Cognate Adverbials and Case in the History of Greek

Abstract

Theoretical research on cognate nouns focuses on the question whether they are arguments or adjuncts. Greek has figured prominently in the discussion: primarily cognate nouns in the accusative case have been investigated, and the existence of different subclasses has been proposed. In this paper, we discuss cognate nouns marked with dative case in Classical and Koiné (Biblical) Greek, and argue that alternation in case morphology correlates with a twofold distinction, between arguments and adjuncts on the one hand, and between different kinds of adjuncts on the other. We propose that certain dative cognates are focused adverbials.

1. Introduction

Cognate Nouns (CNs) are nouns that are morphologically (or, in a broader sense, semantically) related to the verb (*figura etymologica*). Nouns can be a morphological ‘copy’ of the verb (as in some examples of CNs in English, *to drink a drink*) or not (as in some examples of CNs in English, *to sing a song*), and in all examples of CNs in Greek, *trajudise ena trajudi* ‘she sang a song’). Recent research has unfolded the fact that, crosslinguistically, there are two types of CNs, argumental and adverbial. We will argue that Koiné Greek – at least in its Biblical variety (BG) – has both argumental and adverbial CNs and that, like some other already studied languages (Hebrew, Russian), it displays a subdivision into two types of adverbial CNs, focused and manner adverbial CNs. We will show that in BG this distinction correlates, among other things, with case marking: focused adverbial CNs receive dative case [1a], whereas manner adverbial CNs can bear accusative case [1b].

[1] BG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>onomázōn dë tò ónoma kuríou thanátîi thanatoústhô</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>name:ACT.PRT.NOM</td>
<td>name:ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The one who blasphemes the name of the Lord shall surely be put to death.’ (Le. 24:16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>tên dikaián krîsin krînate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the:ACC</td>
<td>right:ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Judge with right judgment.’ (Jo. 7:24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Section 2, we will present the state of the art on cognate nouns and their cross-linguistic typology. Sections 3 and 4 will discuss CNs at different stages of the dia-
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chrony of Greek and examine the Greek data with regard to the typology of CNs and the role of morphological case. Section 3 will present earlier accounts of CNs in Classical and Modern Greek (mainly Horrocks & Stavrou 2010) and some remarks on cognate datives in Classical Greek. In Section 4, we will discuss Koiné Greek cognate datives, and propose an analysis in Section 5. Section 6 summarizes the main conclusions of the paper.

2. State of the Art on Cognate Nouns

The nature of CNs, i.e., whether they are arguments or adjuncts, has long been at the center of theoretical debate. CNs have been analyzed as (i) (thematic) arguments and (ii) adjuncts or Davidsonian event arguments (cf. e.g. Jones 1988; Massam 1990; and Real-Puigdollers 2008, for an overview of the debate).

The argument- and the adjunct-approach are not necessarily mutually exclusive: a third solution proposed is that a language can have both argument and adjunct CNs (Pereltsvaig 1999a; 2002; Nakajima 2006; Horrocks & Stavrou 2010). Pereltsvaig (1999a) has argued that the distinction between the (thematic) argument-type and the (adverbial) non-argument-type CNs not only applies in a comparative perspective, but can also manifest itself within one language, where argument and adjunct CNs can coexist. Pereltsvaig (2002, n. 2) notes that there is no language which allows only adverbial CNs. Crucially, Pereltsvaig (see Figure 1 and [2a–b]) has claimed that adverbial CNs can be further distinguished into two types: adverbial CNs that are used for manner modification (and must contain a modifier), and adverbial CNs that are used for focus (without a requirement for modifier).

![Figure 1: Typology of CNs (from Pereltsvaig 2002)](image)

This fine-grained typology shows that even though optionality of modification is often said to be a defining property of CNs, not all CNs allow it in fact. That is, argument CNs show no restriction with respect to modification, manner modificatio-
COGNATE ADVERBIALS AND CASE IN THE HISTORY OF GREEK

Constructs (adverbial CNs) must contain a modifier, but focused adverbial CNs do not obey such requirement (need not be modified). Moreover, argument CNs can appear with strong determiners, that is, definite determiners or universal quantifiers, whereas adverbial CNs cannot. In languages with rich case morphology the distinction between the various types of CNs typically correlates with differences in case marking. Pereltsvaig (1999a; 2002) reaches the prediction that languages with rich case morphology that display focused CNs will mark them in a case other than accusative.

Greek presents evidence of CNs in the accusative and in the dative. The question arises whether Greek CNs belong to different types of CNs (according to the typology presented above) and, further, what role the dative case has in Greek CNs. In the following sections we will present some features of CNs at different stages in the diachrony of Greek (Classical, Modern and Koiné) and examine the Greek data with regard to the typology of CNs and the role of morphological case. We start with Classical and Modern Greek CNs (Section 3), but concentrate especially on Koiné Greek adverbial cognates (Sections 4 and 5), which have not been studied in detail in earlier work.

3. CNs in (Classical vs Modern) Greek: Earlier Analyses and the Typology of CNs

Horrocks & Stavrou (2010) provide a detailed study of CNs in Classical (CG) and Modern Greek (MG). According to Horrocks & Stavrou, in both CG and MG, we can observe the presence of (accidentally) cognate objects of transitive verbs (CNs with argument status) [3–4].

[3] CG
a. tòn pólemon polemein
   the:acc war:acc wage:act.prs.inf
   ‘To wage the present war.’ (Thuc. 8.58)

b. availability of passivization
   pólemos epolemeito
   war:nom wage:mp.impf.3sg ’War was waged.’ (Xen. Hel. 4.8.1)
   (Horrocks & Stavrou 2010)

[4] MG
a. polemun ton polemo mesa sti xora tus
   wage:act.prs.3pl the:acc war:acc inside in-the land their
   xoris opla.
   without guns
   ‘They wage the war inside their land without guns.’
   (http://iwannaskantzeli.blogspot.com/2010_03_07_archive.html)

b. availability of passivization
   O polemos polemīθike ke kerðiθike.
   the:nom war:nom wage:mp.pst.pfv.3sg and win:mp.pst.pfv.3sg
   ‘The war was waged and won.’
   (tro-ma-ktiko.blogspot.com/2011/02/blog-post_6590.html)
Horrocks & Stavrou also show the adverbial status of some of the CNs in CG and MG: if the cognate noun is singular, indefinite and adjectively modified, the cognate construction with the intransitive verb is synonymous with examples in which the verb is modified adverbially [5–6]. On the other hand, only CG has the specific type of adverbial accusatives of ‘respect/extent’1 [7–8]. Horrocks & Stavrou argue that the difference in frequency of CNs in CG and MG is due to the fact that CNs occur with verbs of all classes (transitives, unergatives, unaccusatives) in CG whereas in MG the verbs that can appear with a CN have been reduced.

[5] CG

\[
\begin{align*}
eúkhomai & \quad \text{semnên} & \quad \text{eukhên.} \\
\text{pray:mp.prs.1sg} & \quad \text{solemn:acc} & \quad \text{prayer:acc} \\
\text{‘I pray (a) solemn prayer.’} & \\
= & \quad eúkhomai & \quad \text{semnôs} \\
\text{pray:mp.prs.1sg} & \quad \text{solemnly} & \text{‘I pray solemnly.’} \\
\text{(Horrocks & Stavrou 2010)}
\end{align*}
\]

[6] MG

\[
\begin{align*}
efxome & \quad oloθermes & \quad efxes & \quad \text{ia...} \\
\text{wish:mp.prs.1sg} & \quad \text{wholehearted:acc.pl} & \quad \text{wish:acc.pl} & \quad \text{for} \\
\text{‘I am sending you my wholehearted wishes for...’} & \\
= & \quad efxome & \quad oloθerma & \quad \text{na...} \\
\text{wish:mp.prs.1sg} & \quad \text{wholeheartedly} & \quad \text{to} \\
\text{‘I wish you wholeheartedly to...’} \\
\text{(Horrocks & Stavrou 2010)}
\end{align*}
\]

[7] CG

\[
\begin{align*}
epeî & \quad \text{ēutûkhêsan} & \quad \text{tôto} & \quad \text{tô} & \quad \text{eutûkhêma} \\
\text{when be-lucky:act.aor.3pl} & \quad \text{this:acc} & \quad \text{the:acc} & \quad \text{good-luck:acc} \\
\text{lit. ‘When they were lucky with this good luck.’ (Xen. Anab. 6.3.6)} & \text{(Horrocks & Stavrou 2010)}
\end{align*}
\]

[8] MG

\[
\begin{align*}
*eftixise & \quad \text{ena} & \quad \text{meyalo} & \quad \text{eftixima} \\
\text{be-lucky:act.pst.pfv.3sg} & \quad \text{a:acc} & \quad \text{big:acc} & \quad \text{good-luck:acc} \\
\text{lit. ‘When they were lucky with this good luck.’}
\end{align*}
\]

Accusative CNs in CG and MG, when adverbial, have to be modified [9–10]. There is a greater variety of modifiers in CG than in MG: CNs in CG can be modified by an adjective, a genitive, or a derivational morpheme.2

[9] CG

\[
\begin{align*}
tôu & \quad \text{sômato\text{\text{sm}}} & \quad \text{noûson} & \quad \text{megálên} & \quad \text{noséontos} \\
\text{the:gen} & \quad \text{body:gen} & \quad \text{sickness:acc} & \quad \text{big:acc} & \quad \text{be-sick:act.prt.gen}
\end{align*}
\]

1 Accusatives of ‘respect/extent’ “specify a domain of relevance for the head of the phrase containing them” (Horrocks & Stavrou 2010, 290).
2 Cf. Pl. Leg. 9.871d, from Bary & de Swart (2005):
[1] pheugêtô \quad \text{aeiphugian} \\
\text{go:act.prs.1sg} & \text{eternal-exile:acc} \\
\text{‘Let him go in an eternal exile.’}
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‘When his body was grievously afflicted.’ (Hdt. 3.33)
(Horrocks & Stavrou 2010)

[10] MG
xarike  xara  meyali
joy:ACT.PST.PFV.3SG  joy:ACC  big:ACC
‘She rejoiced greatly.’

On the other hand, it is worth noticing that, both in CG and MG, modification can be absent from argument CNs [11–12]. CNs without an attributive word are ordinary direct objects that coincidentally occur as morphological cognates to the transitive verbs.

ei mélloi ḫ phulakàs phuláksein…
if be-likely:ACT.PRS.OPT.3SG or guard-duty:ACC.PL guard:ACT.FUT.INF
‘If he were either to perform guard duty or…’ (Xen. Anab. 2.6.10)

[12] MG
filasun  filakés
guard:ACT.PRS.3PL  prison:ACC.PL
‘They guard prisons.’

Smyth (1956) observes that CNs without an attributive word can present various characteristics in different examples in CG:

“substantive without an attribute is (rarely) added to the verb as a more emphatic form of statement: lêron lēreîn ‘to talk sheer nonsense’ Ar. Pl. 517, húbrin hubrízein ‘to insult grievously’ E. H. F. 708.” (Smyth 1956, § 1571)

CNs in the dative case appear in CG but are rare:

[13] CG
a. phóbōi  tarbeîn
fear:DAT  be-frightened:ACT.PRS.INF
lit. ‘fear with fear’ = ‘to be very frightened’
b. pheúgein  phugêi
flee:ACT.PRS.INF  flight:DAT
lit. ‘flee with flight’ = ‘to flee in haste’

According to Smyth, these cognate datives can express cause, manner or means, functions expressed by the Greek dative by virtue of its highly syncretic nature (taking over, e.g., functions of the Indo-European ablative and instrumental).

[14] CG
lumaínetai  lúmēisi  anēkéstoisi
afflict:MP.PRS.3SG  affliction:DAT.PL  incurable:DAT.PL
lit. ‘(He) afflicts (us) with afflictions incurable.’ (Hdt. 6.12)

Example [15] from Smyth (1956), however, is different: it cannot be treated as a manner adverbial CN, but must be treated rather as an adverbial focused CN, as indicated also by the translation given by Smyth. The same holds for [16]; the CN
in the dative case appears without an attributive word and can be considered a focused CN. The phrase τοι ὀντὶ (the:DAT be:act.prt.prs.dat) ‘in fact, in reality, really’ that is found next to the CN constitutes further evidence that this dative has the function of presenting the verbal meaning with emphasis.

‘And flees from old age.’ (Pl. Symp. 195b)

‘It seems to me that (the discourse) was, as a whole, really sportive jest.’ (Pl. Phdr. 265c)

Both functions of dative CNs – the manner and the focused one – are attested, to a much larger extent, in Koiné Greek. Evidence for this will be presented and analyzed in the following sections.

To summarize, accusative CNs in CG, when adverbial, have to be modified; if modification is absent, it is because CNs are not adverbial, but argumental. Dative CNs can be manner adverbials and modified. Few examples of dative CNs can be analyzed as adverbial focused CNs. MG, of course, does not have dative CNs (dative case has been lost). MG preserves the accusative argumental and the accusative manner non-focused type of CN – but not the accusative CN of ‘respect/extent’ (that can accompany an adjective too) or the adverbial focused type. Only argumental CNs are allowed without a modifier in MG.

In the next section, we present data from a stage of Greek not yet studied in detail with respect to CNs, namely Koiné Greek. In Koiné Greek, in contrast to CG, CNs in the dative form an important group. We will show that dative CNs in Koiné Greek differ from CG in another aspect as well: adverbial focused CNs are the great majority of the examples, and far fewer instances of manner non-focused CNs are attested. From a historical perspective, it is surprising to observe that the dative, bound to disappear, develops nevertheless a new function in Koiné Greek. One should however not forget that – although signs of decay are already visible by the 3rd c. BC – the dative is still very productive in all its functions in BG, that is, the variety of Greek that we will study.

4. A Late Development: Cognate Datives in Biblical Greek

In this section we consider the variety of Koiné Greek represented by the language of the Septuagint (LXX, the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible, started in the

3 See Anagnostopoulou & Sevdali (2010) for a summary of the diachronic developments of adverbial and argumental non-cognate datives.
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late 3rd c. BC) and the variety of the New Testament (NT; 1st c. AD): we refer to both as ‘Biblical Greek’ (BG). CNs are a very typical feature of BG, and cognate datives in particular are significantly more frequent than in CG:

[17] BG

a. *epíthumía* gār epíthūmēsa apeltheîn
desire:DAT PTC desire:ACT.AOR.2SG go:ACT.AOR.INF
eis tôn oîkon toũ patrós sou
to the:ACC house:ACC the:GEN father:GEN 2SG.GEN
‘Because you longed greatly for your father’s house.’ (Ge. 31.30)

b. *paraggelía* parēggeílamen humîn mḖ
command:DAT command:ACT.AOR.1PL DAT.2PL NEG
didáskein epî tói onómati toútôi
teach:ACT.PRS.INF in the:DAT name:DAT this:DAT
‘We strictly charged you not to teach in this name.’ (Act.Ap. 5.28)

The increased use of CNs in BG is often attributed to the influence of Biblical Hebrew (Conybeare & Stock 1905; Blass & Debrunner 1961; Moulton & Turner 1963) and its general predilection for repetition. Conybeare & Stock (1905, § 61), for instance, observes that the frequency of cognate accusatives and datives in the Septuagint might be ascribed to “the coincidence of idiom in this particular between Greek and Hebrew”. As seen in Section 3, some instances of cognate datives are found in CG: that is, cognate datives might qualify as a ‘translation effect’ (a stylistic contact effect) only insofar as their frequency – and not their overall presence – is concerned. The fact that they decrease again in the Greek of the NT (see below) is taken as further indication of the relevance of the Hebrew original in the case of the LXX.4

In CG, dative CNs can be both non-focused adverbials, denoting manner, and focused adverbials. In BG, both functions are attested, but the latter is by far the most typical. In fact, this is a peculiarity of dative CNs in BG that, to our knowledge, has not been given the necessary attention before. In the great majority of occurrences (cf. our corpus study below), dative CNs are not modified, and consist of a bare singular noun in the dative, whose meaning is redundant with respect to the predicate. Compare CG [18] and BG [19]:

[18] CG
biaíōi thanátōi apothnéiskein
violent:DAT death:DAT die:ACT.PRS.INF
‘Perish by a violent death.’ (Xen. Hier. 4.3)

[19] BG
thanátōi apothanēi
death:DAT die:MP.FUT.2SG
‘You shall surely die.’ (2Ki. 1.4)

4 Due to space limitations, we cannot comment on alternative strategies to dative CNs which also display cognate forms and fulfill a similar function (cognate participles, PPs, adverbs). See Conybeare & Stock (1905, § 61, 81).
Dative CNs never have a resultative interpretation (never act as arguments), and very rarely have a manner one (like adverbial CNs). What these constructions convey, instead, is emphasis on the predicate’s meaning. We believe that, at this stage, and perhaps due to the influence of the Hebrew model, cognate datives specialize in the expression of focus. They can be straightforwardly compared to the parallel Biblical Hebrew constructions studied by Pereltsvaig (2002) (cf. [2b]). This analysis accounts for the optionality of modification (and, in fact, its scarcity) with dative CNs. As seen in Section 3, modification is obligatory only with adjunct CNs expressing manner; it is optional not only with argumental CNs, but also with another type of adjunct CNs, focused adverbials.

In order to substantiate our observations, we performed a corpus study on the LXX and the NT, taking as our point of departure the list of 51 cognate dative constructions in Conybeare & Stock (1905, § 61). For the LXX, only idioms where the CN shares the root morpheme with the verb were considered; for the NT, 2 occurrences of thanátōi teleután lit. ‘to die of death’, where the verb is not etymologically related to the noun, were added to the small corpus. We analyzed in detail all attestations in the LXX of 21 constructions selected from those listed by Conybeare & Stock, collecting a total of 105 examples of dative CNs. Of the 51 dative constructions found in the LXX by Conybeare & Stock, 10 occur also in the NT, together with 2 additional dative CNs first found in the NT. These 12 expressions yield a total of 13 examples.

Table 1 displays our list of 21 constructions (dative + infinitive), sorted according to the predicate’s transitive/intransitive nature, in order to document the range of contexts and to show that dative CNs can appear with any kind of predicate. Notice that we listed a predicate as transitive as soon as we found a transitive use. We give both a literal rendering and the actual interpretation in context provided by translations of the American Standard Bible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>akoéi akoúeín ‘listen with listening’ = ‘surely listen’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thanátōi thanatōún ‘put to death by death’ = ‘surely put to death’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kakíai kakóûn ‘maltreat with badness’ = ‘treat cruelly’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aloiphêi exaleíphein ‘erase with erasure’ = ‘utterly blot out’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katárais katarâsthai ‘curse with curses’ = ‘curse’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aphanismoi aphanízein ‘destroy with destruction’ = ‘utterly destroy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lēˊthēi (epi)latheîn ‘forget with forgetfulness’ = ‘completely forget’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bdelúgmati bdelússein ‘abominate with abomination’ = ‘utterly abhor’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lithois lithoboleîn ‘stone with stones’ = ‘stone to death’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 For research on the Septuagint, we used the Biblos searchable text (http://mlbible.com/genesis/1–1.htm), for the New Testament we were able to benefit from the PROIEL corpus (http://www.hf.uio.no/ifikk/english/research/projects/proiel). Translations come from the New American Standard Bible.
6 Instances where the cognate construction occurs in the form of a relative clause were not considered.
**Table 1: Dative CNs in the Septuagint**

In this small but representative corpus, we checked for three criteria: (i) the position of the dative with respect to the verb; (ii) the presence of modification; (iii) the presence of determiners. Results are summarized in Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Modification</th>
<th>Determiner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre-V</td>
<td>post-V</td>
<td>non-mod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septuagint</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>83 (79%)</td>
<td>22 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Test.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12 (92%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Corpus study on dative CNs**

Dative CNs are mostly pre-V, in the great majority of cases at the beginning of the sentence (cf. [17]); typically, the dative immediately precedes the verb; sometimes a second-position particle intervenes (cf. [17a]). When the verb is negated, the dative systematically precedes the negation ou or mē [20]. All this evidence points to a very high structural position for the dative constituent. This corresponds to the situation in Hebrew, where the parallel cognate structures occur either sentence-initially or immediately after C⁰ (Pereltsvaig 2002).

[20] BG

\[
\text{thanatói } \text{dè } \text{ou } \text{thanatósomén } \text{se} \\
\text{death:dat ptc neg kill:act.fut.ipl 2sg.acc}
\]

‘Yet surely we will not kill you.’ (Jd. 15:13)

When instead the dative is in post-V position, other constituents (e.g. subject, object, PPs) can occur between it and the verb; postposition is particularly frequent with certain idioms, e.g. sálpiggi salpízein ‘to blow a trumpet’, lithoiś lithoboleīn ‘to stone’.

[ 69 ]
As for modification, there are no cases of pre-V datives containing a modifier: in the few cases in our corpus where the dative is modified, the dative is always post-V:

‘And you shall die the death of those who are slain in the heart of the seas.’ (Ez. 28.8)

‘It will come about also in that day that a great trumpet will be blown.’ (Is. 27.13)

‘And Hezekiah wept bitterly.’ (2 Kings 20.3; Is. 38.3)

As noted by Blass & Debrunner (1961, § 153), when the cognate expresses manner modification, i.e., occurs with a modifier, it is typically in the accusative. A minimal pair is provided in [25]:

‘They rejoiced exceedingly with great joy.’ (Mt. 2.10)

‘And [the friend of the groom] hearing him, rejoices greatly because of the bridegroom’s voice.’ (Jo 3.29)

In sum, only rare instances (less than 8% of the entire corpus) are found where dative CNs express manner modification.

Moving to determiners, all cases but one (in the NT) of pre-V dative CNs are represented by bare nouns, most often singular. Among post-V datives, 4 (17%) are accompanied by the definite article. This conforms to a cross-linguistic tendency observed by e.g. Mittwoch (1998, 320) and suggests that the nominals are non-referential and in a predicative position.

A remarkable feature emerging from our corpus search concerns the nature of the propositions in which dative CNs appear: the construction is typically found in...
prophecies, commandments, and prescriptions, where the predicate is overwhelm-
ingly a future, a subjunctive or an imperative form (92 out of 105 instances in the LXX, 88\%). When the verb is in the present or past indicative, in 9 cases out of 13 the dative CN is postponed. We therefore observe that the use of non-modified da-
tive CNs in BG is somehow connected with the presence of irrealis (non-actual) mood: we propose a tentative account for this fact in the following section.

5. A Syntactic Analysis for Dative Cognates

We can conclude from our corpus search that dative CNs in BG are mostly focused adverbial cognates; in the few cases where adverbial dative cognates express man-
ner modification (i.e., are accompanied by a modifier), they are post-V. The data from BG show that the semantic contribution of pre-V cognate datives consists in expressing emphasis on the truth of the proposition, or the speaker’s certainty about it (cf. the examples and the paraphrases given in Table 1). Interestingly, this is the case especially in contexts where the event at issue has not happened yet (prophe-
cies, prescriptions) but is bound to happen, according to what the speaker believes or expects. Such contexts are a typical feature of the Biblical register, and can ac-
count for the frequency of dative CNs in BG.

We interpret the epistemic effect expressed by BG cognate datives as verum fo-
cus, i.e., as non-contrastive focus on the verb (Höhle 1992; Lohnstein & Stommel 2009; Gutzmann & Castroviejo Miró 2011). In fact, fronting of the dative CN does not result in focus on the adverbial itself, but rather in focus on the verbal predicate. This is a salient feature of verum focus, where it is not the meaning of the focused element that matters, but rather the position it occupies, which triggers broader fo-
cus on the predication. As discussed by Lohnstein & Stommel (2009) and Gutzmann & Castroviejo Miró (2011), various modality operators can interact with verum fo-
cus, accounting for its semantic effects in a number of sentence types, among which futures (‘It will be true that…’) and imperatives (‘Make it true that…’), which re-
present the majority of our examples.

Various strategies to mark verum focus are attested cross-linguistically: besides special focus markers, also fronting of a copy of the verb or of its nominalized form (e.g. in Kwa or Gbe), as well as fronting of a cognate noun. The latter strategy has been thoroughly described by Pereltsvaig (2002) for Biblical Hebrew and Pereltsvaig (1999b) for Russian. Although Pereltsvaig’s semantic account differs from ours, we believe that cognate datives in BG fall into the same category, and that Pereltsvaig’s syntactic analysis applies to them as well. We propose that the fronting of dative CNs in BG may represent an alternative strategy to verb fronting, i.e. to V1 and VSO/VOS orders (which show an increase in Koiné Greek; Horrocks 2010, 108 ff.). The position targeted by BG cognate datives is Foc(us)P, a functional category dis-

\footnote{In this respect our analysis differs from Pereltsvaig’s, according to which focused adverbial cognates express contrastive focus.}
Adverbials are well known for their ability to undergo operator movement to a focus position (cf. e.g. Cinque 1999, 19, 30 ff.). In some cases, rather than being focused themselves, they are part of a bigger focused constituent. We argue that examples like (26) are indeed cases where the whole verbal complex raises to FocP, resulting in postposition of the subject.

(26) BG

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tarakhêi} & \quad \text{tarakhthéseta}\!i \\
\text{disorder:DAT} & \quad \text{be-in-disorder:PASS.FUT.3SG} \\
\text{aporíai} & \quad \text{aporéthéseta}\!i \\
\text{crushing:DAT} & \quad \text{crush:PASS.FUT.3SG}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hê} & \quad \text{the:nom} \\
\text{gê} & \quad \text{earth:nom} \\
\text{kai} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘With breaking shall the earth be broken, with crushing shall the earth be crushed.’
(Isaiah 24.19)

Regarding the First Merge position for dative CNs, we follow Pereltsvaig (1999b; 2002) in considering dative CNs in BG an instance of secondary predication, achieved through the projection of a functional head Pred0, which is right-adjoined to the VP and assigns Case to the adverbial CN. PredP (essentially a small clause, cf. (27)) assigns oblique case: instrumental case in Russian (Bailyn & Rubin 1991), phonetically null oblique in Biblical and Modern Hebrew (Pereltsvaig 2002), dative in BG.

Adverbials realized in PredP are predicates of events (following ideas of Mittwoch 1998). In structure they parallel secondary predicates of participant arguments (see Pereltsvaig 1999b, for a thorough discussion, which we cannot provide here). According to Pereltsvaig, a PRO is in the Spec,PredP position in both secondary predicates and adverbial CNs, but in the case of adverbial CNs PRO is controlled by the event argument of the main predicate, whereas with secondary predicates it is controlled by the participant argument. For Pereltsvaig, the event argument is in the Spec,EventP position that dominates VP (28).

[27] PredP (Pereltsvaig 2002)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PredP} \\
\text{PROi/e} \quad \text{Pred'} \\
\text{Pred} \quad \text{NP} \\
\emptyset \quad \text{secondary predicate} \\
\text{or adverbial CN}
\end{array}
\]

\[8\text{ Due to space limitations we leave open the issue whether in BG a further movement to Force / C is possible in the case of imperatives.} \]
Positions for BG dative CNs (from Pereltsvaig 2002, modified)

Pereltsvaig’s analysis allows for manner/non-focused and focused CNs to be first-merged in the post-V PredP. Manner CNs surface in this position, while focused CNs raise to Foc in the left periphery.

6. Conclusion

The following generalization emerges from the CG and BG data presented (cf. Figure 2):9 all three types envisaged by Pereltsvaig’s typology in Figure 1 appear in Greek (both CG and BG). Case is distributed as follows: argumental CNs cannot be in the dative and adverbial focus-fronted CNs cannot be in the accusative. Our corpus work has shown the productivity of dative CNs in BG. The majority of them can be interpreted as a strategy to express focus on the predicate: an adverbial, non-modified CN in the dative case is fronted to the left periphery, and the resulting semantic effect is emphasis on the truth of the proposition.

9 In the Figure, > means that CNs decrease, < that CNs increase from CG to Koiné Greek.
Pereltsvaig’s (1999a; 2002) generalizations that (i) no language is known that has only adverbial CNs (while there exist languages that only have argumental CNs), and (ii) that in languages with rich case morphology, adverbial focused CNs are non-accusative, are both supported by the Greek data.
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