

XII

CONCLUSION

In the last chapter of this work we shall now try to determine to what extent the few assumed older genetic bonds, existing among the Greek dialects, were disturbed by 350 B.C. in the single Greek dialects by the development of their long-vowel systems. To be sure, in this connection we have to point out first of all that, contrary to the situation we found when analyzing the consonantal systems in Ancient Greek, the historical development of the old Greek long-vowel system does not manifest any special systemic links that would function as mutual closer kindred ties uniting the Attic-Ionic group and the Arcado-Cypriot group of dialects into one higher genetic unit, i.e. the so-called East Greek, or maybe South Greek, whose existence is presupposed—already for the Mycenaean Era—by Porzig, Risch, Pisani, Chadwick, Chantraine, and others.³³¹ The just mentioned fact can, of course, on the other hand, neither be taken for a serious argument against the recognition of the said unit, let alone for the second half of the 2nd millennium B.C., but with reference to the long-vowel system development at least, it seems that most Greek dialects began to differ noticeably from one another as late as on the threshold between the 1st and the 2nd millennium B.C. So all our attempts at a long-vowel system classification of the Greek dialects can, in fact, register only relations between the dialects existing in a period when the probable older contrast of *East Greek* (= Greek *si*-Dialects): *West Greek* (= Greek *ti*-Dialects), or *East Greek: Aeolic* (= a possibly West Greek branch that separated from West Greek as early as during the Mycenaean Era): post-Mycenaean *West Greek* (= West Greek without Aeolic) was, no doubt, already replaced with the later contrast *Attic-Ionic: Arcado-Cypriot: Aeolic: West Greek* (= Doric in the wider sense of the word). Thus, we shall do the best in the light of all these circumstances if we take in this chapter for the basis of our investigation just the division of the Greek dialects of the 1st millennium B.C. which is today most widely endorsed and can be satisfactorily verified, namely the division into the follow-

³³¹ Cf. Porzig, *IF* 61, 147sqq.; Risch, *MH* 12, 61sqq.; Pisani, *RhM* 98, 1sqq. and *Lingua Posn.* 7, 25sqq.; Chadwick, *G & R* 3, 38sqq.; Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique*² I 495sqq.

ing dialectal groups: 1. Attic-Ionic, 2. Arcado-Cypriot, 3. Aeolic, and 4. West Greek;³³² to this division we shall adhere when confronting the actual long-vowel situation prevailing at approximately 350 B.C. with the assumed historical genetic relations.

1. All the *Attic-Ionic* dialects were about 350 B. C. very progressive from the long-vowel systemic point of view, their inner differentiation being comparatively small; in all of them the long-vowel basis was a four-grade one (and in all of them the diphthongs *ei*, *ou* were already monophthongized, the diphthongs *ai*, *oi* being preserved, on the other hand). The most progressive were Attic, the Ionic of the Cyclades, and the Ionic of Asia Minor (they belonged to our systemic type No. 4), for only in these three Attic-Ionic sub-dialects the central \bar{u} was formed before 350 B.C.; but also another progressive phenomenon appeared here on the scene: it was just in connection with the change of \bar{u} to \bar{u} that a certain relief was experienced on the back long-vowel axis, which resulted in a more even use of the back articulation positions. Unaffected by this development was only Euboean, which as late as 350 B.C. still maintained its long-vowel system with four vowels on both, the front and the back axis (type No. 3). As to the other systemic differences that occurred in the past within the Attic-Ionic dialectal area—cf. e.g. the delay in the liquidation of the phoneme \bar{e} in the Cyclades, which can be documented in Naxos, Keos, and Amorgos still in the 5th cent. B.C.—no trace of them whatsoever can be found in the Attic-Ionic long-vowel systemic formations about 350 B.C.. This comparatively small general differentiation in the long-vowel systems of the Attic-Ionic dialects was most likely the outcome of continuous and keen intercourse of all the Attic-Ionic areas in every phase of the Greek linguistic development. The exceptional conservative tendency in Euboean may at the same time be explained in general by the peripheral geographic situation of Euboea in the wide Attic-Ionic area, and specially by the prohibitive influence of the neighbouring Boeotia, which had not witnessed the above-said change of $\bar{u} > \bar{u}$.

2. In sharp contrast to the Attic-Ionic progressiveness in the formation of the long-vowel systems appears to be the totally conservative tendency of the two best documented dialects of the Arcado-Cypriot dialectal group, Arcadian and Cypriot; in both of them it was still as late as about 350 B.C. that the archaic three-grade system was likely preserved, comprising one \bar{e} and one \bar{o} only (while these dialects probably maintained up till then not only their *ai* and *oi*, but also *ei* and *ou*); this situation represented the systemic type No. 1, i.e. a system which corresponded with the assumed proto-Greek type. At the same time it is worth noting that this state of things kept existing in Arcadian and in Cypriot still in the middle of the 4th cent. B.C. in spite of the fact that the two dialects lost mutual contact with each other as early as towards the end of the Mycenaean civilization. This system was very likely

³³² Cf., e.g., Schwyzer's classification in *GG* I 85sqq.

preserved pretty long even by the third up-till-then spoken dialect of the Arcado-Cypriot group, namely by Pamphylian; the latter, however, got in the course of time attached—probably due to the influence of the Ionic of Asia Minor and maybe also of East Aegean Doric—to the systemic type with phonemic “doubling” of the $\bar{\epsilon}$ - and \bar{o} -phones (type No. 3), and it was probably still loyal to this attachment as late as 350 B.C., even if its prospective transition to type No. 5 (with one \bar{o} only), or maybe to type No. 6 (with one $\bar{\epsilon}$ and one \bar{o} only) was soon to be expected, yes, it may have already been in progress at that time. In the dialects of the Arcado-Cypriot group we thus find a very interesting example of three dialects that were separated from each other long ago (even Pamphylian lost evidently contact with the other members of its dialectal group as early as in the second millennium B.C.), yet, notwithstanding, just those two regions in the group that were geographically most distant from each other kept preserving, in spite of the lack of mutual contact, for more than 800 years their ancient archaic long-vowel system. The conservative disposition of Cyprus may be explained by its geographic remoteness, while the archaic character of the Arcadian long-vowel system kept surviving beyond the range of mountains stretching along the Arcadian boundary, while another explanation available might be the fact that Arcadia was only partly adjoining the innovation territory for which a full development of the double $\bar{\epsilon}$, \bar{o} is safely documented (on the Argolic and Corinthian border only).

3. A more variable picture than the comparatively uniform Attic-Ionic innovation dialects, or, for that part, the Arcado-Cypriot group, which was differentiated only in one of its partial regions, is presented to us by the Aeolic world. Although it comprised in the 1st millennium B.C. just three dialects, these dialects demonstrate very clearly how much the old genetic relations were liable to be disturbed by 350 B.C. already.

Each of these three Aeolic dialects, Lesbian, Thessalian, and Boeotian, appear in the light of the moment as belonging to another long-vowel systemic type: Lesbian remained true to the archaic type identical with the proto-Greek type (type No. 1), the characteristic feature of Thessalian was about 350 B.C. a special semi-innovative systemic formation with its only, universal $\bar{\epsilon}$, \bar{o} shifted to the close position (the diphthongs *ei*, *ou* having already been monophthongized, while the diphthongs *ai*, *oi* preserved—type No. 7), and Boeotian with its open $\bar{\epsilon}$ in the place of *ai* (*ei*, *ou* having been monophthongized as well) and with an only \bar{o} represented from the historical viewpoint of the development of the long-vowel systems by 350 B.C. the most progressive Greek dialect altogether (type No. 8). At the same time it is worth noticing again that Boeotian acquired this very progressive character through its rather late and accelerated development from the end of the 6th cent. B.C.; as to Thessalian, on the other hand, so far we cannot fix the date when this dialect separated from type No. 1, yet, we believe that our working hypothesis choosing for this event a date posterior to 700 B.C. is as creditable as any. These essentially different

ways of each of the Aeolic dialects have resulted from the mutual geographic isolation of all these three dialects that surely existed from as early as the end of the 2nd millennium, or at least the beginning of the 1st millennium B.C. (Thessalian and Boeotian were separated from each other by the North West dialects, while the contact of the Aeolians of Asia Minor with their European relatives cannot at all be compared with, let us say, the intense intercourse existing between Ionia and Attica).³³³

As to the Aeolic dialects, noteworthy is also their comparatively great independence in the development of their long-vowel systems, when they are compared with the rest of the Greek world. The Thessalian system (type No. 7) in 350 B.C. has no analogy whatsoever in the contemporary Greek world, the Boeotian system (type No. 7) is, to be sure, outwardly identical with the Corinthian system (type No. 5), yet, judging by the historical phonic content of its individual members it is essentially different from this just mentioned type, and as for Lesbian, we must say that the analogy of its long-vowel system (type No. 1) with some other Greek dialects, naturally, has the character of a mere archaic resemblance, common in the peripheral dialects that were not affected by any innovation. The state of things in Lesbian and Thessalian was without any doubts due to their comparatively great isolation from the rest of the Greek world, while the specific character of the Boeotian development was probably determined by the fact that Boeotia had likely for a long time already been a cross-way of various dialectal tendencies, whether Aeolic, or West-Greek and Attic-Ionic.

4. A certain analogy of the Aeolic systemic differentiation can be found also in West Greek, for there exists here a whole scale of systemic types, from the most archaic up to a comparatively very advanced type. Of the eight systemic types, as we have been discussing them in the preceding chapter, the following types got a footing in the West-Greek area: type No. 1—the proto-Greek type with only one \bar{e} and \bar{o} (represented by Laconian, Cretan, and Cyrenaean), type No. 2—a modification of type No. 1 with four long monophthongs in the front row (Elean), type No. 3—innovation type with double \bar{e} and \bar{o} (and without the “associated” *ei, ou*; the North-West dialects, Megarian, East Argolic, West Argolic except Argos, East Aegean Doric except Cyrenae), type No. 5—a progressive modification of type No. 3 with only three monophthongs in the back row (Corinthian), and type No. 6—a still more progressive modification of type No. 3 with three diphthongs in the back row and in the front row as well (Argolic of Argos). At the same time the most archaic long-vowel system can be found in those West-Greek dialects that were spoken more or less in the periphery of the whole Greek-speaking world (Lacanian, Cretan, Cyrenaean, Elean), whereas the most progressive West-Greek dialects (Corinthian, Argolic of Argos)

³³³ On the other hand it should, however, be pointed out that with the Arcado-Cypriot dialects — as our explanation sub 2 implies — their ϵ nalogical mutual isolation *did not* assume these marked features of progressive linguistic differentiation.

were the dialects of people residing in the area adjoining the Saronic Gulf, whose surroundings represented in the Classical Era the real political and economic center of the Greek world. Somewhere between these two extreme groups, judging from the evolutionary point of view, there is the moderate innovation group of dialects (type No. 3), in which the two most extensive units, i.e. North-West dialects and the East Aegean Doric (Cyrene excepting) had, as a matter of fact, also a rather peripheral position; as to Megaris and Argolis outside Argos, which likewise belong to the zone surrounding the Saronic Gulf, the question may more or less be justly put whether these regions actually belonged to the type No. 3 still about 350 B.C.—Otherwise, we may point out as an interesting feature of the West-Greek dialectal group the circumstance that the West-Greek long-vowel innovation development agreed in many respects with that of the Attic-Ionic group, which, of course, can be quite well explained by the extensive, mutual, and immediate geographic contact of these two groups of dialects, its main scene being the neighbourhood of the Saronic Gulf and the South-East Aegean area. In contrast to it, as it was mentioned before, Pamphylian and Boeotian were the only two members of the Arcado-Cypriot and the Acolic group that betrayed in the development of their long-vowel system more marked traces of contact with other Ancient Greek dialects.

The investigation to which we have subjected the Greek dialects in this work supplied us with further interesting information concerning the development of the dialectal relations between the single Greek dialects of that time. It is, however, necessary to stress once more, also in this conclusive chapter, that the whole of our systemic analysis of the long-vowel systems in Ancient Greek represents but a small fraction of the complete set of the Greek dialectological problems, and that even the mere object of acquiring an all-round phonemic survey of the dialectal phenomena in Ancient Greek will still require a similar treatment of the old Greek short-vowel systems as well; this incomplete character of the present work is also one of the reasons why we have not been comparing here the results obtained in this study with the results of our foregoing analysis of the consonantal systems.

And just as we have owned up in the conclusion of our monograph on the development of the consonantal system in the Greek dialects, in this work, too, we are fully aware of the fact that our analysis of the long-vowel systemic situation in Ancient Greek can by no means be without defects. The need of maintaining systematic and methodical approach, as far as possible, induced us for the most part to find for each problem a plausible solution. That is why some of our readers may disagree with, let us say, our thesis that a number of Greek dialects had not yet accomplished by 350 B.C. the monophthongization of the diphthongs *ei*, *ou*. And, on the other hand, others again may raise objections to our combining the strictly structural standpoint (i.e. consideration of the mere outward appearance of the systemic scheme) with the historical standpoint (i.e. consideration of the differences in the historical phonic content of the single members of the system) when we were trying

to define the main types of the long-vowel system. Yet, we always did our best to present our explanations in such a way as to enable every reader that may disagree with any of our proposed solutions simply to adapt our conclusions or schemes to his liking and standpoint. And this is, after all, what we were aiming at: to contribute to the construction of a basic perspective hypothesis indicating the ways along which the development of the long-vowel system in Ancient Greek proceeded, a hypothesis that would serve as a kind of foundation stone of further and more detailed systemic studies of the phonological problems in Ancient Greek.

Translated by S. Kostomlatsky