

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ANCIENT GREEK LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

Volume 1
A–F

General Editor
Georgios K. Giannakis

Associate Editors
Vit Bubenik
Emilio Crespo
Chris Golston
Alexandra Lianeri
Silvia Luraghi
Stephanos Matthaios



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2014

Table of Contents

VOLUME ONE

Introduction	vii
List of Contributors	xi
Table of Contents Ordered by Thematic Category	xv
Transcription, Abbreviations, Bibliography	xxi
List of Illustrations	xxiii
Articles A–F	1

VOLUME TWO

Transcription, Abbreviations, Bibliography	vii
Articles G–O	1

VOLUME THREE

Transcription, Abbreviations, Bibliography	vii
Articles P–Z	1
Index	547

Unlike adjuncts in the narrow sense, most disjuncts that express the values (c) and (d) are semantically equivalent to adjuncts of an implicit verb of saying (\rightarrow Verba Dicendi) or thinking which governs the sentence in which they appear: e.g. *frankly, I'm tired* compared to *I am frankly telling you I'm tired*.

A great number of adverbs and alternative expressions appear both as adjuncts in the narrow sense and as disjuncts. Thus, *aiskhrôs* 'shamefully' is an adjunct of manner in (7) because it refers to a specific way of living, but an evaluative disjunct in (8) because it states Andromache's evaluation of her death in terms of her disapproval and her feelings:

- (7) *zên aiskhrôn aiskhrôs toîs kalôs pephukósîn*
'to live shamefully is shameful for the noble-born' (Soph. *El.* 989)
- (8) *thanoúmetha, aiskhrôs mèn humîn, dustukhôs d' emoi.*
'We shall die, shamefully for you and sadly for me.' (Eur. *Andr.* 575f.)

The different syntactic status of adjuncts (in a narrow sense) and disjuncts is also reflected in the fact that disjuncts of modality and adjuncts of manner do not appear in \rightarrow coordination (see (1) where *ísôs* 'perhaps' and *houtôs* 'in this way' modify the verbal predicate *ágei* 'leads'). This is probably due to the fact that adverbs lie at different levels in clause structure (Crespo 1998).

Disjuncts in their turn can be used in several ways which are not yet fully described. Among them, conjunctives, also called conjuncts (e.g. *prôton... épeita... 'first... next...'* in (3), *hómôs* 'however') with a value that has nothing to do with its meaning as a member of a conjunction, are optional constituents which generally accompany a coordinating \rightarrow conjunction and link independent units at the same hierarchical level.

In modern times, the term and the notion of disjunct in the sense explained above (as well as the related notion of adjunct in a narrower sense than the traditional one of the optional constituent) were proposed by Greenbaum (1969) and adopted by Quirk et al. (1985) for the analysis of contemporary English and by Pinkster (1972, 1990) for the analysis of Latin adverbs, whence they were subsequently transferred to Classical Greek (e.g. Cuzzolin 1995; Crespo, Conti & Maquieira 2003).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Crespo, Emilio. 1998. "Niveles sintácticos de la estructura de la oración principal simple en griego antiguo". In: *Nombres y funciones*, ed. by María Esperanza Torrego, 43–63. Madrid.
- Crespo, Emilio, Luz Conti and Helena Maquieira. 2003. *Sintaxis del griego clásico*. Madrid.
- Cuzzolin, Pierluigi. 1995. "Preliminari per una descrizione dell'avverbio di frase in greco antico". In: *Studi di linguistica greca*, ed. by Pierluigi Cuzzolin, 137–164. Milan.
- Dik, Simon C. 1997. *The theory of functional grammar*, ed. by K. Hengeveld. 2 vols. Revised 2nd ed. Berlin – New York.
- Greenbaum, Sidney. 1970 [1969]. *Studies in English adverbial usage*. London.
- Pinkster, Harm. 1972. *On Latin adverbs*. Amsterdam.
- . 1990. *Latin syntax and semantics*. New York.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svastvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London – New York.

EMILIO CRESPO

Dissimilation

Dissimilation is a phonological process in which one segment becomes less similar to another segment with respect to a given feature.

Regular synchronic alternations involving dissimilation are much rarer than those involving \rightarrow assimilation (for a general overview of dissimilation, see Aldrete and Frisch 2007, and Bye forthcoming; Suzuki 1998 is a typological study of the phenomenon). Diachronically, dissimilation tends to be sporadic, and to target random lexical items (Posner 1961).

The most prominent synchronic dissimilatory process in Greek is \rightarrow Grassmann's Law (Grassmann 1863), whereby the first of two aspirated segments in a word is deaspirated (\rightarrow Aspiration), e.g. the verb *thúō* 'I sacrifice' has a reduplicated perfect form *téthuka* from expected /*téthuka*/. The [t] of the reduplicant results from dissimilation before the aspirated [t^h]. Another dissimilation, which took place at a much earlier date in the history of Greek, is the so-called *boukolos*-rule: adjacent to labial */u(:)/ or */w/, the \rightarrow labiovelars (*k^w*, *g^w*, and *g^wh*) lose their labiality. The word for 'shepherd', *boukólos*, which comes from **g^wouk^wolos*, gives its name to the process. The /u/ preceding /k^w/ triggers a dissimilation to /k/. The Linear B spelling of the word, <qo-u-ko-ro>, shows that dissimilation had already taken place in \rightarrow Mycenaean; the merger is assumed to have taken place in Common Greek (Thompson 2010:189; \rightarrow Proto-Greek and Common Greek). We would have otherwise

expected ***boupolos*, showing the labiovelar outcome we do in fact find in *aipólos* ‘goatherd’ and *amphipólos* ‘attendant,’ with *-pólos* in both cases from earlier **-k^wolos*.

Otherwise examples of dissimilation are restricted to particular lexical items, a situation that gives rise to debate about whether dissimilation actually occurred in a widespread or clearly definable way. Sihler (1995:56) notes a development from **wew* > **wei*, e.g. in the aorist of the verb for ‘speak,’ *eípon* < **eweik^wom* < **ewewk^wom*; as well as *aweid-* ‘sing’ < **awewd-* (see further Beekes 2010:23). It has been suggested that *zízuphon* ‘jujube tree’ results from an earlier **zuzu-*, but Beekes (2010:502) rejects this; for vowel dissimilation in Attic inscriptions, see Threatte (1980:390–391). There are a number of cases that involve dissimilation of /r/ (see Lejeune 1972:150; Poultney 1972; Vine 2011, with further literature). The most prominent of these is perhaps the suggestion of Wackernagel that *argós* ‘bright; swift’ < **argros*, an idea which has recently been called into question (Vine 2011).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aldrete, John D. and Stefan A. Frisch. 2007. “Dissimilation in grammar and the lexicon”. In: *The Cambridge handbook of phonology*, ed. by Paul de Lacy, 379–398. Cambridge.
- Beekes, Robert S. P. 2010. *Etymological dictionary of Greek*. Boston – Leiden.
- Bye, Patrik. 2011. “Dissimilation”. In: *The Blackwell companion to phonology*, vol. 3: *Phonological processes*, ed. by Marc van Oostendorp et al., 1408–1433. Malden, MA.
- Grassmann, Hermann. 1863. “Ueber die Aspiraten und ihr gleichzeitiges Vorhandensein im An- und Auslaute der Wurzeln”, *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete des Deutschen, Griechischen und Lateinischen* 12:81–138.
- Lejeune, Michel. 1972. *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. Paris.
- Posner, Rebecca. 1961. *Consonantal dissimilation in the Romance languages*. Oxford.
- Poultney, James. 1972. “Assimilatory and dissimilatory gain and loss of r”, *The American Journal of Philology* 93:198–214.
- Sihler, Andrew L. 1995. *New comparative grammar of Greek and Latin*. New York – Oxford.
- Suzuki, Keiichiro. 1998. *A typological investigation of dissimilation*. Ph.D. diss., University of Arizona.
- Thompson, Rupert. 2010. “Mycenaean Greek”. In: *A companion to the Ancient Greek language*, ed. by Egbert Bakker, 189–199. Malden, MA – Oxford.
- Threatte, Leslie. 1980. *The grammar of Attic inscriptions*, vol. 1: *Phonology*. Berlin – New York.
- Vine, Brent. 2011. “On dissimilatory r-loss in Greek”. In: *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog. Akten der XIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 21. bis 27. September 2008 in Salzburg*, ed. by Thomas Krisch und Thomas Lindner, 1–17. Wiesbaden.

DAVID GOLDSTEIN

Doric

1. INTRODUCTION

Like every spoken language, Ancient Greek presents several dialectal varieties from the beginning of its history. The Greek dialects are defined as such because they all share a series of exclusive linguistic features that make them clearly different from each other. One of the most ancient isoglosses that enables us to divide the Greek dialects into two clearly distinct groups is already attested in the Mycenaean tablets (14th–13th c. BCE) (→ Mycenaean Script and Language). This innovation occurs in forms such as *e-ko-si* / (h)ekhonsi/ (Att. *ékhousi* ‘they have’) and involves the change of the final syllable *-ti* into *-si* (→ Assibilation). Although this feature is characteristic of the dialects known as East Greek (→ Southeast Greek), it is not present in the dialects grouped under the term (North-)West (NW) Greek (→ Northwest Greek), in which *-ti* is in fact preserved (*ékhonti*). The Doric dialects belong to this latter group of West Greek.

Within the Doric group, a distinction is usually made between Doric dialects proper and Northwest dialects, that is, Doric varieties that were spoken in the northwest of Greece (Aetolian, Acarnanian, Locrian, Phocidian, etc.). There is no linguistic argument to support the hypothesis that the Northwest Doric dialects form an independent group either from a diachronic or from a synchronic point of view. The peculiarities and innovations that every single NW Greek dialect presents may not be shared by the others; the label ‘North-West’ refers primarily to the geographical aspect, even though it may also be of a certain use (fulness) for the organization/classification of the Doric dialects as a whole (Méndez Dosuna 1985; Brixhe 2006; Colvin 2007).

The West Greek dialectal group is held to have been spoken by the Dorians, one of the lineages that Ancient Greeks considered to have been the founders of their people. Thus, in order to define the dialectal Doric group, two main criteria are used, which seem to be inseparable: linguistic evidence, on the one hand, and (sense of) ethnic community and history, on the other. The former relies on the presence/recognition of a series of phonetic, morphological, syntactic and lexical features shared by this group of dialects. The latter is based on evidence