LINGO No. 6 Issue 2 November 2019 UW ILP NEWSLETTER Editor: Ivan Roksandic

https://www.uwinnipeg.ca/ interdisciplinary-linguistics/index.html





The Interdisciplinary Linguistics Program (ILP) at the University of Winnipeg (UW)

The French $/ \emptyset /:$ A Hypothesis for the Appearance of the Higher-Mid, Front, Round-Tense Vowel

Mathieu Godin, Major in Linguistics

(Note: The phonetic sound explored in this paper concerns the closed-mid front rounded (lax) vowel and will be referred to by either its modern autographic representation /eu/ or it's IPA symbol / \emptyset /.)

Tracing the evolution of modern French from its linguistics roots, five principle linguistic milestones are generally agreed upon. Following the Latin occupancy in Gaul (today modern France), the original Gaulish language was heavily altered by the vulgar Latin of the military, trade and new inhabitants that settled in the area. This first milestones is referred to as Gallo-Roman and said to have been established by the end of 5th century and lasted until the mid-dle of the ninth. Next came Early-Old French: mid 9th century – end late 11th century; Later Old-French: end of the 11th century – beginning of the 14th cen-tury; Middle French: early 14th- 17th; and finally Modern French from early 17th century onward.

The purpose of my research was to establish a hypothesis concerning the appearance of the /eu/ sound into the French language; to this end, a phonetic inventory from each linguistic milestone would delineate a timeframe for this occurrence. The first language explored was Latin/Vulgar Latin.



In the first century of the empire, special attention to the distinction between short and long vowels seems to disappear. Monothongs at this point could be represented in three vocalic levels (high, mid, low)

(Rohlfs, 35-36)

Latin was the chosen starting point on the basis that French is categorized as a member of the Romance language family, but the only daughter to contain the sound in question. Gaulish belongs to the Gaelic language family; an exploration of other European language containing the /eu/ sound revealed that Breton, also a Gaelic language, uses the sound. Unfortunately, tracking down an attested inventory of Gaulish was difficult. What was chosen was the works of R, A. Fowkes, which in 1940, at the time that his article was written. makes the claim that there exists no complete inventory of the "Gaulish correspondences of Indo-European sounds". Thus, the

inventory used is a theoretical reconstruction. The third language explored was Gallo-Roman. Thought this stage is commonly followed by Early late French, some linguists such as Louis Guinet would advocate for a Gallo-Romance-Germanic period of the language between the 3rd and 5th Century as the northern Gaul region.

Continued on page 4

Interdisciplinary Linguistic Program Faculty:

The ILP is anchored at the Department of Anthropology; the core of the Linguistic Faculty resides at that Department, as well as in English, Modern Languages and Classics:

ILP Faculty:

Interdisciplinary Linguistic Program Faculty

The ILP is anchored at the Department of Anthropology; the core of the Linguistic Faculty resides at that Department, as well as in Modern Languages, Classics and Psychology:

Ivan Roksandic (Anthropology) teaches *Languages of the World*, *Morphology* and *Indo-European Linguistics*. His main research interests are language typology and indigenous languages of South America. His current project focuses on the indigenous toponymy in the Caribbean.

Amy Desroches (Psychology) uses cognitive and brain imagining methods to examine reading and language development. In particular, her work focuses on the role of phonology in learning to read, and the impact that reading development has on spoken language processing.

George Fulford is an Anthropological linguist, specializing in Cree and Algonquian languages. He is especially interested in problems related to grammaticalization, language origins, and semiotics and structuralism.

Zbigniew Izydorczyk teaches at the Department of English. His areas of special interest include Old and Middle English, history of English, history of Latin, and palaeography.

Andrew McGillivray (Rhetoric) teaches *Transnational and Intercultural Language and Communication*. His research interests include Icelandic studies, mythology, and medieval rhetoric. He is currently developing a project about cultural memory and the representation of heritage in Manitoba's Interlake region.

Kristin Lovrien-Meuwese (Modern Languages) is interested in language learning in general and second language acquisition in particular, but has most recently worked on a sociolinguistic study of German in Manitoba. Jorge Machín-Lucas (Modern Languages) is a specialist in XXth and XXIst Century Spanish Literature, and teaches courses in Spanish Normative Grammar and History of the Spanish Language.

Jennifer Reid (English) is an academic medievalist who investigates the relationship between language, communications media, and sociocultural identity in Britain and Ireland during Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages. Her abiding research interests are at the intersection of Medieval Studies and Media Studies.

Iuliia Rezvukhina (Anthropology) teaches Morphology and Phonetics & Phonology/ She is interested in sociolinguistics and linguistic variation in general and in heritage languages, in particular. Her two current projects are focusing on language attitudes to Slavic accents in Winnipeg and on the ways immigrants' composite identities are revealed though their speech.

Liliane Rodriguez (Modern Languages) teaches Linguistics, Comparative Stylistics and Translation. Her main research is in Lexicometry, Geolinguistics and Bilingualism. She is the author of several books and of many articles in Linguistics and Translation Studies.

Shelley Tulloch (Anthropology) teaches *Sociolinguistics*. Her research interests include bilingualism, identity, and language revitalization. Her current research focuses on intercultural Inuit education.

In addition, several courses included in the ILP curriculum are taught at other Departments; UW faculty members from those Departments associated with the ILP include Jeffrey Newmark (Religion and Culture), Tracy Whalen (Rhetoric), Bea Castaneda (Developmental Studies), and Glenn Moulaison, the Dean of Arts, who teaches *History* of the French Language.

Students

Admissions: Students interested in majoring in Linguistics should contact the Coordinator of the ILP.

Award: The Angela Mattiaci Memorial Scholarship in Interdisciplinary Linguistics is awarded every October to a student majoring in linguistics with a distinguished performance in ILP courses. For more information visit our website at: http://www.uwinnipeg.ca/index/int erdisciplinary-linguistics **Colloquium:** Every year in April, after the exam period, the Annual Student Colloquium is held, offering to students an opportunity to present the results of their research to the audience of their colleagues.

The XX Annual Student Colloquium in Linguistics for 2019/20 will take place on Wednesday, April 22nd, 2020 from 10:00 AM - 3:00 PM, in room 3D04, on main campus.



| Fall/Winter 2019/20 | | |
|---|---------------------|--------------------|
| LING-1001-001 Introduction to Linguistics | 10:00 – 11:15 Tu/Th | I. Roksandic |
| LING-3311-001/FREN-3111-001 Comparative Stylistics | 4:00 – 5:15 M/W | L. Rodriguez |
| and Translation | | |
| Fall 2019 | | |
| LING-2002/ANTH-2402/ENGL-2805 Morphology | 1:00 – 2:15 Tu/Th | I. Rezvukhina |
| LING-2003-052/ANTH-2403-052/ENL-2802-052 Syntax | 6:00 – 9:00 Tu | J. Reid |
| LING-2103-001/ANTH-2404-001 Languages of the World | 4:00 – 5:45 Tu/Th | I. Roksandic |
| LING-2301-001/FREN-2202-001 Phonetics (lab required) | 2:30 – 3:45 M/W | L. Rodriguez |
| CLAS-2850-001 Classical Roots of Medical Terminology | 8:30 – 9:20 M/W/F | W. Huard |
| PSYC-2620-001 Psycholinguistics | 11:30 – 12:45 Tu/Th | A. Desroches |
| LING-3102/4102/ANTH-3406/4406 Indo-European Lan- | 11:30 - 12:45 | Tu/Th I. Roksandic |
| guage and Myth | | |
| LING-3105-050/DEV-3300-050 Speech and Language | 5:30 – 8:30 Th | B. Castaneda |
| Disorders | | |
| SOC-3214-001 Mass Communication and Media | 1:30-2:20 M/W/F | M. Vrecar |
| <u>Winter 2020</u> | | |
| LING-2001-001/ANTH-2401-001/ENGL-2803/001 Pho- | 4:00 – 5:15 Tu/Th | I. Rezvukhina |
| netics and Phonology | | |
| LING-2104/ANTH-2405/ENGL-2806 Semantics | 2:30 – 3:45 Tu/Th | J. Reid |
| LING-2102/ANTH-2400 Method and Theory in Linguistic Anthropology | 11:30 – 12:45 T/Th | I. Roksandic |
| LING-2401-001/GERM-2202-001 German Phonetics | 12:30-1:20 Tu/Th | K. Lovrien-Meuwese |
| CLAS-2850-002 Classical Roots of Medical Terminology | 8:30 – 9:45 Tu/Th | C. Logheed |
| CRS-2252-001 Conflict and Communication | 10:30-11:20 M/W/F | J. Hyde |
| LING-3103-001/ANTH-4308-001 Sociolinguistics | 1:00-2:15 T/Th | S.Tulloch |
| ENGL-3812-001 History of the English Language | 9:30-10:20 M/W/F | Z. Izydorczyk |
| FREN-3301-001 History of the French Language | 1:30-2:20 M/W/F | G. Moulaison |
| PSYC-3480-050 Interpersonal Communications | 1:00 – 2:15 Tu/Th | M. Lee |
| RHET-3139-001 Rhetorics of Visual Representation | 11:30 – 12:45 Tu/Th | T. Whalen |

*Courses Subject to Change

Concerning the vowel in question, O.F did contain the sound as was shown from the work of

| O.F by the second half of the 12th century. | | | |
|---|-------|---------|------|
| | Front | Central | Back |
| High | į | ü | u |
| | | | Ó ó: |
| High-Mid | é é: | ö | |
| Low-Mid | è | ə | ò |
| Low | | а | |
| Einhorn notes that a modern French spelling of <u>gu</u> , <u>ou</u> or o usually reflects a later 12 th century pronunciation of [6:], [6] or [6] | | | |

respectively

Einhorn. Thought the evidence from Vulgar Latin as seen from the work of Price, does not include the sound in this less formal form of Latin (nor did the sound exist in the more

formal Latin of Rome). Because the Germanic languages were known to show a preference for strong(er) tonic stressing on vowels, the influenced on Gaulish by the Frank settlers (in Gaul) between the $3^{rd}-5^{th}$ centuries, would suggest the appearance of the higher-mid, front, rounded, tense (closed) vowel-/ø/-, since Vulgar Latin did already contain the same open version of the sound /oe/, likely infusing it to Gaulish (though they possibly may have already had it in their inventory).

(Einhorn, 8)

Lastly, it was shown that through the work of Fowkes, that the /ø/ sound may have been apart of the Gaulish phonetic system. Here, at least orthographically, there seems to be a relation between I.E and Gaulish in the /eu/ sound. But as Fowkes stated, there is uncertainty between / ø/ and /oe/ in Gaulish, and at the time of his research much was theoretical speculation. So, the argument for the appearance of /ø/ in French at this stage does lean heavily on the Germanic influence of the Franks.

As was shown through languages found currently through Europe, the number of languages containing the $|\phi(:)|$ sound are predominantly Germanic, although they do tend to have a preference towards the long version of the vowel. This would be perhaps be due to their likeliness towards stronger tonic stressing, and the short version in the French language is due to the accommodation of the Germanic sound to already existing Gallo-Romance sound patterns, during the occupancy of the Franks in the area during this period.

This research is by no means extensive nor exhaustive, but it is a first step. To be able to strengthen the claim that the sound of interest could have possibly been Celtic, as Fowkes possibly proposes, then a wider look through other Celtic languages during the Iron Age would be required. This of course can be difficult due to lack of written sources and the none-existence of spoken works from which to gather data. This research also primarily accessed readily available Eng-

lish research. It

is to be certain

work of 19-20th

century French

linguists, would

trove of research

reveal a whole

that may have

been retained in

the French lan-

guage. The oth-

er difficult piece

to find, and an

that delving

through the

Gaulish short vowels do not differ from the standard Indo-European sounds with one exception

a, e, i, o, u, a (<ə from IE)

Gaulish long vowels remain mostly the same as their IE counterparts with two exceptions as noted.

ā, ī (<ē in IE), ī, ā (<ō in IE), ū

Gaulish diphthongs only show one difference from the IE system.

ai, ae, ī (<ei in IE), oi, au, eu, ou

(Fowkes, 297-299)

important piece to be sure, would have been a representation of the vowel system of Gallo-Romance. As Gallo-Romance was the *entre phase* between two other states of the language. I believe, at this point in the research, that to understand the vowel realisations during this Gallo -Romance period would be to trace the sounds chronologically rather than as a form existing statically. So again, at this stage of research, I would propose that the /ø/ sound, insofar as it is used in today's Modern French, comes from the influence of the Frankish (Germanic) Language.

Interpreting Weekday Names

Andrew McGillivray, Department of Rhetoric

In his Germania (98 CE), Roman historian Tacitus (56–120 CE) describes the gods worshiped by Germanic tribes living beyond the frontier of the Roman Empire, north of the Danube and east of the Rhine.¹ In chapter 9, about the Germans, he writes:

diebus humanis quoque hostiis litare fas habent. Herculem ac Martem concessis animalibus placant." ("Of the gods, they give a special worship to Mercury, to whom on certain days they count even the sacrifice of human life lawful. Hercules and Mars they appease with such animal life as is permissible.")²

In his text, Tacitus presents the Germanic gods influence from Babylonia.⁴ Woden, Donar, and Tiu as the Roman gods Mercury, Hercules, and Mars, respectively, through what he terms, in chapter 43 of Germania, interpretatio *Romana*³. These Roman gods are, in turn, Romanized versions of the Greek gods Hermes, Heracles, and Ares. To further complicate matters, Woden, Donar, and Tiu, the Germanic gods Tacitus describes through his *interpretatio*, are known as Óðinn, Þórr, and Týr in the Icelandic branch of the Germanic tradition, the branch that provides us with the most extensive textual tradition about these gods. In English, these deities are known as Odin, Thor, and Tyr. The names for the days of the week in many Germanic languages originate with these Germanic gods, and likewise many of the names for the days of the week in Romance languages originate with their Roman counterparts. This essay explores the orgins for the names of the days of the week. The problem is at first inspired by language, but as will be shown below has quite a lot to do with mythology and astronomy, as well.

The seven-day week has been used for millenia, something that can be confirmed by referring to the ancient text of Genesis 2:2–3, where it says God finished his creative work on the seventh

day and he then sanctified that day. The seventh day, known as the Sabbath, is again referred to in Exodus 20:8-11 and Deuteronomy 5:12-15, where it is emphasized as a day for rest, blessed by God. The books of the Pentateuch were most likley established "Deorum maxime Mercurium colunt, cui certis by the eighth century BCE, possibly earlier, though, at the latest, the Pentateuch in its extant form dates back to the third century BCE. The seven-day week was therefore likely adopted by the Jewish people by the end of the Babylonian captivity during the sixth century BCE, during which time the Pentateuch might have been crafted into its present form, possibly with

> Near the time of Christ's birth the seven-day astrological week emerged in the Roman Empire.⁵ Like the Jewish week, the astrological week was influenced by the Babylonians and had taken shape in the Hellenistic world. Within the astrological week, each of the seven moving celestial objects is associated with one of the seven days, for the ancients could only observe seven moving celestial objects with the naked eye: sun, moon, and the planets we know as Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn. Furthermore, "[i]n order to set them apart from all the other celestial bodies, which appeared to be stationary, the ancients grouped those seven luminaries together, and appropriately called them 'planets,' a derivative from the Greek verb *planasthai*, which literally means 'to wander.""⁶ The planets were placed in an order respective to their calculated geocentric distances, from furthest to closest, a calculation which corresponds to their perceived geocentric orbital periods.⁷ Saturn had the longest orbital period and was calculated to be the furthest planet from the earth, then Jupiter, Mars, sun, Venus, Mercury, and finally, with the shortest orbital period and thus closest to the earth, moon. The ancient Greeks had also divided the day into 24 equinoctial hours, or hours of equal length no matter the time

¹ The Germani of Tacitus's time, i.e. groups living east of the Rhine and north of the Danube, did not consider themselves as a whole people, but were actually diverse peoples. The Romans applied the term germani to all of the groups as a whole, which indicates the Romans viewed these groups as related; see Hutton and Warmington 132n2.

² Hutton and Warmington 142–145.

⁴Richards 267.

⁵ Richards 267.

⁶Zerubavel 12.

⁷ Zerubavel 14–15.

of year, as opposed to temporal hours, which would vary based on the time of the year.⁸ The seven planets were then distributed through the 24 hours of each day for seven days, for a total of 168 equinoctial hours each week. The division of each day into 24 planetary hours is known as the "astrological doctrine" of "chronocratories."9

Each day of the astrological week began at sunrise, the first hour occupying the period we think of as 6 to 7 in the morning. The first hour of the first day was associated with Saturn, the planet calculated to be furthest from earth; the second hour, from 7 to 8, with Jupiter; the third with Mars; the fourth with the sun; the fifth with Venus; the sixth with Mercury; and, finally, the seventh hour of the day, from what we think of as 12 to 13, was associated with the moon, the days governed by the seven planets, themselves concelestial body calculated to be closest to earth.¹⁰ The cycle then began again, with the hour from 13 to 14 of the first day assigned to Saturn, and so on, repeating three times in full, which brought the clock up to 3 in the morning of the first day. Saturn was then associated with the hour from 3 to 4, Jupiter from 4 to 5, and the first day ended with an hour associated with Mars, from 5 to 6 in the morning. Thus the second planetary day of the astrological week begins with the first hour allocated to the sun, from 6 to 7.

Within the logic of the astrological week, the planet allocated to the first hour of each day was thought to govern the whole day and thus provide the day with its name. This cycle repeats itself through the whole seven-day week: the 6 to 7 timeslot of the third day of the week is allocated to the moon; the same slot on the fourth day to Mars; on the fifth day to Mercury; on the sixth day to Jupiter; and, finally, on the seventh day the 6 to 7 timeslot is allocated to Venus. Saturday begins with Saturn allocated to the first hour (i.e. between 6 and 7 in the morning), as it was at the beginning of the week prior, and thus the cycle recurs. A contribution of the Babylonian astrologers was the belief that each of the planets, which were also considered to be deities, influenced humanity on earth, and this influence began with the hour, and then extended

⁸See *Ptolomy*'s *Almagest* book 2.9 for computation of the "equal" hour, possibly based on the lost work of Greek astronomer Hipparchus (d. c. 127 BCE), and book 9.1 for the order of the planets; cf. Richards 44.

to the day.¹¹ Therefore, from an ancient astrological perspective, human activity would be influenced on two levels, by the planetary god associated with the current hour and also by the planetary god associated with the entire day.

The Jewish week and the astrological week were aligned as early as the first century CE, the Sabbath¹² and the day of Saturn corresponding, though it was not until the more widespread emergence of Christianity that the two were more fully integrated.¹³ When the Germanic tribes came into contact with Christian Romans along the frontier of the Empire, the Germans adopted the seven-day week, and accordingly assigned names for each of those seven weekdays. Unlike the Roman astrological week, which has seven sidered to be divinities, the Germanic week which was adapted after prolonged contact with Rome is a mixture of planets and gods, and, importantly, in the Germanic tradition the planets are not considered to be divine. The Germans thus used their own interpretatio Germanica to replace the Roman astrological week with names appropriate to their cultures, and for this they continued the tradition of the interpretatio Roma*na* that began with Tacitus, though they adapted it to their own ends: Tyr replaces Mars, Odin replaces Mercury, Thor replaces Jupiter, and Frigg replaces Venus.¹⁴ The Germans could not find equivalent gods for Saturn, sun, or moon in their pantheon, so they incorporated these three Roman planetary names into their own languages using a genitive form of the planet's name followed by the nominative form of the word "day."¹⁵ The two cultures would have relied on this system of interpretationes so that they could communicate, especially as it concerns trade and commerce. The intercultural communication that led to the adoption of the seven-day week by the Germans and the assigning of a Germanic deity to each of the four days between Tuesday and Friday likely took place over a lengthy period of time.

The two interpretationes are revealing in at least two aspects. First, there is an inconsistency, for in the Ro-

⁹ Zerubavel 15; Richards 268.

¹⁰ Note that this essay uses the 24-hour clock rather than the 12hour clock to avoid possible ambiguity and repetition.

¹¹ Zerubavel 14.

¹² Zerubavel 17.

¹³See Cassius Dio's Roman History book 37.17–19.

¹⁴ Strutynski 366.

¹⁵ Strutynski 366.

man mythology Mercury is a son of Jupiter, whereas in the Germanic tradition Thor is almost always presented as a son of Odin, the only exception the Prologue to Snorri Sturluson's *Edda* (c. 1220), which has Odin descend from Thor.¹⁶ The Danish grammarian Saxo Grammaticus (1160–1220) deals with this discrepancy in Book 6 of his *Gesta Danorum* (History of the Danes) to demonstrate that the figures referred to by the respective *interpretationes* are not equivalent, for, if they were, an interpreter would have to accept that the son is the father and the father the son. In the same passage Saxo also discredits any claim to divinity the Germanic gods might have had for his audience, stating rather than gods these figures were deceitful magicians:

"Olim enim quidam magicae artis imbuti, Thor videlicet et Othinus aliique complures miranda praestigiorum machinatione callentes, obtentis simplicium animis, divinitatis sibi fastigium arrogare coeperunt."¹⁷

("At one time certain individuals, initiated into the magic arts, namely Thor, Odin and a number of others who were skilled at conjuring up marvelous illusions, clouded the minds of simple men and began to appropriate the exalted rank of godhead.")¹⁸

As a result, Saxo continues, these magicians were granted days of the week like their Roman counterparts. The genealogical discrepancy suggests that the connection between the Germanic and Roman traditions is based on convention and negotiation rather than syncretism and does "not communicate profound mythological insights"; the discrepancy does show "a conscious lack of exactitude in the equations that were agreed upon,"¹⁹ which supports a conclusion that the names for days of the week in the Germanic languages result from the necessity for two or more cultural groups to communicate and agree on a calendar to facilitate trade.

The names for the Germanic days of the week also provide early evidence for cultic belief in the figures of Tyr, Odin, Thor, and Frigg, or at least evidence for cultic belief in pre-figurations of these deities.²⁰ The Germanic deities associated with the days of the week are at least as old as the time when the seven-day week was adopted by the Germanic tribes and Germanic names applied to the weekdays through the interpretation Germanica, a process which probably took hold in the fourth century CE, after the Empire converted to Christianity, and Tacitus's interpretation Romana provides evidence for even earlier worship practices in the first century CE. These two interpretationes provides a pre-history of a millennium or more for the thirteenth-century Icelandic mythological characters we know from the *Eddas*, though their form and function would have changed considerably through time and across space. A seemingly small problem of language, untangling the origins for the names of the days of the week, has an extensive astronomical and mythological context.

References

Cassius Dio. *Dio's Roman History*. Translated by Earnest Cary. Volume 3. London: William Heinemann, 1961.

Ptolomy's Almagest. Translated by G.J. Toomer. New York: Springer, 1984.

Richards, E.G. *Mapping Time: The Calendar and Its History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. Saxo Grammaticus. *Gesta Danorum*. Det Kongelige

Bibliotek. <u>http://wayback-01.kb.dk/</u>

wayback/20101108105429/http://www2.kb.dk/elib/lit/ dan/saxo/lat/or.dsr/

Saxo Grammaticus. *History of the Danes*. Translated by Peter Fisher and edited by Hilda Ellis Davidson. 2 volumes. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1979.

Strutynski, Udo. "Germanic Divinities in Weekday Names." *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 3.4 (1975): 363–384.

Sturluson, Snorri. *The Prose Edda*. Translated by Jesse L. Byock. London: Penguin, 2005.

Zerubavel, Eviatar. *The Seven Day Circle: The History and Meaning of the Week*. New York: The Free Press, 1985.

¹⁶ See chapter 3 of the Prologue to Snorri Sturluson's *The Prose Edda*. The Prologue is the only place in Snorri's extensive mythographical writings which presents Odin as descending from Thor.

¹⁷ Saxo Grammaticus, Gesta Danorum.

¹⁸ Fisher and Ellis Davidson 171.

¹⁹ Strutynski 374.

²⁰ Later textual expressions of these figures are known from the thirteenth-century Icelandic *Eddas*, and they remain popular in the twenty-first century, as deities in the Icelandic Ásatrúarfélagið (The Aesir Belief Society), a state-sactioned religion in Iceland, and also as characters in comics and films across many cultures.

The Portmanteau in Japanese Jeffrey Newmark, East Asian Languages and Cultures Program

Portmanteaus, neologisms formed by the combination of two or more words, are common in the popular vernacular of many modern languages. In English, these may be appropriated into formal usage, as in smog (smoke + fog) or brunch (breakfast + lunch). Sometimes they can become brand names, like Spork (spoon + fork) or Amtrak (America + track). Others might have an ephemeral existence related to their cultural relevance: TomKat (Tom Cruise + Katie Holmes) or Bennifer (Ben Affleck + Jennifer Lopez).

Portmanteaus in Japanese predate their English equivalent, for the earliest appeared in classical (pre-1600) texts. Translated in contemporary Japanese as *kaban-go* or literally portmanteau-words, they were once known as konsei-go or blended words. The first of these were used to coin singular verbs that combined two other verbs. The word yabuku, for example, derived from yaburu (to break) and saku (to tear) to signify the shredding paper or clothing into unusable pieces. Similarly, toramaeru combined toraeru (to take) and tsukamaeru (to capture) to connote being captured and taken away. Such verbs, however, would decrease in time as Japanese would begin to incorporate compound verbs into the lexicon. Terms like tobikomu would be formulated from the verbstem of tobu (to jump) and the full verb of komu (to be packed in) to mean "jump into."

The influx of non-Sino foreign words and concepts into the Japanese vocabulary at the end of the nineteenth century added a new layer to the language. Initially, these terms were represented by Chinese characters and morphemes. Some combined individual meanings to form a new word, as in 國會 (kokkai) or National Assembly from "country" (國) and "to meet" (會). Others were devised phonetically like 加 奈陀 (kanada) for Canada. The phonetic rendering in Chinese characters, however, soon transitioned into Katakana usage for loan-words, consequently elongating the script. The Japanese word for the United States, 米国 (beikoku), for instance, doubled in written length to アメリカ (amerika).

From 1870 to 1970, the increase in Katakana loan words was negligible for the majority of the Japanese public that did not travel overseas. By the time the country had recovered from postwar devastation and reinvented itself as an economic power in the mid-1970s, this would change with Japanese tourists flocking to foreign destinations. Younger travelers in particular had so familiarized themselves with English signage that in Japanese universities, no-parking zones were spelled out phonetically in Katakana as in no-ka $z\bar{o}n(\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{I}-\mathcal{V}-\mathcal{V})$: No Car Zone) rather represented in fewer Kanji characters (駐車禁止: chūshakinshi). Furthermore, just as North American Universities would use abbreviations (UCLA, UWinnipeg), notable Japanese universities would follow suit through portmanteaus. The University of Tokyo (Tokyo daigaku) became Todai, and Kyoto University (Kyōto Daigaku) became Kyōdai.

For students and adults alike, widely assimilated loan words, especially those related to technology, necessitated abbreviations, and portmanteaus would come to serve this purpose. In the early 1980s, one of the most common technological Japanese portmanteaus shortened the word for Word Processor or Wādopurosessa (ワードプロセッサ) into Wāpuro (ワープロ). Naturally, as personal computers flooded the domestic market, **Pāso**narūkonpyūtā (パー ソナルーコンピューター) became Pasokon (パソ コン).

The key difference today between Japanese and English portmanteaus is in the formulation of the words. Whereas there are no apparent linguistic conventions associated with English portmanteaus, there are in Japanese. Namely, the first two morae of each word are combined to make the new term. For air conditioning, **eā kon**dishonā $(\pm 7 - \exists) \div 7 + 2 \equiv$ $\div -)$ is shortened to eakon $(\pm 7 =)$. In historical linguistics, Japanese portmanteau construction recalls pre-modern poetics, for it is the mora and not the syllable that is tallied to compose a 5-7-5 Haiku verse. Ultimately, it is in the realm of popular culture that Japanese portmanteaus are most ubiquitous. It is the measure of a celebrity's fame in Japan when their name has been shortened into a portmanteau. Thus, one of the most popular singers in Japan during the late 1990s, **Kimu**ra Takuya, became known as Kimutaku. The phenomenon further stretched to non-Japanese celebrities, as **Brad Pi**tt became Burapi. Non -Japanese speakers, perhaps unknowingly, are quite familiar with at least two Japanese portmanteaus. After all, Karaoke derived from *kara* (empty) and *ōkesutora* (orchestra), and the Pokemon menagerie emerged from *poketto* (pocket) and *monsutā* (monsters).



The Role of Japanese Honorific Affixes

Jasmine Espiritu, Major in Linguistics

Affixes take on an important role in the morphology of different languages across the world. Some languages use affixes in a specific manner in which they have one single purpose and meaning. The Japanese language has combined a method in which respect and politeness may be displayed when speaking to another individual. The incorporation of various suffixes and prefixes onto verbs, objects and subjects demonstrate that a speaker is giving their utmost respect. This paper will focus on common affixes used in the Japanese language as well as their purpose.

The Role of Japanese Honorific Affixes

Many of world's languages use affixes that demonstrate different forms and meanings. The Japanese language possess affixes to acknowledge respect is being given to whom or what they are talking about; these are called honorific affixes. In the Japanese culture, social status and rank are regarded to be highly important when it comes to referencing the level of accomplishments. The lack of honorific affixes indicate that an individual is speaking to another individual with whom they share a high degree of intimacy. This includes speaking to one's partner, close friends and younger family members. Additionally, there are affixes that indicate respect is being given towards individuals of a higher and/or younger status with the incorporation of endearment. For instance, addressing someone younger would have the suffix '*chan*', added onto who is being spoken to. In general, the addition of different affixes onto a verb, object or subject in the Japanese language are used in order to exhibit the intention of showing respect when speaking to others.

One commonly used prefix in Japanese is 'o' which does not have a direct translatable word but its addition onto a word functions to show respect. According to the Ivana and Sakai study, "the prefix bears the honorific meaning, and its existence forces the nominalisation of verb to which it attaches" (Ivana & Sakai, 2007, p. 181). For further understanding, an example is laid out in order to demonstrate where the prefix -omay be placed:

1. Sensei gakaer-aretaProfessor NOMgo home HAux'The professor went home.'

2. Sensei ga o-kaeri ni nari sae shinakatta Professor NOM Hon go home Ren Obl become Ren even do Neg Past 'The professor did not even go home.' The first example demonstrates the sentence structure with no sign of politeness nor respect whereas the second example shows the prefix incorporated within. It should be noted that although the second example is in negative form, it does not change the placement of the honorific particle. As shown, the addition of the prefix is attached onto the verb *go*; the word '*sensei*' already has some sense of respect along its title. Therefore, the English word *go* has received the marked form of demonstrating respect. Furthermore, this is explained into detail as "*it is well known that o, go, on and mi are devices whereby honorification is achieved, but it must be noted that honorification is not directed towards what is expressed by the base" (Akamatsu, 2011, p. 41). Adding the honorific prefixes onto a word in a sentence does not necessarily mean the word it is added onto is where the honorific prefix. In general, the addition of an honorific prefix onto a word does not change the meaning of the word syntactically, however does change it semantically. The addition of <i>o, go, on* or *mi* does not change the lexical meaning of the word but merely adds further meaning.

Another common prefix used in the Japanese language is 'go' which signifies the honorification of its subject in topic. According to Akamatsu, it is noted that *o*, *go*, *on* and *mi* are all honorific prefixes but are used in different senses. The idea of personal pronouns is emphasized to display importane as the word *niwa* (garden) "*cannot have another honorific particle* go instead (*goniwa) as go is commonly attached to Sino-Japanese words while o is commonly attached to words of native Japanese origin . . . (Akamatsu, 2011, p. 43). This is further clarified by the explanation of 1st person, 2nd person (the addressee), and 3rd person (third party associated with the addressee) making a covert pronominal reference in what is being marked. Although there are a few limitations in which these specific prefixes can be added onto, there are a few words that appear neutral to any distinction between personal pronouns. The word *henji* (answer) is considered neutral and is assumed to be referenced towards the addressee and the third party associated with the addressee. In English, this may translate into 'your/his/her/their answer', however, it cannot be 'my answer' as it may not be referenced toward the 1st person (speaker). Additionally, it is also important to highlight that there are some cases in which any of the honorific prefixes may be used with no limitations. The word *henji* is part of those exceptions as it is neutral to the speaker, addressee, and third party to the addressee.

Furthermore, three levels of honorifics consists of a nonpolite style with the absence of honorifics, a moderately politeness manner and a very polite style. It can be presented as follows,

| 1. | Uta | ga joozu | da ne. |
|----|-------------|----------|----------|
| | Singing | good at | (you) be |
| • | TT . | 7 | |

2. Uta ga joozu <u>desu</u> ne.

3. Uta ag <u>o</u>-joozu de <u>irasshaimas</u>u ne.

Example 2 shows moderate politeness by the addition of the word '*desu*' while the last example demonstrates the utmost addition of politeness from its addition of three honorifics 'o', '*irasshai*', and '*masu*'. For the most part, "the use or nonuse of honorifics in each situation is prescribed by social norms . . ." (Okamoto, 2002, p. 120). Social norms heavily impact the use in different levels of politeness as it depends solely on the situation one is in. For example, a younger individual must display respect towards an elder as it is considered a social norm in the Japanese culture.

Moreover, there are different forms that can be spoken from a direct and distal form. The lack in use of honorific affixes is meant to show one is speaking to another individual whom they are close to. Speaking to younger family members, close friends and significant others would receive the exclusion of honorific affix usage. Dunn Dicket's article reveals the two forms being used in contrast:

| 1. Sasaki-san | wa o-hanashi | nina-tta | (Subject Honorific, Direct) |
|---------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| Sasaki-TI TOP | HP-speak H+ | PAST | |
| 2. Sasaki-san | wa o-hanashi | ninari-mashi-ta | (Subject Honorific, Distal) |
| Sasaki-TI TOP | HP-speak H+ - | DIST-PAST | |

In this case, subject honorification is being shown which means the speaker is addressing another person with humble submission and respect. The difference between the two forms is "the direct form communicates intimacy and spontaneous self-expression and is widely used between family members and close friends." (Dunn Dicket, 2005, p. 219). Consequently, it is said that "distal forms index a more disciplined, public presentation of self" (Dunn Dicket, 2005, p. 219). Overall, it is more common to be using honorific methods of speaking to strangers in order to display the speaker is delivering respect to whom they are speaking to (the addressee).

Continually, Japanese honorifics are not only meant to show respect from younger individuals to older individuals. Caregivers, for instance, use honorifics as they are in a situation acknowledging "public social roles, out-group relationships, and formality, and on occasion they use ADD HON together with REF HON in indexing respect and deference" (Burdelski, 2013, p. 252). In Burdeslki's article, a role-play situation is acted out between a mother and a child in which both participants result in using honorifics towards one another. The mother pretends to be a company caller without the knowledge of her two-year old son. The purpose of this experiment was to determine the usage of honorifics from both parties. For example, the dialogue went as follows,

1. Mother: ka::? O-too-san desu i-nai п RHON-father-RHON be-NEG SE COP-AHON O 'Your father is not there?' 2. Taka (son): (iru-) i-masu *vo:* PP be-AHON be 'He is.'

The conclusion of this experiment show that both the mother and the son have reciprocated the politeness to one another. When the mother had asked her son 'your father is not there?', she had asked it with respect with the incorporation of adding honorific affixes. Her usage of 'o' and 'san' display that politeness is being shown towards a hypothetical out-group relationship with the child as well as their parents. In response, her son replied with the suffix 'masu' returning that same respect. The act of the child using honorific terms display that he is able to distinguish social roles and relationships and help develop the image of his public self. Overall, this experiment demonstrates that not only are younger individuals using honorific prefixes but elder individuals as well.

Affixes play a specific role when they are attached to a word. The Japanese language specifically have affixes which are used to represent honorification. Generally, honorifics have become part of Japanese grammar as it creates a way to deliver respect. The lack of honorifics signifies that one is speaking to another individual they share an intimate relationship with. It should also be highlighted that elders also reciprocate that same respect as incorporate an endearing suffix at the end of whom they are addressing it to. The main purpose and role of Japanese affixes are to deliver good manners by showing respect while displaying a good sense of public self. <u>References</u>

Akamatsu, T. (2011). Honorific Particles in Japanese and Personal Monemes . *La Linguistique*, 47(1), 37-49. Burdelski, M. (2013, February). Socializing Children to Honorifics in Japanese: Identity and Stance in Interaction. *Multilingua: JOurnal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 32(2), 247-273.

Dunn Dicket, C. (2005, December). pragmatic functions of humble forms in Japanese Ceremonial Discourse. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, *15*(2), 218-238.

Ivana, A., & Sakai, H. (2007, September). Honorification and light verbs in Japanese . *Journal of East A sian Linguistics*, *16*(3), 171-191.



Photo: Sanzen-in Temple figures, Japan by Jordy Meow on Unsplash

A Comparison of Classical and Modern Greek Phonology

Giorgia Skorletos, Major in Linguistics

Introduction

Although the change of language over time is inevitable, Greek is an interesting case because it is considered an archaic language due to its slow rate of change in comparison to other languages (Browning, 1983, p. 12). Worth noting is that the research presented on Classical Greek may be limited to a "purist" version of the language, due to the language only being known through written sources (Browning, 1983, p. 14; Bakker, 2010, p. 85). Therefore, this paper will be to compare the changes between Classical and Modern Greek. I will focus on phonetic areas of comparison, including pronunciation of consonants and vowels, how symbols were used to realise these sounds in writing, and prosodic elements such as accent, tone and stress.

The Basic Chronology of Greek dialects

The main periods of the Greek language are Mycenean, Early Greek, Classical, Hellenistic, Middle, and Modern (Miller, 2013, p. 27). The regional dialects can be broken into Prehistoric, Attic, Ionic, Aeolic, and Doric (Miller, 2013, p. 28-30). The main two dialects that will be focused on in this paper will be Attic and Ionic. Due to their popular use at the time, several unique features emerged when they became united, with the Ionic alphabet being adopted into use by the Attic dialect (Miller, 2013, p. 30). Interestingly, the dialectal differences never developed enough to form their own languages (i.e. like Latin) and is still considered a single language identity (Browning, 1983, p. 12). Pronunciation

Consonants – Classical Greek

The consonantal inventory of Classical Greek included stops, fricatives, liquids and affricates. Stops had three places of articulation: bilabial, dental, and velar, with the option of being voiced or voiceless. Additionally, there were the fricatives /s/ and /h/, the liquids /r/ and /l/, and the affricates /zd/, /ps/ and /ks/ (Browning, 1983, p. 33; Allen, 1968, p. 56). Sonorants in Classical Greek were described as Yypóc, meaning "fluid" or "unstable" (Allen, 1968, p. 38). /r/ was a trilled alveolar, and /l/ was most likely clear (Allen, 1968, 38, 39). In some sources, /s/ and its voiced allophone /z/ were considered the only fricative.

There was a possibility of assimilation between syllable or word boundaries. Geminates and consonant clusters also affected the pronunciation or aspiration of certain sounds, such as the geminate $/rr/ < \rho\rho >$, which begins voiced and ends voiceless (Bakker, 2010, p. 91). In addition, the phoneme /h/ often assimilated with stops to make them aspirated (Bakker, 2010, p. 90).

Consonants – Modern Greek

Modern Greek has between 20-25 distinct consonant sounds. The only change regarding the manner and place of articulation is the addition of an alveolar category. The option of voiced or voiceless still remains, however aspiration is no longer considered a phonemic variation, mainly pertaining to the phonemes /p, t, k/ (Holton et al., 2015, p. 5). Glides came into more frequent use, with /j/ appearing when preceding some vowels (Holton et al., 2015, p. 5). The sounds /s/ and /z/ became distinct phonemes, due to a change in orthographical representation (although voicing assimilation still occurs) (Bakker, 2010, p. 92; Holton et al., 2015, p. 3). Some affricates were added. Overall, assimilation between word boundaries still occurs (Holton et al., 2015, p. 9). There is a rich system of clusters, with up to three word-initially, and up to four word-internally (Holton et al., 2015, p. 7). There is also an interesting use of consonant combinations, where some are pronounced as sequential but separate sounds, and others joining to create a single sound. **Vowels – Classical Greek**

Classical Greek can be classified as having an asymmetric vowel system, with 5 short vowels, and 7 long vowels (Bakker, 2010, p. 96; Browning, 1983, p. 32). Vowel length had a contrastive function in meaning (Allen, 1968, p. 59-62). It seems that openness was also a factor, with some symbols representing the open and closed version of a vowel (Allen, 1968, p. 71). The diphthongs were /ai/, /au/, /eu/, /oi/, /āi/, /ɛi/, /ɛu/, and /ɔi/ (Bakker, 2013, p. 99). While it will be discussed in more detail in the next section, we do start to see some diphthongs transitioning to monophthongs. Including long and short vowels, as well as diphthongs, there seems to have been 25 vowel phonemes in total (Adaktylos, 2007, p. 2).

We can see some evidence of fronting with the Attic and Ionic dialects, signalling the beginning of a chain shift in Greek vowels at the time (Miller, 2013, p. 45). It seems that diphthongs were sometimes confused for long simple vowels, meaning the distinctions were not easy to maintain (Allen, 1968, p. 80-81). Adding to the confusion was that the pronunciation of diphthongs differed between word boundaries. For example, diphthongs in pre-vocalic positions were better thought of as a short vowel plus a glide (Allen, 1968, p. 77-78). Eventually these sounds were adapted to be pronounced without their diphthongal element (Allen, 1968, p. 83).

Vowels – Modern Greek

Greek eventually developed to become a simple five-vowel system with no meaningful contrast in vowel length, /i, e, a, o, u/ (Miller, 2013, p. 59). Although fairly straightforward, there are examples where certain environments may change the pronunciation or vowel quality. One example is that $/i/ < \iota >$ becomes non-syllabic if unstressed and followed by another vowel (Holton et al., 2015, p. 4). The combination of two or three vowels is also possible (Holton et al., 2015, p. 4). Many "pre-tonic initial vowels" disappeared from Greek, mainly due to fast and informal speech (Browning, 1983, p. 63). Some Greek dialects today still continue the process of aphaeresis or removal (Browning, 1983, p. 63).

Monophthongization is a common process in the Greek language (Miller, 2013, p. 48). Many of the diphthongs simplified to become monophthongs, such as /ai, oi, ou, ei/ (Miller, 2013, p. 36, 53-54). In addition, some diphthongs changed to fricatives. For example, /au, eu/ will be pronounced as fricatives with voiced and voiceless counterparts (Miller, 2013, p. 58; Allen, 1968, p. 76). Finally, the chain shift that began in the Attic-Ionic period eventually ended up as a "non-chainlike shift," and many vowels merged together to become /i/ (Miller, 2013, p. 60). Symbol Realisation (Changes in Alphabet)

The Greek alphabet currently has 24 letters, with 7 letters for vowel sounds, and 17 letters for consonant sounds. Pronunciation is fairly consistent with written words. Some exceptions are that several letters could correspond to a single sound, or combinations of letters could have a different pronunciation (Holton et al., 2015, p. 3). One example would be vowel combinations, where two vowel letters create one sound (e.g. $/a/<\alpha >$ and $/i/<\iota >$ become $/e/<\alpha\iota >$, or $/e/<\varepsilon >$ with $<\iota >$ become the sound $/i/<\varepsilon\iota >$) (Holton et al., 2015, p. 1). These unique spellings reveal the history of vowel changes in Greek. The adaptation of the Attic alphabet allowed the Ionic dialect to better distinguish vowel length (Allen, 1968, p. 84).

The letter $\langle \beta \rangle$ changes from representing the sound /b/ to /v/. Instead, Modern Greek uses two orthographic symbols to create /b/, which is $\langle \mu \pi \rangle$ (/m/ and /p/). There are other unique combinations, such as /g/ $\langle \gamma \kappa \rangle$, /d/ $\langle \nu \tau \rangle$, and /dz/ $\langle \tau \zeta \rangle$ (Holton et al., 2015, p. 1). The symbol $\langle \gamma \rangle$ was beginning to be pronounced as /j/, which is now typical of Modern Greek (Allen, 1968, p. 30). The symbol $\langle \zeta \rangle$ later came to represent /z/ and /zz/ instead of /zd/ as it originally did in the Ionic alphabet (Bakker, 2010, p. 92). Double consonants may represent either a geminate or no change in pronunciation (Allen, 1968, p. 10; Holton et al., 2015, p. 3). As a speaker of Modern Greek, one of the most notable changes is the sound change for $\langle \phi \rangle$, $\langle \vartheta \rangle$, and $\langle \chi \rangle$, originally aspirated stops in Classic Greek (/p^h, t^h, k^h/) and later fricatives in Modern Greek (/f, θ , x/) (Bakker, 2010, p. 86).

Classical Greek was a polytonic language, meaning it has a "syllabic intonation accent in long and short syllables" (Adaktylos, 2007, p. 4). The two tones were referred to as `oξύς (sharp, acute) and $\beta\alpha\rho$ ύς (heavy, grave), or as high and low tones (Allen, 1968, p. 106, 108). It also had a melodic accent, where varying pitch changed the lexical or grammatical meaning (Adaktylos, 2007, p. 1). Several accentual markings were used to avoid ambiguities, including the acute, grave, and circumflex accent marks (Allen, 1968, p. 114-115). In contrast, Modern Greek is monotonic, meaning it has a dynamic accent, which focuses on using stress and producing a mixture of increased loudness, pitch, and quantity (Adaktylos, 2007, p. 1, 4). Every word with more than two syllables must contain stress, occurring ultimately, penultimately, or ante-penultimately (Holton et al., 2015, p. 10). The position of stress may change for some word classes, such as nouns and verbs (Holton et al., 2015, p. 10-11). Only the acute marking remained (Adaktylos, 2007, p. 1) <u>Conclusion</u>

In sum, I have attempted to discuss the phonological changes between Classical and Modern Greek. The areas of the language that were examined are pronunciation, orthography, and basic prosody. A very brief dialect history and breakdown was also included. Due to the limited scope of this paper, the changes discussed seem very minimal. As discussed in the introduction, Greek is known for its slow rate of change in comparison with other languages. Ultimately, for this reason, not many changes were revealed in this discussion. An interesting thought would be continuing this project to delve into further details for phonology, as well as consider the linguistic areas, such as the grammar, word structure, and the lexicon.

References Cited

Adaktylos, A-M. 2007. "The accent of Ancient and Modern Greek from a typological perspective" (PDF). In Tsoulas, G. *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*. Retrieved from <u>https://web.archive.org/</u>web/20130515110353/http://icgl7.icte.uowm.gr/Adaktylos.pdf

Allen, W. (1968). *Vox Graeca: A guide to the pronunciation of classical Greek*. London: Cambridge University Press. Bakker, E. J. (2010). *Companion to the Ancient Greek language*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell. Retrieved from <u>https://</u>ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uwinnipeg/detail.action?docID=485660#

Browning, R. (1983). *Medieval and modern Greek* (2nd ed.). Cambridge Cambridgeshire: Cambridge University Press. Holton, D., Mackridge, P., & Philippaki-Warburton, I. (2015). *Greek: An essential grammar of the modern language*. London, UK: Routledge. Retrieved from <u>https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uwinnipeg/detail.action?docID=200012</u> Miller, D. G. (2013). *Ancient Greek dialects and early authors: Introduction to the dialect mixture in Homer, with notes on lyric and Herodotus*. Boston, MA: Walter de Gruyter. Retrieved from <u>https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uwinnipeg/detail.action?docID=1037909</u>

<u>Appendix</u>

1.1

(Miller, 2013, p. 27)
<u>Main periods of the Greek language:</u> Mycenean era (c.1500-1100 BCE)
Early Greek – including Homer (c.800-600 CE)
Classical era (c.600-300 BCE)
Hellenistic period – including New Testament Greek (c.300 BCE -300 CE)
Middle Greek (c. 300-1100 CE)
Byzantine Greek (c. 300-1100 CE)
Medieval Greek (c.1100-1600 CE)
Modern Greek (c.1600-present CE) **2.1**

(Bakker, 2010, p. 90; Allen, 1968, p. 12)

| | | Bilabial* | Dental** | Velar*** |
|-----------|--------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Voiceless | Unaspirated^ | $p < \pi >$ | t < \u03ct > | k < K > |
| | Aspirated^^ | $p^h < \phi >$ | $t^h < \vartheta >$ | $k^h < \chi >$ |
| Voiced | Oral | $b < \beta >$ | $d < \delta >$ | $g < \gamma >$ |
| | Nasal^^^ | m < µ > | n < v > | $\mathfrak{g} < \gamma >$ |

*"From the extremities of the lips" (Allen, 1968, p. 11).

**Most likely a true dental rather than alveolar (Allen, 1968, p. 11).

***"By the tongue rising to the palate near the throat," pronunciation could vary somewhat according to the following vowel (Allen, 1968, p. 14-15).

^ Ψιλόν /psil'on/ - "smooth, plain," or "Aφρωνa /'afrona/ - "devoid of sound" (Allen, 1968, p. 12; Bakker, 2010, p. 86).

^^Δασύ /ðas'i/- "rough," or ἡμίφωνα /im'ifona/ - "half-sounded" (Allen, 1968, p. 12; Bakker, 2010, p. 86).

^^^Air "partially expelled through the nostrils" (Allen, 1968, p. 31).

2.2

(Adaktylos, 2007, p. 3)

| | | Bilabial | Dental | Alveolar | Velar/Palatal |
|------------|-----------|---------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Stops | Voiceless | $p < \pi >$ | $t < \tau >$ | $t^s < \tau \sigma > \wedge$ | k < K > |
| | Voiced | $b < \beta >$ | $d < \delta >$ | $d^z < \delta \zeta > \uparrow$ | $g < \gamma >$ |
| Fricatives | Voiceless | $f < \phi >$ | $\theta < \theta >$ | $s < \sigma >$ | χ < χ > * |
| | Voiced | $v < \beta >$ | $\delta < \delta >$ | $z < \zeta >$ | $\gamma < \gamma > **$ |
| Sonorants | Voiced | $m < \mu >$ | n < v > | $r < \rho > (trill)$ | $l < \lambda > (lateral)$ |

*Also affricate /tʃ/

** Also glide /j/

^ Truly affricates, however Adaktylos (2007) included them in this fashion

(Holton et al., 2015, p. 4) Other 5 phonemes not included in the chart are:

 $/k^h$, g^h , $x^{h}/$ - aspirated word-initially /p, l'/ - variants in placement of articulation when pronounced before unstressed /i/ and a vowel **2.3**

(Allen, 1968, p. 59-62; Bakker, 2010, p. 97)

| | Front | Back |
|------|--|--|
| High | $ \bar{l} < l >$ | $/\bar{u}/<\upsilon>$ (round) |
| Mid | $ \bar{\mathbf{e}} < \epsilon_{\mathbf{l}} >$ | $ \bar{Q} < 00 > (round)$ |
| Low | $/\overline{\epsilon}/ < \eta >$ | $\overline{5}/{5} \sim 0 > (\text{round})$ |
| | | $/\bar{a}/$ |

2.4

(Miller, 2013, p. 42; Holton et al., 2015, p. 3)

| | Front | Central | Back |
|------|--|----------------|--------------|
| High | $i < \iota, \eta, \upsilon, o\iota, \varepsilon\iota, \upsilon\iota >$ | | u < 00 > |
| Mid | $\epsilon < \epsilon, \alpha \iota >$ | | 0 < 0, (0) > |
| Low | | $a < \alpha >$ | |

3.1

(Bakker, 2010, p. 87)

| Ionic Alphabet – Letter [Sound Value] | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| A [a, ā] | N [n] | |
| B [b] | Ξ [ks] | |
| Γ [g, ŋ] | O [0] | |
| Δ [d] | П [р] | |
| E [e] | P [r] | |
| Z [zd] | Σ [s, z] | |
| H [ē] | T [t] | |
| $\Theta[t^h]$ | $\Upsilon [y, \bar{y}]$ | |
| I [i, ī] | $\Phi\left[p^{h} ight]$ | |
| K [k] | X [k ^h] | |
| Λ [1] | Ψ[ps] | |
| M [m] | Ω[5] | |

3.2

(Created from my personal knowledge)

| Modern Greek Alphabet – Letter [Sound Value] | | |
|--|--------------|--|
| A [a] | N [n] | |
| B [v] | Ξ [ks] | |
| Γ [γ, ŋ-ɲ] | O [0] | |
| Δ [ð] | П [р] | |
| Ε[ε] | P [r] | |
| Z [z] | Σ [s] | |
| H [i] | T [t] | |
| $\Theta \left[\theta ight]$ | Y [i] | |
| I [i, j, ŋ] | $\Phi [f]$ | |
| K [k] | X [x] | |
| Λ [l] | Ψ[ps] | |
| M [m] | Ω [0] | |

Thoughts on Language

The magic of the tongue is the most dangerous of all spells. (E. G. Bulwer-Lytton) Language is an organism. To digest it one must be, paradoxically, swallowed up by it. (Shemarya Levin) When I cannot see words curling like rings of smoke round me I am in darkness, I am nothing. (Virginia Woolf) Language is a finding-place, not a hiding-place. (Jeanette Winterson) Personally I think that grammar is a way to attain beauty. (Muriel Barbery) Language has no legs but runs over thousands of miles. (Korean proverb) Language is the main instrument of man's refusal to accept the world as it is. (George Steiner) Man was given the gift of language in order to be able to hide his thoughts. (Talleyrand) The limits of my language mean the limits of my world. (Ludwig Wittgenstein) Language is a poor bull's-eye lantern wherewith to show off the vast cathedral of the world. (R. L. Stevenson) Language is man's deadliest weapon. (Arthur Koestler) Language is a city to the building of which every human being brought a stone. (R. W.Emerson) Language is the house of Being. In its home man dwells. (Martin Heidegger) The unconscious is structured like a language. (Jacques Lacan)



Pieter Brueghel the Elder (1526-1569), The Tower of Babel