Olga Spevak*

Appositive construction or noun phrase? On the status of postnominal adjectives in Latin and Ancient Greek

Abstract: The aim of this article is to examine the status of postnominal modifiers in Latin and Ancient Greek. Compared to prenominal modifiers, modifiers in postposition are more loosely integrated into the noun phrase. However, whereas modern scholars analyse them as integral parts of noun phrases, Classical philologists claim that postnominal modifiers are, at least originally, appositive elements. Furthermore, from a typological point of view, there are languages in which postnominal modifiers do not form a part of noun phrases at all. Several criteria of a semantic, syntactic, or pragmatic nature can help us with distinguishing between true modifiers belonging to noun phrases and apposed elements, specifically, semantic completeness and incompleteness of referents, restrictions on predication of modifiers, coordination, and context.

Keywords: noun phrase, appositive adjectives, postnominal modifiers

1 Introduction

Latin and Ancient Greek are languages with variable constituent order. Variability also holds true for their noun phrases: modifiers do not have a fixed position before or after the head noun and they need not occur adjacent to it. In Bakker's (1998) typological study of the languages of Europe, Latin noun phrases turn out to be the most flexible ones in his sample; Ancient Greek also occupies a high position in Bakker's scale (Table 1). By flexibility is meant the number of variants of the modifier/head and head/modifier order.[1]

In this article, I will not deal with flexibility as such but I will focus on one particular point: the syntactic status of postnominal modifiers. In general, whereas prenominal modifiers are considered as fully integrated into the noun

---

[1] Not only flexibility, but also consistency (number of variables of the dominant order) and consequence (number of alternatives to the basic order) are examined.

*Corresponding author: Olga Spevak, Assistant Professor of Philology, Université de Toulouse 2, Toulouse, France, E-mail: spevak@univ-tlse2.fr

Table 1: Flexibility (1.0 full flexibility, 0.0 no flexibility) following Bakker (1998: 387).

Latin	**0.9**
Classical Armenian	0.8
Russian	0.7
...	
Ancient Greek	**0.6**
Slavic languages	0.56 (means)
Germanic languages	0.42 (means)
Romance languages	0.24 (means)

phrase, postnominal modifiers are viewed as more loosely connected to the noun phrase (Rijkhoff 2002: 19f.).

The authoritative modern Latin grammars (Lavency 1997; Touratier 1994; and Pinkster 1995 [1990]) analyse *orator bonus* 'good orator' in (1a) as one syntactic unit (not two units), as a full noun phrase that interchanges with the anaphoric pronoun *is* 'this (one)' and not with *is bonus* (example [1b]); the relative pronoun *qui* refers to the unit *orator bonus* and not to *orator* alone (example [1c]).

(1)   a. (Enn. *Ann.* 269 V. = 249 S.)
        orator bonus spernitur
        'the good orator is despised'
    b. *is spernitur* versus **is bonus spernitur*
       'this is despised' versus 'this good is despised'
    c. [*orator bonus*] *qui spernitur* versus **orator qui bonus spernitur*
       'good orator who is despised' versus 'orator who good is despised'

However, the status of postnominal modifiers in Latin – and in Greek –, especially of adjectives, is sometimes questioned. From two different approaches, they are viewed as "appositive elements" that do not form a noun phrase with their governing nouns but represent a kind of predicatives, "detached attributes" (Fr. *compléments détachés*)[2] or a sort of afterthoughts. I will first present these approaches in detail (Section 2) and then try to establish several criteria that permit distinguishing between "appositive elements" – appositions – and modifiers belonging to noun phrases. First, I will

---

2 Cf. M. Forsgren (1993) for this phenomenon in French: *un chat, immobile, guette une souris* ('a cat, immobile, watches for a mouse'). In French, such constructions are identifiable by intonation.

discuss several problems concerning Latin (Section 3), then, I will focus on Greek phenomena (Section 4).

2 "Appositive" adjectives

The first view to be discussed is that of Classical philologists. According to Meillet (1937: 360), in early Indo-European languages "the adjective did not form a phrase with the substantive it qualified; it was simply apposed to its noun."[3] This statement can be illustrated by the adjective ἴσον (*ison*) 'impartial' in (2), postponed with discontinuity to the governing noun κριτὴν (*kritén*) 'judge'. For Meillet and Vendryès (1963: 584), the adjective is "really in apposition with respect to the idea expressed by the substantive"; even prenominal adjectives are considered as "apposed", as in (3). However, it remains unclear on which basis these statements are formulated (syntactic or semantic criterion?) and, consequently, how to define these constructions.

(2)   (Men. *Epitr*. 226 Sandbach 1972)
        κριτὴν τούτου τινά ζητοῦμεν ἴσον
        'we are looking for an impartial judge to try it'

(3)   (Hom. *Il*. 22.84)
        φίλε τέκνον
        'dear child'

The idea that adjectives are "apposed" to nouns – in particular, adjectives in postposition – has been applied to Latin by Marouzeau (1922):

> The association of two components [of a noun phrase] [...] is more or less close. Sometimes the two elements express a "single concept" (*bonus animus* = confidence) [...] Other times, they are associated in a similar way as an apposition and a noun (*naves quindecim* = ships to the number of fifteen), or as a predicate and the subject, either in a noun phrase (*servus nequam* = his slave, a scoundrel!), or in a subordinate clause (*naves veteres* = the ships that are old, *Roma libera* = Rome of the time when it was free). (Marouzeau 1922: 221)

---

3 The last statement, "it was simply apposed to its noun" seems to have been added later by Benveniste; it is absent from first editions of Meillet (cf. 1908[2]).

In the Indo-European comparative framework, of which Marouzeau (1922: 185 and 221) is an heir, considerations of the "appositive" character of adjectives cover three syntactic functions:

a. predicative: *orator bonus* (*est*), 'the orator is good';
b. apposition: *naves*, *quindecim* (*scilicet*), 'ships, (that is to say) fifteen';
c. *praedicativum*: *orator ipse* (*fecit*), 'the orator himself (did it)'.[4]

The second view is that of the modern typological linguistics. Recently, languages have been discovered in which adjectives, numerals, etc., are not fully integrated into the noun phrase but represent constituents on their own (Rijkhoff 2002: 19). For example in Kalkatungu, an Australian language, there are no noun phrases; each word is a constituent of the clause (example [4]). In the English paraphrases of such constructions this is typically indicated by the use of the dummy pronoun *one*.

(4) the trees, these three, the large (ones)

Non-integrated adjectives represent one of the properties of non-configurational languages. This point is important for my purpose: we have seen that Latin and Ancient Greek allow both pre- and postnominal modifiers and their noun phrases are very flexible; they might present an example of this phenomenon. Lehmann (1991: 224) has characterised Latin noun phrases not as actual phrases but as "nominal groups with a relatively low degree of integration of their components."[5] The hypothesis about "appositive" postnominal adjectives, first put forward by Classical philologists, has returned, only formulated in a different way. The question is whether Latin and Ancient Greek exhibit the symptoms of non-configurational languages where the noun and its adjectives do not form hierarchically structured phrases.[6] In the next sections, I will discuss several proofs or "tests" concerning syntax, semantics, and pragmatics that make it possible to distinguish between a noun phrase and an "appositive element," starting with the status of postnominal numerals in Latin.

---

4 For *praedicativum*, an optional predicative adjective, see Pinkster (1983; Pinkster 1995 [1990]: § 8.5). In this article, I will not deal with the *praedicativum* because it exhibits unique behaviour and does not concern the problem of noun phrases in a direct way.

5 But see Plank's (2003a: 5, cf. 28, note 9) comment on this statement: "Habitual discontinuity may be indicative of a low degree of phrasal integration; but it does not suffice to disprove phrasehood."

6 For Devine and Stephens (2000: 142f.), Ancient Greek is a language that shifted from an ancient non-configurational type to a configurational type. They do not consider Latin as a non-configurational language (Devine and Stephens 2006: 25f.). See also Luraghi (2010).

3 Latin

3.1 *Naves quindecim*: appositive numerical modifier?

From a pragmatic point of view, numerical modifiers in Latin can have two main functions: (i) the numerical modifier functions together with the governing noun and forms a pragmatic unit with it, as in (5), or (ii) the numerical modifier conveys information on its own as in (6), where the number is questioned. In the latter case, the noun is typically given by the preceding context and the answer is reducible to the numerical modifier.

(5)   What did he buy? – *Four.* / He bought *four books*.

(6)   (He bought books.) How many books did he buy? – *Four.* / He bought *four* books.

In Latin, for example, 'eighteen ships' in (7) conveys new information with the underlying question 'what did they do?'. This noun phrase functions as a pragmatic unit and refers back to an entity mentioned before.[7] On the other hand, 'five ships' in (8) corresponds to 'how many ships?'; the governing noun is given by the context. It is typically with this value that the numeral is separated from its noun. In both cases, the modifiers are postnominal and in both cases, they serve to build up the referent and, therefore, cannot be left out.

(7)   (Caes. *Gall*. 4.28.1)
       naves XVIII *de quibus supra demonstratum est ex superiore portu solverunt*.
       'the eighteen ships, to which reference has been made above, set sail from the upper port'

(8)   (Caes. *Civ*. 3.101.4)
       (onerarias naves…) naves *sunt conbustae* quinque
       '(cargo-ships…) five ships were consumed'

After this preliminary distinction, I will address the question of the eventual "appositive" status of postnominal modifiers. Marouzeau (1922: 199, Marouzeau 1953: 26) establishes a distinction between *viginti equites* 'twenty horsemen' and

---

7 Furthermore, the number of the ships is known, see Caes. *Gall*. 4.22.4: *XVIII onerariae naves* 'eighteen cargo-ships'.

equites viginti 'the horsemen to the number of twenty'. His paraphrase implies that he takes *equites viginti* as a sort of apposition (without defining it). Lavency (1997: 120) provides a good definition: the apposition is an expansion of a "complete" (not necessarily definite) noun whose "reference is saturated."[8] Unlike attributive adjectives, which determine or qualify a noun, the non-restrictive apposition conveys accessory information (example [9a]). This characteristic property makes the non-restrictive apposition omissible (example [9b]).

(9)　a.　(Sall. *Iug.* 52.1)
　　　　Eo modo inter se duo imperatores, summi viri, *certabant.*
　　　　'Thus did these two men, both great commanders, struggle with each other.'
　　b.　*Eo modo inter se duo imperatores certabant.*

Another example of a true apposition, formed by two coordinated adjectives, is given in (10).

(10)　(Cic. *Verr*. 2.5.44)
　　　(navis...) Eam navem nuper egomet vidi Veliae..., pulcherrimam atque ornatissimam, *iudices.*
　　　'I saw this ship myself at Velia not long ago...; a splendid vessel, gentlemen, and most completely fitted out.'

If we accept this definition of apposition as an expansion of the noun whose reference is complete, we can interpret *numero quadraginta* in (11) as an apposition with respect to *reliqui omnes* 'all the remaining (elephants)', because this phrase is complete and well delimited. The apposition *numero quadraginta* 'to the number of forty' brings an accessory detail concerning the number of remaining entities and is thus omissible. Likewise in (12): the reference of *omnes naves* 'all the ships' is saturated, so the number can be interpreted as an apposition. In both cases, the entities concerned are known from the preceding context.

(11)　(Sall. *Iug.* 53.4)
　　　Elephanti quattuor capti, reliqui omnes, numero quadraginta, *interfecti.*
　　　'Four elephants were taken, and the rest, to the number of forty, were killed.'

8 We are only concerned here with non-restrictive apposition, not with the restrictive apposition such as *urbs Roma* 'the city of Rome'. For restrictive and non-restrictive appositions, see Quirk et al. (1985: 1305ff.). For a more detailed survey of appositions and their functions, see Spevak (2014: 261–330).

(12)   (Caes. *Civ*. 3.101.1)
       Omnes naves incendit, XXXV e quibus errant XX constratae.
       'He burnt all the ships, thirty-five in number, twenty of which were
       decked.'

The syntactic status of *duae* 'two' in (13) is different: the numeral forms
part of the phrase *naves triremes* and its contribution is to build up
the referent. It cannot be left out because the phrase *naves triremes* would be
incomplete. *Duae* is a modifier that specifies the number of ships – the number
is important for the capture of Brutus's ship, which is encircled by them,
as the following context informs us. Another example of a genuine noun
phrase is given in (14); the resumption made by *quas* refers to *navibus XII*
'twelve ships', and not only to *navibus*, which would be incomplete without
the numeral.

(13)   (Caes. *Civ*. 2.6.4)
       Conspicataeque naves triremes duae *navem D. Bruti... duabus ex partibus
       sese in eam incitaverant.*
       'Two triremes, spotting Decimus Brutus' ship... threw themselves upon it
       from two sides.'

(14)   (Caes. *Civ*. 2.23.5)
       Hunc secutus Marcius Rufus quaestor navibus XII *quas Curio ex Sicilia
       eduxerat.*
       'The quaestor Marcius Rufus followed him with twelve ships that... Curio
       had brought from Sicily.'

Marouzeau's paraphrase of *equites viginti* as 'horsemen to the number of
twenty' cannot be taken as a criterion for identifying the "appositive" numerals.
It probably makes an implicit reference to the ablative of relation *numero* 'to the
number of' that may accompany the numeral. *Numero* is used with nouns with a
saturated reference (example [11]), and also with nouns without saturated refer-
ence.[9] Furthermore, such expressions with *numero* are not completely free in
their usage: they seem to be peculiar to Caesar[10] and are restricted to certain

---

9 See, for example, Caes. *Gall*. 2.4.7: *oppida habere numero XII* 'they had twelve towns' (lit.
'towns to the number of twelve').
10 In Classical Latin prose (see *LLT*), *numero* with a numeral is used 15 times by Caesar and two
times by Sallust; Cicero does not use it at all.

verbs and to certain entities.[11] They are not attested in cases such as (15) with a non-agentive intransitive verb.

(15)   a.   (Caes. *Civ.* 1.61.5)
           (id oppidum) milia passuum *a castris aberat XXX.*
           'This town was thirty miles from the camp.'
       b.   **milia passuum a castris aberat numero XXX.*

We have seen that the interpretation of a numeral as apposition is only possible when the governing noun has a semantically saturated referent. This point makes it possible to reject the example (16a) quoted by Bauer (2008: 44), which is supposed to illustrate an "appositive" numeral. The postnominal numeral functions here as a determiner and cannot be omitted: *post dies* 'after days' would be incomplete information (example [16b]).

(16)   a.   (Cato *Agr.* 126)
           Post dies XXX *aperito et utito.*
           'After thirty days open it and use it.'
       b.   **post dies aperito et utito.*

To sum up: "postnominal" does not necessarily mean "appositive." Postposition of a modifier can be due to pragmatic reasons. Postnominal modifiers that build up a referent are not the same thing as non-restrictive appositions, which are expansions of a noun (phrase) with a complete reference. Unlike postnominal modifiers, appositions bring additional information and are omissible.

3.2 *Orator bonus*: predicative adjective?

Marouzeau's (1922: 221) considerations about the predicative character of post-nominal adjectives, presented in Section 2, are no doubt influenced by the existence of nominal sentences (Fr. *phrases nominales*), that is, sentences without the copula expressed (17).

---

11 These are, specifically, agentive transitive verbs, for example: *facio* 'to do', *expedio* 'to make ready', *interficio* 'to kill', intransitive verbs *convenio* 'to meet', and also several non-agentive verbs: *habeo* 'to have', *cado* 'to fall', and *sto* 'to stand'. The entities involved by *numero* are especially all sort of soldiers, then ships, cities, and elephants, i.e., countable concrete entities.

(17)   (Cic. *Att*. 14.13.2)
        res odiosa et aliena *nostris aetatibus*
        'a weary business and unbefitting our age'

"In this example," says Marouzeau (1922: 80), "we can understand the adjective either in the sense of 'it is a weary thing' (attributive adjective) or in that of 'the thing is weary' (predicative adjective)."

    In this case, it is certainly attractive to interpret the postnominal adjectives as predicative adjectives. However, there are two main objections against generalising this view. The first one is the existence of denominal adjectives in Latin that cannot be predicated (*navis oneraria* 'cargo-ship', *populus Romanus* 'Roman people'); the second one is multiple adjectives (*naves onerariae magnae* 'large cargo-ships').

3.2.1 Denominal adjectives

A noun phrase can only be paraphrased by a predication if it contains a qualifying adjective with a subjective, evaluative meaning (*bonus* 'good', *novus* 'new', *vetus* 'old', etc.), see example (18). Adjectives expressing an inherent property of the noun (such as *onerarius* 'cargo') do not allow such a transformation (example [19]): they cannot be predicated.[12] Predication is only possible if the noun is expressed together with the adjective (example [20]).[13] Such a constraint demonstrates that the adjective in *navis oneraria* cannot be viewed as a predicative adjective.

(18)   *orator bonus est*
        'the orator is good'

(19)   **navis oneraria est*
        *'this ship is cargo'

(20)   *Haec* navis oneraria *est*.
        'This is a cargo-ship.'

3.2.2 Multiple adjectives

At the noun phrase level, adjectives expressing qualities of the same type are coordinated, for example *ruber nigerque* + noun 'red and black + noun';

---

12 See Bolinger (1972: 21) and Fugier (1983: 237f.). For this type of adjectives, expressing inherent properties of nouns (Eng. *ironing board*), see Hetzron (1978), Quirk et al. (1985: 1339ff.); for Latin Risselada (1984) and Spevak (2010: 231).
13 For more examples, see Spevak (2014: 74–76).

adjectives expressing different qualities are juxtaposed: not **niger ferreusque* + noun ***'black and iron + noun' but *niger ferreus* + noun 'black iron + noun'.[14] This phenomenon is called "nesting". In predicative function, adjectives are always coordinated, never juxtaposed, for example *nigrae et siccae* 'black and dry' in (21), used about *orchites*, a kind of olives.[15] In (22), we have a noun phrase with juxtaposed adjectives; the relative clause introduced by *quas* resumes the whole syntactic unit. Paraphrases in (23) are excluded for two reasons: (i) in the predicative function adjectives cannot be juxtaposed and (ii) adjectives expressing inherent properties cannot be predicated.

(21)   (Cato *Agr.* 7.4)
       orchites ubi nigrae *erunt* et siccae
       '(olives) when the orchites will be black and dry'

(22)   (Caes. *Civ.* 1.26.1)
       Pompeius naves magnas onerarias *quas in portu Brundisino deprehenderat adornabat.*
       'Pompey fitted out some large cargo-ships which he had seized in the port of Brundisium.'

(23)   **naves magnae onerariae erant* / **naves quae magnae onerariaeque erant*
       *ships were large cargo   / *ships that were large and cargo

From these two sections, an important conclusion can be drawn: adjectives functioning as attributes behave differently from adjectives used predicatively. Attributive adjectives are juxtaposed when they express different qualities, and they usually do so according to rules of hierarchy.[16] Predicative adjectives are always coordinated, when more than one occur. In other words, juxtaposition of adjectives (example [22]) is a distinctive feature of noun phrases. Denominal adjectives (*Romanus* 'Roman', *onerarius* 'cargo'), which cannot be predicated, are excluded from any "appositive" reading, due to their syntactic behaviour.

---

14 See Pinkster (1972: 112, Pinkster 1995 [1990]: § 6.4) and Risselada (1984). Adjectives expressing dimension and evaluation can be coordinated (cf. Hetzron 1978: 173), in Latin (Pinkster 1995 [1990]: § 6.4) as well as in Greek (see, for example, Hdt. 3.42.1).
15 See Spevak (2010: 238). Besides, noun phrases in English present the same properties, cf. Cabredo Hofherr (2010: 19ff.).
16 See Hetzron (1978), Risselada (1984), and Spevak (2010: 231).

3.3 Constructions with *ille*

The third case that I will examine for Latin is the demonstrative pronoun *ille* 'that'. A sequence such as {noun + *ille* + noun} could be a good candidate for an interpretation as "appositive construction," as Himmelmann suggested.[17] However, the postposition of *ille*, for example with respect to proper names, does not suggest in itself any appositive interpretation. *Quintus ille Apronius* in (24) is a mere variant of *ille Quintus Apronius*, where *ille* refers to shared knowledge.[18] It behaves as a syntactic unit, as one noun phrase, which is as a whole resumed by the relative pronoun *quem*. Therefore, interpretation of *ille Apronius* as an "appositive" element to Quintus is unlikely.[19] Besides, [*Quintus*, [*ille Apronius*]] would imply a specific prosodic segmentation. In (25), the noun phrase as a whole has a non-restrictive apposition as its expansion.

(24) (Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.22)
      Eorum omnium princeps erat Quintus ille Apronius *quem videtis*.
      'Of all the persons… the foremost was the notorious Quintus Apronius, now present in court.'

(25) (Cic. *Flacc.* 42)
      Caput est Heraclides ille Temnites, *homo ineptus et loquax*.
      'The principal man… is Heraclides of Temnos, a silly chattering fellow.

Another example is given in (26): *Antipater Sidonius* with an *ille* in between. The relative clause, started by *ille*, refers to the whole noun phrase, and not only to *Antipater*. The structure of this construction is resumed in the following way: [[*Antipater ille Sidonius*] *ille quem*…].

(26) (Cic. *De orat.* 3.194)
      Antipater ille Sidonius, *ille quem tu probe meministi, solitus est*…
      'But if the great Antipater of Sidon, whom you can remember well, had a habit of…'

All these cases (examples [24]–[26]) are to be distinguished from non-restrictive appositions such as in (27). The first element, *Q. Scaevola*, is complete; *ille augur* is a

---

17 See Himmelmann (1997: 184); he considers such constructions as two miniature phrases ([[noun] [*ille* + adj.]]). They are supposed to prefigure the *Gelenkartikel* or 'connector-article'.
18 On functions of *ille*, see Pinkster (2005).
19 These constructions are considered as "appositives" for example by Bauer (2008: 46).

non-restrictive apposition that recalls the function of Scaevola, and, at the same time, justifies the action: Scaevola has been consulted because he was an augur.

(27) (Cic. *Balb.* 45)
   Si Q. Scaevola, ille augur, *cum de iure praediatorio consuleretur...*
   'If Quintus Scaevola, that famous augur, on being consulted about the law of mortgaged properties...'

In (28), the interpretation of *vir ille summus* 'the great man' as a unit is required. In the preceding context, Cicero has tried to convince Pompey either to make peace or to wage a protracted war; Pompey, on the contrary, insisted on conducting the war aggressively. *Vir* has a definite reading, *summus* qualifies the referent (Pompey); *ille* refers to shared knowledge ('as you know'). Together, they build up a noun phrase 'that great man' and any "appositive" reading ('the man, the great one') is to be excluded for semantic reasons: it does not suit the context. In my view, the ordering *vir ille summus* is just a variant of *ille vir summus* or *ille summus vir*.

(28) (Cic. *Fam.* 7.3.2)
   Ex eo tempore vir ille summus *nullus imperator fuit.*
   'From then on, that great man ceased to be a general.'

In sum, an adjective in postposition – even if preceded by the demonstrative *ille*, which might look like an embryo of the definite article – is not necessarily an "appositive" element. There are syntactic reasons (examples [24]–[26]) or semantic reasons (example [28]) that allow us to consider such instances as noun phrases with a special ordering of their components.

4 Ancient Greek

4.1 Articular adjectives

Delimitation of noun phrases in Greek, at least in the post-Homeric period, is facilitated by the definite article that marks the unity of the phrase. Thus, ὁ σοφὸς ἀνήρ 'the wise man' is a noun phrase with clear boundaries formed by the article and the governing noun; the adjective situated in the middle is well integrated into the noun phrase. However, there is another problem, namely the syntactic status of postnominal articular adjectives (example [29]).

Traditional grammars (Smyth 1920: 293) describe them as attributes, in contrast with non-articular adjectives functioning as predicates (example [30]).

(29) attributive adjectives
ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ σοφός and ἀνὴρ ὁ σοφός
'the wise man'

(30) predicative adjectives
σοφὸς ὁ ἀνήρ and ὁ ἀνὴρ σοφός
'the man is wise'

Recently, the sequence {article + noun + article + adjective}: ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ σοφός (example [29]), termed "double articulation", which also exists in modern Greek, has drawn a lot of attention: is it one noun phrase or two?[20] Rijkhoff (2002: 19f.) considers the articular adjective in double articulation as "appositive": 'the man, the wise one'. According to him, the articular modifier does not form a unit with the noun but represents a noun phrase in apposition, for example in (31), 'the plane-tree, the golden one'.

(31) (Hdt. 7.27.2)
Δαρεῖον ἐδωρήσατο τῇ πλατανίστῳ τῇ χρυσέῃ καὶ τῇ ἀμπέλῳ.
'this is who gave your father Darius that gift of a golden plane-tree and vine'

The difficulty with such an "appositive" interpretation is that the articular adjective can accompany a noun without the article: ἀνὴρ ὁ σοφός 'man the wise'. There is not necessarily "concord in definiteness" between the two elements (*pace* Himmelmann 1997: 178f.), as was shown by Bakker (2009: 221). According to her, the referent of παῖδάς 'boys' in (31) cannot be identified without the help of the adjective and any "appositive" reading is excluded: *'boys, the most handsome ones'.[21] In other words, the articular adjectives function as modifiers and the nouns would be incomplete without them.[22]

---

20 See Plank (2003b: 340f.) and Bakker (2009: 219ff.) for discussion. The indefinite type ἀνὴρ ὁ σοφός is anterior in time to the definite type ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ σοφός (Devine and Stephens 2000: 238). Brunel (1964), Plank (2003b), and Bakker (2009) regard these constructions as one noun phrase.

21 *Pace* Gildersleeve (1900: 280) who labels ἀνὴρ ὁ σοφός as "self corrective," and Smyth (1920: 293).

22 For more examples, see Bakker (2006: 98); cf. also Brunel (1964: 75).

(32) (Hdt. 6.32)
      παῖδάς τε τοὺς εὐειδεστάτους ἐκλεγόμενοι ἐξέταμνον.
      'They chose out the comeliest boys and castrated them.'

Proper names, which have a different referential status with respect to common nouns, are also used with articular adjectives. It is difficult to interpret qualifying adjectives expressing subjective evaluation, such as 'the wise' (example [33]), which could actually be in apposition. However, in the case of determination like 'of Collytus' in (34), we are dealing with true noun phrases.

(33) (Plat. *Apol.* 27a)
      ἆρα γνώσεται Σωκράτης ὁ σοφὸς δὴ ἐμοῦ χαριεντιζομένου...;
      'Will Socrates the wise man recognise that I am joking...?'

(34) (Dem. *Timocr.* 134)
      (μέμνησθε) ἔπειτ' Ἀγύρριον τὸν Κολλυτέα, ἄνδρα χρηστὸν.
      'Next take Agrrhius of Collytus, a good man.'

There is one more point concerning double articulation which deserves mention. Whereas Greek grammars usually agree in saying that the postnominal articular adjective occupies the attributive position (Smyth 1920: 293), i.e., it functions as attribute, translators sometimes prefer to translate it as a predicative adjective, in particular when a qualifying adjective is involved. Example (35) is the best one for illustration.

(35) (Xen. *An.* 5.8.24)
      τοῦτον τἀναντία ποιήσετε ἢ τοὺς κύνας ποιοῦσι· τοὺς μὲν γὰρ κύνας τοὺς χαλεποὺς τὰς μὲν ἡμέρας διδέασι, τὰς δὲ νύκτας ἀφιᾶσι.
      '(If you are wise,) you will do to this fellow the opposite of what people do to dogs: for dogs that are savage are tied up by day and let loose by night.'

The translation of τοὺς κύνας τοὺς χαλεπούς by 'the dogs that are savage'[23] interprets the adjective as predicative, as if we had τοὺς κύνας χαλεπούς with a non-articular adjective. This point could be significant. The articular adjective in double articulation could be nothing but a signal of the attributive value of the adjective. Consider, in this connection, what Himmelmann (1997: 165) says

---

23 Translation by C. L. Brownson (1922) on Perseus (www.perseus.tufts.edu); also in Loeb edition (1998).

about the *Gelenkartikel* in Albanese: "it is a mark that signals the attribute." In any case, for Smyth (1920: 293), τοὺς κύνας τοὺς χαλεποὺς is an expressive variant of τοὺς χαλεποὺς κύνας 'the savage dogs', and I think that he is right.

4.2 Multiple adjectives

Also in Ancient Greek (cf. Section 3.2.2), multiple adjectives behave in different ways, depending on the function they fulfil: predicative adjectives are coordinated (example [36]), attributive adjectives expressing different kinds of qualities are juxtaposed (example [37]).

(36)   (Hdt. 4.52.2)
       ὁ Ὕπανις ποταμὸς βραχὺς καὶ *γ*λυκύς ἐστι.
       'The river Hypanis… its waters are shallow and sweet.'

(37)   (Hdt. 2.91.2)
       ἐπὶ δὲ αὐτοῖσι ἀνδριάντες δύο ἑστᾶσι λίθινοι μ*ε*γάλοι.
       'and upon them stand two great stone statues'

5 Conclusion

Regarding postnominal modifiers as "appositive" in Latin and Ancient Greek, languages with a very flexible constituent order, is attractive, from the standpoints of both Indo-European comparative grammar and linguistic typology. However, a detailed look at actually attested material shows that it is important to distinguish between attributive adjectives, predicative adjectives, and appositions. Even if some cases are difficult to interpret, criteria such as the complete or incomplete nature of the referent, the type of modifiers involved, omissibility, resumption by relative pronouns, coordination, and context help in identifying noun phrases and true appositions. Variation of the ordering, discontinuity, and special arrangement of the noun phrase components result from great flexibility of Latin and Greek noun phrases. Furthermore, there are two phenomena that are unique to noun phrases: denominal adjectives expressing inherent properties and juxtaposition of adjectives. In other words, there is a difference between attributive and predicative use of adjectives; consequently, there is a difference between their use at the noun phrase level and that at the sentence level. At the noun phrase level, multiple (attributive) adjectives expressing different qualities are juxtaposed: they undergo the so-

called "nesting," which proves that noun phrases are hierarchically structured. At the sentence level, (predicative) adjectives do not allow nesting, only coordination; denominal adjectives expressing inherent properties of entities are in principle excluded from this level. All these semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic properties should be taken into consideration for the correct interpretation of putative "appositive" modifiers.

References

Bakker, D. 1998. Flexibility and consistency in word order patterns in the languages of Europe. In Anna Siewierska (ed.), *Constituent order in the languages of Europe*, 383–419. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bakker, S. 2006. The position of the adjective in definite noun phrases. In Emilio Crespo et al. (eds.), *Word classes and related topics in Ancient Greek*, 91–104. Louvain-La-Neuve: Peeters.

Bakker, S. 2009. *The noun phrase in Ancient Greek*. Leiden: Brill.

Bauer, B. 2008. Nominal apposition in Vulgar and Late Latin. At the cross-roads of major language changes? In Roger Wright (ed.), *Latin vulgaire, latin tardif VIII*, 42–50. Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann.

Bolinger, D. 1972. *Degree words*. Paris & The Hague: Mouton.

Brunel, J. 1964. *La construction de l'adjectif dans les groupes nominaux du grec*. Paris: PUF.

Cabredo Hofherr, P. 2010. Adjectives. In P. Cabredo Hofherr & O. Matushansky (eds.), *Adjectives: Formal analyses in syntax and semantics* (Linguistik aktuell/Linguistics today 153), 1–26. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Devine, A. M. & L. D. Stephens. 2000. *Discontinuous syntax: Hyperbaton in Greek*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Devine, A. M. & L. D. Stephens. 2006. *Latin word order. Structured meaning and information*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Forsgren, M. 1993. L'adjectif et la fonction d'apposition: observations syntaxiques, sémantiques et pragmatiques. *L'information grammatical* 58. 15–22.

Fugier, H. 1983. Le syntagme nominal en latin classique. In Wolfgang Haase (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.29(1), 212–269. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Gildersleeve, B. L. 1900. *Syntax of Classical Greek. From Homer to Demosthenes*. New York: American Book Company.

Hetzron, R. 1978. On the relative order of adjectives. In Hansjacob Seiler (ed.), *Language universals*, 165–184. Tübingen: Narr.

Himmelmann, N. P. 1997. *Deiktikon, Artikel, Nominalphrase: zur Emergenz syntaktischer Struktur*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Lavency, M. 1997. *VSVS. Grammaire latine*, 2nd edn. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.

Lehmann, Ch. 1991. The Latin nominal group in typological perspective. In R. Coleman (ed.), *New studies in Latin linguistics* (Studies in Language Companion Series 21), 203–232. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

LLT: *Library of Latin Texts*. Brepolis: Brepols Publishers online.

Luraghi, S. 2010. The rise (and possible downfall) of configurationality. In S. Luraghi & V. Bubenik (eds.), *Continuum companion to historical linguistics*, 212–229. London & New York: Continuum.

Marouzeau, J. 1922. *L'ordre des mots dans la phrase latine, vol. I. Les groupes nominaux*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Marouzeau, J. 1953. *L'ordre des mots en latin. Volume complémentaire*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Meillet, A. 1937. *Introduction à l'étude des langues indo-européennes*, édition augmentée par E. Benveniste. Paris: Hachette.

Meillet, A. & J. Vendryès. 1963. *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*, 3rd edn. Paris: Champion.

Pinkster, H. 1972. *On Latin adverbs*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Pinkster, H. 1983. *Praedicativum*. In H. Pinkster (ed.), *Latin linguistics and linguistic theory* (Studies in Language Companion Series 12), 199–217. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Pinkster, H. 1995 [1990]. *Latin syntax and semantics*. London: Routledge. And its revised and enhanced edition *Sintaxis y semántica del latín*. Madrid: Ed. Clásicas. http://perseus. uchicago.edu/cgi-bin/philologic/navigate.pl?NewPerseusMonographs.19. Accessed on 2015-09-13.

Pinkster, H. 2005. The use of *is* and *ille* in Seneca Rhetor. In Sándor Kiss et al. (eds.), *Latin et langues romanes: études de linguistique offertes à József Herman à l'occasion de son 80ème anniversaire*, 57–64. Tubingen: Niemeyer.

Plank, F. 2003a. Noun phrase structure. In F. Plank (ed.), *Noun phrase structure in the languages of Europe*, 3–33. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Plank, F. 2003b. Double articulation. In F. Plank (ed.), *Noun phrase structure in the languages of Europe*, 337–395. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London & New York: Longman.

Rijkhoff, J. 2002. *The noun phrase*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Risselada, R. 1984. Coordination and juxtaposition of adjectives in the Latin NP. *Glotta* 62. 202–231.

Smyth, H. W. 1920. *Greek grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Spevak, O. 2010. *Constituent order in Classical Latin prose* (Studies in Language Companion Series 117). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Spevak, O. 2014. *The noun phrase in Classical Latin prose* (Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 21). Leiden: Brill.

Touratier, Ch. 1994. *Syntaxe latine*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.