

Specimen

Inhalt / Contents / Sommaire

Aufsätze / Articles

Stella Merlin:
Anaphora, deixis, and word order.
 Syntactic patterns and constraints in Ancient Greek grammatical theory 1

Carmen Quijada Van den Berghe:
 La doctrina de Bonifacio Sotos Ochando sobre la enseñanza de la
 pronunciación española en Francia durante el primer tercio del siglo XIX 21

Esteban Lidgett:
 Caracterizaciones de la oración en la gramática escolar argentina (1863–1922) 43

Marta Sánchez-Saus Laserna:
 Los orígenes de la disponibilidad léxica.
 El *Français Fondamental* — antecedentes, elaboración y recepción 73

Carlos Assunção, Carla Araújo:
 Para uma história da Semântica Lexical — o olhar de Geeraerts 101

Alfonso Zamorano Aguilar:
 Series textuales, edición de textos y gramaticografía.
 Teoría, aplicación, constantes y variables 115

Diskussion / Discussion / Débat

Doyle Calhoun:
 What gets lost in the digital (re-)presentation of older linguistic texts?
 Digital editions, manuscript reality, and lessons from the digital humanities
 for the history of linguistics..... 137

Kurzrezensionen / Short Reviews / Notes de lecture 167

ISSN 0939–2815

Specimen

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft



27.1 (2017)

Specimen

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft

Begründet von
Klaus D. Dutz & Peter Schmitter

Herausgegeben von
Gerda Haßler (Potsdam)
Angelika Rüter (Münster)

in Verbindung mit

David Cram (Oxford), Miguel Ángel Esparza Torres (Madrid),
Stefano Gensini (Rom), Ludger Kaczmarek (Borgholzhausen),
Masataka Miyawaki (Kawasaki), Jan Noordegraaf (Amsterdam),
Jacques-Philippe Saint-Gérand (Clermont-Ferrand)

Die *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* sind zugleich Organ der Gesellschaften “Studienkreis ‘Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft’” und “Werkverband ‘Geschiedenis van de Taalkunde’”.

Veröffentlicht werden nur Originalbeiträge. Für unverlangt eingesandte Manuskripte wird keine Haftung übernommen. Die Verfasser tragen für ihre Beiträge die Verantwortung.

© 2017 Nodus Publikationen. — Die in dieser Zeitschrift veröffentlichten Artikel sind urheberrechtlich geschützt. Nachdruck oder Vervielfältigung, auch auszugsweise, verboten.

Gedruckt auf chlor- und säurefreiem, alterungsbeständigem Papier.
Printed in Germany.

ISSN 0939–2815

Stella Merlin

Anaphora, deixis, and word order

Syntactic patterns and constraints in Ancient Greek grammatical theory

ABSTRACT

This contribution explores some particular syntactic patterns in Ancient Greek word order, concerning the relative position of determiners in the Nominal Phrase (NP). The discussion is based on ancient thought about language and about word order in language, especially focusing on two opposite perspectives: the stylistic comments provided by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1st century BC) and the grammatical theory developed by Apollonius Dyscolus (2nd century AD). The latter highlights some syntactic constraints operating in the structure of the NP, which Apollonius describes in his own metalanguage by means of the notions of *anaphora* and *deixis*. According to Apollonius, an expression such as *ὁ ἀγαθὸς ὁ ἀνὴρ (=the good the man) is impossible since *anaphora* is a property of nouns and not of adjectives or attributes, whereas *ὁ οὗτος ἀνὴρ (=the that man) is not allowed in Ancient Greek, since *deixis* is a property of pronouns, and cannot be articulated.

1. Problems and questions

Ancient Greek (hereafter AG) is often thought of as a free word order language, or at least a language which can show a certain freedom in sentence construction. This is mostly allowed by inflexional morphology: syntactic relations are first and foremost encoded in the word structure rather than in word order. However, word order variation exists and, when not motivated by semantic reasons, it has to be explained by some pragmatic or even syntactic constraints.

I wish to acknowledge Paola Cotticelli, Federico Giusfredi, Roberta Meneghel and Alfredo Rizza for helpful discussion, comments and suggestions. I am grateful to Stephanos Matthaios for the valuable feedback on the main content, to Maria Chriti for the guidance in describing Modern Greek adjectives, and to all the participants to the Berlin Colloquium of the “Studienkreis ‘Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft’” (SGdS), July 16–17, 2015, for their insightful questions. I am thankful to Daniele Artomi and Paola Maria Caleffi, who helped me to improve my English at different stages of preparing the manuscript.

The discussion about word order is typically related to the order of major constituents, namely Subject, Object and Verb.¹ The following examples show that, for instance, in Herodotus's prose, three different word orders, namely SVO² in a), OVS in b) and VOS in c) are attested within the first two chapters:³

- a) οὕτω μὲν Πέρσῃσι λέγουσι γενέσθαι, καὶ διὰ τὴν Ἰλίου ἄλωσιν εὐρίσκο-
υσι σφίσι εἶοσαν τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ἐχθρῆς τῆς ἐς τοὺς Ἕλληνας. (Hdt. I. 5,1)
- b) οὕτω μὲν Ἴουν ἐς Αἴγυπτον ἀπικέσθαι λέγουσι Πέρσῃσι, οὐκ ὡς Ἕλλη-
νές, καὶ τῶν ἀδικημάτων πρῶτον τοῦτο ἀρξάει. (Hdt. I. 2,1)
- c) τελευτήσαντος δὲ Κύρου παρέλαβε τὴν βασιληίην Καμβύσης (Hdt. II
1,1)

Furthermore, the analysis of word order may be approached at the phrase level, investigating the order of parts of speech within a phrase. Looking more closely, for example, to the position of the definite article in the NP, both τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὄνομα 'the name of men' (lit. 'the of the men name') (Pl. *Cra.* 399b.6) and ἡ θέσις τῶν ὀνομάτων 'the imposition of the names' (*id.* 401b.10) are attested in classical prose. We can infer that structures such as τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὄνομα and the possible alternative τὸ ὄνομα τῶν ἀνθρώπων have the same semantic content, although their word order is different. By contrast, a sentence such as σημαίνει τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα 'this name means' (*id.* 399c.1) could be arranged differently, for example τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα σημαίνει, but not *σημαίνει τὸ τοῦτο ὄνομα, because of the presence of the demonstrative pronoun τοῦτο (cf. § 5.1.2).

This having been said, the question is whether there may have been any discussion in ancient times about the difference between such structures and thus about word order.

- 1) As for Modern Greek, see WALS: no dominant word order (table 81A), although the two main structures are SVO and VSO (table 81B). Based on Mackridge (1985).
- 2) With respect to these examples, the label of subject is syntactically given to the nominative form on the basis of the grammatical agreement with the verb, while the infinitive verbs — γενέσθαι in a) and ἀπικέσθαι in b) — function as an object. However, it is well known that the opposition subject vs. object is not equivalent to the opposition topic vs. comment (or theme vs. rheme respectively): in example c) the nominative or grammatical subject belongs to the comment, since the topic seems to be here represented by the accusative or grammatical object.
- 3) Abbreviations for Greek authors follow LSJ. Text corresponds to Teubner edition (see Hdt. in references). Translations by G. C. Macaulay (London, Macmillan, 1890): a) **The Persians** for their part **say that** things happened thus; and they conclude that the beginning of their quarrel with the Hellenes was on account of the taking of Ilium; b) In this manner **the Persians report that** Io came to Egypt, not agreeing therein with the Hellenes, and this they say was the first beginning of wrongs; c) When Cyrus had brought his life to an end, **Cambyses received the royal power** in succession.

Investigating word order in ancient grammars and other texts is not without difficulties. The first problem⁴ is represented by terminology: is there a term or expression indicating word order? Regrettably, there is not. Therefore, where must we investigate?

In general, the main idea is transmitted by the word τάξις 'order' and this can be a first clue. The compound terms σύνταξις (*ordinatio*, syntax) as well as σύνθεσις (*compositio*, composition) must have some relations with the idea of word order, although their meaning was complex and manifold.⁵ It is also worth remembering that comments on word order can be found both in texts on rhetoric or stylistics and in grammars, as a part of a broader discussion variably focused on the literary genre (e.g. D.H. *Comp.* III) or the parts-of-speech system (e.g. A.D. *Synt.* 17) or the word order within the speech (e.g. passages by Apollonius commented later; cf. also e.g. A.D. *Synt.* 344 ff. on word order in the infinitive clauses).⁶

2. State of the art

Modern⁷ studies have shown different approaches and various solutions to the problem of AG word order. One of the first comprehensive contributions was Weil's seminal work on ancient languages compared to modern ones (Weil [1844] 1978). Reference grammars of AG⁸ presented word order in terms of frequency and stylistic properties of selected authors.

Dover 1960 was the first monograph specifically devoted to the word order in AG language: the starting point is the detection of some conditions which can justify the definition of a sequence as right and normal in order despite "some degree of indeterminacy" (Dover 1960: 2–3). Dik's research (see Dik 1995 on Herodotus and Dik 2007 on the tragic dialogue) accounts for word order in terms of pragmatics, interestingly applying such analysis both to prose

- 4) Actually, the very first problem when dealing with languages that are no longer spoken is represented by the "poverty of evidence", since data are limited to the written texts transmitted by the tradition.
- 5) For a complete discussion on the terms related to the idea of order in language, namely σύνταξις, σύνθεσις, παράταξις, ὑπόταξις, see Cotticelli-Kurras (*forthc.* a & b) and the references therein.
- 6) Cf. Scaglione (1972: 7): "Sentence structure and word order, which now appear to us a set of problems belonging to linguistics and eventually bordering on stylistics, have really evolved at the borderline between several disciplines or, shall we say, at the crossroads where the three liberal arts of the Trivium converged. This province of syntax concerning both language and the intensive use of language that we call style, has, through the centuries, shown itself to partake of grammar, logic, and rhetoric as well."
- 7) Saying 'modern' I refer with a very broad sense to the studies appeared in the last two centuries.
- 8) See e.g. Gildersleeve (1900), Smyth (1920), Cooper (1998).

and poetry. Devine/Stephens (2000) accounts for hyperbaton and phrasal discontinuity in Greek prose. A theoretical discussion about aims and methods in analysing AG word order is offered by Cuzzolin (1997), who collected and discussed the VS order in two selected texts of the *Corpus Hippocraticum* (Περὶ ἰερῆς νόσου and Ἐπιδημία).⁹

Within the framework of Functional Discourse Grammar, Bakker (2009) has offered an extensive analysis of word order variation in the NP focusing on the analysis of Herodotus's corpus. The issue of the structure of NP is also investigated in the framework of generative grammar, e.g. by Alexiadou/Haegeman/Stavrou (2007) who collected data from different modern languages, including (Modern) Greek. In the same framework, AG word order is investigated by Beschi (2011) from a cartographic approach, starting from Thucydides.

3. A metalinguistic perspective

Following a metalinguistic perspective, the present paper aims to contribute to the discussion on word order in NP from the point of view of the linguistic theory transmitted by Apollonius Dyscolus (A.D.), probably the most influential grammarian of ancient times, who lived in Alexandria in Egypt in the 2nd century AD. The linguistic perspective is particularly visible in comparison with another ancient approach to the same problem, namely the stylistic tradition, here represented and discussed starting from the example of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (D.H.), a Greek historian and teacher of rhetoric living in Rome in the 1st century BC.

The present paper deals with a micro-syntactic aspect of AG word order that concerns some particular patterns in the NP related to the position of articles and demonstrative pronouns according to ancient linguistic theories on language.¹⁰ In the first part (§4) I will briefly comment some passages by Dionysius, whereas in the second one (§5) I will describe two particular examples from the work of Apollonius in which the syntactic constraints are explained on the basis of his specific theory of *anaphora* and *deixis*. Then I will

⁹ As a general introduction to the problem of word order in AG and for a recent bibliography, see also the entry 'Word Order' in the Encyclopedia EAGLL (2014: 532–539). A list of less recent bibliographical references is provided by Dover (1960: ix–xiii). For an extended summary of different approaches across centuries, see the historical survey by Scaglione (1972). For a selected and critical survey of the studies, see Dik (1995: 259–282) and Bakker (2009: 10–32).

¹⁰ Cf. Parenti (1997) on the adnominal use of demonstrative pronouns and their co-occurrence with the article and Biraud (1983) on the function of different determiners in the syntax of the NP.

attempt to derive a general principle (p. 16, Fig. 1.) and provide some conclusions.

4. The stylistic tradition: Dionysius of Halicarnassus

Dionysius of Halicarnassus extensively deals with the topic of word order in his treatise Περὶ συνθέσεως ὀνομάτων, transmitted with the Latin title *De compositione verborum*, which is variably translated in English as *On Literary Composition* or *The arrangement of words*. The opening definition of the term σύνθεσις is crucial in the organisation and understanding of this work.

Comp. II. 1¹¹

ἡ σύνθεσις ἔστι μὲν, ὥσπερ καὶ αὐτὸ δηλοῖ τοῦνομα, ποιά τις θέσις **παρ' ἄλληλα** τῶν τοῦ λόγου μοριῶν, ἃ δὴ καὶ στοιχειὰ τινες τῆς λέξεως καλοῦσιν.

Composition is, as the very name indicates, a certain arrangement of the parts of speech, or elements of diction, as some call them.

In other terms, according to Dionysius, a linguistic expression is (and needs to be) structured according to some principles that enable to determine the particular relative (see *παρ' ἄλληλα* 'in respect to one another' highlighted in the text) position (θέσις) of the elements. Such elements are the parts of speech, namely the words, which are combined in a progressively complex structure first in members, or *cola* (κῶλα), then in sentences (περιόδοι), finally in the whole text (λόγος).

Comp. II. 4

πλὴν ἢ γε τῶν πρώτων εἶτε τριῶν ἢ τεττάρων εἶθ' ὄσων δὴ ποτε ὄντων μερῶν πλοκὴ καὶ παράθεσις τὰ λεγόμενα ποιεῖ **κῶλα**, ἔπειθ' ἢ τούτων ἀρμονία τὰς καλουμένας συμπληροῖ **περιόδους**, αὐταὶ δὲ τὸν σύμπαντα τελειοῦσι **λόγον**. ἔστι δὴ τῆς συνθέσεως ἔργα **τὰ τε ὀνόματα οἰκείως θεῖναι παρ' ἄλληλα** καὶ τοῖς κῶλοις ἀποδοῦναι τὴν προσήκουσαν ἀρμονίαν καὶ ταῖς περιόδοις διαλαβεῖν εὐ τὸν λόγον.

Enough to say that the combination or juxtaposition of this primary parts, be they three, or four, or whatever may be their number, forms the so-called "members" or **clauses** of a sentence. Further, the fitting together of these clauses constitutes what are termed the "**periods**", and these make up the complete **discourse**. The function of composition is to put words together in an appropriate order, to assign a suitable connexion to clauses and to distribute the whole discourse properly into periods.

¹¹ Text follows Budé edition (see D.H. in references). Translations are by W. R. Roberts (London, Macmillan, 1910). Cf. the French translation by Germaine Aujac and Maurice Lebel in D.H. and the more recent Italian translation by Francesco Donadi (Donadi/Marchiori 2014).

As is well known, such compositional structure of λόγος is a recurrent idea in the ancient thought on language.¹² In Dionysius the hierarchical structure consists of the units relevant for the rhetorical analysis: letters, syllables,¹³ words, clauses, periods and discourse (see De Jonge 2008: 50–53).

According to De Jonge (2008: 251–328) Dionysius’s observations on word order must be taken into account starting from his views on nature (φύσις) and natural style (τὸ φυσικόν, ‘the natural’). The idea of a natural word order is also related to another two essential terms, namely ἀκολουθία ‘orderly sequence, natural order’ and κατάλληλος ‘congruent’. The abstract noun ἡ καταλληλότης, -ητος ‘correct construction, congruent correspondence, right congruence, correct agreement’ is formed on the adjective κατάλληλος, -ον, ‘correspondent, parallel (of lines), appropriate, rightly constructed, congruent, well-arranged, in good order’ (LSJ). Being part of the metalinguistic lexicon of both D.H. and A.D. (cf. § 5), these terms probably originated from their common philosophical background represented by the Stoics.¹⁴

In the fourth chapter (see *Comp.* IV. 19–21), D.H. mentions the work of Chrysippus on the order of the parts of speech (Περὶ τῆς συντάξεως τῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν), so as to set his own work within the previous literature about that topic. However, as D.H. himself reports, Chrysippus’s analysis is oriented primarily to the comprehension of true and false sentences, possible and impossible meaning. Although D.H. shares with Stoics the idea of natural order, at the same time he judges the Stoic perspective, located at a logical but not aesthetical level, not useful for his stylistic purposes.

The order of the parts of speech listed in the fifth chapter (*Comp.* V. 9) testifies to his Stoic theoretical background: after observing that it is natural to put nouns before epithets, appellatives before proper names, pronouns before nouns, simple verbs before complex verbs, finite verbs before infinite verbs and so on, D.H. maintains there are a number of counterexamples for which he cannot provide an explanation. Hence, he concludes that different structures can lead to the same beauty.

Comp. V. 10

Τοτὲ μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τούτων ἐγένετο καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων αὐτοῖς ἡδεῖα ἢ σύνθεσις καὶ καλή, τοτὲ δ’ ἐκ τῶν μὴ τοιούτων ἀλλ’ ἐναντίων.

At one time charm and beauty of composition did result from these and similar collocations, at other times from collocations not of this sort but the opposite.

But, to what extent does this idea of natural order affect syntax? The answer should be searched in the previous chapter (*Comp.* IV) within the exercises of

¹² Cf. Pl. *Cra.* 424c–425a; Arist. *Po.* XX.

¹³ See Chapter XIV on letters and sounds and Chapter XV on syllables.

¹⁴ See De Jonge (2008: 273–315) for a discussion on the Stoic elements in Dionysian thought.

transposition or rewriting (μετάθεσις). In this section D.H. provides some passages of different literary genres (particularly from Homer and Herodotus) transposed in his own versions in order to show, primarily to his students, the rhetorical possibilities of discourse composition. Through such examples he also described the metrical possibilities given by word order: by changing the position of *cola*, it is possible to change the metrical structure, for instance to turn hexameters into tetrameters (*Comp.* IV. 3 on Hom. *Il.* 12. 433–35 and *Il.* 13. 392–3).

As for the syntax of the NP, it is worth taking a closer look to an example from the opening lines of the two versions of a passage of Herodotus given by D.H. in *Comp.* IV. 9 and 11.

(0) Original version (Hdt. I. 6)¹⁵

Κροῖσος ἦν Λυδὸς μὲν γένος, παῖς δ’ Αλυάττου, τύραννος δ’ ἐθνῶν τῶν ἐντὸς Ἄλυος ποταμοῦ.

(1) first version

Κροῖσος ἦν υἱὸς μὲν Αλυάττου, γένος δὲ Λυδός, τύραννος δὲ τῶν ἐντὸς Ἄλυος ποταμοῦ ἐθνῶν.

(2) second version

Αλυάττου μὲν υἱὸς ἦν Κροῖσος, γένος δὲ Λυδός, τῶν δ’ ἐντὸς Ἄλυος ποταμοῦ τύραννος ἐθνῶν.¹⁶

From a syntactical point of view it is possible to observe two variations involving NPs: the first one is the inversion of the original order of the phrase Λυδός_{NOM} (μὲν) γένος_{ACC} ‘a Lydian according to his lineage’ in γένος_{ACC} (δὲ) Λυδός_{NOM} of both the modified versions.¹⁷ As De Jonge (2008: 387) observes “The displacement of Λυδός breaks the parallelism between Λυδός, παῖς (υἱός) and τύραννος, and creates *anastrophe*”. The second variation is more complex since it involves a multiple genitive structure, whose meaning is ‘king of the nations of the internal side of the river Halis’. The most relevant observation involves the position of τῶν.

(0) ἐθνῶν_{GEN} τῶν_{DETGEN} [ἐντὸς_{PREP} [Ἄλυος ποταμοῦ]_{GEN}]

(1) τῶν_{DETGEN} [ἐντὸς_{PREP} [Ἄλυος ποταμοῦ]_{GEN}] ἐθνῶν_{GEN}

(2) τῶν_{DETGEN} (δ’) [ἐντὸς_{PREP} [Ἄλυος ποταμοῦ]_{GEN}] (τύραννος) ἐθνῶν_{GEN}

¹⁵ Cf. the discussion on the same passage in Bakker (2009: 47).

¹⁶ Roberts translates as follows: (0) Croesus was a Lydian by birth and the son of Alyattes. He was lord over all the nations on this side of the river Halis; (1) Croesus was the son of Alyattes, and by birth a Lydian. He was lord, on this side of the river Halys, over all nations; (2) Alyattes’ son was Croesus, by birth a Lydian. Lord over all nations he was, on this side of the river Halys.

¹⁷ The transposition of μὲν in δέ is triggered by the anteposition of the NP παῖς (then υἱός) Αλυάττου and arranges the system of coordinators in the whole sentence differently.

In both versions (see (1) and (2)) provided by D.H. τῶν functions as a definite article linked to the noun ἔθνῶν ‘nations’, which is significantly moved to the end of the phrase creating the typical embedded structure of AG (in (2) interrupted by the nominative τύραννος ‘king’) in which modifiers are positioned between the article (or determiner) and the correspondent noun. On the contrary, in the original passage from Herodotus, τῶν is placed after the noun and functions as the anaphor of the noun ἔθνῶν to which it is linked, adding a restrictive value (‘not all the nations, but only the nations that live in the internal side of the river Halis’).¹⁸ It is quite interesting, although only speculative, to observe that Dionysius did not substitute τῶν with a relative pronoun (which in the ancient classification of the parts of speech belonged to the same category of ἄρθρον). But in that case he would have needed an additional verb and this could be felt as beyond the scope of the *metathesis*.

As a matter of fact, the aim of the *metathesis* or transposition operated by D.H. is never to open a theoretical discussion on the syntactical possibilities of combining words in a sentence, nor to describe syntactic patterns. D.H.’s interest is primarily directed to the whole discourse and the general effect it should produce. This does not mean that single different structures cannot contribute to create a different stylistic effect — see e.g. the second version in (2) which aims to reproduce the ‘degenerate’ (ἀγεννέες) style of Hegesias — but they are not taken into account as syntactic elements, rather as components of a whole discourse. As De Jonge (2008: 390) observes in his conclusive remarks:

Dionysius’ language experiments are in no way theoretical exercises. They have a very practical aim, namely to teach the reader how to write in a correct and convincing style. In accordance with the principles of Atticism and classicism, classical literature is taken as the model for new writing; the method of metathesis shows the merits, defects and particularities of the classical examples.

The stylistic (or rhetorical) perspective adopted by D.H. highlights the virtues of literary texts and points out those properties that determine a pleasantness of the composition. The aim of the Dionysian research into the literary composition (or the word order) is the sake of beauty, which can assume the forms of naturalness, harmony, or cohesion of the parts. To conclude this section on the stylistic tradition, I will quote the following passage in which D.H. claims that the goals of composition, both in poetry and in prose, are pleasure and beauty.

Comp. X. 2

Δοκεῖ δέ μοι δύο ταῦτ’ εἶναι τὰ γενικώτατα ὧν ἐπίσθαι δεῖ τοὺς συντιθέντας μέτρα τε καὶ λόγους, ἢ τε ἡδονὴ καὶ τὸ καλόν.

¹⁸) For the use of the article with a prepositional phrase, see among others Gildersleeve (1900: § 577).

It seems to me that two essentials to be aimed by those who compose in verse and prose are **charm and beauty**.

5. A theoretical approach: the linguistic theory of Apollonius Dyscolus

On the contrary, Apollonius Dyscolus (A.D.) made some comments and remarks on the actual possibilities to combine words according to a perspective that goes beyond the sake of harmony, pleasure, and beauty, especially in his major treatise in four books on syntax, Περὶ συντάξεως, known with the Latin title of *De constructione* and the English one *On Syntax (Synt.)*.

Such linguistic perspective has in common with the stylistic tradition the idea of καταλληλότης ‘congruence’ (see § 4); however, the unit of analysis is not the whole discourse and its effects, but the internal properties of single elements. According to A.D., the principle of congruence can be applied at different linguistic levels, from the correct formation of words, following phonological and morphological criteria (e.g. αὐτή and not *οὐτή in *Synt.* 151) to the notion of person agreement (e.g. *Ἀπολλώνιος_{NOM} γράφω_{1st PERSON} in *Synt.* 159). I will not venture in the complex domain of congruence in A.D. Nevertheless, I will focus on two types of NPs in which articles and pronouns are involved and consequently on the notions of *anaphora* and *deixis*. Indeed, these examples show different possible combinations in AG NPs; they also provide more interesting impossible combinations, such as: *οἱ ἀγαθοὶ οἱ ἀνδρες or *ὁ οὗτος ἀνθρωπος, which are both labelled as incongruent and commented on by relating them to the notions of *anaphora* and *deixis*.

In order to understand the close relationship explored by A.D. between articles, pronouns, *anaphora* and *deixis*, it is worth remembering his metalanguage. In A.D.’s analysis, *anaphora* and *deixis* are interpreted as the primary features of the article (ἄρθρον) and the pronoun (ἀντωνυμία), respectively. *Anaphora* (which means ‘coming up, rising’ from the verb ἀναφέρω ‘bring up’) is the second mention, that is something that refers to a previous mentioned person or thing (e.g. *Synt.* 17); whereas *deixis* (which is ‘proof, display, exhibition’ from δείκνυμι ‘show, prove’) is the first mention, indicating a person or thing that is not recalled, but shown to the eye (e.g. *Synt.* 81). In A.D. *anaphora* and *deixis* are never confused since they are always the expression of two different procedures involving a different information structure and different syntactic constraints. However, both articles (ἄρθρα) and pronouns (ἀντωνυμῖαι) participate in the same semantic property, i.e. definiteness, which is the property of having a defined referent, namely a specific

object in the text or context to which the mode of reference (anaphoric or deictic) is directed.¹⁹

As for the description of incongruent NPs, the research question is the following: does word order create a network of syntactic constraints linked to the deictic or anaphoric nature of phrasal constituents?

5.1 Semantic and syntactic (im)possible combinations

From a modern linguistic point of view, it is impossible not to think about the notion of grammaticality. When A.D. evokes the principle of congruence, does he exactly refer to grammaticality? Or does he simply show that different constructions can lead to different meanings? Actually, both questions might have a positive answer.

Let us consider this passage from the first book of *Synt.*:

Synt. 85²⁰

οὐ παρὰ τὰς μεταθέσεις τῶν ἄρθρων καὶ τὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν γινομένης διαφορὰς τῆς φράσεως ἀποστήσεται τοῦ μὴ συμφέρεσθαι τοῖς ὀνόμασι τὰ ἄρθρα, εἴγε διαφέρει τὸ οἱ νῦν ἄνθρωποι ἀγαθοὶ εἰσι τοῦ νῦν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀγαθοὶ εἰσι, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις τολμήσει φάναι ὅτι οὐ τὸ οἱ τοῦ ἄνθρωποι ἐστὶν ἄρθρον.

It doesn't follow from the facts about transposition of articles and the resulting differences of meaning that the articles don't belong to the nouns, since there is a difference between a) 'modern men are good' and b) 'nowadays, men are good' and nobody will have the audacity to claim that *hoi* does not belong to (=it is not the article of) *anthropoi*.²¹

These two examples are inserted in a broader discussion focused on the noun-article agreement: both being congruent or possible from a syntactic point of view, these sentences show a different meaning: the NP in a) means 'the human beings of this time', while the one in b) means 'nowadays, the human beings'. Their difference, relevant at the semantic level, is determined by the syntax, namely the position of the adverb νῦν. According to the traditional linguistic description, in a) the adverb occupies the attributive position, immediately preceded by the definite article,²² while in b) it occupies the predicative position, being no longer immediately preceded by the definite article.

¹⁹) For a complete discussion on the theory of *anaphora* and *deixis* in A.D., I would refer to Merlin (2016).

²⁰) Text follows the standard edition of the *Grammatici Graeci* (see GG in references).

²¹) The translations of A.D. are essentially those of Housholder (1981), with minor variations. See also the French translation by Lallot (1997).

²²) Each parts of speech or word can occupy the attributive position, that is can be preceded by a definite article. Cf. Gildersleeve (1900: § 575): "Article with adverbs and prepositional and other expressions used as substantives. The article serves to make substantives of adverbs, pre-

By contrast, through the lines of *Synt.*, A.D. mentions some other NPs judged impossible from a syntactical point of view, such as, in *Synt.* 111: *ὁ ἀγαθὸς ὁ ἄνθρωπος THE GOOD THE MAN, *ὁ ἐμὸς ὁ δούλος THE MY THE SLAVE or *ὁ γράψας ὁ παῖς THE HAVING-WRITTEN THE CHILD instead of the correct forms ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἀγαθός 'the good man', ὁ δούλος ὁ ἐμὸς 'my slave' and ὁ παῖς ὁ γράψας 'the child who wrote'. I will discuss on such forms in the following paragraph starting from Table 1.

Hence, in some cases, congruence is related to a semantic meaning; in some others, to a syntactic meaning, which is more closely referred to the idea of necessity and, by contrast, of impossibility to have some syntactic patterns, not only for the meaning but also for the grammatical structure, which corresponds, only in this second interpretation, to the modern notion of ungrammaticality.

Moreover, a relevant example for the understanding A.D.'s deep awareness of linguistic facts is represented by the following passage:

Synt. 91

Τῇ προκειμένῃ συντάξει ἄρα διαφόρως τὰ ἄρθρα προστεθήσεται, εἰ, ὡς εἵπομεν, τὰ ἐπιφερόμενα ὀήματα πρώτης κατηγοροῦ ποιότητος. πάλιν δὲ ἔστω ὑποδείγματα τοῦ μὲν προτέρου ὁ γραμματικὸς Τρύφων ἀεῖδει (ἦν γὰρ ἀσύνετον φάναι ὁ Τρύφων γραμματικὸς ἀεῖδει)· τοῦ δὲ δευτέρου ὁ Τρύφων γραμματικὸς καλεῖται ὁ γραμματικὸς Τρύφων παρεγένετο, ὁ Τρύφων γραμματικὸς [παρ]εγένετο. καὶ σαφὲς ὅτι τὰ ὀήματα κατηγοροῦντα τοῦ ἐπιθετικοῦ εὐλόγως τὴν τοῦ ἄρθρου σύνταξιν παρῆλθετο.

In the foregoing constructions, then, the articles will be added differently according to whether [or not] the verbs used, as we have said, are of the class which predicated a quality [of some NP] for the first time. An example of the case where they are not of this class is 'the grammarian Trypho is singing' (for it would be uninterpretable to say 'Trypho as a grammarian is singing'); an example of the case where the verbs are, by contrast, of this type is 'Trypho is called a grammarian'. In the same way we oppose 'The grammarian Trypho arrived' to 'Trypho became a grammarian'. And obviously it is only logical that verbs which link adjectival predicates should reject the construction [of the adjective] with the article.

The sentence ὁ Τρύφων γραμματικὸς ἀεῖδει is uninterpretable and it seems that the use of ἀσύνετον instead of, for instance, ἀκατάλληλον 'not congruent' (cf. e.g. ἀκατάλληλως in *Synt.* 121 et al.) is not fortuitous (see also Lallot 1997, vol. II: 59, note 242). A.D. is offering here a clear explanation of the difference between the attributive and the predicative interpretation based on the position of a syntactic element which has the properties of a modifier that is γραμματικὸς in the example quoted. The sequence ὁ Τρύφων γραμματικὸς ἀεῖδει is not impossible *per se*, but it just does not make sense, since

positional phrases, and other expressions". See also the passage of Hdt. I. 6 commented here above.

it does not fit with the default predicative interpretation required by the position of the article. By contrast, if the verb is substituted with one of another class, for instance *ὀνομάζω* ‘to call’ (cf. *Synt.* 92), the same sequence will be perfectly understandable according to the predicative interpretation.

5.1.1 Constraints involving the notion of *anaphora*

Let us look now more closely to the pattern formed by article + noun + adjective in different reciprocal order. All the possibilities with and without articles which are optional are summarised in the following Table 1.

	1 (ART)	2 N / ADJ	3 (ART)	4 N / ADJ
1	οἱ	ἀγαθοὶ	∅	ἄνδρες
2	οἱ	ἄνδρες	οἱ	ἀγαθοί
3	∅	ἄνδρες	οἱ	ἀγαθοί
4	οἱ	ἄνδρες	∅	ἀγαθοί
5	∅	ἀγαθοὶ	οἱ	ἄνδρες
6	∅	ἄνδρες	∅	ἀγαθοί
7	∅	ἀγαθοὶ	∅	ἄνδρες
8	*οἱ	ἀγαθοὶ	οἱ	ἄνδρες

Table 1: Patterns in NP involving articles, adjectives and nouns

According to Gildersleeve 1900 § 609:

There are three attributive positions. The first, “ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ”, is the most simple, natural, and straightforward, and is briefer (“σύντομος”) than the second, “ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἀγαθός”, which is more deliberate, and somewhat more rhetorical, pompous (“ὀγκώδης”), passionate. The third position, “ἀνὴρ ὁ ἀγαθός”, is the epanorthotic, self-corrective, or slipshod position. In prose, it produces an effect of familiar ease. In poetry, as the substantive is more frequently anarthrous, the difference between “ἀνὴρ ὁ ἀγαθός” and “ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἀγαθός” cannot be insisted on. [...]

This grammatical entry continues with the frequency data recorded in the main authors.²³ In the first footnote Gildersleeve linked this discussion on the order

²³) For instance, in the section devoted to the *oratores attici*, Gildersleeve reports: “In the case of the adjective possessive pronoun, according to statistics furnished by Dr. Alfred W. Mildner, the first attributive position occurs 1102 times, the second 543 times, and the third only 10 times. It will thus be seen that the second position, on an average, occurs only half as often as the first, and that the third position is very rare”. As for Homer: “The first position is common enough. The second position, according to Krüger, is wanting. The third position, though not uncommon with other adjectives, is rare with the possessive pronoun.”.

of modifiers to Arist. *Rh.* 3.6 (1407 b, 26–37). The examples given are “τῆς ἡμετέρας γυναικός” for “συντομία” (conciseness) and “τῆς γυναικὸς τῆς ἡμετέρας” for “ὄγκος” (loftiness). Therefore, this statement does not involve any theoretical discussion, since “Aristotle does not discuss word order variation in the NP in this passage, but only wants to teach his reader to develop a lofty style” (Bakker 2009: 10 n. 1).

According to the distinction based on the position of the article (i.e. whether the adjective is immediately preceded by the article or not) patterns 1 to 3 show an attributive structure as well as pattern *8, judged ungrammatical by A.D. *Synt.* 111; patterns 4 and 5 show a predicative structure, whereas for patterns 6 and 7 it is actually not possible to establish any attributive or predicative structure at the NP level since the article is missing.²⁴ However, it would be possible to assume a pragmatic distinction of salience or prominence, according to which the first word is the relevant one and serves as a starting point for the construction of the whole sentence. In general, οἱ ἀγαθοὶ ἄνδρες (1) and ἀγαθοὶ ἄνδρες without article (7) are unmarked and convey a neutral status of the adjective relative to the noun; ἄνδρες ἀγαθοί (6) is also unmarked, but the noun is more important than the adjective, whereas οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ ἀγαθοί (2) is marked and conveys separateness of the two constituents, adjective distinct from noun.²⁵

Looking at Table 1, one wonders, beyond considerations on frequency (see Gildersleeve 1900) why the pattern in *8 is impossible.²⁶ Furthermore, as A.D. observes, this is also true for similar patterns involving every part of speech that occurs in adjectival or attributive position, such as: *ὁ ἐμὸς ὁ δοῦλος with a possessive adjective or *ὁ γράψας ὁ παῖς with a participle (*Synt.* 111) mentioned above. Do these examples show any relations with the notions of *anaphora* and *deixis* as they are described by A.D.?

²⁴) We should bear in mind that the distinction between attributive or predicative construction does not immediately result from the analysis of the attributive or predicative structure at the NP level, but only considering the whole sentence, in particular which kind of verb follows (cf. *Synt.* 91 discussed above).

²⁵) Those considerations are based on the document “Word Order in Ancient Greek (especially Attic Prose) from the Ancient Greek Tutorials (<http://atticgreek.org>) created by Donald Mastronarde as complementary content for use with *Introduction to Attic Greek, Second Edition* (University of California Press 2013). For a complete discussion on the articulation of NP constituents, see Bakker (2009: 215–286).

²⁶) It is worth noting that such pattern is completely acceptable in Modern Greek. The pattern ART + ADJ + ART + NOUN is opposed to the predicative structure such as ADJ + ART + NOUN with respect to the value of the adjective: the former, defined as *επιθετικός προσδιορισμός*, i.e. ‘adjectival qualifier’, gives an emphatic permanent qualification to the noun, while the latter, described as a *κατηγορηματικός προσδιορισμός*, i.e. a ‘categorical qualifier’, give a transitory qualification. See also Alexiadou (2014: 20) who quoted the example *to oreo to vivlio* THE NICE THE BOOK > ‘the nice book’.

In order to answer to this core question following the Apollonian meta-linguistic system, it will be worth searching again within the lines of *Synt*.

Synt. 111

ἐπεὶ γὰρ τὰ ἐπιθετικώτερον ἀκουόμενα φέρεται ἐπὶ τὰ ὑποκειμένα, οὐ μὴν τὰ ὑποκειμένα πάντως ἐπὶ τὰ ἐπιθετικά, εἶγε τὸ ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἐπιζητεῖ τὸ λόγιος, τὸ γε μὴν λόγιος τὸ ἄνθρωπος, συμβαίνει καὶ τὴν συνοῦσαν ἀναφορὰν ἐν τῷ ὁ λόγιος συμφέρεται ἐπὶ τὸ ἄνθρωπος.

What is heard adjectivally always modifies the substantive head-noun, never vice versa, the substantive modifying the adjective, because, [in the phrase *ho lógiος ánthropos* ('the learned man')] the word *ánthropos* ('man') does not **require** *lógiος* [to complete its sense], but *lógiος* does require *ánthropos*; so it comes about that the *anaphora* implicit in *ho lógiος* applies to *ánthropos* [i.e. it is a man who has been identified, not a particular chunk of 'learned'].

Here Apollonius provides a philosophical explanation: it is not the substance that 'searches for, requires' (ἐπιζητεῖ) the accident, but is the accident that requires the substance.²⁷ In other terms, the noun requires the epitheton, which cannot in turn requires the noun. Thus, it would be wrong to consider such explanation only in linear terms: the construction does not only involve the sequence of elements, since if that were the case, it would not take into account the grammatical (=correct) patterns in which the accident still precedes the noun, as in 1, 5 and 7. This is why the philosophical explanation is insufficient and needs to be completed by the syntactic one, based on some hierarchical principles.

Coming back to ungrammatical examples such as *ὁ ἀγαθὸς ὁ ἄνθρωπος, *ὁ ἐμὸς ὁ δούλος or *ὁ γράψας ὁ παῖς, the answer is eventually given by the notion of *anaphora*, which is primarily the property to refers to a previous mentioned person or thing. Why is it not possible to have an articulated adjective (that is, any "adjectival" element preceded by an article) before an articulated noun? Because, A.D. said, the article does not belong to the adjective but to the noun.²⁸ Another example provides a further clarification: as for ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἐκείνου 'the father (the) of him' (*Synt*. 85) A.D. claims that both articles are referred to πατήρ. If the articulated adjective (or the attribute) were placed before the noun (i.e. as it were *ὁ ἐκείνου ὁ πατήρ '*the of him the father'), the article would anaphorically recall something (in that case πατήρ) that has not been mentioned yet, which is impossible.

²⁷) The sequence of *substance* and *accidents* represents a further point of contact between Dionysius and Apollonius, originating from their common Stoic background. See De Jonge (2008: 279) and other passages.

²⁸) It is interesting to observe that A.D. attributes to the adjectives a peculiar syntactic behaviour even though they belong to the same word class in his part-of-speech system, being a subclass of the noun.

5.2 Constraints involving the notion of *deixis*

As for the constraints based on the notion of *deixis*, it is worth starting with a fundamental claim on the nature of *deixis*.

Synt. 136

φύσει γοῦν οὔσαι δεικτικαὶ καὶ τὸ ἀντικείμενον ἄρθρον τῆ συντάξει οὐ παραλαμβάνουσιν.

These forms [= the deictic (or demonstrative) pronouns ὄδε, οὗτος, ἐκεῖνο] being inherently deictic, are never preceded by the article, whose syntax is in conflict with them.²⁹

This claim could be easily verified on the basis of linguistic data. In AG different pronouns lead to different structures: a sequence such as οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος is allowed, whereas the sequence *ὁ οὗτος ἄνθρωπος is not. But substituting the demonstrative with the anaphoric pronoun, the sequence ὁ αὐτός ἄνθρωπος is allowed as well. These examples show, first of all, that not all pronouns behave in the same way and that αὐτός is not the same kind of pronouns as οὗτος, since the construction with a preceding article is allowed for the former (αὐτός) and forbidden for the latter (οὗτος).

Since the main feature of the article is the *anaphora*, A.D. describes the sequence ὁ αὐτός ἄνθρωπος as a double *anaphora* (*Synt*. 82 δις ἀναφέρεται 'it makes the *anaphora* twice'). The pronoun αὐτός is an anaphoric pronoun, which can be preceded by an article, or, using A.D.'s lexicon, can be articulated. Conversely, οὗτος, being primarily and inherently a deictic pronoun, like ἐκεῖνος, cannot be articulated,³⁰ which means that it cannot occupy the attributive position.

5.2 A general rule for syntactic constraints

The article has an anaphoric value by definition, since the main property of the article is the *anaphora* (e.g. *Synt*. 25.9). On the one side, anaphoric pronouns are those pronouns which can be articulated, that is to be constructed with an article (=preceded by an article). When a part of speech is preceded by an article, it occupies the so called attributive position. On the other side, deictic pronouns are those pronouns which cannot be articulated. Consequently, deictic pronouns cannot occupy the attributive position.

²⁹) The translation is mine. Cf. Householder's translation: "In fact, [these two words i.e. οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος] being inherently deictic, are never preceded by the article, which is inconsistent with *deixis*".

³⁰) Demonstratives pronouns can be used anaphorically when they are linked to a post-positive article which corresponds in the ancient terminology to a relative pronoun, even without never occupying an attributive position.

The metalinguistic description provided by A.D. can be illustrated as in the following scheme (from Brandenburg 2005: 202 ff.)³¹



Fig. 1: Zeta Scheme for syntactic constraints

In other words, an element that involves the notion of *deixis* cannot be introduced by an article. As a consequence, the deictic element has to be outside the NP sequence article + noun, occupying, according to the traditional terminology, the predicative position.³² Conversely, if any part of speech or word is introduced by an article, it cannot be deictic. As for the elements involving the notion of *anaphora*, they can stay both within or outside the NP sequence article + noun.

Coming back to the starting question (does the word order create a network of syntactic constraints linked to the deictic or anaphoric nature of phrasal constituents?) it is now possible to answer that the syntactic constraint within NP investigated through these examples, being represented by the possibility to occupy an attributive (or adjectival) position or not, forces a deictic constituent to be placed outside the NP sequence article + noun. As a result, word order underlies the deictic or anaphoric nature of words.

6. Conclusion

Different observations originated in distant times, far away from us and from each other, have shown that various perspectives are possible in the investigation of word order. On the one side the beauty of a whole composition sought by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1st century BC), whereas on the other side the syntactic rules determining the correctness of any linguistic expression described by Apollonius Dyscolus (2nd century AD). Although they have much in common (e.g. the idea of naturalness and completeness) their aims cannot by any means lead to a unique explanatory principle.

³¹) This kind of representation is derived from the “Zeta-förmigen” schemes conceived by Brandenburg (2005) with the aim to describe different aspects of the relation between form and function in the classification of pronouns provided by A.D. Here the same scheme is successfully applied to other aspects of the Apollonian linguistic theory.

³²) Parenti (1997: 178 ff.) discussed this definition and preferred the denomination of ‘apposition’ (*nesso appositivo*) because of the incompatibility between the predicative and the referential function: «[...] il predicato è per definizione non referenziale, mentre il Dimostrativo è necessariamente dotato di referenzialità».

The idea that AG is a free word order language is challenged in many respects. First of all, although different sequences and various combinations are thought to transmit the same referential content, e.g. who the participants of an action are, some pragmatic distinction must to be involved (see examples from Herodotus in § 1). Furthermore, word order can be linked to different possible interpretations of sentences (e.g. the discussion about the default predicative interpretation in § 5.1). Finally, not every combination is allowed according to the syntactic (grammatical) rules of AG (e.g. *ὁ οὗτος ἄνθρωπος described in § 5.1.2).

In particular for the phrasal level, the analysis of the micro-syntax of NP constituents has shown that, interpreting Apollonius’s theoretical system, word order is given both by semantic and syntactic reasons. The position of the definite article determines not only the interpretation of sentences — in relation to the predicative or attributive construction — but also the syntactic distribution of different kind of determiners: on the one side, articles and anaphoric pronouns sharing the feature of *anaphora*, on the other one, deictic (or demonstrative) ones having the property of *deixis*.

The complex topic of word order is far from being solved at a unique level of description, since it involves, as its historical interest testimonies, both style and grammar, both semantics and syntax, both choices and constraints.

Stella Merlin
Dipartimento di Culture e Civiltà
Polo Zanotto
Viale dell’Università, 4
I-37129 Verona
Italia
eMail: stella.merlin@univr.it

References

- A.D. Apollonius Dyscolus → GG
- Alexiadou, Artemis
2014 *Multiple determiners and the structure of DPs*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Alexiadou, Artemis / Haegeman, Liliane / Stavrou, Melita
2008 *Noun Phrase in the Generative Perspective*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
- Bakker, Stéphanie J.
2009 *The noun phrase in ancient Greek: a functional analysis of the order and articulation of NP constituents in Herodotus*. Leiden: Brill.
- Beschi, Fulvio
2011 *Verso un approccio cartografico allo studio dell'ordine delle parole nella lingua greca: il caso di Thuc. VII, 1-10*. PhD Dissertation, University of Padova. <http://paduaresearch.cab.unipd.it/3386>
- Biraud, Michèle
1983 "Syntaxe des démonstratifs en attique classique". *L'Information Grammaticale* 17.1: 42-46.
- Cooper, Guy L.
1998 *Attic Greek prose syntax*. University of Michigan Press. [Revision of K. W. Krüger's *Griechische Sprachlehre für Schulen*. Berlin 1873].
- Cotticelli-Kurras, Paola
forthc. a "'Syntaxis' oder 'Hypotaxis'? Ein spannendes Rollenspiel durch die Jahrhunderte". *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft*. 27.2 (2017).
forthc. b "Zur Entstehung von grammatischen Begriffen in der griechischen Terminologie und ihrer Weiterverwendung. Σύνταξις und verwandte". *Festschrift zum 85. Geburtstag von Klaus Strunk*. Hrsg. v. P. A. Mumm.
- Cuzzolin, Pierluigi
1997 "A proposito dell'ordine VS in greco antico". *Studi di linguistica greca, II*. A cura di Emanuele Banfi. Pavia: Franco Angeli, 71-105.
- De Jonge, Caspar
2008 *Between grammar and rhetoric: Dionysius of Halicarnassus on language, linguistics, and literature*. Leiden: Brill.
- Devine, A. M. / Stephens, Laurence D.
2000 *Discontinuous syntax: hyperbaton in Greek*. Oxford: OUP.
- D.H. *Denys d'Halicarnasse. Opuscules rhétoriques III. La composition stylistique*. Éd. par Germaine Aujac, Maurice Lebel. Paris: Les Belles Lettres 1981.
- Dik, Helma
1995 *Word order in Ancient Greek: A pragmatic account of word order variation in Herodotus*. Amsterdam: JC Gieben.
2007 *Word order in Greek tragic dialogue*. Oxford: OUP.

- Donadi, Francesco / Marchiori, Antonia
2014 *Dionigi d'Alicarnasso. La composizione stilistica*. A cura di F. Donadi, A. Marchiori. Trieste: EUT Edizioni Università.
- Dover, Kenneth J.
1960 *Greek word order*. Cambridge: CUP.
- EAGLL *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*. Ed. by G. K. Giannakis, V. Bubenik, E. Crespo, C. Golston, A. Lianeri, S. Luraghi, S. Matthaios. Leiden: Brill 2014.
- GG *Grammatici Graeci recogniti et apparatus critico instructi*. Hrsg. v. Richard Schneider, Gustav Uhlig. Leipzig: Teubner 1867-1910.
- Gildersleeve, Basil L.
1900 *Syntax of Classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes*. New York: American Book Company. <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu>
- Hdt *Herodoti Historiae*. Hrsg. v. Haiim B. Rosén. Stuttgart, Leipzig: Teubner 1997.
- Householder, Fred W.
1981 *The Syntax of Apollonius Dyscolus*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lallot, Jean
1997 *Apollonius Dyscole. De La Construction*. Vol. 1: *Introduction, texte et traduction*; Vol. 2: *Notes et index*. Paris: Vrin.
- LSJ *Greek-English Lexicon*. Compiled by H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. S. Jones et al. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1968. <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu> & <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu>.
- Mackridge, Peter
1985 *The Modern Greek Language: a descriptive analysis of standard Modern Greek*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Merlin, Stella
2016 *The origins of 'anaphora' and 'deixis'. Ancient theories on articles and pronouns*. PhD Dissertation, University of Verona. <https://iris.univr.it/handle/11562/939737>
- Parenti, Alessandro
1997 "Note sulla sintassi dei dimostrativi greci". *Studi di linguistica greca, II*. A cura di Emanuele Banfi. Pavia: Franco Angeli, 175-191.
- Weil, Henri
1978 *The order of words in the ancient languages compared with that of the modern languages*. New edition. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. [Originally appeared in French in 1844 (1879): *De l'ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes comparées aux langues modernes*].

Scaglione, Aldo D.

1972 *The classical theory of composition: from its origins to the present: a historical survey*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Smyth, Herbert W.

1920 *A Greek grammar for colleges*. American Book Company, 1920.
<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu>

WALS *The world atlas of language structures*. Ed. by M. Haspelmath, H.-J. Bibiko. Oxford: OUP 2005.

[Digital version: *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Ed. by M. S. Dryer, M. Haspelmath. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library. <http://wals.info>].

Manuskripte und Anfragen erbitten wir an die Redaktion:

Gerda Haßler

Institut für Romanistik
Am Neuen Palais 10 – Haus 19
D-14469 Potsdam
hassler@uni-potsdam.de

Angelika Rüter

c/o Nodus Publikationen
Postfach 5725
D-48031 Münster
dutz.nodus@t-online.de

Oder an:

David Cram (Jesus College; Oxford, OX1 3DW; U.K.; david.cram@jesus.ox.ac.uk)

Miguel Ángel Esparza Torres (Universidad Rey Juan Carlos; Campus de Fuenlabrada; Camino del Molino s/n; E-28943 Fuenlabrada, Madrid; maesparza@cct.urjc.es)

Stefano Gensini (Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”; Facoltà di Filosofia; Dipartimento di Studi filosofici e epistemologici; Via Carlo Fea 2; I-00161 Roma; stef_gens@libero.it)

Ludger Kaczmarek (Freistraße 2, D-33 829 Borgholzhausen; l.kaczmarek@t-online.de)

Masataka Miyawaki (Senshu University; Room #8412; Higashi-Mita 2-1-1; Tama-ku, Kawasaki 214-8580 Japan; miyawaki@isc.senshu-u.ac.jp)

Jan Noordegraaf (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam; De Boelelaan 1105; NL-1081 HV Amsterdam; j.noordegraaf@let.vu.nl)

Jacques-Philippe Saint-Gérand (Université Blaise Pascal; Clermont-Ferrand II; UFR Lettres, Langues, Sciences Humaines; Laboratoire de Recherches sur le Langage 29, boulevard Gergovia; F-63037 Clermont-Ferrand Cédex 1; jacques-philippe.saint-gerand@univ-bpclermont.fr)

Die *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* erscheinen zweimal jährlich mit einem Gesamtumfang von etwa 360 Seiten. Der Abonnementspreis beträgt zur Zeit EUR 81,00; das Einzelheft kostet EUR 45,50 (Luftpostzustellung für Afrika, Amerika, Asien und Australien auf Anfrage).

Mitglieder des *SGdS*, der *Henry Sweet Society* und des *Werkverband* können die *Beiträge* zu einem ermäßigten Sonderpreis beziehen.

Gültige Anzeigenpreisliste: 6/15.

Nodus Publikationen — Wissenschaftlicher Verlag
Münster (Westf.) • Germany
<http://www.nodus-publikationen.de>