or locative may be used. B 494 Βοιωτών . . . ἰρχον, Σ 134 ἰρχε δ' ἄρα σφιν ἀναζ. Β 108 πολλήσιν νῆσουσι καὶ Ἀργεὶ παντὶ ἀνάσσειν. The locative is often strengthened by a preposition Π 572 ἐν Βοιωτίᾳ ἰρασσει, τ 110 ἐν ἀνδράσιν. Compare also the dative in B 816 Τροσί μὲν ἤγεμόνευ . . . Ἐκτωρ, and the genitive in B 527 Λοκρῶν δ' ἤγεμόνευς . . . Αἰας. The locative sees the object ruled as the localisation of the act of ruling, the dative denotes the object which the act of ruling has in view, the genitive emphasises that the object ruled is the thing to which the act of ruling is restricted. With verbs denoting ‘take’ or ‘receive’ the ablative is usual: Xen. An. VI.6.32 τάφτα δὲ σοι τυχόντες, Soph. O.T. 1004 λάβοις ἔμοι. The locative may also be used. Now the idea is no longer to indicate the source from which something comes, but to emphasize the locality: Α 596 μετάδοσα δὲ παιδὸς ἐδέξατο χειρὶ κόμπλον, and smiling took the cup at her son’s hand. Soph. O.T. 818 δόμοις δέχεσθαι, to receive in his house. Σ 313 (with
The ablative may also be strengthened by a preposition: ΤI0  clearfix Δήμαρχοι πάρα . . . δέξο. When the nature of the relation between the object and the act of receiving is not to be defined, the accusative is used: Σ 115 κήρα δ' ἐγὼ τότε δέξομαι. The contextual-syntactic level sufficiently denotes that κήρα is the object received.

The accusative in Soph. O.T. 371 τυφλός τά τ' ὅσα τόν τε νοῦν τά τ' ἔματ' εἶ, is called grammatically accusativus respectus: you are blind, your blindness stands in relation to your ears, mind and eyes. The accusative states the relation without defining it. In Thuc. V,43,2 we have the dative: ἄνηρ ἡλικία ἐτὶ νέος, i.e. still young with a view to his years. The dative states the relation a little more explicitly. Koine Greek favours the dative of respect. In the New Testament it is far more frequent than the accusative.73 It stands to reason that the more colloquial form of a language will show a certain preference for the more pregnant phrased expression. Note the locative (with preposition) in 1 Clem. 38,2 ὅ ἄγνοις ἐν τῇ συρκί. But the locative is also found in classical Greek: Soph. O.T. 25 (πόλις) φθινουσα μὲν κύλυξιν ἐγκάρπης χθονός, φθινουσα δ' ἀγέλας βουνόμοις. Schwyzer—Debrunner74 regard O.T. 25 and Thuc. V 43,2 as examples of the Instrumental des Mittels.

The abovementioned relations expressed by an accusative, dative, locative, or instrumental, can also be denoted by the genitive: Soph. Ant. 847 φίλων ἀκλαμοτός, unwept by his friends, i.e. restricted to his friends. Hdt. VI, 116 Ἀθηναῖοι, ὡς ποδῶν εἶχον, τάξιστα ἐβοήθον εἶς τὸ ἄστυ. Van Groningen75 correctly translates ‘wat betreft hun voeten’, but explains this usage as partitive genitive—which is meaningless in this context. On the contextual level we have a genitivus respectus; semantically, the genitive denotes restriction.

Although examples can be multiplied ad nauseam, those quoted illustrate sufficiently our main point: the structure of the Greek case system reveals three levels which should be clearly differentiated in determining the meaning of a case in a sentence.

---

72. When 'motion into' is to be stressed, the preposition elc is employed: Xen. An. V,5, 6 οὖν elc τῷ τείχῳ τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας ἐδέχοντο, i.e. they did not allow sick men to pass the walls.
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