The absence of topicalization around interrogatives in Koine Greek
Allison Kirk, Leiden University

1. Background and aim:
In Attic Greek one finds with great abundance constructions containing an element to the left of an interrogative pronoun, as in examples (1) and (2) on the next page. Similar constructions are found, although less frequently (Thomson, 1939) in Homeric (example 4) as well as Ionic Greek (example 3). Example (5) shows an element to the left of a headless relative pronoun. Constructions of the type below are absent in Greek from the Koine period. The aims of this paper are both to provide an analysis of this construction as seen Homeric and Classical Greek, and also to provide a reason for the absence of the construction in Koine. Therefore, the focus of the diachronic study will be on the change from the Attic period to the Koine. Although the pattern in frequency of use of the construction in the different stages of Greek is interesting, as one cannot see a linear chronological progression of the construction steadily falling out of use, the fact that I seek to explore is that the construction was grammatical in Homeric, Ionic and Attic Greek and appears to be ungrammatical in Koine.

2. Methodology in analysing Ancient Greek (AG) word order facts:
2.1. Free word order?!: The word order facts of (AG), in its various stages, have been the source of much inquiry in the fields of both Classics and Historical, and more currently, theoretical Linguistics. In the past the language has often been deemed to have a 'free word order' (Devine and Stephens, 2000), or to be of the 'nonconfigurational' variety (Taylor, 1988). The strategy employed in the analysis presented here is to avoid such classifications and to provide an analysis of the aforementioned construction from the perspective of UG.

2.2. Stable elements (clitics)
One strategy employed here in analysing this construction is to concentrate on the elements of AG which show more stability in placement and which are restricted to certain positions in clauses, such as 'second position' (W2) (Wackernagel, 1892). Included in this classification are sentential particles as well as pronominal clitics (Cervin, 1990). Some scholars have attempted to provide syntactic classifications and analyses of clicits in AG (Arad and Roussou), while others have provided prosodic accounts (Taylor, 1996, Halpern, 1992). I, like many others, (Klavans, 1985, Hale, 1987, 1991: Rigveda) assume that there are at least two classifications of clitics: those which move for entirely prosodic reasons (at PF), and those which undergo syntactic movements, and which also possibly are moved at PF after the syntactic transformations are complete. The sentential particle $\delta\varepsilon$, seen in all of the examples on the next page, falls under the first category, and pronominal clitics such as seen in (2c) and (3) fall under the second. The strategy to determine exactly which syntactic slots 'W2' clitics occupy that is used in this paper is to examine constructions such as those given in (2c) and (3), which contain many overt elements, i.e. two clitics (one sentential and one pronominal), as well as a relative/ interrogative pronoun, and thus the positions which the elements occupy are illuminated.

3. Analysis
Sentential particles are assumed to be generated somewhere above C, i.e. ForceP, and due to their lack of stress must be displaced to the right in order to lean on a sufficiently stressed word to their left. It is well accepted in the literature that pronominal clitics adjoin to C head (Starke, Cardinaletti, 1999). This analysis of pronominal clitics is adopted here, as shown in (A) for example (3).

(A) [CP **ha** C_0+**soi**$_i$ [IP ....soi$_i$]]

Since the positions of these clitics have been mapped out into precise syntactic positions, we can now assign a syntactic position to the element which precedes the interrogative/ relative pronoun in the Attic and Homeric examples- it must be between ForceP and CP, taking the prosodic inversion of $\delta\varepsilon$ into account. Given the fairly recent and ongoing work on the architecture of the left periphery of the clause (Rizzi, 1997), etc., my claim is that the elements preceding the interrogatives/relatives are topics, and occupy the Spec- of a TopicP, located above CP as in (B).

(B) [TopP **tôn d'allôn** Top$_0$ [CP **ha** C_0 + **soi**]]

4. Change in the Koine period: What changes in the Koine period is the disallowance of a topicalized element to the left of an interrogative or relative pronoun. In the forthcoming paper I will attempt to provide an account of how this construction became interpreted as ungrammatical in the Koine period. One might wish to claim that Greek changed from being 'Topic-prominent' to 'Subject-prominent' in the sense of Li and Thompson (1976), however topicalization in general is not uncommon in Koine Greek. Interrogatives may be distinguished from many other elements in that they must take scope over their variables and this could possibly be related to why topicalization does not occur around them. This avenue will be explored in detail. Other notable changes from the Classical to the Koine period are the more infrequent use of particles (Horrocks, 1997), and a rise in verb initial constructions (Taylor, 1994). Therefore, another avenue to be explored is whether or not these changes can

be linked to the one in question here.

Data:

(1) σὺ   δὲ   τίνα   γνώμην   ἔχεις;
    su   de   tina   gnômên   echeis?
you.nom.sg. PART *what*.acc.sg. *opinion*.acc.sg. *have*.2sg.pres.ind.act.
'and you, what opinion do you have?'/ 'and what is *your* opinion?'   *Av. 69; Ran. 1430*

(2a) τὴν   δὲ   δίαιταν   τίνα   ποιήσεις ;
    tên   de   diaitan   tina   poiêseis ?
the.acc.sg. PART *life-style*.acc.sg. *what*.acc.sg. *do*.2sg.fut.ind.act.
'with regard to life-style, what will you do?'

(2b) τὸ   δὲ   βῆμα   τί   **σοι**   χρήσιμον   ἔσται ;
    to   de   bêma   ti   **soi**   chrêsimon   estai ?
    the.nom.sg. PART *step*.nom.sg. *what*.nom.sg. *you*.dat.sg. *useful*.nom.sg. *is*.3.sg.fut.ind.act.
'and concerning the platform, what will be useful to you?'   *Ecc. 673-7*

(3) νησιώτας   δὲ   τί   δοκέεις   εὔχεσθαι
nêsiôtas   de   ti   dokeeis   euchesthai
islanders.acc.pl. *and* *what*.acc.sg. *think*.2sg.pres.ind.act. *hope*.pres.inf.
'And the islanders, what do you think they will hope for?'   *Her.1.27.4*

(4) τῶν   δ' ἄλλων   ἅ   **μοί**   ἐστι   θοῇ   παρὰ νηὶ   μελαίνῃ
    tôn   d'allôn   ha   **moi**   esti   thoêi   para nêi   melainêi
the.gen.pl. PART *other*.gen.pl. *which*.nom.pl. *me*.dat.sg. *is*.3sg.pres.ind.act. *swift*.dat.sg. *by* *ship*.dat.sg. *black*.dat.sg.
'But of the other things, those which are mine, by the swift black ship....'   *Il. 1.300*

References
Cardinaletti, Anna, and Michal Starke. 1999. The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of the three classes of pronouns. In Clitics in the Languages of Europe. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology, ed. by Riemsdijk, Henk van, 145–233. B. – N.-Y.: Mouton de Gruyter. **Devine, A.M. and L.D. Stephens. (2000)** Discontinuous Syntax: Hyperbaton in Greek. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press. **Halpern, Aaron. 1992.** *Topics in the Placement and Morphology of Clitics.* Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University. **Li, Charles N./Sandra A. Thompson 1976.** "Subject and Topic: A New Typology of Languages", in: Li, Charles N. (ed.) Subject and Topic, New York/San Francisco/London: Academic Press, 457-490. **Hale, Mark. 1987.** Notes on Wackernagel's Law in the Language of the Rigveda. In Calvert Watkins, ed., *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929-1985):* Papers from the Fourth East Coast Indo-European Conference, 38-50. Berlin: de Gruyter. **-- 1991.** On becoming 'special': phonology, syntactic change, and the lexicon. Umich Colloquium. **Horricks, Geoffrey. 1997.** *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers,* Longman/Pearson. **Klavans, Judith L. 1985.** The independence of syntax and phonology in cliticization. *Langugae* 61. 95-120. **Rizzi, Luigi. (1997).** The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In L. Haegeman (eds.) *Elements of Grammar*, Dordrecht: Kluwer. **Taylor, Ann. 1996.** A prosodic account of clitic position in Ancient Greek. In Aaron Halpern and Arnold Zwicky (eds.), *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena.*Stanford: CSLI, 478-503. **-- 2002.** The distribution of object clitics in Koine Greek. In Mark R.V. Southern (ed.), *Indo-European Perspectives*, Washington DC: Institute for the Study of Man, 285-316. **-- 1988.** "From non-configurational to configurational: A study of syntactic change in Greek." Penn Review of Linguistics. **-- 1994.** "The change from SOV to SVO in Ancient Greek." Language Variation and Change, Vol.6:1-37. **Thomson, George. (1939).** The Postponement of Interrogatives in Attic Drama Author(s): The Classical Quarterly, Vol. 33, No. 3/4, (Jul. - Oct., 1939), pp. 147-152. Cambridge University Press. **Wackernagel, Jakob. (1892).** Uber ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1: 333-436.