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1. Debts should be acknowledged even when they cannot be repaid. I have endless other obligations but there is no-one to whom I am more deeply indebted, both personally and intellectually, than Henry Hoenigswald. He has encouraged me when I hesitated, helped me when I was in trouble, corrected me when I was wrong, and above all rescued me from obscurity when I was confused. He has been friendly when we agreed, friendlier when we disagreed. This is not easy to express without pomposity and sentimentality — two sins of which Henry could never be guilty. I risk incurring his disapproval but, on this occasion at least, καλός δε κόδωνος.

In 1966 Hoenigswald pointed out that if the model of social sciences is to be taken at all seriously linguists ought to be interested “not only in (a) what goes on (language), but also in (b) how people react to what goes on (...) and in (c) what people say goes on (talk concerning language)”. He also warned that “it will not do to dismiss these secondary and tertiary modes of conduct merely as sources of error” (Hoenigswald 1966: 20). Folk-linguistics, the discipline whose study Hoenigswald advocated, is closely linked with ethnolinguistics and folk-linguistics, the discipline whose study Hoenigswald advocated, is closely linked with ethnolinguistics and folk-linguistics, the discipline whose study Hoenigswald advocated, is closely linked with ethnolinguistics and folk-linguistics, the discipline whose study Hoenigswald advocated, is closely linked with ethnolinguistics and folk-linguistics, the discipline whose study Hoenigswald advocated, is closely linked with ethnolinguistics.

In what follows I want to start from a specific point made by Hoenigswald in his 1966 paper and examine it in some detail with reference to Greek and to the beginnings of Greek linguistics.

2. Hoenigswald (1966: 18) considered the advantages of a more technical investigation for those cultures in which we observe the existence of “a formalized activity in which language is the object of reverence, contemplation, or study”, and noted that the first approach to the subject: “is necessarily by way of vocabulary”; we might start by asking, for instance, for the equivalents of items like ‘word’ or ‘sentence’ and inquire, inter alia, whether they exist and are used in a definable sense. In this context he referred to “the old observation that the Greeks had no word for ‘word’”, but since his purpose was of a more general nature, the observation remains isolated in the article. In my turn I want to ask what notion, if any, the Greeks had of ‘word’. My question is not of a linguistic nature (what was a Greek word? how do we define a Greek word?); it is rather a metalinguistic question, if I can use ‘metalinguistic’ in this extended sense. Yet, it is not, or not predominantly, a question in the history of linguistics; it is mainly a question in Greek folk-linguistics.
the question worth asking and answering? First, because an answer will form an part of an account of the Greek secondary responses to language. Secondly, because the answer is based on evidence which is not entirely lexical, it may lead to some general observations about the parallelism—or lack of it—between metalinguistic and metalinguistic reactions. Thirdly, because it is at least possible that the notion belongs both to folk-linguistics and to linguistic analysis proper. If so, or the work leading to it may serve to test the existence and nature of the link continually which I hypothesized earlier between folk-linguistics and linguistics. If it exists it is in Greece that it ought to be most apparent. The whole tradition of thought in the West at least as far as the nineteenth century is directed or indirect on Greek thought; no doubt at each stage cultural influences of varying types were vast; but they did not destroy the basic contiguity. From a Western point of view Greece that scholarly awareness of language starts; if so, it is in Greece that we test the connection between folk-linguistics and scholarly work. There are other one which one could justify both the question and the time and labour spent in it; for the moment I see no advantage in going into greater detail.

The evidence do we have at our disposal? Obviously we must start with the lexicon, the other types of evidence spring to mind. First, writing and all possible forms of secondly, explicit statements which we may be lucky enough to have from any of ares texts.

Icon has been explored already and Hoenigswald's statement quoted earlier is found in the secondary literature and is basically correct (Fournier 1946: 825; 1947: 830, note 1). In Homer χαῖς and μιᾶς are frequently translated with 'word' (στοιχεῖα οὐδὲν ἀλήθεια), though χαῖς is at least may to thought or story. We have no evidence that Homer had the lexical resources to ask questions such as 'is X one or two words?' or 'are these two words of the type?' In Herodotus we find that χαῖς can refer to one word (δοκεῖσθαι in the Pamphilian story of 2.2, the name οὐδὲν in 2.29), but also means proverb (e.g. τὸ παλαιότερον 7.51) or verse (e.g. ὁμοθύμητος ἐν οἴνοις 4.29) and can be used to refer to a sentence or (e.g. ἐπὶ δὲ ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ... in 3.82). Of the other possible terms, μιᾶς is even rarer and story, myth; μιᾶς is not frequent, occurs mostly in the plural and is best translated 'saying'; λογικά has its usual wide range of meanings. In Attic the closest ant to 'word' are λόγος, μιᾶς, and ἔρωτα. It is hardly necessary to reiterate that which eventually became the technical term for 'sentence' means far more than μιᾶς or μιᾶς is not much better defined. In Plato it refers to a proverb or saying (e.g. 43 b), to a phrase or expression such as ἀλήθεια φόλος (Crat. 399 a), to a single word (9 ε.), to a predicate or verb (Sph. 262 a). The modern translator is constantly in should οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ τῶν ὑπομικράτων τῶν καθαρότατων mentioned in Theaet. 168 b be ren tēς ἑπεξετῶν ἔρωτας ἐκ τῆς ἀλήθειας (Diès 1955: 196), "habitual use of as and words" (McDowell 1973: 42), or—less likely—does it refer to verbs and as implied by LSI s.v. λογικά (vi.2)? Similar problems arise for δοκεῖ. In Homer it only to 'name' or 'proper name'. In Attic it may mean 'word', but also 'name' and, noun as contrasted with ἔρωτα 'verb' or 'predicate'. In the famous passage from the as mentioned earlier (399 a) does Plato speak of the shift from the phrase ἀλήθεια name άληθεία or of the shift from a phrase to a single word?

Later on further terminology—which is now technical terminology—comes in. Dionysius of Halicarnassus (First Century B.C.) uses λογικά for word in his earlier works but in his later contributions speaks of λόγος, λόγιον, λογικόν (Schakenraveld 1983: 70). Householder (1931: 4) points out that Apollonius Dymeus (Second Century A.D.) uses three equivalents for 'word': μιᾶς, μιᾶς, and μιᾶς λογικά or μιᾶς λόγιον; δοκεῖ. However, it still appears as a cover-all term (Ag. Dyme. de synt. 18, 2). We may discuss the exact value of these forms but there is little doubt that by this stage the one-or-two-words and the word-type questions I hypothesized earlier can be asked and answered. I shall return to this later.

What emerges from this brief survey is not, as has been stated, that the notion of word appears late in the development of Greek thought, but rather that the Greek lexicon does not offer any clear evidence for the existence of such a notion; yet, it does not offer any evidence for its absence either. Even when technical thinking about grammar starts and a notion of word is obviously available, the vocabulary does not make it immediately clear.

4. The easiest way of defining a word in English is with reference to the written language: a word is a sequence of letters written between empty spaces and/or some form of punctuation. This statement is obviously trivial and, if in any case, can only refer to word-forms rather than, say, lexemes, but may well account for the confidence with which the layman speaks of words, in spite of the notorious difficulties encountered by linguists in their attempt to produce a definition of this concept. A parallel statement is impossible for classical Greek. In the absence of spacing, accents, and smooth breakings, there was no formal device used to distinguish words in the written language. Admittedly one letter (b) in some regions at least occurred only in word-initial position and some letters could not occur in word-final position, but here writing reflects speech. We do not know that these facts were the object of metalinguistic observation and consequently we do not know whether they are relevant to our inquiry. If so, do we learn anything from the written language?

The answer is definitely positive if we take into account the whole gamut of writing which we find in ancient Greece. Of the three scripts used in Greece for Greek (Linear B, syllabic Cyprian, and the alphabet) it is only the third, and even this in a limited part of its history, which seems to provide no evidence for the Greek notion of word. The first two definitely repay further analysis and the alphabet itself is not as barren of information as at first appears to be.

The data vary in time and space. Linear B was written in the second half of the Second Millennium B.C. in Crete, in the Peloponnesse, at Thbes, and possibly in other parts of Mycenaean Greece. Syllabic Cyprian, with the exception of one early document, dates from the first part of the first Millennium B.C. and stretches until the Hellenistic period; most of the texts come from Cyprus. I do not need to rehearse here the basic data about the Greek alphabet. The three scripts are independent of each other. There is genetic affinity between Cyprian and Linear B, but we do not know the exact nature of the relationship. There is a chronological overlap between Cyprian and the alphabet but until the latest period at least no obvious influences of one on the other.

If what we aim at is a view of what the ancient Greeks in general or, at any rate, the man in the ancient Greek street felt about language, we ought to use the evidence of writing with
The level of literacy in Greece was low at all times and for the potential if Linear B and syllabic Cyprian must have been very low. It is only in the fifth and only in some parts of Greece that writing acquired a different status and image. Yet all that we can hope to reconstruct is the metalinguistic assumptions and of a small subset of Greeks; if so, we should not be deterred by the nature of our sources. The number of literate speakers was not unreasonably small even in the earlier is shown by the Linear B texts of Knossos. It seems probable that these all belonged same year and were written by a minimum of one hundred different scribal hands.

The script was not a caste separate from the others; there must have been a number of administrators who could write but had other tasks as well (Olivier 1977b).

Syllabic scripts are often compared unfavorably with the alphabet. The latter is for its quasi-phonetic character, its simplicity and clarity — qualities which are in the former. Linear B and, to a lesser extent, Cyprian are reproached for the loss of their graphic systems and their incapacity to express all grammatical distinctions, and in our structuring we base a basic point: the syllabic scripts provide information that the alphabet does not offer. From the alphabet, for instance, we learn very little, if anything, about syllabic division; from the syllabic scripts we learn a great deal. For a question closely related to that from which we started — that of word division, i.e., the identification of word forms — the syllabaries are highly informative and far more so than the alphabet.

us start from Linear B. The script has a sign used as a word-divider which has no match in any standardized form of the Greek alphabet until spacing is introduced in the Late Minoan. The regular use of the word-divider is an innovation of Linear B; the sign found — or found only sporadically — in the earlier Creto-Mycenaean scripts is a related term.

Linear B the word-divider is normally a small vertical bar (the size varies) and is used on regularity between sequences of syllabograms to separate them from one another. It does not occur at the beginning of a text nor does it normally occur at the beginning of a line — which effectively prevents us from speaking of a presupposed or postponed determinative. The word-divider can also — but need not — be omitted when it is replaced by an empty space.

The size of the characters changes (e.g., from large to small), between a word and the next one, not the word is followed by an ideogram or number.

In the vast majority of the cases we find a word-divider where a modern editor leaves spacing between words. Yet there are exceptions which can be subclassified into:

1. the word-divider may be occasionally and unpredictably omitted, though none of the made above apply. The omission seems accidental because the same sequence is used by the same writer with and without word-divider (here conventionally indicated comma); cf. KN Fp. 1, 10 (hand 138) e-nem-o, i-jere-ra vs. Fp. 13.3 (hand 138) o-i-jere-ra (twice); FY Kn 187, 8 (hand 2) u-p-o-po-t-peek (the editors doubt the use of a word-divider) vs. Fr. 1236 (hand 2) u-p-o-p, po-ru-nil (cf. also Fr. 1225.1); 64,2,4,14,15 to-o-to, we-to vs. ibid. 6,7,16 i-o-o-to-we-to.

Secondly, Linear B apparently avoids marking the word-divider graphic words which would consist of one sign only: hence the spelling to-o-to: tos-tlos-pat in PY J 3749 and Jn 601.9 contrasted e.g. with Jn 601.9. An isolated sign could be taken for an ideogram or an abbreviation, so that presumably there is a graphic motivation for this rule.

A third set of exceptions could conceivably belong to our second category but is best treated separately. This consists of a number of particles, pronouns, etc. which are regularly not divided, e.g., from the word which precedes or follows. Thus -de and -ye (Gr. Æde, yle) are always joined to the preceding word (and followed by the word-divider), fo and -e (Gr. Æe ? ? ?) are joined to the word which follows. Not all of these spellings can be explained merely on the basis of the Mycenaean reluctance to write one sign word separately since we find two-sign sequences treated in the same manner: da-no-de-men: dámno-men (PY Ep. 794.5), e-ke-de-men: ekeilemen (PY Ep. 926), and o-de-se, and o-mo-se: the negative particle o-ri (Gr. 0) is always joined to the word which follows: o-ri-do-ri, o-ri-do-to, o-ri-pra-kne, o-ri-tom-ri, o-ri-wo-se (o-ri-wo-se). The form o-ri-ki (Gr. o-xi) occurs only once and is joined to te-ri which follows (KN V 280.5; cf. o-ri-te-men ibid., 11-14). By contrast ou-xe (Gr. Ære) is frequently found at Knossos and at Pylos as an independent word, preceded and followed by the word-divider. No doubt we deal here with elements comparable with the prepositional and postpositional elements of the metricals (Maas 1962: 84f.; West 1983: 25f) but the problem is how our particles are to be defined.

I wonder whether a merely distributional and syntactical account is sufficient. Mycenaean has a number of disyllabic prepositions (p ôi, epi, p er ; etc.); in the noun phrases in which they occur they are normally (not always) separated from the noun which follows by a word-divider. Distributionally everything points to a 'prepositional' status of the preposition, yet the 'prepositional' o-ri 'not' is regularly joined to the following word; the prepositions are not. The different spelling may be explained if p er was orthotonic, but ou was not. For later Greek it is often suggested that the prepositions were protoclytic; in Mycenaean the position must have been different, but the suggestion agrees with all that we know about the historical development of the prepositions, which certainly started as orthotonic and presumably nominal elements.

A preliminary conclusion at this stage is that in Mycenaean the word-divider is used to separate accentual groups. i.e., speech sequences characterized by one main accent; the exceptions are explained by graphic reasons. However, before this can be accepted, we must consider two further sets of exceptions.

I have mentioned above the odd instances of omission of word-divider due presumably to negligence or sometimes to lack of space. There are also two instances of sequences which ought to be written with a word-divider but occur consistently and more than once without. In Knossos pâ-sti-ô-to: pâ-sti-thôtôhi to all gods occurs 15 different times in tablets written by four different scribes (Fp.-Ga., Gg. passim); in Pylos we-ô-te-ô-te-ô 'every year' (Fere-Fere) occurs 13 times in the same tablet (Es 644) again without word-divider. In the second sequence we may well have an instance of unification. The formation is archaic, we have no other examples of it in Mycenaean, and it may have survived in a fossilized and 'unarticulated' status with consequent accent simplification. The case of pâ-sti-ô-to is more puzzling. Semantically, the odds are that 'All gods' count as a unit, a single denomination; yet, we expect that if we had more texts we would also find a nominative *pâ-sti-yô-to: pâ-sti-thôtôhi and a genitive *pâ-sti-ô-to: pâ-sti-thôtôhi with both elements declined, so that
metrical grounds it would be difficult to attribute word status to the phrase. The
manner for a Mycenaean phase [on anaton (hekhei)] we would expect a Linear B spelling
*a-na-to-te-ke*. Yet what is really attested is *o-nato, eke* (PY En-, Ep-ep), or even
o-na-to-te-ke with omitted word-divider and omission in writing of -w in word final position
(PY Ep 539, 3; 613,7): correct word division is more important than correct syllabification.12

6. Such much about Mycenaean. What about the other scripts? In the Cyprian syllabary
word-dividers (bars, dots, empty spaces) exist (Mason 1972: 107ff; 1983: 68ff), but are
not used as with much regularity as in Mycenaean and sometimes mark phrases rather than
individual words. Yet, word division is more reliably indicated by another device. In Linear B
the consonants which close a word are normally not written; in Cyprian the final consonant
is noticeable that here too word-division takes priority over syllabification: in the sequence
kaw:ksi:ur: the final -r of kaw:ksi:u must have formed a syllable with the first
vowel of xw:do:ne but the script renders it as if it belonged to xw:do:ne only: po-to-le:te-

If we can judge from the spelling, monosyllabic enclitic and proclitic elements are not
treated as independent words:13 cf. xw:go:ne:ti (not *xw:go:ne:ti mu) for abjad xw:go:
ti:ke (not *ti:ke); xw:go:ne:ti (not *ti:ke). Other enclitic particles are xw:ti, etc. Some proclitics are
earlier identified as: cf. to-go-to-kon: te sto:ke: (not *te:sto:ke); su:ke: (not *su:te:sto:ke). Yet, as Hermann (1906: 240ff) saw a long time ago, the distinction here is between particles which end in a sibilant and are written as independent words,
and particles which end in a nasal and are joined to the word which follows; contrast to-go-
(particles, articles etc.) were proclitic, and explained spellings as xaw:ksi:ur: to:ke; po:se:
ksi:ur; kas: (not *ki:ki:ur) 'and' as due to some form of hypercorrection or linguistic conservatism.

Intercorvors-, he agreed, had changed into -kas-, a sound impossible to indicate with the
normal graphic resources of the syllabary; the spelling of the to:ke type was meant to support the
eymetorically correct pronunciation with -s. The speakers had no difficulty in uttering a
sibilant in word-final position or before pause and consequently that type of spelling was
adopted. The texts published after Hermann's article have not changed the position.
His explanation may be correct and is accepted by Mason (1983: 70) but a difficulty remains.
For e.g. kaw:ksi:ur we have before a word which began with a vowel two possible spellings from
The latter example shows indeed that -s either dropped or became -h thus
supporting Hermann, but Hermann has not succeeded in explaining why the third possible
(and expected) spelling "kaw:ksi:ur:ksi:ur" is normally not attested", though early inscriptions
prescribe intervocalic -s- (in writing at least). As an alternative one might suggest that in
word-final position -s tended to become -h and consequently the -se- sign was felt to have
both an -s- and an -h value, differently from e.g. xaw:ksi:ur, which was not used to express
final -s. An article like kas: may have been pronounced [tah] and this may have called for
one of two spellings, either to:ke or to:ke. If so, the Cyprian writers may have sacrificed
the correct rendering of syllabic and word junction to a correct rendering of the consonantal
The Teiae Dirae make regular use of the colon, two dots one above the other. This is omitted at the end of the line, but otherwise separates words. A more complete statement would further add that:

1. no form of the article is separated from what follows (rö, röğ, rög, rö, rö) and the prepositions are treated in a similar manner (ex, ex, ex, kar, neq, speq, end(?));
2. the particles ṣ or ṣ and are not followed by the colon and the same applies to the negatives ṡ, ṡ, ṡ;
3. two of the previously listed elements may follow each other (conjunction + article, preposition + article) without any intermediary punctuation or punctuation after the second of them;
4. two postpositives (ṣé and ṣé) are attested and again are not preceded by punctuation.21

The archaic inscriptions of Argos and Mycenae vary in their use of punctuation (normally dots). Some do not have it at all, one (Jeffery 1961: 169 no. 20) has a series of oddities (punctuation after rö, whole phrases marked by punctuation), others (Jeffery 1961: 168 nos. 5, 8, 9, p. 169 nos. 19, 22, 26, 28, p. 170, no. 32; p. 174, no. 2) divide words according to criteria very similar to those found in the Teiae Dirae: the article in its various case forms and the prepositions are not followed by punctuation nor are ṣé ṣé, ṣé ṣé, and ṣé ṣé; the postpositives ṡé and ṡé are not preceded by punctuation.22

For Attic Threttie (1980: 79ff.) has listed the main categories to be considered. Inter- puncts characterize private inscriptions of the sixth and fifth centuries but are rarer in public texts of the fifth century, where they also have more specialized uses; in the texts where the main purpose is to divide words the usual rules apply: prepositions, ṣé, and the forms of the article are not separated from the word which follows.23

Thus the general pattern of written "word-division" is relatively consistent; barring mistakes and oddities, a "word" is either an orthotonic word or a sequence of prosodies — orthotonic word — enclitics. Expertise in word-division, thus defined, was obviously more necessary for the Mycenaean or Cyprian scribes than for their alphabetic counterparts, but it is remarkable that all three shared similar conceptions of the word. Continuity of school between Mycenaean and alphabetic writing is probably to be excluded; if so, we ought to reach the conclusion that the Mycenaean, Cyprian and alphabetic writers based their principles of word-division on a common response to speech which consciously or more probably unconsciously, analysed it on the basis of accessional criteria. The continuity between the three traditions is also important for another reason: it allows us to say that for the literate part of the population a notion of word, or more exactly, of word-form, was available at a much earlier stage than the terminology might induce us to believe. We are now in a position to argue on the basis of some concrete evidence against the assumption that the metalinguistic lexicon provides a full account of metalinguistic responses.24

8. In addition to lexic and writing I mentioned above a third type of evidence, that provided by the explicit statements of writers, thinkers and scholars. Here we are on the borderline between folk-linguistics and linguistic analysis; a distinction cannot always be made but a brief inquiry may be relevant to the problem I raised earlier about the continuity or otherwise between these two forms of response to language. What follows is by necessity allusive, incomplete and superficial. A fuller statement would call for a complete
of what we know and do not know about the development of philosophical and thought in Greece.

observation is obvious. The recognition of ‘eight parts of speech’ which is character-traditional grammar presuppose some notion of word or, more exactly, lexeme, effect the ‘parts of speech’ are word-classes. The standard histories of linguistics the eight parts of speech with the Alexandrian grammarians and regularly refer you Thrax. It is not surprising to see that Dionysius’ Techne also offers a definition word (λέξις) as the smallest syntactical element of sentence structure (λόγος). In spite of the justified complaints by the schola about the vagueness of Dionysius’ a, it is reasonable to assume that an explicit notion of word was available to us and his contemporaries — and probably to his predecessors. Yet, the increasing about the authenticity of the Techne make it difficult to base any chronological on this evidence so that we must turn to other sources. The definition of λέξις ἐγγραφέων which Diogenes Laertius (VII 56) attributes to Diogenes of Babylon means as to the meaning of λέξις (word or speech with emphasis on sound rather en). I shall discuss later better attested grammarians like Apollonius Dyscolus.

but the earlier period? Here the evidence is difficult to assess and I can only menw relevant facts. The study of Homeric or poetic words must have started before century. Aristophanes (fr. 222 Koch) refers to them with the term γλώσσα which or had become a technical term for race or special words (cf. Arist. Rhet. 1410 b, 137 b, see Cassio 1977: 75ff; for Greek Latte, 1925: 136ff; cf. also Pfeiffer 1968: 81).

argued that this scholarly interest in some types of words belongs more to lin- ham to folk-linguistics, but the interest in etymologies (word-etymologies), which ral, straddles between the two fields. Later on, Proclus concern with synonymy discussion about δραμα τῶν ἀνωτάτων reflected in Plato’s Cratylus (to give just a few show an interest in language which focusses on words, their semantic analysis and nology. Yet, this is more relevant to a study of the general attitudes to language attitudes to words as such. The literary sources do not tell us what counted as a th what criteria, if any, speech was segmented, and whether the distinction be in-form and lexeme was always so clear; nor do we know at what stage questions of ‘ were first raised. For Aristotle (and for Plato?) δῶρα and ἐνεπ, ‘noun’ and γγ be word-classes (lexeme classes), but in chapter 20 of the Poetics (if authentic) lists under the heading of μέρη τῆς λέξεως ‘parts of speech’ a mixture of wordn, verb, etc.) and other units below and above the level of the word (στοιχεῖα, sentence etc.). This makes it unlikely that at this stage the notion of part resembles the notion of word, as it does in the later grammarians and probably in l. On the other hand the introduction of the notion of πτώσεις however III I understood — implies that in some instances Aristotle distinguished word-lexemes. Later grammarians will make this explicit distinguishing between speech (word-classes) and their παραγωγή (accident) (inflection etc.). The 4th the category ‘word’ also appears in Aristotle’s statements about compounds, clearly takes as single words. Just as Plato had contrasted the ἡμίν ‘Δις φύσις’ with the ἄποικος (‘name’ or ‘word’) ‘Δίδακτος’ (Crat. 399 a), Aristotle (de int. tracts the λέξις ‘καλός ἡμος’ ‘beautiful horse’ with the ἄποικος Κάλλαρτος’ and

enunciates a rule which he then generalizes. The -ετος element of Κάλλαρτος has no meaning of its own; the individual elements of compounds differ from those of simplicity in that they have some force, but nevertheless are not significant in isolation (cf. also poet. 1457 a and see Ackrill 1963: 115ff; Belardi 1976: 117ff). In these statements there is a fair amount of uncertainty; nor is it possible to see how far the formal divergencies between the compounds and the phrases with which they are contrasted matter and how far the definition is purely semantic. However, there is little doubt that the question of ‘wordhood’ has been raised.

So far we are still remote from seeing any link between the evidence provided by the various forms of writing we have examined and that provided by the literary sources. On the one hand we found some techniques for segmentation which seemed to presuppose a notion of word largely based on accentual criteria; on the other hand we have frequent citations of words, semantic and etymological discussions, etc., but we hear little about accentual criteria. Admittedly, if the text is not too corrupt, Aristotle is likely to have mentioned the οἰκέτους among his parts of speech (poet. 1457 a) and these certainly included enclitic forms. Yet since, as we have seen, not all Aristotelian parts of speech word-classes this need not be significant; in other words, we do not need to assume that for Aristotle an unaccented element could be a word. The later grammarians will also list οἰκέτους and δραμα among their parts of speech (word-classes) and there the implication must definitely be that some unaccented forms counted as words, in contradiction with the notion of word which we extrapolated from a study of writing. Yet before reaching the later stage we find sufficient evidence to prove that the accentual notion of word had some influence on Greek thought. We can look again at the famous passage from Plato’s Cratylus which I have quoted earlier (399 a); we are told that in order to make of the ἡμίν Δις φύσις an ἀποικο we must remove the second iota and pronounce the middle syllable grave rather than acute (Δις φύσις → Δίδακτος). This does not certainly amount to an accentual definition of word but shows conscious knowledge of a link between accentual factors and inverbalization. In a passage of the Sophist (237 c) Plato refers to ἄγωνων... ἀγων, τοί μεν ἄνωτάτων, this name, not-being. The use of ἄγωνων to refer to two words would be exceptional; it seems easier to assume that for Plato μεν ἄνωτάτων was a single word. A similar point, again in connection with a negative particle linked to the following word, may be made a propos of Aristotle’s discussion in de int. 16 a, b of phrases like ὁς ἄγωνων, ὁς ἄγων. These, we are told, are not nouns (δῶρα) or verbs (δῶρα), nor is there a special name with which to call them; hence they can be called δωρα ἄγωνων καὶ ἄγων, ἄγων. I do not want to discuss the philosophical or logical implications of this view, but it seems plausible that Aristotle would not have found it necessary to discuss the point or at least to discuss it in the way he does, if he had not conceived of ὁς ἄγωνων καὶ ὁς ἄγων as single words. Here too the suggestion is that the proleptic negative is treated as part of the word which follows.

Finally I turn very briefly to some later and more detailed discussions of words which we find in the grammarians. I shall consider two examples only, both from Apollonius Dysco- lus’ Syntax. In III 123ff. (262 b) Apollonius begins to discuss the subjunctive and in 132 he tackles the problem raised by the conjunctions which normally precede this mood. He wants to argue that e.g. δραμα may occur by itself and not only as part of e.g. καί δραμα. Yet he is not too certain of his ground and the discussion is protracted (Ibid. 133): ‘But if this needs further proof, we will add a little more to show that conjunctions are not
compounded with verbs into single words (εἰς ἐν μὲν ἔκαθος ἔλεγε). [If they were] how could other words intervene? E.g. ὅλος ὕψινος καὶ ἔπεμψε εἰςέστησε..." (Translation by Hesychius 1910: 203). Here Apollonius appears, in the first instance at least, to the principle which Bloomfield much later will call the principle of indivisibility, but he is stopped in full flight by an (anachronistic) objection for which he himself responsible. In Homer, we are told, an expected participle κατελθόντας is replaced by καταλθόντας with another word intervening between the preposition and the verbal stem. Yet we still want to argue that the form is a compound; if so, we must admit that divisibility is possible in compounds though they are single words. Does it follow that ἐν δρώμει is a compound? Apollonius now invokes another principle (also used by Bloomfield in his discussion of words), that of structural regularity. The phrase ἐν δρώμει has the same structure as phrases like ἐν δρόμοις ἔως δρόμοι πεπίστηξε, but here the two conjunctures δρόμοι and ἔως have accents of their own, so that they cannot be parts of a compound. Accordingly, ἐν δρώμει must also be treated as a phrase and not as a compound.

There is a third principle here and must be treated as conclusive: two main accents cannot belong to the same word. The progression of the argument seems clear. Starting point is the assumption that ἐν belongs with the following word, an assumption which, I would argue, was part of the general belief in the earlier period. This is rejected for the reasons indicated. Apollonius seems to have found arguments to support his conclusion: while two main accents must belong to two words, one main accent is not the mark of a single word. Proclitics and enclitics are unaccented and yet they count as independent words.

A question which concerns the nature of words is discussed later in the same work (IV 26ff., 318 b ff.) with reference first to ἔδρα and καθένα, which Apollonius does not want to treat as single words, and then to verbs of the κατελθόντας type, which for Apollonius are compounds and not phrases. Apollonius expounds the same principles as before with some additions or modifications. He mentions phonological facts (in Greek ἐκ can only occur in word-initial position) (IV 28), morphological data (the genitive Νέος Πλεκτος shows that Νεοι Πλεκτος cannot be a compound) (IV 34), structural patterning (IV 41), and finally he offers a more extensive discussion of the accentual principle (IV 47). The individual elements of a compound may have the same accentual pattern in composition as when they are used independently: cf. Περιεχόμενος καὶ κλεῖστος. In this case observation of the accent contributes little to our understanding of the grammatical status of the sequence. Yet we also find forms like τοιχεῖα contrasted with the simplex τοῖχος; in this case the accentual difference clearly indicates that τοιχεῖα is a compound. The level of sophistication reached at this point is quite high; the obvious comparison with the standard contrast drawn in modern textbooks between the English word blackbird with the main stress on the first element of the compound and the phrase black bird with the main stress on the second word.

For our purposes the interesting result is that in Apollonius, as in all his predecessors, there is still hesitation in the identification and definition of words. Part at least of these hesitations must have been determined by the conflict between an earlier, more primitive view based on the 'one accent, one word' principle which I have argued was the current 'folk-linguistic' view, and the more sophisticated developments developed in the course of philosophical and grammatical discussion. In the Greek tradition continuity is not surprising. At a later date - when we cannot say - the anonymous author of the de prosodeis, a pamphlet preserved together with the Technē in some manuscripts and attributed to Dionysius, refers to ὅλος ἔλαχος, i.e. to a phrase formed by a negative particle and an adverb, as to μιὰ λία 'one word'. The scholiast, a more sophisticated scholar, reproaches the author for this mistake: ὅλος ἔλαχος is two words, not one (Gramm. Gr. I p. 112-3 Uhlig). Obviously the discussion continued. Another scholiast in his commentary to the Technē produced a fuller definition of word which anticipates much of the discussion of the twentieth century: "a word is the smallest linguistic sound sequence (πρὸς ἑκατόμετρον), which is indivisible, can be said by itself, understood by itself, and pronounced with one accent and one breathing?" (Schol. Marc. in Gramm. Gr. 13, p. 35 Hilgard). We find here the antecedents of more than one modern definition: the word as an accentual unit, the word as an indivisible unit, the word as a minimum free form, the word as a unit of meaning, etc. In this form the scholiast's definition is eclectic and unworkable (though not more so than most of this century's definitions); yet it gives withe of the long and lively discussions which led to it, and perhaps of the 'pre-scientific' 'folk-linguistic' period which preceded these discussions.

9. The final conclusion is brief. During most of its history the ancient Greek lexicographer offers no exact equivalent for our 'word', i.e. it has no word with a comparable range of meanings. I have argued that some notion of word was nevertheless available and found expression in the various forms of writing used in Greece from the Second Millennium onwards. The exact nature of the notion is of course difficult to establish but it is likely that the scribes or stonecutters identified words mainly on accentual criteria: one main accent - one word. The literary texts are ambiguous and often uninformative, not so much because they do not confirm our belief that some concept of word was available (that is true), but because they give us little, if any, information about the nature of the concept. Yet, Plato, Aristotle, and, much later, the grammarians show signs of a deep preoccupation with the word as accentually identified. Philosophical and grammatical thought inclined to refined this view but I suspect that we ought not to underestimate its importance. In this particular case at least it may be legitimate to argue for some form of continuity between folk-linguistics and linguistics.

Notes
1 For the Homeric words rendered 'word' cf. Fournier 1946: 21 ff.; cf. also Hoffmann (1922), Homer λέξις (in the plural) is attested only twice with the meaning 'words, speech'; the semantic expansion of λέξις probably happened later.
2 In Aristotle, where the word closest in meaning to 'word' is ἕξως, Benze (Introduction Arist. s.v. λέξις 1.2) recognizes two passages where ἕξως = 'word'. In two of these (Nik. Eth. 1103 b, Soph. 169a) the meaning is ambiguous (e.g. καὶ ἔρχεται may be translated 'in one word' but ἔρχεται refers to a sentence or a phrase); in Rhet 1406 ἐν ἔκαστος seems to refer to one word, a compound, a word could well mean something like 'expression'.
3 It is also worthwhile to look at the metalingual vocabulary of the Demotic Papymons which as my count shows are the earliest literary commentary we have in Greece (see for a provisional edition ZPE 19 and cf. West 1983: 75 ff. Burkert 1985: λέξις means 'verse', λέξις seems to have a generic value ἔκαστος means 'name', ἔρχεται probably means 'expression' and once (col. xxii s) refers to one word. Demetrius it is said that ἄνθρωπος ὡς ἔρχεται ἔκαστος λέξις ἐν καὶ ἡ λέξις ἔρχεται ἐν (col. xxvii s) see for.
but very clear discussion is that by Palmer (1971: 41ff) who reaches no positive results. "In conclusion, sadly, we have to say that the word is not a clearly definable linguistic unit" (1971: 51).


Exact references are not always given here but can be easily traced through Olivier-Godart (1973), Ventris and Chadwick (1973: 327ff) and, for the first part of the alphabet, through Ana Jocor (1985).

For the Mycenaean prepositions see Morpurgo Davies (1983), where, however, the accentuation is not discussed. I have not mentioned above Mv. dvco ‘two’ which seems to contradict the rule according to which graphic words composed of one sign only are not written in isolation. This spelling occurs in Pylos only and the dvco sign is probably an invention of a Pylos scribe. Since it is formed by two signs facing each other it may well be that the sign was felt in a different graphic status from that of e.g. the simple sign pa used to write the word ‘all’ in the phrase to-ta-pa. Cf. Masson (1986), Dreyer (1968) and more recently Daniel (1981: 214ff, with note 2). The interpretation of KN amo-me as an iterative formator (cf. Gr. ta-ta ‘day’) is too doubtful to be used in this context.

Dunkel (1981) has argued that for Indo-European we can only reconstruct iterative compounds based on preverbs. So, the -wei-wei- formation cannot be inferred and one cannot quite the accentuation of Voere dvéride etc. as a parallel. Nevertheless composition and accent simplification may have occurred independently. Voere and Greek. Moreover the Cypriot dvco-du-me ‘every day’ discussed by Masson (1966) is also written in one word in a hieratic inscription (seventh or sixth century) where word-differentiation indicated by a dot seems to be relatively regular.

I ignore ko-ka reg of KN R 1815 (written over erase). A possible explanation is that by Rich (1983: 34ff) and so word-final accent would be possible. It is thus probable that the scribe had in mind ko-ka=ko=ka ‘day’ (cf. for the formation Bültij 1983: 395ff).

Cf. e.g. Quick and Greenbaum (1975: 1019). Though the compounds were normally treated as single words it is also true that the Mycenaean scribes ‘expanded’ to compounds in a different way than that in which they responded to simplicity. This was demonstrated (though with different purposes) by Ernst Rich (1983: 374ff) who succeeded in showing that the scribes adopted new speech formulas (sometimes prompted by literary use) so to mark off the different elements of a compound. The importance of Rich's work for a study of Greek attitudes to language is great.

The old mistake is attested: cf. te-te-to-te-po to (vs. te-to-to-po, to-to-to-po, to-to-to-po, te-te-te-tepo; see Rich (1983: 318). Obviously in addition to syllabification questions of jactacy may also be relevant.

I have deliberately spoken of monosyllabic prepositions and endings because the position of disyllabic appositives, if they exist, is doubtful. The first person singular of the verb 'to be', itself singular, is normally spaced from the word which precedes, but Masson (1981: 647, note 78) now quotes one example of such a written in scriptio continua with the preceding word and discusses a Kafkis (hence later) instance of written in the same manner.

An exception is provided by the recently published texts of Kafkis-Lofos (1980: nos. 118 b, 133 b, 191, 303) of the late third century B.C. As shown by Masson (1981: 648), they regularly write te-te-te-tepo, te-te-te-tepo, and even te-te-te-tepo, but in the passages quoted above they have koi-to-to-toi or the like for the expected ko-to-toi instead of the required ko-to-toi. We are prevented from reading ko-to-toi, which would go without any orthographic problems, by the spelling ko-to-toi in a few of the texts. This is difficult to understand what is happening, in the whole these orthography of the regular spelling of the other -teo prepositions.

Compounds are regularly written as single words with the exception of ko-te-toi, which is certainly the case in Cypriot prepositions which end in a vowel called for special syllabification rules (Masson 1983: 69); to-to-toi ‘to’, xal-xal-xal, which implies that the whole -eo class is assigned to the first syllable of the name and is not divided between the first and second syllables of the word-group. Linguistically this is not extraordinary. Morphological factors can influence syllabification; cf. for instance, the Attic scheme of ko-te-toi with a long syllable, although normally clusters of ko-xal-xal are assigned to the second syllable (Snell 1978; Anacker 1978: 666). More interesting is the fact that the Cypriot spelling may reveal some awareness of the phoneme.

17 The origins of punctuation must be Semitic (cf. Lefebvre 1913: 30ff). For our purposes, however, a discussion of the Semitic antecedents is not necessary since the linguistic response in which we are interested is Greek and Cypriot only. Similarly, it did not seem worthwhile to investigate the use of the word 'divider' in Cretan scripts other than Linear B.

18 Still useful, in spite of its date, is the Berlin dissertation by Rudolf Kaiser (1981) with the earlier literature. Some detailed comments are also available in Masson 1983: 53ff. For a preliminary study I found essential the archaic inscriptions collected in Jeffery (1961), where the various forms of punctuation used in archaic Greek are discussed in detail.


20 For the new stele cf. Herrmann (1981); for the old stele (now lost) see e.g. Schwyzer (1923: no. 710), Meigs and Lewis (1966: no. 30) and for a full list of the old editions cf. Herrmann (1981: 1-2, note 4).

21 The importance of the Teide Dissima for a study of punctuation was underlined by Kaiser (1987: 17-19) who drew the right conclusions: "In univumum ignium statutum rurum cense ratione, ut omnis rae verbale selectum atque positum interpolationes a nominibus suis seque sequantur" (cf. Lefebvre 1913: 303). For the punctuation it is customary to refer to Jacobson (1909: 107 note 12). Jacobson says that it is not known to say than Kaiser (1872) or Lefebvre (1914). One word is mentioned in the standard editions of the old stele. Interpolations are sometimes omitted in Meigs-Lewis (1969: no. 30; cf. B 9, 29, 32, 39 twice) and in Schwyzer (1923: no. 755; cf. A 1, 31, 32). Schwyzer also adds an interpolation in B 8. Since the stele is lost it is now necessary to return to Bode's CIG 3044 and Ross (1981: 12). In the new stele Herrmann (1981) shows that in a few stele interpolation in a) 21, 22, 23, 24, 25; b) 4, 11, 12; c) 4, possibly 12, d) 32. The photographs make it likely that there are interpolations in c) 4, d) 22 and possibly in b) 10. The other passages are too broken to be checked, with the possible exception of b) 12 where the stele 58 too does not seem to be punctuated after ëë and nor is apparent that we would expect it to be.

22 There are two interesting sets of exceptions in Jeffery (1961: nos. 18, 188, 188, 188, 188, 188). First, in a list of dozenomia which consists of names joined by re 113 re and follow re 113 (all instances of ëë at the end of a line, so that there may be potential interpolations after ëë too). This contrasts with the rest of the inscription, where ëë occurs twice without being followed by an interpolation and ëë occurs once immediately after a noun (with no interpolation) and before two nouns. The omissions are that the interpolations are meant to emphasize the position of the names. Second, the regular plural of the article this appears three times before an interpolation (and a noun or another word). It is not sufficient to explain this with the disyllabic form of the article, since the disyllabic preposition ëë is not followed by an interpolation. It is conceivable that this form was orthographic indicated by the conventional accentuation.

23 Также (1980: 23) observes that “in a number of texts there is no rationality but people lie behind the placing of the interpolations”. This is occasionally so, but there is no reason to list among these texts, for instance, those, for example, that in a number of texts have an interpolation (and a noun or another word). It is not sufficient to explain this with the disyllabic form of the article, since the disyllabic preposition ëë is not followed by an interpolation. It is conceivable that this form was orthographic indicated by the conventional accentuation.

24 So far I have been deliberately refrained from mentioning the Near Eastern evidence for word-division, since the question of possible influences is obviously insoluble and in any case should not be important (cf. above acts 17). Yet in most cases the writing for the determinatives and logographic concepts of word, in unison mean there is no added factor that the Gossen-Kell marks out a word rather than a phrase. Akkadian does not normally separate words in writing but Akkadian leaves empty spaces between words and significantly for our purposes treats as words a sequence of an orthographic word and any number of nomial particle. In the Early Millennium B.C. (the Second Millennium data are too obscure) the Hieroglyphic Latin script separates words
with a special sign which in some texts is used with absolute regularity. Thus too the enclitic particles are not separated from the orthotonic element which precedes them. Finally, we should not forget the extensive grammatical work done in the Near East at a much earlier date than in Greece (and in India). The peculiar linguistic situation created a need for glosses and these presupposed some notion of word. Also the Old Babylonian grammatical texts of the Second Millennium B.C. give evidence for the setting up of paradigms which presumably presupposed both an analysis into word-forms and some notion of lemmata (cf. Jacobsen 1974: 41ff).

Grund. Gr. 1 p. 22 Uhlig: λέξει τοις μέσοι τάχους τοις κατά στάσεις. I have followed Robinson's translation (1957: 91); a more literal version is that of Aresni (1969: 23): "Das Wort ist der kleinste Teil des auf Zusammensetzung beruhenden Satzes." For an introduction to the question see Pinborg (1975: 69ff and especially 105ff). A list of selected recent additions to his bibliography ought to include at least Siebenbusch (1976, with the review by Fehling 1979), Erbse (1980), Ax (1982). For the parts of speech cf. also Wouters (1979: especially 197ff) and Schriver (1983). For the outsider the main problem is that the whole chain of activity in standard grammar is now under discussion and that it is difficult to know whether the old view according to which grammatical analysis had reached its final form before the second century B.C. is still correct.

The odds are that this does mean word or only word; cf. Pinborg (1975: 97) and see also the old observations by Schmidt (1839: 11ff, with notes 31, 32, 37); cf. also the German translation by Hülsen (Schmidt 1979: 107, note 31 a).

There is a further problem here since Aristotle uses προτος not only in citation but also for what we would call derivation: in Rhet. 1410 a the adjective χαλκός, 'made of bronze' and the genitive χαλκοῦς ἐκ τῆς χάλκες, 'bronze' are treated as προτός of the same word. We would say that χαλκός and χαλκός are different words or lemmata. The literature about Aristotle's προτός is immense; for a survey see Calabri (1972: 86ff, but cf. also Belardi (1979: 11ff)).

I am grateful for this reference to my colleague Leahy Brown.

For a general discussion cf. Ackert (1961: 111ff) and above all Belardi (1979) who rightly disagrees with the views previously expressed by Pagliaro (1954: 25ff).

This would be difficult to argue if, on the basis of the controvertial passage Soph. El. 166 b 3 (cf. note 6a23), we had to assume that Aristotle treated the ol as negative or as it were (e.g. Gudeman's commentary to the relevant passage of the Poetics). Yet I fail to see why translators and commentators ignore Wackernagel's arguments (1955: 109ff.) in favour of an 'only one' ol and a 'baritone' oλ; in the absence of a proper refutation of what seems to me the only correct interpretation I see no need to be worried by these passages and I am ready to argue that for Aristotle oλ was unaccented (cf. Erbe's note in his edition of the scholia to Hom. II. 23. 238). I do not think that this view must be rejected on the strength of Herodotus (1. 494, 514) that the ol-negative kétvres like λόος and oλ (cf. Allen 1973: 123) since the grammarians always spoke of the proclitics as χαλκός (Vandervelde 1943: 62ff. and 73).

The observation that νυττεν ζαλίστρες nyatn kalistreres (Hesiod. 504) is difficult to understand and cannot be given too much weight particularly since nyatn is a modern correction for nyatn of the manuscripts.

Obviously the whole of my paraphrase and summary is couched in terms which are far too modern. I must repeat again (cf. note 15) that 'proclitics' is a modern term (but for the notion of proclitic cf. the observation by Quintilian I 15 27 quoted by Allen 1973: 25: "cum dicō eum Höna, tumquam sum eum esse non dubium esse, sit esse et ita ait Höna, et sic eum esse et ait Höna"). I have hesitated in translating γνώσασθαι γνώρισθαι, the phrase used by Diogenes of Babylon in his definition of ᾑκτης (cf. p. 272 above and note 26; cf. also [Plate] Def. 414 d 4) but it seems likely that by this stage γνώσασθαι need not mean literally 'which is written' or 'which can be written' but is closer to 'to act' or 'to be an action'; for an earlier use see Apoll. Dys. syn. 1, 180 where προς γνώρισθαι refers to meaningless sounds or noises.

This article was completed except: for a very few items it has been impossible to introduce additions and alterations after that date.