CAPPADOCIAN GREEK arev ‘NOW’ AND RELATED ADVERBS: THE EFFECTS OF CONFLATION, COMPOSITION, AND RESEGMENTATION

In the Istorikovn Lexikovn thī Nevai Ellhnikhvī, an adverbial form arev, glossed as ‘twvra’ (‘now’), is given for the Cappadocian dialects of Modern Greek. In addition, other apparently related forms are cited, including aresouv, aretsouv, arevtsa, revtsa, among others, with a more emphatic meaning ‘amevswī twvra’ (‘right now’), all of which quite plausibly can be taken to be built from arev as a base, with revtsa suggesting the base can be more accurately indicated as (a)rev. All of these forms are said to be “of unknown etymology” (agnwvstou etuvou).
Within Greek, of course, forms arev / rev, and especially the monosyllable rev, look quite familiar, as variants of the particle brev ([vré]) that Pring\(^2\) glosses as “unceremonious mode of address or cry of surprise, impatience, etc.”.\(^3\) However, it is difficult to motivate a semantic or functional connection between an adverb meaning ‘now’ and this particle of address,\(^4\) suggesting that one should look elsewhere for the etymon of the Cappadocian adverb.

\(^2\)J. Pring, *The Oxford Dictionary of Modern Greek (Greek-English)*, Oxford 1975 (p. 40, s.v.).

\(^3\)While all the variant forms of brev, including arev and rev, are generally considered to derive from Ancient Greek mwrev, the vocative of mwrovı ‘dull, foolish’, a borrowing explanation for at least some of the forms cannot be entirely ruled out. See now B. Joseph, “Methodological Issues in the History of the Balkan Lexicon: The Case of Greek vré/ré and its Relatives”, to appear in *Gedenkschrift für Zbigniew Golab* (V. Friedman & M. Belyavski-Frank, eds., (1996)), for discussion (with literature) of all of the variants of brev that are found in Greek and in other Balkan languages.

\(^4\)This is not to say that such a connection is impossible. For instance, English now can be used as a discourse-initiating element (as in, *Now, what are we going to do about this problem?*), and from such a function, it is not such a large step to use as a general attention-getter. However, in the Greek case, the movement would have to have been in the opposite direction, from an attention-getting function to the meaning ‘now’. Admittedly, the English use of now indicates that a close relation between the two functions is possible, but the direction of functional shift evident in the English is a broadening, which in this case seems
Fortunately, one does not have to look too far afield, for Greek presents another potential source for Cappadocian (a)rev, through a set of adverbs found in Medieval Greek, with continuations in some of the modern dialects, that offers a more compelling semantic basis for the connection than does the lexical family of brev. Thus in what follows, an account is developed for this new etymological proposal for (a)rev ‘now’.

The relevant Medieval Greek forms are Δεδαυρε (accented as “edare in some sources⁵) and its apparent “plural” form Δεδαυρε.⁶ These forms are well attested in Medieval Greek, occurring in the poems of Theodoros

---

⁶So labeled, for instance, by Pernot (loc. cit.). It is not at all clear that -te has to be treated as a “plural” marker in any sense, either historically (see below on its etymology) or synchronically; note, for instance, that -te in Δεδαυρε can co-occur with a singular imperative, as in (2), and is found on other adverbs in which there is no hint of a plural meaning, e.g. in τακτε ‘supposedly; as it were; I wonder’ (cited by Pernot (op. cit.: 295),
Prodromos and Michael Glykas, from the middle of the 12th century, and in the early 14th century *Chronicle of Morea*, as the following examples show:

(1) Δεδαβρε, μιξβάν Ομάδον ἀπαντά τὰ λαμβάνω (Prodromos II.63)  
‘Now, mix together everything which I take’

(2) Δεδαβρτε, μανβῆ γραμμάτων καὶ καθήκεται να προχωθή (Glykas 204)  
‘Now, study (lit.: “learn letters”) and believe you will get ahead’

(3) a. κ’ Δεδαβρτε τοῦ Δεμποβίδης ..... (Morea 2540H)  
‘And now he restrained him ....’

b. ..... ὡσαῦν σεῦ βλεψῶν Δεδαβρτε (Morea 4102H)  
‘...... as I now see you’.

As indicated by the above translations, the meaning of Δεδαβρε / Δεδαβρτε is ‘now’, and this meaning is confirmed by various facts. For one thing, in the

and note also the more standard variant τακατεί, presumably with an adverbial ending -ı, as in dialectal (e.g. Rhodian) τοβτε compared with Standard Greek τοβτε).


10So E. Kriaravi, *Lexikov thu mesaiwnikhti ellhnikhti dhmwdou grammateiva1 1100-1669*, t. 5, Qessalonivkh 1977 (p. 299-301, s. vv.), who also gives further meanings for Δεδαβρτε (but not for Δεδαβρε) of ‘then’, for an example in which the adverb indicates temporal sequencing (referring to the next action taken), and ‘immediately’, which in one case is for *Morea* 2540, where the manuscript variants suggest instead ‘now’, as indicated above.
lines from the Paris (P) manuscript of the *Chronicle of Morea* that correspond to those cited in (3) from the Copenhagen (H) manuscript, the adverb τώρα ‘now’ occurs instead of ἄδειφτε:

(4) a. καὶ ἄδειφτε τῷν ἀκοπνάδεσσα ..... (Morea 2540P)
   ‘And now he restrained him ....’

b. ..... ὡσά ἄδειφτε τώρα (Morea 4102P)
   ‘...... as I now see you’.

In addition, among the modern forms directly connected with ἄδειφτε / ἄδειφτε are the Pontic ἀδαράβ and Tsakonian [éðari], both having the meaning ‘now’.11

Besides this meaning, some instances of ἄδειφτε / ἄδειφτε seem also to mean ‘behold!’, as in the following from different versions of the romance *Libistros and Rhodamne*, cited by Kriaras:12

In any case, in all these meanings, the adverb is linked to temporal immediacy. For a parallel to the apparent, but not actual, contradiction of a single element meaning both ‘now’ and ‘then’, compare the meanings of Ancient Greek δή ‘at this point; at that point; now; then’, where the sense is literally “at some (close) temporal point”, and thus either ‘now’ (‘at this point’) or ‘then’ (‘at that point’).

11Both forms are cited by Pernot (op. cit.: 153), who actually uses <z> in the Tsakonian form as his symbol for the voiced interdental fricative noted here as [ð].
and indeed the examples from Prodromos and Glykas in (1) and (2) above seemingly admit a nontemporal, discourse-initiating sense of ‘now’ (see footnote 4). This sense is important, however, for it provides some insight into how Δεδαντα arose in Medieval Greek. While it is not clear if Δεδαντα ‘now’ and Δεδαντα ‘behold!’ are to be treated as a single polysemous lexical item synchronically, or instead two different but homophonous words, it is likely that they have different etymological sources. Several proposals have been advanced for the sources of these forms, as outlined below, but most are not concerned with the semantic difference between ‘now’ and ‘behold!’.

In particular, the ‘now’ word can be taken to derive from a combination of temporal adverbials, specifically the Medieval Greek adverb evda (from Ancient Greek “hdh ‘already; immediately; now’ or dhv ‘at this point; at that point;”

---

12Loc. cit., s.vv. “Esc.” and “Paris” refer to different manuscript versions (“Esc.” for Escorial).
now; then’) and “arti ‘just now; presently’, and indeed, the form edavrti, meaning ‘already’, which is a more transparent compound with “arti, is attested in Medieval Greek. The ‘behold’ form, on the other hand, can be taken to derive from evde (also edev), itself from idev ‘see!’, plus avre, from the imperative of aivrw ‘take, which when combined together provide a good basis for the ‘behold’ meaning.

It is likely therefore that for the temporal meaning, the form with -t-, ∆edavrte, is basic, while for the ‘behold’ meaning, the form without -t-, ∆edavre, is basic. The apparent “plural”, ∆edavrte, in the meaning ‘now’, most likely

---

13So Kriaravı (loc. cit., s.v.), following Andriotis. Both possible sources for evda require some special assumptions about the development into evda; for instance, to account for the initial e-, a dialectal development of h to e (regular in Pontic but not the rest of the dialects, though the change is more widespread in some phonetic environments) might be assumed or else, especially if dhv is the source, prothesis of e, perhaps as in etouvtoı (where the e is analogical based on another deictic, ekeivnoı). Similarly, the final -a seems to be an analogical replacement for -h, based on other adverbials with that ending.

14So S. Lambros, Collection de romans grecs en langue vulgaire et en vers, Paris 1880 (p. 336), though note that Pernot (op. cit., 63) feels that the -i is an analogical replacement for the -e of ∆edavrte.

15For example, in Libistros and Rhodamne (N) 1598, as cited by Kriaravı (loc. cit.), and in Callimachus and Chrysorrhoe 1191 (Lambros op. cit.).

16So Kriaravı (loc. cit., s.v.), following Pernot.
shows remodeling of the vocalism of the ending based on another temporal adverb, such as tovte ‘then’ or povte ‘when?’, and thus is not a plural in any real sense; ∆edavrte ‘behold’, however, could be a true plural in origin at least, since a -te plural ending on an imperative is unexceptional, especially if, as seems likely, edar- had been reinterpreted as a unit.

Still unaccounted for at this point is the form ∆edavre, without -t- but with the meaning ‘now’. It could well be a conflation or crossing of ∆edavrte ‘now’ (from ∆edavrti with -e from tovte or the like) with ∆edavre / ∆edavrte ‘behold’. That is, based on an etymologically erroneous linking of the ‘now’ and the ‘behold’ lexemes — and one can point to typological parallels such as the juxtaposition of English attention-getting forms as in Now, hold on there just a minute! to give some plausibility to such an identification of the two etymologically distinct words — speakers could easily have created a form ∆edavre ‘now’ to provide a counterpart to original ∆edavrte, so that it would parallel, from a formal standpoint, the pair ∆edavre / ∆edavrte ‘behold’.

As far as etymology of Cappadocian arev is concerned, all that matters is having ∆edavre with the meaning ‘now’ available. Due to the existence of the independent form evde, ∆edavre would be readily segmentable, with the result that via a resegmentation and clipping, arev could arise, a part of a word carrying the meaning of the whole word, just as English cab with the meaning
‘taxicab’ appears to be a clipping from taxicab.\textsuperscript{17} Support for this account comes from the existence of the widely attested form Δeda in Medieval Greek, which has the meaning ‘now’,\textsuperscript{18} for it appears to be a clipping (shortening) of the readily segmentable Δedavre ‘now’, with the first part carrying the meaning of the whole source form, just as taxicab in English has also spawned the clipping taxi with the meaning of the whole source form. This account could also be used to provide a straightforward reason for the appearance of the variant base re- for Cappadocian arev, as indicated by the related form revtsa; that is, rev- need not be a phonological apheresis but rather one result left over from the resegmentation imposed on Δedavre.

\textsuperscript{17}I interpret the origin of cab in this way, even though most sources (e.g. The American Heritage Dictionary\textsuperscript{3}, Boston 1992 (s.v.)) treat it as a shortening just of cabriolet, a word for a type of carriage. Cabriolet, when compounded with taximeter (from taxameter, thus a meter for measuring the tax or charge on something) formed the basis, taximeter cabriolet, from which taxicab derived. What is telling here, though, is that while cab can have the meaning of ‘driver’s compartment within a vehicle’, and in that sense may well be a shortening just of cabriolet, to get the meaning ‘taxicab’, one would have to, it seems, go to the form taxicab itself for the shortening. Thus, cab in the meaning ‘taxicab’ would have to derive from taxicab itself, and therefore be a one-time part of a whole that came to take on the meaning of the whole itself.

\textsuperscript{18}Kriaravı (op. cit., 298).
One potential problem with this proposed etymology concerns the attested accent on the final syllable in the Cappadocian form, but this need not be a serious obstacle. For one thing, the evidence of Pontic adarav and Tsakonian [éz̃ari] cited above, along with Medieval Greek Δεδαβρέ, suggest that accent for this form was variable; indeed, if the clipping occurred on the form underlying the Tsakonian form, then an accentless [are] might have resulted, either syllable of which could thus end up stressed in accent-bearing positions in a sentence or phrase. It is possible as well that there is some influence from Turkish here, for it not only has stress regularly on the final syllable in a word, but also shows a word which could have provided a direct point of departure for end-stress on the Cappadocian form: ará ‘interval’, when it occurs in a doubled form, ará ará, has an overtly temporal sense ‘from time to time’, which would thus be semantically, as well as phonologically, close, to arev ‘now’.

Thus overall the derivation of arev from Δεδαβρέ provides a solid basis for the meaning and form found for this Cappadocian adverb, requiring only that

19It is possible that the Pontic form [har] ‘now’ found in the Ophis region of the Pontic dialect, cited by P. Mackridge (p. 133) in “Greek-Speaking Moslems of North-East Turkey: Prolegomena to a Study of the Ophitic Sub-Dialect of Pontic”, Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies 11 (1987), 115-137, and the similar form [ar] found in other subdialects (Mackridge, p.c. 20/1/95), belong etymologically with the Cappadocian arev under discussion here. A. Papadopoulos (Istorikovn lexikovn thı pontikhvı dialevktou, Athens 1958-61, s.v.) derives these Pontic forms in general from Ancient Greek ajvra, with the initial [h-] of the Ophis
one allow for the effects of resegmentation, some analogically induced reshaping, and clipping, the assumption of which, as well-attested processes of morphological change all, is not at all problematic.20
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form being from the Turkish deictic particle ha, found elsewhere in Ophis. The semantics of Papadopoulos’ suggested etymology leave something to be desired, compared with the straightforward semantics of the connection with ejdavre. I am grateful to Peter Mackridge of the University of Oxford for help concerning the Pontic forms.

20It is possible also that the same processes, and even some of the same lexemes, are responsible for the ultimate derivation of Modern Greek edwv ‘here’ from Ancient Greek »wde, if, as noted by N. Andriwthî (Etumologikov lexikov tî koinhvî neoolhnikhvî, Qessalonivkh 1983, s.v.), following Pernot and others, the deictic evde was somehow involved in the creation of edwv. That is, one can suppose that a combination of evde and »wde, giving *edwvde, could easily have been resegmented to *edwv-de, with the second syllable understood as a reinforcing deictic particle, and clipped to give edwv, a series of processes similar to what is posited here for edavre leading to arev.