On Continuity and Change in the Dialects of Lesbos and Related Areas – Multilingualism and Polydialectalism over the Millennia

Brian D. Joseph
The Ohio State University

Throughout the history of Greek, there has been a tension between and among different geographic dialects and different stylistic registers of usage, a situation with both purely linguistic and decidedly sociolinguistic dimensions. In this presentation, along with some discussion of the general evidence bearing on this tension from various stages of Greek, I survey some of the particular evidence concerning the involvement of Lesbos and related dialect areas in this intriguing linguistic and sociolinguistic situation, drawing on material from ancient usage as well as modern.

Key words: history of Greek language, ancient and modern Greek dialects, sociolinguistics, language contact.

1. Introduction

For literally millennia, the island of Lesbos, together with the particular variety of Greek spoken there, has been of considerable importance and interest within the larger Greek picture. To be sure, at different stages within the history of Greek the dialect has had a different status — and indeed a different form — vis-à-vis other varieties of Greek, but nonetheless, one can discern some continuity in Lesbos amidst the changes, and at the same time witness how the local dialect, of whatever form, has participated in interactions with other varieties and has reacted to tensions among different varieties, involving both competition but also more "peaceful" co-existence.

First a bit of information about the oldest form of Greek on Lesbos is in order. Virtually nothing is known about Lesbos Greek in the Bronze Age, that is during the period of the earliest documented Greek as found in the Mycenaean Greek ("Linear B") tablets from (approximately) the 14th century BC. Interestingly, however, there are certain features of Mycenaean Greek that are reminiscent of features attested in Classical times in the dialect of Lesbos, e.g. the vowel *o* occurring in the outcome of earlier syllabic resonants (cf. Mycenaean < pe-mo > 'seed' representing /spermo/ (as if σπέρμο in "alphabetic" Greek) and thus with a final vowel (from earlier syllabic nasal, in this case *-n)

130

that is like the vocalism found in Lesbian δέκοτος 'tenth' with the medial *o* from an earlier syllabic nasal, in this case *-m-). Similarities like these have led some scholars to posit a special link between Mycenaean Greek and the later Greek of Lesbos and closely related varieties (on which see below).[1] Such claims, however, are inconclusive and their assessment is hindered by the absence of clear evidence of the extent of variation found in Mycenaean Greek times and the rather limited geographic range of the Linear B evidence (found at a few spots on the Greek mainland, most notably Pylos, and on a few of the islands, most notably Crete). In the case of < pe-mo >, it is noteworthy that another form < pe-ma >, with a different final vocalism from < pe-mo >, is also attested in Mycenaean, but the exact interpretation of the source of this variation is somewhat uncertain. The coexistence of these two forms in the overall Mycenaean corpus might reflect an original geographic variation, especially since < pe-mo > is found only at Pylos whereas < pe-ma > is found at Knossos (on Crete); interestingly, though, < pe-ma > is also found at Pylos, so the variation there may well reflect dialect borrowing, that is, the introduction into one dialect of a form proper to another dialect through interactions between speakers of the two dialects, or some other causal factor. Alternatively, the *a*-form could represent the "true" Mycenaean outcome and the *o*-form a deviation from that. As a result, it is not entirely clear what the status is of *o*-vocalism as the possible outcome of syllabic resonants in Mycenaean, so that the relationship between Mycenaean Greek and other Greek dialects based on a feature like this is less than secure; thus, any light such features might shed on the Bronze Age form of Lesbos Greek and its relatives may have to remain the province of speculation.

References here to relatives of Lesbos Greek need some explication. In post-Bronze Age Greek, and in particular in Ancient Greek of the first millennium B.C., several distinct speech-forms, what can readily be called dialects or sub-dialects, are to be recognized. These include Attic, Ionic, Arcadian, Cyprian, Doric and Northwest Greek. These are conventionally grouped, based in part on the degree of similarity they show to one another internally,[2] into an Attic-Ionic dialect, an Arcado-Cyprian dialect, and a West Greek dialect. In addition, the dialect of the island of Lesbos, together with Boeotian and Thessalian on the Greek mainland, make up another dialect group distinct from these others, one referred to Aeolic. The sub-dialects in this group are known from inscriptions on Lesbos and on the mainland, but also most significantly, in the case of Lesbos, from the poetry of Sappho and Alcaeus from the 7th and 6th centuries.[3] These distinct dialects and sub-dialects are generally to be identified with geographic regions, e.g. Attica for Attic, many of the Aegean islands for Ionic, the Peloponnesos and Central and Northwest Greek for Doric, Boeotia, Thessaly, and Lesbos for Aeolic, and so on; moreover, to some extent, it has been conjectured that these distinct dialects correspond (roughly)

to major tribal divisions in the early waves of Greeks entering Greece in the late third or early second millennium BC.

The Greek of present-day Lesbos is not directly descended from ancient Aeolic, but rather, like all of the Modern Greek dialects,[4] it derives from the Hellenistic Koine, the common language over much of the Greek-speaking world in post-Classical times that derives largely from ancient Attic-Ionic. Still, present-day Lesbos Greek shows continuity with ancient Greek as the natural development, in that region, of Classical Greek as it was transformed into the Koine and from that into modern forms. That is, one can trace a direct path from Ancient Greek to any modern dialect, including the modern Lesbos dialect, as long as the leveling influence of the Koine is taken into account. The matter of continuity is taken up again in section 4 below, with discussion of some specific instances.

With regard to what the ancient form of Lesbos speech looked like, it clearly is different from ancient Attic and the other dialects, with differences showing up in matters of pronunciation, accent, grammar, and vocabulary. Some of the differences appear to be profound, and a glimpse at some of the lower numbers reveals this quite dramatically: where for 'four' and 'five' Aeolic has πέσ(σ)υρες and πέμπε, respectively, whereas Attic has τέτταρες and πέντε.

2. Dialect Differences and Dialect Mixing in Ancient Greek

It was noted above in connection with Mycenaean *pe-mo/pe-ma* that dialect mixing might be the cause behind the observed variation in that case. Whatever the situation there, it has long been assumed, with good reason, that dialect mixing involving Aeolic can be seen in the Greek of the Homeric epics, In particular, one finds, for instance, the Aeolic infinitive ἔμμεναι 'to be' within a few lines of Attic-Ionic εἶναι (*Iliad* 1.91 and *Iliad* 1.117, respectively). Similarly, although Homeric usage quite frequently has the Ionic form for 'four', τέσσαρες, a form πίσυρες also occurs, presumably Aeolic (as πέσ(σ)υρες cited above suggests). Similarly, a past tense form ἤμβροτον (from ἁμαρτάνω 'miss, fail to hit') occurs, with the Aeolic-looking *o*-vocalism from an earlier syllabic resonant (as above, but in this case *r), alongside the more frequent ἤμαρτον.

This mixing of dialects and borrowing between them continued in Classical times, where at least occasionally one can find inscriptions with Attic forms mixed in with forms that reflect the local dialect. An example involving Aeolic is the mid-4th century Boeotian inscription (IG VII.2418, cited as #40 in Buck 1968: 229) from Thebes, with an Attic genitive singular in –ου in a proper name (e.g. Ἀλεξάνδρου) alongside native Boeotian genitives in –ω (e.g. Ἀγεισινίκω).

In the case of Aeolic elements in Homeric Greek, the motivation for the intrusion of extra-dialectal forms into another linguistic variety may be a matter of the history of the development of epic diction, with forms from an older layer of composition retained for poetic reasons. In the case of Attic forms intruding into a properly Aeolic (Boeotian) inscription, the motivation may have in part to do with the usual forms the individuals named in the inscription gave to inflected forms of their names, but one cannot discount likely influence from the positive social valuation accorded to the Attic dialect, as the dialect associated with the political, economic, and cultural center of Athens. This latter sort of motivation is a theme that runs through much of the history of Greek dialect interactions.

These examples mentioned so far have been traditional geographically based linguistic differences (or presumably so, in the case of Mycenaean *pe-mo/pe-ma*) with mixing of dialects through borrowing being a fairly natural and expected outcome of interaction among speakers of different dialects. Geography is clearly a key dimension to variation in Ancient Greece (as in any speech community that covers a large territory). However, it is important to note that there is evidence for linguistic differences in Ancient Greek that are not based on geography –in the *Cratylus* (418B/418C) of Plato, Socrates comments on male/female linguistic differences in the following passage:

οἶσθα ὅτι οἱ παλαῖοι οἱ ἡμέτεροι τῶι ἰῶτα καὶ τῶι δέλτα εὖ
μάλα ἐχρῶντο, καὶ οὐχ ἥκιστα αἱ γυναῖκες, αἵπερ μάλιστα τὴν
ἀρχαῖαν φωνὴν σωίζουσι. νῦν δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἰῶτα ἢ ει ἢ ητα μεταστρέφουσιν
ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ δέλτα ζῆτα, ὡς δὴ μεγαλοπρεπέστερα
ὄντα ... οἷον οἱ μὲν ἀρχαιότατοι ἱμέραν τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκάλουν,
οἱ δὲ ἐμέραν, οἱ δὲ νῦν ἡμέραν

'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 and delta to zeta, thinking they have a grander sound. ... For instance, in the earliest times they called day *himéra*, others said *heméra*, and now they say *hēméra*.'

Variation of this sort between the genders is found in many, maybe even all speech communities. Thus it is fair to assume that male-female linguistic variation of a similar type, though not necessarily involving the same sounds, was to be found in Lesbos in ancient times, even if there is no direct evidence of it. It would be an interesting exercise to examine the language of Sappho's poetry, as the record of the usage of one particular woman, and compare it with that of Alcaeus's works, as the record of the usage of one particular man, and see if there are any differences in usage evident that could be attributed to male

versus female speech patterns; such a study, however, needs to be left for a future investigation.

Moreover, the Ancient Greeks themselves were aware of dialect differences, and we know this from evidence that goes beyond Socrates's keen observations about male and female speech. The very occasional and indeed quite rare writing of the same inscription in two dialects, seen in an early 6th century inscription (GDI 5531, cited as #1 in Buck 1973: 184), with both an original East Ionic version and a later-added Attic version, attests to such an awareness, even if a very marginal practice at best.[5]

More productively, there is other relevant evidence of a lexical nature, in that there were specific words that the ancient Greeks themselves used to refer to different kinds of Greek speech. These terms are largely based on geography but to the extent that geography correlated with ancient dialect divisions, the terms also provide labels for the ancient dialects as the ancients perceived them. Thus verbs in -ίζω occur that refer to doing some activity in a way associated with some particular group, and speaking is one of those activities the verb can refer to. Attested examples include Ἀττικίζω 'side with the Athenians; speak Attic Greek', Δωρίζω 'imitate the Dorians in life, dialect, etc.; speak Doric Greek', and Ἰάζω / Ἰωνίζω 'speak Ionian Greek'; in terms of what such forms might say about the dialect of Lesbos, it is interesting that among these dialect-identifying -ίζω verbs is Αἰολίζω 'speak Aeolic Greek' (also, and primarily, 'compose (music) in the Aeolian mode'). Similarly, there is an adverbial formation in -στί[6] reserved specifically for 'speaking in a particular language form', where the language-forms in question sometimes are clearly for different languages (e.g. Σκυθιστί 'in the Scythian (language)') but sometimes seem to be purely geographic in nature (e.g. Πελοποννασιστί 'in Peloponnesian(-style speech)'); of interest here is that the apparent dialect divisions recognized by the -ίζω verbs show up here in these adverbs: not only does one find Δωριστί 'in Doric (speech)' and Ἰαστί 'in Ionian (speech)', but also, significantly for the view being developed here of Lesbos linguistically in ancient times, Αἰολιστί 'in the Aeolic dialect'. Thus these vocabulary items make it clear that Aeolic was recognized in ancient times as a separate and distinct variety of speech within the larger Greek context.

3. Ancient Dialect Clashes involving Lesbos

When speakers of different dialects come into contact with one another, so that their dialects might be said to "clash", there can be several possible outcomes. As seen in the case of Attic forms in the Boeotian in inscriptional example above, there can be the intrusion of forms from one dialect into the other. Somewhat more interesting is the emergence of what might be referred to as

134

"compromise" forms, forms that are neither properly part of one dialect nor of the other but are mixed forms that are induced by dialect contact. In some instances, such forms might actually represent movement away from historically attested forms, and can be called "hypercorrection", recognizing that speakers of the one dialect often try to approximate a form in the other dialect that is perceived as prestigious, but they can get it wrong, as it were, over-correcting for the difference between their dialect and the other one. An example involving the northern dialects of Modern Greek, the dialect group that includes Lesbos Greek, hinges on the fact that these dialects typically lose high vowels that are present in other (especially southern) dialects. By way of trying to emulate the more prestigious southern forms, northern speakers occasionally add high vowels in places where they did not occur historically and do not even occur in the south, giving a compromise, as it were, between the local vowel-less forms and the perception that other, generally more prestigious, dialects often have vowels where the local dialect lacks them. For instance, the northern dialect of Zagori (in Epirus, cited in Newton 1972: 188) has καπινίζω 'I smoke' for historically expected (and attested southern) καπνίζω, as if southern καπνίζω instead had a vowel separating π and ν in this word. A likely example from Lesbos is the third person plural form έχιν 'they have' (and other forms like it), corresponding to standard (and historically prior) έχουν. The regular loss of the unstressed high vowel ου gave εχν, which could then be "restored", in a historically incorrect way, as having lost the high vowel ι not ου. Contact with and awareness of the southern dialects would have made such northern speakers sensitive to differences between their dialect and other dialects, and the resulting forms like καπινίζω and έχιν attest to such a sensitivity (and feelings of "incorrectness")

A third outcome is local resistance and a maintenance of a native form in the face of "pressure" from a prestigious and sometimes dominant and prevailing other dialect. Ancient Lesbos usage offers a possible example of this sort, in the usage of a single speaker. The relevant background is that there is a small class of Ancient Greek nouns that show an "intrusive –τ-" in some case forms and derivatives,[7] e.g. ACC.SG χρό-α vs. χρῶ-τ-α. An important fact about these forms is that they are widespread in ancient Greek dialects, but do not occur uniformly in all such nouns and all case forms of these nouns, nor in all dialects. For the most part, the intrusive –τ- is found in Attic Greek, so that Attic is at the forefront of this innovative occurrence of a new noun stem. Still, even in Attic intrusive –τ- is realized somewhat sporadically; it is found to some extent in other dialects, and Lesbos Greek (Aeolic) actually leads the way with intrusive – τ- in *some* words, ahead of Attic, but not in others; for instance, the first intrusive –τ- form of έρως 'love' occurs in Sappho, in the genitive έρωτος. A certain ancient writer, Hellanicus (5th century), writes in the Attic dialect, but interestingly, even though Attic has an intrusive –t- in the derivative 'αγήρατο-

'ageless' (from γῆρας, mirroring intrusive –τ- in Attic (Isocrates, mid-5th century) versus τ-less forms in early Attic and in other dialects, Hellanicus has τ-less 'αγήραο-. Since Hellanicus is from Mytilene, one possible explanation for his failure to follow strict Attic usage is that for this word, his usage shows the persistence of traits of his native Lesbos dialect, with its overall more restricted intrusive –τ-, against pervasive influence of Attic. Without direct evidence of Lesbos usage for this particular word, this account cannot be proven to be the right one; however, given what is known in general (though not in ἐρωτος, of course) about intrusive –τ- in Lesbos as opposed to Attic, it is a reasonable explanation to advance here,

4. Continuity from Ancient Greek into Modern Lesbos Usage Revisited

As noted above in section 1, there is continuity between dialects of Modern Greek and the ancient language, even though many changes and alterations of Classical Greek are evident and even though the modern dialects are not the direct descendants of the ancient dialects of their respective regions. For instance, details of linguistic form may differ, but the general "cut" of the language is the same, and reveals the ancient basis in such overarching features as noun declension (e.g., the use of case forms to express grammatical relations within a sentence) or verb conjugation (e.g., with many of the ancient categories of person and number and tense preserved, even if not wholly intact). Such continuity of a general sort represents the ways in which the dialect reveals itself to be part of the larger Greek diasystem, even in the face of details that differentiate it from other members of the overall system.

At the same time, though, there are some particular features, most notably lexical items, that continue Ancient Greek words and are found only in various regional dialects but not in the standard language. Such archaisms provide direct links between Ancient Greek and the modern regional dialects, although not, as emphasized already, with the particular local variety of Ancient Greek. Two key works that examine this subject of lexical archaisms in the modern dialects are Andriotis 1974 and Shipp 1979. A look through these volumes reveals several lexical items found in the modern-day Lesbos dialect -- and other regional dialects as well -- but not in the standard language. Among them are the following: ανθρωπίζω 'act like a man' (item 680 in Andriotis), attested in Lesbos as ανθρουπίζου (with similar forms in but absent from or at best rare in standard Modern Greek;[8] χιμαίρα 'goat' (item 6519 in Andriotis), attested in Lesbos as χιμαίρα and elsewhere, but absent from standard Modern Greek in this particular meaning.[9]

These words are not exclusive to present-day Lesbos, inasmuch as they are attested in other regional dialects (e.g. ανθρωπίζω is found in Kefallonia and

Pontic, according to Andriotis) but at least a couple of forms in these compendia are found only in Lesbos, as lexical archaisms continuing an ancient form. This form is επιδώμιον (item 2435 in Andriotis) 'ledge of a roof', a noun presumed for ancient Greek based on the Ancient Greek verb →πιδωμώ 'build upon' and found only in modern Lesbos as πιδώμ'; neither the verb nor the noun seems to have survived into Modern Greek anywhere except for this form in Lesbos, so that it provides a telling link between ancient and modern Greek through Lesbos. Another such case is κατατάκω (Shipp, p. 308) 'melt, thaw', an ancient verb that seems only to have survived in modern Lesbos κατατάζ' 'putrefy'.

There is also one other interesting ancient-modern linkage through Lesbos that deserves mention. Kretschmer (1905: 65) notes that modern Lesbos attests the form [jlu] for the name of a particular female demon that chokes young children, and a comparable form is found in various dialects, including medieval Cypriot (in the *Chronicle of Makhairas*) and Chios. The link to ancient Lesbos usage is that the word occurs in Ancient Greek, as Γελλώ 'a goblin supposed to carry off young children', but it is most prominently attested in Sappho's poem 47. In fact, Kretschmer believes that the modern Lesbos form, which presupposes a high vowel initial syllable in earlier times, i.e. Γιλλού, may be the original form, with the ancient Γελλώ showing the effects of influence from the verb γελῶ 'laugh' (presumably through a connection to sinister laughter on the part of the goblin).

Examples like these give some concrete and highly specific evidence of continuity in the Greek language in various parts of the Greek-speaking world, over several millennia. Evidence of continuity can be deceptive, though, and one has to judge each example carefully, as there are instances of false continuity, which while interesting in their own right do not show anything about the way different stages of the language are connected to one another. For instance, within a multi-millennial span of Greek, starting from the prehistoric period before attested Greek and into the present, the historical stages of development of so-called "contract" verbs have been recreated; the first wave was between early pre-Greek to Classical Greek, where, for instance, *τιμά-ει 'he honors' became Ancient Greek τιμᾷ (with earlier –αει contracted to –α); the persistence of the base τιμα- allowed for the innovative creation (innovative from the modern point of view) of forms such as 3SG τιμά-ει, with the regular ending –ει from verbs like κάν-ει, βλέπ-ει, etc. added onto the contracted form. In this case, the events leading to the modern forms that re-create the prehistoric uncontracted forms are temporally too separated -- being nearly 3000 years apart -- for them to somehow be the same phenomenon; instead, this is simply the accidental re-creation of earlier forms. One such case of false continuity involving the modern Lesbos dialect is that one can find nouns with an extra and unexpected -τ- in the plural of some neuter nouns; e.g. in Aivali for the plural of λάθος 'mistake' one finds not a form derived from earlier λάθη (e.g. λάθ' or the

137

like) but rather a form with an inserted -τ- before the neuter plural ending, namely λάθη-τ-α. This modern "intrusive -τ-" is reminiscent of the Ancient Greek intrusive –τ- discussed above, where it is clear that ancient Lesbos showed some interesting relevant developments, but the two phenomena are totally unrelated to one another; the modern Aivali form most likely represents a -τ- taken over from neuter nouns like όνομα 'name', where there has been a -τ- in the forms outside of the nominative/accusative singular throughout all of the Greek-speaking world since prehistoric times, whereas the ancient "intrusive -τ-" is not restricted to neuter nouns (as with έρως, cited above) and seems to be rather restricted in its appearance.

5. Conclusion: Dialect Clashes Once Again

As a final perspective on modern dialect contact involving Lesbos, there is suggestive evidence of a rather unusual kind that may point to the intrusion of the standard dialect in the modern era into Lesbos usage as early as 1901. This evidence comes from Kretschmer's 1901 expedition to Lesbos, during which he made recordings, using a large and heavy phonograph that was the latest in recording technology at the time, of Greek folk songs. Kretschmer's recordings (Schüller 1999) may well be the earliest audio-recorded Greek (thus the earliest nonwritten record of Greek), or at least close to the earliest, and thus provides direct insight into pronunciation in ways that go well beyond any inferences one might draw from contemporaneous orthographic representations. Caution is in order, though, as the three available songs are sung by a (Pontic) Greek from Samsun living in Mitilini; admittedly, then, his dialect may not be representative of Mitilini but the songs and the pronunciations employed are not Pontic either; in this way, then, they may offer some insight into Mitilini usage, even if not "pure" Lesbos usage.

From the point of view of dialect awareness, dialect clash, and speaker attitudes about what to do regarding a tension between different dialects, it is noteworthy that the songs show non-Lesbos phonological features. For instance, in the modern Lesbos dialect, historical nasal-plus-stop clusters, as in κοντά 'near', are pronounced without nasality (e.g. [koda] for 'near'; see, e.g., Newton 1972: 208) but in the 1901 songs these clusters come out with a clear nasal, a characteristic associated with Standard Greek of the time. This fact provides direct evidence that at least (some) speakers in Lesbos were bi-dialectal and aware of the standard language at that time, and one can surmise that the formal register of Greek (i.e., the standard language) was deemed more appropriate than the local speech form in the quasi-formal context of being recorded.

What all the foregoing in part suggests is the not too surprising observation that Greeks show now – and have shown for centuries – a

remarkable sensitivity about language and about dialects, perhaps the result of practical experience with multiple dialects from ancient times. Lesbos, like most of Greece, has been and continues to be a focal point in the twin issues in the Greek-speaking world of linguistic contact and linguistic continuity.

6. Notes

[1] See Sihler (1995: 10), for instance, in his overview of the scholarly consensus on Greek dialects.

[2] Actually, what is more important for measuring dialect relationships is shared innovations they show away from the "proto-Greek" starting point, but for our purposes here it is sufficient to think in terms of degree of similarity.

[3] Note also that the poetry of Corinna (6th century B.C.), though a fairly small corpus, gives evidence of literary Boeotian.

[4] Except for Tsakonian, which is generally held to derive (more or less) directly from an ancient Doric dialect.

[5] The circumstances surrounding this unusual dual-dialect inscription are that it is on a pillar marking a gift from a certain Phanodicus of Proconnesus to the pryteaneum at Sigeum. It was composed in East Ionic, apparently Phanodicus's native dialect, and then produced again in Attic at Sigeum, a city held by Athenians. I would like to thank my colleague Dr. Fritz Graf of the Department of Greek and Latin for very enlightening discussion about this particular inscription and its (nearly) unique use of two dialects.

[6] See now Anghelina 2004 for a discussion of these adverbs, in the overall context of ancient Greek derivational patterns involving a -t- extension.

[7] These forms are collected and discussed most recently in Anghelina 2004, from which the information presented here derives.

[8] To judge from the lack of an entry for the word in Babiniotis 1998; Delijanis et al. 1998 has an entry for this verb but it is rather brief and seems to be there mainly to refer to the more usual form, ανθρωπεύω, suggesting that the –ίζω form is a variant of restricted occurrence (e.g. regional only).

[9] It survives of course in the meaning 'chimera' (referring to the ancient mythical beast or to a 'pipedream')

7. References

Andriotis, Nikolaos. 1974. *Lexikon der Archaismen in neugriechischen Dialekten.* Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Anghelina, Catalin. 2004. *Variation with Intrusive T in Ancient Greek.* Ohio State University Ph. D. dissertation.

Babiniotis, George. 1998. Λεξικό της νέας ελληνικής γλώσσας. Athens: Center for Lexicography.

Buck, Carl D. 1973. *The Greek Dialects.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press (reprinting of 1955 edition)..

Chadwick, John. 1973. *Documents in Mycenaean Greek.* Second Edition. (First Edition, 1956, by Michael Ventris and John Chadwick). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crusius, Martinus. 1584. *Turcograeciae Libri Octo.* Basileae: Leonardus Ostenius Sebastianus Henricpetrus.

Delijanis, A, et al. 1998. Λεξικό της κοινής νεοελληνικής. Thessaloniki: Aristoteleio Panepistimio Thessalonikis, Instituto Neoellinikon Spoudon [Idryma Manoli Triandafyllidi].

Du Cange, Dominus. 1688. *Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae & Infimae Graecitatis.* Ludguni: Annissoniorum Joannis Posuel, et Claudii Rigaud.

Hock, Hans Henrich. 1991. *Principles of Historical Linguistics.* Mouton de Gruyter.

Joseph, Brian D. 1992. Interlectal awareness as a reflex of linguistic dimensions of power: Evidence from Greek. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 10.71-85.

Joseph, Brian D. 1994. Modern Greek *ts*: beyond sound symbolism. *Sound Symbolism*, ed. by L. Hinton, J. Nichols, & J. Ohala, 222-236. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kretschmer, Paul. 1905. *Der heutige lesbische Dialekt verglichen mit den übrigen nordgriechischen Mundarten* (Schriften der Balkankommission. Linguistische Abteilung III. Neugriechische Dialektstudien I). Vienna: Alfred Hölder.

Newton, Brian. 1972. *The Generative Interpretation of Dialect.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schüller, Dietrich. 1999. *The First Expeditions 1901 to Croatia, Brazil, and the Isle of Lesbos* (Audio CD; Sound Documents from the Phonogrammarchiv of the Austrian Academy of Sciences. The Complete Historical Collectin 1899-1950.) Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Shipp, G. P. 1979. *Modern Greek Evidence for the ancient Greek Vocabulary.* Sydney: Sydney University Press.

Terkourafi, Marina. 2005. Understanding the present through the past: processes of koineisation in Cyprus. To appear in *Diachronica*.

Watkins, Calvert. 1970. Language of gods and language of men: remarks on some Indo-European meta-linguistic traditions. *Myth and Law among the Indo-Europeans*, ed. by J. Puhvel, 1-17. Berkeley: University of California Press.

8. Περίληψη

Κατά τη διάρκεια της ιστορίας της ελληνικής γλώσσας, υπάρχει μια τάση και μεταξύ διαφορετικών γεωγραφικών διαλέκτων και μεταξύ διαφορετικών υψών. Μέσα σε μια τέτοια κατάσταση, υπάρχουν εντελώς γλωσσολογικές καθώς και κάπως κοινονιογλωσσολογικές προεκτάσεις. Σ' αυτή τη μελέτη, προφέρω μια συζήτηση των γενικών δεδομένων γύρω από αυτή τη τάση σε διάφορα επίπεδα στην ιστορία της γλώσσας και ιδιαίτερα παρουσιάζω τα στοιχεία σχετικά με τη Μυτιλήνη και κοντινά μέρη, από την αρχαία και τη σύγχρονη γλώσσα.