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Abstract

The present paper deals with coordinated compounds in the history of Greek: it proposes morphological and semantic criteria for their classification, and provides detailed exemplification from Ancient Greek, Medieval Greek, and Modern Greek dialects.
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1. Introduction

Greek is the only European language in which single-word coordinated compounds constitute a morphological category exhibiting considerable productivity (Wälchli 2005: 3, 205). Strangely enough, however, they have to a large extent escaped theoretical linguistic investigation: apart from the data collection provided by Andriotis (1956, 1960, 1980) and Mirambel (1978: 331), and the broad theoretical outlines offered by Anastasiadi-Symeonidi (1996) and Ralli (2007, 2009a), an overview of coordinated composition in Greek is lacking. An equally unjustifiable lack is the diachronic investigation of this compositional form in Greek, despite the fact that the very lengthy attestation period of the language (about 3,500 years) could provide a unique long-term scope over the phenomenon. A recent rise in the theoretical interest for coordinated composition and its cross-linguistic exemplification (e.g. Wälchli 2005; Bauer 2008; Renner 2008) combined with a renewed interest in a specific type of coordinated compounds in Greek, namely [V V] ones (Nicholas & Joseph 2007; Nicholas & Joseph 2009; Kiparsky 2009; Ralli 2009b), provides the background and the motivation for the present investigation, which constitutes a revised and updated version of a previous contribution (Manolessou & Tsolakidis 2009).

The present paper attempts to examine the various derivational patterns producing copulative compounds in Greek, their synchronic and diachronic productivity, and their morphological, syntactic and semantic properties. The basis of the discussion is a rather “comprehensive” definition of coordinated compounds, in the sense that, by applying different criteria, certain formations are sometimes considered as forming part of the category of coordinated compounds and sometimes not. For example, the so-called ‘loose multi-word’ compounds of the
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Type αναλυτής-προγραμματιστής /analitis proγramatistis/ ‘computer analyst-programmer’ or συνθέτης-τραγουδιστής /sinθetis tragoudistis/ ‘songwriter-singer’ would be viewed as copulative compounds in a framework like Olsen’s (2001); this is to be expected, since Olsen’s analysis is based on English, which lacks single-word coordinated compounds, and thus possesses ‘a label with no obvious referent’ (Bauer 2008: 3). On the contrary, under Ralli’s (2007) analysis of Greek, which does have single-word coordinated compounds, this formation is not considered a compound at all: on the basis of strictly morphological criteria, only [stem stem] and [stem word] formations, not [word word] ones belong to Greek compounds (cf. also Ralli 2009a).

Similarly, the so-called reduplicative compounds (also known as amredita), which consist in the repetition of the same word, e.g. λίγο-λίγο /liγo liγo/ ‘slowly, little by little’, σιγά-σιγά /siγa siγa/ ‘slowly, imperceptibly’ can in one view be considered as the prototypical case of coordinated compounds, since the very word dvandva in fact belongs to this category (Sadovski 2002; Bauer 2008: 2). Again, however, a purely morphological criterion would exclude them from Greek compounds, on the basis of their [word word] structure.

The position adopted here is the inclusion of these types of compounds in the discussion, since a) the aims of the paper are mainly historical and comparative, i.e. to examine as many diachronical and dia-dialectal facts as possible1 and b) the criteria adopted are not purely morphological but also syntactic and semantic ones.

2. The categorization of coordinated compounds

2.1 Morphological criteria

2.1.1 Single-word vs. multi-word compounds

On a morphological basis, as already stated, the main distinction corresponds to the differentiation between ‘single-word compounds’ of the [stem stem] or [stem word] type vs. ‘multi-word’ compounds of the [word word] type (Anastasiadi-Symeonidi 1996; Ralli 2007).

From a diachronic point of view, loose multi-word compounds constitute a novel morphological category in Greek, under the influence of French, appearing only after the mid-20th c. (Anastasiadi-Symeonidi 1986). Inevitably, they are absent both from older texts and from the Modern Greek dialects, and are explicitly characterized as foreign in older grammars of the language (Triantafyllidis 1941). According to Mackridge (1985), the formation of asyndetic [word word]

1 Where no indication of provenance is given, the form belongs to Standard Modern Greek. Dialectal data are provided with an indication of local provenance, and originate from a corpus compiled on the basis of Andriotis (1960, 1980), Mirambel (1978), and from various dialect descriptions (for a list see Ralli, Melissaropoulou & Tsolakidis 2006). Medieval data originate from a corpus compiled from the complete analysis of the two dictionaries of Kriaras (1967-) and Trapp (2001-).
combinations was possible in earlier Greek, e.g. θάλασσα λάδι /θalasa lαði/, lit. sea-oil ‘calm sea’ or παιδί μάλαμα /peði malama/, lit. child-gold ‘angelic child’. However, such formations are not coordinating by determinative. In general, the majority of Greek loose multi-word compounds are also determinative, and therefore do not belong in the present analysis: παιδί-θαύμα /peði θavma/ ‘wonderboy /wondergirl’, ταξίδι-αστραπή /taksiði astrapi/ ‘lightning trip’. The rare cases which could be included under the label of ‘coordinated compounds’ are [N N] combinations having a single referent, to which two different properties are attributed (‘multifunctional’, in Renner’s (2008) terms), such as various types of machinery, establishments or professions (Gavriilidou 1998) (1):

(1) a. πλυντήριο-στεγνωτήριο /plindirio steγnɔtori/o/ ψυγείο-καταψύκτης /ψygio katapsiktis/
ˈwashing machine-dryer’ ‘refrigerator-freezer’

b. αρτοποιείο-ζαχαροπλαστείο /artopiio zaxaroplastio/ βιβλιοπωλείο-χαρτοπωλείο /vivliopolio xartopolio/
ˈbakery-pastry shop’ ‘bookshop- stationary store’

c. αρχιτέκτονας-αρχαιολόγος /arxitektonas arxeoloγɔs/ συνθέτης-τραγουδιστής /sinθetis trαγudistis/
ˈarchitect-archaeologist’ ‘songwriter-singer’

‘Single-word’ compounds on the other hand are a much more widespread and productive native formation. Wordhood can be determined on the basis of the fact that the compound has a single word accent, and that only the second part of the compound bears inflection markers, while the first one remains uninflected, e.g. (2):

(2) γλυκόπικρος < γλυκός + πικρός
/ɡlikopikros/ < /ɡlikos/ + /pikros/
bittersweet < bitter + sweet

However, the morphological criterion of wordhood is insufficient to distinguish coordinated compounds from all other Greek compound types, i.e. possessive and determinative ones, since they all conform to the same structure: single words whose constituents are connected via the linking vowel /o/ (Ralli 2007, 2009a).

2.1.2 Same category

The most obvious criterion (although rarely mentioned in the literature) for distinguishing coordinated compounds from the other types of single-word compounds in Greek (and presumably any other language that possesses them) is identity of lexical category: Only coordinated compounds are restricted to the
structures [\text{N N}], [\text{Adj Adj}], [\text{V V}] and [\text{Adv Adv}]. However, for nominal coordinated compounds, this criterion is also insufficient, since it is not bidirectional: it is not the case that all [\text{N N}] compounds are coordinating, e.g. (3):

(3) κουρτινόξυλο < κουρτίνα + ξύλο
/kurtinoksilo/ < /kurtina/ + /ksilo/
‘curtain rail’ < ‘curtain’ + ‘wood, wooden rail’

βουνοκορφή < βουνό + κορφή
/vunokorfi/ < /vuno/ + /korfi/
‘mountain top’ < ‘mountain’ + ‘top’

An additional problem with this criterion involves pragmatic difficulties: especially for older forms of the language, which are imperfectly known, it is very difficult to guess from the context whether a given [\text{N N}] compound is copulative or determinative, when the referent is no longer existent. For example, a term like μουχρουτσοκύτελα /muxrutoskutela/ (Assizes of Cyprus, 15th c.) is analysable as /muxruti/ ‘a type of dish’ < arab. miqrâ-t and /skuteli/ ‘a type of bowl’ < Lat. scutella. It could mean either ‘a collection of a certain type of dishes, which are something between a /muxruti/ and a /skuteli/’ or ‘a collection of various types of dishes, including /muxrutia/ and /skutelia/’.

On the other hand, the criterion is quite adequate for the other morphological categories: it is almost impossible to think of [\text{Adj Adj}], [\text{Adv. Adv}] and [\text{V V}] compounds which are not coordinated. The only difficulty is that an exclusive dependence on this criterion would also include blends, which are not normally included under composition proper. Cf. the following examples of Greek blends (from Andriotis 1960 and Koutita-Kaimaki & Fliatouras 2002) (4):

(4) ζαβλακώνω < ζαβώνω + βλακώνω
/zavlakono/ < /zavono/ + /vlakono/
‘daze, fuddle’ < ‘render stupid’ + ‘render stupid’

ταρακουνώ < ταράζω + κουνώ
/tarakuno/ < /tarazo/ + /kuno/
‘shake’ < ‘disturb, shake’ + ‘move, shake’

ψιντρός < ψιλός + χοντρός
/psindros/ < /psilos/ + /xondros/
‘thin’ < ‘thin’ + ‘thick’

From a purely formal point of view, coordinated composition could be seen as a morphological continuum of increasingly tighter coordination: loose multi-word coordinated compounds $>>$ single-word coordinated compounds $>>$ blends with
coordinating meaning. The choice between the three types would also be pragmatically/stylistically dependent, as they belong to different registers: blends are characteristic of a ‘lower’, more ‘popular’ register, while multi-word compounds are, to a certain extent, ‘learned’ formations2.

2.1.3 Number

In the case of nominal coordinated compounds an important sub-categorisation criterion is number: Prototypical [N N] coordinated compounds are of plural number, and refer to a group of entities (5):

(5) γυναίκοπαιδα < γυναίκες + παιδιώτικα
/γυνακοπαιδα/ < /γυνακες/ + /παιδια/
‘women and children’ < ‘women’ + ‘children’

μαχαιροπίρουνα < μαχαίρια + πιρούνια
/maxeropiruna/ < /maxeria/ + /pirunia/
‘cutlery’ < ‘knives’ + ‘forks’

αγελαδομούσκαρα < αγελάδες + μουσκάρια (Crete)
/αγελαδομουσκαρα/ < /αγελάδες/ + /μουσκαρια/
‘cattle’ < ‘cows’ + ‘calves’

αντεροσύκωτα < άντερα + συκώτια
/αντεροσυκωτα/ < /αντερα/ + /συκωτια/
‘entrails’ < ‘intestines’ + ‘livers’

To the same category belong a group of [N N] compounds which are composed uncountable nouns; although their number is singular, they refer to a group composed of uncountable entities (6):

(6) αλατοπίπερο < αλάτι + πιπέρι
/alatopipero < /alati/ + /piperi/
‘condiments’ < ‘salt’ + ‘pepper’

λαδόξιδο < λάδι + ξίδι
/laðoksiðo/ < /laði/ + /ksiði/
‘vinaigrette sauce’ < ‘oil’ + ‘vinegar’

On the other hand, another important subcategory of coordinated compounds consists of [N N] single-word compounds with a single referent, to which two different properties are attributed. Scholars have insisted on this semantic differentiation between prototypical copulative, dvandva nominal compounds, which refer to multiple entities or a collection of entities, and which thus could be considered a type of exocentric compounds, since their referent is neither of their component parts (Ten Hacken 2000; Scalise & Bisetto 2005) and appositive compounds (Wälchli 2005; Bauer 2008) which attribute different properties to the same referent. From a purely morphological point of view, however, there is no distinction between the two types of compounds in Greek, apart from the plurality of number.

There is, however, an important historical difference between the two types of nominal compounds in Greek: although singular number appositive compounds exist from the Classical period onwards3, and are quite productive (cf. Tserepis 1880: 439-445; Debrunner 2006 [1917]; Jannaris 1897: 310-311; Muller 1920), pluralia dvandva compounds are a creation of the Late Medieval period. In more detail, Classical Greek possesses only appositive nominal compounds such as (7):

(7) κλαυσίγελως /klausigelo:s/ ‘laughter mingled with tears’ X. HG. 7.2.9
ιατρόμαντις /iatromantis/ ‘healer and diviner’ A. Supp. 263
ἱππαλεκτρυών /hippalektryo:n/ ‘horse-rooster’ Ar. Ra. 932

The longest recorded word in the Greek language belongs to this category:

(8) λοπαδοτεμαχοσελαχογαλεοκρανιλεμόνι /lopadotemakhoselakhogaleokranillemoni/ ‘(a dish containing) various kinds of fish, meat, fowl and sauces’

The productivity of this type of compound actually increases during the Koine period. On the contrary, there are no traces of pluralia dvandva compounds in Classical or Koine Greek4, and even in learned high register texts of the Byzantine

3 There are no coordinating compounds at all in the earliest attested phases of Greek, i.e. Mycenaean (Meissner & Tribulato 2002) and Homeric (Risch 1974).
4 A possible exception from Classical Greek is an artificial compound from Aristophanic comedy: σκοροδοπανδοκευτιαρπόλιδες /skorodopandokeutiapopolides/ ‘female sellers of bread and garlic and inkeepers’ Ar. Lys. 458. There are no examples from the Koine period, in either learned or popular texts. In fact, in one of the more popular texts of the period, the New
period they are extremely rare (Steiner-Weber 1991). Trapp (2001-) records only two examples: πρεσβυτεροδιάκονοι /presviterodiakonio/ ‘priests and deacons’ and Ἡρακλειανοσεργιοπυρροπαυλοπετρίται /iraklianoseryioipiropavlopetreite/ ‘followers of Heracleianus, Sergius, Pyrrus, Paul, and Peter’.

The first appearance of the pluralia dvandva nominal compound type are dated around the 10th c, with the first certain example being γυναικόπαιδα /gynekopeda/ ‘women and children’ from the historian Theophanes Confessor (388.29). Vernacular medieval literature from the 12th c. onwards contains dozens of examples, such as (8):

(8) καρυδοκουκουνάρια < καρύδια + κουκουνάρια
    /kariðokukunaria/ < kariðia/ + /kukunaria/
    ‘walnuts and pine nuts’ < ‘walnuts’ + ‘pine nuts’

δαμασκηναπιδόμηλα < δαμάςκηνα + ἀπίδια + μῆλα
/Ptochoprodromos 3.197
/ðamaskinapidomila/ < /ðamaskina/ + /apiðia/ + /mila/
    ‘plums and pears and apples’ < ‘plums’ + ‘pears’ + ‘apples’

χαλιναροκαπίστελα < χαλινάρια + κάπιστρα (?)
/Diig. Tetr. 642
/xalinarokapistela/ < /xalinaria/ + /kapistra/
    ‘bridles and halters’ < ‘bridles’ + ‘halters’

ἀδελφοξάδελφοι < ἀδελφοί + ἔξαδελφοι
/notary Varouchas 679.10-11
/adelfoksadelfi/ < /aðelfi/ + /eksadelfi/
    ‘brothers and cousins’ < ‘brothers’ + ‘cousins’

Only a few of these compounds survive in Standard Modern Greek (ἀδελφοξάδελφοι is a case in point), while most of them are retained in the Modern Greek dialects, where the formation is extremely productive, e.g. (9):

(9) βαρκοκάϊκα < βάρκες + καίκια (Naxos)
    /varkokaika/ < /varkes/ + /kaikia/
    ‘boats and caiques’ < ‘boats’ + ‘caiques’

βοιδάλογα < βόιδια + ἀλόγα (Epirus)

Testament, there are no coordinating compounds at all, except for the [Adv Adv] formation νυχθήμερον /nyxðimeron/ ‘night and day’ (Blass-Debrunner-Funk 1961: 66).
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/voiðalo/ < /voiðia/ + /alo/ ‘draft animals’ < ‘oxen’ + ‘horses’

λυροντάουλα < λύρες + νταούλια (Crete)
/lirodaula/ < /lires/ + /daulia/ ‘musical instruments’< ‘Cretan lyras’ + ‘tambourines’

2.2. Semantic criteria

From the above discussion, it becomes obvious that, for nominal compounds at least, semantic criteria are more important than purely formal ones. The basic criterion, according to Wälchli (2005) is the expression of the notion of ‘natural co-ordination’ i.e. the copulative connection of two meanings/entities which are in any case logically, lexically or associatively connected, such as the pluralia dvandva described above, of the type /γινεκομεðα/ ‘women and children’. Both the multi-word nominal compounds of the type /σινθέτις τραγοδιστής/ ‘songwriter singer’ and the single-word compounds of the type /αππελέκτρον/ ‘horse-rooster’ belong to a different type, that of appositive coordinated nouns, since a) there is no necessary relationship between their two elements and b) their referent is not the sum of the two parts or a superordinate notion but rather an entity/notion somewhere ‘in between’ the two constituents.

The same semantic distinction between additive and appositive compounds holds also for adjectives, since many have this intermediate meaning (Wälchli 2005; Bauer 2008). For example, κιτρινοπράσινος /kitrinoprasinos/ ‘green-yellow’ is not both green and yellow, but a pale yellowish green colour. Of course the creation of such ‘intermediate’ compounds is possible only when the two constituents denote similar properties, otherwise the meaning can only be additive, e.g (10):

(10) ψηλόλιγνος < ψηλός + λιγνός
/psiloliγnos/ < /psilos/ + /λιγνός/
‘tall and thin’ < ‘tall’ + ‘thin’

τυφλόκουφος < τυφλός + κουφός
/tiflokufos/ < /tiflos/ + /κουφός/
‘blind and deaf’ < ‘blind’ + ‘deaf’

It must however be emphasized that the additive or intermediate appositive meaning is frequently secondary and attributable only to pragmatic factors. For example, the reason why the colour adjective γαλανόλευκος /galanolefkos/ ‘blue and white’ is interpreted as alternatingly blue and white and not as a light blue colour somewhere between blue and white is that it has been traditionally attributed to the Greek flag, which bears these two colours.

Pragmatic and language specific factors often intervene in the attribution of meaning, since the same coordinating construction may have different meanings in
different languages (Søgaard (2005)): A classic example is the adjective ἀνδρόγυνος /androgynos/, /anðrogynos/, which in Ancient Greek had intermediate meaning ‘an effeminate man’ and in Modern Greek an additive one ‘a couple’.

What follows is a list of various semantic labels for coordinated compounds proposed in the recent literature (Wälchli 2005, Bauer 2008) with exemplification and comments on the basis of Greek data.

a) additive: the category has already been discussed and exemplified above in the case of nouns and adjectives. For additive adjectives, what needs to be mentioned in order to complete the picture is a description of diachronic evolution: the examination of Medieval dictionaries (Kriaras 1967- ) and Trapp (2001- ) reveals an unusual richness of such adjectival formations, which leads to the impression that this formation type is extremely productive in Medieval Greek (cf. Browning 1983: 84-85). However, the fact is that multisyllabic compound adjectives were a feature of vernacular literature of a certain kind (mainly verse romances and satire) and not of everyday spoken language of the period (Beaton 1989: 94-95, Lendari 2007: 96-99, Steiner-Weber 1991). Medieval texts of the period which do not belong to these genres display very few coordinating compounds. For example, the Chronicle of the Morea has only two coordinating compounds, both verbs (Aerts & Hokwerda 2002). On the contrary, learned byzantine literature includes multiple adjectival compounds which are obviously completely artificial formations, such as ὀλεθροβιβλοφαλσογραμματοθόρος /oleθrovivlofalsoγrammatotθoros/ ‘pernicious false book writing destroying’ (?) ἀκτινολαμπροφεγγοφωτοστόλιστος /aktinolambrofengofotostolistos/ ‘shiny moonbeam lit’ or λευκερυθροφωσφόρος /lefkeriθrofosforos/ ‘red white light-bearing’.

In the verbal domain, the intermediate appositive category seems not to be at all well represented, apart from a few cases like χοροπηδώ /xoropiðo/, ‘skip around, jump up and down’, lit. ‘dance and jump’. Most verbs belong to the additive category, and denote two separate verbal activities (11):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>μπαινοβγαίνω &lt; μπαίνω + βγαίνω /benovγeno/ &lt; /beno/ + /γeno/</td>
<td>‘go in and out’ &lt; ‘go in’ + ‘go out’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>κλοτσοπατώ &lt; κλοτσώ + πατώ /klotsopato</td>
<td>‘kick and step on’ &lt; ‘kick’ + ‘step on’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An interesting feature of verbal coordinating compounds is that they too constitute a Medieval Greek innovation, being absent from Classical and Koine Greek, apart from two isolated examples of the 2nd c. AD (Nicholas & Joseph 2009, Ralli 2009b). Even in the late medieval period, the relevant dictionaries do not
record more than 30 attestations. However, in the Modern Greek dialects, the formation is extremely productive (Ralli 2009b).

b) collective: the meaning of these compounds is close to that of additive ones, but the notion they refer to is superordinate to the two parts of the compound. This category contains only nouns, such as (12):

(12) μαχαιροπίρουνα < μαχαίρι + πιρόνια
'/maxeropiruna/ < '/maxeria/ + '/pirunia/
‘cutlery’ < ‘knives’ + ‘forks’

τσουκαλολάγηνα < τσουκάλια + λαγήνια
'/tsukalolagina/ < '/tsukalia/ + '/layinia/
‘pots and pans’ < ‘pots’ + ‘jugs’

c) synonymic: the two members of the compound have similar or even identical meaning. The overall meaning is not additive but emphatic. This is especially frequent with verbs, and less so with pluralia dvandva nouns (13):

(13) a. κιτρινοχλωμιαίνω < κιτρινίζω + χλωμιαίνω
'/kitrinoxlomieno/ < '/kitrinizo/ + '/xomieno/
‘become pale’ < ‘become yellow’ + ‘become pale’

βασανοτυραννώ < βασανίζω + τυραννώ
'/vasanotirano/ < '/vasanizo/ + '/tirano/
‘torture’ < ‘torture’ + ‘torment’

τρεμοτουρτουλιάζω < τρέμω + τουρτουλιάζω
'/tremoturtuliazo/ < '/tremo/ + '/turtuliazo/
‘shiver’ < ‘tremble’ + ‘shiver’

b. αρνοπρόβατα < αρνιά + πρόβατα (Peloponnesse)
'/arnoprovata/ < '/arnia/ + '/provata/
‘sheep’ < ‘lambs’ + ‘sheep’

μαντηλοτσέμπερα < μαντήλια + τσέμπερια (Dodecanese)
'/mandilotsembera/ < '/mandilia/ + '/tsemberia/
‘kerchiefs’ < ‘handkerchiefs’ + ‘headkerchiefs’

Singular compound nouns have emphatic meaning and are a relatively rare feature of vernacular medieval literature, e.g. (14):

(14) ἐρωτοαγάπη < ἔρωτας + ἀγάπη Livistros P 296
'/erotoagapi/ < '/erot/ + '/agapi/
In the case of adjectives, the formation is comparatively rare, but existent (15):

(15) μελανόμαυρος < μελανός + μαύρος Erotokritos D 901
/melanomavros/ < /melanos/ + /mavros/
‘pitch black’ < ‘black’ + ‘black’

μπασταρδόμουλος < μπάσταρδος + μούλος (Heptanese)
/bastarðomulos/ < /bastarðos/ + /mulos/
‘bastard’ < ‘bastard’ + ‘bastard’

Synonymic compounds are almost non-existent in Standard Modern Greek, but quite common in the dialects. In several cases, dialects capitalise on the existence of learned/standard-popular/dialectal synonymic doublets, e.g. (16):

(16) κοσκινοντρίμονα < κόσκινα + ντριμόνια
/koskinodrimona/ < /koskina/ + /drimonia/
‘sieves’ < ‘sieves’ + ‘sieves’

mularoordana < μουλάρια + βορντάνια
/mularoordana/ < /mularia/ + /vordania/
‘mules’ < ‘mules’ + ‘mules’


Adverbs can be included in the synonymic category only if [word word] formations are taken as a type of coordinated compounds. Reduplicated adverbs (amredita) appear already in Mycenaean (Meissner & Tribulato 2001: 316): we-te-i-we-te-i /wetei wetei/ ‘year by year’ and a-mo-ra-ma /amor amar/ ‘day by day’, but they are very rare in Classical Greek, the only exception between πάμπαν /pampan/
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‘wholly’ (Andriotis 1956). Medieval Greek provides only a few examples, e.g. ἀγάλλα ἀγάλλα /agalia agalia/ ‘slowly slowly’ Erofili D 412. Dictionaries of Modern Greek provide only few examples, but reduplication is a productive schema which can function ad hoc for almost any adverb (cf. an extensive list of examples in Nakas 1996-1997). From this viewpoint, of course, such formations belong to the domain of syntax and phrase structure, not composition per se (Ralli 2007: 120-122), although traditionally amredita formations are examined along with coordinated compounds.

d) A similarly dubious morphological category is that of alternative/approximative compounds, which also involves only [word word] formations. It includes adjectives and adverbs, with an overall meaning which is disjunctive (either the first or the second member of the compound) or approximative (something close to one or other member), e.g. δυο-τρεις /dio tris/ ‘two or three, only a few’, σήμερα-αύριο /simera avrio/ ‘today or tomorrow, one of these days’.

e) generalising: this category denotes, through the addition of opposites, a general notion such as ‘everywhere’, ‘always’, e.g. δεξια-αριστερά /deksia aristera/ ‘right and left, everywhere’, μέρα-νύχτα /mera nixta/ ‘day and night, all the time’, μικροί-μεγάλοι /mikri megaloi/ ‘young and old, everybody’. Again, this category involves only innovative multi-word compounds

f) mimetic: a marginal category involving artificial [word word] formations, whose first or second constituent is meaningless, simply repeating the other constituent echo-like. Modern Greek occasionally employs such a reduplicative schema, of Turkish origin, by repeating the first constituent while replacing its first sound by /m/, in order to impart a derogatory meaning (Konstantinidou 2004), e.g. κούπες-μούπες /kupes mupes/ ‘cups and mups, i.e. cups and other stupid things’, Θανάσης – Μανάσης /thanasis manasis/ ‘Thanasis and Manasis, i.e. that idiot of a Thanasis’. Any word can participate in this schema, and therefore again this not properly speaking a derivational process.

g) antithetic: the two members of this type of compounds express opposite notions, and thus a meaning which could be either additive or intermediate. The category involves verbs, nouns, and adjectives, e.g. (17):

(17) a. ανοιγοκλείνω < ανοίγω + κλείνω
/anigoklino/ < /aniyo/ + /kline/
‘open and close’ < ‘open’ + ‘close’

πεφτοσηκώνομαι < πέφτω + σηκώνομαι (Peloponnese)
/peftosikonume/ < /pefto/ + /sikonome/
‘fall and get up’ < ‘fall’ + ‘get up’

λυνοδένω < λύνω + δένω
/linoðeno/ < /lino/ + /deno/
‘tie and untie’ < ‘untie’ + ‘tie’

λαμποβρέχει < λάμπει + βρέχει (Pontus)
/lambovrexi/ < /lambi/ + /vrexi/

‘rain and shine’ < ‘shines’ + ‘rains’

b. γελόκλαμαν < γέλιο + κλάμα (Cyprus)
/γελοκλαμαν/ < /γελιο/ + /klama/

‘tearful laughter’ < ‘laughter’ + ‘crying’

σβησογράψιμο < σβήσιμο + γράψιμο
/zvisograpšimo/ < /zvisimo/ + /grapsimo/

‘writing and erasing’ < ‘erasing’ + ‘writing’

c. εξυπνόζαβος < ἐξυπνός + ζαβός
/eksipnozavos/ < /eksipnos/ + /zavos/

‘smart and stupid’ < ‘smart’ + ‘stupid’

γλυκόπικρος < γλυκός + πικρός
/γλυκόπικρος/ < /γλυκός/ + /πικρός/

bittersweet < bitter + sweet

h) determinative-coordinative: A category of compounds which deserves special mention is that which involves determinative compounds with three or more members, two of which are in a coordinating relation with each other. The category is rare in Classical Greek, and exists only as an artificial creation of comic poets (Tserepis 1880: 431-437) (18):

(18) σπερμαγοραιολεκιθολαχανοπώλιδες < σπέρμα + ἄγοραία λέκιθος + λάχανον + πωλ White Lys.457
/spermagoraiololikitholakhanopo:lides/ < /sperma/ + /agoria/ + /lekithos/ + /lakhanon/ + /po:lo:/

Sellers of grain, cheap pulse and vegetables < ‘grain’ + ‘market’ + ‘pulse’ + ‘vegetable’ + ‘sell’

σκοτοδασυπυκνόθριξ < σκοτεινός + δασύς + πυκνός + θρίξ Ar.Αchar.389
/skotodasyypuknótithriks/ < /skoteinos/ + /dasys/ + /pyknos/ + /thriks/

‘dark with shaggy and thick hair’ < ‘dark’ + ‘shaggy’ + ‘thick’ + ‘hair’
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μακροκαμπυλαύχην < μακρός + καμπύλος + αὐχήν
Epicharm. Frg. 46.1
/makrokampylaukh:en/ < /makros/ + /kampyllos/ + /aukhe:n/
‘with long and curved neck’ < ‘long’ + ‘curved’ + ‘neck’

Medieval dictionaries provide a multiplicity of examples, especially adjectives, e.g. (19):

(19) a. μυξοσκατοφάγος < μύξες + σκατά + τρώγω
Poulologos 220
/miksoskatofagos/ < /mikses/ + /skata/ + /troyo/
‘eater of mucus and shit’ < ‘mucus’ + ‘shit’ + ‘eat’

b. μαυροπλουμιστομάτης < μαύρος + πλουμιστός + μάτι
Florios 191
/mavroplumistomatis/ < /mavros/ + /plumistos/ + /mati/
‘with black and shiny eyes’ < ‘black’ + ‘shiny’ + ‘eye’

The Modern Greek dialects also maintain examples of this formation, although they are non-existent in Standard Modern Greek (20):

(20) a. ασπροστρογγυλοπρόσωπος < ἀσπρός + στρογγυλός + πρόσωπο
(Dodecanese)
/asprostrongiloprosopos/ < /aspros/ + /strongilos/ + /prosopo/
‘with a white and round face’ < ‘white’ + ‘round’ + ‘face’

b. αθθοκαρποστεμμένος < ανθός + καρπός + στεμμένος
(Dodecanese)
/aththetaokarpoSTEMménos/ < /anthos/ + /karpos/ + /stemmenos/
‘crowned with flowers and fruits’ < ‘flower’ + ‘fruit’ + ‘crowned’.

3. Conclusions

Most formations mentioned in the general theoretical literature are productive in Greek. From a diachronic viewpoint, the Medieval period sees the development of new derivational types, which are mostly retained in the Modern Greek dialects, and much less so in Standard Modern Greek.
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Περίληψη

Η παρούσα εργασία προτείνει ένα γενικό πλαίσιο κατηγοριοποίησης των παρατακτικών συνθέτων (dvandva) με βάση μορφολογικά, συντακτικά και σημασιολογικά κριτήρια, και εξετάζει την διαχρονική εξέλιξη της μορφολογικής αυτής κατηγορίας και των υποκατηγοριών της στην Ελληνική.
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