



Fig. 2: Balloon Plot of Chi-Square Residuals (Transitivity Hierarchy, Revised Features)

7. Discussion and conclusions. If Luraghi’s features are correct, then her Transitivity Hierarchy cannot be, and if her Hierarchy is correct, then it must be sensitive to other features than those that she proposes. As the results above demonstrate, the Affectedness Object Prototype does appear to distinguish ACC, GEN, and DAT verbs, but would correlate with a hierarchy in which DAT case-assigning verbs are more transitive than GEN case-assigning verbs. Replacing object Affectedness with the subject Volitionality, Luraghi’s Hierarchy is confirmed. We therefore conclude that the latter solution is the correct. There are two additional reasons for favoring the solution provided here.

First, there is a class of verbs which can case-mark their objects with either ACC or GEN. If such verbs are intermediate between High Transitivity (HT) and Medium Transitivity (MT), as we have shown, then this optionality makes sense. However, if ACC verbs are HT and GEN verbs are Low Transitivity (LT), as would be the case if their levels of transitivity are determined by object Affectedness, then one would not expect this category to arise, since the ACC/GEN alternation would occur across non-adjacent categories. Second, we believe that Volitionality is a property which is more ontologically-salient than Affectedness, in that the volitional actions of a sentient subject are more readily observable than whether or not an object is affected. Compare examples (4) and (5), wherein the GEN object of *amelein* ‘neglect’ would be [+affected] and the DAT object of *apeilēsas* ‘threaten’ would not be so, according to Luraghi. It is not clear to us, nor to anyone with whom we’ve consulted, that the object of ‘neglect’ is necessarily affected (or more affected than the object of ‘threaten’). For this reason, we conclude that the indeterminacy of Affectedness, relative to Volitionality, makes it a poor candidate for predicting transitivity.

□ This analysis, therefore, confirms Luraghi’s ranking of ACC>GEN>DAT case-marking verbs within her Transitivity Hierarchy, but demonstrates COS and Volitionality (rather than COS and Affectedness) to be the determining factors. ACC case-assigning verbs are [+COS] and others are not, and among the two others, GEN case-assigning verbs are always [+volitional] and DAT case-assigning verbs are not (always).

□ In Classicists’ discussion of Greek case, such an analysis fundamentally changes the conversation around how GEN case-assigning verbs are described. In nearly every authoritative grammar of Classical Greek, including the most recent (Boas et al. 2019), GEN case on direct objects is described as “partitive”, and while there certainly are instances of partitive GEN case

in the data, not all GEN objects are so. Where ACC and GEN case-assigning verbs are distinguished by the parameter of [\pm COS], we submit that both the case assigned by both categories of verbs is “pure” and “lexically-assigned”, reflecting the core meaning of the verb.

References

- Bar-asher Siegal, Elitzur & Nora Boneh. 2015. Decomposing affectedness: Truth-conditional non-core datives in Modern Hebrew. *Proceedings of IATL30. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 78. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL. <http://mitwpl.mit.edu/catalog/mwpl78/>.
- Boas, Evert van Emde, Albert Rijksbaron, Luuk Huitink, & Mathieu de Bakker. 2019. *The Cambridge grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s2058631019000308>.
- Crane, Gregory R. (ed.). 2005–2019. *Perseus Digital Library (Perseus 4.0)*. Medford, MA: Tufts University. <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu> (accessed December 7, 2019).
- Dowty, David. 1991. Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67(3). 547–619. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.1991.0021>.
- Filip, Hannah. 1996. Psychological predicates and the syntax-semantics interface. In Adele E. Goldberg (ed.), *Conceptual structure, discourse, and language*. 131–147. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information. <https://web.stanford.edu/group/cslipublications/cslipublications/site/1575860406.shtml>.
- Hansen, Hardy & Gerald M. Quinn. 1992. *Greek: An intensive course* (2nd revised edn.). New York: Fordham University Press. <https://www.fordhampress.com/9780823216635/greek/>.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1987. The status of thematic relations in linguistic theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18(3). 369–411. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4178548>.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 2003. *On the meaning of prepositions and cases: The expression of semantic roles in Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.67>.
- Luraghi, Silvia. 2010. The extension of the transitive construction in Ancient Greek. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 42. 60–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03740463.2010.486919>.
- RStudio Team. 2018. RStudio: Integrated development for R. Boston, MA: RStudio. <http://www.rstudio.com/>.
- Smyth, Herbert & Gordon Messing (eds.). 1956. *Greek grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. <https://www.hup.harvard.edu/catalog.php?isbn=9780674362505>.
- Warnes, Gregory R., Ben Bolker, Lodewijk Bonebakker, Robert Gentleman, Wolfgang Huber, Andy Liaw, Thomas Lumley, Martin Maechler, Arni Magnusson, Steffen Moeller, Marc Schwartz & Bill Venables. 2019. gplots: Various R programming tools for plotting data. R package version 3.0.1.1. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=gplots>.
- Wei, Taiyun & Viliam Simko. 2017. R package "corrplot": Visualization of a correlation matrix (Version 0.84). <https://github.com/taiyun/corrplo>.