Philippaki-Warburton, I., K. Nicolaidis & M. Sifianou (eds.) 1995. *Themes in Greek Linguistics: Papers from the First International Conference on Greek Linguistics, Reading, September 1993.* Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 117. John Benjamins, Amsterdam. 534 pp. $US 79.00.

Reviewed by NICK NICHOLAS, *University of Melbourne.*[*]

The current volume includes 66 out of the 77 papers presented at the inaugural International Conference on Greek Linguistics, held in Reading in 1993. These conferences, of which the second was held in Salzburg in 1995, and the third is to be held in Athens in September 1997, are an important development in Modern Greek linguistics: they represent the first truly international forum for discussion on Modern Greek, and compliment the annual meetings of the Linguistics Department of Aristotle Universtity, Thessalonica, which has been publishing its *Studies in Greek Linguistics* (Μελέτες για την ελληνική γλώσσα) series since 1980.

Studies in Greek Linguistics is a conference proceedings in the mould of the Berkeley Linguistics Society and the Chicago Linguistics Society: a large number of brief papers is published, with page formatting and font selection left entirely at the discretion of the authors,[1] and with an emphasis on comprehensiveness. Although this Benjamins volume is much better formatted, it likewise tends to the inclusive and brief—the average length of a paper in this volume is 8 pages (compare an average of 12 pages for the 1994 *Studies* volume). Concretely, this means that authors are barely given the opportunity to develop a substantive argument. Given that, on the one hand, the *Studies* series is still going strong and, on the other, that there is no extant widely disseminated journal dedicated to Modern Greek linguistics (a gap not quite filled by the University of Athens journal *Glossologia*), the field does not need a better formatted version of *Studies* so much as a forum in which linguistic argumentation can be conducted more fully and pervasively. The situation of the proceedings of the second international conference (Salzburg University is producing a volume in the *Studies* mould, while Benjamins is publishing a volume of selected, more expansive papers) may not have arisen by design; but it is ideally suited to the requirements of the field, and, I believe, reflects better on Benjamins and its role as an academic publisher.

---

[1]Font difficulties are, of course, exacerbated for *Studies* by their use of Greek (60 of the 75 papers in the 1994 *Studies* volume); it is lamentable that dot-matrix printed documents are included in a volume of conference proceedings this late in human history. It would be pleasing to attribute the complete absence of traditional polytonic accentuation to the social progressiveness which Aristotle University has long been associated with. However, this seems likelier to be a consequence of the authors' dependence on widely available word-processing packages, on the one hand, and the unwieldiness of accent entry on computers driven by Microsoft ('the Chomskyan linguistics of computer operating systems'), on the other.

There is a substantial (although thankfully not overwhelming) presence in this volume of papers written from the point of view of the Anglo-American linguistic orthodoxy—at that time, still predominantly Government and Binding rather than Minimalism. Thus, three of the four plenary papers, and nine of the twenty papers on syntax, semantics and pragmatics are written in an explicitly generativist framework, while four more are written in a formal semantic framework. There is, of course, nothing improper about a conference proceedings including papers in the paradigm most of its participants are working in. Indeed, this volume is laudable for including papers from a variety of fields, including discourse analysis, contact linguistics, computational linguistics, and dialectology. All the same, one should note the preponderance of Chomskian models—which one might in jest term the 'Microsoft of linguistics', for their market dominance—against other formal models: there is one paper apiece from Lexical-Functional Grammar and Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar perspectives, and two semantics papers situated in the French tradition. This distribution sits uneasily with the characteristically Koernerian blurb on the back of all CILT volumes:

> Since the spectrum of possibilities in linguistic theory construction is much broader and more variegated than students of linguistics have perhaps been led to believe, the *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory* (CILT) series has been established in order to provide a forum for the presentation and discussion of linguistic opinions of scholars who do not necessarily accept the prevailing mode of thought in linguistic science.

In this review, I deal with four of the nine papers in the volume which are of some direct relevance to the diachrony of language. Before going on, I should note that, despite the title, the focus of this volume is squarely on Modern Greek, and not on Greek in all its manifestations. Ancient Greek *per se* is discussed in only a couple of papers (as is also the case with the *Studies* series); and when it is discussed, it is clearly out of place in the broader context of the volume. The type of paper considered here is that where Modern forms are situated in a broader diachronic context—rather than Ancient and Hellenistic forms being studied in and of themselves. It is such papers, I feel, which are appropriate in such a volume. While the continuity of the Greek language is frequently stressed by its students, there is a clear division between historical linguistic accounts of Greek which start from the modern language and work their way backwards, and those which ignore the modern language. (In this respect, 'modern' should be considered as including all vernacular or vernacular-like text written after 700 AD.)[2] The proper venue for work disassociated from Greek after 700 AD is not this—notwithstanding the obvious need for historical linguists working on Ancient, Middle and Modern Greek to remain aware of each others' work.

The papers considered here are the following:

---

[2]I use this earlier date, rather than the date of 1100 AD usually found in histories of Greek, to include a corpus of text all too rarely exploited by historians of Greek—conceivably because it cannot be counted as part of the Greek literary corpus—but which is clearly Modern Greek: namely, the Proto-Bulgarian inscriptions (Beshevliev 1963), written in the eighth and ninth centuries AD.

- A. Ph. Christidis & K. Nikiforidou: *Structural and Cross-linguistic Regularities in the History of Three Particles.*
- A. Apostolou-Panara: *Language Change Under Way? The Case of the Definite Article in Modern Greek.*
- D. Chila-Markopoulou: *Problems in Diachronic Syntax: Free Relatives in Medieval and Modern Greek.*
- T. Tachibana: *Spatial Expressions in Byzantine Vernacular Greek.*

Christidis & Nikiforidou's paper represents a peculiar convergence of these researchers' work. Christidis (1987) has spent time analysing the semantics of two particles of Modern Greek: να /na/, a subjunctive marker which has displaced the Ancient infinitive, and νά /ˈna/, a deictic marker comparable to French *voilá* and Latin *ecce*. While Christidis has never denied that the two particles are etymologically distinct (να < ἵνα /hína/ 'in order to' < 'whither'; νά < ἤν /éːn/ 'look!'—although see below), he contends that they are synchronically related: the subjunctive marker abstractly locates its complement in temporal space as an extension of the deictic marker concretely locating its complement in physical space. Christidis further contends that this relation led to the analogical remodelling of /eːn/ to /eːna/ after /hina/. Nikiforidou's (1991) work, on the other hand, has been on the semantics of conditional and concessive markers in Modern Greek: in particular, how their semantics can be formulated compositionally in terms of their component particles, including the hortative particle ας /as/ 'let' < ἄφες /áfes/ 'let!'

From this background, Christidis & Nikiforidou compare the history of three particles—να, ας, and the hortative particle για /ja/ < εἶα /eîa/ 'go on!', which is used in Modern Greek to introduce imperatives.[3] This hortative particle is homonymous with preposition για /ja/ 'for' < διά /dia/ 'through, because of, with a view to'; Christidis & Nikiforidou contend that για is also synchronically polysemous, rather than merely homonymous, with the benefactive meaning of the preposition analogous to the hortative. The analysis is plausible: if phonological merger leads to the homonymy of two words which incidentally happen to have some semantic commonality, that commonality will determine the further development of the words. This is in fact just a special case of the well-known phenomenon of analogy—although the role of analogy in the formation of grammatical particles has not perhaps been sufficiently appreciated.[4] That the three particles, which are

---

[3]On the syntactic status of για, see Joseph (1985a:400). Joseph (1994:515) has at least pointed to the possibility that για, a homonym of which is also present in Albanian *(ja)* in a function akin to Greek νά (and glossed in Buchholz *et al.* (1977) as *da!, hier!, schau!; sieh, dort ist er*), might have originated in Turkish (ultimately Arabic) interjection *ya* (glossed in Kornrumpf (1979) as *oh!;* (at the beginning of a sentence) *well; yes, but...;* (at the end of a sentence) *indeed; there!; after all*). Note that a shibboleth of Northern Greek, and Thessalonican in particular, is the use of για [ja] sentence-finally in the same meaning as sentence-final *ya,* and where Southern and standard Greek would use Turkish loanword ντε *(de)* instead. This usage, at least, seems directly attributable to Turkish. The source of the semantic discrepancies in sentence-initial [ja] between Greek, Albanian, and Turkish, however, has not yet been explained.

[4]Joseph (in press) has issued a challenge to the relevance of grammaticalisation theory altogether, on the basis of the fact that Modern Greek third person nominative clitics arose by

all irrealis and potentially hortative, have also become conditional markers in Modern Greek, with semantic restrictions tied to their etyma, is likewise no surprise. However, it does highlight a truth too often ignored by historical linguists: language is a system *où tout se tient,* to use Meillet's felicitous phrase; semantic changes to function words do not occur in isolation, but affect the remaining members of their paradigm. The paradigm should always be kept in mind in considering the career of any one of its members. The teachings of structuralism should not be ignored by its epigones.

A problem with Christidis & Nikiforidou's approach, which is also characteristic of Christidis' (1986) earlier work on που /pu/ and να, is that it constitutes diachronic linguistics minus the diachrony. The only diachronic component of their data are the dictionary entries for the etyma of the modern particles; older texts containing the particles, and possible instances of reanalysis, are not considered at all. Instead, the authors proceed on the basis of current thinking on how language change is effected, such as grammaticalisation theory, and apply its results to the modern data. But grammaticalisation theory is an empirical discipline; and the assumption that everything will work out for the diachrony, and the transition from etymon to reflex went ahead in a smooth and predictable manner, is dangerous. As I contend with regard to που in my doctoral research, the generalisations such an account engenders are excessively simplistic in the face of data from earlier stages of the language and modern dialects—and indeed, in the face of a fuller evaluation of the *synchronic* distribution of the particle.

A brief note should be made about the etymology of νά. To my mind, Christidis has not convincingly refuted Joseph's (1981) argument that νά is in fact a Slavonic borrowing.[5] That νά appears in areas far from Slavonic contact, such as Cyprus, is not a compelling counterargument: the Slavonic borrowing ρούχο /ruxo/ 'clothing' turns up as far away as Cappadocia. A word which enters a language early and pervasively enough can travel very far indeed, and the isolation of Cappadocia from the rest of the Greek-speaking world did not become absolute until the incursions of the Seljuk Turks in the eleventh century. (Cyprus, by contrast, was never as isolated from mainstream Greek this past millenium as Cappadocia has been.) On the other hand, Slavonic *na* turns up as far from the Balkans as the Ukraine and Poland—regions where Greek influence can safely be discounted. So the case looks stronger for at least a convergence of loan lexeme and native lexeme in Greek—as Joseph (1994) has also argued for για (see note above).

This argument becomes all the more strong if one accepts Joseph's (1996b) recent proposal that syntactic change in Greek may have diffused from urban centres outwards, travelling from metropolis to metropolis via the trade routes (in a manner characteristic of Trudgill's 'parachuting'—see Chambers & Trudgill (1980:182–204), and in particular

---

analogy with accusative clitics, rather than grammaticalising independently. While the challenge is not necessarily debilitating, it is true that current grammaticalisation theory considers analogy as a mechanism only of propagation, and not of actuation.

[5]Indeed, Joseph (1985b) goes so far as to cite the insistence of traditional Greek etymology on positing an Ancient Greek origin for νά as an illustration of Greek linguistic ethnocentrism.

their treatment of the spread of [ʀ/ʁ] in Europe), and potentially reaching those metropoles from another language: the example Joseph discusses is that of infinitive loss in Greek, which Joseph believes was set in motion in Thessalonica, from contact with Bulgaro-Macedonian—and which has travelled as far as Cyprus and the Pontus, although not Cappadocia or Southern Italy.

Joseph has not established his case incontrovertibly: the infinitive appears to have been substantially in decline much earlier on, and could have died out independently in Cyprus and Thessalonica, say, once the decline had been set in motion earlier on in the language they shared at the time. Still, Joseph's application of modern thinking on geolinguistic diffusion to the diachrony of Greek represents a significant challenge to traditional thinking on the subject. In a strange way, this aspect of the phenomenon actually accords with Christidis & Nikiforidou's view: in the case of να/νά, we have a convergence not only between Ancient ἵνα and ἤν, but also involving Slavonic *na;* similarly for για, the convergence involves not only Ancient διὰ and εἶα, but also Turkish *ya* and (possibly independently) Albanian *ja*. Further research in this area must also take into account the role of language contact in claims for such convergences.

Apostolou-Panara's paper concerns a recent innovation in colloquial Greek: the use of sentential stress for definite articles to mark out the referent as exceptional in some way. The author's corpus includes no instances further back than 1978 (although written expression of sentential stress must rely on the typographical artifice of capitalisation or vowel repetition). The phenomenon is completely analogous to sentential stress on the definite article in English: Αυτό ήταν ΤΟ πάρτυ /afto itan to parti/ corresponds word-for-word to *That was THE party*. Therefore, it is tempting to see this as a loan from English, whose cultural influence in Greece need hardly be emphasised. While Apostolou-Panara accepts the role of English was decisive, she points out that there are native antecedents for the construction—notably the use of the article before superlative adjectives, and believes it is possible that external and internal factors worked together in bringing about this addition to Greek.

Several points should be made here. First, the Greek construction can be used as an extreme of quantification with mass nouns: cf. (1) with its literal equivalent, *He is earning THE money*:

(1)   Αυτός   βγάζει   Τ Α   λεφτά
         aftos   vɣazi   ta   lefta
         he   takes out   THE   money
         He is earning big bucks

In addition, in English the stressed article can serve to isolate its referent as a unique referent—typically in combination with another modifier, such as an adjective or a relative clause. This cannot occur in Greek. Thus, in English one can construct a sentence like *This is THE arsehole I was telling you about,* where *the* serves only to underscore the uniqueness of the referent. In its Greek equivalent, (2), the stressed article can only be understood as an intensifier:

(2)   Αυτός είναι ΤΟ καθήκι που σου ’λεγα
        aftos ine to kaθiki pu su leɣa
        This is *the complete and utter* chamberpot I was telling you about

At an impressionistic level, too, the construction is much more frequently used than its putative English etymon is. This indicates that the construction is now operating autonomously of English. To ascribe the rise of this construction merely to English influence is not adequate, and the grammatical system of Greek it is enmeshed in must be considered—as indeed Apostolou-Panara proposes.

The second point concerns the ultimate origin of the construction. Apostolou-Panara mentions an account by Ladd (1980), according to which the article, being a function word, is unlikely to receive emphasis; so its contrastive stress actually represents stress on its noun argument. Apostolou-Panara states that this stress could not appear on the noun itself, when the noun is at the end of a sentence, since default sentence stress occurs sentence-finally. Now if this is the case, then one would find that all instances of the construction would occur sentence-finally; nouns in other parts of the sentence can still receive sentential stress. This is definitely not the case in English (cf. *THE place to be*); however, it may well be the case in Greek—it is certainly the case for all examples I have seen or heard. An alternative analysis which I would propose is that what is being emphasised is, in fact, the semantic content of the definite article—namely, the noun's definiteness, which can translate into its uniqueness (as in English), or prototypicality (as in Greek, as Apostolou-Panara argues.)

A final point involves a further innovation in the definite article, which Apostolou-Panara discusses only very briefly. In this construction, the definite article appears before nominals, with similar emphatic/exceptional force, in contexts where the definite article would not normally be expected. This is either because it would be ungrammatical (3, 4) , or because a cliché is used which does not normally contain the definite article (5; cf. 6).

(3)   έκτοτε   έκανε   τα   χιλιάδες   λίφτιγκ
        ektote   ekane   ta   xiliaðes   liftig
        since then   she did   *the   thousands   facelifts
        She has had *thousands* of facelifts since

(4)   αυτοί οι άνθρωποι   διαθέτουν   ΤΗΝ   υπομονή
        afti i anθropi   ðiaθeun   tin   ipomoni
        those people   have available *the   patience
        Those people are very patient indeed

(5)   συμβαίνουν   τα   τέρατα   και   τα   σημεία
        simvenun   ta   terata   ke   ta   simia
        occur   the   monsters   and   the   portents
        All sorts of monstrous things are happening[6]

---

[6]John Burke has pointed out to me the potential for (5) to have arisen by analogy with other definite noun phrases, such as τα γνωστά 'the well-known [events]'. Such analogy

(6) σημεία κ\αι τέρατα
    simia ke terata
    portents and monsters
    Portents and monsters (cliché)

In this usage, sentential stress of the article is not obligatory—and indeed needn't be, since the very presence of the definite article is highly marked. This seems to be an extension of the stressed definite article construction, where the definite article always occurs in grammatically acceptable slots, making of the definite article a general intensive marker, dissociated from its traditional function in Greek grammar. Whatever triggered this development in Greek, one can be sure its effects will be far-reaching.

Chila-Markopoulou's paper is an abbreviated version of a more extensive version in Greek (Chila-Markopoulou 1990–1991). This paper addresses the problem of case-matching for free relatives in Mediaeval and Modern Greek. In the modern language, free relatives are mostly assigned case by the matrix predicate rather than the relative clause predicate, forcing the case with respect to the relative clause to match that with respect to the matrix. (There are some complications involving clitics where the free relative is object of the matrix and subject of the relative clause.) In Mediaeval Greek, on the other hand, just as with the Ancient language, there are no matching effects: case is assigned to free relatives exclusively by the relative clause predicate. In formal terms, Chila-Markopoulou accounts for this in terms of an empty noun phrase *(pro)* in apposition with the free relative, which is subcategorised by the matrix verb, allowing the free relative itself to be subcategorised by the relative. The question Chila-Markopoulou then sets out to address is, why did this situation change in Modern Greek, with the putative *pro* noun phrase no longer distinct from the free relativiser, and case matching now enforced?

According to Chila-Markopoulou, case matching was enforced as a result of the morphological levelling of case in Modern Greek. This increased the potential ambiguity of sentences with free relatives. The role of the free relative with respect to the matrix predicate was hitherto unexpressed, since the free relative was assigned case exclusively by the relative clause. But determining this role could no longer be resolved by seeing what other arguments the matrix predicate had, when the case of those arguments had become itself ambiguous. So the role of the free relative with respect to the matrix had to be expressed independently; this was done by case matching. This change, Chila-Markopoulou concludes, was parametric in the differentiation between Mediaeval and Modern Greek.

In her discussion, Chila-Markopoulou considers a second issue: the profusion of free relatives in Mediaeval Greek (όστις, ός, όπου, όποιος, οποίος, ο ποίος, το), compared to just two free relatives in Modern Greek: όποιος and ότι. Chila-Markopoulou again appeals to notions of information pressure in the elimination: in particular, the ambiguity of το with its homonymous clitic pronoun (as well as its morphological restriction to the accusative and genitive case), and the ambiguity of όπου with the homonymous locative

---

does not seem sufficient by itself, however, to account for the emphatic force of an utterance like (5).

relativiser (and its case invariance). Forms which were ambiguous were discarded by speakers, since other, non-ambiguous free relatives existed, and could behave must more flexibly and explicitly in case assignment.

Chila-Markopoulou's paper is a welcome addition to research in Mediaeval Greek syntax; despite pioneering work by such scholars as Joseph (1983) and Mackridge (1993, 1994), Mediaeval Greek remains an under-researched area in general. There are, however, some problems with the author's approach. To start with, she falls into the trap (which ensnares so many researchers) of taking Mediaeval Greek texts at face value. It is well-known that Atticism has been a pervasively intrusive phenomenon in virtually all Greek writing of the past two millenia, and that Early Modern semi-vernacular texts are no exception; so the question of the linguistic authenticity of old texts as attestations of a contemporary vernacular is highly relevant. (See Joseph (1996a) for a discussion of the textual authenticity of Early Modern Greek infinitives.) There is little doubt that the Classical relativisers ός and όστις did not survive into the vernacular Early Modern language; so their behaviour in the semi-vernacular texts cannot be counted. It is only when we are dealing with constructions absent in both Attic and Ecclesiastical Greek that we can be sure we are dealing with an element of the spoken language; this is the case for το and όπου, so Chila-Markopoulou's results involving those relativisers are indeed pertinent.

Another problem is that Mediaeval Greek is not properly delimited as a linguistic entity—something important, if case matching for free relatives is to be asserted to be 'a parameter' chronologically dividing Mediaeval from Modern Greek! Chila-Markopoulou's examples range from Malalas, in the sixth century, to *Libystros and Rodamne* and *The Chronicle of Morea,* in the fourteenth (which I would call Early Modern). Even if we assume the language remained static in the interim, we are given no account of the first instances of case matching: we do not know when exactly this parametric change is meant to have taken place, other than some time between the fourteenth and eighteenth century.[7] The loss of the case-unfriendly free relatives το and όπου, which Chila-Markopoulou associates with the transition to case matching, has not been dated any more accurately than that.

The allusion to morphological levelling is similarly diffuse, and in some instances inaccurate. For instance, elsewhere Chila-Markopoulou (1990–1991:34–35) explicitly states that the dative, while significantly curtailed in later texts, was still extant, and that this is why matching was not enforced in late Mediaeval Greek. In fact, there is no reason to suppose the dative survived in the vernacular past the tenth century; so dative loss by itself cannot explain the information pressure brought to bear on free relatives, if it was not to take effect for another six centuries. In fact, the notion of information pressure as applied here seems suspect. On the one hand, the noun paradigms for which the nominative has

---

[7]Incidentally, this very period of Greek seems to be even more under-researched than the Early Modern period preceding it—with the exception of Cretan Renaissance literature of this time, which has been studied extensively. This seems to be at least in part due to the relative scarcity of editions of works from the period, and what is regarded as their lower literary value.

become indistinct from the accusative since antiquity involves only feminine nouns (though not feminine definite articles): masculines retain their distinctness, while neuters never had it. Second, information pressure has not had an appreciable effect on many Greek dialects, in which το and όπου are extant as free relatives. (One need think only of Pontic, in which *do* functions as free relative, bounded relative, interrogative 'what?', and generic complementiser (Papadopoulos 1961 s.v. ντό).)

Third, the ambiguity of το between clitic and relativiser has been overstated; as Mackridge (1993) argues explicitly in a paper Chila-Markopoulou cites, mediaeval texts are quite consistent in their rules for the relative ordering of verbs and clitics, and this can often be used to disambiguate το—and to discover that modern editors have often gotten the interpretation wrong. (See note after (8).) For instance, Chila-Markopoulou cites the following example as ambiguous:

(7) Av   *το*   κερδίσει   *το*   ποθεί   να τους αναστελώσει
     an   to   kerðisi   to   poθi   na tus anastelosi
(i) if   REL   he wins   it   he desires   he will set up for them
     If he desired what he won, he would set up a shrine for them
(ii) if   it   he wins   REL   he desires   he will set up for them
     If he won what he desired, he would set up a shrine for them
     (*Libystros and Rodamne,* ms S, 634–635)

But in fact, this ambiguity in Mediaeval Greek results only when the relative clause and resumptive clitic are contained within a subordinate clause. When the combination is contained within a matrix clause, as in (8), the clitic follows rather than precedes the verb, and is in no way ambiguous with a relative clause.

(8) Και   τα   φορώ   υπερίψε   τα   εις το αίμα των ανθρώπων
     ke   ta   foro   iperipse   ta   is to ema ton anθropon
     and   REL   I wear discard   them   in the blood of people
     And discard what I am wearing in human blood
     (*Digenes Akrites,* ms E, 1195; Mackridge 1993:335)[8]

Indeed, even as an instance within a subordinate clause, the ambiguity in (7) is more imagined than real—not only because context usually does fill in enough information to disambiguate, but because of the pragmatic function of the reduplicating clitic. In Modern Greek, clitic doubling serves to topicalise its referent, and is not possible where the referent is indefinite. In interpretation (7i), the second instance of το, as clitic, is called upon to topicalise the first; but the first introduces an indefinite noun clause—το κερδίσει 'what he wins'. So (7i) sounds anomalous to a Modern Greek speaker. In the case of (7ii), on the other hand, the first, clitic instance of το does not properly serve to reduplicate the object of the main clause—since it would have to do so cataphorically. Rather, the

---

[8]As it stands, the passage is corrupt, and has been emended by Trapp (1971) from υπερίψε τα to ερρύπησα '*I have polluted* what I am wearing in human blood'. Alexiou (1985), in turn, reinserts the clitic τα before ερρύπησα; the point Mackridge makes with this example is that this poisitioning is inconsistent with the grammar of the Escorial (E) manuscript, and early Modern Greek in general.

relative clause το ποθεί 'what he desires' comes as an afterthought expression in the sentence. Since therefore the clitic is not as closely bound with topicalising the relative clause in (7ii), the relative clause being displaced from the sentence proper, (7ii) sounds less anomalous, and is thus the preferred interpretation.[9] So if the ambiguity of cases like (7) is much less widespread than Chila-Markopoulou seems to believe, the case that relativiser-το was lost due to functional pressure is significantly weakened.

Finally, it seems highly implausible to attribute the displacement of free relative όπου to its homonymy with its etymon, locative relativiser όπου 'where'—given that όπου (phonologically reduced to οπού (unstressed) and που) continued on in use as a bounded relativiser. That the phonologically reduced bound relativisers are phonologically distinct from the locative is no counter-argument: in its modern reflexes, and indeed in the late mediaeval texts, the free relativiser likewise appears in the phonologically reduced form οπού. So the free and bounded relativisers were equally subject (or not subject) to homonymic pressure from όπου. Whatever the reason for the loss of free relative όπου (and its case invariance is a likelier theory), it cannot have been a homonymy which had already been eliminated in the spoken language.

Finally, **Tachibana's** paper deals with the distribution of compound spatial prepositions in Early Modern Greek. These prepositions are composed of an adverb and a simple preposition (either εις /is/ 'to, at, in', or από /apo/ or εκ/εξ /ek(s)/ 'from'), and developed to cope with the reduction in and lack of specificity of the Ancient prepositional paradigm. Compound prepositions are also extant in Contemporary Modern Greek (where εις has developed into σ(ε) /s(e)/, and εκ has dropped out), and Tachibana compares the possible combinations of adverbs and prepositions in the two language stages. Refreshingly, and following an increasing tendency in Mediaeval Greek studies, the author uses electronic corpora of Early Modern texts—in this case, the texts of the Escorial *Digenes Akrites* and *Libystros and Rodamne*—although he is still compelled to go back to the time-honoured method of pencil and photocopy for the remaining nine works he analyses.

Tachibana finds that the compound prepositional paradigm is not as tightly integrated and grammaticalised in Early Modern Greek as it is now. For example, after the adverb επάνω 'above', the contemporary language chooses between σε and από on the basis of semantics: σε for 'on', από for 'over'. In the early modern language, preposition choice is conditioned by the matrix predicate; verbs of motion take από, consistent with its semantics ('from'). In fact, από in general is not used as generally in Early Modern Greek as it is in the contemporary language: there are very few instances in the corpus where από is not used in a compound preposition to express motion-from, whereas in the contemporary language the από/σε distinction is thoroughly semanticised.

The differentiations made in contemporary Greek by από/σε are instead made in Early Modern Greek by prepositional prefixes, while εις remains constant as the preposition.

---

[9]My thanks to John Burke for his insights on this matter. As he points out to me, familiarity with the discourse conventions of older Greek texts eliminates much of the ambiguity a modern researcher might impute to them.

Thus, contemporary κάτω ἀπό 'under from = beneath' corresponds to Early Modern ἀποκάτω εις 'from-under at'. Similarly, Early Modern εξοπίσω εις 'from-behind to' corresponds to contemporary πίσω ἀπό 'behind from = behind', while Early Modern οπίσω εις 'behind at' corresponds to contemporary πίσω σε, and means 'back at'. It is interesting to note that in contemporary Greek, when the object of a compound preposition is relativised, both the nominal and the simple preposition are deleted, and the Early Modern prefixed adverbials are used to distinguish between the ἀπό and σε forms, in the absence of the prepositions themselves; the same occurs when the object of the compound preposition is a clitic, since simple prepositions cannot have clitic arguments (Ingria 1981:61).

Thus, in contemporary Greek one says πίσω ἀπό το τραπέζι /piso apo to trapezi/ 'behind the table', but αποπίσω του /apopiso tu/ 'behind him', and το τραπέζι που καθότανo αποπίσω /to trapezi pu kaθotan apopiso/ 'the table he sat behind'. Contrast this with the σ(ε) case: πίσω στο τραπέζι /piso s to trapezi/ 'back at the table' and το τραπέζι που καθόταν πίσω /to trapezi pu kaθotan piso/ 'the table he sat back at'.[10] So we have an interesting connection between the two stages of the language. In Early Modern Greek, there was no functional alternation between prepositions: εις was universal for location and motion-towards, and semantic differentiation was expressed by preposition prefixing on the adverb for the marked alternative (ἀπό/εκ). In Contemporary Modern Greek, there is a functional alternation between prepositions; but when the preposition is neutralised, because the argument is either clitic or relativised, the language falls back on preposition prefixing for the marked preposition, ἀπό—a resource bequeathed it by Early Modern Greek.

So Tachibana's work on Early Modern Greek enables us to gain insight on the provenance of a syntactic mechanism used in the contemporary language. This proves once again the vital importance of a proper full grammatical treatment of Early Modern Greek (regrettably, yet to be essayed) for our understanding of the language. Tachibana's approach and meticulousness are exemplary, and should be emulated by whichever researcher feels bold enough to take on this crucial task.

A couple of **concluding remarks** on the presentation of the volume are appropriate. As already noted, the professional appearance of *Themes* makes a welcome contrast to the scientifically rich but visually incoherent *Studies* series. The uniformity imposed has brought on some unwelcome features, however. In particular, Greek (ancient and modern) appears uniformly in romanised form, with just three or four exceptions. Even in these

---

[10]With a clitic object, πίσω του also means 'behind him', so that there is in fact no significant semantic differentiation between αποπίσω του and πίσω του. The reason πίσω του does not mean 'back at him' (i.e. 'back where he was') may have to do with the low salience and frequency of a meaning like 'back where he was', compared to 'behind him': the unmarked expression πίσω του would have been retained for the latter meaning. Note also that the genitive in Greek has been long associated with locative meaning, so there is no obvious clash in having πίσω του, with a genitive clitic, mean 'behind him'.
In the case of πάνω, at any rate, the semantic differentiation in prefixing is preserved before clitic arguments: πάνω του 'on him', αποπάνω του 'over him'.

cases, the presentation is unsatisfactory. In Karantzas' stylistic analysis of Calvo's *Odes,* the font looks bitmapped, and is monotonic—a rather bold move, given Calvo's conscious archaism. It seems hard to believe that the editors could not obtain a presentable polytonic font, when the font `Ismini`, at least, is freely available on the Internet. The situation is even worse for Tsiapera's paper on mediaeval Cypriot, where a laser font has been obtained—but without any accents! The tell-tale use of mathematical fonts (on which accents are absent) to render Greek is surely outmoded by now: it ill befits an academic publisher. The provision of camera-ready copy Benjamins has insisted on for the second *Themes* volume should rectify this problem.

Greek romanisation has become standard practice, particularly in formal linguistics, over the past three decades; but it conveys the covert message that Greek script is of ancillary importance in science, and the romanisations used are wildly inconsistent.[11] This situation is unacceptable; if it is felt that transliteration is necessary, then transliteration should be consistent and adequate. (Moreover, even if transliteration is utilised, Greek script should be retained alongside it.) It is for the very purpose of a uniform transliteration scheme that the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) was invented; and it is regrettable that the IPA is not more widely used by linguists working on Greek, particularly given that the 'non-standard' symbols required—θ, ð, ɣ, x—are hardly unfamiliar to Greeks.[12] The avoidance of the IPA is all the more surprising since the number of linguists working on Greek trained in the United States, with its longstanding rejection of the IPA, is quite small: the majority of participants in this conference are trained in Britain and France. Given that the intended audience of this volume are professional linguists, rather than philologists or laypeople, a consistent transliteration scheme with at least some rapprochement towards the IPA does not seem an unreasonable request.

The second point relates to the language of the papers. In contrast to the *Studies* series, there are no Greek-language contributions in this volume. This is appropriate, given that *Themes* is intended for a much broader audience than *Studies.* There is a justifiable, more general concern that Greek is being displaced by English even within Greece as a language of scientific communication; but it is the job of *Studies* and *Glossologia,* not Benjamins, to address this concern and the problems of terminological fabrication this entails. Disconcertingly, however, there are no papers in any language other than English in *Themes*. This is not standard policy for the CILT series, and it certainly does not correspond to the situation in *Studies,* where French and German contributions still appear.[13] The one-language policy apparently adhered to in *Themes* may be a reflection of historical inevitabilties, but it is still a premature and unnecessary step.

---

[11]Thus, δ /ð/ is transliterated sometimes as *d,* and sometimes as *δ,* though never as ð*; χ* /x/ varies between *h, x,* and *ch;* stress is sometimes left out, and sometimes indicated by acutes; the transliteration of [j] is as unsettled as its phonemic status, and varies between *i* and *j* even within the same paper (although interestingly *y* seems to be absent); and so on.

[12]Of course, for reasons of convenience, ð and x usually appear in Greek linguistics as δ and χ; this is a minor and tolerable deviation.

[13]Not Russian, apparently, as Žuravliova (1994) appears in Modern Greek translation.

In all, however, this volume represents a valuable initiative on the part of Benjamins and the CILT series (where it joins successful series on Arabic, Hamito-Semitic and Romance linguistics), and the second *Themes* volume currently being prepared is set to further improve on this foundation, and to establish the *Themes* series as a pivotal presence in Modern Greek linguistics.

References

Alexiou, S. (ed.) 1985. *Βασίλειος Διγενής Ακρίτης (Κατα το χειρόγραφο του Εσκοριάλ) και Το ´Ασμα του Αρμούρη [Basil Digenes Akrites (According to the Escorial Manuscript) and The Lay of Armouris]*. Ερμής, Athens.

Beshevliev, V. (ed). 1963. *Die Protobulgarischen Inschriften.* (Berliner Byzantinische Arbeiten Band 23) Akademie-Verlag, Berlin.

Buchholz, O., W. Fiedler & G. Uhlisch 1977. *Wörterbuch Albanisch Deutsch*. VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, Leipzig.

Chambers, J. K. & P. Trudgill. 1980. *Dialectology*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Chila-Markopoulou, D. 1990–1991. Προβλήματα Διαχρονικής Σύνταξης: Οι Ελεύθερες Αναφορικές Προτάσεις στα Μεσαιωνικά και Νέα Ελληνικά [Problems in Diachronic Syntax: Free Relatives in Medieval and Modern Greek]. *Γλωσσολογία* 9–10:13–42.

Christidis, A.-P. 1986. Το μόρφημα «που» σαν αναφορικός δείκτης [The morpheme 'pu' as a definite clause nominaliser]. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 7:135–148.

Christidis, A.-P. 1987. On the Interplay of Deixis and Anaphora in the History of Greek: Ancient Greek ἤν, ἵνα, Modern Greek νά, να. In Killen, J. T., J. L. Melena, & J.-P. Olivier, (eds.) *Stydies in Mycenaean and Classical Greek Presented to John Chadwick,* 97–111. University of Salamanca, Salamanca.

Ingria, R. 1981. *Sentential Complementation in Modern Greek*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Joseph, B. D. 1981. On the Synchrony and Diachrony of Modern Greek NA. *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 7:139–154.

Joseph, B.D. 1983. *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive. A study in Areal, General, and Historical Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Joseph, B. D. 1985a. Complementizers, Particles and Finiteness in Greek and the Balkans. *Folia Slavica* 7:390–411.

Joseph, B. D. 1985b. European Hellenism and Greek Nationalism: Some Effects of Ethnocentrism on Greek Linguistic Scholarship. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 3:87–96.

Joseph, B. D. 1994. Borrowing at the Popular Level: Balkan Interjectional Particles of Turkish and Greek Origin. *Septième Congres International d'Études du Sud-Est Européen: Rapports,* 507–520. Greek National Committee for Southeast European Studies.

Joseph, B. D. 1996a. Textual Authenticity: Evidence from Medieval Greek. In Herring, S., P. van Reenen & L. Schoesler (eds.) Textual Parameters in Ancient Languages. Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Joseph, B. D. 1996b. On the Spread of Constructions in the Balkan *Sprachbund*. Paper given at the *Fifth Worshop in Comparative Linguistics,* Columbus, Ohio.

Joseph, B. D. in press. Where Can Grammatical Morphemes Come From? Greek Evidence Concerning the Nature of Grammaticalization. *Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Meeting of the Formal Linguistic Society of the Midwest.*

Kornrumpf, H.-J. 1979. *Langenscheidt's Universal Dictionary: Turkish-English, English-Turkish*. Langenscheidt, Berlin.

Ladd, R. D. 1980. *The Structure of Intonational Meaning*. Indiana University Press, London.

Mackridge, P. 1993. An Editorial Problem in Medieval Greek Texts: The Position of the Object Clitic Pronoun in the Escorial *Digenes Akrites*. In Panayotakis, N.M. (ed.) *Origini Della Letteratura Neogreca: Atti del Secondo Congresso Internazionale "Neograeca*

Medii Aevi", I:325–342. Biblioteca dell'Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia, Venice.

Mackridge, P. 1994. Η Θέση του Αδύνατου Τύπου της Προσωπικής Αντωνυμίας στη Μεσαιωνική Δημώδη Ελληνική [The Position of the Weak Form of the Personal Pronoun in Mediaeval Vernacular Greek]. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 15:906–929.

Nikiforidou, V. 1991. *Conditional and Concessive Clauses in Modern Greek: A Syntactic and Semantic Description.* Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of California at Berkeley.

Papadopoulos, A.A. 1961. Ιστορικόν Λεξικόν της Ποντικής Διαλέκτου [Historical Dictionary of the Pontic Dialect]. Επιτροπή Ποντιακών Μελετών, Athens.

Trapp, E. 1971. *Digenes Akrites: Synoptische Ausgabe der Ältesten Versionen.* Wieneer Byzantinische Studien VIII. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna.

Žuravliova, E. 1993. Φωνητικό και φωνολογικό σύστημα της Ταυρορουμέικης Νεοελληνικής Διαλέκτου των Ελλήνων της Ουκρανίας [The Phonetic and Phonological System of the Tavrorumei Dialect of Modern Greek in the Ukraine]. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 14:561–572.