

Bartoněk, Antonín

Chronology of the first Greek compensatory lengthening reexamined

Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. E, Řada archeologicko-klasická. 1968, vol. 17, iss. E13, pp. [153]-162

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/109525>

Access Date: 27. 11. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

ANTONÍN BARTONĚK

CHRONOLOGY OF THE FIRST GREEK COMPENSATORY LENGTHENING REEXAMINED

Old Greek belongs to those Indo-European languages which in the course of their historical development displayed the tendency to liquidate consonantal groups by compensatory lengthening. The studies of ancient Greek dialects have induced us to divide Greek compensatory lengthenings into three groups:¹

a) The first and the oldest compensatory lengthening, accomplished in connection with the liquidation of the primary non-terminal consonantal groups *rs*, *ls*, *ms*, *ns*, *sr*, *sl*, *sm*, *sn*, *ln* (and maybe also *sw*), and running its course probably prior to the accomplishment of the Attic-Ionic change $\bar{a} > \bar{e}$ (the type **esmi* > *ēmi*, **bolnā* > *bōlā*, **stalnā* > *stālā*, cf. the Attic-Ionic *εἰμί*, *βουλή*, *στήλη*); as essentially concurrent with this compensatory lengthening is usually considered to be an analogical vocal lengthening of *e*, *i*, *u* before the consonantal groups *rj*, *mj*, *nj* (type **phtherjō* > *phthērō*, cf. the Attic-Ionic *φθέρω*). These lengthenings were accomplished in all the Greek Classical dialects, Thessalian and Lesbian excepting, where we can observe in their place the gemination of liquids and nasals (cf. the Lesbian-Thessalian *φθέρρω*). Thus we have to deal with a very extensive innovation isogloss.

b) The second compensatory lengthening, associated with the liquidation of the primary terminal *-ns* and the secondary non-terminal *-ns-* and originating later than the Attic-Ionic change $\bar{a} > \bar{e}$ (type *ens* > *ēs*, *tons* > *tōs*, cf. the Attic *εἷς*, *τούς* [Acc. Plur.], and **pantjə* > **pantja* > *pan(t)sa* > *pāsa*, cf. the Attic *πᾶσα*). This change was accomplished without residue in some Greek regions only: in the whole Attic-Ionic area, in the Doric Megarian-Corinthian-East Argolic areas, in the North-West dialects, further in Boeotian, Laconian, and Pamphylian; besides, it was partly carried out (i.e. more or less only either in the end of the word or only medially) also in a few more areas, such as Crete, the East Aegean Doric islands (Rhodos, Thera and others), and Elis.

c) The third compensatory lengthening, accomplished as the result of the liquidation of the consonantal groups *rw*, *lw*, *nw* and demonstrable only in the Ionic of Asia Minor, the Ionic of Cyclades, East Aegean Doric, Crete, and Argos.

Of these three compensatory lengthenings the lengthenings of the type *pansa* > *pāsa* and *ksenwos* > *ksēnos* are substantially younger, so that their accomplishment cannot be assumed to have taken place in the Linear Script B already. Thus the

¹ An abbreviated version of this article appeared under the title "Compensatory Lengthening in Mycenaean" in *Atti e Memorie del 1° Congresso Internazionale di Micenologia, Roma 1967* (ed. 1968).

type *ksēnos* presupposes liquidation of the phone *w* after a foregoing nasal or liquid, whereas in Mycenaean *w* had been positively preserved even in this position (cf. the Mycenaean expression *ke-se-nu-wi-ja* = *ksenuwija* [Nom. Plur.]). It is true that the existence of the type *pāsa* might be admitted as a theoretical possibility in Mycenaean already (in the group *ns* the Mycenaean orthography omits *n*, and while in terminal position, even the whole *ns*), but it is worth noting that Arcadian — as a successor of the dialectal group which included the language of the Linear B texts—was never the scene of the second compensatory lengthening, and neither were a number of other Greek dialects. Moreover, the very geographic distribution of those above-said dialects that did not accomplish the second compensatory lengthening either at all or at least in some positions in the word indicates with its dispersal a *post-Mycenaean* (with Doric dialects *post-colonization*) accomplishment of this change; besides Arcadian, the second compensatory lengthening was not effected at all in Lesbos, Thessaly, Argolis, Central Crete, and it is restricted only to some positions in the word in Elis, West and East Crete, and in the East Doric islands. This conclusion finds corroboration also in the fact that in the Attic-Ionic area the accomplishment of the second compensatory lengthening (type *pansa* > *pāsa*) is a later occurrence than the local change $\bar{a} > \bar{\alpha}$, which is today as a rule associated with the beginning of the 1st millennium B.C.

We shall therefore turn our further attention just to the oldest compensatory lengthening of the type *esmi ēmi*. This lengthening is generally supposed to have been already accomplished in the language of the Linear Script B. It is true that researchers have until recently been mostly concentrating² only on the expressions *a-ke-ra₂-te*, *-o-pe-ro-si agersantes*,³ *ophelonsi* < **opheln-*. It was only recently that Doria⁴—and still more recently also Ruijgh⁵—tried substantially to amplify the number of suitable documents, and the outcome of their efforts was the conclusion that the first compensatory lengthening actually was accomplished in Mycenaean.

But these arguments differ as to weightiness and force of evidence, and even if, taken together, they seem to corroborate the view of the Mycenaean accomplishment of the first compensatory lengthening, each of them separately appears to be in some way disputable, whether from different linguistic points of view (cf. e.g. Ruijgh's scepticism concerning *a-ni-ja*, *a-ke-re*, *-o-pe-ro-si*,⁶ but also, let us say, Gallavotti's hypothesis about the "Aeolic" gemination in Mycenaean [*a-ke-ra₂-te* = *agerrantes*]), or simply because the hitherto offered interpretations of Mycenaean expressions are not always fully reliable (cf. e.g. Doria's interpretation of the expression *e-ke-r(i)ja-u-na* [usually transcribed as *e-ke-ra₂-u-na*], which is, no doubt, attractive, but certainly not the only possible one).

All this considered, the present situation appears to be the following: The possibilities of drawing arguments in favour of the above hypothesis directly from the Mycenaean material seem to have been exhausted without the hypothesis being univocally substantiated. For this reason we should like in this contribution to attempt its verification from another angle, namely by answering the question to what extent the Mycenaean accomplishment of the first compensatory lengthening may be safely

² See, e.g., Vilborg, *Tentative Grammar* 41, 53 (but with reservations).

³ Or *angelantes* < **angels-*.

⁴ Doria, *Avviamento* 56 f.

⁵ Ruijgh, *Études* 59 ff.

⁶ Cf. the reservations of Ruijgh (l.c.) concerning some Mycenaean interpretations.

assumed if we take into consideration the geographic spread of the first compensatory lengthening in the Greek dialectal world of the first millennium B.C.

We have already pointed out that the compensatory lengthening of the type **esmi* > *ēmi* affected nearly the entire Greek dialectal world, Thessaly and Aeolis of Asia Minor excepting. Yet, the outcome of this process were not quite the same *ē*- and *ō*-results throughout this vast area. On the one hand, the lengthening of *a* into *ā*, *i* into *ī*, and *u* into *ū*, e.g. in the word *stālā* < **stalmā*, had identical results in all the Greek dialects; on the other hand, however, if *e* or *o* were lengthened in this way, the result was either a close *ē/ō*, differing from the primary *ē/ō* (which inclined in this case rather to assume the character of an open quality), or an *ē/ō* of mid-long quality, fully identical with the quality of the primary *ē/ō*. Compare e.g. the Attic-Ionic, Megarian, Corinthian, East-Argolic, and the North-West *εἰμί* (*beside* *ἔθηκε*)⁷ with the Arcadian, Elean, Laconian, West-Argolic, Cretan, and East Doric *ἦμί*,⁸ whose secondary *ē* assumes quite the same character as the primary *ē* in *ἔθηκε*.⁹ At the same time this important differentiation seems to have been chronologically closely connected with the accomplishment of the first compensatory lengthening, for the possibility of it occurring long after the first compensatory lengthening process should be, in our opinion, rejected for the following reasons:

a) If long *ē*, *ō*, identical with the primary *ē*, *ō*, had originated in the very beginning of the compensatory lengthening process (i.e. for instance an *ēmi* would have originated with the same *ē* as in *ἔθηκε*), this universal *ē*, *ō* could not have later split in the first type dialects into the secondary close *ē*, *ō* and the primary open *ē*, *ō*, for two phones which have once fused become phonetically and phonemically indistinguishable in their common global quality, while their origin can be detected only by theoretical linguistic judgement. From this we may draw the conclusion that in the first type dialects the first compensatory lengthening gave rise to the close *ē*, *ō* from the very beginning.

b) If, on the other hand, however, the close *ē*, *ō* had resulted from the first compensatory lengthening at the outset everywhere, it would obviously imply that this new close *ē*, *ō* would have had to fuse in the course of time with the primary *ē*, *ō* in the second type dialects, i.e. in Arcadian, Boeotian, Elean, Laconian, West-Argolic, Cretan, East Aegean Doric, and in Pamphylian, and this fuse would have had to occur before the date of the first available documents in those dialects, in other words prior to the 7/6th cent. B.C. The accomplishment of such a phonic change is, naturally, improbable, not only because there is no indication in any of the enumerated dialects of a former existence of an *ēmi* with a close *ē*, but also, and particularly, because such a change — utterly undocumented so far — would have had to be effected by the 7/6th cent. B.C. in quite a number of Greek dialects, which were not always genetically closely interrelated and were, besides, often separated from one another with high mountains or the sea. In fact, it is hard to imagine that a change of this kind

⁷ We prefer here the later spelling *η/ω* to the earlier *ē/ō*.

⁸ The form *ἦμί* is, however, not documented as such in all the dialects quoted.

⁹ In Boeotian, the old universal *ē*, comprising both the primary and the secondary *ē* (see both *ἔμι* and *ἀνέθηκε* in the early Boeotian inscriptions), was shifted to *ē* after the accomplishment of the monophthongization of *ai* > *ē* so that only *εἰμί* [= *ēmi*] is documented in the later, i.e. "Ionic" alphabet of Boeotia (in contrast to *η* e.g. in *καί*). As for Pamphylian, the later contrast *ῶσα*: *ἀγγύρου* seems to indicate that even in the older *ῶσα* (2nd lengthening) and *ἔβόλασσεν* (1st lengthening) the *ō*-vowel was identical with the quality of the primary *ō* as found e.g. in *ἐχέτο*.

could have been accomplished within the boundaries of one single continuous isogloss, comprising an area of a wide circumference and strongly divided, stretching from Elis to Arcadia, Messenia, Laconia and West Argolis, but also to Boeotia (and maybe Achaea as well), and to Crete and the East Dorian islands. Even less probable would be the assumption that the change would have been accomplished in each of these regions more or less independently. In our opinion, namely, the fact that these areas appear to be similar as to the quality of their compensatory lengthening of e, o , makes in the light of the geographical situation of these regions the impression of being rather an expression of archaizing tendency. In other words, we see in it a tendency to preserve what existed before and not an outcome of some innovation changes $\bar{e} > \bar{e}, \bar{o} > \bar{o}$, all the more so since no phonic change of this kind has, in fact, been ascertained in the whole development of the Greek long-vowel system (we can observe there rather the opposite current tendency to close the open or the mid-long \bar{e}, \bar{o}). This reflection justifies us, therefore, in concluding that in the second type dialects the process of the first compensatory lengthening was from the very beginning giving rise to a long \bar{e}, \bar{o} which was identical with the primary \bar{e}, \bar{o} ; thus we evidently have to deal with \bar{e}, \bar{o} of mid-long quality.

And so on the basis of arguments formulated sub a) and b) we may take for granted that the crystalization of both these types, the type $\epsilon\iota\mu\acute{\iota}$ and the type $\eta\mu\acute{\iota}$, was either directly concurrent with the accomplishment of the first compensatory lengthening or was occurring shortly after it (we have here in mind only such space of time as was necessary for stabilization of phonemic unsteadiness that had resulted from the accomplishment of the change in a dialect). To express it once more in concrete words, things were as follows: in one group of Greek dialects the newly arisen \bar{e}, \bar{o} was assuming a close character rather immediately after the accomplishment of the first compensatory lengthening, while in the other group it was fusing with the primary \bar{e}, \bar{o} either at once or after a short and practically negligible space of time. This, of course, means that the accomplishment of the first compensatory lengthening resulted in splitting the Greek linguistic world into two extensive areas that distinctly differed from each other as to their long-vowel system development.¹⁰ That is to say, while the dialects of the $\eta\mu\acute{\iota}$ type kept preserving only five long vowels, the dialects of the $\epsilon\iota\mu\acute{\iota}$ type disposed now of seven long vowels: they had in addition a close \bar{e}, \bar{o} , and their mid \bar{e}, \bar{o} got probably shifted to the position of open \bar{e}, \bar{o} . At the same time the innovation area of the $\epsilon\iota\mu\acute{\iota}$ type was formed in such way as not to exclude the possibility of this innovation spreading from one centre. If we take into consideration that the accomplishment of the first compensatory lengthening occurred no doubt before the departure of the main colonization stream from Attica to Asia Minor across the sea, this innovation affected in its earliest phase a territory which was continuous, had a good system of communication, and extended from the north-west coast of the Gulf of Corinth (Aetolia, Locris, Phocis with centres adjoining the Corinthian Gulf) across the Corinthian Isthmus itself as far as the north and south-west coasts of the Saronic Gulf (Megaris, Attica, East Argolis). Even in those times when there was no canal across the Isthmus, this isthmus surely represented a smaller communication obstacle between the two gulfs than the ranges of mountains separating some of the regions of the Peloponnese (to put it concretely, we can e.g. much easier imagine the spread of the above-mentioned innovation across the Isthmus of Corinth, whether westward or eastward, than assume in conformation

¹⁰ See Bartoněk, Development 133 ff.

with paragraph b) that e.g. the West-Argolic, Arcadian and Laconian $\eta\mu\acute{\iota}$ might have been the outcome of one and the same continuous innovation change of the older $\bar{\epsilon}mi$ into $\bar{\epsilon}m\acute{\iota}$).

Thus it appears most probable that both, the multiplication of long vowels and the compensatory lengthening itself, were accomplished in this innovation area as late as in the post-Mycenaean Era, for among the participators in the origin of the new close $\bar{\epsilon}/\bar{\rho}$ couple were not only the Attic-Ionic dialects, but also a part of the West-Greek (= Dorian) dialects, i.e. the so-called North-West dialects, Corinthian, Megaric, East Argolic. The assumption that Attic-Ionic had adopted the close $\bar{\epsilon}/\bar{\rho}$ before this period already and after the Doric migration passed on this innovation to some of the West-Greek dialects appears incredible in the light of the following argument: At the time of Dorian southward and eastward expansion it does not seem probable that a spread of such an Attic-Ionic influence westward across the Isthmus of Corinth as far as Aetolia should have taken place, all the less so since Attica was by this time preparing to extend her cultural and political aspiration eastward, via the Cyclades to Asia Minor. The other conceivable hypothesis, assuming the accomplishment of the close, compensated $\bar{\epsilon}/\bar{\rho}$ in some of the West-Greek dialects at some older date and its subsequent spread to Attic-Ionic, must be refuted in the light of the fact that the rest of the West-Greek dialects, which can hardly be imagined as distinctly separated from the above-mentioned group of West-Greek dialects prior to the Dorian migration, appear to be quite ignorant of this close $\bar{\epsilon}/\bar{\rho}$. The only possibility would be to assume the existence of two innovation centres with the close $\bar{\epsilon}/\bar{\rho}$ in the post-Mycenaean period, centres that happened to originate independent of each other, one in the Attic area and the other in Doric regions near the Corinthian and Saronic Gulfs. This would, however, mean overtaxing the capacity of chance, and it will surely be more reasonable to look for a common denominator of the origin of the close $\bar{\epsilon}$, $\bar{\rho}$ pair in both these areas, provided this undertaking is practicable from the geographic point of view. And we believe it is. Be it as it will, the multiplication of the long-vowel phonemes in the area of the two Gulfs certainly seems to be a post-Mycenaean innovation phenomenon, accomplished until some of the West-Greek dialects got in touch with the Attic-Ionic dialects subsequent to the Dorian migration. And if this phenomenon actually represented a late occurrence, then we must likewise assume here a late—i.e. post-Mycenaean—accomplishment of the first compensatory lengthening, because, as we have pointed out sub a), we can by no means imagine that the $\bar{\epsilon}/\bar{\rho}$ couple originating through a compensation process should have first acquired the character of a mid quality, identical with the primary $\bar{\epsilon}$, $\bar{\rho}$, and then, in the course of time, it should have departed from this $\bar{\epsilon}$, $\bar{\rho}$ once more and changed into $\bar{\epsilon}$, $\bar{\rho}$. This taken for granted, we have even to assume the post-Mycenaean accomplishment of the first compensatory lengthening in all the West-Greek dialects, for, as it was indicated before, the post-migration differentiation of the West-Greek dialects does not make the impression of being a continuation of some pre-migration differences. If West Greek had namely accomplished the first compensatory lengthening before the Dorian migration already, there could hardly exist in the Classical Era differences between “Doris mitior” (with the “additional” close $\bar{\epsilon}$, $\bar{\rho}$) and “Doris severior” (without the close $\bar{\epsilon}/\bar{\rho}$ couple) so distinct as to make of “Doris mitior” in the 1st millennium B. C. a scene of a geographically connected isogloss with a good communication system, which actually was the case.

As for the Attic-Ionic and West-Greek dialects, the possibility of an early, i.e. Mycenaean (or pre-migration) accomplishment of the first compensatory lengthening

should therefore be dismissed. Naturally, this conclusion does not imply that the first compensatory lengthening was definitely not accomplished before in some other Greek dialects. The only remaining dialects, however, which might come into consideration, would be the Aeolic and Achaeae (proto-Arcado-Cypriot) dialects.

As far as the Achaeae dialects are concerned, the first compensatory lengthening appears to have been accomplished in them in the Mycenaean Era already. This view finds support in the fact that in all the three "Arcado-Cypriot" dialects of the Classical Era, i.e. in Arcadian, Cypriot, and Pamphylian, we can demonstrate the accomplishment of the first compensatory lengthening (see e.g. Arc. ἦναι, βωλᾶς, Cyp. e-mi [not e-si-mi], Pamph. ἐβδλάσεν).¹¹ In respect to the quality of their both \bar{e} -result and \bar{o} -result we may safely say about Arcadian and about Pamphylian with rather great probability that this quality was in these dialects identical with the quality of the primary \bar{e} , \bar{o} (cf. Pamphylian ἐχέτῳ Schw. DGE 686₈ [Silyon, IV]), whereas the same can neither be proved nor disproved in Cypriot, considering the syllabic script employed in this area. In the light of these circumstances there are but two explanations available: either all these dialects passed through the process of the first compensatory lengthening in their common Peloponnesian-Achaeae home already, or else they accomplished it with precisely the same results, and quite independently of each other, in areas that were practically isolated. The latter possibility seems to be less probable, even though we have to admit that tendencies towards some phonic changes may survive after a period of symbiosis as potential tendencies, and may experience their full accomplishment much later in new, isolated areas, where the dialectal units are independent of their former associates. On the other hand, it may of course be pointed out that a quite analogical process, i.e. the second compensatory lengthening of the type *pansa* > *pāsa*, was not effected in all those Greek regions which had accomplished the first compensatory lengthening, although the potential tendency to this change may rightly be assumed in all these areas thanks to the foregoing process of the first lengthening.

As for the Aeolic dialects, we know that Thessalian and Aeolian of Asia Minor, represented chiefly by the Lesbian dialect, never accomplished the first compensatory lengthening, liquidating the consonantal groups affected elsewhere by this lengthening through gemination. We cannot say how old this gemination actually was, but it evidently must be antedated to Aeolian colonization of Asia Minor, for otherwise we could hardly explain the Thessalian-Lesbian conformity. On the other hand, a still older, i.e. Mycenaean, provenience of this phenomenon may be objected to by arguing that it was just the cognate Boeotian which knew no gemination and effected the first compensatory lengthening instead. This would seem to indicate that the accomplishment of the Thessalian gemination may have occurred later, when the West-Greek tribes got already wedged in between Thessaly and Boeotia. This would, however, imply even for Boeotia the origin of the first compensatory lengthening at a later date, probably associated with the accomplishment of this lengthening in the neighbouring areas, adjoining the Corinthian and Saronic Gulfs. The only discrepancy consists in the fact that Boeotian did not produce in connection with the first compensatory lengthening a new couple of \bar{e} - and \bar{o} -phonemes. It might be explained by arguing that the first compensatory lengthening as such may have actually penetrated to Boeotia from the areas adjoining the Corinthian and Saronic Gulfs, but the systemic innovation accompanying it in the latter areas failed to

¹¹ See Note 9.

assert itself here owing to the fact that the main Boeotian centres were situated in a territory separated from the Corinthian Gulf, the North-West regions, and Attica to a large extent by high mountains.

Yet, there is another explanation available. The Boeotian situation, whose characteristic feature is the fuse of the secondary \bar{e} , \bar{o} arisen from the first compensatory lengthening with the primary \bar{e} , \bar{o} , is identical with the condition known to us from most places in the Peloponnese (Corinthia and East Argolis excepting) and from the Dorian islands, i.e. from areas which prior to the Dorian migration were inhabited by the Achaeans. And it is just the language of the Mycenaean Achaeans—as we have already pointed out—which may be attributed the accomplishment of the first compensatory lengthening, the documents from Arcadia and Pamphylia pointing, as it seems, to the conclusion that the process effected mid-long \bar{e} -/ \bar{o} -results, identical with the quality of the primary \bar{e} , \bar{o} . Thus the question remains open whether the first compensatory lengthening had not been accomplished as early as in the Mycenaean Era not only in the Achaean part of the Peloponnese, but also in one of the most important Aeolian areas in Central Greece, in Boeotia. This assumption would, however, not concern Thessaly, because there either was at that time already in progress the gemination of liquids and spirants—but this is not very probable in the Mycenaean Era—or the tendency to accomplish the first compensatory lengthening had not acquired sufficient force, while the gemination process was running its course later, most likely in the post-Mycenaean times. (The idea that Boeotian may have effected the gemination at some early date together with Thessalian, abandoning it later in favour of the first compensatory lengthening, would be utterly unsubstantiated from the phonetic points of view.

And now, when venturing to attempt on the basis of these arguments some hypothetic conclusions, the chronological picture of the process of the first compensatory lengthening in Greek dialectal prehistory seems to be assuming the following outlines: In Peloponnesian Mycenaean (i.e. in Achaean) the compensatory lengthening of the type **esmi* > *ēmi* had been accomplished before the fall of the Mycenaean civilization. In this lengthening, whose \bar{e} - and \bar{o} -results fused with the quality of the primary \bar{e} , \bar{o} , participated automatically also the Mycenaean dialects of the islands and Pamphylia. As to the Greek mainland, this innovation affected either the whole of the Peloponnese or at least its major part, while it is not altogether excluded—although by no means certain—that this innovation penetrated also to Boeotia, which was one of the areas of Mycenaean spread in Central Greece, in other words, that it penetrated to the Aeolic area. To what extent this might have been possible is a question which likely depends on the spread of Ionic in the area surrounding the Isthmus and Gulf of Corinth—as, according to Strabon,¹² the Ionians were residing even in the north of the Achaean Peloponnese (the question, of course, remains to be answered whether Strabon did not mistake the Peloponnesian Achaeans, who gave the country their name, for Ionians; on the other hand, however, Ionian settlements in Megaris and Corinthia at least may be taken for quite probable by that time). The Ionians themselves—as was pointed out before—had very likely not yet accomplished the first compensatory lengthening in the Mycenaean Era, and the same must be said about the Dorians, who were still living outside the sphere of Mycenaean influence, while those Mycenaean areas that were geographically nearest to the Dorian territory, i.e. Aeolian Thessaly and perhaps also other Central Greek

¹² See Strabon VIII 1, 2 p. 333.

Aeolian areas to the north-west of Boeotia, likewise kept apart from this innovation and were by that time already striking out the path towards the gemination of liquids and nasals, or at least were preparing for it.

When after the fall of the Mycenaean centres—no matter by whom they were destroyed—the Dorians settled down in the south of Greece, their language was bound to be rather strongly affected in numerous respects by the substrate influence of the Peloponnesian (Achaean) and maybe also Central Greek (Aeolic) Mycenaean. The accomplishment of the compensatory lengthening of the type **esmi* > *ēmi*—as an easy means of liquidating consonantal groups, a means hitherto unknown in Doric—might have been one of the manifestations of this influence. At the same time it was to be expected that in Peloponnesian territory this compensatory lengthening would assume the local, substrate Achaean form, i.e. with the *ē*- and *ō*-outcome, identical, as to quality, with the primary *ē*, *ō*, and this development is safely demonstrable in Elis, Messenia, Laconia, West Argolis, and in the Dorian islands in the Aegean Sea, whose Dorian settlers surely arrived there via the Peloponnese. As for Achaea, it is today impossible to make sure what *ē*- and *ō*-results were the outcome of the accomplishment of the first compensatory lengthening, because the inscriptional documents of this region are very late and bear marks of various interdialectal tendencies (we have to deal here particularly with the so-called “Achaean Koine”).

In contrast to it, in the Dorian areas of North-West Greece, near the north coast of the Corinthian Gulf, where no special centres originated even at the time of expansion of the Mycenaean culture, the first compensatory lengthening was accomplished with a special and specific *ē*-/*ō*-result: the originating *ē*, *ō* failed namely for reasons unknown to us to find in the local long-vowel system a phoneme with which it could fuse, and finally assumed the position of independent close *ē*-/*ō*-phonemes (maybe the parallel short *e*, *o* had a close quality there), thus giving rise to a significant systemic innovation, which was to play a prominent role in the future history of Greek dialects. A similar development evidently occurred also in Attica, which very likely was neither affected by the influence of the first Achaean compensatory lengthening in the Mycenaean Era, and the same holds good probably also about other areas in the neighbourhood of the Saronic Gulf and the Isthmus of Corinth—in Megaris, Corinthia, and East Argolis. Further down the Peloponnese this influence did not penetrate, not so much owing to the ranges of mountains, but rather to the credible assumption that the first compensatory lengthening had already been accomplished in that part of the country, with a somewhat different *ē*- and *ō*-results. — As far as Boeotia is concerned, the hypothesis suggested above, that it was associated with the Peloponnesian-Achaean group, encounters one serious difficulty: the Isthmus of Corinth, which is a sort of connecting bridge between the Peloponnese and Central Greece, shows no traces of the “Peloponnesian” variant of the first compensatory lengthening (at the best it might be assumed that the overlying of the former population by the Dorian newcomers was here so radical that for a time being the original Doric character without the first compensatory lengthening was the dominant factor, and it was not until later that it succumbed to the innovation tendency and effected the first compensatory lengthening, to be sure, with a different *ē*- and *ō*-results). If we take into consideration, however, the fact that the compensatory lengthening is a phonological process which is upon the whole quite current in the historical development of languages in general—and in Greek of the close of the 2nd millennium B. C. it appears to have been constantly liable to occur—we might, after all, apply to this Boeotian

problem also the hypothesis about a parallel and independent Mycenaean accomplishment of the first compensatory lengthening both in the Peloponnese (with the Aegean islands) and in Boeotia as well, as these two regions represented the main and at the same time also the most progressive areas, in which the Mycenaean civilization was thriving. In other words, it means that we take into consideration the possibility that Boeotian might have in the Mycenaean Era already more or less independently liquidated those consonantal groups which were liable in the Greek world to be affected by the first compensatory lengthening, and that it actually accomplished this change in respect to such \bar{e} - and \bar{o} -results the analogy of which we assume in the Peloponnesian accomplishment. In principle, however, we can, in our opinion, hardly positively prefer this hypothesis to the solution of the problem suggested on p. 159, according to which the first compensatory lengthening in Boeotian did not occur until in connection with the accomplishment of that wide-spread Doric-Ionic innovation isogloss: even this theory may be modified by the assumption that in this case the first lengthening may have taken place in Boeotia on the whole independently, even if it happened as late as in the post-Mycenaean period.

In conclusion therefore we may say that the detailed analysis of the geographical distribution both of the compensatory lengthening and of its varying \bar{e} - and \bar{o} results permits us to put forward the view that Peloponnesian Mycenaean (i.e. „Achaean“ or „proto-Arcado-Cypriot“ of the Mycenaean period) had very likely completed the first compensatory lengthening of the type $esmi > \bar{e}mi$. On the other hand, however, the present paper has also supplied arguments which seem to us to favour the view that in the Mycenaean period this phenomenon was essentially restricted to the greater part of the Peloponnese and the southern Aegean islands, with the single—and doubtful—exception of the Central Greek of Boeotia. This would mean, therefore, that the Mycenaean of the Linear B texts, about 1200 B.C. at least, was considerably different in its treatment of compensatory lengthening from either all other Greek dialects or at least the great majority of them; and its territory in this respect was an area of innovation characterized by a tendency which was later to become almost universal throughout the Greek world.

Translated by S. Kostomlatský

K CHRONOLOGII PRVNÍHO ŘECKÉHO NÁHRADNÍHO DLOUŽENÍ

Otázka mykénské realizace řeckého náhradního dloужení typu $*esmi > \bar{e}mi$ byla zatím řešena pouze na základě jazykového rozboru lineárních B textů, ale bez většího úspěchu. K problému je však možno přistoupit i z jiné stránky, totiž z hlediska, do jaké míry se jeví mykénské uskutečnění prvního náhradního dloужení, tj. změny provedené již v 2. tis. př. n. l., reálným ve světle geografického rozšíření prvního náhradního dloужení v řeckém nářečním světě v 1. tis. př. n. l. Autor provádí tento geografický rozbor v první části svého článku a na jeho základě se mu jeví obraz chronologického uskutečnění prvního náhradního dloужení v řecké nářeční prehistorii asi takto: v peloponneské mykénštině (tj. v „achajštině“) se uskutečnilo náhradní dloужení typu $*esmi > \bar{e}mi$ ještě před pádem mykénské civilizace. Na tomto dloужení, jehož e -ové a o -ové výsledky tu splývaly s kvalitou \bar{e} , \bar{o} primárního, se staly eo ipso účastnými i předpokládané mykénské dialekty na egejských ostrovech a na Kypru. Přitom na řecké pevnině zasahovala tato inovace větší část Peloponnesu a není vyloučeno — ale to je již dosti nejisté — že se tato inovace rozšířila i do Bojotie, jakožto do jedné z oblastí středořecké (tj. „aiolské“) mykénštiny. V Attice se však zřejmě v době mykénské první náhradní dloужení ještě neprovedlo a stejně ho zůstali v té době stranou jak Dórové, žijící stále ještě mimo oblast mykénské civilizace, tak i mykénské oblasti Dórum geograficky nejbližší, tj. zejména aiolská Thessalie.

Když potom po pádu mykénských center, ať už se to stalo číkoli rukou, přišli Dórové na řecký jih, byl jistě jejich jazyk po mnoha stránkách, jak toho konec konců máme i celou řadu nápisných dokladů, dosti silně zasažen substrátním vlivem peloponéské (achajské) a snad i středoecké (aiolské) mykénštiny. Realizace náhradního dloužení typu **esmi* > *ēmi* — jakožto pohodlný prostředek k likvidaci souhláskových skupin, v dórštině dosud asi neznámý — mohl být jedním z projevů tohoto vlivu. Přitom bylo nasnadě, že se v peloponéských krajinách bude toto náhradní dloužení realizovat v místní substrátové podobě achajské, tj. s *e*-ovým a *o*-ovým výsledkem totožným s kvalitou primárního *ē*, *ō*, a opravdu tento vývoj je bezpečně prokazatelný v Elidě, Messénii, Lakónii a v západní Argolidě, jakož i na dórských ostrovech v Egejském moři, jejichž dórští osídlenci šli zřejmě cestou přes Peloponnés. Pokud jde o Achaju, nelze dnes bezpečně zjistit, k jakému *e*-ovému a *o*-ovému výsledku vedla tamní realizace prvního náhradního dloužení, protože nápisné doklady z této krajiny jsou velmi pozdní a jsou již poznamenány různými interdialektními tendencemi (jde zejména o tzv. „achajskou koiné“).

Naproti tomu v dórských oblastech řeckého severozápadu, při severním pobřeží Korintského zálivu, kde ani v době expanze mykénské kultury nevznikala nějaká její hlavní centra, se první náhradní dloužení uskutečnilo se zvláštním a specifickým *e*-/*o*-ovým výsledkem: takto vznikající dlouhé *ē*, *ō* totiž z důvodů nám nejasných nenašlo v stávajícím dlouhovokalickém systému foném, s nímž by bylo mohlo splynout, a zaujalo nakonec (snad tam mělo paralelní krátké *ē*, *ō* zavřenou kvalitou) postavení samostatného zavřeného *ē*-ového, resp. *ō*-ového fonému, a dalo tak vzniknout významné systémové inovaci, která měla mít v další řecké nářeční historii přímo eminentní význam. Obdobný vývoj nastal zřejmě i v Attice, kam asi v mykénské době vliv achajského prvního náhradního dloužení nepronikl, a ze stejných důvodů patrně i v dalších oblastech při Saronském zálivu a v sousedství Korintské šíje: v Megaridě, Korinthii, východní Argolidě. Dále na Peloponnés jí byly cesty uzavřeny, ani ne tolik horami, jako spíše pravděpodobnou skutečností, že tam všude bylo už první náhradní dloužení uskutečněno, a to s poněkud jiným *ē*-ovým a *ō*-ovým výsledkem. Pokud jde o Bojotii, ta buď a) byla nově vzniklým inovačním územím geograficky nyní oddělena od ostatního území „peloponéské“ varianty prvního náhradního dloužení, anebo b) byla získána pro první náhradní dloužení až teprve nyní, ale v té podobě, že se tam první náhradní dloužení uskutečnilo bez průvodní systémové inovace spočívající ve zdvojení dlouhých *ē*-ových a *ō*-ových fonémů. Tento eventuelní vývoj, uvedený sub b), by byl na sever od Korintského zálivu bez paralely, a tato okolnost hovoří spíše ve prospěch prvé z obou eventualit. Té je však naopak na závadu fakt, že Korintská šíje, spojovací most mezi Peloponnésem a středním Řeckem, nejeví žádné stopy „peloponéské“ varianty prvního náhradního dloužení. Uvážíme-li ovšem, že náhradní dloužení je hláskoslovný proces v historickém vývoji jazyků vůbec dosti běžný — a v řečtině z konce 2. tisíciletí př. n. l. téměř jakoby neustále „na spadnutí“ — mohli bychom tento bojotský problém možná řešit i hypotézou o paralelním a nezávislém mykénském uskutečnění prvního náhradního dloužení jak na Peloponnésu a egejských ostrovech, tak zároveň i v Bojotii — jakožto ve dvou hlavních, a tím zároveň snad i jazykově nejprogressivnějších oblastech, v nichž se mykénská civilizace rozvíjela.

Komplexní rozbor geografického rozložení jak prvního náhradního dloužení, tak i jeho rozdílných *ē*-ových a *ō*-ových výsledků dovoluje vyslovit nakonec názor, že peloponéskou mykénštinu, tj. „achajštinu“ či „protoarkadokyperštinu“ mykénského období, měla již pravděpodobně první náhradní dloužení typu **esmi* > *ēmi* uskutečněno. Znamená to tedy, že se mykénština lineárních textů B již kolem r. 1200 př. n. l. svým provedeným náhradním dloužením výrazně odlišovala buď od všech ostatních řeckých dialektů, nebo alespoň od jejich velké většiny (to v případě, že týmž vývojem prošla do té doby již též mykénská bojotština), a že se její území jevílo z tohoto hlediska jakožto území inovační, zasažené tendencí, která se měla stát později tendencí v řeckém světě téměř všeobecně uskutečněnou.