

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ANCIENT GREEK LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

Volume 2
G–O

General Editor
Georgios K. Giannakis

Associate Editors
Vit Bubenik
Emilio Crespo
Chris Golston
Alexandra Lianeri
Silvia Luraghi
Stephanos Matthaios



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2014

Table of Contents

VOLUME ONE

Introduction	vii
List of Contributors	xi
Table of Contents Ordered by Thematic Category	xv
Transcription, Abbreviations, Bibliography	xxi
List of Illustrations	xxiii
Articles A–F	1

VOLUME TWO

Transcription, Abbreviations, Bibliography	vii
Articles G–O	1

VOLUME THREE

Transcription, Abbreviations, Bibliography	vii
Articles P–Z	1
Index	547

- Kakridis, I. Th. 1948. *To metafrastiko provlima* [The translation problem]. Athens.
- Kitromilidis, Paschalis M. 1996. *Neoellinikos Diafotismos* [Modern Greek enlightenment]. Athens.
- Knox, B. M. W. 1964. *The heroic temper. Studies in Sophoclean tragedy*. Berkeley – Los Angeles.
- Maronitis, D. N. 2001. "Glossa kai Metafrasi" [Language and translation]. In: *Istoria tis Ellinikis Glossas. Apo tis arhes eos tin isteri arhaiotita* [History of Greek Language], ed. by A.-F. Christidis, 972–975. Thessaloniki (see also English edition, 2007).
- Mounin, G. 2002. *Oi orees apistes* [Les Belles infidèles], transl. by Diapanepistimiako Diatmimatiko. Programa Metaptiakiakon Spoudon Panepistimiou Athinon. Athens.
- Ragavis, A. R. 1860. *Metafraseis Ellinikon Dramaton* [Translations of Greek drama]. *Sophocles' Antigone - Aristophanes' Nefele, Eirini, Ornithes*. Athens.
- . 1999. *Apomnimonevmata* [Memoirs]. Athens.
- Remediaki, Ioanna. 2006. *Oi metafraseis tis 'Antigonis' tou Sophokli sti neoelliniki skini (1850–2000)* [The translations of Sophocles' Antigone for the modern Greek stage (1850–2000)]. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Athens.
- Steiner, G. 1984. *Antigones. The Antigone myth in Western literature, art and thought*. Oxford.
- Svoronos, Nikos G. 1999. *Episkopisi tis neoellinikis istorias* [Review of modern Greek history]. Athens.

IOANNA REMEDIAKI

Ionic

Ionic is a Greek dialect group characterized by a number of features, some specific to it and others shared with other dialects. Ionic was the dialectal base of several literary languages of the Archaic and Classical periods, in both poetry (epic, elegiac and iambic; → Epic Diction; → Elegy, Diction of; → Iambic Poetry, Diction of) and prose (history, philosophy, science; → Literary Prose). Here we will be concerned exclusively with Ionic as documented in inscriptions (→ Epigraphy) and similar documents.

According to the *theoria recepta*, there are three varieties of Ionic: the dialect of Euboea (West Ionic), the Ionic of Asia Minor (East Ionic) and the Ionic of the Cyclades (Central Ionic). Together with → Attic, these three varieties form the Attic-Ionic group, which in the second millennium BCE made up a more or less homogeneous dialectal unit in Central Greece. In addition to Asia Minor, the Cyclades and Euboea, Ionic was also spoken in many colonies in both the north-east (the Chalcidice Peninsula, the Thracian coast of the Aegean, the Propontis, and the Black Sea) and the west (in the Greek colonies of the north-eastern Iberian Peninsula, southern France, Magna Graecia, and Sicily) in the first millennium BCE.

From approximately the 5th c. BCE onwards, the influence of Attic begins to be felt in all varieties of Ionic. From 350 BCE (Asia Minor and the Cyclades) or the second century BCE (Euboea) almost all inscriptions are written in Attic or Koine, with dialectal features appearing confined almost exclusively to personal names.

1. THE GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF IONIC

1.a. *The Ionic of Asia Minor (E.Ion.)*

In the 5th c. BCE Ionic was spoken along the coastal strip of Asia Minor, from Phocaea and Smyrna in the north (previously Aeolic cities) to Halicarnassus (originally a Doric city) in the south, as well as on the islands of Samos and Chios. Herodotus (1.142.3) identifies four regional subdialects in Ionia, corresponding to the twelve cities that originally formed the Dodecapolis:

- a. The Carian variant, spoken in Miletus, Myous, and Priene;
- b. The Lydian variant, spoken in Ephesus, Colophon, Lebedos, Teos, Clazomenai, and Phocaea;
- c. The Ionic of Chios and Erythrae;
- d. The Ionic of the island of Samos.

However, inscriptions do not confirm this classification: there are certainly dialectal differences between Ionic cities (some of them due to the influence of neighboring Aeolic (→ Lesbian (and Asian Aeolic) on the northernmost Ionic cities, see below), but they do not correspond to Herodotus' classification. In addition, the inscriptions that have been preserved seem to reflect the early existence of an Eastern Ionic Koine (→ Koine, Origins of), probably based on the dialect of Miletus. Among the colonies founded by Ionians from Asia Minor in the west are those founded by Phocaea, such as Massalia (southern France), Emporion (north-eastern Spain), and Velia (Campania, Italy). Most Greek colonies in the Hellespont, the Propontis, and the Black Sea, and some on the Thracian coast of the Aegean (such as Abdera and Maroneia) were founded by Ionians, particularly from Miletus: Sinope (which in turn founded Trapezous), Apollonia, Istros, Olbia, Odessos, Proconessos, Cyzicos, Lampsacos, Perinthos, etc.

1.b. *The Ionic of the Cyclades (C.Ion.)*

Ionic was spoken in Paros (and its colony Thasos), Amorgos, Andros, Ceos, Delos, Naxos, Siphnos, Ios, and Tenos, while Doric was spoken in Thera, Pholegandros, Melos, Anaphe, and Cimolos. Ionic was probably also spoken at some point on Cythnos and Seriphos and on some other minor islands, but the few inscriptions preserved there are written in Attic or Koine. Lastly, some of the Cyclades took part in the founding of some colonies in the north of the Aegean (e.g., Thasos was founded by Paros), in the Black Sea, and in the Propontis (e.g. Parion was founded by Paros and perhaps Eretria).

1.c. *Euboean (W.Ion.)*

In addition to the island of Euboea, with Eretria and Chalcis as its most important cities, Euboean was also spoken in Oropos and its sanctuary the Amphiareion (Boeotia), the Euboean colonies of Magna Graecia and Sicily (Cumae; Pithecoussai; Neapolis; Rhegion; Leontini, Catania; Zancle, which founded Himera; Naxos founder of Tauromenion), and (although very few dialectal sources have been preserved) the Euboean colonies of the Chalcidice Peninsula (Olynthos, Mende, Torone, Dicaia, and Methone). Our knowledge of Euboean is based almost exclusively on epigraphic evidence, as we cannot be sure that it was used as a literary language, and it did not draw the attention of ancient grammarians, whose comments on Euboean are very scarce. Worthy of mention is the remark by Plato (*Crat.* 434c) on Eretrian rhotacism, to which he attributes the form *sklērótēr* (< *sklērótēs* 'hardness'); wrongly, because in Euboean *s* > *r* did not occur word-finally. However, some scholars believe that certain features in the language of Homer come from the Euboean dialect, and even suggest that there was a Euboean phase in the oral tradition of Homeric poetry.

2. IONIC FEATURES

In addition to pan-dialectal archaisms inherited from → Proto-Greek and Common Greek, the three Ionic subdialects share a number of features with Attic (below 2.a., 2.b.), which can be traced back to the Proto-Attic-Ionic of the second millennium BCE. Some of these (2.a.) are characteristic of → Southeast Greek, and are therefore also found in → Arcado-Cypriot and some of them in → Pamphylian. W.Ion., C.Ion.,

and E.Ion. share a number of features not found in Attic (2.c.). There are also other features that are specific to each variety of Ionic (2.d., 2.e.).

2.a. *Features common to Attic-Ionic and Characteristic of Southeast Greek*

- (1) → Assibilation (*-ti(-) > -si(-)) vs. W.Gk. -ti(-): *eíkosi* 'twenty', *anatíthēsi* 'he dedicates', *légousi* 'they say' (W.Gk. (*w*)*íkati*, *anatíthēti*, *légonti*).
- (2) *t^(h)j > ss > s in some categories: *tósos* 'so much', *pósos* 'how much', *mésos* 'middle' (< *tótjos, *pótjos, *médhjos; cf. W.Gk. ss: *tóssos*, *póssos*, *méssos*).
- (3) ss (< *s + s, *ts, *ths, *ds) > s: aor. of the type *etélesa* 'I fulfilled' and *élpisa* 'I hoped'; dat. pl. *génesi* 'race' and *posí* 'foot', vs. W.Gk. ss (*génessi*, *possí*, *etélessa*, etc.).
- (4) Vocalism *o* in the verb "to want", *g^(w)ol-, instead of the original vocalism *e*, *g^(w)el-, which is preserved in W.Gk. (*deílomai*, *déloomai*): E.Ion. and C.Ion. (and Attic) *boúlomai*; W.Ion. *bóloomai*.
- (5) (*h*)*ierós* 'holy' (E.Ion. also *irós*: cf. 2.d.i.6), vs. W.Gk. *hiarós*.
- (6) Nominative plural of the article (*h*)*oi*, (*h*)*ai*, vs. W.Gk. *toí*, *taí*.
- (7) Numeral *prótos* 'first' (W.Gk. *prátos*).
- (8) *eíkosi* 'twenty' (W.Gk. (*w*)*íkati*).
- (9) Temporal adverbs in -*te*: *tóte* 'at that time', *póte* 'when?', (*h*)*óte* 'when' (W.Gk. -*ka*: *tóka*, *hóka*).
- (10) Ending of the 1 pl. act. -*men* (W.Gk. -*mes*).
- (11) Athematic infinitive -(*e*)*nai* (→ Infinitives (Morphology of)): *apodóunai* 'to give back', *omnúnai*, 'to swear', *théinai* 'to put' (W.Gk. -*men*: *apodómen*, *thémen*, etc.).
- (12) Preposition *prós* 'to, towards' (Arc.-Cypr. *pós*, Mycenaean *po-si*) vs. W.Gk. *potí*.
- (13) Conditional conjunction *ei* 'if' and modal particle *án* (W.Gk. *ai* and *ka*).

2.b. *Attic-Ionic Features not shared by the other Southeast Dialects*

- (1) /a:/ > /æ:/ > /ɛ:/ (only inherited /a:/ and /a:/ from the first → compensatory lengthening). This is a feature exclusive to Attic-Ionic (as 2.b.2.), predating the Ionians' migration to Asia Minor and the consequent fragmentation of Proto-Attic-Ionic: *dēmos* 'popular assembly', *stratēgós* 'general', *stélē* 'block of

- stone'. Unlike Attic, in which /a:/ is retained after *i*, *e* and *r* (→ Attic Reversion), in Ionic /a:/ > /ɛ:/ occurs in all positions. In some inscriptions from Naxos, Ceos, and Amorgos from the 7th, 6th, and 5th c. BCE, and very sporadically in Euboea, the inherited /ɛ:/ and the vowel resulting from /a:/ are represented in different ways: <H> is used only for the latter, whereas the inherited /ɛ:/ is written as <E> (the same grapheme used for /e/). From this one can infer that at the time of these inscriptions /æ:/ (< /a:/) had not yet merged with the inherited /ɛ:/; cf. Naxos (offering from Delos, 6th c. BCE): ANETHEKEN, NIKANAPH, ΚΑΣΙΓΝΕΘΗ (*anéthēken* 'he dedicated', *Nikándrē* < *Nikándrā*, *kasignētē* < *kasignētā* 'sister'); Carystos (5th-4th c. BCE): ΘΗ (*têi* < *tâi*), but ΣΟΤΕΡ (*sōtēr* 'saviour').
- (2) Fronting of /u(:)/ > /y(:)/. On this change in Euboea, see below 2.d.iii.2.
 - (3) <ei>, <ou> as outcomes from compensatory lengthenings and isovocalic contractions: *ênai* 'to be', *toûs nómous* 'the laws', *gráphousi* 'they write', *phérein* 'to carry', *démou* 'people' (gen. sg.).
 - (4) Shortening in hiatus and quantitative → metathesis: *drakhméōn* (Attic *drakhmôn*) 'drachma' (gen. pl.), *basiléōn* 'king' (gen. pl.), *basiléōs*, *póleōs* 'city' (gen. sg.). These changes gave rise to the → Attic Declension: nom. *Pheidíleōs*, *Anaxíleōs*, gen. *Pheidíleō*, *Anaxíleō*.
 - (5) Vocalism *o* in the name of the god *Apóllōn*.
 - (6) Outcome *a* of the syllabic resonants (→ Syllabic Consonants): *stratēgós* 'general', *déka* 'ten', *anagrápsai* 'to write'.
 - (7) Early loss of /w/ in all positions from the earliest inscriptions: *eíkosi* 'twenty', *pléontas* 'sailing', *epoíēse* '(s)he made' (aor.).
 - (8) Dental outcome of → labiovelars before *e* (*pénte* 'five', *tésseres*, *téttares* 'four').
 - (9) **dj*, **g(w)j*, and **j* > *z*: *Zeús*, *mézōn* 'bigger' (Attic *meízōn*), *ergázōntai* 'they work', *dikázein* 'to judge'.
 - (10) The so-called nu-ephelestikon at word-end: *trísín* 'three' (dat.), *eíkosin* 'twenty'.
 - (11) Personal pronouns: nom. (*h*)*ēméis* 'we', (*h*)*uméis* 'you'; acc. (*h*)*ēméas*, (*h*)*uméas* (Attic *hēmás*, *humás*).
 - (12) Aorist and future of *-ízō*, *-ázō* verbs in *-sa* and *-sō*: *edíkasan* 'they judged', *ērgásanto* 'they worked'.
 - (13) Thematic (→ Thematic Vowel, Stem Formation) inflection of contract verbs: *poiéîn* 'to make', *timân* 'to honor'.
 - (14) The 3 sg. imperf. of *eimí* 'to be' is *ên* (replacing the original **ēs*), analogical to the 3 pl. (→ Analogy), which in turn is replaced by *êsan*.
 - (15) Extension of the 3 pl. ending *-san* beyond the aorist.
 - (16) *eis*, *es* 'into, to, in' + accusative: *eis stélēn* 'in a block of stone'.
- 2.c. *Features common to the three Ionic Variants but not shared by Attic*
- (1) No reversion of /æ:/ (< /a:/): *oikíēn* 'house', *triékonta* 'thirty', *deutéren* 'second' (fem.), *Puthagórēs*, *préxesthai* 'to achieve' (fut.).
 - (2) No contraction of *ea*, *eā*, *eo*, *eō*, *eou* (*akratéa* 'powerless' (acc.), *aphanéas*, 'unseen' (acc. pl.), *étea* 'years', *álseos* 'grove' (gen.), *pōléontas* 'selling' (acc. pl. pres. ptc.), *drakhméōn* 'drachma' (gen. pl.)), except when such clusters are preceded by vowel: *tôn adikiōn* (< *tôn adikiēōn*) 'injustice' (gen. pl.), *Eretriás* (< *Eretriéas*), *Eretriōn* (< *Eretriēōn*) 'Eretrians'. Furthermore, *eo* can undergo hyphaeresis, particularly in W.Ion.: (*h*)*eoréte* > (*h*)*orté* 'feast', *Eteokléēs* > *Etokléēs*, *Théoklos* > *Thóklos*.
 - (3) (*h*)*istía* 'hearth of a house' (Attic (*h*)*estía*). W.Ion. also *hestía*.
 - (4) *gínomai* 'to become' > *gínomai*: *gínointo*, *gínesthai*, *gínētai*.
 - (5) Genitive singular of the *ā*-stems in *-eō* (< **-ēō* < **-āō*), generally with contraction when the cluster is preceded by a vowel: *Puthagóreō*, *Timagóreō*, *Timarkhídeō*, *políteō* 'citizen', *Kallíō*, *Khairíō*, *neaníō* 'young man'. Vowels sometimes also contract when preceded by a consonant: *Aiskhúnō*, *Menónō*, *Diagórō*.
 - (6) Stems ending in a sibilant. In the gen. sg., alongside the expected forms in *-eos* (cf. *Dio-téleos*, *Aristokráteos*, *Dēmosthēneos*), *-eō* is also documented (also with contraction *-eō* > *-ō*), reshaped after masculine nouns in *-ās* (Ionic nom. *-ēs*): *Apollopháneō*, *Dexikráteō*, *Phanokléō*, *Dēmokhárō*, *Eukrátō*.
 - (7) Stems ending in *-eus*. The gen. sg. (< **-ēos*) sometimes ends in *-eos* (*basiléos* 'king', *hieréos* 'priest') which can be analogical to the gen. of the *s*-stems or a paradigmatic regularization based upon the cases which

have a short *-e-* (*basiléa, basiléas, basiléōn*). Some instances of acc. pl. in *-eas* (*basiléas, hieréas, Eretriâs < Eretriéas*) are attested, vs. *-eis* (*basileís, hieréis...*) of the Hellenistic period, which is taken from Koiné.

- (8) Comparative *mézōn* ‘bigger’ (vs. Attic *meízōn*): *mézō, mézōna*. Alongside *plēō* ‘more’, *mézō*, we also find *eláTonos* (for <T>, see below 2.d.i.1.) ‘smaller, less’, *elássonas, [elás]sonas, mézōna*.
- (9) Thematic inflection of athematic verbs: *tithóntōn* (with hyphaeresis?) (imp.), *tithéin* ‘to put’, *kathistân* ‘to bring down’, *didōún* ‘to give’.
- (10) The participle of *eimí* is *eón, eoûsa, eón* (W.Ion. also *ón, oûsa, ón*): *pareóntos* ‘being present’ (gen.), *eóntos* ‘being’ (gen.).

2.d. *Features of the Varieties of Ionic*

2.d.i. The Ionic of Asia Minor

- (1) The Ionic regional alphabet (→ Local Scripts), also called Milesian because it was probably created in Miletus, is a “blue” alphabet (<Ξ> = *ks*, <Ψ> = *ps*). The Ionic alphabet shows some major innovations: a) <H> stands for /ε:/ (both the /ε:/ inherited from Proto-Greek and the new /ε:/ derived from /a:/) instead of aspiration, which had been lost in E.Ion.; b) <Ω> represents /ɔ:/, while the grapheme <O> stands for /o/ and /o:/; c) a particular grapheme, <T> (*sampí*), of debated origin and probably with the phonetic value /ts/: *eláTonos* ‘less’ (gen.), *téTaras* ‘four’, *teTarápona*, ‘forty’, *AlikarnaTéōn* ‘from Halicarnassus’. Between the 5th and 4th c. BCE the Ionic alphabet replaced local alphabets in the various regions of Greece.
- (2) 3rd compensatory lengthening after the loss of /w/ in the clusters /nw/, /rw/ and /lw/: *xeínoi* ‘foreigners’, *gounata* ‘knees’, *Ouliádēs* (p.n.).
- (3) A tendency to preserve the long diphthong *ēi* internally: *lēistás* ‘robbers’, *Istiēiōn* ‘from Histiaea’, *chrēiúzōsin* ‘they have need of’. The suffix *-ēio-*, found in adjectives derived from *-eu-*stems, not only preserves the length but also spreads to adjectives derived from other stems: *ierēia* ‘priestess’, *ieréa, prutanēion* ‘magistrates’ hall’. Final *-ēi* and *-ōi* show variations: *autēi* ‘she’

(dat.), *gráphēi* ‘he writes’ (subj.), *trítēi* ‘third’ (fem.), *tē(i) boulē(i)* ‘the Council’ (dat.), *dēmárkhōi* ‘chief of a demos’ (dat.), *ierēō(i)* ‘priest’ (dat.: see below 2.d.i.19).

- (4) *eo* and *eou* > *eu*: *teleúsi* ‘they fulfill’, *teleuménōn* (pass. ptc.), *exaireúmetha* ‘we are deprived of’, *Theugénēs, Kleukúdēs, Kleudórou* (cf. 2.d.i.17). The most widespread view holds that *eu* is the outcome of the diphthongization of *eo*, and that this is an isogloss shared with C.Ion. and the Doric of the islands (the few examples documented in Aeolis must be attributed to E.Ion. influence). According to other scholars, *eu* instead of *eo* is an inverse spelling due to the opening of the second element of the diphthongs *eu* and *au* since the Archaic period (cf. 2.d.i.5).
- (5) *ao, eo* instead of *au, eu*: *taótas* ‘this’ (fem. pl.), *aotoús* ‘them’, *políteoma* ‘citizen rights’, *pheógein* ‘to flee’, *eoxámenoi* ‘praying’ (aor. ptc.); cf. *taútas, autoús, políteuma, pheúgein, euxámenoi*. These spellings may point to the back quality of the second element of the diphthong, due to the pronunciation /y(:)/ of old *u*, or they are hypercorrect spellings caused by the change of *ao, eo* to *au, eu* (cf. 2.d.i.4).
- (6) *irós* ‘sacred’ is mainly documented in the northernmost Ionic cities, alongside *ierós*, which is attested throughout the Dodeca polis: *irētēēn* ‘priesthood’, *ireiē* ‘priestess’. The former constitutes an isogloss with the Aeolic of Asia Minor, where it is probably caused by Ionic influence.
- (7) In Chios and Miletus *glássa* ‘tongue’ is documented, probably an archaism against *glóssa* in the other Greek dialects.
- (8) Alongside *émisus* ‘half’, *émusus* also appears, due to anticipatory → assimilation. This is another feature shared with the Aeolic of Asia Minor.
- (9) → Psilosis or loss of initial aspiration: *ep’ón* ‘upon which’, *tómusu* ‘the half’, *kat’ékaston* ‘each’, *ap’ekástou* ‘from each’, *katóper* ‘just as’; cf. *eph’hôn, thómusu, kath’hékaston, aph’hekástou, kath’hóper*.
- (10) *(ó)kōs* ‘in order that’, *okósos* ‘as much as’, *okoíos* ‘of what quality’ (< *(o)kwo-: Attic *(hó)pōs, hopósos, hopoíos*); the velar appears to be restricted to the north of Ionia and colonies, and confined to the Archaic period (cf. Hualde 1997:471). It is probably

due to the generalization of the velar outcome from the inherited labiovelar in the sequence *ou-k^wōs ‘in no wise’.

- (11) *t^(h)j, *k^(h)(^w)j, and *tw > ss: *préssō* ‘I achieve’, *élasson* ‘less’, *kērussóntōn* ‘let them proclaim’ (3 pl. imp.), *tésseres* ‘four’.
- (12) Unlike Attic and W.Ion., -rs- is kept in E.Ion.: *Órsippos*, *ársēn* ‘male’.
- (13) *Eslós* instead of *esthlós* ‘brave’: *eslê[s]*, *Éslōnos*. Since examples are restricted to Erythrae and Chios, it may be an isogloss shared with the Aeolic of Asia Minor.
- (14) *xunós* ‘common’ = Attic *koinós*.
- (15) Thematic dative plural -*oisi(n)* and dative plural of -*ā*-stems in -*ē(i)si(n)* alternate with -*ois* and -*ais* until the beginning of the 4th c.: *toútoisin* ‘these’, *eggónoisin* ‘descendants’, *Anthestērioisin* ‘Feast of flowers’, *díkēisi* ‘judgement’, *naútēisin* ‘sailors’, *númphēsin* ‘nymphs’. Only -*ois* and -*ais* are attested from the 4th c. BCE onwards.
- (16) Masculines in -*ā*. Hypocoristic forms in -*ēs* (< -*ēēs* < -*ēās*) are common: *Apellês*, *Phanês*, *Philtês*, *Aristês*. Alongside the regular gen. sg. -*eō*, there are examples of -*eos*, analogical to the *s*-stems: *Apelléos*, *Arísteos*, *Puthagóreus* (with -*eo*- > -*eu*-). More problematic is the gen. in -*eu*: *Arísteu*, *Apollónídeu*, *Eukleídeu*, *Pútheu*. Such forms could be the result of the phonetic development -*eō* > -*eu*, which is implausible, or of the influence of the *s*-stems.
- (17) Stems ending in a sibilant. Alongside an ending -*eos* (cf. 2.c.6) and -*eus* due to the phonetic development of -*eos* (*Theugéneus*, *Apollopháneus*, *Autokráteus*, *Perikleûs*), there is also a gen. sg. in -*eu*: *Aristoméneu*, *Iētropháneu*, *Astukráteu*. Acc. sg. forms in -*ēn*, analogical to the -*ā*-stems, date from the late Hellenistic period and are probably due to the influence of Koine. Some examples of the acc. pl. in -*eas* (Attic and Koine -*eis*) are preserved: *akratéas* ‘powerless’, *aphanéas* ‘unseen’.
- (18) Stems in -*i*. Alongside the declension -*is*, -*eōs*, the o-grade vocalism -*is*, -*ios* is widely documented: gen. sg. *lúsios* ‘loosing’, *prutánios* ‘ruler’, *pólios* ‘city’, *Leóntios*, *Prōtokhários*; acc. pl. *tàs prēsis* ‘the sales’. The gen. sg. *prutáneos* may be analogical to the *s*-stems or a paradigmatic regularization.
- (19) Stems in -*eu* (Attic nom. *hieréus* ‘priest’, gen. *hieréōs*). Some nouns adopted the thematic

declension (nom. *basiléos* ‘king’, *hieréos*), perhaps due to a phonetic development -*eus* > -*eos*. Subsequently, the dat. *ieréōi*, interpreted as a dative of the Attic declension, could have given rise to the new thematic declension: nom. *iéreōs*, gen. *iéreō*.

- (20) Nom. sg. *meís* ‘month’ against Attic *mén*.
- (21) Both forms of the root of ‘Zeus’ are attested: *Zēnós*, *Zēnodótō*; *Dí*, *Dieitréphēs*.
- (22) Hypochoristic personal names with nom. -*âs*, gen. -*â* and -*âdos* are common: gen. *Apellâs*, *Apellâ*, *Apollâ*, *Artemiâ*, *Apollâdos*, *Prēxâdos*. Hypochoristic personal names in -*ûs*, -*ûos* adopted a declension with a dental (-*ûs*, *ûdos*): *Dionnúdos*, *Kokkúdos*.
- (23) Demonstrative pronouns: *keínos* ‘that’ (Attic *ekeínos*). Reflexive pronouns: *eōuto* ‘himself’, alongside *eauto*- and *eaoto*-.
- (24) → Numerals: vocalism *e* in the second syllable of ‘four’: *tésseras*, *tessērōn*, *tesserákonta* ‘forty’, although forms in zero-grade are also attested: *teTaráqonta*, *téTaras*. Worth mentioning are the forms for ‘twelve’, *duōdékōn* and *dékōn dúōn* (for the declension of numerals higher than four, see below).
- (25) Conditional conjunction *én* ‘if’ (< *ei án?*; Attic *eán*).
- (26) Forms of subjunctive with a short vowel (alongside forms with a long vowel) are only documented in Chios, Teos, Miletus, Ephesus, and Emporion (→ Subjunctive (Morphology of)): *poiései* ‘(s)he makes’ (aor. subj.), *ekkópsēi* ‘(s)he cuts out’ (aor. subj.).
- (27) *támnō* ‘I cut’ against Attic *témnō*: *epitamnéō*, aor. *étamon*; verb *lambánō* ‘I take’: *lápsetai*, *lapsómetha*, *kateláphthē*, *laphthéōsin*.

Several explanations have been put forward for the fact that E.Ion. shares a number of features with its neighbor Aeolic of Asia Minor (→ Lesbian (and Aeolic Asian)). According to Porzig and Risch (→ Southeast Greek), such features in Lesbian are due to the influence of Ionic after the speakers of both dialects had settled in their locations in Asia Minor. This is the most plausible explanation for certain isoglosses such as psilosis, *iros* and **ens*. The cases, however, in which the features are characteristic of southern dialects (*-*ti(-)* > -*si(-)*, **g(w)ol-*, *oi*, *ai*, *eikosi*, *prós*) and which can therefore be dated to the second millennium BCE were probably caused by the fact that before the Doric invasions and the migration of the future Lesbians and future Ionians

to Asia Minor, the Proto-Lesbians occupied an area in Greece under the influence of E.Gk.

Similarly, since Solmsen (1897–98) the presence of Aeolic features (→ Aeolic Dialects) in E.Ion. has been explained as a result of the influence of the neighboring Lesbian. However, a detailed analysis of the facts (Hualde 1997) shows that these features are less numerous than commonly thought. Although Aeolisms are more common in the northernmost cities, such as Phocaea and colonies, Erythrae, Samos, and Chios, they are also documented in other Ionic cities located further to the south, such as Miletus. Aeolic features include: a) diphthong in the third plural instead of the second → compensatory lengthening: cf. *préxoisin* ‘they achieve’ and subj. *lábōisin* ‘they take’ in Chios (= *préxousin*, *lábōsin*); subj. *-ōisi* in Emporion (Attic *ōsi*); and b) declension of numerals above four in Chios and Samos, vs. non-inflected forms in the rest of the Dodecapolis (gen. pl.: *dúōn* ‘two’, *dékōn* ‘ten’, *tesserakóntōn* ‘forty’, *pentekóntōn* ‘fifty’, *enenékóntōn* ‘ninety’). Further supposed Aeolicisms like the participle *gegōnéontes* ‘becoming’ in Chios or the athematic inflection of the *verba vocalia* (Emporion *dipsant[i]* ‘thirsting’ dat.ptc.?) are isolated cases and may have other explanations.

2.d.ii. The Ionic of the Cyclades

In most of the Cyclades (Naxos, Amorgos, Ceos, Andros), the alphabet used in the oldest inscriptions is a “light blue” alphabet. Worthy of mention is the alphabet of Paros and its colony Thasos, in which, unlike the Milesian alphabet, <Ω> represents /o/ and /o:/ while <O> stands for /ɔ:/. Apart from this, the Ionic of the Cyclades shows almost the same features as the Ionic of Asia Minor and is therefore usually considered a variant of the latter (cf. Bartoněk 1970). The main differences between them are as follows:

- (1) Retention of initial aspiration in C.Ion. vs. psilosis in E.Ion.
- (2) Thematic dative plural *-ois* vs. *-oisi* in E.Ion. (cf. 2.d.i.15 above).
- (3) *(ho)po-* in the indefinite interrogative vs. *(o)ko-* in E.Ion.
- (4) *hierós* ‘holy’ vs. *irós* / *ierós* in E.Ion.; but *irós* also appears in Thasos, probably due to Aeolic influence, cf. 2.d.i.6 above.

The features that separate the Ionic of the Cyclades from E.Ion. are also found in Euboean (cf.

2.d.iii.). In addition, the influence of Attic can be seen in the Cyclades from the 6th and 5th c. BCE onwards, not only due to geographical proximity but also for historical and political reasons (the Attic-Delian League).

2.d.iii. Euboean

Because of the uneven distribution of the preserved inscriptions (many Euboean dialect features are witnessed only in Eretria and Oropos), we lack sufficient evidence to identify potential local differences within Euboean. Western Euboean colonies probably differed from the metropolis in some ways, such as the retention of *w* and the back pronunciation of /u(:)/.

- (1) Unlike the rest of Attic-Ionic, the Euboean regional alphabet is a type of “red” alphabet: <Ψ> = /k^h/, <X> = /ks/; /ps/, meanwhile, is represented by <ΦΣ>. Between the middle and end of the 5th c. BCE, the Euboean alphabet was replaced by the Milesian one.
- (2) According to the *theoria recepta*, unlike the rest of Attic-Ionic, W.Ion. /u(:)/ retained its back articulation. This hypothesis is based primarily on the use of *koppa* before *u*, and some forms with vocalic assimilation (*léϕuthos* ‘casket for unguents’, *Qúϕnus* p.n., *hupú* ‘under’). However, both facts, which are documented only in western Euboean colonies and date from the Archaic period, prove only the back pronunciation of *u* when such colonies were founded (cf. del Barrio 1990). Similarly, some examples of *koppa* followed by *u* from the Archaic period are preserved in E.Ion. as well (Chios *ϕúlika* ‘wine cup’, Smyrna *léϕuthos* and *ϕulíkhne* ‘small cup’), and we can be certain that in this dialect the change /u(:)/ > /y(:)/ did take place.
- (3) /w/ drops without compensatory lengthening: *Kórei* ‘the Maiden’, *próxenon* ‘public guest’.
- (4) *ea* > *ia*, although this is documented only in *ían* ‘if’ (< *eán*).
- (5) Shortening of long diphthongs in final position: *-ēi* > *-ei*, *-ōi* > *-oi*: dat. sg. *teî bouleî* ‘the Council’, *toî démoi* ‘the popular assembly’, *toî boloménoi* ‘wanting’ (dat. ptc.), *pareî* ‘(s)he is present’ (subj.), *sumbaínei* ‘it happens’ (subj.).
- (6) *bólomai* ‘I want’ against *boúlomai* in the rest of Attic-Ionic: *bólētai*, *tòn bolómenon*.

- (7) *hierós* ‘holy’, never *hirós* (cf. 2.d.i.6 and 2.d.ii.4 above).
- (8) Euboean retains initial aspiration: *hidrúrantō* ‘they founded’ (3 pl. aor.; for -s- > -r-, see below 2.d.iii.10), *hustérei* ‘coming after’ (fem.), *hóstis* ‘any one who’, *aph’hekástou*.
- (9) In inscriptions from Euboea and its colonies, some forms with two aspirated plosives that contravene → Grassmann’s Law are attested: *thuphlós* ‘blind’, *ethéthēn*, ‘I was put’ (aor. pass.), *ethráphthē* ‘(s)he was reared’ (aor. pass.). Although some scholars believe that such forms are analogical to other forms of the same root, they are probably archaisms.
- (10) One feature unique to Euboean is → rhotacism of the intervocalic sibilant, irrespective of its origin: *hidrúrantō* ‘they founded’ (3 pl. aor.), *thúōrin*, ‘they sacrifice’ (3 pl. subj.), *hopórai* ‘as many as’ (fem.), *sítērin* ‘eating’ (Attic *hidrúsantō*, *thúōsin*, *hopósai*, *sítēsin*). The oldest examples date from the second half of the 6th c. BCE. The change postdated Euboean colonization in both the east and the west, as it is not documented in the colonies.
- (11) -rs- > -rr-: *Púrrikhos*, *Tharrúnontos*, *Órrippos* (cf. 2.d.i.12 above).
- (12) *t^(h)j, *k^(h)(^w)j, and *tw > tt: *élatton* ‘less’, *préttóntōn* ‘achieving’ (gen. pl. ptc.) (cf. 2.d.i.11 above).
- (13) Dative pl. -ois and -ais: *hekástois* ‘each’, *toís nómois* ‘the laws’, *theaís pásais* ‘all goddesses’, *kitharistaís* ‘players of the cithara’ (cf. 2.d.i.15 and 2.d.ii.2 above).
- (14) Stems ending in a sibilant: acc. sg. in -ēn (probably analogical to the acc. of masculines in -ā) is documented as early as the beginning of the 5th c. BCE: *Aristotélēn*. The nom. sg. of personal names in -klēs has been reshaped by analogy with the rest of the paradigm and presents the uncontracted form in -klēēs: *Theoklēēs*, *Themistoklēēs*.
- (15) As in Attic, masculine personal names in -is, -ios are inflected in -is, -idos: *Dēmokháridos*, *Opóridos*, *Apólaxidos*.
- (16) Demonstrative → pronouns: the stem of the masculine *tout-* spread to the rest of the paradigm and to derived adverbs: *toúta*, ‘this’ (neut. pl.), *toútei* ‘in this point’, *entoútha* ‘here’ (Attic *taúta*, *taútēi*, *entaútha*). Although there are very few examples in dialectal texts, *ekeínos* ‘that’ seems to have been the Euboean form. The dialectal form of the reflexive is *heautós*.
- (17) Unlike E.Ion., Euboean inscriptions always show (*ho*)po-: *hópōs* ‘in order that’, *hopóte-rai* ‘which of two’ (fem. pl.).
- (18) *khílioi* ‘thousand,’ as in Attic (against *kheílioi* in the rest of Ionic).
- (19) Frequent use of -ippos, -óndēs, and -ikhos in personal names (the latter two probably due to Boeotian influence): *Prēxíppou*, *Ménippos*, *Prēxóndēs*, *Hippóndēs*, *Amúnikhos*, *Phruníkhou*.
- (20) The suffix -the(n) indicating ‘place whence’ is frequent: *Tamunêthe*, *Histiaêthen*, *Boudióthen*.
- (21) Adverbs of place: *hópoi* ‘to which place’, *hékhoi* ‘where’.
- (22) *epí* + dative for the name of the deceased in funerary inscriptions: *epí Menéphroni eimí* ‘I am over (or in honor of) Menephron’.

2.e. Intradialectal Geography

Traditional studies of Greek dialectology (Smyth 1894; Bechtel 1924:30; Buck 1955:10; Thumb & Scherer 1959:247ff.) usually divide Attic-Ionic into two subgroups, Attic and Ionic, with Ionic including the Ionic of Asia Minor, the Ionic of the Cyclades, and West Ionic or Euboean. Thus, according to traditional studies, Euboean is closely related to the Ionic of Asia Minor and of the Cyclades. However, analysis of the features of these four dialects shows a different situation and makes it necessary to modify the traditional classification of Attic-Ionic (cf. Bartoněk 1970; del Barrio 1987 and 1988; López Eire 1987).

Firstly, the features common to Euboean, E.Ion., and C.Ion. are not significant, because they are archaisms (no reversion; no contraction of *ea*, *eo*, *eou*, etc.; *mez-* vs. Att. *meiz-*; gen. sg. of -ā-stems in -eō vs. Att. -ou; etc.) or analogical changes (*histía*; gen. sg. *póleos*, *basiléos*), which do not imply any relationship between these three dialects after the Ionic migration. The same is true of the features common to W.Ion. and C.Ion. but not shared by E.Ion. (but shared by Attic): they are either archaisms (*h-*; no third compensatory lengthening; (*hó*)*pōs*) or choices that may have been made independently in each of the two dialects (cf. dat. pl. -ois and -ais). However, some of the features common to Attic and Euboean (-ēi > -ei; -rs- > -rr-; *t^(h)j, *k^(h)(^w)j, and *tw > tt; masc. personal names in -is, -idos;

nom. sg. *-klēēs; khīlioi*), are innovations that do not occur in either E.Ion. or the Cyclades; they therefore show a relationship between Attic and Euboean following Ionic migration and the subsequent fragmentation of Attic-Ionic but prior to the influence of Attic on the dialect of Euboea (some of these shared features are documented as early as the 7th and 6th c. BCE). Euboean in turn shares with → Boeotian some features that imply their relationship: shortening of long diphthongs in final position; *ea > ia* (although only in *ían < eán*); **t^(h)j*, **k^(h)(w)j*, and **tw > tt*; personal names in *-ōndēs* (Boeot. *-ōndās*) and *-ikhos*; influence of the masc. demonstrative *hoútos* on the rest of the paradigm (Eub. *tout-*, Boeot. *hout-*); *epí* + dative; perhaps dat. pl. *-ois* and *-ais*.

To sum up, there is no evidence that in the first millennium there was a special relationship between Euboean on the one hand and E.Ion. and C.Ion. on the other, nor is it legitimate to consider W.Ion. a variant of Ionic or an intermediate dialect between E.Ion. and Attic. On the other hand, although Attic and Euboean do share some innovations they also present a number of major differences that make it difficult to support the hypothesis that these two dialects constituted a dialectal unit within Attic-Ionic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bartoněk, Antonín. 1970. "Attic-Ionic dialects reclassified", *SBORNIK E* 15:149–157.
- Bechtel, Friedrich. 1924 (1963). *Die griechischen Dialekte III: Der ionische Dialekt*. Berlin.
- Buck, Carl D. 1955. *The Greek dialects*. Chicago.
- Del Barrio Vega, María L. 1987. *El dialecto de Eubea*. Madrid.
- . 1988. "La posición dialectal del euboico", *Emerita* 56.2:255–269.
- . 1990. "Consideraciones sobre la evolución /u/ > /ü/ del jónico-ático a partir de algunas formas euboicas", *CFC* 24:175–183.
- . 1991. *El euboico*. Madrid.
- . 2007. "I dialektos tis Fokeas ipo to fos tis ellinikis ditikis epigrafikis [H διάλεκτος της Φώκαιας υπό το φώς της ελληνικής δυτικής επιγραφικής]". In: *Actes du Ve congrès international de dialectologie grecque*, ed. by M. B. Hatzopoulos, 9–27. Athens.
- García Ramón, José L. 2003. "Ionisch". In: *Der Neue Pauly V*, cols. 1079–1083.
- Hualde Pascual, María P. 1993. *El dialecto jonio de la Dodecápolis: fonética y morfología. Estudio intradialectal*. Ph.D. diss., Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- . 1997. "Eolismos en Jonia: revisión de un problema de geografía intradialectal", *Emerita* 65:221–256.
- . 1997. "Algunos problemas de morfología del jonio: relaciones interparadigmáticas en la flexión nominal", *CFC EGI* 7:171–184.
- Knitl, Elisabeth. 1938. *Die Sprache der ionischen Kykladen nach der inschriftlichen Quellen*. Munich.
- López Eire, Antonio. 1972–73. "Los jonios y el jónico-ático", *Zephyrus* 23–24:197–207.
- . 1985. "Jónico y ático". In: *Symbolae Ludovico Mitxelena septuagenario oblatae I*, ed. by José L. Melena, 81–93. Vitoria.
- . 1987. "Géographie intradialectale de l'ionien-attique", *Verbum* 10:155–178.
- Panayotou, Anna. 2007. "Ionic and Attic". In: *A history of Ancient Greek. From the beginnings to Late Antiquity.*, ed. by A.-Ph. Christidis, 405–416. Cambridge.
- Santiago, Rosa A. 1999. "Lesbismos en jonio: nuevos datos y revisión del problema". In: *Katà dialekton. Atti del III colloquio internazionale di dialettologia greca*, ed. by Albio C. Cassio, 233–278. Naples.
- Smyth, Herbert W. 1894. *The sounds and inflections of the Greek dialects: Ionic*. Oxford.
- Stüber, Karin. 1996. *Zur dialektalen Einheit des Ostionischen*. Innsbruck.
- Thumb, Albert and Anton Scherer. 1959. *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte II*. Heidelberg.

MARÍA LUISA DEL BARRIO

Iotacism

→ Vowel Fronting