

# ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ANCIENT GREEK LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

Volume 2  
G–O

*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

proto-language could be analyzed as combinations of initial \*A/O + /e/, e.g. Gk. *antí* ~ Lat. *ante* < PIE \*Aenti. Also the various classes of → nasal presents in Sanskrit could now be analyzed as

stemming from the same formation with a nasal infix before the final consonant of the root and ablauting between singular (\*-ne-) and plural (\*-n-), cf.

verb class	Skt. 3 sg.	1 pl.	PIE 3 sg.	1 pl.	meaning
V.	<i>śṛṇóti</i>	<i>śṛṇumá</i>	* <i>k̑l̑-né-<u>u</u>-ti</i>	* <i>k̑l̑-n-u-més</i>	'hear'
VII.	<i>yunákti</i>	<i>yuñjmá</i>	* <i>yú-né-<u>ǵ</u>-ti</i>	* <i>yú-n-ǵ-més</i>	'yoke'
IX.	<i>punáti</i>	<i>punimá</i>	* <i>pu-né-A-ti</i>	* <i>pu-n-A-més</i>	'clean'

Although criticized as too speculative at first, de Saussure's theory received concluding support with the excavation of the documents of the Hittite empire in Hattušaš in 1906 and the subsequent discovery made by Kuryłowicz in 1927 that in Hittite the phoneme spelled <ḫ> occurs in many cases in the position of the Saussurean \*A/O, e.g. Hitt. *ḫant-* 'front, opposite side' ~ PIE \*Aent- (: Gk. *antí*, Lat. *ante*), Hitt. *paḫš-* 'protect' ~ PIE \*peAs- (: Lat. *pāscō*, *pāstor*), etc. This unexpected confirmation of de Saussure's theory in turn reinforced the confidence in IR as a basically correct and fruitful method of historical research. It subsequently made its way into the handbooks of historical linguistics (cf. already Hermann 1907), with major contributions to its principles and procedures from the 1940s to the 1960s.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bonfante, Giuliano. 1945. "On reconstruction and linguistic method", *Word* 1:83–94, 132–161.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 1959. "Internal reconstruction in Seneca", *Language* 35:477–495.
- Deutscher, Guy. 2002. "On the misuse of the notion of 'abduction' in linguistics", *Journal of Linguistics* 38(3):469–485.
- Fox, Anthony. 1995. *Linguistic reconstruction. An introduction to theory and method*. Oxford.
- Givón, Talmy. 1999. "Internal reconstruction, on its own". In: *Language change and typological variation: in honor of Winfred P. Lehmann on the occasion of his 83rd birthday, I: Language change and phonology; II: Grammatical universals and typology*. Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph Series, vol. 30, 86–130. Washington D.C.
- Hermann, Eduard. 1907. "Über das Rekonstruieren", *Kuhn's Zeitschrift* 41:1–69.
- Hock, Hans H. 1991. *Principles of historical linguistics*. Berlin – New York – Amsterdam.
- Hoenigswald, Henry M. 1960. *Language change and linguistic reconstruction*. Chicago.
- Joseph, Brian D. 2010. "Internal reconstruction". In: *Continuum companion to historical linguistics*, ed. by Silvia Luraghi and Vít Bubeník, 52–58. London.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1927. "ə indo-européen et ḫ hittite". In: *Symbolae grammaticae in honorem Ioannis Rozwadowski*, I, 95–104. Cracow.

—. 1964. "On the methods of internal reconstruction". In: *Proceedings of the ninth international congress of linguists, Cambridge, Mass., August 27–31, 1962*, ed. by Horace G. Lunt, 10–36. The Hague.

Marchand, James W. 1956. "Internal reconstruction of phonemic split", *Language* 32:245–53.

Ringe, Don. 2003. "Internal reconstruction". In: *The handbook of historical linguistics*, ed. by Brian D. Joseph and Richard D. Janda, 244–261. Oxford.

de Saussure, Ferdinand. 1879. *Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles dans les langues indo-européennes*. Leipzig.

DANIEL KÖLLIGAN

## Intonational Phrase

The prosodic constituent immediately below the → utterance and immediately above the → phonological phrase is the intonational phrase, which has been the subject of extensive research cross-linguistically. As a result, the unit is known by a range of different terms in the literature, including intermediate phrase (Pierrehumbert 1980), tone unit (Halliday 1967), and intonation unit (Chafe 1994:53–70); see further Fox (2000). Devine and Stephens (1994:409–455) is the standard treatment of the intonational phrase in Ancient Greek, although they refer to this constituent as the *major phrase*.

The intonational phrase can be characterized from different perspectives. Syntactically, the intonational phrase usually corresponds to the *clause* (Selkirk 1986; Nespor and Vogel 1986; Cruttenden 1997:68–73) as opposed to the *sentence*, which is the prosodic analogue of the utterance. Just as a sentence often contains many clauses, its corresponding utterance often contains many intonational phrases. The beginning of Plato's *Parmenides* (126a) is punctuated as a single utterance (sentence) but is assumed to contain eight intonational phrases (marked *i*), each of which roughly corresponds to a clause:

- (1) [*epēidē Athēnazde oíkothen ek Klazomenôn aphikómētha*]ᵢ  
 ‘When to Athens from our home in Clazomenae we arrived, [*kat’ agorân enetúkhomen Adeimántōi te kai Glaukōni*]ᵢ  
 at the marketplace we ran into Adeimantus and Glaucón,  
 [*kai mou labómenos tēs kheirós ho Adeímantos*]ᵢ [*khaîr’*]ᵢ [*éphē*]ᵢ [*ô Képhale*]ᵢ  
 and taking me by the hand Adeimantus said,  
 ‘Hello, Cephalus,  
 [*kai éi tou déēi tôn tēide hōn hēmeís dunatōi*]ᵢ [*phráze*]ᵢ  
 and if you need anything here that we’re able to do, say so”’

Wherever a clause ends, we find the end of an intonational phrase (Selkirk 1986), even if that clause is part of a larger utterance. Note that parentheticals like *éphē*, ‘he said’, are generally assumed to start a new ᵢ (Fränkel 1965; Devine and Stephens 1994:416–418).

Prosodically, the intonational phrase is thought to be the longest stretch of speech to which a single intonation pattern applies (that is, a pattern of high or low pitches). ᵢ is usually delineated by a change of pitch level or pitch direction, pauses of varying duration (Devine and Stephens 1994:432–433), anacrusis, or final-syllable lengthening (Cruttenden 1997:35). Additional phonetic features that can signal an ᵢ include tonal downtrend (declination in pitch throughout a stretch of speech), slowing of tempo, and changes in voice quality (Nespor and Vogel 1986:187–193; Cruttenden 1997:68–73; Fox 2000:298–300; Wennerstrom 2001:30–31; Gussenhoven 2004:22–23).

At least one tonal rule of Greek applies within the intonational phrase: a word-final H (‘) is lowered (ˊ) *within* an ᵢ (a phenomenon known as *koímēsis*), but shows up as H (‘) ᵢ-finally (Sturtevant 1940; Trubetzkoy 1969:238; Allen 1973:245–248; Allen 1987; Devine and Stephens 1994:431–432). We see this in the continuation of the passage from *Parmenides* 126a (the sign ‘=’ indicates a host-enclitic relationship):

- (2) [*allà mèn dé*]ᵢ [*eípon egō*]ᵢ [*páreimí=ge ep’ autò toúto*]ᵢ [*deēsómenos humôn*]ᵢ  
 ‘But indeed,’ said I, ‘I am here for just this, asking a favor of you’

We can see the word-final H tones lowered at the end of *allà*, *mèn*, and *autò*, but the word-final Hs at the end of *dé* and *egō* remain H because they occur at the end of intonational phrases, indicated orthographically by commas.

Despite the prototypical correlation between clause and intonational phrase, it is possible for sub-clausal units to be so encoded, whether adverbials, sub-constituents, or even a syllable (Cruttenden 1997:68). As vocative phrases often exhibit their own intonational pattern, they are prototypically encoded as intonational phrases, as is clear from the retention of word-final H tone in *hanér* (from *ho anér* with → crasis), ‘the man’:

- (3) [*hanér*]ᵢ, [*ánax*]ᵢ, [*bébēke deinà thespíās*]ᵢ  
 ‘The man, o king, has gone having foretold terrible things’ (Soph. *Ant.* 1091)

Other evidence that vocatives form their own intonational phrases comes from the placement of second-position clitics like *mén* (→ Wackernagel’s Law I):

- (4) [*ô basileû*]ᵢ, [*állōs mèn . . .*]ᵢ  
 ‘O king, otherwise . . .’ (Hdt. 1.42.1)

The vocative *ô basileû* forms a separate domain for clitics, hence the position of *mén* only after *állōs*. Clause-initial and clause-final vocatives may well have had different pitch contours (see generally the discussion in Devine and Stephens 1994:417; Cruttenden 1997:36–37, 77). The prosodic status of clause-internal vocative phrases appears to have been subject to more variation in prosodic coding (Devine and Stephens 1994:428):

- (5) *all’ ô mél’=án=moi sitiōn diplōn édei*  
 ‘But good friend I would need double the food’ (Aristoph. *Pax* 137)

Provided that this is the right reading of the text (see Platnauer 1964), the vocative phrase *ô mél’* is integrated within the clause as the clitics *án* and *moi* follow immediately afterward (see further Barrett ad *Hipp.* 327; Dik 2007:227). There is some question as to how to parse the line prosodically, however. One option is that everything (i.e., vocative and enclitics) is hosted by *all’*. For this analysis, one could compare Vedic Sanskrit, where non-initial vocatives are enclitic

(Delbrück 1888:33–35, Wackernagel 1892:425). A second possibility is that the vocative phrase hosts both *all'* (which would be proclitic) and the enclitics. In the recent editions of both Olson (1998) and Wilson (2007), the vocative is set off by commas.

As mentioned above, indirect evidence for the boundaries of intonational phrases has been argued to come from certain second-position enclitics (see e.g. Devine and Stephens 1994:422–423; Goldstein 2010; Scheppers 2011). While not couched in terms of the prosodic hierarchy, Fränkel's investigation of *Kōla* in Greek and Latin (Fränkel 1932, 1933, 1964, 1965, 1968) is essentially an investigation of the intonational phrase. One way to state the generalization about second-position clitics is that they select for a host that occupies the left edge of an intonational phrase. In canonical root clause contexts like the following (6), the left edge of the first word of the sentence is assumed to be the left edge of an intonational phrase, which makes it a licit prosodic host for the clitics *dé* and *min*:

- (6) [*Kroîsos=dé=min ekáthēre*]<sub>ι</sub>  
 'And Croesus purified him' (Hdt. 1.35.2)
- (7) [*apò Babulónos=dè kai tēs loipēs Assuríēs*]<sub>ι</sub>  
 ι [*khíliá=hoi proséie tálanta arguríou*]<sub>ι</sub> [*kai paîdes ektomíai pentakósioi*]<sub>ι</sub>  
 'From Babylon and the rest of Assyria, thousands of talents of silver came to him and five-hundred castrated boys' (Hdt. 3.92.2)

One could explain the position of *dé* and *hoi* by arguing that they each occur second in an intonational phrase (alternatively, *dé* could be described as occurring second within the utterance as a whole). While the details of such an analysis are complex (see the references above for more extensive treatment), the central idea is that the more intonational phrases you have in a sentence, the more licit 'second' positions become available.

Intonational phrase boundaries can also be detected on the basis of → hiatus (sequences of two adjacent, non-elidable vowels; see Devine and Stephens 1994:424):

- (8) [*pásais d' aitíais kai blasphēmíais háma tóu-tou kekhrēménou*]<sub>ι</sub> [*anánkē . . .*]<sub>ι</sub>  
 'Since he resorted to all kinds of invective and slander, (it is) necessary . . .' (Dem. *De Corona* 34)

The final vowel of the → genitive absolute phrase (-*ou*) fails to undergo elision before the initial vowel of (*anánkē*). Support for this analysis is also available from clitic distribution (see Goldstein 2010:172–198). Further evidence for intonational phrasing comes from → movable consonants, especially movable *nu*.

Metrically, the intonational phrase prototypically corresponds to the verse line or *stichos* (Devine and Stephens 1994:398, 424; Golston and Riad 2000). This is reflected in several features. First, verse-ends and clause-ends tend to coincide; the rates vary among genres, e.g. verse-internal sentence-end is more common in Euripides' *Cyclops* (a satyr play) than in Aeschylus (Devine and Stephens 1994:425). The epitome of the coincidence between verse-end and clause-end is the phenomenon of *stichomythia*, whereby characters exchange repartee in alternating verses (see Gross 1905; Schwinge 1968; Seidensticker 1971; Collard 1980). Third, the phenomenon of 'brevis in longo' reflects final lengthening of short vowels at the end of an intonational phrase (Steriade 1982; Devine and Stephens 1994:79, 426). If a line in meter marks the end of an ι, final syllable lengthening in meter can be related to the phonology of the language generally. Lastly, in the trimeter hiatus is generally not permitted line-internally (for further details, see Devine and Stephens 1994:425–426).

Ancient grammarians had a notion (or notions) that resemble the contemporary concept of the intonational phrase (Devine and Stephens 1994:420–422). In particular, the second-century CE grammarian Nicanor *ho stigmatias*, 'the punctuator' (see Blank 1983), developed an elaborate system of punctuation based on duration of pauses (as well as boundary tones?). See Nagy (2000) on the punctuation of the Bacchylides Papyrus.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, William S. 1973. *Accent and rhythm. Prosodic features of Greek and Latin: a study in theory and reconstruction*. Cambridge.
- . 1987. *Vox Graeca*, 3rd ed. Cambridge.
- Barrett, William S. 1964. *Euripides: Hippolytos*. Oxford.
- Blank, David L. 1983. "Remarks on Nicanor, the Stoics, and the ancient theory of punctuation", *Glotta* 61:48–67.
- Chafe, Wallace. 1994. *Discourse, consciousness, and time: the flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing*. Chicago.
- Collard, Christopher. 1980. "On stichomythia", *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 5:77–85.
- Cruttenden, Alan. 1997. *Intonation*, 2nd ed. Cambridge.
- Delbrück, Berthold. *Altindische Syntax*. Halle.

- Devine, Andrew M. and Laurence D. Stephens. 1994. *The prosody of Greek speech*. Oxford.
- Dik, Helma. 2007. *Word order in Greek tragic dialogue*. Oxford.
- Fox, Anthony. 2000. *Prosodic features and prosodic structure: the phonology of suprasegmentals*. Oxford.
- Fränkel, Eduard. 1932. "Kolon und Satz. Beobachtungen zur Gliederung des antiken Satzes, I", *Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, 197–213.
- . 1933. "Kolon und Satz. Beobachtungen zur Gliederung des antiken Satzes, II", *Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, 319–354.
- . 1964. "Nachträge zu 'Kolon und Satz, I'". In: *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, Erster Band, zur Spracher, zur Griechischen Literatur*, 131–140. Rome.
- . 1965. *Noch einmal Kolon und Satz*. Munich.
- . 1968. *Leseproben aus Reden Ciceros und Cato*. Rome.
- Golston, Chris and Tomas Riad. 2000. "The phonology of Classical Greek meter", *Linguistics* 38.1:99–167.
- Gross, Adolf. 1905. *Die Stichomythie in der griechischen Tragödie und Komödie*. Berlin.
- Gussenhoven, Carlos. 2004. *The phonology of tone and intonation*. Cambridge.
- Halliday, Michael A. 1967. *Intonation and grammar in British English*. The Hague.
- Nagy, Gregory. 2000. "Reading Greek poetry aloud: evidence from the Bacchylides papyri," *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 64:7–28.
- Nespor, Marina and Irene Vogel. 1986. *Prosodic phonology*. Dordrecht.
- Olson, S. D., ed. 1998. *Peace*. Oxford.
- Pierrehumbert, Janet. 1980. *The phonology and phonetics of English intonation*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Platnauer, Maurice, ed. 1964. *Aristophanes: Peace*. Oxford.
- Scheppers, Frank. 2011. *The colon hypothesis: word order, discourse segmentation and discourse coherence in Ancient Greek*. Brussels.
- Schwinge, Ernst-Richard. 1968. *Die Verwendung der Stichomythie in den Dramen des Euripides*. Heidelberg.
- Seidenstecker, Bernd. 1971. "Die Stichomythie". In: *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie*, ed. by Walter Jens, 183–220. Munich.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth O. 1986. "On derived domains in sentence phonology", *Phonology* 3:371–405.
- Steriade, Donca. 1982. *Greek prosodies and the nature of syllabification*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Sturtevant, Edgar H. 1940. *The pronunciation of Greek and Latin*, 2d. ed. Philadelphia.
- Trubetzkoy, Nikolai. 1969. *Principles of phonology*, trans. C. A. M. Baltaxe. Berkeley.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1892. "Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung", *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1:333–436.
- Wennerstrom, Ann. 2001. *The music of everyday speech: prosody and discourse analysis*. New York – Oxford.
- Wilson, Nigel G., ed. 2007. *Aristophanis Fabulae*, vol. 1. Oxford.

DAVID GOLDSTEIN

## Intralingual Translation into Modern Greek

"The translation of ancient poems into colloquial language may be considered even as profanation," says A. R. Ragavis (1860:γ), eminent scholar and (reluctant) translator from the 19th-c., a time during which the act of intralingual translation in Greece not only was not self-evident, but had to justify its existence as an 'evil' necessity. Such translation was (and still is) employed predominantly for texts of ancient Greek literature, and secondly, for ecclesiastical texts, thus forming a constant field of ideological-political conflict (which was to escalate to violent conflict), with the central poignant issue being the question whether another language/form, indeed a 'common' one, could and should render the meanings of the sacred (and) ancient Greek word. It had to be proved that the new language was not "a lower *idiom*" (Mounin 2002:23), but that it was able to follow the pace of the old grandeur, the 'original', as it is called according to an essentially evaluating definition that obviously considers the translation inferior. The quotes are used here on the assumption that every translation is an autonomous text, a fact that constantly claims its space in the field but is disputed frequently. (Similar quotes could be invoked by the term 'intralingual', but that issue goes beyond the objectives of this article, in which we will use the term without quotes.) As to the ecclesiastical texts, the few translation efforts of the past have now been abandoned, while, regarding ancient Greek literature, considerable tumult is caused almost every summer in the press about the 'legitimacy' of a translation/performance presented in the Epidaurus Festival.

The language of 'originals' was for a long time considered unsurpassed, and hence was untranslated. Subsequently, when the best code was sought, the Language Question (*Glossiko Zitima*) emerged, determining for centuries the intralingual translation framework. The Greek language (and thus consciousness) was split from the 1st-c. CE with → Atticism, the distinction between written language (literature-oriented/archaic) and oral language (popular), which by 1500 CE had begun to be called 'vulgar'. At the same time, however, we have the first paraphrase of the *Iliad*, and an anthology of sections of the *Holy Bible* in popular language, while