

A HISTORY OF
ANCIENT GREEK

From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity

Edited for the Centre for the Greek Language
by

A.-F. CHRISTIDIS

with the assistance of

MARIA ARAPOPOULOU

MARIA CHRITI

SBD-FFLCH-USP



295367



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

KA + PO 2 T 5 WINE 20 ME 2

WOOL 2 WINE 2

As follows Alxoitas (?) gave to Thyestes the unguent-boiler spices for the boiling of oil: coriander, cyperus, (unknown), fruit, wine, honey, wool, wine.

[6] Vn 10

o-di-do-si du-ru-to-mo	ὡς δίδονοι δρυτόμοι
a-mo-te-jo-na- de e-pi-pu-ta 50	ἀρομοτειώνα-δε· ἐπίφυτα 50
a-ko-so-ne-qe 50	ἄξονές τε 50
to-sa-de ro-u-si-jo a-ko-ro a-ko-so-ne	τοσσαδέ Λουσίω ἀγοῶ
	ἄξονες
100 to-sa-de e-pi-pu-ta 100	100 τοσσαδέ ἐπίφυτα 100

As follows the woodcutters will supply to the wheelwright's workshop: 50 saplings and 50 poles. So much in the territory of Lousos: 100 poles, 100 saplings.

3 Ionic and Attic*

A. PANAYOTOU

TRANSLATED BY CHRIS MARKHAM

1 The Ionic-Attic dialect group

The identification of the differences among dialects and their classification into groups on the basis of certain characteristics – whether we are dealing with ancient Greek dialects or those of other languages – is above all a theoretical construction, one which involves a number of subjective elements; the dialect features which are isolated and emphasized will differ significantly from scholar to scholar. The combined study of two dialects, Ionic (with its varieties) and Attic, presupposes the recognition of certain features, those which each individual scholar views as significant, which will allow us to distinguish, up to a certain point, this group from others. However, it is evident that in language there are no watertight compartments, that some of the features of a particular dialect do not characterize the group as a whole, while many of these features are also encountered in other Greek dialects which do not belong to the same group (see III.1). Therefore, whether we distinguish within the Ionic-Attic dialect group two, three, four or even more variants or dialects is a more or less subjective issue, and the distinctions we make will inevitably be artificial ones. The process of rigid classification no longer serves any useful academic purpose and certainly bears little relation to the linguistic situation of antiquity or the view which the native speakers and grammarians of the time took of this situation, their opinions differing, as is only natural, from age to age. We shall therefore avoid such distinctions here and confine our description to the features of the group by geographical region, without this entailing any particular dialect classification.

* The dialect forms of Ionic are accented conventionally in accordance with the rules of the Attic dialect, except, naturally, for those cases where phonetic or morphological problems make the proper accent uncertain. As a working rule, as Ionic is a psilotic dialect, no *spiritus asper* is used here in quoting Ionic dialectal forms.

1.1 *The geographical region*

As we would expect from such an extensive region, the Ionian world presented a broad variety of dialects. Variants of Ionic were spoken along the coast of Asia Minor, on most of the islands of the Aegean (with the exception of Cythera, Crete, Melos, Thera and the south-eastern Dodecanese) and in their colonies. The metropolitan – in the broadest sense of the word – region can be broadly represented as a zone which, during the pre-classical period, extended north of the Doric zone (from the Peloponnese, Crete, Rhodes, and Cos as far as Caria) and to the south of the Aeolic zone (from Boeotia and Thessaly to Lesbos and Smyrna). By the time of Herodotus the Ionic dialect had already spread to the north and south of this area, from Smyrna, formerly an Aeolic city, to Halicarnassus, originally Doric. Ionian colonies were numerous in Chalcidice and along the northern coastline of Aegean Thrace, the Propontis, the Euxine, Magna Graecia and Sicily, Galatia, or on the Iberian peninsula.

The Attic dialect, on the other hand, was spoken in the comparatively limited geographical area from which it took its name, and in the Athenian colonies (e.g., Lemnos, Sigeum, Amphipolis). The synoecism of townships celebrated in myth as the work of Theseus, and the existence of a single political center in Attica, Athens, can only have assisted the homogenization of the dialect, in the written language at least. The city's political system and economic prosperity, which created more opportunities for education (and therefore a better standard of schooling) also played a significant role in reducing illiteracy (see 11.22), and thereby led to the use of writing by broader sections of the population. At the same time the settlement in Attica of large numbers of foreigners in the sixth and, even more so, the fifth century BC also had both direct and indirect – and long-term rather than short-term – effects on the evolution of the Attic dialect: on the one hand the cultivation of the dialect by the non-Athenian intellectuals who were using it as their medium for teaching and writing; on the other the dissemination of non-Attic features, for the most part lexical, through the presence of foreigners, metics, or slaves – features which were to a greater or lesser extent assimilated by the lower classes of the Attica region.

2 *The script*

2.1 *The alphabets*

Herodotus attributed the reform of the Phoenician “alphabet” to the Ionians (Heubeck 1979, 105–9; see also 11.17 and 11.18). The main features of the alphabets of the Ionian Dodecapolis (Jeffery 1990, 325–45) are the use of the letter H to render [ε:] (and, by analogy, of the letter Ω to render [ɔ:]), as well as the use of Ξ for [ks], Ψ for [ps] and of Τ (*sampi*) for [ts] (Brixhe 1982, 216 ff. and 11.18 in this volume).

For the alphabets of the Aegean islands (Jeffery 1990, 289–308) we note that in the alphabet of Paros and its colony, Thasos, [o] is rendered by the letter Ω and [ɔ:] by the letter O: e.g. Δήμητρος ἠώρος (= Δήμητρος ἠόρος), πώλεος (= πόλεως).

In the alphabet of Euboea and its colonies (Jeffery 1990, 79–89) [x] is rendered by ↓ (and its variants) and [ks] by the graphemes +, X (and variants).

The old alphabet of Attica appears to have been influenced originally by the alphabets of Aegina and Euboea (Jeffery 1990, 66–78). It was used until the end of the fifth century BC. In 403/2, following the devastating defeat in the Peloponnesian War and the restoration of democracy, the Athenians voted to abandon the old Attic alphabet and to introduce a standardized variant of the eastern Ionic alphabet. In the words of Theopompus, τοὺς δὲ Ἀθηναίους ἐπεισε χρῆσθαι τοῖς τῶν Ἰώνων γράμμασιν Ἀρχίνος ὁ Ἀθηναῖος, ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Εὐκλείδου (“In the archonship of Euclides Archinus the Athenian persuaded the Athenians to use the alphabet of the Ionians,” *Souda*, s.v. Σαμίων ὁ δῆμος; see Threatte 1980, 26–51). Apparently some thirty years later the same alphabet was introduced to Boeotia (Vottéro 1996), having been adopted perhaps a little earlier in Macedonia, and went on during the course of the fourth century to displace the local alphabets throughout the whole Greek-speaking world. Henceforth the Ionic alphabet, inextricably linked with Koine, was to be the main instrument in the Hellenization of those speaking other languages, or, at the very least, the medium in which they would write their own languages, for as long as the Greek script – and through it Greek cultural models – continued to be a sign of social status.

2.2 *The spread of writing*

It has to be emphasized that according to all the evidence – principally the number of inscriptions which have been found – the civilization of Athens was, above all others, a “civilization of writing,” well before this phenomenon began, in the Hellenistic period, to characterize the whole Greek-speaking world. It is evident that this is related to the Athenian political system: from as early as the time of Solon, but mainly from the time of Cleisthenes, political changes are accompanied – and this is, of course, no coincidence – by an increase in the number of inscriptions. This rise is seen not only in the number of official texts, most of which are addressed to the citizens of Athens, but also in the number of texts of a purely private character, on vases and funerary monuments (cf. Teodorsson 1974, 29–32). If the use of writing is now so widespread, this must be at least partly a result of the role of the school in the society in question; it is obvious that there will have been social differences in the type and duration of education provided (cf. Plato, *Protagoras* 326c: Μάλιστα δὲ δύνανται οἱ πλουσιώτατοι καὶ οἱ τούτων υἱεῖς, προῤαιτάτα εἰς διδασκάλων τῆς ἡλικίας ἀρξάμενοι φοιτᾶν, ὀφθαίτατα ἀπαλλάττονται “And the most able are the wealthiest. Their sons begin school at the earliest age, and are freed from it at the latest,” trans. W. R. M. Lamb). However, despite these social differences it is clear that literacy was far more common in Athens than in other Greek-speaking regions from as early as the archaic period, but much more so in classical times (see also II.20, II.22, VIII.1).

3 The sources

3.1 *Literature*

The Ionic dialect served as the basis for the creation of certain languages, to some extent artificial, which constituted the characteristic medium of expression for each of the various literary genres in ancient Greece (see VII.A.1, VII.A.2). This is the case for both epic and lyric poetry (mainly elegiac and iambic). From the fifth century BC Attic was the primary dialect for the composition of drama, at least for the dialogue, which gradually came to dominate as the role of the chorus diminished.

Ionic was the first and most widespread of the languages used by writers of prose (Meillet 1975, 218–34). It was one of the most refined

manifestations of Ionian civilization, already highly evolved in the Archaic period; Dionysius of Halicarnassus describes it as “clear and accessible, pure and concise” (σαφή καὶ κοινήν, καθαρὴν καὶ σύντομον). It is first and foremost the language of philosophical thought, but also of science – of medicine, for example: Hippocrates of Cos, writing in the fifth century BC, does not employ Doric, but “uses pure Ionic” (ἀκράτω τῇ Ἰάδι χρῆται); as do his successors, the physicians of the schools of Cos and Cnidus (see VII.B.7). Ionic was also the language of the historian, from as early as the time of Hecataeus of Miletus; Thucydides shows unmistakable traces of this influence. Attic, on the other hand, occupies an arena which seems to have been alien to Ionian thought – that of rhetorical discourse. From the fifth century BC onwards Attic became the dialect of all educated speakers of Greek, gradually supplanting all other dialects in prose. Yet this was not the old dialect form of Attic, but a simpler one, which owed a great deal to the Ionic dialect: the Koine (see IV.6–8).

3.2 *Inscriptions*

Despite the existence of many important early texts, Ionic remains the least studied of all the ancient Greek dialects. However, for purely historical – and perhaps also linguistic – reasons, the influence of Attic on Ionic is apparent, and of some importance, in certain regions, especially the colonies, from as early as the fifth century BC (see Panayotou 1990 for Chalcidice).

4 Language

Herodotus (1.142, see Text [1]) identifies four different variants within the Ionic dialect: that of the Ionian cities of Caria, that of the Ionian cities of Lydia, of Samos and, finally, of Chios and Erythrae on the Asia Minor coast. None of these variants has left any trace in the written language; as far back as the archaic period there was most probably an Ionic Koine in written discourse, a language free of local idiosyncracies, based on the Ionic of the educated classes (López Eire 1987, 166–7).

In Attica the abundance (both in absolute terms and in comparison to other regions) of epigraphic material has permitted very minute linguistic analyses, mainly over the past twenty years; the purpose of these analyses has been to describe the evolution of the spoken language, as inferred from the “errors” in the written language, and to monitor the

manner in which the language evolved. It has become clear that there was more rapid evolution in the sociolects of the poorer classes, with slower, more conservative and relatively uniform evolution taking place in the sociolects of the more affluent, those who had spent more time at school and on whose speech and writing the corrective effect of education was thereby able to make a more enduring mark (see Teodorsson 1974, 29–32 and elsewhere).

The nature of Euboean Ionic was to some extent shaped by the influence of the Boeotian dialect, for both historical and geographical reasons; a much more decisive influence was exerted by Attic, but, for historical reasons, not until the end of the sixth century BC, when Euboea entered the Athenian sphere of influence.

4.1 Phonetics and phonology

The sub-system of vowels of the Ionic and Attic dialects, at least in classical times, had not only short vowels but also eight long vowels: [a:], [ɔ:], [o:], [u:], [y:], [i:], [e:], [ɛ:]. This was due, in part, to such developments as:

- Raising of *[a:], whatever its origin, to [ä:]: **ep^hansa* > ἔφηνα, Ion.-Att. δῆμος, νίκη instead of the δᾶμος, νίκα of the other dialects; this was a process found only in the Ionic-Attic dialect. However, raising of this type was interrupted before the later compensatory lengthenings (i.e., the lengthening of a short vowel preceding a consonant cluster, following the simplification of the latter, as **ransans* > πάσας) and before the contractions *a + e* (of the type **timaete* > τιμάτε). This [ä:] continued to raise until it merged with the ancient /ɛ:/ in both dialects, but at a different period in different regions.

In the Attic dialect alone there are two environments in which we find a “reversion” (known as *Rückverwandlung*) of this [ä:] to [a:]: (a) following [r], Att. ἡμέρα, πράττω/Ion. ἡμέρη, πράσσω (with the exception of the contraction [e], [a], acc. sing. **plḗra* > πλήρη). In chronological terms this raising is earlier than the loss of the /w/ in the cluster [rw]: **korwa* > Ion. κοῦρη/Att. κόρη; (b) following [i], [e] and the diphthongs with second element *i*: Att. Ἀστίας, γενεά/Ion. Ἀστίης, γενεή.

- Fronting of /u:/ > /y:/ in Attic and in the Ionic of Asia Minor, and also in Euboea according to recent studies (see Méndez Dosuna 1993, mainly 114 ff.).

- Monophthongization of /ai/ (regarded by some as a post-classical change; but see Teodorsson 1974, 97–101, 197) and the subsequent raising of the front vowels.
- The third compensatory lengthening, where the loss of the **w* in the clusters [rw] and [nw] resulted (in Ionic, not Attic) in the lengthening of the preceding short vowel: **ksenwos* > Ion. ξείνος/Att. ξένος, **korwos* > Ion. κοῦρος/Att. κόρος. It must be emphasized that these developments are interrelated, in the sense that a change at one point triggered chain-effects throughout the phonological system (see more recently Horrocks 1997, 102 ff.).

The following features are common to this dialect group:

- Quantitative metathesis (i.e., a reciprocal exchange in quantity between two vowels, one following the other) of the type νηός > νεώς, the effects of which have direct effects for morphology.
- In Ionia (and more rarely in Euboea) and in the respective colonies, the vowel sequences *-ea*, *-ee*, *-eo* etc. could be used uncontracted in adjacent syllables, but not in Attic, where contraction was preferred: Ion. ἔτεα, Καλλικράτεος/Att. ἔτη, Καλλικράτους.
- In Ionia (and more rarely in other regions), as in the Dorian cities of Asia Minor, the vowel clusters *-eo-* (more rarely *-ao-*) in adjacent syllables form a diphthong: *eo* > *eu*, *ao* > *au*; Θευγένης, ἀδικεῦμεν/Att. Θεογένης, ἀδικουμέν).
- A feature found almost exclusively in the ending – the position where the diphthongs of this type are preserved – is the monophthongization of /ɛ:i/, /ɔ:i/ and /a:i/; in Ionia and Attica the second element of the diphthong is lost, i.e., /ɛ:i/ > /ɛ:/, /ɔ:i/ > /ɔ:/, /a:i/ > /a:/ (graphemic neutralizations HI~H, OI~O, AI~A respectively): τῆ οἰκία > τῆ οἰκία, ἐν Δίῳ > ἐν Δίῳ; in Euboea and its colonies, however (but also in Boeotian, in the North-West dialects, etc.) the first element of the diphthong is just shortened: /ɛ:i/ > /ei/, /ɔ:i/ > /oi/, /a:i/ > /ai/ (HI~EI, OI~OI, AI~AI respectively): τεῖ οἰκίαι ὄλει, ἐν Δίῳ (dative singular).
- The early loss of aspiration is mainly a characteristic of Asia Minor (and also of the Aeolic and Doric of Asia Minor): ἰρός, κατοπερ, Ταργηλιών. In Attica, however (and in some cases in Euboea, its colonies, and in the Ionic-speaking islands of the Aegean), the aspiration survived until later: Att. Θαργηλιών, Acanthus Ηιέρον, but Ἐρόνασσα. During the second half of the fifth century BC, however, orthographic variation perhaps indicates that “a change in the phonetic quality of [h] was taking place” (Teodorsson 1974, 231) too.

- In Ionic, as in all the Greek dialects and sub-dialects (except those of Attica and Euboea) the cluster [-ss-] corresponds to [-tt-] in the two latter regions: Ion. πρήσσω, ἐρέσσω, θάλασσα/Att. πράττω, ἐρέττω, θάλαττα/Eub. πρήττω. In eastern Ionic also the cluster [rs] corresponds to the Attic and Euboean [rr]: Ion. ἄρσῃν, χερσόνησος/Att. and Eub. ἄρρῃν, χερρόνησος. In both of these cases the Koine was to retain the Ionic forms.
- In Eretria and Oropus the voiceless [s] becomes voiced in an intervocalic position, and then became [r] (rhotacization); this is a relatively late feature (after the mid-fifth century BC): ὄπωρ ἄν/Att. ὄπως ἄν, Ἄρτεμίρια/Att. Ἄρτεμία. This feature is referred to also by Plato (*Cratylus* 434c).

4.2 Morphology

- A characteristic which Ionic and Attic share with the so-called eastern dialects is the morphophonological transformation of **ti* > *si*, e.g. in nouns, adverbs, verbs, numerals: Ion.-Att. εἴκοσι, γερούσια, third person plural -ουσι/Dor. φίχατι, Lac. γερούτια, NW Gk. third person plural -οντι, λύοντι/Att. λύουσι(v).
- Mainly, in the Attic dialect we see the so-called *nu-ephelesticon* in non-inflected words as well as in final morphemes of inflected words, when preceded by a short [e] or [i]: e.g. third person singular -ε or -σι, dative plural -σι, ἔλεγεν, λέγουσιν, non-inflected words like ἔμπροσθεν, εἴκοσιν. It is probable that Attica was the main center from which this feature spread to all the Greek-speaking regions from the fourth century BC onwards.
- Ionic and Attic (and also Arcado-Cypriot) form the active present tense infinitive of athematic verbs with the ending -(ε)ναι, in contrast to other dialects where the corresponding ending is -μεναι, -μεν, -μειν: e.g., Ion.-Att. εἶναι/Lesb. εἰμεναι/Thess. εἰμεν/Boeot. εἰμεν/El., Lac. ημεν/Rhod. ημειν.
- In Attic the distinction between singular, dual, and plural number is more frequent than in Ionic. The gradual abandonment of the dual number, in favor of the plural in the koine, must be related on the one hand to the role of Ionic in the evolution of the Koine, and on the other to the more general trend towards reduction of the suppletive forms and simplification of the inflectional system in the latter (see Appendix III.1).

- The tendency to create analogical forms in order to limit multiplicity of forms in examples with more than one stem (*suppletion*) is a feature most probably bequeathed to the Koine from Ionic: whereas Attic retained (in official texts at least) complex examples of the type οἶδα, οἶσθα, οἶδε, ἴσμεν etc., Ionic created the analogical forms οἶδας, οἶδαμεν, οἶδατε. We should interpret in the same context the early examples in Ionia of verbs in -μι, for example, which are inflected as in the contracted verbs: τιθῶ, τιθεῖς etc.

5 Attic, Ionic and Koine

For reasons associated, initially at least, with the economic penetration and consequent military and, later, cultural dominance of Athens, the Attic dialect acquired great authority as the language of culture, thus displacing Ionic from the field of written prose. Yet the influence of Attic on Ionic was reciprocal: the many years of coexistence and the geographically extensive area of contact, the powerful influence of Ionian literature, all resulted in the penetration (or adoption) of a number of features from Ionic, which left their mark on the Koine in its phonology, morphology, syntax, and vocabulary. The Koine evolved in Athens on the basis of a more conservative form of Attic, that of the educated classes, with a number of Ionic features. As the medium of communication of the Macedonian and all the subsequent Hellenistic kingdoms Koine was to displace the local dialects from written prose and also to have a substantial influence – varying in extent from place to place – on the spoken language. All the modern Greek dialects have their roots, to a greater or lesser extent, in the Koine (see IV.6–IV.8).

Selected Texts

[1] Herodotus 1.142 Godley

γλώσσαν δὲ οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν οὗτοι [sc. οἱ Ἴωνες] νενομίκασι, ἀλλὰ τρόπους τέσσαρας παραγωγέων. Μίλητος μὲν αὐτέων πρώτη κέεται πόλις πρὸς μεσομβρίην, μετὰ δὲ Μυοῦς τε καὶ Πηγήνη. αὐτὰ μὲν ἐν τῇ Καρίῃ κατοικηγνται κατὰ ταῦτά διαλεγόμενα σφίσι, αἶδε δὲ ἐν τῇ Λυδίῃ, Ἐφεσος Κολοφῶν Λέβεδος Τέως Κλαζομεναὶ Φώκαια αὐτὰ δὲ αἱ πόλιες τῆσι πρότερον λεχθείησι ὁμολογέουσι κατὰ γλώσσαν οὐδέν, σφίσι δὲ ὁμοφωνέουσι. ἐπι δὲ τρεῖς ὑπόλοιποι Ἰάδες πόλιες, τῶν αἱ δύο μὲν νήσους οἰκέαται, Σάμιον τε καὶ Χίον, ἡ δὲ μία ἐν τῇ ἡπείρῳ ἴδρυται, Ἐρυθραία. Χίοι μὲν νυν καὶ Ἐρυθραῖοι κατὰ τούτῳ διαλέγονται, Σάμιοι δὲ ἐπ' ἐωντῶν μούνοι. οὗτοι χαρακτηρὲς γλώσσης τέσσαρες γίνονται.

They [the Ionians] use not all the same speech but four different dialects. Miletus lies farthest south among them, and next to it come Myus and Priene; these are settlements in Caria and they use a common language; Ephesus, Colophon, Lebedos, Teos, Clazomenae, Phocaea, all of them being in Lydia, have a language in common which is wholly different from the speech of the three cities aforementioned. There are yet three Ionian cities, two of them situate on the islands of Samos and Chios, and one, Erythrae, on the mainland; the Chians and Erythraeans speak alike, but the Samians have a language which is their own and none other's. It is thus seen that there are four fashions of speech. (Trans. A. D. Godley)

[2] Stele, with boustrophedon inscriptions in both Ionic and Attic, each in the corresponding alphabet, with partially identical content. Sigeum, in the Troad. Ca. mid-sixth century BC. Jeffery 371, nos. 43, 44 and 416, table 71, nos. 43, 44; *CEG* 179

Φανοδίκο	
ἐμὶ τὸρμοκ-	
ράτεος τὸ	
Προκοννη-	4
σιδ᾽ κρητήρ-	
α δέ : καὶ ὑποκ-	
ρητήριον : κ-	
αὶ ἠθμόν : ἐς π-	8
ρυτανήϊον	
ἔδωκεν : Συκε-	
εὔσιν	
Φανοδίκο : εἰμί : τὸ Η-	12
ερμοκράτος : τὸ Προκο-	
νεσιδ᾽ : καὶ γό : Κρατῆρα	
καπίστατον : καὶ ἠῶμ-	16
όν : ἐς πρυτανεῖον : ἔ-	
δοκα : μνῆμα : Σιγε<ι>-	
εὔσι : Ἐάν δέ τι πάσχ-	
ῶ, μελεδαίνῃν : με ὀ	20
Σιγειῆς : Καί μ' ἔπο-	
<ι>σεν : Ηαἰσῶπος : καὶ	
: ἠάδελφοί	

(ION.): I am [the funerary monument] of Phanodicus, son of Ermocrates, from Proconnesus; he donated the crater and its support and the strainer to the prytaneion for the people of Sigeum.

(ATT.): I am also of Phanodicus, son of Hermocrates, from Proconnesus; I offered the crater and its support and the strainer to the prytaneum in order

that the people of Sigeum might remember me. If anything befalls me, take care of me, people of Sigeum! I was made by Aesop and his brothers.

(Trans. C. Markham from Modern Greek)

[3] Dextrograde inscription in Attic alphabet, written *stoichedon*. Funerary monument from Attica, Merenda (ancient Myrrhinous); ca. mid-sixth century BC. Jeffery, 78 and 401 no. 29, table 3, no. 29; *IG* 1.2³, 1261; *CEG* 24

A. Σῆμα Φρασικλείας | κόρῃ κεκλέσομαι | αἰεὶ,
ἀντὶ γάμῳ | ἄπαρὰ θεῶν τοῦτο | λαχὸς ὄνομα.
B. Ἀριστίον Πάρι[ος μ' ἔπ]ο[ι]σε.

I am the grave of Phrasicleia; I shall always bear the name of maiden, since this is the name the gods reserved for me, instead of marriage. Aristion of Paros made me. (Trans. C. Markham from Modern Greek)

[4] Plato, *Cratylus* 418b–c Fowler

ΣΩΚΡΑΤΗΣ (. . .) Οἴσθα ὅτι οἱ παλαιοὶ οἱ ἡμέτεροι τῷ ἰῶτα καὶ τῷ δέλτα εὖ μάλα ἐχρῶντο, καὶ οὐχ ἦριστα αἱ γυναῖκες, ἀλλ' ἄλλοι μάλιστα τὴν ἀρχαίαν φωνὴν σφῆζουσι. νῦν δὲ ἀντὶ μὲν τοῦ ἰῶτα ἢ εἰ ἢ ἦτα μεταστρέφουσιν, [. . .] ὥς δὴ μεγαλοπρεπέστερα ὄντα.

ΕΡΜΟΓΕΝΗΣ Πῶς δὴ;

ΣΩ. Οἶον οἱ μὲν ἀρχαιότατοι ἡμέραν τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκάλουν, οἱ δὲ ἡμέραν, οἱ δὲ νῦν ἡμέραν.

ΕΡΜ. Ἔστι ταῦτα.

ΣΩ. Οἴσθα οὖν ὅτι μόνον τούτων δηλοῖ τὸ ἀρχαῖον ὄνομα τὴν διάνοιαν τοῦ θεμένου; ὅτι γὰρ ἀσμένους τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἡμῖν ἐκ τοῦ σκοτους τὸ φῶς ἐγγίγνεται, ταύτη ἀνόμασαν ἡμέραν.

SOCRATES: You know that our ancestors made good use of the sounds of iota and delta, and that is especially true of the women, who are most addicted to preserving old forms of speech. But nowadays people change iota to eta or epsilon, [. . .] thinking they have a grander sound.

HERMOGENES: How is that?

SOC. For instance, in the earliest times they called day ἡμέρα, others said ἐμέρα, and now they say ἡμέρα.

HER. That is true.

SOC. Only the ancient word discloses the intention of the name-giver, don't you know? For day comes out of darkness to men; they welcome it and long (ἡμῆρουσι) for it, and so they called it ἡμέρα. (Trans. H. N. Fowler)

Cf. Teodorsson 1974, 263–5; Duhoux 1987, 192–5. Ca. 386/5 BC. Despite the difficulties of the text at this point, it is clear at least that the raising and shortening of the /ε:/ > [i]

allowed Plato the popular etymology deriving the word ἡμέρα from ἡμερος, thereby offering one of the oldest pieces of evidence of *iotacism*.

[5] Part (section A) from legal texts, written *boustrophedon*. Eretria. 525–500 BC. *IG XII.9*, 1273–4; cf. Cairns 1991, with previous bibliography (*SEG* 41, 725)

Δικῆν : ἔπειάν : κατομόσει : τίν[υ-]
 σθα(ι) : τρίτει ἡμέ[ε]ει : χοῦματα
 δόκιμα : κα[ι h]υγιᾶ : ἰάν : μεῖ τείσ-
 ε<ι> [[: hḗου]]

4

The judge [or arbiter] shall award the penalty after he has taken an oath. The defendant will pay on the third day goods which are acceptable and sound. If he does not pay, the plaintiff [[shall seize (or remove?) him]]. (Trans. F. Cairns)

L.1: Cairns (1991, 302) considers ΔΙΚΕΝ as aorist infinitive of ἔδικον “cast,” “fine,” rather than the accusative of δίκη.

L.4: In the erasure probably the equivalent of ἄου with intrusive *spiritus asper*; see Cairns 1991, 305–6.

4 Arcado-Cypriot*

A. PANAYOTOU

TRANSLATED BY CHRIS MARKHAM

1 The Arcado-Cypriot dialect

Arcado-Cypriot is the term conventionally applied to the linguistic forms of Greek which were spoken in Arcadia and Cyprus and which, despite the differences in their respective systems of writing, present evident linguistic similarities. Certain scholars have identified in the Pamphylian dialect (see III.5) isoglosses with Arcadian and Cypriot, which permit them – without, of course, overlooking their differences – to examine Pamphylian and Arcado-Cypriot together in the same group of dialects, known as *Achaean*. The main similarity is the use of the dative instead of the genitive after certain prepositions in order to convey concepts such as distance or separation, i.e., functions of the ablative case.

During the first millennium BC the people of Arcadia, a remote and mountainous region in the heart of the Peloponnese, spoke and wrote a dialect which has a number of shared features with the Cypriot of the same period. In fact, these features are so numerous, old, and important that it is quite clear that the two dialects share a common origin.

As is known from archaeological evidence, in the twelfth century BC – if not earlier – Greek tribes from various points of origin gradually settled in Cyprus (V. Karageorghis 1988). The island lies on the searoutes to Egypt and the Syrian-Phoenician coast. Not only the geographical position of Cyprus, but also its wealth in minerals, principally copper, attracted foreigners, whether interested in settling permanently or simply exploiting its resources (Deger-Jalkotzy 1994; Vanschoonwinkel 1994). There can be no doubt that the island was the

* The dialect forms of Arcado-Cypriot are accented conventionally in accordance with the rules of the Attic dialect, except, naturally, for those cases where phonetic or morphological problems make the proper accent uncertain. The frequent use of Attic forms for purposes of comparison does not reflect any predilection for Attic forms on the part of the author; they are used merely as the forms with which most readers are likely to be familiar.