The principal goal of this talk is to present a new analysis of puzzling facts of Homeric Greek, by recasting them into the same type of analysis that, twenty years ago, resolved equally puzzling facts of Rama, an Amerindian language. The analysis will consist of the identification of a similar category of “relational preverbs” in both languages and in presenting it in a grammaticalization perspective.

Definition: “relational preverbs” are a category of verbal prefixes grammaticalized from postpositions. They are characterized by their being linked to an argument of the verb, while exhibiting different degrees of grammaticalization and lexicalization in their relation to this verb. As such, they may be defined as being morphologically prefixal but functionally adpositional.

PART 1 – Relational preverbs twenty years ago: the case of Rama

1. Problematic data in Rama

At the origin of the discussion of so-called “relational preverbs” was problematic data in the analysis of a yet undescribed language, the Rama Chibchan language of Nicaragua. Consultation with Ken Hale, who was working at the same time in the same region, resulted in a joint paper published in *Language* (Craig & Hale, 1988), arguing for a category of “relational preverbs” in many languages of the Americas, with different degrees of relation to postpositions and different degrees of grammaticalization.

2. Postpositions vs. Relational Preverbs in Rama

The text excerpt (1) shows the existence of two types of instrumental marking in Rama, one with a postposition (PSP) *u* as in (1c), and one with a relational preverb (RP) *yu-* as in (1b):

(1) About the instrument ‘kiskis’ (kitchen tongs)

a. nainguku kiskis nsu-kwaakan-i
   so tongs 1PL-have-PRESENT
   ‘that’s why we have the kiskis’
The relationship between postpositions and relational preverbs is obvious enough in Rama to produce the following inventories. It should be noted that not all the postpositions have corresponding relational preverbs:

(2) Inventories of relational preverbs and of their source postpositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>postpositions</th>
<th>relational preverbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ba(ng)#</td>
<td>goal, target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u#</td>
<td>comitative, instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka(ng)#</td>
<td>ablative, source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>su#</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aa(k)#</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki#</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kama#</td>
<td>beneficiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki(ng)#</td>
<td>beneficiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aing#</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Arguments for the reanalysis of postpositions into verbal prefixes

The reanalysis of postpositions into verbal prefixes needs to be demonstrated in view of the Rama word order [SOXV], including a very common contiguous order of a postpositional phrase just before the verb, as in [S O PP V]. Three types of arguments are presented here.

3.1. Constituent structure argument

A number of elements may be found intervening between the relational verbal affix and the NP it is linked to, showing that the elements of the adpositional phrase [NP PSP] no longer form a syntactic constituent:

(3) ARG X [RP-V]

a. X=ADVERB
   sut neli uwaik ba-altanaang-i
   1PL Nelly *long time* RP/for-wait-PRESENT
   ‘we wait for Nelly for a long time’
b. $X=\text{WH-WORD}$
   tiiskama taa yu-taak-u
   child who $\text{RP/with-} \text{come-PRESENT}$
   ‘who brought the baby?’

c. $X=\text{NEGATION}$
   tiiskama nah aa ba-tang-i
   child 1 NEG $\text{RP/for-} \text{want-PRESENT}$
   ‘the child does not want me’

3.2. Semantic bleaching argument

In certain combinations of RP and verb, the semantics of the RP has evolved from that of the PSP of origin, in the direction of semantic bleaching, as in (4) below, arguing for a different status of postposition and relational preverb:

(4) From comitative postposition (a.) to patient/theme relational preverb (b.)

a. kohki u an-taak-u
   kohki $\text{PSP}$ they-go-\text{PAST}
   ‘they went with Kohki’

b. kohki yu-an-taak-u
   kohki $\text{RP}$ they-go-\text{PAST}
   ‘they took/carried Kohki’

3.3. Phonetic argument

A phonological argument can be found in the fact that a RP can become nasalized when affixed to the nasal of a consonant-initial verb form – here a person marker in (5b) – whereas no nasalization occurs between a postposition and the nasal of a consonant-initial verb form, as shown in (5a):

(5) Absence or presence of nasalisation between the PSP / RP and the nasal of a consonant-initial verb form

a. [maa-\text{ka} ] na-ngalbi-u
   you-PSP 1-run-\text{PAST}
   ‘I ran away from you’

b. [kā-na-ngalbi-u ]
   RP 1-run-\text{PAST}
   ‘I ran away from (him)’

4. Different types of relational preverbs

Being morphologically “relational preverbs” does not specify the exact relation that the RP holds to the verb it is affixed to. In Rama RP are found in three configurations, shown in (6-8). In (6) the RP only occurs in the absence of the lexical argument it is linked to. In (7), both constructions exist, but this time the RP can occur with its lexical argument; in addition, the RP does not have the same meaning as the corresponding PSP. In (8), the RP can also occur with its lexical argument, but this time only the RP construction exists:

(6) [ maing taata ka ] na-ngalbi-u
    my father $\text{PSP/from} \text{1-run-PAST}$
    ‘I ran away from my father’

(7) [ Ø ka-na-ngalbi-u ]
    (him) $\text{RP/from} \text{1-run-PAST}$
    ‘I ran away from (him)’

(7) [ kohki u ] an-taak-u (kohki) yu-an-taak-u
kohki *PSP/with* they -go-PAST (kohki) *RP/with-they-go-PAST*
‘they went with kohki’

(8) *[ paalpa ba ] aa an-alpi-u (paalpa) ba-an-alpi-u
manatee *PSP/for* NEG they-look-PAST (manatee) *RP/for-they-look-PAST*
(they did not look for a manatee) ‘They looked for (it/a manatee)’

These three patterns were analyzed in Craig & Hale (1988) as corresponding to **three degrees of relation of the affixed RP to the verb: as cliticized, incorporated and lexicalized RP.**

4.1. Cliticized relational preverbs

The characteristics of cliticized RP are as follow:

a) The cliticized RP arises from a **constraint on stranding postpositions** in the context of a “zero anaphora” language, i.e. in the absence of anaphoric 3rd-person pronouns. Craig & Hale claim that the trigger of the procliticization of a PSP is the non-overtness of the oblique NP itself.

b) The cliticized RP exhibits a high degree of **productivity** in the sense that the procliticized RP may occur with all sorts of verbs. Some PSP occur more frequently as procliticized RP than others: for instance, while instrumental, comitative, and beneficiary/goal PSP are commonly expressed as proclitics on the verb, locatives are not.

c) The semantic relation that holds between the cliticized RP and its PSP of origin remains constant. Procliticized RP **maintain the semantic** interpretation they would have as PSP.

The following text excerpt illustrates the variety of verbs that can take an instrumental RP when it is cliticized:

(9) Text excerpt: Kiskis 2 (instrumental)

a. nainguku kiskis nsu-kwaakari,
so tongs 1PL-have-PRESENT
‘that’s why we have the kiskis’

b. suuli-kaas [yu-nsu-auk-kama,]
animal-meat [RP/with-1PL-roast-SUB]
‘for us to roast meat with (it),
VERB 1 ‘to roast’

C. sumuu [yu-nsu-apii-kama]
banana [RP/with-1PL-extract-SUB]
‘for us to take out banana with (it)’
VERB 2 ‘to take out’

D. an ung-i karka salpka-kaas [yu-nsu-kaniis-kama]
and pot-PSP/IN out:from fish-meat [RP/with-1PL-fry-SUB]
‘and for us to fry fish from the pot with (it)’
VERB 3 ‘to fry’
4.2. Incorporated relational preverbs

Another type of RP is the incorporated one. Incorporated RP are found in cases in which the NP argument may appear overtly before the RP with which it is construed. They exhibit the following characteristics:

a) Incorporated RP cooccur with a full lexical NP.

b) Incorporated RP are less productive than cliticized RP, as they occur in combinations of specific postpositions with specific verbs. The main verbs with which incorporation occurs are movement deictic verbs taak ‘to go’ and siik ‘to come’ with the comitative -u ‘with’.

c) Incorporated RP exhibit a semantic drift (from +control to –control), when compared to its PSP of origin. The change from semantics of [+control] of the PSP to that of [-control] of the incorporated RP appears clearly between the PSP in (11) and the incorporated RP in (12).

(10) PSP vs incorporated RP

a. PSP
   maukala i-park-i seem ngabang-u
ten 3-make-TNS same silkgrass-PSP/with
   ‘he makes nets with (INSTRUMENTAL) silkgrass.’

b. Incorporated RP
   naing taata ngabang vu-i-siik-i nguu –ki
   my father silkgrass RP/with-he-come-TNS house-PSP/in
   ‘my father brings (come+with) the silkgrass (PATIENT) in the house’

(11) [+control] semantics of PSP -u ‘with’

a. barka aa i-taak-u baaning anul-u
   but NEG 3-go-TNS DIS them-PSP/with
   ‘but she would not have gone with them’ (who were going too)

b. taa-u m-taak-u
   who-PSP/with you-go-TNS
   ‘with whom did you go (who was going too)’
c. Namaa y-aakar ngurii-ki yaing tiiskama u
still 3-stay hole-PSP/in 3POSS child PSP/with
‘she stays still in the hole with her child (who was staying there too)’

(12) [–control] semantics of RP yu-

a. ngurii psutki yaing tiiskama yu-i-taak-u
hole inside 3POSS child RP/with-3-go-TNS
‘inside the hole she took (< go+with) her child (PATIENT)’

b. tiiskam taa yu-taak-u
child who RP/with-go-TNS
‘who took (carried < go+with) the child (PATIENT)?’

4.3. Lexicalized relational preverb

The third type of relation between a RP to a verb is that of a RP lexicalized in a frozen combination of [RP-V]. This is the case of the RP ba- (expression of goal) when used with two specific verbs, as shown in (13):

(13) a. ba-alp- ‘to look for’
    b. ba-ting- ‘to want’

5. Summary on the RP system of Rama

One of the most common instances of RP in Rama is the surface phenomenon of procliticization of a PSP stranded by virtue of zero anaphora, independent of the semantics of the verb, with the proclitic RP retaining the semantics of its postpositional source. This situation of clear cliticization is a rare case in the languages of the world, but can be easily argued for in Rama. It could represent the first step in a process of grammaticalization of postpositions into preverbs.

Rama also has instances of more advanced grammaticalization, considered as incorporation of the RP. This could correspond to cases of applicative constructions of other languages. The lack of morphosyntactic arguments to argue positively for an applicative voice analysis (absence of case marking, absence of passive voice in the language) would make it simply a default analysis. But it certainly occurs in the combination of comitative and movement verb, which are well-known for being cases of applicative constructions in many languages of the world.

The third type of RP is a limited non-productive case of lexicalization, which is expected to have gone through a discourse process of cliticization and have become fixed lexicalization through high frequency of use. It corresponds to common events very frequently evoked in narratives.
PART 2 – Relational preverbs twenty years later: the case of Homeric Greek

This second section presents a new analysis of some problematic data from Homeric Greek and means to demonstrate how a grammaticalization and typological approach helps clarify a blind spot in the grammar of an ancient language. The new analysis argues for the existence of a system of relational preverbs in Homeric Greek, of the kind described for Amerindian languages such as Rama. It also shows its relation to the larger system of verb prefixation of that language.

6. Problematic data: a system of multiple preverbation

6.1. Preliminaries: about adpositions, cases and preverbs in Homeric Greek

Homeric Greek attests a system of well-described morphemes expressing spatial or non-spatial relations, and functioning as preverbs, adverbs, prepositions or more rarely postpositions. Table 1 shows an inventory of these morphemes, along with their spatial meaning; these morphemes are labeled here Path morphemes in reference to their spatial meaning:

Table 1 – An inventory of Path morphemes in Homeric Greek with their spatial meaning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path morphemes</th>
<th>Spatial meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>amphi</td>
<td>around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ana</td>
<td>up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apo</td>
<td>off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anti</td>
<td>against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dia</td>
<td>through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eis</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ek</td>
<td>out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epip</td>
<td>at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hupip</td>
<td>above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hupoi</td>
<td>under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katai</td>
<td>down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metai</td>
<td>amid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parai</td>
<td>beside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peri</td>
<td>around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prox</td>
<td>forth (from in front)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Syntactically, the three functions of these Path morphemes can be summarized here as follow:
- As adverbs, they are independent from any particular argument;
- As preverbs, they are satellites of the verb.
- As adpositions, they are linked to an argument and command its case;

---

2 Data collected from the entire texts of the Iliad and the Odyssey, through the database of the Perseus Digital Library (Crane, 1997).

3 This inventory, for the sake of relevance and brevity here, excludes a set of “compound Path morphemes”, which are addressed in Imbert (to be defended).
Definition of “satellite” (Talmy, 1991 : 486):

« [...] Satellite is a grammatical category of any constituent other than nominal complement that is in sister relation to the verb root. The satellite, which can be either a bound affix or a free word, is thus intended to encompass all of the following grammatical forms, which traditionally have been largely treated independently of each other: English particles, German separable and inseparable verb prefixes, Latin or Russian verb prefixes, Chinese verb complements, Lahu non head ‘versatile verbs, Caddo incorporated nouns, and Atsugewi polysynthetic affixes round the verb root. »

These Path morphemes may interact with three different cases affecting the verb argument. Each case has argument-marking functions and Path-coding functions. Table 2 shows these three cases along with their main argument-marking and Path-coding function. The **accusative case** is of particular importance in this paper, and appears in **bold** in Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Main argument marking function</th>
<th>Main spatial meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>object marking</td>
<td>direction ‘to, toward’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>noun complement marking</td>
<td>direction ‘from’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>attribution marking</td>
<td>localization ‘in’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows the possible interaction between each of the Path morphemes presented in Table 1 and these three cases, *when the Path morpheme functions as an adposition* and as such is linked to an argument. **Note how some of them can command the three cases while others command only one:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path morphemes</th>
<th>Spatial meaning</th>
<th>Case(s) commanded as adposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>amphí</strong></td>
<td>around</td>
<td>Acc/Gen/Dat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>aná</strong></td>
<td>up</td>
<td>Acc/Gen/Dat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>apó</strong></td>
<td>off</td>
<td>Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>anti</strong></td>
<td>against</td>
<td>Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>diá</strong></td>
<td>through</td>
<td>Acc/Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>eis</strong></td>
<td>to</td>
<td>Acc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ek</strong></td>
<td>out</td>
<td>Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>en</strong></td>
<td>in</td>
<td>Dat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>epí</strong></td>
<td>at</td>
<td>Acc/Gen/Dat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>hupér</strong></td>
<td>above</td>
<td>Acc/Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>hupó</strong></td>
<td>under</td>
<td>Acc/Gen/Dat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>katá</strong></td>
<td>down</td>
<td>Acc/Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>metá</strong></td>
<td>amid</td>
<td>Acc/Gen/Dat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>pará</strong></td>
<td>beside</td>
<td>Acc/Gen/Dat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>perí</strong></td>
<td>around</td>
<td>Acc/Gen/Dat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>pró</strong></td>
<td>forth</td>
<td>Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>pros</strong></td>
<td>forth (from in front)</td>
<td>Acc/Gen/Dat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One last fact needs to be mentioned about these Path morphemes: they may interact with each other within one sentence. The Homeric system allows for the combination of a preverb and an adposition, for instance. Example (9) shows that the adposition may be simply redundant with the preverb (9a) or differentiated from the preverb (9b). The Path morphemes appear here in **bold** and the verb argument appears in **italic**:

(14) Preverb + adposition combination

a. Redundant adposition (II. 2.720)
   eretai d’**en** ekastei penté:konta em-bébasan
   rower:NOM.PL. LNK in each:DAT fifty in-walk:PPF.3PL
   ‘In each (ship) boarded (stepped in) fifty oarsmen’

b. Differentiated adposition (II. 18.233)
   autàr Akhaiο: arises Pátroklon […] kát-thesan en lekhéessi
   ‘But the Achaeans with gladness […] laid Patroclus down on a bier’

6.2. Problem: multiple preverbation as a blind spot

Verb prefixation is well-known and extensively described in Homeric Greek. However, one specific point constitutes a blind spot in the reference grammars: it happens when the verb takes several preverbs, as shown in the template of (15). The problematic data is the item X, for, if the PV element (preverb) is easily analyzed in the grammars, this X element is either not mentioned at all or only briefly analyzed in different unconvincing ways:

(15) Template for multiple preverbation

\[
[X- PV- V]
\]

Examples (16a-c) contrast “simple preverbation” ([PV-V] constructions) as in (16a) with “multiple preverbation” ([X-PV-V] constructions) as in (16b); the construction in (16c) being the problematic data under consideration:

(16) Verb prefixation in Homeric Greek

a. Non-prefixed verb
   baíno:
     walk
     “To walk”

b. Simple preverbation b’. Simple preverbation
   ana-baíno: eis-baíno:
   PV/up walk PV/to walk
   “To walk up” “To walk to”

c. Multiple preverbation
   eis-ana-baíno:
   X/to PV/up walk
   “To walk up to”
The X element of (16c) is variously treated in the traditional grammars: if mentioned or taken into account and not altogether ignored, it is generally analyzed as a typographical choice, as a mistake or misinterpretation resulting in the attachment of a postposition to the following prefixed verb. The aim of this paper is to revisit this blind spot in the description of Homeric Greek, from a grammaticalization and typological approach, by analyzing X as a relational preverb, such as what has been described in Amerindian languages and more specifically in Rama.

7. X is not a “typo” but a RP: Arguments for the reanalysis of postpositions into verbal prefixes

7.1. The ambiguity of X: typo or not typo?

The “typo” analysis is based on examples like (17)-(18), where the existence of variant transcriptions in the manuscripts point to an ambiguous status of the X element:

(17) Ambiguity of an X element for the same sentence in different manuscripts (Il. 5.763)

a. [P SP # PV V] (manuscript used in Magnien, 1930)  
   mákhe:s ex apo:-dío:mai
   battle:GEN X/out PV/off drive:PRES.SUBJ.1SG
   ‘I drive him out of the battle’

b. [RP PV V] (manuscript used in Perseus)  
   mákhe:s ex-apo-dío:mai
   battle:GEN X/out PV/off-drive:PRES.SUBJ.1SG
   ‘I drive him out of the battle’

(18) Ambiguity of an X element in two sentences in one and the same manuscript (Magnien, 1930)

a. [P SP # PV V] (Il. 20.212)  
   mákhe:s ëx apo:-néesthai
   battle:GEN X/out PV/off return:PRES.M/P.1SG
   ‘I return from (out of) the battle’

b. [RP PV V] (Il. 16.252)  
   mákhe:s ex-apo:-néesthai
   battle:GEN X/out PV/off-return:PRES.M/P.1SG
   ‘I return from (out of) the battle’

These examples are ambiguous as to the postpositional or prefixal status of X. But an exhaustive observation of the occurrences of X elements in the Homeric data shows two facts:

a) Occurrences of an X element, i.e. occurrences of “multiple preverbation”, are not anecdotal and are productive, as shown in Table 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total token frequency</th>
<th>Total type frequency</th>
<th>Attested combinations of prefixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple preverbation</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) The examined Homeric data provides three different arguments showing that X cannot be analysed as a typo, but as a relational preverb derived from a postposition through a process of grammaticalization.
7.2. Arguments for a RP analysis

Three main arguments can be used 1) to demonstrate the prefixal nature of X and 2) to argue for a relational preverb analysis of X. Note how the unspecified gloss ‘X’ will be replaced in what follows by the specific gloss ‘RP’.

7.2.1. Constituent structure argument

The RP is prefixal and not postpositional, i.e. the elements of the adpositional phrase [NP PSP] no longer form a syntactic constituent, as the [RP-PV-V] construction may be separated from the verb argument in different ways. Moreover, the verb argument does not necessarily precede the [RP-PV-V] construction: it may follow it or be absent.

- The [RP-PV-V] construction may be separated from the verb argument (ARG) that precedes it by some discursive element or adverb (marked ‘ITEM’ in the example):

(19) [ARG # x # [RP-PV-V]] (Il. 23.683)

zdô:ma dè hoi pró:ton para-káb-balen
ARG ITEM [RP-PV-V]

‘A girdle first he cast about him’

- The verb argument may be absent:

(20) (Ø ARG) [RP-PV-V] (Od. 14.26)

tòn dè tétarton apo-pro-é:ke pólín=de
[RP-PV-V]

DEM:ACC LNK fourth:ACC off-forth-send: AOR.3SG city=to

‘And the fourth he had sent forth away (Ø: ‘from X’) to the city’

- The verb argument may follow the [RP-PV-V] construction, and may in addition be separated from it by another NP (marked ‘OTHER NP’ in the example):

(21) [[RP-PV-V] # SYNT # ARG1] (Od. 12.306)

ex-ap-ébe:san etaíroi ne:ös
[RP-PV-V] OTHER NP ARG

out-off-walk:AOR.3PL comrade:NOM.PL ship:GEN

‘And my comrades went out from the ship’

7.2.2. Semantic bleaching argument

Semantically, the [RP-PV-V] construction may be semantically bleached. In that case, the semantics of the RP cannot be distinguished from the semantics of the whole construction (or becomes less distinguishable).
(22) (Il. 7.185)

hoí d’ ou  gignó:skontes  ape:né:nanto  hékastos
DEM:NOM LNK NEG know:PART.PRES.NOM deny:MID.AOR.3PL every_one:NOM

‘But they knew it not, and everyone denied (it)’

7.2.3. Morphosyntactic argument

Although the RP has a prefixal morphological status, it maintains an adpositional function: the verb argument of a [ARG # [RP-PV V]] construction cannot take an adposition, because the RP syntactically introduces the argument and commands the case.

As mentioned in 6.1, preverbs may be associated with adpositions in Homeric Greek; this is a well-known syntactic fact that can be observed with many “simple preverbation” examples. However, while simple preverbation allows for the use of an adposition on the oblique argument of the verb, “multiple preverbation” never does, in 100% of its occurrences⁴. In “multiple preverbation” constructions, the PV functions as a simple verb satellite with no link to a particular argument, while the RP is linked to an argument and commands the case, just as it would if used as an adposition:

(23) Multiple preverbation: [ARG-CASE # [RP-PV-V]]

a. With a dative case (Od. 11.98)

xíphos arguróe:lon kouleô:i  en-kat-épe:x’

‘I thrust my silver-studded sword into its sheath’

b. With an accusative case (Il. 8.291)

toi homòn lékhos  eis-ana-baínoi
2SG:DAT same:ACC bed:ACC RP/to-PV/up-walk:PRES.OPT.3SG

‘(A woman that) shall go up into thy bed’

c. With a genitive case (Il. 5.763)

mákhe:s  ex-apo-dío:mai
battle:GEN RP/out-PV/off-drive:PRES.SUBJ.1SG

‘I drive him out of the battle’

This section has therefore demonstrated that the X element is not a typo, but a RP grammaticalized from a PSP, and that it is morphologically a prefix that still functions as an adposition controlling case marking. A grammaticalization approach to these newly identified

---

⁴ An adposition will of course be used when a “secondary” oblique argument is added to the verb, for example to introduce a second portion of Path in the spatial situation. Thus in (23b), if one wants to add an argument like “from her own bed”, an adposition (like ek ‘out’) will be necessary to introduce this second NP [her own bed], as the verb eis-ana-baíno: ‘to go up to’ is unable to do so, semantically (it does not contain any Source-coding Path morpheme) and syntactically (its RP eis- ‘to’ is already linked to a NP, namely [thy bed])
RP further reveals *three different syntactic behaviors* for them, corresponding to different degrees of grammaticalization, as shown next.

### 8. Different types of RP: both ends of the grammaticalization process

Revisiting these RP constructions in a grammaticalization approach reveals in Homeric Greek the synchronic co-occurrence of *both ends of the grammaticalization process* from PSP to RP: from cliticized RP to lexicalized RP.

#### 8.1. Cliticized relational preverbs

The RP may be simply cliticized. This process is *productive* and *no semantic bleaching* occurs: each part of the construction (RP, PV and V) conveys its own meaning; syntactically, the RP *commands the case* it would have commanded as an adposition:

(24) Cliticized RP

a. (Od. 16.449)

    ἥ μὲν ἀρ’ ἐσ-ανα-βάς’ ὑπερό-ία σιγαλόεnta

    REL:NOM LNK LNK RP/to-PV/up-walk:AOR.3SG upper_chamber:DAT bright:DAT

    ‘So she went up to her bright upper chamber’

b. (Il. 13.87)

    τοί μέγα τείkhos ὑπερ-κατ-εβε:σαν ὅμιλο:i


    ‘(The Troyans) who had got down over the great wall in their multitude’

c. (Od. 14.26)

    τὸν δὲ τέταρτον ἀπ-προ-έκε ρόλιν=de

    DEM:ACC LNK fourth:ACC RP/off-PV/forth-send: AOR.3SG city=to

    ‘And the fourth he had sent forth away (from X) to the city’

#### 8.2. Lexicalized relational preverbs

The RP may also be found lexicalized into the [RP-PV-V] construction. Three observations can be used as evidence to demonstrate this claim:

a) This process is *not productive*;

b) The RP is *semantically bleached*, in the sense that the semantics of the RP cannot be distinguished from the semantics of the whole construction anymore (or becomes less distinguishable, its lexicalization being a matter of degree);

c) **The syntax of the [RP-PV-V] construction changes.** If the construction is intransitive, there is, as expected, no verb argument. However, *if the construction is transitive, the verb argument to which the RP is syntactically linked now takes the object-marking case*, i.e. the accusative case, even if the involved RP cannot command the accusative case when used as an adposition.

Thus, in examples (25)-(26), the lexicalized construction *ἀπό-ανά-ainómai* ‘to deny’ may be intransitive (25) or transitive (26). In (26), the argument (semantically linked to the RP) is
treated as the direct object, and as such takes the accusative case. *This occurs while the Path morpheme apó ‘off’ is normally used exclusively with the genitive case:*

(25) [RP-PV-V] (Il. 7.185)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEM</th>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>LNK</th>
<th>NEG</th>
<th>know:PART.PRES.NOM</th>
<th>deny: MID.AOR.3PL</th>
<th>every_one: NOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hoì d’ ou</td>
<td>gignó:skontes</td>
<td>ape:né:nanto</td>
<td>hékastos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘But they knew it not, and everyone denied (it)’

(26) [[RP-PV-V] + obj-acc] (Od. 10.297)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LNK</th>
<th>2SG.NOM</th>
<th>no_more</th>
<th>LNK</th>
<th>deny: MID.AOR. INF</th>
<th>god:GEN</th>
<th>couch:ACC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>éntha sù</td>
<td>me:ké’t épeit’</td>
<td>apané:naštai</td>
<td>theoû</td>
<td>euné:n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Then do not thou thereafter refuse the couch of the goddess’

It should be noted that examples (25)-(26) illustrate an “extreme” case of full lexicalization. The lexicalization tends to be more complete when the PV itself has already been lexicalized into the verb stem, or when the verb stem does not exist by itself anymore. Here, the verb apó-aná-ainómai ‘to deny’ is built on the stem *ainomai ‘to take away, to rob of’, prefixed with the aná- ‘up’ and apó- ‘off’. The stem is not attested on its own anymore in the data. So the [PV-V] construction aná-ainómai is already fully lexicalized, and its corresponding [RP-PV-V] construction shows similar evidence of complete lexicalization.

Thus, Homeric Greek attests both ends of a grammaticalization process from PSP to RP, such as what has been described in Rama. It supports therefore the claim made by Craig & Hale (1988) of not only a postpositional origin of RP systems in Amerindian languages, but also of the varying stages of grammaticalization the RP undergo.

9. Explaining more problematic data: Incorporated RP in Homeric Greek?

Considering multiple preverbalization as involving a system of RP is actually key to explaining even more problematic data, such as examples (27)-(28) that may appear on the surface to ressemble the above examples (25)-(26), in that the multiprefixed verb is used with a verb argument marked as an object, i.e. with the accusative case:

(27) táphron d’ ek-dia-bántes oruktè:n

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dich: ACC</th>
<th>LNK</th>
<th>RP/out-PV/through walk:PART. AOR. 3PL</th>
<th>dug: ACC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ‘So they walked through and out (from) the digged ditch’

(28) aktè:n d’ ex-ana-básai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>shore: ACC</th>
<th>LNK</th>
<th>RP/out-PV/up-walk:PART. PRES. 3PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ‘And when they had stepped forth upon the beach…’

However, examples (27-28) represent a syntactic situation that is problematic for two reasons:

(a) The verbs ek-dia-baino: and ek-ana-baino: are not lexicalized verbs and are perfectly transparent as to their spatial meaning; the verb baino: means “to walk”
and each preverb codes a different portion of Path; thus, this is not a case of RP lexicalization.

(b) The use of the genitive case on the verb argument should be here compulsory because of the RP ek- “out of”, which can only be used with the genitive when used as an adposition (as shown in section 6.1). But the accusative is used here instead; thus, this is not a case of RP cliticization.

The analysis proposed in this paper – that multiple preverbation involves a system of RP found at different stages of grammaticalization - accounts for the particularities of examples (27)-(28). One can take them as attesting the existence in Homeric Greek of a stage of syntacticization of the RP, corresponding to an intermediate stage between those of cliticization and lexicalization. Examples (27-28) can be considered as examples of applicative-like constructions, with an RP taken to be incorporated and to function like an applicative marker, such as what can be found in other languages of the world.

Only a few clear examples like the two given in (27-28) could be found in the data, but further investigation might reveal more evidence of the existence of incorporated RP in Homeric Greek, and allow for a further study of their syntactic behavior and possible productivity limitations.

10. More about Homeric multiple preverbation: semantic and conceptual motivations underneath

More yet can be said about the Homeric system of relational preverbs described here (Imbert (2007; tbd; submitted) which could not be addressed here for the sake of brevity. In particular, about a claim (Imbert, tbd) that the emergence and evolution of the Homeric relational preverbs are in fact semantically- and conceptually-driven. Two arguments supporting this claim will be briefly introduced here.

First, there are clear semantic constraints (cf. Bybee, 1985) on the order of the preverbs that are affixed on the verb stem. These constraints consist of conceptual distinctions between the different portions of Path coded by the different preverbs. More specifically, such a semantic analysis of the Homeric multiple preverbation and RP system draws a striking parallel with semantic constraints on the order of similar multiple Path morphemes in other languages, such as is the case for the directionals in Jakaltek Popti’ (Mayan family). While the affix ordering constraints worked out for Jakaltek Popti’ (Grinevald Craig, 2003), and has helped reveal parallel constraints in preverbation of Path morphemes in Homeric Greek, it is hoped that, in return, the new analysis of Homeric Greek (Imbert, tbd; submitted) will further provide interesting insights on the conceptual and functional motivations of affix ordering in Amerindian languages, and potentially in other languages.

Second, not all of the RP in Homeric Greek reach the same degree of grammaticalization, from cliticized to lexicalized RP. The variability of their grammaticalization partly relies on a phenomenon of Source vs. Goal asymmetry, that is not mentioned in the reference grammars and that has been recently addressed in the typological literature.

Source vs. Goal asymmetry is one of the research themes of the “Trajectory” Project, and is coordinated by Anetta Kopeccha (MPI Nijmegen / University of Lyon 2) and Miyuki Ishibashi (University of Lyon 2).
Conclusion

Thus, this paper demonstrated the existence of a system of relational preverbs in Homeric Greek. This system shares striking similarities with that of Rama and other Amerindian languages, in its grammaticalization processes and syntactic behavior. In return, this paper shows how Homeric Greek offers substantial support for the analyses that have been lead twenty years ago on these Amerindian systems: relational preverbs do result from the cliticization of postpositions, which in time may get syntacticized and lexicalized, through an interesting process of grammaticalization from postposition to preverb. Further investigation carried out in Homeric Greek on the semantic and conceptual motivation for this process may also lead to interesting new investigations in the languages of the Americas.

On a broader perspective, this paper has illustrated the productivity of a functional-typological approach that takes into account the dynamics of grammaticalization phenomena.
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