

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ANCIENT GREEK LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

Volume 1 A–F

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

'three', gen. *tetórtau* 'fourth' (ordinal, gen. fem.), *pénte* 'five', *déko* 'ten', *duódeko* 'twelve', *pénte kai déko* 'fifteen', *eíkosi* 'twenty', *triákonta* 'thirty', *pentékonta* 'fifty', *exékonta* 'sixty', *hekotón* 'hundred', *triakásioi* 'three hundred'.

Prepositions and preverbs, as in the other non-Attic-Ionic dialects, may have → apocope. Worth noting are the following forms: *aná* 'up, upon', with the doublet *on-* (*onéthuse* 'he sacrificed') and *un-* (*unétheke* 'he consecrated'); *apú* + dative 'from' (*apú toî hieroî* 'from the temple') used as the dative prepositional case, although it is followed by a genitive in *ap' Eraéōn* 'from the Heraeans' (SEG 11.1045); *es* (< **ex*) + dative 'from' (*es toî hieroî* 'from the temple'), with the doublet *ex-* in the preverb before a vowel (*exelaúnoia* 'I would never expel'); *epés* + dative 'with reference to' (*epés toî ergoî* 'with respect to the work'), though the case in *epè wergo* 'with respect to the rite' (?) (SEG 11.1112.3) is dubious; *in* + accusative 'in, into, to' and dative 'in' (Att. *eis* + acc., *en* + dat.); *pedá* + acc. 'after' and dat. 'with, besides' (Att. *metá*); *pós* 'motion to' (Att. *prós*); *sún* 'with' (Att. *xún*); *hupér* 'over' and *hupó* 'under', though in Orchomenus (Schw. 664) we find *hopér* and *hopú*.

The modal particle is always *án*. The conditional conjunction *ei* 'if' has the doublet *ei* + word beginning with a consonant/*eik* + word beginning with a vowel: *ei d'án/eik án*. There has been a failed attempt to identify the particle *ke* in the sequence *eik epì dôma pûr epoísē* 'if someone puts fire in the temple' (Schw. 654.21) with a segmentation *ei k'epí*, but this would be the only instance of *ke* in Arcadian, besides being a type of construction, without the modal particle, already attested in Homer. The coordinating conjunction *kai* 'and' appears in Mantinea as *kás* (Schw. 661 and 661⁸), but also as *kai* (SEG 37.335). Further conjunctions are *méste* 'until', in *mést'án* (Schw. 656.30 and 654⁸), and *aphôte* 'since' (SEG 37.340.12).

There are a number of words and expressions recorded only in Homer and Arcadian, among which *ámata pánta* 'always; all days', *apuésthō* 'let (the wronged party) summon', *artúen* 'to make all arrangements', *askēthēs* '(animals) without blemish', *bólētoi* '(if anyone) want', *déatoi* 'it seems', *dôma* 'temple', *kéleuthos* 'road'. Though they are usually known as "Homeric words", they are not poetic words, but archaic lexical uses preserved in this dialect.

From as early as the 4th c. BCE we find evidence of external influences in the inscriptions,

with forms like *laphuropolíou* '(having been) a sale of booty' (Arc.-ō) (Schw. 656.11), subj. *ēi* of *eimí* 'to be' (Arc. *ē*) (Schw. 657. 34–5), *anánkas* '(by) force' (Arc. of Tegea -*au*) (Schw. 657.53–4). In the 3rd c. BCE these influences increase, with the appearance of features of Attic Koine (→ Koine, Features of) and Doric Koiná (→ Formation of Doric Koines, the). In the 2nd c. BCE it is still possible to find Arcadian features in combination with other features of Attic-Ionic Koine in Schw. 675.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Buck, C. D. 1955. *The Greek dialects*. Chicago.
 Colvin, St. 2007. *A historical Greek reader. Mycenaean to the Koiné*. Oxford.
 Dubois, L. 1986. *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien*. Louvain-la-Neuve.
 IG = *Inscriptiones Graecae* V 2. Berlin 1913.
 Lillo, A. 1981. "En torno a los dativos de la declinación temática en -ōi y -ōi en arcadio", *Studia Philologica Salmantica* 5:221–232 (available at http://interclassica.um.es/investigacion/hemeroteca/s/studia_philologica_salmantica/numero_5_1981, accessed March 2013).
 —. 1983. "On type *hierēs* forms in Arcadian and Cypriot", *Glotta* 61:1–4.
 —. 1988. "A propósito de un nuevo libro sobre el arcadio", *Minos* 23:195–206.
 Schw. = Schwyzler, E. 1923. *Dialectorum Graecarum exempla ephigraphica potiora*. Leipzig (Repr., Hildesheim, 1960).
 SEG = *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 1–57.
 Te Riele, G.-J. M.-J. 1987. "Helisson entre en sympolitie avec Mantinée: une nouvelle inscription d'Arcadie", *BCH* 111:167–190.
 Thumb, A. and A. Scherer. 1959. *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte II*. Heidelberg.

ANTONIO LILLO

Arcado-Cypriot

1. DEFINITION

The term Arcado-Cypriot is applied conventionally to describe a branch of Greek dialects attested mainly through 1st-millennium epigraphic material found in Arcadia in the central Peloponnese, and on the island of Cyprus, as well as through *glossai* (i.e., obsolete words which need explanation; → Dictionaries of Dialects: From Antiquity to the Byzantine Period). It is generally agreed that the → Arcadian and the → Cypriot dialects share numerous and remarkable isoglosses (→ Dialects, Classification of) which cannot be attributed to close regional influence, or to continuous contact or parallel random choices. Some of these characteristics

are exclusively shared by the aforementioned dialects and by 2nd-millennium BCE Mycenaean Greek (→ Mycenaean Script and Language), as attested through the → Linear B texts; a set of old common features can also be traced back to → Pamphylian. The term Arcado-Cypriot is also currently used to define a reconstructed Gk. dialect spoken by the ancestors of future Arcadians and Cypriots, at a period of linguistic unity which, on the basis of archaeological and linguistic criteria, is supposed to have existed in the last quarter of the 2nd millennium BCE, before the migration of Greeks to Cyprus. Arcado-Cypriot in this sense can only be reconstructed from 1st-millennium common Arc. and Cypr. characteristics projected backwards. For some authors, (proto)-Arcado-Cypriot is considered to be a post-Mycenaean form of Myc. Gk., from which it evolved during the period after the collapse of the Mycenaean kingdoms; thus the Linear B texts offer a *terminus post quem* (see more recently in this sense Panayotou 2007, with previous bibliography). However, it has been suggested by other specialists that (proto)-Arcado-Cypriot was contemporary to Myc., without extant or known written documents and attested only indirectly through 1st-millennium Arc., Cypr. and other colonial isoglosses (Dubois 1997:88).

Arcado-Cypriot is examined here as a 2nd-millennium form of Greek, a reconstruction based on the study of 1st-millennium common features of either Arc. or Cypr.

2. SOME METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

It has to be stressed that because of the ambiguity of texts written in local alphabet(s) from Arcadia, which are rare at any rate, as well as of the texts written in the Cypriot syllabaries (→ Cypriot Syllabary), for the reconstructed forms of Arcado-Cypriot we are often dependent, in interpreting all the data, on the 4th- and 3rd-c. BCE dialectal inscriptions from Arcadia written in the Milesian alphabet. The situation is more complicated for Cypr. data, because all *texts* in the Milesian alphabet (not just abbreviated names, e.g. on coins) are written in Koine (→ Koine, Features of; → Cypriot §6).

3. SOURCES

Ancient writers do not give any account of the similarities between Arcadian and Cypriot dialects, despite the fact that there are old legends about the kinship of Arcadians and Cypriots, especially in the foundation of Paphos by Agapenor, king of and leader of the Arcadians during the expedition against Troy, in the *Iliad* (2.609) and later works (references in Graf 1996). Agapenor is also mentioned by Pausanias (8.5.2–3) as the founder of the sanctuary of Aphrodite in Palaepaphos. The same author records *ibid.* that the cult of the Paphian Aphrodite was introduced by Laodike, Agapenor's daughter at Arcadian Tegea (Jost 1985:370 note 4, 512–513).

4. DESCRIPTION

4.a. Phonology

The main Arcadian and Cypriot isoglosses which can be plausibly traced back to the 2nd millennium are the following (cf. Morpurgo Davies 1992:424–425):

i. The raising of *e* > *i*, mainly in a nasal environment, shown in the preposition or preverb *in* 'in, into' (= Att. *en*) in free (*passim*) and bound forms, as in Arc. *ímpasin* 'the right of holding land (fem. acc. sing.)' (= *émpasin*, Att. *énktēsín*), Arc. *prodedikasmínas* 'judge beforehand (pass. part. perf. fem. acc. plur.)' = Att. *prodedikasménās*, Cypr. *inalalísména(n)* 'inscribe (part. pass. perf. fem. acc. sg.)' or *inalalísména* (neut. acc. pl.) = [inala:lísména:n] or [inala:lísména] (Egetmeyer 1992, s.v. *i-na-la-li-si-me-na*), where only the preverb is affected, but not the morpheme of the participle, *Minokrátes* corresponding to Attic *Menokrátes* (pers. name from *menos*- 'force').

ii. The raising of *o* > *u*, mainly in the proximity of a nasal or before a morpheme boundary, is one of the most important isoglosses that are common to Arc., Cypr. and Pamph., probably going back to the period of the presumed unity. The impact of the vowel development *o* > *u* is omnipresent in morphology; see below §4.b. on the ending /-āu/ in the gen. sg. of masc. *a*-stems and on the verbal endings -*tu*, -*ntu*. After Bechtel (1921:8–9), a number of specialists (including Lejeune 1972:238 §253, Chantraine, *DELG*, s.v. *ἀπό*, *DGE* II [1995], s.v. *ἀπό*) admit that the form of the preposition *apú* 'from', already attested in Myc. and in Arc., Cypr. (→ Thessalian, → Lesbian

(and Asian Aeolic)), is a further instance of the raising $o > u$ (< *apo*). In recent publications this opinion tends to be contested (Dubois 1988 I:137, Hodot 1990:147–148, Egetmeyer 1992, s.v. *a-pu* with previous bibliography), where *apu* and *apo* are dissociated. Examples of this raising may be adduced as in Arc. *unéthuse* ‘dedicate (3rd sg. aor. act.)’ = Att. *anéthusen* (Theutis, early 5th c. BCE, *IG* V.2,554) and Cypr. *unétheke* < *onéthēke* ‘dedicate (3rd sg. aor. act.)’ = Att. *anéthēken* (references in Egetmeyer 1992, s.v.); in both dialects, forms in *on-* and *un-* are attested, but in Arcadia *ana-* also occurs from the Archaic period onwards (Dubois 1997:84–85) and in Cyprus from the Classical period on (references in Egetmeyer 1992, s.v. *a-ne-te-ke*). Both forms of the preverb/preposition *ana-* and *on-/un-* ‘on, upon, upwards, throughout, etc.’ derive from **on-* (DGE II, s.v. *ὄν*). The same interpretation holds for Arc. *egénontu* ‘become (3 plur. aor. ind.)’, Cypr. *génoitu* ‘become (3rd sg. aor. opt.)’ for which see below §4.b.

iii. Usually, the inherited vocalic resonants (→ Syllabic Consonants) developed to *o*, as in Arc. *déko* ‘ten’ = Att. *déka*, though see below on *Triakásioi* ‘the 300’, Cypr. *katéworgon* ‘besiege (3rd plur. aor. act.)’ = Att. *katheîrxan* (in this sense). Note, however, *dekataphóros* ‘tithe-paying’ (last quarter of the 3rd c. BCE, where the pressure of Koine *déka* ‘ten’ is not excluded). It must be stressed that the fluctuation between *a-* or *o-* vocalization is frequent in all dialects of the first millennium BCE, each one presenting a tendency towards one or the other, rather than an exclusive choice (Bader 1970).

iv. For the assibilation **ti > si*, a feature of Southern dialects (→ Southeast Greek), which was generalized in grammar and lexicon in both Arc. (Dubois 1988 I:70–73) and Cypr. (Egetmeyer 2010 I:193–194), see below.

4.b. Morphology

As is obvious from the cited examples of Arcadian and Cypriot isoglosses, all the above characteristics play an important role in morphology:

i. The raising of $o > u$ in final position and generally the neutralization $o \sim u$ before a morpheme boundary resulted in, for instance, the formation of the diphthong */āu/* from the sequence *[āo]* in the gen. sg. of the masc. *a-*stems (generalized in fem. *a-*stems only in Tegea; Dubois 1988:104), as in Arc. *Therrílau* < *Therrílaō* (pers.

name, masc.), *gāu* ‘land’ (gen. sg. fem. *a-*stem) = Att. *gês*, *oikíau* ‘house’ (gen. sg. fem. *a-*stems) = Att. *oikíās*, in Tegea, Cypr. *Timakórau* (pers. name, masc.) < *Timagórau* = Att. *Timagórou*, cf. Pamph. *Asklapiádaū* (personal name). The raising $o > u$ is also attested in the verbal endings *-tu*, *-ntu*: e.g. Arc. *ōnēsantu* ‘purchase (3rd pl. aor.)’ (Attic *ōnēsanto*), Cypr. *génoitu* (see above), and in other terms such as Arc. *állu* ‘other’ (pron. neut. sing.) = Att. *állo*.

ii. The → assibilation **ti > si* is important in morphemes and lexical derivation, in both Arc. (Dubois 1988 I:70–73) and Cypr. (Egetmeyer 2010 I:193–194). In both dialects, numerals are affected (cardinal and ordinal numbers: e.g. Arc. *Triakásioi* ‘The assembly of 300 (ordinal adj. nom. pl. for sing.)’, abstract nouns in *-sis* and their derivatives as Cypr. *anósija*, ‘dreadful’ (subst. adj. nom. pl. neut.) = Att. *anósia*, *pósis* (above), 3rd pl. *-onsi*, *-asi*, Cypr. *[íō(n)si]* < **éōnsi* ‘be, live (act. subj. pres.)’ = Att. *ōsi*, the conjunction *kás* and the preposition *kasi-*, both from **kati* (see below).

iii. In both Arc. and Cypr. there are examples of nom. sg. *-ēs* in the inflection of the *eu-*stems (against *-eus* in most dialects). Thus, taking into account only the examples beyond doubt, the Arc. inflection is as follows: nom. sg. *-ēs*, (*h*)ierēs ‘priest’; acc. sg. *-ēn*, Arc. *hierēn*; gen. sg. *-éos* < *-ēos*, *Eubōléos* (pers. name); dat. sg. *-î*, *ierî* (4th c. BCE); nom. pl. *-ês* (contracted) < *-êes* < *-êwes*, [*Ka*] *phuiês* ‘citizens of Kaphyai’, *Ēraêês* ‘citizens of Heraia’ (369–367 BCE, *GHI* #32 col. II₂₈); acc. pl. *-ěās* < *-ěās*, *Ēraéas* (4th c. BCE); both *-ēōn* and *-eōn* are attested in the gen. pl., *Ēraēōn* (6th/5th c.) but *Torthunēōn* ‘citizens of Torthuneion’ (4th c.). The Cypr. inflection is as follows: nom. sg. [basilé:s] ‘king’, but *-eus* is also attested from the 5th c. onwards, as in *basileús*; gen. sg. *-ē(w)os*, *basilêwos*; dat. sg. *-ēwi*, *basilêwi*; nom. pl. *-ēwes*, *Edaliêwes* ‘citizens of Idalion’. The development of the ending *-ēs* (eventually also of the acc. *-ēn*) was attributed by Masson (1978, 1980) and some other scholars to the period of Arcado-Cypriot unity. According to another view, the ending *-ēs* was the result of a parallel and late leveling of the inflectional pattern with the acc. *-ēn*, and it took place in an independent manner in Arc. and Cypr. during the late Archaic and Classical periods (Lillo Alcaraz 1983:1–3).

iv. Arc. and Cypr. retain inherited dat. pl. *-ois* and *-ais* of *o-* and *a-*stems respectively (Brixhe 1992:134 note 30).

v. Like Ion. and Att., among other dialects, Arc. and Cypr. developed *hoi* (masc.) and *hai* (fem.) as nom. pl. forms of the definite article, by analogy with the nom. sg. *ho*, *ha*, while Doric and other dialects retained *toi* < IE **toi* (masc.), *taí* (fem. by analogy with the masc.) (Rix 1992:183 §196).

vi. The dem. pron. *ónu* 'this' is attested in Arc. and Cypr. as the equivalent of Attic *hoútōs* to refer to 'what follows', or to strengthen *deixis* as in *A(n)driás ónu, tòn édoken* [édō:ken] ..., 'this statue here', i.e., on which the dedication is written (Tamassos, c. 375 BCE, ICS 216, Egetmeyer 2010 II:813–814, Tamassos 3). For Arc. *ónu*, which is considered to be an Achaean relic, see Dubois 1988:125–126. Other related forms are known from both dialects; in Arc. *ónu* is coupled with *oní* 'here' (to point to what is present) = Att. *hóde*, see Dubois 1988:124–125, *id.* 1997:85; in Cypr. *one* is also attested, see Egetmeyer 2010 I:434.

vii. The inherited ending *-toi* of 3rd sg. pres. and fut. mid. verbs is preserved (Dubois 1988:178–180; Morpurgo Davies 1992:428 §8), as in Arc. *bólētoi* 'wish (3rd sg. subj. pres.)' = Att. *boulētai*, Cypr. *keītoi* 'lie buried (3rd sg. pres.)' = Att. *keītai*, cf. Cypr. 1st indic. sg. *keīmai*.

viii. Due to the raising of *o* > *u*, mid. 3rd sg. and 3rd plur. verbal endings of past tenses are *-tu* (sing.), *-ntu* (pl.), as in Arc. *egāmantu* 'take as wife (3rd pl. aor.)' = Att. *egēmanto*, Cypr. *génoitu* 'to be (3rd sg. opt. aor.)' = Att. *génoito*, *katēs(s) atu* 'consecrate (3rd sg. aor.)' < secondary thematic aor. *éssai* = Att. *kathézomai* 'to be seated', for which see Egetmeyer 2010 I:484 §601, who transcribes *kathēs(s)atu*.

ix. It is possible, but still not demonstrated, that 3rd pl. ath. aor. indic. forms *-an* (< *-n* < **-nt*), as Arc. *sunéthean* 'put together' (= Att. *sunéthesan*) and Cypr. *katéthijan* < *katéthean* 'put down, dedicate' (= Att. *katéthesan*), which also occur in other dialects such as Boeotian, are due to the parallel generalization of the morpheme *-an* in the 1st millennium BCE (cf. Morpurgo Davies 1992:423, 424, #11).

x. In both dialects, pres. and aor. ath. infinitives occur, as in *-(e)nai* (Arc.), *-wenai* and *-enai* (Cypr.) or Arc. *ênai* [ɛ:nai] 'be (inf. pres.)' (= Att. *ênai* [ɛ:nai]), *dônai* [dō:nai] 'give-inf. aor' (= Att. *doûnai* [dō:nai]) (for the origin of [ɛ:] and [ɔ:], see Dubois 1988:175 §111); Cypr. *dowénai* 'give (inf. aor.)'; see Egetmeyer 2010 I:525–526.

xi. The conjunction *kás* 'and' (= *kaí* in other dialects) is the most frequently attested form

in Cypr., with a variant *ká*. In Arc., *kás* is documented only in Mantinea, where it was replaced by *kai* before the end of the 5th c. BCE (Dubois 1988:136 §85). As seen above §4.a., *kás* and *kasi-* are etymologically related (< **kati*). *Kasi-* is attested in Cypr. as first member of the compound *kasígnētos* 'brother', the equivalent of the *adelphós* of other dialects. Even if the evolution **kati* > *kasi* is post-Mycenaean, it is a feature which can be safely traced back to the period of the presumed Arcado-Cypriot unity.

xii. Whether or not associated with *apó* (see above §4.a.), *apá* is one of the Arc. and Cypr. isoglosses, although it is also shared with other 1st-millennium dialects.

4.c. Syntax

According to the inscriptional evidence, the → dative in Arc., Cypr. and Pamph. is exclusively used after some prepositions/preverbs (*apú*, *eks*), or even absolutely, to express 'motion away from, distance from a spatial or temporal point, provenance'; that is, for ablative functions. The other Gk. dialects use the gen. for the same function: Arc. *apekhomínos* ... *apú tōi ierōi* 'to keep away from the sanctuary' (Mantinea, early 5th c. BCE, IG V.2, 262_{20–22}), *apú tāt* ... *amérai* 'from the day' (Tegean decree found at Delphi, 324/323 BCE, GHI # 101₂₉₊₆₀), Cypr. *eks tōi woíkoí tōi basilēwos kàs eks tāt ptóliwi* 'from the king's household and from that of the city' (in Cypr. *eks* is the only allomorph and is used before both vowels and consonants), Idalion, 499/498–470 BCE, ICS 217 A₆, cf. Egetmeyer 2010 II: 629–635, Idalion 1), *apú tāt gài tāt basilēwos* 'from the king's domain' (ICS 217 A₈), *apò [tōi ...] kà(s) eikostōi wétei* 'from the twentieth and ... year' (dedication to the sanctuary of the Nymph on the summit of Kafizin, c. 225–222 BCE, Kafizin 252), *Diweíthemis* (pers. name) 'law given by Zeus(-first component in dat.)' (ICS 178, 173, 217 B₂₁). This is the most important of the features shared by Arc., Cypr. and Pamph. that can be safely attributed to their common dialectal heritage. The causes of this phenomenon have been variously interpreted; whatever the reason may be, examples of the type *Diweíthemis* (with ablative function expressed without preposition/preverb) must be taken into account, since the difference between Achaean and the other dialects is not purely syntactic but also semantic. It seems thus that during the 2nd millennium BCE, in the immediate post-Mycenaean period, there was in Greek a

tendency towards reducing diversity in endings. In some areas, locative and ablative functions were no longer morphologically distinguished. These were the regions from which the future Arcadians, Cypriots and Pamphylians came. In other areas, locative and ablative functions were morphologically kept separate, with the dative absorbing the locative function, and the genitive the ablative function. In most cases the ambiguity was eliminated by means of the prepositions used. In personal names there was no such a danger.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bader, Françoise. 1970. "De mycénien *matoropuro*, *arepozoo*, à grec *Ματρόπολις*, *ἀλειφόβιος*: le traitement des sonantes-voyelles au premier millénaire", *Minos* 10:7–63.
- Bechtel, Friedrich. 1921. *Die griechischen Dialekte*. I. *Der lesbische, thessalische, böotische, arkadische und kyprische Dialekt*. Berlin.
- Brixhe, Claude. 1992. "Du «datif» mycénien aux protagonistes de la situation linguistique." In: Olivier 1992:129–157.
- Chantraine, Pierre. 1968–1980. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*. Paris 1968–1980. New edition 2009.
- Christidis, Anastasios-Phoibos, ed. 2007. *A history of ancient Greek. From the beginnings to late antiquity*. Cambridge.
- DGE. *Diccionario Griego-Español* (Francisco Adrados, ed.). Madrid, 1980–.
- Dubois, Laurent. 1988. *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien*. I. *Grammaire*, II. *Corpus dialectal*, III. *Notes – Index – Bibliographie*. Louvain-la-Neuve.
- . 1997. "L'arcadien et le chypriote: deux dialectes cousins", *CECC* 27:83–91.
- Egetmeyer, Markus. 1992. *Wörterbuch zu den Inschriften im kyprischen Syllabar*. Berlin – New York.
- . 2010. *Le dialecte grec ancien de Chypre*. I: *Grammaire*, II: *Répertoire des inscriptions en syllabaire chypre-grec*. Berlin – New York.
- GHI: *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404–323 BC*. (P.J. Rhodes & Robin Osborne, ed.). Oxford 2003.
- Graf, Fritz. 1996. *DNP* 1, s.v. "Agapenor".
- Hodot, René. 1990. *Le dialecte éolien d'Asie. La langue des inscriptions, VII^e s. a.C.–III^e s. p.C.* Paris.
- ICS: Masson, Olivier. *Les inscriptions chypriotes syllabiques. Recueil critique et commenté*. Réimpression augmentée. Paris 1983.
- Jost, Madeleine. 1985. *Sanctuaires et cultes d'Arcadie*. Paris.
- Kafizin: Mitford Terence B. *The Nymphaeum of Kafizin. The Inscribed Pottery*. Berlin – New York 1980.
- Lejeune, Michel. 1972. *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. Paris.
- Lillo Alcaraz, Antonio. 1983. "On type *hierēs* forms in Arcadian and Cypriot", *Glotta* 61:1–4.
- Masson, Olivier. 1978. "Sur un problème dialectal arcado-chypriote: les noms en *-ής*", *BSL* 73.1:287–291.
- . 1980. "Une nouvelle inscription de Paphos concernant le roi Nikoklès", *Kadmos* 19:65–80.
- Morpurgo Davies, Anna. 1992. "Mycenaean, Arcadian, Cyprian and some questions of method in dialectology." In: Olivier 1992:415–431.
- Olivier, Jean-Pierre, ed. 1992. *MYKENAÏKA, Actes du IX^e colloque international sur les textes mycéniens et égéens (...)*, Athènes 2–6 octobre 1990. Athens – Paris.

- Panayotou, Anna. 2007. "Arcado-Cypriot". In: *A history of ancient Greek. From the beginnings to late antiquity*, ed. by A-F. Christidis 2007:417–426 and 504–506. Cambridge.
- Rix, Helmut. 1992. *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen*. Darmstadt.

ANNA PANAYOTOU-TRIANAPHYLLOPOULOU

Archaisms in Modern Dialects

1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The question of the presence of ancient dialect elements in the Modern Greek dialects has not been addressed directly until now. It has usually been alluded to indirectly in the context of attempts to understand the nature of the Koine or to solve the problem of the origins of Modern Greek.

The Koine, as is well known, was spoken over a vast area. In part of this area, Ancient Greek dialects were previously spoken; in the rest of it, other languages. This fact raises certain questions, such as: Was the form of the Koine the same in areas that had an Ancient Greek dialect substrate as in those which had another language as a substrate? Was the form of the Koine affected by the type of Ancient Greek dialect it had as a substrate? Can the analysis of modern data lead us to conclusions about the type and density of ancient dialect elements in the Koine in areas with different substrates (ancient dialect or other language)? The comparative study that would allow us to answer the first question is not possible today, as the areas in which the Koine had another language as a substrate have long ceased to form part of the Greek-speaking world, so that it is impossible to investigate the development of the Greek language there. In contrast, in most of the areas where the Koine had an Ancient Greek dialect as a substrate, Greek continues to be spoken, so that, in theory at least, the search for ancient dialect elements is possible.

The first attempt to investigate the contribution of Ancient Greek dialects to the development of Modern Greek was unsuccessful. This was the well-known "Aeolodoric" theory, which claimed to have identified → Aeolic and → Doric elements in Modern Greek. Hatzidakis (1892) correctly rejects this interpretation and defines the relationships between Modern Greek and the Koine, while at the same time determines the