

Christos CLAIRIS

Editeur

RECHERCHES
EN LINGUISTIQUE GRECQUE

I

*Actes du 5^e Colloque international de linguistique grecque
Sorbonne, 13–15 septembre 2001*

ΓΛΩΣΣΟΛΟΓΙΚΕΣ ΕΡΕΥΝΕΣ
ΓΙΑ ΤΗΝ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ

I

*Πρακτικά τού 5^{ου} Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Ελληνικής Γλωσσολογίας
Σορβόννη, 13–15 Σεπτεμβρίου 2001*

L'Harmattan
5-7, rue de l'École-Polytechnique
75005 Paris
FRANCE

L'Harmattan Hongrie
Hargita u. 3
1026 Budapest
HONGRIE

L'Harmattan Italia
Via Bava, 37
10214 Torino
ITALIE

Jim DAVY

University of Cyprus, Nicosia

Anna PANAYOTOU

University of Cyprus, Nicosia

Les auteurs développent le procédé que Brian Newton¹ a décrit comme gémation spontanée en grec chypriote. S'inscrivant pour l'essentiel dans la tradition française 'expressive', Newton a examiné ce procédé comme typiquement familier et affectif. Pour nous, il faut d'abord distinguer entre longueur expressive facultative et gémations phonologiques obligatoires, les secondes uniquement en position intervocalique. Sont présentées ici sommairement trois catégories d'origine phonologique, avec des implications sur leur chronologie.

1. Introduction

This is the first of two papers on aspects of Brian Newton's account of 'spontaneous' gemination² in Cypriot Greek – instances of consonantal gemination that he viewed as neither original to ancient Greek nor accountable in terms of borrowing, analogy or regular phonological change (eg, in his transcription: /yallín/ 'glass', /appékso/ 'outside', /čímman/ 'wave', /mútti/ 'nose', /séllenon/ 'celery'). Newton noted close similarities in the present lexical distribution of such phenomena in the dialects of Cyprus, many islands of the Dodecanese, and Chios, together with evidence of earlier extension over perhaps the greater part of non-mainland Greece, where presumably it predated geminate simplification. 'As simplification itself seems to have occurred sporadically on the mainland a couple of centuries BC...spontaneous gemination is clearly of very early origin.'

In the present paper we explore Newton's confusion of phonological gemination with merely emphatic lengthening, which

¹Brian Newton, 1968, Spontaneous gemination in Cypriot Greek, *Lingua*, Amsterdam, North-Holland, Vol. 20, p. 15-57.

²On the phonological grounds for his use of the term 'gemination', see Brian Newton, 1972, *Cypriot Greek*, The Hague, Mouton, p. 32-3; cf. also in part Georgios Tserdanelis, Amalia Arvaniti, 2001, The acoustic characteristics of geminate consonants in Cypriot Greek, *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*, Nicosia, September 1999, Thessaloniki, University Studio Press, p. 29-36, and references there.

has since 1968 hindered insight in this area. Reorganising the available data accordingly, we then briefly present three major motivational categories, with tentative historical implications (to be discussed more fully in the second paper). Essentially, our account is based on Newton's data, checked and expanded in terms of majority attestations among our more conservative CG informants. The resultant collection roughly doubles Newton's original assemblage, organised around some 65 etyma, differing in principle only in that we include loans that appear to have undergone parallel gemination *within* CG. So too we follow Newton's list of 'spontaneously' geminable consonants: non-clustered sonorants, voiceless fricatives, and stops; except that our informants attest no examples of /čč/ < /č/.

2. Phonetically automatic lengthening

Excluded from Newton's account are certain phonetically automatic neutralisations of the simple-geminate distinction, with products which, he treated as phonetically long though phonemically simple: intervocalic /z/ and /ž/ (eg: /mezés/ [mez :és] 'meze', and /vizyá/ [viž :á] 'breasts'), and /l/ or /n/ before *y* (eg: /varélya/ [varél :ya] 'barrels', /nyós/ [n :yós] 'youth'). The phonetic treatment of the latter type by our informants tends to differ from Newton's account, giving lengthened [λ :] and [ɲ :] without succeeding *yod*. There is just a little evidence that such lengthening may lead to phonologically distinctive gemination in a depalatalising context (eg: παλλούρα 'bramble' < anc. παλίουρος).

3. The expressive tradition and optional emphatic lengthening

In seeking motivation for the remainder of his data, Newton appealed to the *expressive* tradition which saw 'spontaneous' gemination in Indo-European as a mark of *affect*, particularly characteristic of popular speech and so reflected only fragmentarily in surviving documentation (for Latin and Germanic, see Graur, Martinet; for Greek, see also Skoda)¹. In CG, gemination has indeed been viewed as a regular feature of various 'expressive' lexical types. Newton notes the special categories of onomatopoeic exclamation (eg: /ttúp/, /ússu/) and apocopated forms of certain compound personal names (eg: /ttoulos/, /ttófas/); so also

¹Alexandru Graur, 1929, *Les consonnes géminées en latin*, Paris, H. Champion, XXII, 237 p., André Martinet, 1937, *La gemination consonantique d'origine expressive dans les langues germaniques*, Copenhagen, Levin and Munksgaard, 207 p., Françoise Skoda, 1982, *Le redoublement expressif* (...), Paris, SELAF 15, 269 p.

we find in his data examples of the nearly regular gemination in reduplicatives (eg : /xaxxarízo/, /kakkarízo/), and apocopated names of the type /stillís/¹.

Newton attempted, however, to extend this approach beyond such special categories. His basic proposal arises from the observation that 'occasional gemination' may occur under sentence stress (more particularly, under 'extra loud stress') in items such as those that he transcribes /kathólu/, /yemmátos/, /xalláli/, /kallón/, /kallá/, /ósso(n)/. Together with the 'traditional' observation that gemination is often stress-adjacent, this leads him to the principle that 'gemination arises as a sort of «spilling over» of sentence stress onto adjacent consonants from the vowel which bears the main stress, and...this consonant lengthening becomes a permanent feature of certain words which frequently bear sentence stress.'

Given the semantically pedestrian nature of much of Newton's data (/sellenon/, /čimma/, etc), his principle is *a priori* dubious. Moreover, most cases that seem likely candidates for phonologisation via 'extra loud stress' turn out on closer inspection to be *merely* emphatic variants. In some instances this is suggested by Newton's own brief comments ; eg : /mmá/ ('/ma/ may occur under weak stress'), /ákkú/ ('usually /áku/'), /yelló/ ('possible for usual /yeló/'). In others, Newton simply writes a geminate form without comment ; eg : /ššúme/ 'I am shaken', /išša/ 'straight ahead', /ótti/ 'whatever', /kriffá/ 'secretly'. Our informants regularly rejected all the above as citation forms, although utterances so interpretable could be elicited in suitably emphatic contexts and were then usually accepted as possible under such special conditions.

Here, where none of Newton's criteria for the designation 'geminate' appear to apply (cf. note 1 above), we prefer the term *emphatic lengthening*, based on what appears to be the primary phonetic characteristic. Such segments do not have the *fortis* characteristics associated with the CG geminates ; in particular, items such as Newton's /ótti/ lack the aspiration that is regular in geminate stops (thus [ót:i], against /mutti/ 'nose' [mút^hi]). The distributional characteristics are also different. For the unclustered stress-adjacent segments that concern us, emphatic lengthening arises word-initially and intervocalically, preferentially in pre-accentual continuants (as in most of the examples above), otherwise in post-accentual continuants

¹Cf. now G. and A. Drachman, E. Γεωργίου, Γ. Σταύρου, Ρ. Συμεού, Ε. Τρύφωνος, 2001, Υποκορισμός κυρίων ονομάτων στην κυπριακή, *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*, Nicosia, September 1999, Thessaloniki, USP, p. 487-494.

or stops (as in the remaining examples).

Among native Greek items that might seem specially prone to such emphatic use, very few involve stable gemination that could be claimed as evidence for Newton's principle. Apart from a scattering of items not meeting the distributional restrictions above (eg: /anáθθeman/ 'a curse', /potté/ 'never'), we find just comparatives in /-itteros/, /-óttēros/, forms of the type /ménēn/, /énēn/ 'is not', and forms of /úllos/ 'all'. Whatever the merits of these particular cases (cf. also 4a, 4b and 4c below respectively), they are clearly an insufficient basis for a general explanation.

4. Principles of stable phonological gemination

Such problems in the allocation of his data undermine Newton's various attempts to extract generalisations in terms of phonological distribution, rule-ordering and segment preference. The quite different conditions that we propose are based on the residual data for stable phonological gemination only. Such gemination arises in intervocalic position (the few clear exceptions are by clipping; eg, /ssopínno/ 'absorb' for ἔσω- + πίνω), under three major types of condition:

- (a) patterns of gemination in 'expressive' proparoxytones
- (b) adjacency of stress sites
- (c) post-accentual position, adjoining formerly long vowel.

Of these, the first has directly ancient roots. Beyond this, in so far as our data allows a judgement, the Roman and late medieval periods appear pivotal. From the former emerge our first clear instances of type (a) items in /-állin/, /-úllin/, etc. without 'expressive' motivation, and of type (b) gemination under stress adjacency in derivatives; and to about that period, or just before, may be attributed the conditions for type (c) gemination in compensation for shortened vowel. From the latter period, commonly first in Italian/Venetian loans, emerge signs of the weakening of suffixal gemination processes.