

ΦΩΝΗ ΕΛΛΗΝΩΝ: IDEOLOGY OF FRAGMENTATION IN THE SCHOLARSHIP OF ITS DIACHRONIC ANALYSIS

LEO PAPADEMETRE

From a contemporary linguistics metrical theory perspective, the change of quantitative-to-qualitative-based rhythm in the prosodic system of Ελληνικά – during and after the so-called "classical period" of its development – reflects a *transfer of quantity* within the structural domains of the phonological syllable. This type of transfer is linguistically "natural" and universally observable. However, "classics"-historical linguistics scholarship tends to ascribe to this natural process of shift a most catastrophic fate. Considering the basic tenet of the interface of the theory of linguistics and poetics that "the ubiquity and mutual implication of verb and verbal act impart a seminal unity to the two inseparable universals, language and poetry" (Jakobson 1979: 230), the present discussion seeks to open a dialogue with all those linguistic analyses on the evolution of Hellenic speech which claim to use contemporary linguistic methods of analysis but whose overt/covert ideology of fragmentation and entropy advances an argument of *stasis*, maintaining a "classics-canonical" *status quo*.

1. Background to the *linguistic issue at hand*

Central among the Hellenic diachronic linguistics issues has been the analysis of the phonological and prosodic changes of Ελληνικά from the fifth century BCE to almost the end of the fifth century ACE as observed and studied through classical and post-classical texts and fragments, in contemporary inscriptions and later in papyri. Especially relevant to this discussion has been the perceived "fundamental change" in the metrical system between the so-called "Classical and Modern periods" of Ελληνικά which is associated with the so-called "loss of vowel quantity distinction" in the phonological system of the language during its classical period (Allen 1968 & 1987, Caragounis 1995, Devine & Stephens 1994, Garantoudis 1989, Gignac 1976, Maas 1929, West 1982).

However, although this "change in quantitative distinction" in phonological and prosodic terms reflects a process shift in the nature of the vocalism and rhythm system of the Hellenic language, the way the received 'classics-linguis-

tics' scholarship has been analysing this natural evolution is indicative of the ideology many scholars adhere to, which fragments ελληνικά into 'areas of study' and thus has established two distinct linguistic periods, "classical vs. post-classical" with an artificial scientific divide between them. This ideological attitude in scholarship seems to have had its genesis in the in-famous debate on the Erasmian pronunciation which first appeared in Europe around 1528 and has exerted a significant influence even on linguistics scholars of Ελληνικά ever since.

Chrys Caragounis in his 1995 article "*The Error of Erasmus and Un-Greek Pronunciations of Greek*" characteristically indicates the determining criteria used by Erasmian-faithful linguists even today to support their canonical insistence on a re-constructed pronunciation of Ελληνικά and, by inference, to continue dividing the SPEECH of the Hellenes:

"More recent Erasmians avoid the inscriptions (particularly the earlier ones) – the primary evidence for the pronunciation of Greek – and seek, instead, to establish the pronunciation of Greek chiefly by phonetic speculation and comparative philology (for example, W. S. Allen, *Vox Graeca*, 1968, 1987). Thus, in addition to Latin, English, German, French, Norwegian, Lithuanian, Hungarian, Persian, Sanskrit, Gothic, Slavic, Armenian, etc. are all used in the effort to determine the pronunciation of classical Greek, but strangely enough Byzantine and Modern Greek are almost completely left out of account! It thus becomes virtually a case of trying to establish the pronunciation of the English of Wyclif or Tyndale by setting aside Modern English and instead making use of all the other European languages. When Modern Greek is mentioned it is usually to illustrate its presumed distance from classical Greek. This strange methodology is here deemed misguided and lacking in scientific stringency..... The reference-point is (and was also for Erasmus) the living pronunciation of the Greek language, hence, how some scholars can discuss ancient Greek pronunciation by ignoring or setting aside the Modern Greek evidence is difficult to understand" (1995: 161-162).

Caragounis' reference to Allen's scholarship on the subject of Ελληνικά is important in the present discussion, because of the influence that VOX GRAECA has had on subsequent 'classics-linguistics' research since its appearance in 1968 which is still evident in Allen's 1987 article "*The Development of the Attic Vowel System: Conspiracy or Catastrophe.*"

For, Allen's often-quoted 1968 (revised in 1987) treatise reflects through its Latin title a covert element of the mediated view of Ελληνικά via latinate scholarship since the European Renaissance: VOX GRAECA, is the subject of his inquiry, not ΦΩΝΗ ΕΛΛΗΝΩΝ.

This is a learned attitude born in schools of ideology about 'other' cultures

examined from with-out, especially by those who consider 'others' "dead". An ideology which, firstly, does not reflect a scientific interest in the evolution of Hellenic Speech and of its speakers – constantly creating their multi-aspects of their culture over time – and secondly, an ideology seemingly unaware of the fact that, in its almost 80 years of development, contemporary linguistics scholarship has been discussing and analysing such systematic phenomena associated with qualitative vs. quantitative rhythm systems from various theoretical perspectives as natural, universal processes in the development of a phonological and metrical system of any given language (see Hogg R. & C.B. McCully 1987; Garantoudis 1989; Gignac 1976; Papademetre 1997a, 1990, 1983, 1982).

But this is not an isolated case; within the ranks of this 'classics-linguistics' scholarship there reigns a consistent insistence on entropic analysis of so-called "classical Greek" disregarding the systematic phonological and prosodic connections of all stages of the language's development that lead to contemporary, living Ελληνικά. Indicative of this inherited entropic attitude is how such scholars define the parameters of scientific discussion on the subject, prime example of which is Devine & Stephens in their recent authoritative book, *The prosody of Greek speech* (Oxford University Press 1994):

"The reconstruction of the prosody of a *DEAD* language, particularly those aspects for which the orthography provides no evidence, is prima facie an almost impossible undertaking. In the words of [Paul Maas] in one of the most popular handbooks on Greek metre,

" *Even an approximately correct pronunciation of Greek is impossible, particularly in respect of the musical accent...the same applies to rhythm*" (Maas, trans. by Lloyd-Jones, 1962: 55/56) .

In light of this rather gloomy prognostication, we decided to try a rather different methodology – a sort of archaeological laboratory phonology" (Devine & Stephens, 1994: vii).

In this impressive book of 565 pages of collated/correlated facts from research studies ranging from neurology, anatomy, psychology to poetics, musicology, and canonical 'classics', there is seldom a comparative reference to studies related to the analyses of the stages of development of Hellenic speech from pre-classical to modern times, the period, that is, of over 2500 years during which Ελληνικά, empirically and scientifically, has never stopped being a living language with numerous native speakers and writers. So, why this canonical insistence on regarding Ελληνικά as a "dead" language? On the basis of which linguistics (or 'other') theory of language death – or under which scientifically proven linguistic circumstances – the last speaker of Ελληνικά died?

In view of the evolutionary nature of Language and Culture universally, the burden of scientific proof regarding linguistic entropy lies with entropic scholars. For, 'classics-linguistics' scholars choosing to remain canonical in their Hellenic scholarship base their research and argumentation on an established ideology of fragmentation of the Hellenic language in water-tight compartments 'στεγανά επιστήμης' of taxonomic periods and subjectively-measured literary styles. They prefer to disregard scientifically the language's evolutionary systematicity as empirically manifested in the continuous existence of Hellenic speakers, writers, creators of a culture in constant development. The whole array of communicative functions over time, according to the scientific principles and criteria of contemporary linguistics, is conveniently considered peripheral to the restrictive concerns of a discipline often defended as "areally focused" by its constituency. Here is how Devine & Stephens justify their own adherence to the canon:

"There is an increasing recognition of the importance of a general theoretical perspective, even if formalised abstract theory construction is arguably inappropriate in an areally focused subject like Classics" (Devine & Stephens 1994: vii).

However, theirs is a self-proclaimed classics-*linguistics* scholarship! Should Devine & Stephens' weighty contribution to the Hellenic linguistics issues be also considered a result of an "areally focused" discipline, un-answerable to the vigour of contemporary linguistics argumentation, theory, and research? Why? In order to maintain a self-proclaimed 'signification' in a scientific discipline marked by ellipsis in its epistemology, or more tragically in its phenomenology, due to the continuous presence of the living Hellenic language & culture among any assorted, *Romantik*, fragments of European (re)-appropriated 'Culture'?

For, as their book proclaims, 'classics-linguistics' still focuses on Hellenic *Speech*, the subject matter of its scientific discourse; therefore, such scholarship cannot remain irrelevant to linguistics research, description, analysis, and explanation. Furthermore, scholars using linguistics theories of prosody and rhythm ranging from Lehiste (1970-1990) to Fujimura & Lovins (1978-1982) and Fant (1988-1991), or Liberman & Prince (1977) to Steriade (1982-1988) or Clements & Keyser (1983), cannot continue to advocate a "focused" analysis of a language that considers "dead", because, in all disciplines relying on *Language* to mediate their ideas on a given subject of scientific inquiry

"... it is *ideology* that determines which aspects of culture and language are considered major or minor and which practices are dismissed as exceptions that only prove the general moral rule" (Herzfeld 1983:162-3).

For, a hermetic-hermeneutical attitude in linguistic inquiry, reflecting a canon-

ically-inherited and adhered to ideology towards diachronic speech phenomena, remains un-scientific if its objectives remain related to and emanate from 'historically traditional' concerns of a 'received' discipline, be it 'classics' or 'linguistics'; if its credo is expressed overtly or covertly as follows:

Es stellt sich immer wieder die zentrale Frage: wie streng folgt hier oder dort der Autor diesen Regeln; das hängt ab von seinem 'Stil': ist er streng, klassisch, feierlich, – oder aber lässig, natürlich, unpräzise (Snell 1982:10).

{"The central question poses itself always, again & again : how strict does the author follow these rules here and there; that depends on his 'Style': is he strict, classical, celebratory, – or is he loose, natural, imprecise" }.

If 'classics-linguists' are still pre-occupied with standards of measuring and analysing "style" in poetics of any language, dead or alive, based on some still debated perceptions of "aesthetics", then, they should not claim to analyse Hellenic *Speech* based simply (and naively) on some selected fragments of eclectic specimens of poetic expression that has survived – and shelved as museum curiosities; for, all attempts at understanding the evolution of *speech* phenomena by examining poetic form entropically must face the scientific consequences of the laws of *physis* in particle-physics (a generative source of linguistic theory): the manipulative reciprocity between the observer and the observed from any synchronic stage, let alone form a distance of over 2000 years; especially when

" we lack here the most important prerequisite of all historical study; for we can never attain that kind of 'empathy' by which all other manifestations of the art, literature, science, philosophy, religion, and social life of the ancients are brought so near to us that they become an essential part of our own culture. This is so because from the first century AD onwards the purely quantitative rhythm gradually declined, so that it has now vanished not only from the literature, but from the speech of Europe. Our feeling for rhythm is altogether dominated by the dynamic rhythm of our own language and metric... We have no means of reading, reciting, or hearing Greek poetry as it actually sounded. It may be possible for us to form a mental notion of it; but such a notion is too shadowy to serve as a basis for the scientific investigation of the subject..." (Maas 1929, trans. by Lloyd-Jones 1962: 3-4).

Notice, however, that Maas also views the Hellenic language – and, by implication and inference, the whole Hellenic civilisation – from a distance and entropically; an ideological stance which continues to regard "dead" – and disassociated – his so-called "ancients" from any cultural and linguistic systemic connections of Ελληνικά before or after that isolated, taxonomised period of linguistic and cultural analysis. Thus, when attempted, the re-construction of that cut-off, "dead" fragment in the continuous systematicity of Hellenic lan-

guage and culture serves overtly or covertly the cultural objectives of a programmatic appropriation in creating a reflected 'heritage' in European Culture based on a subjective interpretation of what constitutes an advancement of linguistic science, and much less on what is not hegemonic but more inclusive orientation towards 'other' cultures and practices (see Papademetre 1997a for a further discussion).

Any analysis claiming to be concerned with the linguistic transformations in the *Speech* system of Hellenes, and the poetry it creates, but relying solely on the interpretation of selected written fragments of a consciously taxonomised era (cf. Caragounis 1995:161ff), ascribes to the encoded ideology of separation between the so-called "classical" from the "not-classical" development of Hellenic Speech. Such encoded ideology perpetuates an associated, subjectively hermeneutic analysis: namely, that the Hellenic Speech of that selected period is superior to any other period before or after.

Such un-scientific, linguistic assumptions reveal a disregard for the basic principle in linguistic science which demands that any *Speech* analysis, synchronic or diachronic, be based on all possible aspects of human communication, especially in those cultures where its people have been empirically found to be steadily negotiating creatively their world of ideas and their culture *in evolutionary linguistic terms*.

2. Inherent entropic ideology of fragmentation in two recent scientific analyses of Ελληνικά

Two relative recent linguistic analyses of Ελληνικά claim to use contemporary linguistics terminology and argumentation. Let us examine closely, under the magnifying glass of encoded ideology, whether they espouse in their view of the evolution of Speech, and more specifically Hellenic *speech*, the basic linguistic principle.

{A} W.S. Allen's 1987 article "*The Development of the Attic Vowel System: Conspiracy or Catastrophe*". In this article, Allen declares from the outset his inherited entropic ideology of separation in the scientific analysis of Ελληνικά in his discussion of what he calls "the anomalous vowel system of Attic Greek": "Since this system is the one enshrined in Attic literature of the 5-4 cent. BC, its familiarity could lead one to think of it simply in terms of the end-point of a series of preceding adjustments. It is, however, an anomalous and inherently unstable system in its lack of the high back short vowel, and may more appropriately be seen as a transient phase approximately half way in time

through a more comprehensive history from one relatively stable system to another; and it is this which justifies our consideration of further changes in the post-classical era" (Allen 1987: 25-26).

Embodied in such inherited view, there is the questionable linguistics position that "vowel stability" is based on assumed criteria of symmetry, a seriously contested issue in view of natural languages processes in linguistic research, including typology in language universals. Why a lack of a short [u] be viewed as a case of a-symmetrical, "anomalous", and "unstable" speech? For whom? The speaker who is still capable of communicating, or the observer who plots vowels on ideologically-motivated diagrams? Whose standards of measure are being used?

For even Allen, referring to his own formalisation of reconstructed vowel systems by diagrams – "traditionally of triangular or quadrilateral shape" –, has to concede that

"It has long been accepted that the positions as conventionally plotted on such diagrams do not accurately reflect the actual articulations;" (Allen 1987: 22).

However, he bypasses the inherent problem of formalisation of approximated phonetic physiology by making unwarranted references to "tongue movements".

"...the various historical shifts of position can sometimes be better illustrated and understood by plotting them in the framework of a continuous curve from high-front through low to high-back. It is also relevant to indicate in the shape of the diagrams the inherent physiological asymmetry between the front and back axes, reflecting the greater space available for tongue movement between the low and high position in the front buccal region as compared with the back (see e.g. A. Martinet, *Économie des changements phonétiques*, Berne 1955, pp. 98 f.)" (Allen 1987: 22).

However, a covert circularity in argumentation is revealed when the above unfounded physiological definition of (a)symmetry – used as a heuristic devise to justify the cause of change in the vowel system – is juxtaposed with the statements made by the researcher himself at the outset of his article, namely that

"symmetry need not imply immutability... [and] ...external factors were ...the cause of the first changes in the Proto-Greek system" (Allen 1987: 21).

For this proto-system, Allen continues (assuming the reader's familiarity with the received scholarship),

"we can confidently reconstruct a simple and symmetrical vowel system, comprising the five vowel qualities */i, e, a, o, u/, each with quantitative phonemic distinctions of short and long – a system virtually identical with that reconstructed for Proto-IE..." (Allen 1987: 21).

In other convenient words, the symmetry needed to justify the asymmetry of Attic is reconstructed as 'the origins' of the system and thus used as the Procrustean bed on which subsequent changes are measured. The irony in this scenario is that, in the end, the vowel system in the "enshrined Attic" is regarded not only "anomalous", "unstable" but "overcrowding" as well (p. 25), when compared to the "simple" but "symmetrical" vowel system of Allen's so-called "standard Modern Greek" (p. 21). So, if the living vowel system of Ελληνικά since Proto-Greek had ostensibly a period of "overcrowding", why is this diachronic observation still regarded NOT relevant to the entropic analysis of this 'classics-linguist'?

For, in the end, Allen in his analysis of this one isolated stage of Ελληνικά is forced to admit that

"... the uneasy feeling remains that in simply stating the individual stages of development, even with the benefit of immediate local explanations, one is missing some kind of more general rule" (Allen 1987: 31).

Nevertheless, loyal to the canonical ideology towards fragmentation of Ελληνικά, Allen chooses a terminal "adaptation of the theory of 'catastrophes'" in order to give credence to his insistence on entropic analysis of the language. He thus concludes his analysis by resorting to a theoretical perspective associated with the widely criticised 'theory of conspiracy' in phonological rules, as follows:

"In our case, the various types of local discontinuity are those described above for the individual changes affecting the Greek vowel system (simplification of consonant clusters, monophthongisation of diphthongs, etc.). As a result of these changes a state was eventually reached in which there coexisted an anomalous accentual system and an unbalanced vowel system; and the situation was resolved by the 'catastrophic' collapse of the latter, thereby effecting the normalisation of the former... Viewing the development in this way, we might speak not so much of a "Great Vowel Conspiracy" as of a "Great Accent Catastrophe" – of principled opportunism rather than strategic planning. The option would still remain, for those who favour an orthogenetic explanation, to view the antecedent local disruptions as part of a grand overall strategy, specifically designed to engineer the catastrophe in question; but that is a matter of personal philosophy" (Allen 1987: 32).

Thus, after we are told that both an attitude of 'conspiracy' or 'catastrophe' may do in regards to the evolution of Ελληνικά, we are ultimately warned that "personal philosophy" remains the order of many 'classics-linguists' day. But, 'philosophy', in its Hellenic etymological meaning, is NOT unrelated to ideology. The choice of "word" indicates the covert avoidance of the political ramifications prevalent in such linguistic discourse regarding the evaluation and

socio-economic ranking of European languages as "major" or "minor", reflecting unwittingly a marked attitude towards the ontological reciprocity of a language with the culture it has helped create and has been created by.

{B} But, if Allen continues a tradition of fragmentation and application of perceived rules via "principled opportunism", Devine & Stephens in their momentous book *The Prosody of Greek Speech* (Oxford University Press 1994), introduce their topic of "the development of the stress accent in Greek" in Chapter 5 as a case of multi-layered "erosion":

"The development of stress accentuation in Greek was part of a more general process of restructuring the entire prosodic system which also involved the loss of distinctions of vowel quantity and syllable weight (...Allen 1987b). This process began in less educated sociolinguistic strata, perhaps as early as the fourth century BC. in vulgar Attic (...Schmitt 1924, Drerup 1929). It was probably promoted by bilingual interference from languages lacking quantity distinctions and having stress accentuation, for instance by Coptic in Egypt (...Gignac 1976). The erosion of the old prosodic system did not penetrate extensively into the literary register until quite late, and then first among Christian writers of the early fourth century AD. such as Methodius, Areius and Gregory of Nazianzus, a large portion of whose audience probably spoke varieties of Greek devoid of the old prosodic system (Maas 1962), while learned writers continue to imitate the old system in their often successful attempts to write quantitative verse" (p. 215).

What are the ideological subtexts in this introduction? Firstly, that "less educated sociolinguistic strata ... as early as the fourth c. BC.", i.e. around the time of Plato and Aristophanes – or even when Praxiteles was carving his Hermes at Olympia –, the Hellenic people were already speakers of a phonological/prosodic system, named here "vulgar Attic" (as if all variations of Ελληνικά had become by then Attic) which presumably is at odds with the surviving written record, the focus of analysis and interpretation of these 'classics-linguists'. Secondly, that this "vulgar" speech of the common people was "probably promoted by bilingual interference from" other languages; thus a foreign influence infiltrated the purity of spoken-Attic, an invading, African influenza of sorts, was the culprit! Thirdly, that this "erosion" fortunately did not contaminate the "literary register" – the ΑΔΥΤΟΝ of classics raison d'être – until 800 years later!!!

The reference to Christian writers and their contribution to the spreading of the *nosema* is left open to ideological interpretation. Notice, however, Devine & Stephens' overt satisfaction at allowing in their hallowed canon those "learned writers", who seemingly against all cultural odds continued "to imitate

the old system", being often "successful" in their "quantitative poetry", the standard of poetic measure for these classics-linguists.

Is this science or patronising ideology? Is this scientific analysis of linguistically established data or canonical referencing? For, if we examine the epistemological premise of this book, we discover that

"... the premise of the method is that, although different languages have different prosodic systems, prosodic structure does not by and large vary cross linguistically in a random, unlimited and unpredictable fashion" (Devine & Stephens 1994: vii).

and compare it to the proposed merits of the "feedback loop" notion suggested by Devine & Stephens and embedded in their scholarly designed diagram of inter-related disciplines informing their project, we can clearly detect a circularity of argumentation at work:

"The diagram has a feedback loop between reconstruction of Greek, data collection and general prosodic theory, because existing theory is used to interpret new data and new data are used to test and refine existing theory, which in turn may indicate the need to collect further data" (p. vii).

How can these classics-linguists, however, be able to use "new data...to test and refine existing theory" when this theory is based on an *a priori* assumption of "death" attached as its own disclaimer-tag:

"The reconstruction of the prosody of a dead language, particularly those aspects for which the orthography provides no evidence, is *prima facie* an almost impossible undertaking" (p. vii).

This disclaimer not only reflects these scholars' ideology of adherence to received scholarship on the subject of evolution of the Hellenic sound system, entropic and static, but is further exposed as circular when these two scholars quote Edward Sapir's anthropological 'rule of thumb': "Study carefully the phonetic system of a language... and you can tell what kind of verse it has developed"; to which Devine & Stephens add agreeably their credo: "The converse is equally true" (p. viii).

In other words, these contemporary classics-linguists are caught in the circularity of their own argument. For, the logical sequence of their argument should be: "Study carefully the verse system of a language... and you can tell what kind of phonetics it has developed". This is not only a 'rule of scholarly thumb' which assumes, and therefore accepts *a priori*, again, that the poetic system of a language is equally dependent on the musical system which a language has developed, but more to their point of inference, that it is equally dependent on the rhythm of a living language, especially its vocalism which is the rhythm's bearer.

In linguistics we would call this a convoluted case of circular argumentation,

which is further complicated by Devine & Stephens when they attempt to answer their own question of

"...whether the coexistence in a single language of the rhythmic system reconstructed in Chapter 3 and the accentual system analysed in Chapter 4 is typologically suspect.... No really relevant typological support for the situation envisaged for Greek was afforded by pitch differentiated stress languages nor by the fact that tone languages can have a stress accent. However, when the function of pitch in word prosodic systems was systematically studied in a cross linguistic perspective, it emerged that a foot based system of rhythm can coexist with an independently patterned pure pitch accent. Whether the former can appropriately be called a stress system depends partly on what are assumed to be the phonetic exponents of rhythmic prominence in Greek (which is a substantive matter), and partly on what are assumed to be the general phonetic and phonological implications of calling a syllable stressed (which is largely a matter of terminology)" (p. 223).

Since the "substantive matter" is the assumptions made on what are "the phonetic exponents of rhythmic prominence", we should examine how Devine & Stephens regard Hellenic rhythm on the basis of syllable and feet structures, as follows:

"The basic contrastive elements of the rhythmic patterns of Greek speech are heavy and light syllables, or, more precisely, their rhymes... [Syllables are the] basic structural components of the rhythm of the language and consequently of everyday speech... There are some strong indications that feet, along with their definitional constituents thesis and arsis, are the basic structures into which syllables are organised in the rhythm of the Greek language (as in many other languages)" (p. 117-118).

Therefore, if indeed there are "strong indications" for such overall organisational structures of rhythm in Ελληνικά (and cross-linguistically), why do these researchers cannot accept the process nature of the possible third case of the two "systems" – "a foot based system of rhythm" and "an independently patterned pure pitch accent" – having co-existed in the diachronic development of the Hellenic language? Is it because their canonical, static view of "classical-Greek" would thus be tainted by the corollary aspect of process, dynamic form, *polumorfiva*? Or is it because such a natural linguistic probability would force classics scholarship to widen their self-established boundaries of research and to start examining anew the linguistic and cultural periods that preceded and followed their isolated taxonomic period of entropic inquiry from the whole corpus of Ελληνικά?

Because the "substance" in the question all classics-linguists are called to address is precisely a matter of scientific ideology based on a dynamic, process

view of Hellenic prosody which, if accepted exposes the static and entropic view that "classics" has imposed on research of Hellenic prosody, phonology, rhythm, metre and "everything else classical and presumed dead".

Thus, the following ontological questions are pertinent to all linguists of Ελληνικά:

(1) For how long still will linguistics scholarship condone the *status quo* in the diachronic analysis of Ελληνικά based on circularity and entropic mentality of classics-linguists?

(2) For how long still will linguistics scholarship condone the ideology of maintenance and adherence to dependence-upon-dependence style of argumentation which is based on culture-specific-dictums like: either "In the Beginning was the Word", or "In the Beginning was Rhythm"?

(3) For how long can linguistics scholarship, Hellenic, or Universal, be subjected to a hermeneutics ideology based on culturally-acquired determinism on human behaviour of human sound with its culture-specific, ascribed inferentiality to the creation or demise of the civilisation which has engendered it?

3. Platonic closure (...in the manner of...)

In the end, we still need to address scientifically the integrated linguistics questions: what is linguistically connecting all periods in the evolution of the language spoken by Hellenes since they started recording graphologically (and later audio-magnetically) their world of ideas? This is the *substantive matter* of scientific inquiry on this issue and should be the main focus of informed discussion in Hellenic linguistics. Because, if there was one or two or more *strophes* in the Hellenic language system in its long history of continuous existence, that is a matter of objective scientific examination, analysis, and interpretation; but, when any strophe is interpreted as a "KATA-strophe", or worse *Entropy* occasioning the "collapse and erosion" of a whole civilisation, this can only be a personal, subjective perspective based on a scholar's ideology on the interplay between a system of culture and its expression through verbalisation, its complete language system.

Furthermore, if the basic tenet of the interface of the theory of linguistics and poetics is accepted that

"the ubiquity and mutual implication of verb and verbal act impart a seminal unity to the two inseparable universals, language and poetry" (Jakobson 1979: 230)

then, the prosody in Hellenic poetry must be regarded as naturally reflecting the Hellenic language's phonetic/phonological, rhythmical/metrical system in

its diachronic development and in its totality in dynamic terms of continuous evolution in many different parts of the country, not only in Attica¹.

For, the diachronic evolution of the language's prosodic system reflects a fundamental perception/production principle in action: relative rhythm, i.e. correlated ascending-descending sonority based on syllable structure whose rhyme has been differentiated structurally (with or without nucleus extension) as the result of the distinction or not in vowel quantity in all spoken forms used in many localities by many people, simultaneously (as is the case in synchronic situations). This structural flexibility and specificity in the syllable's rhyme (with or without nucleus extension) has been the marked characteristic of relative rhythm in Hellenic speech diachronically, governing the phonology, rhythm and metre of Ελληνικά past and present (see details in Papademetre, 1990).

A detailed and systematic diachronic investigation in structural terms will establish linguistically that the relative rhythm principle is still fundamental in composing Hellenic poetry, because it is based on this prosodic differentiation of syllable structure centred on the vocalic rhyme². In its evolution, the basis of differentiation in the language's rhythm for the purpose of communication among its speakers, its ρυθμική in speech and its reflection in poetry/music, shows a gradual transfer during the period between late 6th century BCE to early 5th century ACE: from dependence on the rhythmic interplay between rhymes with or without extended nuclei (which creates a pitch-based, quantitative prosody, cf. spoken Bengali) to dependence on rhythmic interplay between rhymes themselves whose relative prominence is expressed on a weak/strong continuum of stress/loudness in syllables (which creates a stress-based, qualitative prosody, cf. spoken Ελληνικά).

Nevertheless, the underlying principle of the language's basic rhythm has been maintained: step-like [κλιμακωτή], ascending-descending relative sonority of syllable sequences. The basic carrier of that rhythm, the rhyme that carried the communicative meaning of rhythm, has simply evolved [μετατοπίστηκε] from the syllable's nuclei (quantitative relation) to the syllable's rhymes (qualitative relation) (Papademetre 1990).

-
1. According to Caragounis 1995, and orthographically speaking, the systemic changes have been reflected in the written language found in contemporary use in inscriptions from as early as late-sixth century BCE and continue to be manifested until late-second century ACE.
 2. In the words of Massimo Peri: "in the last fifty years, Greek poetry has become the focus of intensive research, if we try to take stock of metrical & linguistic studies we find ourselves facing a desert. There has been no attempt at systematising theory and terminology; there has been no contribution to the study of birth and history of metrical forms, with the notable exception being the research on the problem of origins of *dekapentasyllavos*" (see "Introduction" in Garantoudis, 1989).

Does this natural sound evolution mean "death" of a language and a civilisation? According to whose hermeneutics? Would quantitative language (poetry/music) be considered "better" than qualitative? By whom? On what scientific basis? Developed for what natural phenomena, by which natural scientists, based on what ideology on the interface between Language and Culture?

For if I am dead	so are
so is	our desires ³
science	to connect
linguistics	with the rhythm of
classics	ΕΛΛΑΣ

Γιατί
 Κι αν σπάζουμε τ' ΑΓΑΛΜΑΤΑ ΤΩΝ
 δεν αποθνήσκουν οι Θεοί...
 ΟΙ ΕΛΛΗΝΕΣ
 ΥΜΝΟΥΝΕ⁴

L. Papademetre
School of Languages-Modern Greek
Flinders University of South Australia

REFERENCES

Allen, W.S. 1987: "The development of the Attic vowel system: Conspiracy or catastrophe". In J. T. Killen, J. L. Melena & J.-P. Olivier (eds.), *Studies in Mycenaean and Classical Greek, presented to John Chadwick*. MINOS, Revista de Filologia Egea, 20-21 (Universidad de Salamanca, Universidad Pais Vasco-Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea) 21-32.

-
3. O. Elytes: "One day, perhaps, computers counting the sequence of vowels and consonants in all possible combinations will "nail down" somewhere that magic combination which the poet's aesthetic sense captured instantly. It would be, though, let us admit it, a murder of sorts. For those who unveil *The Goddess* do not go unpunished; nor would they achieve much. On the contrary, those who try the opposite path and rely on the symbolism of icons will be ridiculed". "E Methodos tou ARA" *Hartis*: Bi-monthly Review of Literature and the Arts, 21-23. Athens 1986.
 4. C. P. Cavafy: "the composition of verse is the grammar of poetry" quoted in the article "Grammatical Imagery in Cavafy's poem Θυμήσου, Σώμα.." by R. Jakobson & P. Colacides. *Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry*" Roman Jakobson 1981: 582-590.

- Allen, W.S. 1987³: *Vox Graeca* (Cambridge: University Press).
- Allen, W.S. 1973: *Accent and rhythm* (Cambridge: University Press).
- Caragounis, C.C. 1995: "The error of Erasmus and un-Greek pronunciations of Greek". *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 8, 151-185.
- Devine, A.M. & Stephens, L.D. 1994: *The prosody of Greek speech* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Dihle, A. 1954: "Die Anfänge der griechischen akzentuierenden Verskunst". *HERMES-Zeitschrift für Klassische Philologie* 82, Heft 2.
- Garantoudis, E. 1989: *Archaia kai Nea Hellenike metrike*. Studi Bizantini e Neogreci, fondati da Filippo Maria Pontani. Quaderni 21, Università di Padova (see also this book's review by B. D. Joseph in the *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 9:1, 1991).
- Gignac, F. T. 1976: *A Grammar of the Greek papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods*, Vol. I: Phonology (Milano: Instituto Cisalpino-La Goliardica).
- Herzfeld, M. 1983: "Semantic slippage and moral fall". *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 1, 161-172.
- Hogg, R. & McCully, C.B. (eds.) 1987: *Metrical phonology* (Cambridge: University Press).
- Jakobson, R. 1979: "Language and poetry". In R. Jakobson & L.R. Waugh, *The sound shape of language* (Boston: Harvester Press).
- Jakobson, R. 1981: *Linguistics and poetics*. Selected writings III (The Hague/Paris/New York: Mouton Publishers) 29ff.
- Maas, P. 1929: *Griechische Metrik*. Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft, Band 1, Heft 7 (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Maas, P. 1962: *Greek metre* (trans. by H. Lloyd-Jones) (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Papademetre, L. 1990: "The diachronicity of the metrical system in Modern Greek dialectology" {in Greek}. In *Studies in Greek linguistics-Supplement*, Proceedings of the 10th Annual Meeting, May 1989, Department of Linguistics (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis Publishers).
- Papademetre, L. 1983: *Vowel deletion and cluster simplification: A window to constraints and therapies in syllable structure* (Brown University: Ph.D. Thesis, University Microfilms International, Nr 8228314, Ann Arbor, Michigan).
- Papademetre, L. 1982: "Metrical structure and its interaction with vowel deletion in the northern dialects of Modern Greek". *North-Eastern Linguistics Society* 12 .
- Schwyzler, E. 1950-53: *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage Karl Brug-*

manns Griechischer Grammatik. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 2.1
(München: C. H. Beck).

Snell, B. 1982: *Griechische Metrik* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

West, M.L. 1982: *Greek metre* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

West, M.L. 1987: *Introduction to Greek metre* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).