**The classification of the Greek dialects according to their long-vowel systems by 350 B.C.**

In: Bartoněk, Antonín. *Development of the long-vowel system in Ancient Greek dialects.* Vyd. 1. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1966, pp. 149-155

# XI

# THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE GREEK DIALECTS ACCORDING TO THEIR LONG-VOWEL SYSTEMS BY 350 B.C.

The combined diachronic-synchronical approach which we followed in the preceding chapter will now be concluded by a synoptic synchronical analysis of the long-vowel system relations in the single Greek dialects, the analyzed situation being that which existed about the middle of the 4th cent. B.C. The basic viewpoint from we are going to start will be the criterion of conservatism, i.e. the criterion informing us how long the way was which each dialect made on its evolutionary progress from the assumed proto-Greek system. It means that when classifying the single Greek dialects we shall, to be true, essentially consider above all the differences in their outer long-vowel systemic aspect, but to a certain extent at least we shall try to differentiate them also with respect to the functional loading and to the historical phonic content of individual phonemes. Naturally, in this respect, it will not be possible for us to take into account all the phonetic changes which could produce major or minor dialectal differences in the frequency of the long-vowel phonemes, such as the different results of various contractions or diverse combinatory phonic changes with restricted frequency; on the whole, we shall concentrate here only on those phonic differentiation phenomena that we were taken up with in the foregoing chapters. We believe namely that in cases when the long-vowel systems of a greater number of Greek dialects present a quite identical picture these phenomena are predestined to become a significant additional help in classification.

And now we shall attempt the promised synchronic analysis from the just described points of view, an analysis of the long-vowel system in each of the Greek dialects according to the above-adduced systemic types, as we find them somewhat differently arranged on pp. 182/3 (see Table *K*):

1. In the middle of the 4th cent. B.C. the most archaic long-vowel system must be attributed to those Greek dialects which had preserved up till then the assumed proto-Greek system of five monophthongs without invigorating the functional capacity of their single members by any monophthongization of diphthongs. This group includes Lesbian, Arcadian—probably associated with Cypriot—Cretan, Cyre-

naean, and Laconian—together with Messenian and the sub-dialects of Tarentum and Herakleia, i.e. on the whole dialects that were either peripheral or otherwise isolated. This fact appears to be in full accord with the archaic character of this systemic type, supporting at the same time our conviction that the common participation of the enumerated dialects in the above-mentioned systemic type is in itself no proof of any special closer kinship.

Certain differences characterizing the enumerated dialects concern chiefly the historical content of some of their phonemes, referring particularly to the question to what extent these dialects experienced the origin of the secondary *ē*, *ō* as the product of accomplished compensatory lengthening of different types, as well as in what degree the functional loading of their universal *ē*, *ō* was additionally increased by these lengthenings (the results of the *e*+*e*, *o*+*o* contraction being essentially the same in all the enumerated dialects). Thus, considering the frequency of occurrence of the phonemes *ē*, *ō*, we may, in accord with our analysis on pp. 85sqq., fix for the enumerated dialects the following sequence (from the lowest frequency upward): 1. Lesbian[323] [324] (without any compensatory lengthening), 2. Arcadian (only the first compensatory lengthening; as to Cypriot,[325] the hitherto available material does not justify us in making any definite conclusions, but the situation was probably identical with that in Arcadian), 2a. Central Cretan[326] and Cyrenaean[324] (the first and the third compensatory lengthening), 2b. Laconian (the first and the second compensatory lengthening; the 2nd compensatory lengthening was owing to its great frequency in nominal and verbal affixes probably a much more frequent phonic phenomenon than the 3rd compensatory lengthening), 3. West and East Cretan (the first and the third compensatory lengthening unrestricted, the second only in the middle of the word; it is, however, doubtful whether the loading of the phonemes *ē*, *ō* was actually greater here than in Laconian,[323] for the end position was with the second compensatory lengthening, as to frequency, very likely the most important).

2. With the just discussed dialects of the archaic systemic type is closely connected also the long-vowel Elean system of six long monophthongs. When compared to the preceding dialects, it was more progressive insomuch that it represented a sort of

---

[323] Should it be found possible to believe about Lesbian and Laconian on the basis of the documents *Φεδίο* and *Φεδίλᾱς* that these dialects experienced the monophthongization of *ei* into *ę̄* — and analogically perhaps also of *ou* into *ǭ*—as early as in the 5th cent. B.C., it would, naturally, mean that these dialects would be ascribed from this time limit onward the character of the systemic type No. 3 or No. 6. Cf. page 81.

[324] In Lesbian—as well as in Cyrenaean in the medial position only—the occurrence frequency of the diphthongs *ai*, *ei*, *oi* got obviously increased in connection with the local liquidation of those types of the consonantal group *-ns/—/* which elsewhere were subjected to the second compensatory lengthening.

[325] As to Cypriot, see Note 112.

[326] Apart from it, the change *eu* > *ou* increased in Cretan also the functional loading of the diphthong *ou*.

intermediate systemic type between type No. 1 and the innovation type which we shall discuss under 3. We know well enough, of course, that from the historical view-point Elean had little in common with the said innovation type and that $\bar{\alpha}$ certainly originated in it before a number of Greek dialects began to display the tendency towards "doubling" the long $\bar{e}$- and $\bar{o}$-phonemes.—Another feature that made Elean related to the sytemic type No. 1 was naturally the fact that neither Elean had most likely accomplished by 350 B.C. the monophthongization of the diphthongs *ei, ou.*

3. The dialects we spoke of sub 1 and 2 in this chapter represent—provided that they actually had not accomplished the monophthongization of *ei* and *ou* before 350 B.C.—a distinctly separate systemic twofold group of a more or less archaic character. The sharpest phonemic contrast to this couple of archaic systemic types must be seen about 350 B.C. in the systemic type No. 3, comprising seven monophthongs and representing an immediate continuation of the long-vowel systemic type of seven monophthongs that had arisen from the proto-Greek type (identical, in fact, with systemic type No. 1) at some time about 1000 B.C. through phonemic "doubling" of the long $\bar{e}$- and $\bar{o}$-phones. Contrary to the greatest extent of this basic systemic type of seven monophthongs, as we have fixed it for approximately 700 B.C. by the existence of a geographically on the whole continuous dialectal isogloss, extending from the North-West dialects as far as Pamphylian, type No. 3 suffered later some losses, and about 350 B.C. it comprised only the North-West dialects, Megarian, East Argolic, Euboean, East Aegean Doric (except Cyrenaean), Pamphylian, and maybe also West Argolic outside Argos. This enumeration is remarkable for the fact that type No 3. included now above all those dialects that represented the two extreme borders of the area of the former most extensive seven monophthong isogloss (at one end the North-West dialects and at the other end East Aegean Doric with Pamphylian—while Euboean was to a certain extent also peripheral), whereas a comparatively great central portion of the extent of the former isogloss (Argos, Corinth, Attica) had undergone prior to 350 B.C. already phonetic changes that resulted in still more progressive systemic formations, as we shall try to point out under 4, 5, and 6. At the same time, however, it is not altogether impossible that some of the dialects which we have included under the heading of type No. 3 had also experienced analogical transformations before 350 B.C. already; here we might take into consideration mainly Argolic outside Argos and Megarian—in both cases their Argive, Corinthian, and also Attic neighbourhood could obviously play a part—this hypothesis lacking, to be sure, so far any positive substantiation.—On the other hand, however, we are likewise short of satisfactory material proving that at least some dialects of type No. 1 were possibly switching over to type No. 3 before 350 B.C. by transforming as early as then their *ei, ou* to $\bar{e}$, $\bar{o}$; in the best case we might declare it possible in Lesbian and Laconian owing to the available local documents *Φεδίō, Φεδίλαις*, yet even this conclusion is far from being firmly founded

If we take dialects of systemic type No. 3 one by one, we may again divide them-- to

a certain extent analogically as we have done so with type No. 1—into two groups, the criterion being to what extent and mainly with what results the different sources of the secondary $\bar{e}$, $\bar{o}$ asserted themselves in these dialects, especially the different types of compensatory lengthening (and also the Attic-Ionic change $\bar{a} > \bar{\alpha} > \bar{\varrho}$). The first group would be represented from this point of view by those Greek dialects in which compensatory lengthening produced every time the close $\bar{\varrho}$, $\bar{o}$ only (so that henceforth the same together with the close $\bar{\varrho}$, $\bar{o}$ originating through contractions and through monophthongization from *ei*, *ou* formed a very significant phonemic counterpart to the open primary $\bar{\varrho}$, $\bar{o}$); the second group would comprise those dialects whose $\bar{e}$- and $\bar{o}$-results of the compensatory lengthening were either exclusively or at least predominatly open so that the close $\bar{\varrho}$, $\bar{o}$ had a comparatively lower functional loading in them (its occurrence being for the most part restricted to the contracted or "monophthongized" $\bar{e}$, $\bar{o}$ only).

The inner structure of these two groups appears to be approximately the following: 1. a) the North-West dialects, East Argolic, and Megarian (the first and the second compensatory lengthening accomplished, both with closed $\bar{e}$- and $\bar{o}$-results); 1. b) Euboean (represents a certain variant sub-group, because the functional loading of the open $\bar{\varrho}$ was significantly increased in it at the expense of the phoneme $\bar{a}$, this being the outcome of the Attic-Ionic change $\bar{a} > \bar{\alpha} > \bar{\varrho}$);[327] 2. a) West Argolic outside Argos (probably only the first compensatory lengthening accomplished,[328] with open $\bar{e}$- and $\bar{o}$-results); 2. b) Pamphylian (both the first and the second compensatory lengthening accomplished, the $\bar{e}$- and $\bar{o}$-results being open in either case); 2. c) East Aegean Doric, Cyrenaean excepting (the first and the third compensatory lengthening accomplished without any restriction, while the second compensatory lengthening occurred in the middle of the word only; the $\bar{e}$- and $\bar{o}$-results are with the first and the second compensatory lengthening open, while with the third they are close).

4. Now we are coming to the innovation variants of the systemic type we have just been discussing. This trunk splits essentially into two branches. One branch is represented by Attic, Cycladic, and the Ionic of Asia Minor with its central $\bar{\imath}$, whose shift from the position of $\bar{u}$ contributed to a more favourable distribution of single monophthongs in the back long-vowel row from the articulation point of view. To be sure, the fact that the phonemes were merely shifted here without any fusing resulted in the following situation: this systemic type, though having three monophthongs in the back long-vowel row, nevertheless preserved its full number of seven monophthongs, which precisely corresponds with the number of monophthongs in the

---

[327] This very likely holds good in spite of the fact that outside the Attic-Ionic area it is the quality $\bar{e}$ and not $\bar{a}$ that originates through the contraction $a + e$, for the frequency of this contraction was surely not higher than the long $\bar{a}$ frequency before the accomplishment of the Attic-Ionic change $\bar{a} > \bar{\alpha} > \bar{\varrho}$.

[328] Somewhat different was the situation in Argive, but this Argolic subdialect does not belong to the systemic type No. 3.

systemic type No. 3.—As to the indications of some further dialectal splitting within the systemic type No. 4, let us stress here especially the differences between the Ionic and the Attic functional loading of the phoneme $\bar{a}$ (the Attic $\bar{a}$ manifested greater frequency owing to the specifically Attic backward shift $r\bar{\alpha}$, $e\bar{\alpha}$, $i\bar{\alpha} > r\bar{a}$, $e\bar{a}$, $i\bar{a}$).

5. The second innovation variant branch of the systemic type No. 3 begins with Corinthian. It is true that about 350 B.C. the local long-vowel system was probably quite identical with type No. 4 as to the systemic distribution of its front and back long monophthongs (both the said types had namely three monophthongs only in the back long-vowel row), yet in their total long-vowel schemes the Corinthian system (type No. 5) and the non-Euboean Attic-Ionic system (type No. 4) differed from each other insomuch that the Corinthian type likely had only six monophthongs in all (these being accommodated on the front and back axes only), while the Attic-Ionic type disposed of one more monophthong, i.e. its central $\bar{\imath}$. This is to be traced down to the fact that in Corinthian the close $\bar{o}$ and $\bar{u}$ fused, while in Attica, Ionia, and the Cyclades the close $\bar{o}$ merely shifted to the place which had some time before been fully evacuated by the old $\bar{u}$ after its transformation into $\bar{\imath}$.

6. Another evolutionary phase in the history of the second variant branch of the systemic type No. 3 must be seen in the Argive three-grade systemic type with five long monophthongs, as it presents itself to us by 350 B.C.; it is a systemic formation which also Corinthian was certainly approaching at that time, if it had not reached it even before that date. It is true that this Argive type was quite identical, as to the number of phonemes and their outer distribution, with that altogether archaic systemic type No. 1, yet, when taking into account their different functional loading we see a distinct difference between the two types, the chief characteristic feature of Argive (Argolic of Argos) being its much more even functional loading of the single long monophthongs—more concretely spoken the local considerable increase of the functional loading of the phonemes $\bar{\imath}$ and $\bar{u}$.—It must be noted, of course, that Argos separated from the systemic type No. 1 later than, let us say, Corinth, this circumstance finding its expression in the fact that about 350 B.C. the Argive $\bar{e}$-, $\bar{o}$- phonemes were functionally more loaded than for instance the Corinthian ones: the then-existing Argive $\bar{e}$, $\bar{o}$ (going back to the older open $\bar{\varepsilon}$, $\bar{\varrho}$) comprised also the results of both the first and the third compensatory lengthenings, whereas the presupposed contemporary Corinthian $\bar{\varepsilon}$, $\bar{o}$ (going back to the older open $\bar{\varepsilon}$, $\bar{\varrho}$ as well) contained only the primary $\bar{e}$ and $\bar{o}$, as in the Corinthian area it happened at the time of the first compensatory lengthening already that the transformation of the archaic three-grade system to the four-grade one occurred.

7. A rather near analogy of the Argive systemic type was about 350 B.C. the Thessalian long-vowel system, judging from the purely synchronical point of view; it differed from the Argive systemic type only by the close quality of its universal $\bar{e}$, $\bar{o}$. Seen diachronically, it was, however, a systemic formation with a rather specific development, for, in contrast to Argive, it evidently never passed in its history

through an innovative, "$\bar{e}/\bar{o}$ doubling" phase, corresponding to the systemic type No. 3, but developed directly from the archaic type No. 1, namely by shifting the mid $\bar{e}$, $\bar{o}$[329] to the position of the close $\bar{\underset{.}{e}}$, $\bar{\underset{.}{o}}$, these close qualities being later strengthened by monophthongizing the diphthongs *ei*, *ou* with the same close $\bar{e}$- and $\bar{o}$-results (both changes occurred prior to the 4th cent. B.C.). This, obviously, means that the Thessalian long-vowel system, however similar it may have been to the Argive long--vowel system about 350 B.C., originated in a quite different way, and, particularly from the historical point of view, cannot be classified as a further phase of the second variant group of the systemic type No. 3, this variant comprising, thus, in our classification only Corinthian and Argive.

8. On the other hand, it is the Boeotian long-vowel system—which was by 350 B.C. from the purely synchronical point of view a full analogy of the systemic type No. 5— that fits in this second variant group of the above-said innovative systemic type No. 3 without any difficulty when judged in the light of its historical development, and this in spite of the fact that it remained together with Thessalian (see type No. 7) closely associated with the quite archaic systemic type No. 1 for a very long time, maybe as late as the middle of the 1st millennium B.C.. The quite different form of the Boeotian long-vowel system in the Classical Era, when compared to Thessalian, is, naturally, the outcome of the fact that the Boeotian long-vowel system, which rapidly began to strike out its new path approximately as late as towards the end of the 6th cent. B.C., must have passed from 500 to 400 B.C. through evolutionary phases that gradually corresponded in principle—at least as to the number of phonemes and their outer distribution—to the systemic types No. 3[330] (when close $\bar{\underset{.}{e}}$, $\bar{\underset{.}{o}}$ originated in Boeotian through monophthongization of the diphthongs *ei*, *ou*), and Nos. 5—6 (when the same $\bar{\underset{.}{e}}$, $\bar{\underset{.}{o}}$ got narrowed to $\bar{\imath}$, $\bar{u}$), assuming in the end—shortly before 350 B.C.—through the monophthongization change *ai* > $\bar{\underset{.}{e}}$ the leading position in the development of the Greek long-vowel system. To be sure, in its concrete systemic structure it had at that time in its front vocalic row four monophthongs (so that it seems from the synchronic point of view as if it had returned to the systemic type No. 5), yet, this quasi-conservative feature was to a great extent counterbalanced by the fact that in Boeotian there remained at that time only *oi* as a prospective source of further supplementation to the local long-vowel system.

The essential difference between the Boeotian long-vowel system and the presupposed Corinthian system consists, however, in the different historical content of the $\bar{e}$-members: Firstly, the Boeotian $\bar{\underset{.}{e}}$ contained only the older *ai*, and it was definitely substantially less frequent than the Corinthian $\bar{\underset{.}{e}}$, which had originated from the primary proto-Greek $\bar{e}$, secondly, the Boeotian $\bar{\underset{.}{e}}$, which corresponded both to the proto-

[329] This $\bar{e}$-, $\bar{o}$-couple likely comprised already also the results of the *e* + *e*, *o* + *o* contraction.

[330] The then-existing Boeotian close $\bar{\underset{.}{e}}$, $\bar{\underset{.}{o}}$, of course, did not contain the products of compensatory lengthening of or equivocalic contraction, but only the monophthongs arisen from *ei*, *ou*, and that was probably why it fused rather soon with $\bar{\imath}$, $\bar{u}$.

-Greek primary *ē* and to the local *ē-* products of the compensatory lengthenings and contractions, had an essentially different historical phonic content than the Corinthian *ę̄*, which comprised, on the one hand, only the local products of the compensatory lengthenings and contractions, but, on the other hand, also the monophthongization substitute for the original *ei* (while in Bocotian this substitute had always been separated from the local substitute for both the primary *ē* and for that arisen by compensatory lengthenings or contractions, and by 350 B.C. it had, no doubt, occupied the position of *ī* already).