Bartoněk, Antonín

Introduction

In: Bartoněk, Antonín. *Development of the long-vowel system in Ancient Greek dialects.* Vyd. 1. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1966, pp. 5-23

I

INTRODUCTION

The sources available to us, when we want to get acquainted with the character of Old Greek dialects, can in no way be compared, as to reliability, with the linguistic material which is at the disposal of students of modern dialectology. In the living languages of the present day we may study each single linguistic phenomenon and its spread directly among the people speaking the language or dialect, both within the contemporary chronological stage, and at any place of the geographical area in question. On the other hand, in cases of dead dialects or of a historical and no more spoken phase in the development of a living language we can resort to written documents only, this fact implying a number of difficulties. First of all, most of these texts belong to the literary domain, and such texts are, in Greek as a rule, useful to us merely as sources of complementary character when we take into consideration the typical dialectal specificity of quite a number of Ancient Greek literary genera. This fact is well known, and it would be superfluous to deal with it here in detail. Of little use are to us, however, even pieces of direct linguistic information contained in glossaries and in the works of ancient grammarians, or maybe in occasional allusions of other ancient writers. Irrespective of the fact that such information may be—and often actually is—unreliable, it is usually presented in such a manner that we are not in the position to attempt its chronological classification without having an opportunity of confronting it with respective inscriptional material. The attention of scientists attempting a dialectal analysis of Ancient Greek must therefore be concentrated mainly on Greek inscriptional documents, while other sources are only complementary.

Yet, neither the dialectal evaluation of inscriptions is void of difficulties. We are now putting aside the fact that it is sometimes hard even to identify the dialect of the inscription in question, especially if it was found in the area of another dialect; it must be admitted that Greek dialectology has by now made quite sufficient progress to be able to solve successfully most of such disputes. Much greater and more intricate difficulties are connected just with the graphic aspect of these inscriptions.

The spelling namely imparts to us merely a graphic representation of the phonetic phenomena, including, naturally, all the various drawbacks of such a situation: lagging of the signs behind the phonetic changes, unsettled practice in spelling when introducing orthographic novelties, insufficient orthographic erudition of individuals who either compiled or directly engraved the texts of the inscriptions, etc.

And we may say that an extra risk is associated with these difficulties on the following account: when analysing concretely the linguistic peculiarities of the single Greek dialects researchers often fail to realize adequately that the Greek inscriptional practice as such does not, linguistically seen, truly mirror the real semblance of the local dialects. It is true that this circumstance has been now and then pointed out in different theoretical statements,[1] yet in discussions of concrete linguistic development of the single dialects it is usually not taken into consideration with due consistency. One should be on one's guard particularly when meeting in inscriptions originating at the very beginning of the historical documentation of the respective dialect with some peculiarity which may be classified as a specific local phenomenon, characteristic of just that particular dialect when compared to other dialects, whereas in documents of later periods the situation is already so far changed as to make the same local feature retreat at least partly or maybe altogether into the background, while the type which prevails belongs to the common Greek stock or is at least akin to it. The retreat of such a phenomenon from inscriptions need not imply the fact, to be sure, that this phenomenon must have disappeared also from the colloquial usage in the dialect in question, that is to say among the population which was not influenced by the use of some interdialect. It is more probable that persons compiling the texts of later inscriptions simply conceived this local phenomenon as merely a kind of provincial feature, and tried to avoid it, led by their stylistic aspirations. Unfortunately, it is not always possible to guess in single instances which of the two explications is more creditable, whether the purely dialectal liquidation of the linguistic peculiarity in question or its overlaying by an interdialectal linguistic phenomenon, i.e. a phenomenon that came into being due to external influence affecting above all the linguistic style of higher social classes. (In any case, however, we have always to count with the possibility—which becomes even more plausible in the Hellenistic Era—that many a specific local phenomenon of the above-said kind will disappear in the course of time even from the language of those classes that kept preserving the original dialect with utmost consistence.)

Yet, in spite of this difficulty, we are quite often able to recognize a purely dialectal change, because it enters the organic structure of the system of the dialect in question, developing, so to say, in accord with its inner linguistic laws. It generally becomes manifest in that after the accomplishment of the change there usually appears in the dialect a new quality, hitherto quite unknown in the respective linguistic situation.

---

[1] See e.g. Buck,[3] § 275.

If we encounter for instance in Boeotian nearly from the very beginning of its documentation a certain graphic unsteadiness in reproducing the original diphthong *ei* [and later also the long primary *ē*, as well as the secondary *ē*, that is as far as the latter originated through contraction or compensatory lengthening],[2] and if the concrete manifestation of this process is the fact that in the light of chronological sequence of the preserved inscriptions the original spelling *EI* [= *ei*] makes gradually more and more way to the spelling ⊢ [= *ẹ*?] and to *I*, until the sign *I* altogether prevails in the course of time (or if in the other case the original spelling *E* [= *ē*] is more and more replaced by the signs ⊢ , *EI* [= *ẹ*] and later partly also by *I*), then we cannot but take for granted that the spelling practice mirrored here two actual intra-Boeotian phonetic changes, whose characteristic tendency was to close increasingly both the mentioned Boeotian phonic formations; in this way, in Boeotian there originated in each of the two cases something that had never before existed in the dialect in identical linguistic situation. Thus we are sure to have encountered here a direct graphic reflexion of a real purely dialectal linguistic development, the said reflexion betraying particularly with its early unsteadiness the phonetic-graphic perplexity of the engravers and inevitably lagging behind the phonetic state of things—and this phenomenon cannot be mistaken for some higher-style interdialectal process.

An entirely different picture presents, let us say, the graphic unsteadiness in reproducing the Elean substitute for the proto-Greek primary *ē*; we have in mind the fact that this phone is sometimes reproduced in Elean inscriptions with the sign *A* [cf. the Elean *μά* = the Attic *μή*, the Elean *ἔα* = the Attic *εἴη*, and the like].[3] This phenomenon may be traced as far back as to the earliest Elean inscriptions from the first half of the 6th cent. B.C., whereas, on the other hand, some time after the adoption of the Ionic alphabet (this event occurred shortly before 350 B.C.) the above-mentioned tendency markedly began to lose its ground, and since the beginning of the 2nd cent. B.C. it is the H-spelling that seems to have been the only possible one. In this case it seems that the new, the typically Elean phenomenon was only that presupposed very open Elean "*æ*-pronunciation" of the primary *ē*, making the Elean engravers use for a long time—especially in the older inscriptions—quite often the A- spelling for the above-said pronunciation, this sign being considered the most suitable for reproducing that quality, whereas the later very outstanding tendency to prefer sing *H* as the more appropriate for it hardly represents a graphic reflexion of a real purely dialectal Elean retrograde phonic change, which would

---

[2] In principle, we have to do here with two separate narrowing tendencies, that of the close *ẹ* arisen from *ei* by monophthongization, and that of the close *ẹ* going back to the originally mid long *ē*, which corresponded in Boeotian both to the primary proto-Greek *ē*, and to the secondary *ē* originated by compensatory lengthening or contraction. See more on pp. 29sqq. Cf. also Thumb — Scherer 21sq., and 24.

[3] See more on pp. 89sqq.; cf. also Thumb — Kieckers 239.

7

lead to a full restoration of the same mid-$\bar{e}$ pronunciation, whose opening had resulted in the past just in the origin of the Elean $\bar{æ}$. Whether this long-lasting unsteadiness in spelling—without any safer indication of a more systematic reduction in the frequency of the A- spelling before the middle of the 4th cent. B.C.—or the considerably late final victory of the H- spelling, representing, in fact, a phonic quality which meant in Elean something like the return to a very ancient situation, both these circumstances seem rather to be pointing to some interdialectal impulses resulting in this case in the final supremacy of the H- spelling. These impulses found support particularly in the fact that in no other contemporary Greek dialect was the continuation of the proto-Greek $\bar{e}$ evidently such an open sound as it was the case in archaic Elean, as we may assume, neither do we find any traces of a perspective tendency towards such open pronunciation anywhere else in the Greek speaking world of that time. Thus the graphic development from the unsteady A/E [or A/H—after the adoption of the Ionic alphabet] to the fixed H most probably represents in Elean an expression of an interdialectal integration tendency, whose aim was to avoid the specifically local open $\bar{æ}$-pronunciation of the proto-Greek $\bar{e}$ as a kind of provincial feature. At the same time we may rightly assume that the less open pronunciation was asserting itself in Elean first in the speech—yes, maybe in spelling even before—of the higher social classes (particularly in the language of official documents). But in the course of time it naturally grew to be the colloquial usage of increasingly greater number of Elean inhabitants, for with the progressing integration of the Greek political life the use of local dialects was gradually more and more restricted, while an ever increasing number of people spoke in the area of each dialect some form of Koine whose characteristic feature was a growing tendency to implant "common Greek" elements in the "local dialectal basis"—this being particularly true about the non-Attic-Ionic dialects—and thus, obviously, to abandon this basis progressively.

To be sure, we could hardly take for granted that a more pronounced interdialectal influence made itself felt in the real colloquial usage before ca. 350/300 B.C. This is approximately the time when the inscriptions of practically all the Greek dialects begin to betray comparatively strong tendencies to arrive at some sort of interdialectal equalisation, yet, it would again be wrong to ascribe every manifestation of such tendencies found in the inscriptions of that time to the speaking public of each respective dialect at large.

About the subject of the unsteadiness of spelling in Greek inscriptions and of its linguistic significance we may, therefore, say the following conclusive words: As to the purely dialectal changes, we may actually see in the unsteadiness of spelling an expression of perplexity on the part of the engravers, the spelling in inscriptions lagging here, upon the whole, behind the pronunciation (we may see in it the well-known characteristic peculiarity of the written word implying the subconscious endeavour to observe the orthographic traditions). On the other hand, with respect to the interdialectal processes the spelling of the Greek inscriptions seems very often to be, so to

say, a head of the spoken dialects (we do not mean here an actual outstrip in spelling, but in the development of the language itself; this advance consists in the fact that the written word does not usually reproduce the dialects in their purest colloquial form, inclining rather to employ higher-style formations aiming at an interdialectal equalisation—and in the case of Greek such formations were upon the whole a correct indication of the forthcoming dialectal development of the entire Greek-speaking world). Thus in the former case we meet with a multiple way of graphic reproduction of one and the same linguistic unit, which was just undergoing some transformation, while in the latter case we encounter a quite appropriate double reproduction of two distinctly different linguistic units, each of which belonged to another stylistic frame, one to the local dialectal basis and the other to a stylistically differentiated interdialectal formation characterized by the possibility of choice.

Examples from modern languages tell us namely that a dialect as such does not admit of such possibility of choice as to make us acknowledge the existence of some linguistic unsteadiness, and that every real unsteadiness in a language, i.e. such as does not concern spelling only, is, in fact, the product of some mixture. "A pure dialect is a linguistic structure of the spoken word only", "undifferentiated from the stylistic standpoint", this fact "being closely connected with the stability if its norm",[3a] which means that a pure dialect alone cannot perform the functions of a higher-style linguistic structure. These functions are taken over by interdialects and similar higher linguistic structures. Yet, we must concede that these—provided they existed at all at those times—were, no doubt, each a factor of a geographically very limited extent e.g. at the first daybreak of the Greek post-Mycenaean culture. It was only later, in connection with political development aiming at establishing partial hegemonies and different alliances, that more extensive interdialectal units were originating (above all the Ionic of Asia Minor and the "Aetolian" and "Achaean" Doric), until, in the end, it was Attic that absorbed all the remaining dialectal variety, giving rise to the Hellenistic Koine.[4] Anyhow, considering the prevailing tendency in most Greek inscriptions to conform with a higher stylistic standard we must count with the probability that the situation in Greek dialects, as we can follow it with the help of our most reliable sources, i.e. the Greek inscriptions, reflects more the history of Greek interdialects—especially in the second half of the first millennium B. C.—than the history of the dialects themselves. This must be born in mind when we study Greek inscriptional documents, and in the light of this fact we must also try to determine the linguistic character of each phenomenon disclosed in the inscriptions.

Yet, the difficulties so far discussed are not the only ones we meet with when attempting to analyze the Ancient Greek dialects on the basis of the inscriptions. First of all, it is not possible in the case of a dead language and dialect to study the

---

[3a] Cf. Chloupek, *Sborník A 8*, 134sq.

[4] Cf. Buck[3] 173sqq. (on the different types of the Greek Koine).

history of each single linguistic phenomenon directly in the terrain, and thus all the minor shades characterizing the transition areas escape the observer's notice. And secondly the research-workers are often up to another set of difficulties when trying to apply a further basic principle of the modern dialectological research, namely the demand always to base the investigation on the analysis of linguistic material of the same chronological period, for the preserved Greek alphabetic inscriptions cover a space of time stretching from the 8th cent. B.C. down to the Christian Era — and we do not take into account texts written in the Linear Script B, on the top of it.

The first of our difficulties, our comparative ignorance of the minor local dialectal differences in Ancient Greece, results in the necessity of our concentrating most of the isoglosses on the boundaries of the geographical regions and also of identifying the number of dialects with the number of these regions. Considering the very manifold both horizontal and vertical geographical diversity of the Greek territory we very likely do not make any essential mistake, nevertheless, the very fact that some of the Greek regions were strongly differentiated from the dialectal standpoint even internally (especially Thessaly, Argolis, and Crete) makes us realize that a detailed picture of the Greek dialects might be unusually interesting if it were possible to investigate them directly in the terrain with the help of modern dialectological methods. For this reason it is also practically useless to try to draw up complex dialectal maps for Ancient Greek. They would be rather a cumbersome expedient, for on the boundaries of the single regions too many isoglosses would be found interfusing without making us feel sure that this situation actually corresponded with the real state of things. Greater usefulness may be in this case attributed to the registration of important single phenomena in tables, as we find it, let us say, in the work of Buck.[5]

The second difficulty, the too great chronological extent of the documents, may be successfully faced only if we strictly abide by the rule to find always at first some identical chronological basis for comparing akin phenomena in various dialects. When analyzing the dialectal situation in a dead language whose documents represent such a great chronological extent as it is the case in Ancient Greek, it is surely possible to attempt a dialectal classification in a number of such chronologically fixed and limited stages. Naturally, we cannot fix these stages just arbitrarily, but we have to take into account both, special conditions of the development of the respective language, and the possibilities the inscriptional sources supply us with. Concretely worded it means the demand not to attempt in Ancient Greek a cardinal synchronical dialectal classification until all the principal dialects can dispose of a sufficient number of inscriptional documents, while, on the other hand, not so late as to make our evaluation of the Greek dialects dependent on inscriptions displaying to a considerable extent tendencies towards interdialectal levelling. Yet, it should neither be done before the time when in the different non-Ionic dialects there was introduced the

---

[5] Cf. Buck,[3] Tables.

Ionic alphabet in place of the old local alphabetic systems. This last demand must namely be granted if we are to accomplish satisfactorily some important comparative phonetic investigation in all the dialects simultaneously.

In this way the required cardinal time limit would be pretty well fixed. The Ionic alphabet was accepted by most of the Greek dialects between 400 and 350 B.C., and, upon the whole, soon after—that is to say towards the end of the 4th cent. B.C.—we may rightly assume wide-range tendencies to approach dialectal levelling in many Greek dialects. And as we have, on the top of it, by 350 B.C. a great number of preserved inscriptional documents in each of the Greek dialects, the just-mentioned time limit surely appears to be the most suitable one for attempting the most important and relatively the most complete dialectal classification in Ancient Greek that we may think of.

To be sure, now and then it will be necessary to consult in the course of our synchronic analysis attached to approximately 350 B.C. also the linguistic phenomena that can be demonstrated by inscriptions from other periods only. Thus with respect to peculiarities demonstrable only in some period before 350 B.C., we shall feel entitled to introduce them in our analysis any time, if desirable, provided they do not represent doubtless archaic phenomena which were replaced in inscriptions long before this date by later phenomena of purely dialectal character. And similarly we shall not fail to allude to such peculiarities as were for the first time demonstrated in documents subsequent to 350 B.C., if we have reasons to believe that they belonged to the spoken usage of the respective dialect about the middle of the 4th cent. already. Most often it will concern those purely dialectal changes whose oldest inscriptional document comes from the 2nd half of the 4th cent. B.C. — On the other hand, we shall naturally not include in our discussion any phenomena of assumably interdialectal origin, not even if they occur in documents prior to 350 B.C.

The difficulties Greek philologists meet with when analyzing from the dialectal point of view ancient Greek written documents, especially the inscriptional material, are, therefore, serious enough to prevent any research-worker from drawing v e r y e x a c t c o n c l u s i o n s in his investigation. Yet, our foregoing discussion makes it clear that the said difficulties are not so unsurmountable as to hinder us in sketching at least an a p p r o x i m a t e p i c t u r e o f t h e m o s t i m p o r t a n t r e l a t i o n s between the Greek dialects, e.g. as they existed about 350 B.C. When taking this date, which seems to us to be the most suitable one for any comparative classification study of Greek dialects, for our fixed cardinal point, we may, naturally, go back from 350 B.C. to more remote past in search of some older chronological stages that would give us analogous, even if probably still less clear views of the dialectal situation. This brings us, however, to a special methodical item concerning Ancient Greek dialectology, i.e. to the question how to get even with the problem of relations between the synchronical and the diachronical working approach when attempting a classification analysis of Greek dialects.

When investigating the dialects of a dead language we cannot escape the necessity to keep all the time within the limits of its historical development only, so that irrespective of what period of its history we may choose for performing a synchronical analysis of the dialectal relations, we realize that none of these periods bears the character of a contemporary, living linguistic reality. This means that we must be very careful when trying to find for each phenomenon its proper place not only in space but also in time, which again makes it quite imperative to lay much greater stress than in the case of a modern language on establishing a well-founded modus vivendi between the synchronical and the diachronical standpoint. A mere synchronical approach to linguistic phenomena, without considering simultaneously also their historical development, would of necessity result here in a schematic and rather one-sided view of linguistic facts, while, on the other hand, a mere diachronical analysis, without any systematic attempt to obtain a synchronical view through all the dialects, would again deprive us of the possibility of gaining a real horizontal view of relations between the single dialects. This remark is quite appropriate in our case for the following reason: for solving the problems of all the prehistorical and historical periods in the development of the Greek language it will neither suffice to obtain only one synchronical section view through the Greek dialects like that, let us say, which we have attached to approximately 350 B.C., nor will a traditional classification scheme do, derived from the genealogical division of Ancient Greeks into Ionians, Aeolians, and Dorians.

As to the first extreme, its onesidedness is quite obvious at first sight. The distribution of dialectal peculiarities about 350 B.C. presents namely such a picture of interrelations between the Greek dialects as would make it for us hard indeed safely to divide these dialects into more clearly differentiated groups without some historical information about the foregoing ethnical distribution of the Greek tribes and without linguistic documents from more ancient periods. This statement finds best corroboration in a linguistic map of the most important Greek dialectal isoglosses, such as was drawn up e.g. by Schwyzer.[6] Only some of these isoglosses remind us directly of some former partial genetic units, whereas some others are but fossil remnants of very ancient conditions which may be considered as basic for all the Greek dialects, another group is the product of specific innovations accomplished on a more or less extensive dialectal territory, any older genetic kinship being often no factor here whatsoever, and finally some of the isoglosses must very likely be interpreted merely as results of similar tendencies entirely independent of each other and manifesting themselves simply as parallel phenomena in different localities of the Greek-speaking world. A mere synchronical classification analysis of all these relations depicting them precisely as they existed about 350 B.C. is certainly of great value to us, but if it were not supplemented with diachronical aspects it would be incomplete and distorted,

---

[6] Cf. Schwyzer, *GG* I, Appendix.

for alone it would be incapable of elucidating sufficiently the then-existing dialectal relations in their full plasticity and significance.

Just as serious—even if perhaps less apparent at first sight—is the danger concealed in the other of the above-mentioned extremes, i.e. in a consistent application of the traditional views of the Greek ethnogeny on all the evolutionary periods of the Greek language. It is true that we have pointed out in the preceding paragraph that the synchronical classification of the Greek dialects must always be supplemented in some form at least by the diachronical classification aspect, nevertheless, this does not mean that we should try to insert all the periods in the development of the Greek dialects into the traditional classification scheme, comprising, in accord with the ancient doctrine about the three principal Greek tribes, only Ionic, Aeolic, and Doric.

As for the 1st millennium B.C., this simplyfing standpoint has been at least to a certain extent surpassed by a pretty general acknowledgement of a special Arcado--Cypriot dialectal group, and partly also by the fact that relative independence is usually attributed to the so-called North-West dialects (and if we wanted to be quite consistent, we should separate even from this group Elean as an independent, isolated dialect, as Thumb does.)[7] But this genealogical scheme can be transferred neither to the more ancient phases in the development of Greek without danger. This holds good particularly about the Mycenaean Era. By saying so, we do not wish to side with Cassola,[8] who finds for the Ionic-Aeolic-ArcadoCypriot tribal splitting essentially as late a date as the post-Mycenaean period. Nevertheless, very suggestive appears to be the view of Risch,[9] according to whom there existed in the Mycenaean Era only two dialectal types of Greek, i.e. the South-Greek or Mycenaean type, which later gave rise partly to the more archaic Arcado-Cypriot dialectal group and partly to the more progressive Attic-Ionic group, and the North-Greek type, comprising the predecessors not only of the later Doric and North-West dialects but also of the Aeolic ones. At the same time we feel inclined to believe with Georgiev[10] that the practically total linguistic identity of Mycenaean from Peloponnesos [Pylos, Mycenae] and from the Cretan Knossos is the product of certain dialectal levelling, which ran its course in the second half of the 2nd millennium B.C. at least in the centres of Mycenaean culture. That such dialectal levelling may actually have occurred appears all the more probable if we think of an analogical levelling process in Greek of the Hellenistic period. At that time, what had been diverse for centuries, began suddenly from the 4th cent. B.C. to display levelling tendencies, and after a few centuries there were hardly any traces left of the old dialectal division of the Classical Era—i.e. with a few minor exceptions, such as Tsakonian, which still exists as a continuation of the Laconian

---

[7] See Thumb—Kiokers 67.

[8] See F. Cassola, *La Ionia nel mondo miceneo*, Napoli 1957, esp. pp. 154sqq. and 199sqq.

[9] See E. Risch, *Die Gliederung der griechischen Dialekte in neuer Sicht*, *MH* 12 [1955], 61—76.

[10] See V. Georgiev, *Issledovania po sravnitel'no-istoričeskomu jazykoznaniu*, Moskva 1958, pp. 69.

dialect in the hard accessible mountainous region of Peloponnesos. This specific linguistic development is, no doubt, quite rightly ascribed to the universal unifying influence of the Hellenistic Era.

Even the Mycenaen Era, however, was a period of a considerable economic, cultural, and partly also political, unity in the entire Aegean area, as we can surmise from the contents of the Linear B documents, from different statements found in Homer, and from archaeological excavations. Thus we should not wonder if we found that all these unifying factors had manifested themselves also in an extensive tendency towards linguistic unity, just as it was the case in the Hellenistis Era. The obviously practically undifferentiated language of the Mycenaean texts—whether from Crete or from Peloponnesos—positively speaks more in favour of this idea than against it. There is, however, one question to be answered, whether we have to deal with a mere temporary linguistic formation without any further development attached to it, depending solely on the mixed interdialectal speech of the population living directly in the Mycenaean centers, a Koine-formation which was discontinued after the fall of the Mycenaean culture, allowing the ancient local dialects to emerge again from underneath it and undergo their further development [this view is propagated mainly by Georgiev],[11] or whether this said form of speech had already turned into usage with a great proportion of the Mycenaean population, the old pre-Mycenaean dialectal differences having largely been wiped out by that time, and whether it served later, after the collapse of the Mycenaean civilization, as a basis that gave rise to one or more non-Doric Greek dialects of the Classical Era [this opinion seems to be implied in some formulations of Risch and Cassola]. As to our standpoint, we feel more inclined to adhere to the latter view, assuming above all—contrary to Georgiev and in full accord with Risch and Cassola — that the pre-Mycenaean dialectal differentiation may have been—but need not have been—quite different from its post-Mycenaean counterpart, and that every more concrete speculation about the possibility of the dialect of the Linear B Script originating from the integration of some quite well known dialectal components may lack any solid foundation and thus be purposeless. This implies, for instance, that we do not refute Georgiev's opinion that here we have to deal with a certain kind of Koine, but we are not willing to accept his suggestion that it was of necessity a Koine springing from a fuse of the Achaean and the Ionic elements (by Achaean elements Georgiev means those elements that were later differentiated into Aeolic and Arcado--Cypriot). The Mycenaean Koine could namely originate—just as it was the case even in Hellenistic Greek—principally, if not exclusively, on the basis of one pre-Mycenaean dialect, which can so far be characterized only by the statement that its typical

---

[11] See also S. Ja. Lurje, *Jazyk i kultura mikenskoj Grecii*, Moskva—Leningrad 1957, pp.179sqq. Lurje's view is, however, somewhat more complex. — Most recently, this problem has been dealt with at the Fourth Mycenaean Colloquium of Cambridge (April 1965), esp. in Risch's, Georgiev's and Bartoněk's papers, with some new aspects.

feature was the change of the suffix -*ti*[—] (especially in the 3rd person verbal suffix) into -*si*[—]. But even if an attempt at identification of this single dialect were reasonably possible, we should bear in mind that any trying to characterize it by the application of post-Mycenaean terms (we think e.g. of L u r j e's attempt to identify it with Aeolic) might mean gross anachronism, for nowhere do we find any guarantee for the correctness of the supposition that there existed a direct relationship between this pre-Mycenaean dialect, which we believe to have stood at the cradle of the Mycenaean culture, and some non-Doric dialect of the Classical Era.

From what we have said appears to be really necessary from the methodical point of view to analyze in future the dialectal situation in the 2nd millennium B.C. quite independently of relations valid for the 1st millennium B.C. I believe one cannot dissuade enough from mixing the two periods. We run, no doubt, a great risk of distorting reality when venturing upon theories too definite and too much operating with analogies while discussing dialectal relations of periods short of documentation. The following reflexion will perhaps help us to take the right view of this problem: "Who can say what our knowledge of the dialectal situation in Greece of the Classical Era would amount to if there were no preserved written documents from this period, and if the Hellenistic Koine were the only Ancient Greek idiom familiar to us?" We would probably in such a case speak of a comparatively uniform language even with reference to the pre-Hellenistic Greek of the 1st millennium B.C., yes, some research-workers would probably be willing to project many a post-Hellenistic dialectal phenomenon, known to us from still later stages of Greek linguistic development and having no connection with the classical dialects whatsoever, to the pre-Hellenistic period.

We have inserted here these cautious words not to assume an essentially sceptical attitude as to any effort to analyze the Greek dialectal interrelations of the 2nd millennium B.C., but we wish only to recommend the maximum of cautiousness to any one whose interest is attracted by these phases of the Greek linguistic development. The concrete possibilities of a synchronical analysis of Greek dialects in the 2nd millennium B.C. are, to be sure, considerably limited by the fact that a synchronical analysis cannot be attempted until in the 2nd half of this millennium, the results being very hypothetical even so, for we are ignorant of the linguistic situation in the principal counterpart of the Linear B Script dialect, i.e. in the predecessor of the Doric dialects, a predecessor which surely had preserved the original form of the suffix -*ti*(—). Contrary to it, the dialectal situation in the first two thirds of the 1st millennium B.C. can be subjected to a synchronical analysis in a much larger extent. R i s c h believes that it is esp. the time of the great colonization which represents a significant chronological boundary. Notwithstanding, we suppose that it is possible to perform a synchronical analysis also from other standpoints during the above-said period. It is true, of course, that with reference to the more ancient times it will often be necessary to operate with dialectal forms that are merely assumed—the oldest

documents in the post-Mycenaean Greek dialects come from the end of the 8th cent. B.C. Yet, in contrast to the Mycenaean Era, in which practically all the assumed linguistic reconstructions are of a considerably hypothetic character, we can, thanks to the great progress made by research-work in Greek historical grammar, especially in regard to phonology and morphology, reconstruct the linguistic situation in the early centuries of the 1st millennium B.C. with a high degree of probability. In regard to this period the argumentation employing purely reconstructed forms does not, as a matter of fact, lag far behind argumentation operating only with forms directly documented. To be sure, when performing the cardinal and conclusive classification projected chronologically to approximately the middle of the 4th cent. B.C., we shall have to rely on directly documented material with decisive predominance, resorting to reconstructed forms practically only in non-problematic cases.

Summing up we may thus comment the problem of the relations between the synchronical and diachronical standpoint in the Old Greek dialectology as follows: one single scheme based on the traditional historical division of the Greek tribes into Ionians, Aeolians, and Dorians will not suffice for the study of all the historical and prehistorical periods in the development of the Greek language, because we must take into account the probability that the relations between the single Greek dialects may have been different in different times. This practically means that we have to follow carefully the historical development of the dialectal interrelations and must not simply apply what holds good for one period to any other period. An important methodical help will be to us especially the making up of a number of successive synchronical section views through the dialectal interrelations, but we must not be surprised if the results of our analysis do not correspond now and then with what we were used to consider traditional in Greek dialectology. It is only if we follow with a very objective attitude the relations between the Greek dialects in a succession of several chronological section views of this kind that we shall be able efficiently to combine the demands of a synchronical and a diachronical approach to a language which we have postulated as indispensable for Ancient Greek dialectology, and all this will help us in constructing an all-round picture of the differentiated dialectal development in Ancient Greek.

Yet, neither a thorough evaluation of sources, as to their reliability, nor a correct insertion of all the documented and reconstructed differentiation phenomena into proper synchronical and diachronical relations are by themselves as yet a sufficient guarantee of an entirely objective approach to a dialectal classification. This aim will be attained only by an objective evaluation of the established linguistic facts according to their differentiation significance. This question has so far been given hardly any greater attention. Up till now, the authors, when classifying, either just enumerated everything that could be ascribed some differentiation value in characterizing a dialect, and thus often placed directly side by side linguistic phenomena of quite dissimilar differentiation significance, or else selected from traditional grammatical

compendia a few phenomena only—often without deeper objective criteria—so that the differentiation character of a dialect was often determined by a more or less arbitrary selection of a certain number of specific dialectal features; at the same time we cannot exclude even the possibility that there were cases when the author's a priori view of the mutual close relations of some large or small group of Greek dialects fundamentally influenced his own selection of the above features.

Both above-mentioned forms of approach to the classification of Greek dialects are evidently insufficient, and it seems that a more perfect methodical plan will have to be devised with a more objective basis to it. The most natural criterion of determining the differentiation significance of linguistic peculiarities appears to be the frequency of occurrence of a given phenomenon. Yet, since there is no possibility of ascertaining such frequency quite precisely, the best we can do is to try to compare more or less successfully the frequency of one phenomenon with that of another. To a certain extent at least we may find here a useful indicator in the method of dividing single linguistic differentiation phenomena into phonological, morphological, syntactical, and lexical phenomena. The sequence of these four types of linguistic phenomena, as to their differentiation significance, may roughly be arranged as follows:

a) the phonological phenomena, because they can occur in the whole lexical stock of a dialect (e.g. the Attic-Ionic change $\bar{a} > \bar{æ}$, the East Greek change -ti[—] > > -si[—] in some suffixes, especially in the personal ending of 3rd Pl. Act. [and also Sing.], and the like);

b) the morphological phenomena—these may occur just in words of a certain type, and as to declension and conjugation, in certain grammatical forms only (see e.g. the grammatical contrast -ov: -$\bar{a}o$: -av, -$\bar{a}$, -$εω$ (-$ω$) in Gen. Sing. of masculine $\bar{a}$-stems [the Attic Ἀτρείδου in contrast to the Homeric, Boeotian, and rarely Thessalian -$\bar{a}o$, Arcadian and Cypriot -av, Lesbian, Thessalian, and West Greek[12] -$\bar{a}$ and Ionic -$εω$, -$ω$], or the non-grammatical, suffixal contrast -$εος$: $ιος$ with names of material, the second form being typical for Lesbian and Thessalian);

c) the lexical phenomena, because they concern single words only (see e.g. the contrast of the West Greek, Boeotian, Thessalian, and Pamphylian (F)ίκατι, φίκατι, hικάδι, ἰκάδι when compared to the East Greek[13] and Lesbian εἴκοσι, or the restriction of the occurrence of the verb λείω, λέω "to want" to the West-Greek dialects, or the existence of the Attic-Ionic and Arcadian ἄν side by side with the Cypriot and Lesbo--Thessalian κε and with the Boeotian and West Greek κα);

d) the syntactical phenomena—they concern only word and sentence connections

---

[12] The term "West Greek" denotes here, as well as everywhere in this monograph, "Doric" in the wider sense of the word, i.e. with the North-West dialects included.

[13] The term "East Greek" denotes in our monograph the same as Risch's "South Greek", i.e. a closer community of Greek dialects comprising both Attic-Ionic, and Arcadian-Cypriot (together with Pamphylian); in this case, of course, Pamphylian has a West Greek form.

(see e.g. the Arcado-Cypriot combination of the prepositions ἀπύ, ἐξ (ἐς) and others with dative instead of genetive, the latter being the usage in the rest of the dialects,[14] or cf. the exceptionally frequent use of optative in Elean).[15]

And now a few special remarks commenting the significance of the single types we have mentioned. The phonological differentiation phenomena can be realized every time when the phone in question actually appears in the context (this is the case with the so-called spontaneous phonetic changes), or they assert themselves consistently at least in every such instance when the phone appears in a certain phonic environment (the combinatory changes). In contrast to morphological differentiation phenomena the phonological phenomena are usually not linked up with a certain grammatical form or a certain complex of grammatical forms, neither with a certain word type. On the other hand, morphological peculiarities are always limited in the above-mentioned sense: thus e.g. the suffixal contrast $-ov : -\bar{a}o : -av : -\bar{a} : -\varepsilon\omega$ ($-\omega$) may occur only in Gen. Sing. of the masculine a-stems. (In this respect there exists a kind of transition group between the phonological and the morphological phenomena, namely the phonological differentiation phenomena dependent on some morphological aspect, such as the already quoted change $-ti[—] > -si[—]$.)

This our giving preference to phonological phenomena to the detriment of morphological ones does not, of course, mean that in individual instances some morphological phenomenon could not be more significant from the differentiation point of view than a phonological phenomenon. Thus e.g. the above-mentioned morphological suffixal contrast $-ov : \bar{a}o : -av : -\bar{a} : -\varepsilon\omega$ ($-\omega$) is, no doubt, of greater importance for dialectal classification than let us say the phonic change $-lt(h) > -nt(h)$ with its rather rare documentation [cf. ἐνθοῖσα Alcman 1_{73} Diehl, and the like.[16]]

Therefore, the phonological phenomena, taken by the average, could certainly pride themselves on the highest frequency among the discussed types, but if we take them singly we find considerable differences between them, this often holding good even with respect to such phenomena as are generally in our grammatical compendia quoted side by side without discrimination as typical differentiation features of single dialects. Thus for instance the contrast $\bar{a} : \bar{\alpha}$ manifesting itself between the Attic-Ionic dialects, on the one hand, and the remaining Greek dialects, on the other hand, belongs, no doubt, to the most significant Greek differentiation phenomena; it was the case just because the long $\bar{a}$ obviously was in non-Ionic Greek one of the most frequently occurring vowels at all, which means that the Greeks of the Classical Era were quite well accustomed to this contrast. Of a rather smaller importance, on the other hand, was perhaps a similar contrast—also a product of an Attic-Ionic inno-

---

[14] Cf. Buck³ § 163,1.

[15] Cf. Buck³ § 176,3.

[16] The said phenomenon is attested also in some West Greek and Arcadian inscriptional documents; cf. Buck³ § 72.

vation[17]—i.e. the dialectal difference $\breve{u} : \ddot{\breve{u}}$; the reason was that the Greek phones u, $\bar{u}$ had an essentially lower frequency than the long $\bar{a}$. Similarly we may distinguish different grades of differentiation significance also within the group of morphological phenomena. This is partly connected with the differing frequency in the occurrence of single inflexional types and grammatical forms (the Attic *-ov* in Gen. Sing. of the masculine $\bar{a}$-stems or the very widely spread *-εσσι* in Dat. Pl. of the 3rd declension appear to us certainly more important classification factors than, let us say, the comparatively great dialectal variety of the inflexional suffixes with nouns of the type *πειθώ*).

A special sub-group of morphological differentiation phenomena is represented by the morphological dialectal diversities that are not of the inflexional type (cf. for instance the quoted contrast *-εος : -ιος* with adjectives of material); these may, upon the whole, be taken for morphological phenomena of average or minor differentiation significance, owing to their rather characteristic lexical aspect, this being particularly manifest when we compare them, let us say, to the above-mentioned Attic *-ov* or to the dative suffix *-εσσι*.

Quite similarly, the comparatively very small differentiation significance of the lexical phenomena is mainly to be traced to the fact that single words, or maybe groups of several kindred words, have on the average generally rather low frequency. Exceptions are only some words of more or less formal validity, such as conjunctions, prepositions, different particles or copulative verbs, all these being to a great extent expressions that may, in fact, be designated sometimes as only quasi-morphological elements. Here we have to include e.g. the quoted contrast *ἄν : κε : κα*, or the contrast of the Attic-Ionic and Arcadian *εἰ* (and of the Cypriot *ἤ*) with the Aeolic and West Greek *αἰ*. Among all the lexical differentiation phenomena we must, naturally, distinguish two basic types, firstly the true lexical contrasts, etymologically entirely different, representing two fully contrasting lexical units, such as the above-quoted West-Greek *λέω, λείω* when compared with */ἐ/θέλω* in the remaining Greek dialects, and secondly the pseudo-lexical contrasts, which are in their substance based on some special and upon the whole isolated differentiation phenomena of either phonological or morphological provenience, but which must be from the synchronical standpoint designated as lexical peculiarities, just on account of the rather isolated occurrence of these phonological and morphological phenomena. Their characteristic feature is, at the same time, the identity of the etymological basis of all the compared forms (here we may mention for instance the alluded to contrast *Ϝίκατι... : εἴκοσι...*). As to the grade of differentiation significance, it must be determined with both these types in each case individually, yet, considering the phonological and often also the morphological dependence of the latter type we may, on the whole, ascribe to the pseudo-lexical

---

[17] The said change, however, did not occur in Euboean—before 350 B.C. at least. See more on p. 110sqq.

peculiarities greater differentiation significance than to the true lexical differentiation phenomena.

As far as the syntactical differentation phenomena are concerned, we can so far hardly attribute to them any special significance in the classification of Greek dialects, owing to the comparatively stereotype character of most of the preserved Greek inscriptions; of major significance are perhaps only the differences in the construction of prepositional cases.

From what was stated here we may draw the conclusion that henceforth it will be necessary to pay the main attention to peculiarities of the phonological and morphological character (in the latter case particularly the declension and conjugation phenomena will have to be considered), while the other two types will be taken into account only as complementary features of the basic picture. At the same time, however, it would also be worth suggesting to divide either, the phonological peculiarities and the morphological ones, into several subgroups; three of them might serve best, while the second would be comprising the non-extreme phenomena in their full extent. When observing this principle one should, of course, have to count with the possibility that the third subgroup of the phonological phenomena might prove to be less significant for the dialectal classification than the first subgroup of the morphological phenomena.

All this is, naturally, only an outlining suggestion which ought to become first of all the subject of discussion. There is no doubt that it could be supplemented by other standpoints which might turn out to be very helpful in the treatment of our problems. There is one criterion, however, which definitely deserves special emphasis, i.e. due consideration which we ought to have for the systemic differences between single Greek dialects, and specially for the systemic differences of phonemic character with their comparatively most developed methods of systemic research. Concretely said, I mean here an analysis of the differences that can be found between the single Greek dialects in their short-vowel subsystems, in their long-vowel subsystems (here we usually include also the diphthongs as long as they can be ascribed the character of independent phonemes),[18] and in their consonantal subsystems. This phonemic methodical approach, which was introduced in linguistics by the school of structuralists, has, to be sure, already occasionally been applied also in the study of the Classical languages—as we shall see in a special comment on pp. 24sqq.—but when compared to its very extensive application in modern linguistics we must say that it has been done in a very small measure, so far.[19] It is true that we have to proceed with greatest caution every time when trying to apply methods employed in the study of living languages also in the sphere of such languages (or within such evolutionary phases of living languages) that have left only written documentary

---

[18] On this question see more on pp. 40sqq.

[19] Concerning the possibilities of applying the ideas and methods of work elaborated by the adherents of the structuralistic views to the sphere of Greek and Latin, see Bartoněk, *Eirene* 4 [1965], 123—132.

20

material to be consulted. Documented manifestations of a dead language (or of a no more spoken evolutionary phase of a living language) frustrate beforehand every hope that we might ever acquire the totally precise knowledge of the phonetic realization of such phenomena as were e.g. the Old Greek phones. But, on the other hand, let us add that it is just the phonemic approach which—in spite of the fact that it sprang up from a thorough knowledge of living languages—does not really aim at quite precise determination of all concrete phonetic realizations of the language in question, rather attempting a certain kind of phonic abstraction, i.e. studying phonemes as basic phonological units, seen from the functional point of view, while phonemes as such may for the most part be distinguished even in the dead languages with the application of the greatly developed modern phonemic methods, even though quite precise knowledge of their concrete phonetical realizations may be missing. Thus for instance, it is not of essential importance for us to know what the exact sound of the sign Σ was in the word $\sigma\beta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\nu\nu\mu\iota$ [i.e. before voiced b], and what it was in contrast to it in the word $\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\omega$ [i.e. before voiceless p], but it is significant for us to realize that the initial sound of the word $\sigma\beta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\nu\nu\mu\iota$ and the initial sound in the expression $\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\omega$ were two combinatory variants of one and the same phoneme s/z, each of the variants being bound up with different phonic neighbourhood. Let us add that phonological considerations of this kind are often of a very great practical importance, because without joining the combinatory variants into the unit of a phoneme, the phonic inventory of any language would be a mere mechanical registration of all sounds occurring in it, irrespective of whether a mutual misplacement of any of them might affect the meaning of the communication or not. Thus, should, let us say, the sounds n and $ŋ$ have been confused in the Greek words $\check{\alpha}\nu\vartheta\varrho\omega\pi o\varsigma$[20] [ˈanthrōpos] "man", and $\check{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda o\varsigma$ [ˈaŋgelos] "messenger"

---

[20] When quoting we use here the Greek alphabet only when we reproduce verified forms of Greek words (e.g. $\check{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda o\varsigma$), and when we give phonic interpretation of Greek expressions written in Cypriot syllabic Script (e.g. $Ϝ\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\iota$). In all other cases we use Roman letters (i.e. when quoting non-verified, mainly prehistoric forms of Greek words, such as *pantja; when giving the pronunciation of verified Greek expressions, e.g. [ˈaŋgelos] /the expression in question is to be found in square brackets/; when presenting graphic transcription of Greek words written in the original in Linear B Script or in Cypriot Syllabic Script, such as po-me or we-te-i; when giving phonic interpretation of Greek expressions written in the Linear B Script, such as poimēn; when quoting non-Greek expressions, e.g. German Ast, or assumed IE. forms, e.g. *ozdos); in some of these cases—as it may be seen from the above examples—italics are employed. Italic Roman types are also employed when different morphological elements (e.g. -ti-, -si-), or single phones and phonic combinations (e.g. e, o, ai, au) are quoted. When giving independent phonemes we do not employ for technical reasons oblique brackets, such as [p], the context itself, however, makes it clear whether the phonic symbol represents in its respective place an independent phonemic unit, or a mere combinatory variant of a phoneme, or maybe only the assumed pronunciation. — On the other hand, when the graphic symbols corresponding with respective phones or phonic combinations are to be presented, capital signs of the Greek alphabet are regularly employed (e.g. in the sentence "the Attic EI

(that is to say should a person have pronounced by mistake [ˈaŋthrōpos] and [ˈangelos]), it could not have resulted in any change as to the idea communicated (n and ŋ are therefore in ancient Greek two combinatory variants of the same phoneme, the position before k, g, kh, and maybe also before n and m,[21] being reserved for ŋ), whereas if we replace, let us say, the initial n in the Greek νῦν [nǖn] "now" or the initial n in νή [nē̌] "really" by the consonant m, we get quite different words: μῦν [mǖn] "mouse" (Acc. Sing.) and μή [mē̌] "no". (Thus we have to conclude that n and m could not have been two combinatory variants in Ancient Greek; they evidently were two mutually quite independent phonemes.)

From what we have just said may, therefore, be concluded that the application of phonemic methods is fully justified even when we have to deal with the dead languages—no matter that we are obliged to confine ourselves to the so-called historical phonemics, in which the synchronical interest in effecting section views through a linguistic system in a given period intermingles with the diachronical analysis of the linguistic development, starting, to be sure, with phonetic knowledge that may be acquired by applying the traditional linguistic methods of research, yet, following, afterwards, the complex systemic development not only of one single phone, but of some larger group of these phones at the same time, just because one phonetic change is often capable of bringing about an alteration within the whole partial subsystem in question.

This practically means that the basic set of phonological, morphological, lexical, and syntactical isoglosses, as we have been describing it above, may for any chosen period be augmented by several, extraordinarily important systemic isoglosses of phonemic character, based on the differences within the single phonemic subsystems, as they are found in different Greek dialects. The same could after all be done even with the systemic isoglosses belonging to the other linguistic aspects, but the questions of the systemic character of a language are less worked out in the spheres of morphology, syntax, and vocabulary than in that of phonology, and thus the results obtained here would be less reliable.

To accomplish an all-round analysis of the Greek dialects from all these standpoints is, naturally, a task that will still require much time and a great deal of working effort of numerous research-workers. To try to accomplish it at a stroke, so to say, would be beyond one person's power, and at the same time it would imply a great risk of undertaking the task of a quite complex evaluation of all interrelations of the single Greek dialects before all the partial questions have been properly and responsibly dealt with. We suggest, therefore, that the next working programme of the Greek dialectologists should be to work out consummate descriptions of relations between the single Greek dialects from one or other partial point of view, and thus

---

was pronounced as ẹ̄"). Roman capitals are used when reproducing graphic transcription of the single signs of Linear B Script (e.g. PA).

[21] Cf. Schwyzer, *GG* I 214sq.

prepare the way for those who will at some time in future succeed by a creative synthesis of all these partial views in reconstructing a plastic picture of the real dialectal situation in all the evolutionary phases of Ancient Greek. The partial task to be undertaken by the author of this work is to give a long-vowel system analysis of the single Greek dialects from the assumed proto-Greek period down to about 350 B.C.: to the appertaining set of problems will be devoted the following chapters of this study.