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of allomorphs was eliminated. This happened both when the instrumental case was dropped and when the dative was dropped. The loss of the instrumental also had the effect that the -ā- and -ō- stems, which did not display stem allomorphy, became closer to each other even with regard to the endings. The next case to be lost, the dative, was morphologically complex also because it triggered stem allomorphy in part of the consonant stems. Stem allomorphy was also typical of the nominative of consonant stems. Remarkably, this did not prevent the loss of the dative, nor did it cause the loss of the nominative, a case with very high token frequency. The different paths taken by the forms of the two cases clearly show that case syncretism in Greek is deeply rooted in usage: irregular patterns are preserved if they are frequent enough to be stored individually (nominative); otherwise they are dropped (dative).
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**Causative Formation**

Ancient Greek has no specific causative or anti-causative morphemes. However, there are several morphological means to express causative meaning (for monographic studies of this category see Kuehne (1882) and Hildebrand (1889); see also for a short overview Popescu (1962)).

The commonest formal type of causative opposition is associated with → diathesis (active/middle voice distinction); causative members of the opposition take active morphemes, while anticausatives (sometimes also called, quite infelicitously, ‘pseudo-reflexives’ or ‘pseudo-passives’) are inflected in the middle; see e.g. Rijksbaron (2002:25ff.), Allan (2003:2, 60ff., 82ff. et passim). For some such pairs in the → present tense system, the diathesis opposition is accompanied by the alternation of root vowel (o in causatives, e in non-causatives), which corresponds to the Common Indo-European present causative with the suffix *-eye/o-* and -o-grade in the root (cf. Vedic pāt-āya-ti ‘makes fly’ < *pot-eye-iti* etc.), as in the case of *phobēō* (*phobō*) ‘terrify’ – *phēbomai* ‘panic, flee in terror’ (cf. hōs te kai álkinon āndra phobēi ‘who terrifies even the warlike man...’ (Hom. Il. 16.689) – allā kai autoi hup’ Argeioi phēbonto ‘but they themselves were running in fear from the Argives’ (Hom. Il. 11.121)), see Lavidas (2009:65ff.). This morphological type, still attested in (Old) Germanic and Slavic and very productive in Indo-Iranian, virtually disappeared in Greek (see Brugmann 1913:60ff.; Marguliés 1930:87ff.; Schwyzer 1950:222; Tucker 1990:38ff.; Si sphere 1995:504); according to Tucker (1990:143), even in the case of the handbook example *phobēō*, the causative opposition exists between *phobēō* and *phōbomai* ‘panic’, not between *phobēō* and *phēbomai*. Very few are also examples of causatives associated with other present types, such as nasal, reduplicated or -skō presents (cf. piōn ‘drink’ – *pipi-skō* ‘give to drink’; see Marguliés 1930:98ff.; Schwyzer 1950:222; Tucker 1990:38ff.; Si sphere 1995:504); according to Tucker (1990:143), in the case of the handbook example *phobēō*, the causative opposition exists between *phobēō* and *phōbomai*. Very few are also examples of causatives derived from nominal stems (‘factitives’). They include verbs in -āo (going back to PIE derivatives with the suffix *(e)h₂), such as *dēlō* ‘cause visible, show’ (*dēlos* ‘visible, clear’) (the most productive type, probably an analogical back formation from adjectives in -ōtos), -ēo; as well as a few other types: verbs in -āo, -ainō and -iōn (see Popescu 1962:32; Tucker 1981; Tucker 1990; Hamp 1988 on these formations), cf. *semnōo*, *semnēō* ‘make solemn, magnify’ (*semnōs* ‘holy, solemn’).
iii. Some verbs or verbal forms can be employed both as causatives and anticausatives with no change in their form. This latter type (called ‘labile’ in typological literature) is virtually nonexistent in Homeric Greek and relatively rare in the Classical language, but becomes more common in post--Classical Greek, cf. exa[i]phnês [anoigô tous ophthalmoû mou (Urkunden der Ptolemaierzeit [ältere Funde] 1, 78 rp i) ‘and suddenly I open my eyes’ (transitive-causative) – hou tôs ouk anoigetôi to stôma autô (NT, Acts, 8:32:6) ‘so his mouth does not open’ (intransitive) (Lavidas 2009:313 et passim; Karantzola and Lavidas 2014).

iv. In the → aorist system, causatives can also be expressed by signatic aorists (see e.g. Schwzyer 1939:755ff.; van de Laar 2000:410; Duhoux 2002:36ff.; on the situation in → Mycenaean, see Floyd 1978:287), cf. é-sbe-n ‘I have gone out, I have been quenched’ – é-sbe-sa ‘I have quenched’, é-phu-n ‘I was born’ – é-phu-sa ‘I have generated’, and

v. by reduplicated forms (e.g. lantánhō ‘escape the notice of’ – lēlathon ‘I make forget’; see e.g. Schwzyer 1939:748), probably going back to the original imperfects of reduplicated presents (this type had become productive in Vedic causative aorists with → reduplication of the type djijanat ‘has generated’). Traces of the causative function of → reduplicated presents may be preserved in the meaning of the few active occurrences of the reduplicated present hístēmi ‘set, place’ = causative of ‘stand’ (on which see, in particular, Marguliês (1930:8ff.); Giannakis (1997:74ff.)); on evidence for the reconstruction of the causative meaning for reduplicated stems in PIE, see, for instance, Kulikov (2008:338ff.).

vi. In addition, anticausatives can (occasionally) be expressed by ‘medio-passive’ aorists in -(th)ê-, cf. meîgnumi ‘mix’ – míg-ê-n ‘I have mixed’ (intr.), phainō ‘show’ – e-phân-ê-n ‘I have appeared’.

vii. For a number of verbs, there is a correlation between transitivity and tense (while diathesis is virtually irrelevant for marking causative meaning): forms of the present system (i.e. present proper and imperfect) are (mostly) employed transitively, while perfect and aorist forms are (predominantly) intransitive; cf. trans. 3 sg. impf. arâriske ‘has joined’ – intrans. 1 sg. perf. arêra ‘(I) have been joined’); trans. 3 sg. pres. phîeî ‘brings forth, produces’ – intrans. 3 sg. aor. éphu ‘has grown’, 3 pl. perf. pephûkasi ‘have grown’. On this correlation in Homeric Greek see, in particular, Marguliês (1930:84), Lavidas (2009:56); for this phenomenon (‘split causativity’) in Vedic and IE in a typological perspective see Kulikov (1999).

viii. Causative meaning can also be expressed periphrastically, in constructions with the verb poiô ‘make’ + infinitive of the base verb and the accusative of the causee, as in sé theoi poiôsan hikêsthai oîkon ‘the gods have made you come home’ (Hom. Od. 23:258); see Wackernagel (1926:263). This construction was particularly common in the 5th–4th c., especially well-attested in the philosophical works of Plato and Aristotle; for a comprehensive study of periphrastic causatives in Ancient Greek, see Gibson (2002; 2005; for other verbs expressing the causative meaning, see Jiménez-López 2011).
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Chiasm

The term ‘chiasm’, alternately ‘chiasmus’ (from the Greek verb khíazo, ‘to shape like the letter χ’) is a figure of speech wherein two corresponding elements (words, phrases, or grammatical structures) are placed in the middle of an antithetically balanced clause (ex.: A-B-B-A) (→ Figures (σχήματα), Ancient Theories of). This crosswise placement of elements takes its name from the Greek letter which is itself a cross: χι (Χ). The elements highlighted within a chiasm bear some relationship to one another (whether they be synonymous or antithetical) which the structure is used to emphasize.

The Attic orator and rhetorician Isocrates first used the term ‘chiasm’ to describe a parallel inversion of corresponding elements in the 4th c. BCE (Lausberg 1960:893). A normal example of chiasm is:

(1) kalòn gár tò áthlon kai hê elpis megálē
   ‘For the prize is noble and the hope is great’ (Pl. Phd. 114c)

Note that here no corresponding elements are repeated (i.e., the pattern above is Adj.-Noun-Noun-Adj., but no specific forms/words occur twice). One can, however, find many examples of chiasm in both the writings of the Ionian philosophers as well as among the writers and orators of 4th c. Athens, in which one or more words in the preceding clause is repeated in the following clause. This is more properly termed ‘chiascopic repetition’:

(2) athánatoi thnétoi, thnétoi athánatoi, zôntes tòn ekeinôn thánaton tôn dê ekeinôn bion tethnéotês
   ‘Immortals mortals, mortals immortals, one is living the death of the other, dying the other’s life’ (Heracl. Fr. 62)

Chiasm can also be applied to ideas, motifs, or passages within a larger text. This more abstract form of chiasm is termed a ‘chiasatic structure’. Such structures appear to be much older than the rhetorical term ‘chiasm’, and pre-date the beginnings of Athenian rhetoric, as examples of chiasitic structures can be found in Sumero-Akkadian and Ugaritic texts dating to the 3rd millennium BCE, as well as in the text of the Torah, where it is considered to be one of the most essential elements of its structure (Breck 1994:21).

Instances of chiasm abound throughout the history of Greek rhetoric, from the writings of the Ionian philosophers through to the works of Plato and the orators. It also appears frequently in the text of the New Testament. Its enduring popularity may be attributed to the fact that it proved to be both an elegant and useful tool for organizing text as well as a helpful cue for the reader (all the more essential when one considers that Greek texts of these periods were without punctuation, accentuation, or word divisions). Further, it was considered to be a helpful mnemonic aid. Lastly, it is important to note that the ancients were not strictly linear thinkers; instead they “were taught […] to read from the center outward and from the extremities to the center” (Breck 1994:29). This approach extended the manner in which the alphabet was taught: first from beginning to end, then