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the need to create a national pantheon from a multitude of local cults. Weather-gods and sun-gods head the pantheons, followed by such figures as the grain-god, the stag (stamnos-god, etc.), ending with natural phenomena such as mountains and rivers, etc. Male deities are provided with female consorts, listed separately and not strongly characterized except for an Ishtar figure, who may also appear in the male list.

The end of the Hittite kingdom removes this documentation which is only partially replaced by the inscriptions of the Neo-Hittite states of SE Anatolia and north Syria (c.1600–700 BC). Details of cult are lacking. The Hurro-Hittite weather-god and his consort continue to be worshipped, and the stag-god becomes more prominent, as do Kababa from Carchemish and the moon-god from Harran. At this period, limited evidence may be drawn from the *Phrygian monuments and inscriptions, principally relating to 'mother Kubile' (Kubaba), represented on stone monuments as a figure in a palaos ('cylindrical head-dress') and long robe, standing in a small shrine or naktis (see cnnal). O. R. Gurney, Some Aspects of Hittite Religion, Schweich Lectures, 1976 (1977); M. N. van Loon, Anatolia in the Second Millennium bc; Anatolia in the Earlier First Millennium bc: Iconography of Religions 13, pts 12 and 13 (1985–80); V. Haas, Geschichte der hebräischen Religion (1994); M. Popko, Religion of Asia Minor (1993); B. E. L. van Ginkel, Chronometriae of the Hittite Period, parts 1–2 (1998), pt. 3 (2001). JEM

Anatolian languages In the course of the 20th cent. new evidence emerged for a family of closely related languages attested in Anatolia (Turkey) from the 16th cent. BC and indirectly known two or three centuries earlier; the evidence for the group spans two millennia and ends with the Roman empire. The best attested language is Hittite, which was spoken by a dynasty which moved from Nela (= Kanel = mod. Kültepe in central Anatolia, north-east of Kayseri) to *Hattuša, modern Boğazköy or Bogaz- kale (east of Ankara), the future capital of the Hittite empire, which eventually dominated most of Anatolia and part of Syria (see tmyr). The word selgi, literally ‘in the language of Nela’, means ‘in Hittite’, while Hittite (our term is based on a biblical form) was originally derived from the name of the previous non-Indo-European inhabitants of the area, the Hattu. The Boğazköy archives yielded a very large number of *cuneiform tablets with texts (historical, religious, etc.) which we can now classify as Old Hittite (c.1750–1450) or Middle Hittite (c.1450–1380) or Neo-Hittite (c.1380–1220); after B. Hrozny in 1915 argued that Hittite was *Indo-European, the grammar and lexis have become quite well known and we now understand most texts. The same archives also provided cuneiform evidence for two other related languages, introduced in the Hittite texts by the words parlaminti ‘in Palaic’ and libebeti ‘in Luwian’. Palaic is the language of the Pala territory, located in north-western Anatolia. Probably it died before the Neo-Hittite period; there are only a few imperfectly understood texts, but the affiliation of the language is not in doubt. Cuneiform Luwian, also attested on clay tablets mostly of religious nature, is slightly better known and was probably the language of the southern and western part of Anatolia. It survived longer than Palaic and had strong influence on Hittite, especially in the later period, as shown by the numerous lexical borrowings. In the first millennium the family is best represented by Hieroglyphic Luwian (also called Hieroglyphic Hittite), a Luwian dialect, written in a special syllabic script, rich in logograms, which was developed in the second millennium, possibly for monumental purposes. Most of the inscriptions were set up by the kings of the small states of south Anatolia and Syria which in the first millennium BC survived the collapse of the Hittite empire, until at the end of the 8th cent. they were defeated by the Assyrians. The youngest known member of the Anatolian family are *Lycian and *Lydian, two languages written in an alphabet derived from Greek, mostly in the 5th and 4th cent. BC. In addition three poorly attested languages, all written alphabetically, probably belong to the family: Carian (see Caria) has recently been deciphered and has a slightly higher number of characters than Carian and Egypt dating from the 7th to the 4th cent. BC; Sidetic (named from *Sidai, which is documented by a very few inscriptions from *Pamphylia (3rd cent. BC), and Psidian has some inscriptions (mostly names) from the 3rd cent. AD. (See schnall.) The languages listed above, all of which must derive from a non-attested Proto-Anatolian, show regular correspondences with the ancient Indo-European languages. Part of the lexicon (here exemplified from Hittite) can be easily etymologized: cf. water ‘water’ (Gr. ὠάπ), gunu ‘knee’ (Lat. genua, new. ‘new’ (Gr. νέος), wet ‘year’ (Gr. πέρας), ak- ‘eat’ (Lat. edî), and see also paradigms like *mêl ‘I am’, *kôl ‘you are (storg), *ekêt ‘he/she/it is vs. Greek αἰὲ ( < *erêt). Best, foret or Skt. deini, ne, dati, etc. Hittite, Palae, and Cuneiform Luwian have a where reconstructed Indo-European has a and use -ê or -êê in correspondence with one or two of the Indo-European ‘laryngeals’, which were later lost in all Indo-European languages. It is now clear that the original Anatolian language had an accent distribution similar to that of Indo-European. Morphologically the most striking features are the conservatism of the case system (seven or perhaps eight cases in Old Hittite, but also the absence of a contrast between masculine and feminine (there is a neuter and a common gender) and the organization of the verbal system based on two conjunctures with contrasts of past and present marked by different sets of endings. There are only two tenses (no imperfect and future, no aspectual distinction of aorist and perfect) and two moods (indicative and imperative, but no subjunctive and optative). The syntax is characterized by long chains of enclitic particles which follow the first word of the sentence and by the final position of the verb. The problem arises whether Proto-Anatolian is simply a branch, however early, of the Indo-European family which has lost some of the original categories, or is a sister rather than a daughter of Indo-European. This last view was supported by the American scholar Edgar Sturtevant, who spoke of an Indo-Hittite protolanguage; his demonstration is no longer accepted, but recent contributions are moving in the same direction through more on the basis of morphology and syntax than on that of phonology.


anatomy and physiology

J. The examination of the parts of the body, their forms, location, nature, function, and interrelations (to adapt the lex provided by A. Cornellius Celus in the proem to book I of the De medicinis)—whether through dissection (ἀνατρικνη, the title of several ancient medical works, and of a lost work by Aristot) o or as part of more abstract speculation about natural causes (ψυχολογια)—was a concern not only for doctors. Physiology did not have the restricted range it has today; in antiquity it covered all kinds of speculative investigation into nature—in areas ranging from the search for the soul and its physical location in the body to the explanation of organic processes in animals and plants. This means that ancient medical writers often paid close attention to the work of those whom we might regard today as having quite different concerns. Much early Greek cosmology, for example, was concerned (directly or indirectly) with problems surrounding the nature and origins of life, and the relations between the
Caria

elective magistrates open to senators: those of *quaestor, held at 30 from *Sulla's legislation onwards, but five years younger under the Praetor; of *aedile, of *praetor, held at 39 under the late Republic, but by some at 30 under the Praetor; and of *consul, held at 42 after Sulla (cf. the career of *Cicero), by patricians at 33 under the Praetor, and by new men (see NOWY-ROMO) at 38 or later (cf. the career of Ct. *Julius Agricola). Successful election to these posts depended on birth and achievement (cf. Tuc. Ann. 4. 4: high birth; military distinction, and outstanding gifts in civil life, i.e. forensic or political oratory, knowledge of the law: note the order). Success might be achieved not only in the magistracy that preceded but in preliminary offices civil and military (as one of the *vigintiviri or *tribuni militum), and in positions held at Rome, in Italy, or the provinces, under the republic often involving command of troops, that normally followed the praetorship and consulship (pro-praetorships, -consulships, allocated by seniority and the lot, see PROC CONSULS, PRO PROpraetor); or that were devised under the Praetor to get previously neglected work done (e.g. curatorships of roads in Italy; see CURA (770)). After AD 14 elections were effectively conducted in the senate and a man's success depended on the verdict of his peers or on his ability to strike bargains with his rivals' supporters; but Augustus' lex Julia de martandis ordinibus (see MARRIAGE LAW, ROMAN) provided speedier advancement for men married with children, while the opinion of the emperor, known or surmised, was of great and increasing weight (cf. ILS 244. 4; Pliny, Pan. 66), hence too the favour of his advisers. Some posts, notably legionary commands and governorships of regions that were part of his 'province' (e.g. *Syria, *Galus (Transalpine) outside Narbonensis), were in his direct gift, though the senate ratified such appointments (both types of office were 'legates' (Legati) of Augustus). The influence exercised by the emperor has given rise to the view that there was a special type of career 'in the Emperor's service' regularly involving particularly speedy advancement (especially between praetorship and consulship) enjoyed by 'military men' (Viri militares). A more cautious hypothesis is that men advanced themselves using what gifts they had; those who took to army life necessarily were the appointees of the emperor. Each appointment was ad hoc and might depend on a number of factors, e.g. current needs, a man's availability, experience, record, current effectiveness of his supporters, but precedent was also relevant.

The word 'career' is often applied to the posts offered by the emperor to men of equestrian and lower status, whether in official positions (e.g. *praefectus praetorio = prefect of the praetorian guard, or *praefectores Augusti in his provinces, supervising tax collecting) or as his private agents (also *praefectores) managing his private estates (see PROCURATOR). But although such posts mostly had their distinctive standing, and were normally preceded by up to three military posts, and although (because of this) recognizable patterns of advancement developed (cf. the two 'Italican careers' ILS 1350 and 1352), appointments were again ad hoc, ad hominem (cf. AE 1962, 188), intermittent, and accepted on a basis of mutual goodwill, with character rather than professionalism the overt criterion. Imperial freedmen and even slaves who held subordinate positions in the organizations enjoyed lower standing, but their continuous service over long periods of time justifies the application of the term 'career' to their activities (see PROBREMEN; SLAVES).

In the army below the rank of tribune it is legitimate to speak of a career, since the minimum period of service outside the praetorian guard was 20 years. Men frequently record their advance through minor posts of privilege (e.g. testenaria, OC watchword) to (e.g.) one of the 60 centurions of a legion, or upwards through legionary centurionships (e.g. ILS 2653) (see CENTURIONSHIP).

Elsewhere the word is inappropriate: outside the limited state apparatus the ancient world lacked the great organizations that now provide methodical advancement in business and industry.


BML

Caria, mountainous region inhabited by Carians in SW Asia Minor. South of the *Maecander, with Greek cities (*Cnidus and *Halicarnassus) occupying the salient peninsulas and mixed communities on the shores of the gulf. Until the 4th cent. BC the pastoral Carians lived mainly in hilltop villages grouped under native dynasties (some of which paid tribute to the Athenian empire in the 5th cent.) and organized round sanctuaries, the principal seat being *Mylasa. The Carians claimed to be indigenous; but in Greek tradition they came from the islands, and the interior of Caria is in fact lacking in prehistoric sites. They preserved their language until Hellenistic times. We have some inscriptions (mostly from *Egypt) written in an alphabet, partly of Greek origin, which has recently been deciphered (see next entry); the language seems to be *Indo-European and belong to the Anatolian group. (See ANATOLIAN LANGUAGE; CARIAN LANGUAGE.)

Carians were early associated with *Ionians in mercenary service (especially under the Pharaohs; Carians continued to live in Egypt even after the Persian takeover in 525 BC: Hdt. 2. 61 and archaeological evidence). Subjected by *Croesus and then by Persia, they joined the *Ionian Revolt and embushed a Persian army. The coastal communities joined the *Dellion League at the time of the *Eurybyzmod campaign. Under the rule of the *Hecatomnaids (c.350—after 334), and especially of *Mausolus, Carian Hellenism was intensively furthered; there was much building activity, and modern cities were planned to promote the Greek way of life but the Hecatomnaids also promoted the local element, in an active and simultaneous policy of *Carianisation. Thus the Hecatomnaids put up Greek dedications at *Laodrma, *Amymone, and *Simi, but made no big splash at the more famous panhellenic sanctuaries, preferring to patronize these Carian places. The Hellenising influence of nearby *Rodos must also be remembered, especially in Hellenistic times, when the Rhodian *peregrini in Caria was extensive (and larger than was formerly believed). But the 4th cent. seems to have been the period of greatest activity and innovation. See also ANATOLIAN.


Carian language Direct evidence for the Carian language (see CARIA) is limited to approximately 30 inscriptions from Caria proper and well above 200 inscriptions (some still undeciphered) written by Carian speakers in Egypt (from the 7th cent. BC). There are also miscellaneous short texts from other sites and two short texts from Greece (4th and 3rd cent. BC). The alphabet, which in Caria shows a great deal of variation, is clearly derived from the Greek alphabet with some additions but a number of letters have different values from those of the equivalent Greek letters. The brilliant decipherment started by the English Egyptologist John Ray in the 1980s and then completed by the Spanish scholar Ignacio Adiego and the German scholar Diether Scharr.
from the 1900s has shown that all earlier readings (partly based on the assumption that the script was half syllabic, half alphabetical) were misguided. The recent discovery of a short Greek–Carian bilingual from Karanu (late 4th cent. BCE) has confirmed the new view. We still know little about the language, since the texts are short and fragmentary and largely consist of names, but it is now clear that it belongs to the Anatolian group of Indo-European and is close to Luwian and Lycian (nominative singular, with no ending; accusative singular in =; genitive singular in =e; accusative plural in =e, cf. Cum. Latin: -ā; *āt, *āthe; *āthe). The pur都说 of why some of the letters which are recognizably Greek in appearance have such different values remains unsolved though various suggestions have been made. All the evidence is admirably collected in Adiego’s book quoted below.


Carmen, Marcus Aurelius, elder son of M. Aurelius *Carus, left by him as Caeser in the west, when he marched against Persia (AD 228). Made Augustus before his father’s death, Carinus succeeded him as colleague of his brother *Numerianus and crushed the rebel *corrector Venetiae, Julianus, in battle near *Verona. Early in 263 Diocletian, appointed emperor to succeed Numerianus, ended a difficult campaign at the battle of the Margus in Moesia.

HIC A 1475; M. Fiedler, Roman Imperial Title Deed and Chronology, AD 315-284 (1990), 98 ff.

Caristia (casa cognatio), Roman family festival on 22 February. Ovid (Fast. 2. 617–38) makes it a reunion of surviving family members after the *Parennalia’s rites to the departed (February 13–21), and the presence of the ancestral spirits (*Lares: Fast. 2. 631–4) supports that. Valerius Maximus (2. 1. 8) adds that no outsiders were admitted and family quarters were settled. It appears under the date in the calendars of Philocalus and Poeninius Silvanus, under February in the Menologio rustico.

Iacae. ib. 13, 2. 414; Latte, RIt. 374 n. 3, 339 n. 2; F. Schneider, ARW 1920/1, 381–9.

carmen, from canto ('something chanted'), a formulaic or structured utterance, not necessarily in verse. In early Latin the word was used especially for religious utterances such as spells and charms: the laws of the *Twelve Tables contained provisions against anyone who chanted a maledictum, 'evil spell' (Plin. HN 28. 2. 18). Carmens became the standard Latin term for song, and hence poem (sometimes especially lyric and related genres: cf. C. O. Brink on Hor. Epist. 2. 2. 25, 59–60, 91), but the possibilities of danger and enchantment inherent in the broader sense continued to be relevant, and is often play on the different senses (see e.g. Ov. Met. 7. 167).


Carmen arvale, hymn sung during the sacrifice to *Dea Dia by the *filii arvalis (arval brethren). Although only recorded in an incipitonal copy of ch 218 (A. Gordon, Album of Dated Latin Inscriptions (1938), 44 no. 276) and marred by errors of transcription, this hymn is of great interest, because it dates from the 4th cent. BCE at the Laces (Lakes for Larhes). Norden believed that it revealed the influence of Greek poetry. In spite of the problems that it poses, the hymn is understandable. It is addressed to the *Lares, *Senones (see *SANCIUS Duo PIUS), and *Mars. The first two groups of deities are invoked three times one after the other, and Mars three times three. The Carmen culminates in a quintuple cry of triumph (triumph). In the context of the sacrifice to Dea Dia, these divinities are requested to guarantee the integrity of the land and the harvest, so that Dea Dia can exercise her office there.


Carmen de bello Aegyptiaco (or Actio) is the title given to a poem of which 52 or more less complete hexameters in eight columns and a number of fragments survive on P. Firth 817, published in 1809 by Ciampiti and attributed by him and many since for weak reasons to C. *Rabirius (2); it may be part of the Res Romanae of *Cornelius Severus. It deals with Octavius’s Egyptian campaign after Actium and *Cleopatra VII’s preparations for suicide.


Carmen de figuris, anonymous Latin poem (c. 400), dedicated to *Aurilus Mestius, and describing figures of speech in 166 hexameters. Three lines are devoted to each figure, defining it and giving one or two examples. The material is taken from *Rutilius Lupus and *Alexander (12). The prosody is late, but aphaeresis of final s and ancient forms (e.g. indisputum) imitate preclassical poetry.


OSS/MW

Carmen de ponderibus et mensuris (perhaps c. 400), a Latin didactic poem in 208 hexameter verses, once ascribed to *Prianus, but now attributed to one Rem(nus) Pavius (or Plau in his), sets out the several systems of *weights and *measures adopted in ancient Greece and Rome. It includes two interesting technical accounts (i) a hydrometer for measuring the specific gravity of liquids (ll. 103–21), similar to the instruments attributed elsewhere to the Alexandrians *Menelaus (3), *Pappus, and *Hy- poka; and (2) a method used by *Archimedes for solving the problem of the crown (to distinguish an alloy from pure gold or silver) by means of a hydrostatic balance (ll. 125–62), much like the instrument attributed to Archimedes by Menelaus.


Carmen Nerei See NEREI CARMEN.

Carmen Priami ('The Song of Priam'), a poem in *Saturnian verse, of which *Varro, Ling. 7. 28 quotes one line; an archaisch composition, apparently written after and in reaction to *Erimost Ascula.


CARMEN SATRIARE

Carmen Salutare or CRAMINA SALLARIA, the ancient hymn(s) of the *Salli in *Saturnian verse, unintelligible (Hor. Epist. 2. 1. 85–6; Quint. Inst. 1. 6. 60) despite commentaries by L. *Aelius and others; the few fragments, already corrupt in antiquity, mostly illustrate obsolete diction (e.g. intervocative s [z] = classical r). As transmitted, they include (fr. 1) the synapsed imperative caste rie ( = cæste) and the title dulem des 'god of gods' for Janus, (fr. 2) the unchanged Indo-European form tremvis ( = tremve), the Doric Greek -worm and the name Lacceios (or Laccestt: Macrob. Sat. 1. 15. 14) 'god of light' for Jupiter; but text and interpretation remain speculative and controversial (one theory derives them from a misunderstood commentary).
dialogue

Greek As a special literary-philosophical form of writing, dialogue has its origin in Socrates' philosophical activity; *Aristotle's description of written philosophical dialogues as 'Socratic logos' (Post. 144b11) reflects the association of the form with representations of Socratic conversations, often written by members of Socrates' circle (like *Plato), in which he is himself often the or a, main speaker. A typical 'Socratic' conversation, or dialogues, will be one in which question-and-answer plays a leading role. As the genre develops in antiquity, this element gradually declines in importance, being replaced by long speeches either exclusively by the main speaker with short interjections by others, or more often by different speakers. The beginnings of such developments are already visible in the Platonic corpus, although there they are partly the result of experimentation with the genre.

*Diogenes (6) Laertius (3.48) says that some people claimed that *Zeno (1) of Elaeus was the first writer of dialogues, and that *Aristotle (fl. 72 Rose) gave this role to one Alexanderus (otherwise unknown); but it is Diogenes' view that in any case it was Plato who closely defined the form, and that it was his dialogues which 'would justly win first prize for their beauty and invention'. Plato is supposed to have been much influenced by the (now lost) prose 'memes' of *Sophron (which he is said, probably unreliably, to have kept under his pillow); other more obvious influences would have been dramatic dialogue, and debates between speakers in *Horace, e.g. 3.80-2 and *Thucydides 2.8.85-113.

*Aristotle's own early works, now lost except for fragments, included some dialogues. According to Cicero, *Suetonius ad Atticum 13.19.4, he appeared as a character in (some of) them, as Plato never did, but as *Cicero does in his dialogues; Aristotle also apparently subordinated other roles to his own. The same letter (which refers to 'many' dialogues by another pupil of Plato's, *Heracleides (1) Ponticus) gives some general insight into the thinking behind, and the models for, Cicero's dialogues. The writing of dialogues in Greek was revived by *Plutarch in the 1st and 2nd cents. an, and a little later by *Lucian. Plutarch's dialogues (e.g. De genio Socrates) are modelled especially on Plato's, but are lighter in content, while *Lucian's stance is more usually that of satirist than of philosopher; his range is greater than even Plato's, and shows the influence not only of Sócrates' *Logos, but also, rather more obviously, of New *comedy and other later literary developments.


Latin Dialogue in the general sense occurs in Latin literature not only in drama but also occasionally in the written versions of speeches, where a passage of dialogue between an orator and his opponent is called an alternatio, and notably in Roman *satire. The first Roman known to have written in the specific genre of the literary prose dialogue, in the manner of *Plato (1) and his successors, was M. Tullius Brutus (praetor c.140 BC), who com-
Greek language

(dated: T. Barnes, JRA 1989, 252-3), in spite of causing local hardship (IG 4' 80-1 = Sherck, Hadrian 73), won him some Greek approval. Under Trajan the recruitment of Roman senators from Athens and Sparta advanced Greek political integration, working at the time, *Plutarch (Prococ, gen. 469) counselled resigned acceptance of Roman dominion. *Hadrian conferred benefaction throughout the province; his foundation of the *Pamphilennion (131/2) promoted a flux of easterners to Greece, among them the travel-writer *Pausanias (3). In the later 2nd and early 3rd centuries. Greece flourished as a cultural centre (see AGONIA; SECOND SOPHISTIC). Levels of prosperity varied regionally; ancient writers stress depopulation in Roman Greece, but the archaeological evidence for an emptied countryside down to 200 (Alocox, see Sibbog, below), rather than merely confirming this picture, may point as well to greater nucleation (i.e. rural villages and migration to urban centres); certainly some cities now prospered, as could a small place like *Aeaea; *tourism was probably a significant source of wealth. The *Heruli (267) damaged Athens, prompting Athenian self-defence (see LIBERinux DEERIUS, 8). In the 4th century Christianization wound down traditional cults, although the *Panathenaea were still being celebrated c.410 (IG 55 3818 with PLRE 2 'Phatracius' 2). In 396 *Alaric sacked Corinth, *Argos (1), and Sparta, prompting a wave of defensive building throughout the province. Recent archaeology shows a previously unsuspected prosperity in the 5th-6th centuries, down to the Slav invasions (from 582); many basilical *churches were built, and the countryside was densely populated.


Greek language

1. Introduction In the Classical period Greek was spoken in mainland Greece (including the Peloponnesse), in the islands of the Aegean (including Crete, Rhodes, and Cyprus), and in the Greek colonies in Asia, Africa, and Italy. It is the European (and Indo-European) language with the longest attested history; the first documents belong to the second half of the second millennium bc and there is no real break between ancient Greek and the modern language of Greece. Most of the evidence from the 8th century bc until now is written in the Greek alphabet, but at an early stage two syllabic scripts were also in use: Linear B in the second half of the second millennium rendered the Greek spoken by the exponents of Mycenaean civilization (see MYCENAEAN LANGUAGE; PRE-ALPHABETIC SCRIPTS (GREECE)) while during the first millennium bc a distantly related script, syllabic Cypriote, was used for the local dialect of Cyprus and remained in use until the 3rd century bc. The language changed in time: conventionally we distinguish an ancient period which goes from the first attestation of Mycenaean Greek (in Linear B) to the end of Hellenistic Greek (roughly in AD 300), a Byzantine and medieval period (until c.1600), and a modern period. Here we concentrate on the central period of ancient Greek in the 5th and 4th centuries bc. After a general account of its development we give a very brief discussion of the main features of the language.

2. Origins Greek is related to language groups such as Italic, Germanic, Indo-Aryan, Celtic, Slavic, Anatolian, Armenian, Albanian, etc., all of which descend from an unattested parent language (conventionally called Indo-European or IE), which we partially reconstruct through comparison (see LINGUISTICS, HISTORICAL AND COMPARATIVE). It is not possible to establish whether Greek belongs to a wider subgroup of IE; the old theory that it was closely related to Latin or Italic has long since been exploded. It shares a number of features with Armenian and Indo-Iranian, but they are not sufficient to define specific subgroups. The ancient belief that the language was autochthonous cannot be accepted; Indo-European speakers must have reached Greece from elsewhere, though the language may have acquired its main character in Greece itself. Some specific features which distinguish ancient Greek from the Indo-European parent language are listed below.

3. Dialects When we speak of Greek we often mean Attic, i.e. the dialect of Athens. Yet from the Mycenaean period until the late Hellenistic period there was no standard Greek language and all cities or regions had different forms of speech, which they transmitted to their colonies. Even Mycenaean is only one of the varieties of second-millennium Greek. These local 'dialects' had equal or similar status and presumably most of them were mutually intelligible. Until the late 4th century bc (and often much later) they were used in normal oral intercourse and for written documents, laws, letters, etc. The contemporary inscriptions provide the best evidence for the differences, which encompass phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexicon (e.g. Lesbian πατρις 'of all' (dim. sing.)), Attic ἄνετος, Lesbian ἵππως 'to be', Attic ἦλθεν, Thessalian αἰτεῖ καὶ κακα, Arcaean δ᾽ ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἰonica-Attic ἔθνες ἡτέροις 'but if anyone' with a different order of the indefinite pronoun and the potential particle ἐκ/εκ/ἐκ from e.g. Phocian αἰτεῖ καὶ κακα; West Greek λείπει 'I want', Attic ἔλθη. On the basis of shared features modern scholars classify the various forms of Greek (partly on the model of the ancient grammarians, see GRAMMAR, GREEK) into groups: Ionic-Attic, Arcado-Cypriot, Aesopic (which includes Lesbian, Boeotian, and Thessalian), Doric (which includes dialects such as Laconian, Argolic, etc.), and North-West Greek (see DIACLASSIS, GREEK (HESIODIC)).

In spite of the absence of a standard language, from the 5th century bc to the latest—but probably much earlier—the Greeks thought of themselves as speaking a common language; for Herodotus (8 144) ἄλλος ἔλθην ("Hellenism") was based on shared blood, language, customs, and religion. See HELLENISM AND HELLENIZATION. Greek was not identified with any of the dialects, but by the early 3rd century bc the Athenians were reproached for behaving as if Greek and Attic were the same thing (*Φοσίλιος 1), lit. 30 KA). In the same period we begin to find that in the local inscriptions the dialect is sometimes replaced by a form of language which is very close to Attic though not identical with it; it is the beginning of the so-called Ionic-Attic καὶ διαλέκτου (common language), which eventually prevailed and provided Greece with a standard language from which the later dialects developed. By the end of the 2nd century bc most local inscriptions were no longer in dialect; in contrast with the many dialects of the earlier colonies, the language brought to Asia and Africa by Alexander (3) the Great and his Successors was a form of koine. For a brief period other forms of common language, such as the so-called Doric koine of Peloponnesse, prevailed in certain areas of mainland Greece, but in the end they were all replaced by the koine (in the inscriptions at least).

4. Literary Greek Literary texts too were composed in different dialects but the dialect was mostly determined by the literary genre and its origin rather than by the author's origin. *Hesiod, who spoke Boeotian (an Aeolic dialect), composed hexameters in the same mixed dialect (based on Ionic) as Homer, while *Pindar, also a Boeotian, wrote choral poetry in a very different mixed dialect which included some Doric features. The iambic trimeters of Attic tragedy are written in a very literary Attic heavily influenced by Homer and by Ionic, but the choruses are written in Doric or rather in a literary form of Attic with superimposed Doric features (μαχαίρι for Attic πτέρνιξ 'mother', etc.). Notice that for the literary dialects we tend to speak, as the grammarians did, of Aeolic, Ionic, and Doric rather than of Thessalian, Illyrian, Cretan, and the like (Attic and Lesbian are exceptions), since the dialect used does not normally show features specific to a town or locality; it is more a generic colouring.

The history of literary Greek starts with *Homer, i.e. with a poetic language which, because of the various stages of its formu-
late development, is remote from the language of normal conversation and under an ironic patina includes both late and early features as well as features of different dialects: Mycenaean, Aeolic, Ionic. Because of its cultural importance and its wide diffusion, epic poetry provided a common linguistic ground for a linguistically divided culture; in spite of its ironic colouring the epic language is used for Tyrian elegiac poetry which exalted the Doric Spartans to war and for the verses of the oracle at Delphi, a North-West Greek city. The risk was that the prestige and all-perceiving influence of the epic language might have led to the fossilization of all literary language. Yet the dialects—and the way in which they were tied to different literary genres—provided a source for linguistic renewal. Elegiac poetry was composed in epic language but some of it was in a more or less purer form of Ionic. We have meter poetry in Lesbian (Sappho and Alcaeus, I), Ionic (Anacreon) and even Bocotic (Corinna, though we are uncertain about the date); in these texts we observe not only the phonology and morphology of the various dialects but presumably also some new lexicon and the characteristics of a simpler style. Iambic and trochaic verses favoured Ionic and we find in Hipponax’s poetry, for instance, a rich vocabulary full of colloquials and of foreign words. Archilochus too comes much closer to the language of conversation than Homer. Comedy, which can be in Attic but also in Doric, allows colloquials not tolerated in tragedy. Yet the multiplicity of literary dialects also leads to new forms of artificiality. The language of choral poetry is a mixed language which is characterized by a Doric (i.e. non-Attic-Ionic) patina, but in fact exploits elements of all forms of poetry. The result of so much mixture may be magnificent as in Pindar but may also sound baroque: Aristophanes (1)’s parody of Pindar (Alk. 941 ff) makes this clear. Literary prose can, though need not, be closer to conversational language. Its first forms came from Ionic; even a Doric doctor like Hippocrates (2) wrote of medicine in Ionic. Attic literary prose, which started in the 5th cent., shows clear signs of Ionic influence but eventually acquires linguistic forms and a style of its own. We have limited evidence for Doric prose. 

In Hellenistic times the use of the literary dialects becomes more artificial; Theocritus wrote his Lydias in epic language, in Doric, and in Aeolic (i.e. Lesbian), a tour de force which reflects the formed style of Alexandrian poetry. At a later stage we find deliberate attempts to spur the koinē and to prefer an accurate imitation of Attic. At the same time a prose text like the New Testament shows both Semitic influences and a higher level of colloquial complexity.

5. Development. The presence of dialects effectively prevents us from treating the development of Ancient Greek as a continuous process from Homer (or Mycenaean) to the koinē. Yet some changes seem to be widely attested in the Greek-speaking area either because of similar structural forces or because of mutual influences between dialects. In the official or literary language the complexity of sentences increases and the simpler patterns are reserved for the colloquial style or specific rhetorical effects. The whole, which is absent from Mycenaean and still vestigial in Homer, is generalized in all dialects and is used to neutralize adjectives, participles, infinitives, and whole sentences. A new abstract and technical vocabulary is created through the use of suffixation (-aoke, -aoroe, -aire, etc.) or of composition. Greek is the one European language in which we can follow the independent creation of an abstract or technical vocabulary; the other languages, Latin included, directly or indirectly exploited Greek as a model or as a source of loan words.

6. Linguistic features. We list here some of the main features of ancient Greek, with special reference to classical Attic. Phonology

The phonological system of Classical Attic is relatively well known (see pronunciation, koinē). In the Classical period the vocalic system had five short vowels (a, e, o, i, y) and written a, e, o, i, v and seven long vowels (ia, ei, oi, ui, i, y, u), written a, e, o, ai, au, eu, ou, i, y, u. The so-called long diphthongs (ai, ei, ou, ui), i.e. a (or e), ai (or e), au (or e), and i, y (or u), were rarer and tended either to merge with the short diphthongs or to lose the second element.

The consonantal system included the dental fricative [s], the glottal fricative [h] (the rough breathing) which had a very limited distribution, and four sonorants: the two liquids [l], [r] and the two nasals [n], [m]. The nine stops were organized according to three modes of articulation (voiceless, voiced, aspirate, and voiced) and three places of articulation: labial (p, b, p’, b’), dental (t, d, d’), velar (k, k’, g). Unlike the modern language Ancient Greek had geminate consonants such as [pp, ll, mm], etc.

Some dialects have five long vowels (a, e, o, i, u), instead of seven, and in most dialects we find a [u, u] pronunciation of ο. The distribution of vowels also differs. Attic and Ionic changed the inherited [o], which is preserved in all other dialects, into [o]. written ο, though in Attic this change was never completed and after [o], [o] the sound reverted to [o]. Hence Doric and Aeolic μπ or οτιc against Attic-ionic μπο and οτιc vs. οτιc. The tendency to monophthongize diphthongs, which is typical of later Greek, is implemented earlier in dialects like Bocotic.

The consonantal system is relatively stable in all varieties of Greek, but some dialects still preserve [w] (written with p, the so-called digamma), which was lost in Attic. Other dialects tend to change the aspirated stops into fricatives at an early stage or to lose the secondary intervocalic [s] which is found elsewhere. Hence Laconian ως ‘god’ for Attic θος, where θ may well indicate a dental fricative [θ] (cf. English th) and Laconian ποσα ‘worse’ corresponding to Attic ποσα.

For the accentual system of Greek and the major phonological changes which mark the shift from classical to Byzantine Greek, see pronunciation, koinē.

The system just described contrasts with that reconstructed for Indo-European (see linguistics, historical and comparative). The Indo-European *laryngeal consonants were lost; the voiced aspirate stops (*tʰ, *dʰ, etc.) yielded voiceless aspirates; the vocalic resonants *r, *r̥, *r̂ were replaced by vowels or combinations of consonant and vowel, while the consonantal variants [w, r] of *r and *w tended to disappear; the inherited labiowelar stops (*pʰw, *bʰw, *gʰw) merged with velars, dentals, or labials, depending on the environment. Indo-European *s changed to *h word-initially before a vowel and internally between vowels, where it was eventually lost; all word-final stops were lost and final *h changed to *h. Not all of these changes are pre-Mycenaean, but those concerning the aspirates, the vocalic resonants, *r, probably final *r, and the final stops are. Other changes involved sound clusters and differed in the various dialects; in Mycenaean, Arcado-Cypriot, Ionic-Attic, and Lesbian, but not in Doric and North-West Greek, *r became *l (cf. Att. δώροn ‘gifts’ and Dor. δῶρον); in most dialects (including Ionic) *d̥, *t̥, *s̥ became *s, but in Attic and Boeotian we find *t (cf. Ion. οἰκόν of ‘the citizen’ marks genitive, singular, and masculine. Suffixation and composition are the two most productive means of word-formation.

Morphology and syntax

Greek is a heavily inflected fusional language where the different grammatical categories are mostly marked by suffixes (nominal and verbal endings) or, far less frequently, by prefixes (e.g. the verbal augment or the reduplication). Inflection in verbs like ηφισσω ‘take’ vs. ηφασσω ‘I took’) is at best marginal. Note that one unsegmentable morpheme fulfills various functions: ον, written in στόλον ‘of the citizen’ marks genitive, singular, and masculine. Suffixation and composition are the two most productive means of word-formation.
Greek Language

Nouns and adjectives are classified into inflectional classes (de-
cisions) according to their phonological shape (o-stems, a-
siems, consonantal stems). In the Classical period the nominal
inflection distinguished five cases (nominative, vocative, accusa-
tive, genitive, dative), three numbers (singular, dual, plural) and
genders (masculine, feminine, and neuter). Later develop-
ments led to the loss of the dual (which in some dialects is absent
from the earlier attestations) and even later ones to that of
the dative. Gender was determined by agreement patterns rather
than by semantic factors or the phonological shape of the word
(late γαρια 'horse/mare' can be masculine or feminine without any
difference in inflection). It was normal (though not compulsory)
to use masculine and feminine for males and females but words for
inanimate objects could be masculine, feminine, or neuter. In
progress of time inflectional cases came to be tied to gender as
is the case in Modern Greek. At the same time in Hellenistic Greek
we witness a drastic simplification of the earlier inflectional variety.

Verbal morphology is highly complicated. A first distinction is
between finite and non-finite forms; the former are characterized
by personal endings for the singular, dual, and plural (there is not
a full complement of dual endings and they too tend to disapp-
pear). The latter include participles, verbal adjectives, and infiniti-
ves, which are marked by special suffixes and share some of the
syntactical, and in some instances morphological, properties of
the noun.

In the finite verb the main grammatical categories are aspect,
which indicates the way in which action etc. is envisaged (derivative
or imperfective, punctual or aoristic, active or perfective), time
(present, past, future), mood (indicative, subjunctive, optative,
and imperative), voice (active, middle, passive), person (first,
second, and third singular, dual or plural). Most verbs have	hree main stems (distinguished by vocalic alternation or affi-
ixation or more rarely by different roots) which indicate different
aspects: durative/imperfective (e.g. συνάνθρωπος 'I am persuading')
or punctual/aoristic (e.g. συναντώ with the aorist
συνάναντα 'I persuaded'), or active/perfective (e.g. συνάν-
θρωπος 'I was persuading') and the imperfect
συνάνθρωπος 'I was persuaded'). Except for the future the so-called tenses
(present, imperfect, aorist, perfect, pluperfect, future, future per-
fect) in the non-indicative moods and the non-finite forms mark
primarily contrasts of aspect, while the indicative forms indicate
both time and aspect distinctions: Xen. Cyrc. 5. 22 ἔλθον δὲ ἔλθειν ἀνέκ
καὶ óχθες ἀνέκανα καὶ ἐκεῖνος ἐκεῖνος ἐκεῖνος ἐκεῖνος ἐκεῖνος ἐκεῖνος ἐκεῖνος ἐκεῖνος ἐκεῖνος ἐκεῖνος ἐκεῖνος ἐκεῖνος ἐκεῖνος ἐκεῖνος ἐκεῖ

Lexicon

Though lexical differences between dialects are commonplace, if
we allow for phonological differences, most of the basic vocabu-
lar of Greek is shared by all dialects. The bulk of the early Greek
lexicon is built on inherited Indo-European roots but numerous
words cannot be etymologized and presumably belonged to pre-
Greek populations. They include nouns and place names ending
in -ος/ος and -οιος, in -ος and a number of words for flora, fauna,
etc. Mediterranean origin (λιθω, μοῦ, μισος, etc). In
addition there are substantive or derived words of Semitic origin
like οὐκομεν 'hesitate', οὐκομεν 'cummin', γογγας 'gold',
γογγας 'tunic', etc. In the Classical period it is noticeable that
the cultural insularity of the Greeks and their reluctance to learn
frequent languages led to very few borrowings from the outside; by contrast the later contacts with the Romans produced a large crop of loanwords or calques. New vocabulary is normally built via suffusion and coinvention; both processes are productive, all through the history of the language. Compounds are characteristic of literary language (where they may be new creations or may be taken from the epithets of the religious language and the formulae of oral poetry), but also occur in everyday language: the flavour of Pindar’s μεταφράσεως ’which is an object of care to me’ or of the comic σαρκοσαρκον πτωκοδακαλίας ’smearing pine-bend’ (σαρκοσαρκόν) is different from that of the immeasurable μαλακτίς compounds of Attic inscriptions (σαρκοσαρκόν ’barley seller’, μαλακτίς ’bread seller’, etc.) which have only practical overtones.


Gregory (1) I, the Great, pop. AD 596–604, of senatorial and papal family; probable prefect of Rome c.573; subsequently monk; deacon 578; aposiopetis (lit. ‘delegate’, a church official) at Constantinople 579–585; pope 586 (despite his poor Greeks); then adviser to Pope Pelagius II. When pope, despite ill-health, he violently administered a Rome stricken by flood, plague, and famine, excommunicating in population and isolated and threatened by Arian (see ARIANISM) and pagan *Lombards. He reorganized papal estates for Rome’s supply, centralizing their administration through appointments, paid imperial troops, appointed officials, and negotiated with the Lombards. He devotedly served the Byzantine empire as the ‘boly commonwealth’, but sometimes acted independently of emperor and exarchs. Warfare and political fragmentation limited his powers, but expectation of the Day of Judgement sharpened his sense of spiritual responsibility for the world. As churchman, he upheld ecclesiastical discipline in Italy and Dalmatia, maintained authority in the vicariate of Illyricum, restructured the dioceses of his dwindling patriarchates, and laboured to convert Jews and *pagan rustics. He urged Church reform on the Mercings, reviving the vicariate of Arles at their request. He struggled (against imperial opposition) to end the Three Chapters schism in Venetia and Istria, and (with small success, and perhaps small need) to suppress Arian *Donatism. He worked to convert the Lombards through queen Theodelinda, and organized a mission to the Anglo-Saxons (596). In the east, he maintained papal appellate jurisdiction, and was friendly with the patriarchs of *Alexandria (1) and *Antioch (1). With Constantinople he quarreled over its patriarch’s title Eccumenical, wrongly seen as challenging Rome’s primacy. Generally, though, he was sensitive to local religious traditions.

A contemplative at heart, he saw episcopal duties as a necessary, but uncongenial extension of his monastic vocation into the secular world. His diocesan appointments favoured monks, alienating Rome’s secular clergy. No original theologian, he was an eloquent moralizer and mystic, striving to make sense of his beleaguered world, and transmuting much patriotic thought to the Middle Ages. His Moralia in Job proved enormously popular, his Cursus pastoralis remains a mirror for priest and bishop. His Dialogues (whose authenticity has been challenged) inspiringly portrayed the Italian Church as ascetic, preaching, theocratic, but episcopally controlled. His *Homiliae in Evangeliem, preached to the besieged city, movingly lamented Rome’s decay. He defended sacred art, reformed the Roman Sturgy, and perhaps established a choir school. He conventionally condemned bishop Desiderius of Vienne for inappropriately teaching classical culture, and suspected its influence on potential monks, but conventionally acknowledged its utility in biblical studies; his straightforward, rhythmically skilful prose shows rhetorical training (Many letters, though, are chancery-drafted.) A chief founder of the papal states, and of papal prestige in the post-Roman west, his leadership, and vigorous sense of Rome’s political and Christian traditions, justified his epithet as ‘God’s consul’.


Gregory (2) of Nazianzus (ad 320–49) educated at Athens with *Basil of Caesarea, remained much more committed than his friend to the value of traditional patristic, a commitment powerfully expressed in his counterpart to the emperor Julian’s cultural policies (Citations 4–5).

Son of a bishop, he faced great difficulties in reconciling his ascetic ambitions with the role devolved upon him in the local church establishment. He caused much embarrassment for his father when he ordained him presbyter, and for Basil when he
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both languages well, and acquainted with the grammar-book of Dionysius of its initial state. Following his studies under the Stoi philosopher Sánn Párcaménus (see A.gr., 1.), he understood both the Stoi and the Alexandrian views on language and applied these to Latin in his book On the Latin Language (De lingua Latina). This is not a grammar of Latin, but a lengthy discussion about the language, its structure, vocabulary, and, so far as he could trace it, its history.

Varro was the most original thinker about language that we know of in the Latin world. In addition to his application of Stoi semantics to the Latin verb he made an extensive study of word formation and inflexion, drawing on the principle of regularity ("analogy"), but recognizing existing irregularities as well. In his books he began the process of grouping Latin case forms together, leading to the later establishment of the traditional five declensions. These five were set out by the late Latin grammarians such as Priscian (ca. 500) several centuries before a comparable simplified account was applied to Greek, probably under Latin influence, at the end of the Byzantine age, and this must be laid to the credit of Varro's early insights.

Three main differences between Latin and Greek had to be noticed by Varro and others: (a) The Latin ablative case, not found in Greek and recognized by Varro as the 'sixth' or 'Latin' case. The term ablative was created later by reference to one of its major functions, 'taking away from'. (b) The absence of a definite article in Latin. The word-classes were maintained at night when a preposition, Palaeon (1st cent. AD) made the interrogative, which the Greeks treated as a subclass of adverb, a class in its own right. (c) The confusion in Latin of the present tense of the verbs ("have done") with the pluperfect ("had", having differential verb forms in Greek (παρεκκλήσοντα, παρέκκλησι) and a simple form in Latin (feri). This was duly noted by Priscian.

7. A number of Greek grammarians are known to have been working on syntax in the 1st cent. BC; and after; the first grammarian dealing exclusively with it, whose work is, in part, extant, is Arch. (13) Dioscorus, writing in Alexandria and in the Alexandrian tradition around AD 200. He was regarded by Priscian as his principal authority, and later Byzantine grammarians in the main wrote summaries and commentaries on the basis of Arch's work. The work of these Byzantine Greek grammarians between 500 and 1500 was the main vehicle for the reintroduction of Greek studies in the western Renaissance.

8. A considerable number of late Latin grammarians are known and their work is extant; the most prominent among them are Donatus (1) (4th cent.) and Priscian (writing in Constantinople around 500), who became authorities for the later medieval grammarians, both practical and theoretical. Donatus wrote two short grammars of Latin; Priscian wrote at great length, and his principal work, Institutiones grammaticae (The Principles of Grammar) runs to 974 printed pages. The work is divided into eighteen books, the last two being wholly devoted to syntax and drawn largely from Arch. Priscian's work recapitulates the entire achievement of the Graeco-Roman grammatical tradition, in which the debt of today's language studies can hardly be exaggerated. See Grammar and Grammarians, Greek and Latin.

H. Steinthal, Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft bei den Griechen und Römern (1891; repr. 1963); R. H. Robins, A Short History of Linguistics (1982); P. H. Matthews, in G. C. Lapchick (ed.), Studia della lingua latina; (1990); J. A. Kemp, The Latin grammaticae of Dionysius Thrax (In/St. 1950); J. J. Taylor (ed.), The History of Linguistics in the Classical Age (1987); A. A. Long (ed.), Problems of Stoicism (1971). The ancient Greek and Roman scholars were mainly interested in describing their own languages (as also were the Indian grammarians); linguistic history and comparison were ignored. Yet one attempt, not entirely free from political overtones, led to the (false) derivation of Latin from Greek in the 1st cent. AD. Modern historical and comparative linguistics owes its beginnings to a closer study of Sanskrit, the literary and scholarly language of India, and to the encounter with the sophisticated Sanskrit tradition of grammatical analysis. After some earlier tentative statements, and especially after Sir William Jones'

uses linguistic comparison to establish that two or more languages are genetically related and descend from an earlier language which may or may not be attested. We know that the Romance languages (French, Italian, Spanish, etc.) are related and descend from a form of Latin, but we can also show that languages like Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, Armenian, English, etc. descend from an unattested parent language. We can reconstruct the main features of this language which we call conventionally Proto-Indo-European (PIE or simply *Indo-European*, and which must have been spoken before writing was developed. Similar techniques allow us to reconstruct Proto-Semitic, the parent language of Hebrew, Arabic, Akkadian, etc. or Proto-Algonquian from which a number of Amerindian languages in NE and central North America derive, etc. The question whether all languages descend from one language or many remains open. Within each family we can also establish different degrees of relationship. Greek, Latin, French, English, German are all Indo-European, but Greek and Latin belong to separate branches, English and German to the same branch (Germanic), while French descends from Latin. In general, comparative linguistics may provide evidence for prehistoric events such as the origin or movement of peoples but it also lengthens the history of the languages studied and throws light onto their features. We should not confuse this comparative linguistics, which aims at identifying genetic relationships, with the homonymous discipline which compares different languages (mostly unrelated) in order to establish language types and general features of language.

General principles

The comparative and historical study of language requires familiarity with the principles of general linguistics (see Linguistics) which have largely emerged from the study of living languages. In its turn, the general study of language change has much to contribute to the theoretical study of language and has developed as a discipline in its own right (cf. McRae; Campbell; Hock and Joseph, Joseph and Janda; see bibliography). The questions investigated concern the causes and modalities of language change in general and of specific instances of language change. It is now clear that sociolinguistic factors are partly responsible for the occurrence and modalities of language change (prestige forms of language are imitated) and that language variety is much more pervasive than the number of named dialects implies. Ideally all historical studies should take into account the various layers of each language (registers, dialects, etc.) and their correlation with socio-historical factors, but often the necessary data is not available and we can only speculate.

Good methodology demands that comparison is based on the earliest phases of the languages considered. History must come before comparison; in languages, like Greek and Latin, for which we have a long and uninterrupted documentation, we can use internal evidence to establish what forms are the earliest. Attic forms are, for example, πρίγιν, πρίθωρ are shown by Homer (see Printhus) to be from γρήγος, γρήγος, while γρήγος is from γρήγος, and Attic μετέρων is from an earlier μετέρων, which derives from μετέρων. This last form is reconstructed through dialect comparison and here the digger indicates that it is not attested (elsewhere an asterisk is used).

Modern linguistic studies

The ancient Greek and Roman scholars were mainly interested in describing their own languages (as also were the Indian grammarians); linguistic history and comparison were ignored. Yet one attempt, not entirely free from political overtones, led to the (false) derivation of Latin from Greek in the 1st cent. AD. Modern historical and comparative linguistics owes its beginnings to a closer study of Sanskrit, the literary and scholarly language of India, and to the encounter with the sophisticated Sanskrit tradition of grammatical analysis. After some earlier tentative statements, and especially after Sir William Jones'
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decences between Gr. πατερ, Lat. pater, Sle. pater, OHG *fater (*but pater after s), point to an original IE *pater and to rules like IE *πατερ-Gr. πατερ, pater or IE *pater-OHG *fater is the direct descendant of IE *fater, but 'paternal' is a borrowing from Latin.

We may also reconstruct a protolanguage sounds not attested or scarcely attested in the daughter languages. In addition to liquids, nasals, a sibilant (*f, *s, *s, *f, *z), and the regular series of voiceless and voiced stops *p, *t, *k, *kʰ, *g, *gʰ, IE also had the so-called voiced aspirated stops *bh, *dh, *gh, *ghʰ. An IE *bh is preserved in Sanskrit but appears in Greek as ψ (i.e. pʰ, an aspirated p in the Classical period), while in Latin in initial position we find b but internally b-.

Cf. Skt. bhāti 'brother': Gr. ὥριον; Lat. frater, but Skt. bhāt 'desires' : Lat. quer. Even more complex is the development of IE *kʰ: Greek always presents θ (aspirated θ') while Latin has initially θ' but internally θ- and the latter before or after an θ, after u, and before l. Cf. Skt. dhātāma 'smoke': Gr. ὅψας; Lat. fumus; Sle. medhātas 'muzzle': Lat. medias; but Gr. ὄψας 'red': Lat. ruber, Skt. śādas 'udder': Lat. über, etc. We also reconstruct a series of so-called labiodentals (velar sounds of the English k type with lip-rounding; cf. Eng. on): *gʰ, *g'. In historical Greek they merged with labial, dental, and velar sounds, but in the Linear B script they still have distinct signs, so that the development must have taken place after the Mycenaean period. To take a simple case, Latin quis qui obviously corresponds to Gr. k' i, that is to say, while Latin preserves an IE *kʰ as quis, Greek changed it to r. But this occurred only before i or e (cf. Lat. quis : Gr. kai). Before o or ø Gr. shows ὅς, for the /interrogative form mò, mò (adjective, etc., from IE *h'os-'). This explains the connection between ròw 'i pay' and mòw 'fine, payment', so obviously semantically, and so desconcerting when the sounds are compared: rö/-nö represent the regular developments from IE *h'os- and *k'os-.

It used to be believed that vowel changes were too erratic to present any regularity. In fact, vowels develop as regularly as the other sounds. The basic vowels of late IE (a e i u o, short and long) are fairly faithfully preserved in the classical languages (though in Latin this is only true for the first syllable of the word). Cf.: aIE *gaie 'i drive' Gr. ἐγέρεος Lat. aages áa *mater 'mother' mätter e *hē 'carry' ἐφάω fəs o *pē 'fall' ἐπαν-πίς pisis o *ōst 'eight' ἐπτά octó o *ōsō 'give' ἐποιέω do-num, etc.

Some apparent exceptions to these rules are explained through the reconstruction for IE of semivowels (approximants) which between consonants function as the nucleus of a syllable (like vowels) but between vowels function as consonants. Thus next to consonantal [i, w] (cf. Eng. y and w), we have vocative i and u; next to consonantal l, s, n, we have vocative j, y, y (the last four symbols indicate vocative sounds like those indicated by -b in bubble and -on in button). The IE vocative liquids are preserved in one language, Sanskrit, where we often find syllabic r (transcribed as ṭa, ṭa, ṭa, 'dead', ṭo, 'body', etc. In the classical languages the vocative liquids of IE *u always develop a vowel, either before the liquid (Lat. su.ar or or Gr. ἑλ, ap or after it (Gr. ἵλα, ἱλικα). Thus skt. ṭa 'bear' corresponds to Grk. ῥάρα but Lat. ura. The vocative nasals are preserved in no language. Greek alternatives like that of ανά (an-) 'i stretch': ἀν- epub 'stretched', xwv (xwv) 'i kill': ἔξω 'he killed', etc., are frequent, but at first sight unexplainable: Sanskrit offers similar problems: lat- 'stretched': 'dāla 'stretched', bha 'kill': bha 'darya 'killed', etc. Bruggmann pointed out that the relation of cf-uy: (mpor-) 'vow, feysy : feys, showed that the verbal adjective was formed from the root in its 'weak' form, i.e. without *e (nil-grade); that ταμ-ταμ- were therefore expected to form ōta-τα, ōta-τα, with a vocatal nasal (ŋ) which obviously developed into a in Greek (and Sanskrit) but en in Latin (cf. textui
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'stretched'). This at once explained why the roots of sαυθ 'suffer' was ἠράνων (cf. ἀπρασ). Similarly, the ancestor of δρακον was δρακόν (from δράκος), that of πύθος, ἡπιόν (from πύθης), etc. In IE, the accusative singular had the ending -ιον, cf. Latin res. But after a consonantal stem, -ιον had to become syllabic (-ιο) which in Greek gave ˓ιον, in Latin -em; hence, -αθ, but -ατ, in contrast to -αθον ὀθο- with ὀθο- from -ιον and -ιον. The same applies to ἵνα- δεικν, ἵνα- ἵππον, etc.

3. Morphology. The study of historical and comparative morphology depends on a certain extent on that of phonology. If we allow for the regular phonetic correspondences we are likely to find that cognate languages often show remarkable morphological and grammatical equivalences, though the degree of conservatism will depend on the type of language studied. Indeed the morphology is often a good indicator of the family to which a language belongs. The classical languages, which are heavily inflected, show considerable agreements between themselves and with their cognates. A simple comparison between nominative sing. Skt. náv, Gr. ναῦς, Lat. návem, accusative Skt. náv, Gr. ναύς, Lat. náven leads to the reconstruction of the IE nōm and acc. nās, with -όν endings. The declension of family, with the old genitive familión (retrieved in pater familión), closely corresponds to that of olóδ- – -ατ- – -άτ. Equally close parallels can be observed in the other declensions, the pronouns, the verbal inflections, etc.

Inflectional patterns also reveal another great force at work in the history of languages: the tendency to regularize or at least generalize pre-existing formal patterns even beyond their original locus (analysis). In English, past forms like sαθ tend to be replaced by sαθεd, etc. in Latin the old gen. sing. of ˓ιον ended in -ιον. But already in Old Latin, the norm is -ίον ('later -ιο, -ιο in the model of the a-stems: e.g. m. dominus). Conversely, the original a-stem gen. plural in -ιον or -ιον which survives into classical times in the proclitic μοιον, τιμον, ταμον and poetical δεημ, διομ, etc., was replaced on the analogy of the a-stems by -ιον: δεημ, διομ, after διόμ, etc. Sound change may disrupt the regularity of a paradigm, but analysis may well restate it, though we are not normally able to predict with certainty whether a specific instance of analogical change will happen or not. 'Spaced' is now in current use but 'readed' for 'read' is not. See GREEK LANGUAGE; LATIN LANGUAGE.

4. Syntax. The study of historical syntax is at present in a state of flux because of profound changes in the way in which theoretical linguists envisage syntax in general; the same applies to comparative syntax. Our ability to reconstruct syntactical patterns for a non-attested language has been doubted and the most obvious successes of the comparative method concern phonology, morphology, and lexical reconstruction rather than syntax. Yet for a number of languages and especially for the classical languages a great deal of factual work has been done and some results are established; we have a view of the syntactical development in the attested phases and a more sketchy impression of what we can reconstruct for the parent language—and perhaps in the field of morpho-syntax (meaning and use of morphological categories) than elsewhere. The case-system of the classical languages represents a gradual reduction of an IE system of (at least) eight cases, found as such in Sanskrit (and in a somewhat different form in Old Hittite). Case merger (syncrasis) led to a combination of functions; hence the variety of functions performed by, for example, the Latin ablative or the fact that after prepositions like Gr. ἐτ, Lat. ex 'from' Greek uses the genitive (which continues an ancient ablative) and Latin the ablative. Syncrasis processes continue, of course, after the Classical period, when Greek loses the dative and the languages derived from Latin tend to lose all case distinctions. Similarly in the course of the development of the classical languages we witness a reorganization and simplification of the verbal system which in the late Indo-European phase at least

must have been similar to that of Greek and Indo-Iranian (i.e. was based on the three fundamental categories of present, perfect, and perfect, which differed because of their aspect, and on four moods: indicative, imperative, optative, and imperative); the contrast of subjunctive and optative was lost in most languages but a future, which did not exist in IE, was independently created. Reconstruction explains some apparent oddities: the Greek rule that after a neuter plural subject the verb is in the singular (αιδος θησ σεν 'the animals runn') is inherited, since it occurs in early Indian and Iranian, and is based on the fact that the neuter plural was originally a collective singular. The so-called Wackernagel's law, a rule of IE word order, is still partly respected in the early phases of the IE languages (and is absolutely regular in Hittite); unaccented words (e.g. particles, pronouns) took second place in the sentence, whatever their meaning: cf. μου το σφικτα τον γνόσας 'you seemed to me a small child' (Wackernagel (1), 1. 1 ff.). Similarly the so-called stress of Greek, where stresses are separated from verbs, reflects an archaic IE pattern where preverbs had much greater autonomy; even in early Latin we find ὁδον 'I beg you', where the pronoun 'you' (which occurs in second position according to Wackernagel's law) follows the independent preverb sub; the latter formula is το σφικτα.

The role of subordination in IE is not clear, but the elaborate sentence construction of the classical languages, in which hypotaxis (subordination) seems the dominant feature, are in many cases based on a shift of earlier paratactic (co-ordinating) constructions. Earlier juxtapositions such as τοισ—οισ 'I am afraid—may he not come' were shifted in meaning 'I am afraid that he might not come'; the same explanation applies to μου οισ ημιθ (see ημιθ).

Cf. Wackernagel (1) and (2); Clackson, 137-86.

5. Lexicon and etymology. The meaning of words plays an important role both in historical and in comparative linguistics. When we study the history of a language we want to know not only what new words enter the language or what words are lost, but also what words change meaning, how, and why. We do not believe any longer that to establish the etymology of a word means to know its true meaning, but we are still interested in taking back form and meaning of a word to the earliest possible stage since history of the lexicon (which includes the history of lexical meaning) is an essential part of linguistic history. Semantics (the study of meaning) is also essential for comparative linguistics which depends on establishing correct word equivalences between related languages. While phonological rules give a firm grounding to etymology, what limits can we set to semantic divergence? Should we compare Skt. युध 'battle' with Lat. in the 'law'? The answer is negative since the correct comparison is with the homonymous Latin in 'broth', but decisions are not always easy. We do not any longer accept the old etymologies of the type λοκος ας non locendo 'a wood is called λοκος there because there is no light (λοκος) 'see ETYMOLOGY', but we acknowledge that it is difficult to formulate general laws of semantic development. Nevertheless comparative studies have cleared up many problems which would have remained insoluble within Latin or Greek. The word συνήθη, mentioned above, would hardly be analysable in Greek. Comparatists can show that it derives from IE *sne-hit-*, represented also by Lithuanian kunā 'price', Slavic цена 'price', German hand 'hand'; but 'price' or 'pay' are also found in IE, so this noun derives from a verbal root *sneh- 'to pay' which survives in ruh (cf. also the verb συνάθη 'pay back' and the noun συνάθη 'ransom', 'price' from *sneh-). Ruh, comme is a borrowing from Greek (as Eng. penal, penalty are borrowed from Latin or Old French). Most of the old etymologies must be discarded but the research of a century has succeeded in amassing a vast corpus of firmly established etymologies, conveniently listed in etymological dictionaries (Walde-Hoffmann and Beekes for the classical
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Linus (Aioe), an old song sung either at the vintage as in H. 18. 570, where it is performed by a boy accompanied by the lyre and by a cheerfully dancing and shouting group of young people, or a song of lament using the titulus cry aitavos ("ailas for Linus"), which was interpreted as a mournful song in honour of Linus. Linus was also a mythical person for whom various genealogies exist, e.g. son of Apollo and Pamnate, a local princess of Argo (1); after he exposed Linus, he was pursued by dogs and the city was plagued by Apollo till satisfaction was made (Paus. 1. 41. 6-8). He had strong connections with music: (a) he invented the thretos (Hesiod. Poem. in ps.-Plut. De mus. 3); (b) he was killed by Apollo in a music contest, because he had boasted that he was as good a singer as the god (Paus. 9. 29. 6 f.); (c) he was the music teacher of Heracles and was killed by his pupil (Apollod. 2. 63); (d) he was generally considered a great composer and citharode (Pind. Hyg. 7. 204). The Linus song was widely sung under different names in the near east (Hdt. 2. 79), cf. lytters.


Liris, river of central Italy, now called Garigliano below *Interamna Lirenas. Rising near the *Pausanias Lucus it flows south-south-east to Sora, turns sharply south-south-west, cascades picturesquely at Isola del Liri, and enters the Tyrrhenian sea through many cliff country at *Minturnae. Chief tributaries: Fibremus (Ciceron's natal stream: Lego. 2. 6), Terrus, Melopus, mod. Rapido; G. Cerasulo (ed.), AGER AQUINAE. ARCHEOLOGICA LUGO LIVIAE SULLA RIVARIA LIRIO (2004).

BTS/UWR

Literacy

The number of people who could read and write in the ancient world is hard to determine. Without statistical evidence, we must rely mostly on chance information and inference: for example, the institution of *ostracism implies that most Athenian citizens could be expected to write a name. A written *text indicates the literate, not the illiterate, and especially the highly educated elite. The ancient habit of reading aloud meant that written texts could often be shared the more easily by others; the presence of *inscription does not itself imply that they were read by everyone, since their symbolic value added another dimension to their written content. There are also many different levels of literacy, which complicate the picture, from the basic ability to write through a short message, to functional literacy or 'craft literacy', to the skill required for reading a literary papyrus (reading and writing skills may also have been separate). However, certain broad generalizations are possible. The 'mass literacy' of modern industrial countries was never achieved in the ancient world (cf. Harris (see biblog, below), who believes a maximum of 20-30 per cent literacy was achieved, and that in Hellenistic cities). Women, slaves, and the lower social levels would usually be less literate. Archaic Greece and particularly Archaic Rome have left fewer instances of writing (graffiti, inscriptions), implying sparse literacy, and Archaic Greek cities sometimes attempt to ensure an official's power over the written word was not abused. However, there were pockets and periods where a higher rate of basic literacy among the adult citizen-
Lutetia

Tabularium (public archive) and dedicated the buildings in 69 with lavish games. (Cf. ELLRP 367–8.) During the 70s he defended the Sullan settlement, but finally acknowledged the corruption of senatorial juries and accepted its modification (70). He opposed the laws of A. *Cabinius (3) (67) and C. *Manlius (66)—Pompey had inflicted him in 77—and in 65, as censor, the attempts of his colleague M. *Licinius Crassus (1) to enfranchise the Transpadani (see Transpadani) and annex Egypt. In 63 he was ignominiously defeated by Caesar in an election for the chief pontificate (see Pontificae). He tried to throw suspicion on Caesar as involved in the conspiracy of *Catiline but failed, and his auctoritas now declined: in 61 he was asked to speak in the senate after two men much junior to him. He died soon after. He was a mediocre orator (Cic. Brut. 222) and never equalled his father’s cultural interests.

Lutetia (Lutecia) (mod. Paris), civitas-capital of the Parisii. The original settlement, on a marshy island in the Seine, was destroyed in 52 sc. Under the empire a new town, built in the Roman fashion, developed on the island and the south bank, where remains of important public buildings still exist. After the invasions of the 3rd cent. an settlement was again confined to the island, defended by a wall of reused stones. Now called Parisii, it was a favourite residence of *Julian (proclaimed Augustus here in 360), but its real greatness did not begin until Claudio made it his capital.


Luwian or Luvian is a branch of the Anatolian family of Indo-European languages. The Hittite archives include clay tablets with rituals written in the so-called cuneiform Luwian; the texts date from the 16th to the 13th cents. sc. It is also clear that the Hittite language was strongly influenced by Luwian. A different script, the so-called Hieroglyphic Luwian, which is in fact a syllabic script rich in logograms, was devised in the second millennium sc for a closely related language or dialect. We have a few difficult inscriptions in the 14th and 13th cents., but most of the texts (rock inscriptions, stelae, lead letters, etc.) belong to the 10th-7th cents. sc and were written by the small states which survived the fall of the Hittite Empire in Central and South Anatolia. Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian are very close but not identical. It is often assumed that *Lycia belongs to the same group but this is not certain. It is also likely that at some stage Luwian was spoken on the south and west coast of Anatolia. See Anatolian Languages.


Luxorius or Luxurius, of Carthage (5th–6th cent. ad), author of some 90 short poems, in various metres and on various subjects, which afford an insight into the Vandal society of North Africa in which they were written. His identification with an obscure grammarian, Lusitius, is a matter of doubt. In inspiration his poems owe most to the epigrams of *Marzial. He apparently held the titles of rank vir clarissimus and spectabilis.

Texts Arch. Lat.; M. Rosecrhan (1961), with trans. and comm.; H. Hopp (1968), with comm.


Luxury, laws against See under SUMPTUARY LEGISLATION.

Lycanthropy (or werewolves) Those who ate human flesh at the human sacrifice offered on Mt. Lycaon in *Arcadia were believed to be changed into wolves (see Plato, Resp. 8. 565d; ps.-Pl. Miln 313c; Theophrastus in Porphy. Abst. 2, 27, 2). Here *Lycaon (3) would have been the first to be thus changed, as punishment for his sacrilegious human sacrifice. Various stories speak of athletes who lived as wolves for nine years but regained their human form after abstaining from human flesh during this period and subsequently were victorious in contests thus Demeterus (Plin. HN 8. 82) and Damarchus of Parthias (Paus. 6. 3. 2). A comparable episode is given by *Pliny (1) (HN 8. 81) and *Augustine (De civ. D. 18. 17). But the best known literary were-wolf is probably that of *Phorbas the Arbiter, *Satyricon 61–2. Modern scholars suggest that the phenomenon might indicate the existence of a group of "wolf-men" devoted to the worship of a wolf-god, a rite of passage like the Spartan *kerykeia, or a transgressive act evoking a regression to an animal state.


Lycaon, mythological characters whose name seems to include the Greek word for wolf, λυκες. (1) Son of *Priam and Laodoe, killed by *Achilles (Il. 21. 34–135). (2) Father of *Pandaros (Il. 2, 825–7). (3) Son of *Pelasgos and king of *Arcadia. According to *Apollodorus (6. 3. 96–9) he had 30 sons; *Pausanias (3. 8. 1–5) gives the names of 28 of them, all of whom except Nyctimus and Oenourios founded settlements in Arcadia. Some of his actions depict Lycaon as a *culture-bringer and pious ruler: he founded *Lycoura, and gave *Zeus his epitaph *Lycaeus, instituting the festival Lycaia in his honour (Paus. 8. 2. 1–7). But his sacrifice to Zeus Lycaeus of a newborn child shows him in a different light. For Pausanias (ibid.) the act appears to be a simple, though horrific, sacrifice, in punishment for which Lycaon was changed into a wolf (see Lycanthropy); other sources compound Lycaon’s impurity by having him entertain Zeus to a feast and offer the god human flesh to test his divinity (cf. already Hesiod, fr. 164 M–W). Sometimes the responsibility for the feast is attributed to Lycaon’s sons (Apollod. 3. 8. 1). Zeus punished the transgressors with a thunderbolt, or sent a fleet, or changed Lycaon into a wolf.


Lycaonia was the name given to the country round Laranda, the region’s metropolis during the Roman empire, covering the northern foothills of the *Anatolian *Taurus and the southern part of the central Anatolian plateau. The Lycaonians were first mentioned by *Xenophon (1). The area stretched north as far as Iconium, which was generally reckoned to be the last city of *Phrygia, east to *Cappadocia, and adjoined the genuine highland region of *Iasus on the south-west. Since it lay astride the overland route from western Anatolia to the Cilician Gates and Syria, the successive rulers of Asia Minor—*Persian, *Macedonian, *Seleucid, and Atalattid (see Pergamum)—attempted to control the region and it was part of the Roman province of Asia by 100 bc, before being assigned to the new province of *Cilicia around 80 bc. After the dissolution of Cilicia the area of Darbo and Laranda was controlled by the dynasty Antipater of Alexander the Great. Laranda was formed by the dynastic Antipater and other communities further north formed a *keonoi (confederacy) and issued bronze coins almost entirely for the first and only time. In the mid-1st cent. ad S. *Paul was addressed by the people of Lystra in the Lycaonian language.
Macedonian language

Macedonian, cults

Nowadays historians generally agree that the Macedonians form part of the Greek ethnē (see ETHNOCOPY; MACEDONIAN LANGUAGE); hence they also shared in the common religious and cultural features of the Hellenic world. Consequently most of the gods worshipped in Greece can also be found in Macedonia. However, regional characteristics have to be noted. Especially in the areas bordering on Thrace and among the Paeonians in the north—though these had early contacts with the Macedonians in the centre—local deviants in cult and religion have been attested.

The cult of Zeus was one of the most important cults in Macedonia. Its places of worship on Olympus (1), at the foot of the mountain at Dion, and at Aegae (Verginia) were extremely popular. As father of Macedon he was the Macedonians' eponymous ancestor. The cult of Artemis was widely practised. Although most of the evidence dates to Roman times one may assume the existence of older religious practices. In the area in contact with Thrace it was influenced by the Thracian cult of Asclepius and the worship of Paeonians, probably themselves types of a deity of fertility and vegetation. Herodotus (4.33) says that in Thrace and Paeonia always brought wheat-straw in their offerings to Artemis Basileia. In central Macedonian Euboea is attested, on horseback and holding a torch. She has frequently been associated with Artemis. By comparison the cult of Apollo is not as widespread. Here too local deviants can be found. In Thrace, where Pythian Games were held in honour of Apollo Pythius, the cult of Apollo is even connected with the Cult of Zeus and Artemis. The cult of Dionysus, whom the Paeonians called Dyulas, was especially popular. However, the sites are unevenly distributed. On the basis of the borders of the later Macedonian provinces there are fewer monuments for Dionysus in the south-west, while in one of the cult centres was in the area of the Pangaean—a region admitted also settled by the Thracians.

Zeus, Apollo, *Herales, Dionysus, *Athena, and other such gods appear on coins of the 5th and 4th centuries BC. This evidence, however, ought not to be overestimated since these gods were depicted chiefly in order to demonstrate the close links with the Greek world. Especially important was Hercules not only as the ancestor of the Macedonian royal family, but also fulfilling manifold other functions, e.g. as the patron of hunting. Other cults of not inconsiderable importance were those of *Helios, among the Paeonians worshipped as a disc. *Selene, the *Dioscuri, healing deities—represented by *Aesculapius and *Hygieia—river-gods, nymphs, the Paeion *Muses, and a strange *snake, alongside the cult of Dionysus and the Samothracian * mysteries (see SAMOTHRAKE). *Orpheus was not unknown (Derveni papyri 0.330 BC, see ORPHEIC LITERATURE). The so-called Thracian Rider (see RIDER-GODS) is attested on votive tablets in north and east Macedonia. However, in contrast to Thrace the Hera-Euipia is frequently depicted on Macedonian tombstones. The numerous dedications of the dead as e.g. *Aphrodite, Artemis, *Athena, Dionysus, *Eros, *Hermes, and *Herales belong in this context. These monuments, as well as most of the rider-statues and the votive reliefs depicting various deities, generally date to the second half of the 2nd and the first half of the 3rd centuries AD.


MO/NMD

Macedonian language

The problem of the nature and origin of the Macedonian language is still disputed by modern scholars, but does not seem to have been raised among the ancients. We have a rare word *makoviewtir (important passages in *Plutarch, Alex. 51 and Num. 14), but the meaning of this form is ambiguous. The adverb cannot tell us whether Plutarch had in mind a language different from Greek (cf. *φωνομεν, *in Phoenician), or a dialect (cf. *μακαρις, *in Megarian), or a way of speaking (cf. *μακεδονις). We have some 'Macedonian' glosses, particularly in *Hesychius lexicon, but they are mostly disputed and some were corrupted in the transmission. Thus *ακοδοι, 'eyebrows' probably must be read as *ακοδοι (with r which renders a digamma). If so, it is a Greek dialect form; yet others (e.g. A. Mellier) see the dental as authentic and think that the word belongs to an Indo-European language different from Greek.

After more than a century we recognize among linguists two schools of thought. Those who reject the Greek affiliation of Macedonian prefer to treat it as an Indo-European language of the Balkans, located geographically and linguistically between *Illyrian in the west and Thracian in the east. Some, like G. Bonfante (1987), look towards Illyrian; others, like I. F. R. Russi (1938), towards Thraco-Phrygian (at the cost, sometimes, of unwarranted segmentations such as that of *αλιδοι to *αλιδο and *ηροκ). Those who favour a purely Greek nature of Macedonian as a northern Greek dialect are numerous and include early scholars like A. Fick (1874) and O. Hoffmann (1906).
macellum

scholars, like G. Harzdakis (1887, etc.) and above all J. Kallirès (1954 and 1976), have turned this assumption into a real dogma, with at times nationalistic overtones. This should not prevent us, however, from inclining towards this view.

For a long while Macedonian onomastics, which we receive relatively well thanks to history, literary authors, and epigraphy, has played a considerable role in the discussion. See also **PERSONAL, CRETE.** In our view the Greek character of most names is obvious and it is difficult to think of a *Helleneization* (see HELLENSEISM) due to wholesale borrowing. Παλινώκες is attested as early as Homer, Ἰλιόφως occurs next to the Mycenaean feminine a-κωσα-αδα-μα (Alexandria), Ἀδαμης, then Ἰλιόφως, matches the Cyprian Lawgos, etc. The small minority of names which do not look Greek, like Ἱλυσός or Ἀσαβάρθας, may be due to substratum or admixture influence (as elsewhere in Greece). Macedonian may then be seen as a Greek dialect, characterized by its marginal position and by local pronunciations. The main point is posed by names like Βορυκάθος for *Φούτσα* with a first element which is clearly Indo-European but which shows an apparent *(b)* treatment of Indo-European *(a)* in contrast with Greek *(ph)* *(Greek: 'to carry' Greek: ψηφο).* If the phenomenon is prehistoric, we may think in terms of a non-Greek Indo-European language which influenced Macedonian (Brixhe and Panayotou; Brixhe refers to the so-called Briges/Brukos, but it is also possible to argue, with Hatzopoulos, that we witness a later change from *(ph)* to *(f)* or *(v)* written β, since late forms like ἱλιοφως for ἵλιοφως or Βόρυκαθος for Βόρυκαθος, which are clearly Greek, point to an exchange between *(v)* written π and *(f)* written φ in the local dialect (and in some parts of Thessaly). The discovery at *Πελά* of a curse tablet (4th cent. BC) which may well be the first Macedonian* text attested reveals a number of features which link Macedonian to North-West Greek (Locritan, Aitolian, Phocian, Epictote), including the adverb δίδηκεν which cannot be Thessalian (SEG 43.434). Nevertheless there may be Thessalian features in our texts, such as the patrimonymic adjectives in -κος/-κος which we must wait for new discoveries, but we may tentatively conclude that Macedonian is a dialect related to North-West Greek with some Thessalian features. See CRETE LANGUAGE; DIALECTS, CRETE (PREHISTORY).


**OMA/AMDA**

**Machon** See MACHON AND FIDES, ROME.

**Machon** and **Podoalites**, sons of *Asclepius* and physicians already in *Homer*, but sons of *Poseidon* in the *Iliad* (see EPIC CYCLE). In II. 2, 731–3, they lead the contingent from *Trico* in *Thessaly* (focus of the later center of Asclepius), *Ithome*, and *Oechalia*. Their names have an epic ring, *Magis* being *Warriors*, *Toda-* *leipos* apparently *Lily-foot*. Machon tends *Meneaus* (II. 4, 200–19), but is also active as a fighter and is wounded by *Paris* (II. 11. 505–20); Podoalites is too busy in the battle to tend *Bryophytes* (II. 11. 816). Their further feats at *Troy* consist mostly of healing or fighting: they heal *Philoctetes* (Soph. *Philo* 1333 f.; other sources name only one of them), Machon is killed by *Bryophytes* (*Little Blad* fr. 30 Bernabé), Podoalites survives the war and settles in one of several places, especially in *Caria* or southern *Italy*. They had a cult, both separately (Machon at

Gerenia in *Messenia*, Paus. 3. 26. 9; Podoalites an *onooche* in *Daunia* (see *Dauniae*), on Monte Gargano, Lycoph. *Alex. 1047* and together, generally with their father.

**Parnell, Hero-Curtis, S. J. and E. Edekestein, Asclepius A Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies (1945).**

**Machon**, New Comedy poet and raconteur, born at *Corinth* or *Sicyon* but resident in *Alexandria* (1), where he staged his comedies about the middle of the 3rd cent. BC. From his epitaph by *Dioscorides* (1) (Ath. 3. 341 f., Anth. Pal. 7. 708 = 24 Gow–Page, HIL) *'Ο city of Cecropes, sometimes on the banks of the Nile too the purgant thyme has grown in the garden of the Muses*—it has been inferred (city of *Cecropes* is Athens) that Machon revived the keen inventive of Old Comedy in Alexandria (cf. fr. 21 Gow), but the two surviving comic fragments belong rather to the style of Middle or New Comedy, which was not devoid of pungency. See COMEDY (GREEK), OLY, MIDDLE NEW.

Machon also composed in iambic trimeters a book of anecdotes (pistai see CHIRIA) about the remarks and behaviour of notorious Athenian courtiers, parasites, etc. (462 lines, mainly scurrilous, preserved in Ath. 13).


**WGA**

**Macrinius** See PUDICUS KINOS MACRINIUS, T.

**Macrinus** See OPUBILUS MACRINUS, M.

**Macro** See SUTOXUS MACRIO, Q. NARSUS CORBUS.

**Macrobius** (RJ 7), *Ambrosius Theodosius*, wrote (1) *De verborum Graeci et Latinis differentiis vel societatibus*, (2) *Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis*, (3) *Saturnalia*, in MSS of (2) and (3) styled vir clarissimus et illustris (the highest grade of senator); in the dedications of (1) and of *Avianus* falsly simply *Theodosius* (the correct short form) and hence identical with Theodosius, praetorian prefect of Italy in AD 430 (Cameron, see bibliography below), rather than with Macrobius, proconsul of Africa in 410 (Plarrant); father of P. Macrobius Plotinus Eustathius, city prefect c. 441, dedeceasee of (2) and (3); grandfather of Macrobius Plotinus Dusidius, who corrected a text of (2).

(1) *De differentiis*. This treatise, addressed to a Symmachus (the orator *Symmachus* (*2*)'s grandson, consul 446), comparing the Greek verb with the Latin, survives in extracts made at Bobbio and more extensively by Erbuta; it uses *Apollonius* (1) Dyscolus and may have been used by *Pirianc. Another Biboio fragment (*De verbo), addressed to a scholar called Severius, comparing the Latin verb with the Greek, is not Macrobius' work, though possibly based on it.

(2) *Commentarii*. Having discussed how Cicero's *Repubblica* differs from *Plato* (*1*), and what *dreams* are, Macrobius espouses the Somnium philosophically; discussing on number-cypristos, oracles, moral virtue, astroon, music, geography, and the *soul* (vindicating Plato against *Aristotle*); he praises E. *Cornelius Scipio Aemilius for uniting all the virtues, and the Symmarchus for uniting all the branches of philosophy. The main source is *Porphyry*, in particular his commentary on *Timaeus*; but direct knowledge of *Plotinus* has been established. Despite frequent inconsistences and misapprehensions, the work was a principal transmitter of ancient science and Neo-Platonic thought to the middle Ages. See NEOPATISMOS.

(3) *Saturnalia*. This work is cast in the form of dialogues on the evening before the Saturnalia (16 December, see SANTURALS, NTVNAALE) of AD 433 (2) and during the holiday proper. The guests
pre-alphabetic scripts (Greece)

(1) Invocation. The god is addressed with his (cult) name(s), patronymic, habitual residence, functions, and qualities. This part serves both to identify and to glorify the god. (2) The argument (in older literature called δίκαιο επίκαιον), consisting of considerations that might persuade a god to help, e.g., a reminder of the praying person’s acts of piety, or a reference to the god’s earlier beneficences or his natural inclination to help people. This part often expanded into a eulogy with narrative aspects, especially in ἁγνομ. (3) The prayer proper, the petition. For the great majority of both private and public prayers contains a wish. There is a large variation in ‘egocentric’ motifs (‘Γεβανογίουςμας’). Drought, epidemics, or hail, for instance, can be prayed away (ἀνανεώσασθαι), but also passed on to enemies or neighbours (ἐκμακρυνθείσασθαι). This comes very close to the curse, which, too, may contain elements of prayer: the term ἄπλος (ἀπλός) denoted both prayer and curse. Although feelings of gratitude were not lacking, the prayer of gratitude was extremely rare. It did exist but instead of terms for gratitude (γάργαρη, γρατία) expressions of honour (μανή, ἐπανοϋ, λαύς) were generally employed, glorification being the most common expression of gratitude, as in human communication. Private prayer often lacked these formal aspects, but in public cultic prayer too very simple invocations occurred, e.g., in the famous Bleasian prayer (see Βλεάς): Ὁ χαίρε (Ταῖν, κον- ceive) Hippod. Haer. 5. 7. 34. 87 Wendland. There were also linguistically meaningless sounds which accompanied certain dances and processions and which could be interpreted as invocations of the god, such as olaolo, thythmbo, chothai, polion. They could even develop into the name of a god: the cry ἱθάμακε became the divine name ιθαμος. Most of our evidence for Roman prayer is late, preserved in Augustan (particularly Livy) and later writers.

Although Greek influence is noticeable, especially with respect to the formal aspects, Roman, and generally Italic, prayers (gregae) distinguished themselves by their elaborate accuracy. In order to summon the correct deity knowledge of divine names and use of precise language were crucial. Hence prayer books with traditional prayers were available for public ceremonies. If the precise identity of a god could not be ascertained, precautionary formulas such as quaequaque nomine (by whatever name) or vive deo (whether god or goddess) had to bring help. The latter formula is so stereotyped that the expression vive deo, vive dea on a series of coins (Degreve, ILLRP 129-1) and in the Acta Pristiae Arvalium (J. Scheid, Commentarii Pristiae Arvalium qui supervenit. Roma Antica 4 (1998) index s.v. vive) even seems to amalgamate into a new name of one deity, which should be written with a capital: SVEVECLEUSTESVAT. Doubt existed. Prayers for individual use were often equally formulaic (cf. Cato, Agr. 132. 2), but both officially and privately less elaborated prayers occurred as well, e.g., Mars vigilis (Mars, wake up!), Serv. at Aen. 8. 3).

Ancient prayer used to be spoken aloud. Silent or whispered prayer was reserved for offensive, indecent, erotic, or magical uses, but was later adopted as the normal rule in Christian practice. Kneeling down, though not unknown, was unusual, the gesture of entreaty being outstretched arms, with the hands directed to the god invoked (or his cult-statue).


pre-alphabetic scripts (Greece) Writing in the Aegean area appears to be a native growth, although no doubt inspired by earlier scripts used in Anatolia and Egypt. Apart from an isolated
Pre-socratic philosophy

The Phaestus Disk is an isolated document found in a Minoan context at Phaestus in Crete. It is almost certainly written in a syllabic script from right to left, but its place of origin is uncertain, and its relationship to the Minoan scripts doubtful. Any attempt at decipherment of such a small sample is bound to fail. See Greek language, and the next entry.


Precato terrae, Precato omni herbam, two short anonymous prayers of uncertain date to Mother Earth and to all herbs; the second may show Christian influence. Attempts to read these texts as Iambic semiarai have resulted in much misguided conjecture.

Texts: Ash. Lat. 4-5, Shackleton Bailey; with trans., Duff, Minor Lat. Poets.

Pre-Greek languages

The Greek language is known to have been well established in mainland Greece and Crete by the 13th century bc. But the presence of an earlier language in this area can be inferred from the classical place names, the majority of which are without meaning in Greek. In a few cases the resemblance to a Greek word may be fortuitous or the result of deliberate adaptation (e.g.  ἐνίξτρα,  ἔνωσις,  Ναυακάστρον; most inhabited sites with Greek names are of historical date (e.g.  Ναυακάστρον,  Μέγας Πελοπόννησος). The elements used in the Pre-Greek names can only be reliably identified if of sufficient length. The best examples are: (1)  ἐνίξτρα,  ἕνωσις as in  Καλλιάρτος,  Ζεσσέρφων; since this suffix is absent from Asia Minor, but -ένωσις is common there, it has been suggested that these have a common origin, but this cannot be proved. (2)  παρά (Attic and Boeotian -παρά) as  Παρασάρκων,  Αλακριασοῦς (Ἀλακριασοῦς,  Γαργαρίτης); this should be distinguished from  παρα (which is also Attic) as in  Καρφαλών,  Πιλαρής; (3)  νιπτό as in  Νιππόσ,  Νιθώσ,  Νιφέας; these may be connected with the ethnic names in  ἐνωσίς,  γενος as in  Δεμοκράτες,  ἐνώπιον. This conclusion is supported by the presence of a large number of words in the Greek vocabulary without known etymology, which may well be loan-words from a earlier language of the region. Many of them are the names of plants and animals native to the Mediterranean area, but they also include artifacts. Some of these are the same suffixes as the place names. (1) appears in e.g.  τυρόπυρις,  τυρόπυρις. Pre-Greek -tree',  ἄρτιφυες 'chick-pea',  ἄσφυες 'wormwood',  ἄπαυες  'bath' (Mycenean  ἀς-μα-τα),  λαβύρινθος  'labyrinth' (Mycenean  ἀς-ρητ-η-τα), (2) in  κεκυπτος (Attic  κεκυπτος) 'cypress',  καλακριαστος 'niche',  καλλιαρτος 'statue',  παρα 'piece used in games',  χνίπα 'fellow'; (3) in  νιπτο 'kind of wasp',  ιθνή 'cut',  σταθμό 'drag-net'.

Greek tradition knew of a pre-Greek people called *Pelagians (Πελάγιοι), but *Herodotus (1. 1, 37) declared himself unable to say what language they spoke. The name has in modern times been used for a hypothetical *Indo-European language reconstructed from these place names and loan-words, but this theory has not been generally accepted. Two theories are often mentioned though they cannot be demonstrated. First, it is suggested that some words which refer to plants, animals, etc. of the Mediterranean area like  ὁδός 'wine' (Mycenean  ὀδός),  Νιθώσ 'cypress', and are often found in more than one ancient language, may belong to a so-called Mediterranean substratum, i.e. to a non-Indo-European language which has left no direct evidence, but was widely spoken in the area. Second, it has been argued that there was an Anatolian (or Luwian) substratum in Greece since the *-ένωσις, and *-νιπτό suffixes of Greek match productive Anatolian suffixes in -enosis and -enud, and there are even whole matching names: the Anatolian place name  Παρασάρκων is close to Greek  Παρασάρκων, but, while in Greek the word has no etymology, in Anatolian (or Luwian) pan means "house" or "temple" and *-enosis indicates belonging.

We have direct evidence of a Pre-Greek language or languages in Crete. The bronze age inscriptions in Hieroglyphic Cretan and Linear A (see Pre-Alphabetic Scripts (Greece)) are evidently not in Greek, but their language cannot yet be reliably identified. At a later date a few alphabetic inscriptions are known from eastern Crete in a non-Greek language conventionally called Eteocretan. A famous stele from *Leumos contains an early alphabetic inscription in a language which appears to have affinities with Brusitan (e.g. *ARIAT = Hr. avit's 'years'). This has been taken as confirmation of the story in Herodotus (1. 94) that the Brusitans (Τρισσόντες) were an offshoot of the Lydians (see Etruscan Language). In *Cyprus there are 2 millennium bc inscriptions in the undeciphered Cypro-Minoan script(s), which are not likely to be in Greek; in classical times there are syllabic inscriptions from *Amathus which are certainly not Greek. Their language is conventionally referred to as Eteocypriot.

J. Chadwick, Greek and Pre-Greek, Thuro, Philos. Soc. 1949, 80-98; J.-L. Garcia-Ramos, New Paths 11 (2007) 'Pre-Greek languages'.

Prejudice

See: Homouniformity, Intolerance, Intellectual, and Religious Factor, Race, Sexism (Pagans), Anti-; Womem.

Pre-socratic philosophers, thinkers who lived not later than *Socrates. See e.g. Anaxagoras; Anaximander; Anaximenes (1); Atomism; Eudocitus; Empedocles; Heracleitus (1); Hippas (1); Leucippus (3); Parmenides; Pythagoras (1); Sophistes; Thales; Xenophanes; Zeno (1).

Pre-socratic philosophy

Philosophy before *Plato comprises: (a) *Socrates; (b) the *Sophists (roughly contemporary with Socrates); (c) two centuries of thinkers from *Thales (early 6th cent. bc) to *Democritus (late 5th cent.), many of whom were enquiring into *Nature. The period, ending with Socrates—although a few thinkers were younger than Socrates—is generally known as Pre-socratic philosophy.

The classification makes sense because many problems relating to the sources and texts are common to all the thinkers up to the time of Socrates. Some of them wrote little or nothing. Those who did compose in verse or prose may also have delivered the same or other teaching orally. All the written texts are lost and have been reconstructed (where possible) using quotations from
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pronunciation, Greek

The main features of the pronunciation of ancient Greek may be established through the study of contemporary documents, literary texts, spelling mistakes, puns, grammarians' statements, etc. (see pronunciation, Latin). In many points we may claim only approximate accuracy, but it is certain that the pronunciation of ancient Greek was different from that of Modern Greek and also differed from most modern scholarly pronunciations which inevitably show the influence of national traditions and the scholar's first language. What follows mostly refers to Classical (late 5th cent. BCE) Attic written in the Ionic alphabet (see alphabet, cause) and offers a traditional view of Attic pronunciation different from that of those scholars like Theodorson who believe that by the 4th century BCE, this had already advanced a great deal further in the Modern Greek direction.

A. Vowels and diphthongs

Attic had five short and seven long vowels: [a, i, y, e, o, a, i; i, y, e, o, o, o]. Square brackets and symbolism refer to phonetic transcriptions. Note that there are different conventions in transcription and e.g. short [a] may be indicated by [a] or [i]; long [a] by [a] or [i]. Also, in what follows, [e] = [E] × [E] × [E]; [o] = [O] × [O]; [y] = [Y].

1. Three letters indicated both short and long vowels: a, o, O. Of these [a] and [o], written a, were central or more likely, slightly froneted vowels (for the quality cf. a in Italian or in Northern English cat); [i] and [e], written i, were high front vowels similar in quality to French i and to the vowel of Eng. see. In Attic, in part of Ionic, etc., a represented [y] and [y], i.e. front vowels with lip-rounding similar to French u or German ü. Other dialects used the same symbol to indicate [a] and [a], back vowels similar to German u and the vowel of Eng. long. [O] and [o], written o, were "open" vowels, [O] and [o], written o, were "long" vowels.

2. In Ionic and Attic there was a long open e-vowel [e] written [e] (cf. in French marse) as well as a closer counterpart [e] (cf. French fête). This was originally written e, but by the end of the 5th cent. BCE a digraph ex was used (see below). The letter ω indicated [o], a long open back vowel (cf. French fort), whose close counterpart [o] (cf. French bon) was written first with e and then with the digraph ex. Later on (c. 250 BCE) the pronunciation changed to [u] still written ex. The equivalent short mid vowels were written e and o, the exact quality is uncertain—presumably higher than that of [e] and lower than that of [o].

3. In the history of Greek diphthongs tend to disappear. By the end of the 5th cent. BCE Attic had changed the original diphthongs [ei] (e.g., written a o, into long vowels [e] × [o]; this explains the use of the digraphs for long vowels (see above). The diphthongs [ai] [o] (as in Eng. my and boy), which were written a and a, survived longer but at a much later stage [a] changed into [e] and still later [o] into [y]. Similar changes had occurred in Bocotian many centuries earlier. The [au] and [au] diphthongs, written a and a, were preserved all through the Classical period; the second element was [u] and not [y]. The status of [u] is not clear but in Attic it occurs before vowel only; before consonant it had been replaced by [y], written u.

4. The long diphthongs a, a, a, a, a, a, a, a were probably pronounced with a later onset of the glide and were unstable. The element was lost in pronunciation, if not in spelling, by the...
second or first century AC. Spellings like φ, ψ, ρ with iota subscript are a Byzantine innovation.

Later developments. In Modern Greek the significant distinctions of quantity have disappeared though stressed vowels tend to be long: ω, ο, ω, α, α, α are all pronounced [i]. The second element of the α-diphthongs turned into a fricative [i] or [y] according to the sound that followed. Most of these changes were probably complete by the early Byzantine period.

B. Consonants. 1. The letters κ, τ, χ and δ, γ indicated voiceless and voiced stops of the bilabial, dental, and velar series: [p b k d g] as in French p, t, 'hard' c, d, 'hard' g. It is likely that [d] (and [n]) were dental and not alveolar as in English t c n s. A set of voiceless aspirates ([pʰ], [tʰ], [kʰ]) were written with ϕ, θ, χ, cf. the southern English pronunciation of p in pin and such words as top-hat.

2. The labial and dental nasals [m, n] were indicated by μ and ν (cf. French m and n). A velar variant of the latter sound (cf. [ŋ] in Eng. thin) was found before velar sounds and was frequently, though not exclusively, indicated with γ (as in εγγυηθένη), which in this use was called φυγα by the grammarians. Greek ρ, ρ, was probably a voiced roll tip-tongue sound, similar to Italian r or Scottish r. The initial variant (φ) was probably voiceless ι indicated a dental lateral sound [l] as in English leave and ε a voiceless dental sibilant [s]; cf. French son and Eng. see where, however, [ε] is alveolar. A voiced variant [λ] was found before voiced consonants.

3. The rough breathing (') indicated a breathed glottal fricative (like English h) found at the beginning of some words before vowel, the smooth breathing ("), first used by the Alexandrian grammarians, indicated its absence.

4. Three letters indicated consonantal clusters. The value of ζ was disputed and probably varied from dialect to dialect; in Classical Attic it indicated a [zd] cluster but at various stages it may have corresponded to an affricate [dz]. However as early as the 4th cent. AC Attic shows signs of a pronunciation [zed] or [ζ]. ξ and η represented the clusters [kζ] and [ηζ] respectively.

5. Some dialects still knew the voiced semivowel [w], similar to English w, which was expressed by the letter r (digamma) and which had disappeared in Attic. A voiceless variant of it may underlie the spelling θ found in some inscriptions.

The spellings α, ξ, ρ, etc. indicated long or geminate stops and continuants [pp] etc., similar to those of modern Italian. In the case of Attic ττ corresponding to tonic or the real pronunciation, at least for the early period, is disputed.

Later developments. We have evidence from an early period for the tendency of the voiced and aspirated stops to place itself into continuants; the full change, however, took place only in the imperial and early Byzantine period. θ, δ, χ came to indicate [θ] (like English f), [θ] (like Eng. th in thing), [θ] (like ch in Scottish loch); θ and δ indicated [y] and [d] (like th in Eng. other); [γ] (γ) was changed into [φ] (the voiced equivalent of [g] or [j]) (cf. y in Eng. yes). The long geminate consonants were lost and replaced by the corresponding non-geminate consonants.

C. Syllables. The ancient divided words into syllables and established rules for this division. From the point of view of metre what counts is the alternation of long (or heavy) and short (or light) syllables, but syllabic quantity should not be confused with vocalic quantity. All syllables which contain a long vowel or diphthong are long (ου, αυ), but syllables are also long if they contain a short vowel and a final consonant, i.e. if the vowel is followed by more than one consonant (the first syllable of άγος is light, that of άγος heavy, but in both forms [α] is short). In contrast with Latin, the distribution of the Greek accent is determined by the length of vowels, not of syllables.

D. Accent. 1. Much of our information on the nature of the Greek accent comes, directly or indirectly, from the ancient grammarians. The early Greek accent was one of pitch, i.e. the prominence given within the word to the accented syllable was obtained through a rise of the pitch, followed by falling pitch; differences of stress, if present, were not a relevant factor and it has also been argued that stress had a distinct independent from that of high pitch (Allen). The date at which the 'musical' or pitch accent was replaced by an accent like that of Modern Greek where stress is a primary component is not easy to establish. The change may have developed for a long time, but probably was completed by the end of the 4th cent. AC. Most modern pronunciations follow Modern Greek in replacing high pitch with stress; the 'elenchitic' pronunciation (still in use in England), which uses for Greek the same rules of accentuation as for Latin, ought to be rejected.

2. The Greek inscriptions did not normally indicate the word accent or even the division of words (see Epigraphy, Greek). For this and for the distinctions among the various kinds of accent we depend on the information provided by ancient authors, by some papyri, and by the late manuscripts in which the accents are marked. Most words had one main accent but some so-called enclitic and proclitic elements (mostly pronouns or particles like το, εν, δ) formed an accentual unit with the word which preceded or followed (the rules cannot be discussed here). The rise in pitch was followed by falling pitch mostly on the next syllable, though sometimes on the second mora (unit/element) of a long vowel. The usual signs were first introduced by the *Alexandrian grammarians (possibly by *Aristophanes (2)), but the distinction between acute andgrave is already mentioned in *Plato (1) (Cra. 395). Of the three types of accent the acute (δέκτα) indicated a high pitch; according to one interpretation of a disputed passage by *Dionysius (7) of Halicarnassus (De comp. ver. 11), the range of voice in speaking from the highest to the lowest pitch was a fifth. The acute could rest on both short or long vowels or diphthongs; in the second case it is likely though not generally accepted, that the higher pitch concerned only the second mora of the vowel (=). In the ancient tradition all unaccented syllables were seen as bearing a grave accent (παίνει), which therefore indicated a lack of accentuation. The fact that an acute resting on the last syllable of a word was changed into a grave within a phrase (θεὸς but θεόν ἄλλον) is variously interpreted: loss of accent, partial lowering of pitch, purely graphic convention, etc. Note, however, that this use of the grave is relatively late; the papyri prefer spellings like καλὸς ἀνήρ (for καλὼς ἄνηρ), σάρκωμα (for σαρκωμά), etc. The circumflex (περίεργα), found only on long vowels or diphthongs and, as the original sign indicates, represents a high pitch on the first mora followed by a falling pitch on the second (χρήσις = χρήσις in other words it is a combination of an acute and a grave (ή ρήσεως, according to another terminology).

3. The Greek accent was different from Latin in that it was free, i.e. its position was not determined merely by phonological rules, but also by a number of different factors: grammatical, lexical, etc. Yet, as in Latin, the accent was limited to one of the last three syllables of a polyysyllabic word. In Greek further limitations depended on the quantity of the vocalic element of the last syllable. If this was short, an acute could be found on any of the last three syllables; if the penultimate syllable was long and carried the accent in Attic that had to be a circumflex. If the last vocalic element was long, the accent had to rest on one of the last two syllables and if it was on the penultimate could only be an acute.