

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

ILP Faculty:

Interdisciplinary Linguistic Program Faculty

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

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

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

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

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

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

Kristin Lovrien-Meuwese (Modern Languages) is interested in language learning in general and second language acquisition in particular, but has ge

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

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

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

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

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

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

“Olim enim quidam magicæ artis imbuti, Thor videlicet et Othinus alique complures miranda præstigiorum machinatione callentes, obtentis simplicium animis, divinitatis sibi fastigium arrogare coeperunt.”¹⁷

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

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

The names for the Germanic days of the week also provide early evidence for cultic belief in the figures of Tyr, Odin, Thor, and Frigg, or at least evi-

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

Portmanteaus, neologisms formed by the com-



Dicket, 2005, p. 219). Consequently, it is said that “distal forms index a more disciplined, public presentation of self” (Dunn Dicket, 2005, p. 219). Overall, it is more common to be using honorific methods of speaking to strangers in order to display the speaker is delivering respect to whom they are speaking to (the addressee).

Continually, Japanese honorifics are not only meant to show respect from younger individuals to older individuals. Caregivers, for instance, use honorifics as they are in a situation acknowledging “public social roles, out-group relationships, and formality, and on occasion they use ADD HON together with REF HON in indexing respect and deference” (Burdelski, 2013, p. 252). In Burdeslki’s article, a role-

A Comparison of Classical and Modern Greek Phonology

Giorgia Skorletos, Major in Linguistics

Introduction

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

The Basic Chronology of Greek dialects

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

Pronunciation

Consonants – Classical Greek

The consonantal inventory of Classical Greek included stops, fricatives, liquids and affricates. Stops had three places of articulation: bilabial, dental, and velar, with the option of being voiced or voiceless. Additionally, there were the fricatives /s/ and /h/, the liquids /r/ and /l/, and the affricates /zd/, /ps/ and /ks/ (Browning, 1983, p. 33; Allen, 1968,

pronunciation of diphthongs differed between word boundaries. For example, diphthongs in pre-vocalic positions were better thought of as a short vowel plus a glide (Allen, 1968, p. 77-78). Eventually these sounds were adapted to be pronounced without their diphthongal element (Allen, 1968, p. 83).

Vowels – Modern Greek

Greek eventually developed to become a simple five-vowel system with no meaningful contrast in vowel

Allen, W. (1968). *Vox Graeca: A guide to the pronunciation of classical Greek*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Bakker, E. J. (2010). *Companion to the Ancient Greek language*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell. Retrieved from <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uwinnipeg/detail.action?docID=485660#>

Browning, R. (1983). *Medieval and modern Greek* (2nd ed.). Cambridge Cambridgeshire: Cambridge University Press.

Holton, D., Mackridge, P., & Philippaki-Warbuton, I. (2015). *Greek: An essential grammar of the modern language*. London, UK: Routledge. Retrieved from <https://ebookcentral.prom>

/k^h, g^h, x^h/ -

Thoughts on Language

The magic of the tongue is the most dangerous of all spells. (E. G. Bulwer-Lytton)

Language is an organism. To digest it one must be, paradoxically, swallowed up by it. (Shemarya Levin)

When I cannot see words curling like rings of smoke round me I am in darkness, I am nothing. (Virginia Woolf)

Language is a finding-place, not a hiding-place. (Jeanette Winterson)

Personally I think that grammar is a way to attain beauty. (Muriel Barbery)

Language h n
