

neuters;²²) yet the number of occurrences is slight, and here too the results, although in agreement with the Romance developments, are for that reason somewhat unreliable. I therefore continue to regard my suggestion as plausible but am discreet enough to realize that my **illō-cu/illō-c* is distantly related to Rohlf's *illūd* (vs. *illūm*), even more closely related to Merlo's **ill'hoc* or **illoc*, and a blood brother to Hall's *illōd*. We are all of us aiming more or less in the same direction, but perhaps none of us has as yet hit the bull's-eye squarely in the center.

The Dialect Geography of Modern Greek Passive Inflections

By B. E. NEWTON, Burnaby (Canada)

1. Introduction

Dialectal variation in the actual form of inflectional endings, particularly within the conjugational system, has been one of the most neglected areas in modern Greek linguistics.¹⁾ While the study of the morphophonemic reflexes of grammatical categories as opposed to their functions is not perhaps in itself very rewarding or revealing, at the same time the establishment of the distribution of

²²) *Chronicon Salernitanum*, 1956, p. 239. Westerbergh unhesitatingly links this spelling alternation with the differentiation of masculine and neuter in the South Italian dialects.

¹⁾ I assembled most of the data used in the present study while doing field work on modern Greek phonology during the years 1963 and 1968–9, this last research being supported in part by the grant of a Canada Council Leave Fellowship and by an award from the President's Research Fund, Simon Fraser University. In most cases the points for which data are presented were visited and informants consulted on the spot. For Dodona, Raftena and Ammotopos I rely on information provided by university students in Ioannina who are natives of these villages. Published studies were drawn on for the following points: Kephallonia (Skiadaresis, 1959), Lakonia (Koukoules, 1908), Germa (Georgiou, 1962), Skopelos and Limnos (Kretschmer, 1905), Naxos (Oikonomidis, 1952), Zea (Kolia, 1938), Kimolos (Vogiatzidis, 1925), Astipalea (Karanastasis, 1958), E. Crete (Pangalos, 1955). In all other cases the data are based on personal enquiries unless there is an explicit statement to the contrary.

the main variants is relevant in at least two ways. Firstly the historical development of the modern Greek inflectional paradigms can be effectively investigated only when the full range of dialectal variation is considered; an account of the origin of modern Greek *μποροῦσα* 'I was able' does not constitute an account of the imperfect active of oxytones, for in addition to this form we find *ἠμπόρουνα*, *μπόρουγα*, and other forms which, from the objective point of view, have as good a claim for discussion under that rubric as does the form which, it so happens, most Greeks regard as 'standard'. Secondly the fluctuation which still occurs to some small degree in the 'standard' spoken forms of the demotic language and, much more markedly, in its written forms, can best be interpreted against the background of the living vernaculars. Particularly in reading modern Greek we tend to find quite striking divergences between the practices of authors purporting to write in 'literary demotic'. One will perhaps use *ἐρχότανε* for both 'he' and 'they were coming'; another will use *ἐρχονταν* for both persons, and that in spite of the fact that the nearest grammar will inform us that the former contrasts with the latter as singular versus plural. The most striking range of variation is perhaps that observed in the endings of the passive paradigm, particularly in the imperfect, and it is the dialect geography of this latter and its present counterpart with which we shall be concerned. The basic aim of this study is to present the facts as they are available to me from personal observation with a view to the identification and taxonomy of certain salient points of variation. Questions of historical origins are mentioned only incidentally but miscellaneous points of interest will, however, be touched on as they arise and the paradigm corresponding to current Athenian usage will be traced to its origins within the vernacular dialects. The dialects to be considered belong to what may be roughly defined in a negative way as excluding such modern varieties of Greek as have had little or no discernible influence on the development of the modern standard; we therefore exclude the geographically and linguistically peripheral dialects of South Italy, Asia Minor and Tsakonia. Maniot is mentioned only parenthetically on the basis that its inclusion would complicate the overall picture by introducing a paradigm isolated within its immediate neighbourhood but with nothing of intrinsic significance to add to the general account.

One of the most crucial distinctions to be made in an investigation such as this is that which sets off variation in the underlying form

of a given morpheme from that which relates the phonetic reflexes of one and the same underlying form; we are here concerned with the former type of variation and not the purely phonological variation which arises from the action of local sound changes. For example, the third plural present active of the verb 'have' occurs variously as [éxun], [éxune], [éxni], [éx'in].²⁾ The third form is probably, however, merely the normal reflex in northern dialects of an underlying /éxune/; for, as is well known, northern dialects delete unstressed high vowels and raise unstressed mid ones, so that from the phonetic form we can work backwards quite easily to the appropriate underlying /éxune/. Just slightly more complicated is the case of [éx'in] (found in Lesbos). What happens in this case is that an underlying /éxun/ is acted on by the rule of high vowel loss to yield [éxn] and this in turn is converted to [éxin] by the insertion of the same epenthetic [i] as breaks up the final cluster of [i/ílusm] 'my friend', which arises by normal northern phonological processes from /i + ílos + mu/. Finally the new [i] palatalizes the preceding [x]. Thus [éx'in] would be regarded by us as merely a local rendition of /éxun/, while [éxni] would represent /éxune/, so that the variants are not four, but two. For the purpose of the present study, the main phonological rules which are needed in order to account for local variations in phonetic form are, in addition to the high vowel loss and raising just mentioned, those which act on underlying sequences of nasal + stop. These convert an underlying /nt/ to [nd] in most dialects, to [d] (or [dd]) in some, and in Karpathos (with obscure restrictions) to [tt].

To simplify the exposition, the fifty five points for which information is presented are arranged in a 7 × 8 matrix in such a manner that relative positioning and approximate orientations are preserved (i.e. the tables are topologically correct). These points are shown (see table 1) in the arrangement which is used throughout. The broken lines partition the dialects into what on phonological grounds may be regarded as their most natural subsets. On the left we have the dialects of the Ionian Isles and the Peloponnese ('Peloponnesian-Ionian'); the top area comprises the northern dialect complex and in the bottom right we have what I shall call the 'insular' dialects, although various islands such as Skiros, Skopelos,

²⁾ Phonetic forms are enclosed in square brackets in the case of full words and are italicized in the case of endings. Diagonals represent 'underlying' forms.

The Dialect Geography of Modern Greek Passive Inflections 265

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	Zitsa (Ep.)	Germa (Kastoria)	Velvandos (Thess.)	Chalkidiki	Thasos	Pithio (E. Thrace)
2	Corfu	Dodona (Ep.)	Sikourio (Thess.)	Skopelos	Limnos	Samothraki
3	Kephalonia	Amnotopos (Arta)	Aya Triada (Lamia)	Kokkinomilya (N. Euboea)	Skiros	Lesbos
4	Zakinthos	Etoliko	Megara	Kimi (C. Euboea)	Chios	Samos
5	Killini	Manesi	Aegina	Naxos	Ikaria	Kalimnos
6	Lala	Yokareika	Zea	Kimolos	Astipalea	Kos
7	Kopanitsa	Lakonia	Sphakia (W. Crete)	Santorini	Karpathos	Simi
8	Kinigou	Anoya	Aya Galini (C. Crete)	E. Crete	Rhodes	Cyprus
		Monemvasia				

Table 1. Topological chart of locations providing data.

Lesbos and others to the north of these fall into the northern dialect area. In the centre we have the so-called 'Old Athenian' group, although my own observations indicate that the special features of Old Athenian phonology, while still evident in the speech of the older generation in Megara and around Kimi (Euboea) are no longer to be found in Aegina, whose inhabitants now speak a dialect which appears to me to be virtually indistinguishable from the modern *κοινή*.

2. The Present Passive

Variation within the present passive paradigm is quite restricted. It may most conveniently be studied by considering the six endings in three pairs: (1) the second and third persons singular, (2) the first person singular and the third person plural and (3) the first and second persons plural.

(1) The second and third persons singular ('2S' and '3S'). These endings appear to be absolutely uniform throughout the whole area; that is, we find *'ese* and *'ete* respectively (or the *'isi*, *'iti* which arise in northern dialects from the process of mid vowel raising). No variants have ever turned up in my field work and only two minor departures are known to me in the literature. First, instead of *'ese*, *'e* is cited by Pangalos (1955 : 336) and Chatzidakis (1905 : 385) for Sphakia in western Crete, although my own informants in Chora ton Sphakion gave me [*éršese*] 'you come'. Secondly Psaltis (1905 : 76) reports the syncopated 3S forms *χρείασ.ται* and *φάιν.ται* ([*xriázte*] [*fénte*]?) for Saranda Ekklesies in eastern Thrace, and the phenomenon is found in Lesbos after nasals (cf. [*x'ínti*] 'it is poured' from [*xínete*], Kretschmer, 1905 : 311).

(2) First person singular and third person plural ('1S' and '3P'). The only important focus of variation here lies in the choice between [*o*] and [*u*] as the initial vowel. In some dialects the endings have [*o*] in both cases (*'ome*, *'onde*) and these are marked 'O' in table 2. In others [*u*] occurs instead of [*o*] in 3P alone ('1' in the table), while still others have [*u*] in both cases ('2'). It may be noted that in northern dialects unstressed /*o*/ is converted to [*u*] and unstressed /*u*/ drops, so that the entry 'O' at the points representing these dialects implies that the phonetic forms are *'umi* and *'unde* (or *'ude*) while '1' indicates that we have *'umi* and *'ndi* (or *'di*). Thus the form for 'they sit' at Raftena (2C) is [*káðði*], which derives from an underlying [*káðunte*] by the phonological processes operative in

The Dialect Geography of Modern Greek Passive Inflections 267

that area. In particular /nt/ goes to [d] and /u/ drops, creating a sequence [θd] which is then converted by the usual voicing assimilation rule to [δd]. A similar situation obtains at Germa (1C) where [akúγdi] 'they are heard' is reported for /akúγunte/ (Georgiou, 1962) and Limnos (2F, Kretschmer, 1905 : 313), which has [féndin] 'they appear' (underlying /fénunten/?).³) This final [n] is also found in

Table 2. Initial vowel of 1S and 3P present passive endings. 0: [o] in both endings; 1: [o] in 1S, [u] in 3P; 2: [u] in 1S and 3P. Diagonals express alternatives and dots points for which data are lacking.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1		0	1	0	.	.	.
2	0	0	1	.	.	1	0
3	2	0	0
4	2	.	0	1	1	0	0
5	2	2	2	2	1	1	1
6	2	2	.	1	0	0	1
7	2	0/2	.	1	0/1	1	0/2
8	.	2	2	1	1	1	2

Lesbos ([fénudín] etc.), but here the regular occurrence of [u] in the third plural puts Lesbian into the class with underlying /o/ in both persons.

The only remaining local peculiarity is that loss of the final [i] < /e/ in 1S which is found in Lesbos⁴) and Samothraki and is reported by Psaltis (1905 : 76) for Saranda Ekklesies. The whole question of the loss of secondary high vowels in northern dialects is beset with difficulties and it is therefore uncertain whether this particular phenomenon is to be regarded as the result of the action of a local phonological rule on /ome/, in which case it is not to be considered a peculiarity in the underlying form at all, or whether we should set up an idiosyncratic /omi/ or /om/. It may be noted that in Lesbos, where *um* occurs in 1S of the imperfect passive for /omu(n)/, homonymic clash occurs between the present and imperfect: [káθum] represents /káθome/ 'I sit' and /káθomun/ 'I was sitting'.

Of much greater significance in the development of the modern *νοινή* is the replacement of earlier [o] by [u] in dialects other than

³) Compare also the [mavezódi]/[mazévdí] reported for Imbros (Andriotis, 1930).

⁴) Kretschmer (1905) does not appear to note this but I have found it to be regular at the places with which I am familiar (Plumari, Ayassos, Molivo).

northern ones. There are three easily discernible stages. Some insular dialects (Chios, Astipalea, Kimolos and Corfu) retain the original [o] in both persons; then most other insular dialects proceed to replace *‘onde* by *‘unde* in the third plural. Finally in the Peloponnese both persons are affected: [káðume], [káðunde]; at any rate all informants I questioned stated that this represented the normal situation there, although some claimed that the occurrence of [o] in one or both of these forms was not unknown even in ordinary colloquial speech. Koukoules (1908) records *‘ome* and *‘ume* for 1S in Lakonia and the apparently unique *-óðan*, or *-úðan* for 3P.

(3) The first and second persons plural (‘1P’, ‘2P’). It is in these members of the paradigm that dialectal variation is concentrated. The data available to me are presented in table 3.⁵⁾

Table 3. Present passive first and second plural endings

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	-ómaste ‘ísti	‘umésti ‘ísti ‘isésti	-ómastene -ósaste	‘umasti ‘ísti		-ómesta ‘este
2	-omástene -osástene -ósaste	-ómasti ‘ísti	‘umsti ‘ísti	‘oméste ‘este		-ómaste -óste
3	-ómaste -ósaste	-ómasti ‘ísti	-ómaste ‘este	-ómaste -ósaste	‘este	-ómisti -ósti ‘ísti
4	-omástene -osástene	-ómasti ‘este	-ómast -ósast	-ómaste -ósaste	‘omaste ‘esaste	-ómeste -óste
5	-ómaste -ósaste	-ómaste -ósaste	-ómaste -ósaste	‘úmesta ‘este		‘úmeste ‘este
6	-ómaste -ósaste	-ómaste -ósaste	‘umáste ‘usáste	‘umaste ‘este	‘oméste ‘este	‘umeste ‘este
7	-ómaste -ósaste	-ómaste ‘úmaste -ósaste ‘úsaste	-ómaste ‘este	-ómesta -úmesta	‘úmeda ‘este	‘úmesta ‘este
8	-ómaste -ósaste	-ómaste -ósaste	‘uméstane ‘este	‘uméstane ‘este	‘úmeste ‘este	‘úmastin ‘este

⁵⁾ Data for Santorini are from Georgakas (1934). The other points for which I have drawn on published studies are listed in footnote 1. Papa-christodoulos (1958) and Menardos (1925) provide several variants for 1P in both the present and imperfect in their descriptions of the dialects of Rhodes and Cyprus respectively.

Certain questions concerning stress placement are discussed below in connection with the imperfect passive, as are the interlocking functions of augmentation and inflectional suffixes in keeping apart the present and imperfect in these two persons. Attention may be drawn at this point to the relations which hold between the segmental constitution of the two plural endings in question. Perhaps the most striking point of divergence lies in the occurrence in many northern and insular dialects of the ending *‘este* (northern *‘isti*) in 2P, contrasted with the various ‘extended’ forms such as *-ósaste* found in Peloponnesian-Ionian and sporadically elsewhere. The endings of 1P itself display three basic patterns, *-ómaste*, *-ómeste*, *-ómesta*. The taxonomic procedure we shall adopt here will be to set up the *-ómaste* : *‘este* combination as basic and assume that the other patterns derive from this by two processes.

Firstly 1P may convert the vowels of its last two syllables to *|e| + |e|* by what we shall call ‘assimilation’ (sc. to the vowels of *‘este*) or it may metathesize them. Secondly 2P may develop an extended form on the basis of either an assimilated or metathesized 1P. There are thus five possibilities:

- (1) The basic pattern is retained. This is the case with, for instance, the dialect of Simi (7G), which has *-ú mesta* : *‘este* and of Karpathos (7F) with its archaic *-ú meða* : *‘este*.
- (2) 1P undergoes assimilation. The *‘oméste* : *‘este* of Astipalea (6F) would fall into this category.
- (3) 1P undergoes metathesis. An example would be the *-ómaste* : *‘isti* of Zitsa (1B).
- (4) Assimilation of 1P is followed by extension of 2P. This would be expected to result in *-ómeste* : *-óseste*, although there appear to be no examples of precisely this combination of sequences. What we do find in Chios (4F) is *-ómeste* : *-óste* and it seems reasonable to suppose that in this particular case assimilation and extension were succeeded by the third process of dissimilatory loss (haplology). That is, from *-ómaste* : *‘este* came *-ómeste* : *‘este* and then by extension *-ómeste* : *-óseste*. The latter underwent dissimilatory deletion of its second syllable.
- (5) Metathesis is followed by extension of 2P. Thus in Samos we find *-umásti* : *-usásti* and in the Peloponnese *-ómaste* : *-ósaste*. Samothraki appears to have a syncopated form of this : *-ómaste* : *-óste*. If we refer to these five categories as ‘O’ (basic patterns retained),

'A' (assimilated), 'M' (metathesized), 'AE' (assimilated extended) and 'ME' (metathesized extended), the areal distribution of the various types may be represented as in table 4.

Table 4. Vocalic patterns of 1P and 2P endings in present passive. 0: no change from basic *e . . . e*; M: 1P metathesized; A: 1P assimilated; E: 2P extended

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1		M	A	ME	M	.	0
2	ME	M	A	A	.	.	ME
3	ME	M	M	M	ME	.	A
4	ME	M	ME	ME	ME	AE	ME
5	ME	ME	ME	.	0	.	0
6	ME	ME	.	AE	M	A	A
7	ME	ME	.	M	0	0	0
8	.	ME	ME	0	0	0	M

If we remember that the 'basic pattern' is also historically the oldest it is clear on inspection that the insular dialects represent the most conservative state of affairs. The innovatory features display a certain degree of randomness in their distribution, but the general pattern is clear. While assimilation appears to be the predominant trend in the north-easterly regions of the area under consideration, metathesis is evidently characteristic of Peloponnesian-Ionian and the more westerly of the northern dialects. Extension of 2P is clearly shown to be of southern and Ionian origin and the swath which it cuts across the map to Chios and Samos possibly mirrors the prestigious character of Peloponnesian-Ionian.

There is one final point of instability in the present passive endings which is worth considering. It has already been seen (table 2) that the 1S and 3P endings may have initially either /o/ or /u/. It now appears that the first plural ending likewise appears with /u/ in most insular dialects, including that of Karpathos, which in other respects is strikingly isolated on its retention of the ancient *-me ϑ a*. There are altogether five o/u patterns possible within the present passive paradigm: (1) /ooo/. /o/ occurs in 1S, 1P and 3P. This is the case in certain peripheral northern dialects (W. Epirus, Samothraki, Lesbos, Samos) and Corfu. (2) /oou/. /u/ occurs only in 3P. This is found at certain points in the north and in Old Athenian. (3) /uou/. In Kephallonia, Zakynthos and the Peloponnese 1S and 3P, but not 1P have the high vowel. (4) /ouu/.

The Dialect Geography of Modern Greek Passive Inflections 271

This is characteristic of the insular dialects, although Chios and Astipalea have the /ooo/ pattern and Ikaria /oou/. Kimolos is said to have /u/ only in 1P (Vogiatzidis 1925), which makes it unique in this respect. (5) /uuu/. This occurs in Cyprus and optionally in Simi and Lakonia.⁶⁾

Table 5 The imperfect passive endings

<i>Northern</i>						
1B. Zitsa	¹ umun	¹ usun	¹ undan	-ómastan	¹ ustan	¹ undan
1C. Germa	¹ uman	¹ usan	¹ dan	¹ umàstan	¹ usàstan	¹ dan
1D. Velvendos	¹ uman	¹ usan	¹ undan	-umàstan	-usàstan	¹ undan
1E. Chalkidiki	¹ uman	¹ usan	¹ undan	-ómastan	-ósastan	¹ undan
1F. Thasos	¹ uman	¹ usan	¹ udan	¹ umstan	¹ ustan	¹ udan
1G. Pithio	¹ uman	¹ usan	¹ undan	-ómastan	¹ ustan	¹ undan
2B. Dodona	¹ uman	¹ usan	¹ undan	-ómastan	-ósastan	¹ undan
2C. Raftena	¹ uman	¹ usan	¹ dan	¹ umstan	¹ ustan	¹ dan
2D. Sikourio	¹ oman	¹ osan	¹ ondan	-omàstan	-osàstan	¹ ondan
2E. Skopelos	-ómna	-ósna	-ótani	-ómasni	-ósasni	-ótstani
2F. Limnos	¹ omne	¹ esne	¹ ndan	¹ omèste	¹ este	¹ ndan
2G. Samothraki	¹ um	¹ osun	¹ undan	-ómastan	-óstan	¹ undan
3B. Ammotopos	¹ uman	¹ usan	¹ undan	¹ umastan	¹ ustan	¹ undan
3C. Laspi	-ómuna	-ósuna	¹ etan ¹ ondan	-ómastan	-ósastan	¹ ondan
3D. Aya Triada	¹ oman	¹ osan	¹ ondan	-ómastan	-ósastan	¹ ondan
3E. Kokkinomilya	-ómuna	-ósuna	¹ etan	-ómastan	-óstan	¹ ondan
3F. Skiros	-ómone	-ósone	-ótan	-ómaste	-ósaste	-ótan
3G. Lesbos	¹ um	¹ us	¹ ud	-ómastan	-óstan	-ódan
4B. Etoliko	-ómna	-ósna	-ódane	-ómasti	-ósasti	-ódane
4C. Arachova	¹ omna	-ósna	-ótan	-ómast	-ósast	-óntsan
4G. Samos	-ómna	-ósna	-ódane	-umástni	-usástni	-ódane
<i>Peloponnesian-Ionian</i>						
2A. Corfu	-ómuna	-ósuna	-ótune	-omástene	-osástene	-óndane
3A. Kephallonia	-ómuna	-ósuna	-ótuna	-ómaste	-ósaste	-ódane
4A. Zakynthos	-ómuna	-ósuna	-ótuna	-ómaste	-ósaste	-óndane
5A. Killini	-ómuna	-ósuna	-ótane	-ómaste	-ósaste	-ótsade
5B. Manesi	-ómuna	-ósuna	-ótane	-ómaste	-ósaste	-óndusan
5C. Chalki	-ómuna	-ósuna	-ótane	-ómaste	-ósaste	-ósane
6A. Lala	-ómuna	-ósuna	-ótane	-ómaste	-ósaste	-ósande

⁶⁾ Peloponnesian informants whom I confronted with -úmaste claimed it to be unknown outside Mani. This comment is supported by the paradigm cited by Blanken (1951) for Cargese (¹ome, ¹ese, ¹ete, -úmaste, ¹este, ¹ude). I do not have a record of any personal observation on this point for Mani itself, but the nearest village to Mani at which I made enquiries (Anoya, 8B) has -úmaste in the imperfect (and I would suspect in the present, although only -ómaste was supplied).

272

B. E. Newton

6B. Yokareika	-ómuna	-ósuna	-ótane	-ómaste	-ósaste	-ósade
6C. Ligourio	-ómuna	-ósuna	-ótane	-ómaste	-ósaste	-ósande
7A. Kopanitsa	-ómuna	-ósuna	-ótane	-ómaste	-ósaste	-ósande
7B. Lakonia	-ómuna	-ósuna	-ótane	-ómastun	-ósastun	-ódusan -ódane -ódustan
7C. Kinouria	-ómuna	-ósuna	-ótane	-ómaste	-ósaste	-óndusan
8A. Kinigou	-ómuna	-ósuna	-ótane	-ómaste	-ósaste	-ósande
8B. Anoya	-ómuna	-ósuna	-ótane	-ómaste	-ósaste	-óndusan
8C. Monemvasia	-ómuna	-ósuna	-ótane	-ómaste	-ósaste	-óndustan
<i>Old Athenian</i>						
4D. Megara	-ómuna	-ósuna	-ótane	-ómaste	-ósaste	-ódune
4E. Kimi	-ómane	-ésane	-étane	-ómastane	-ésastane	-óndisane
5D. Aegina	-ómuna	-ósuna	-ótane	-ómaste	-ósaste	-ódune -ódisan
<i>Insular</i>						
4F. Chios	-ómuna	-ósuna	-ótane	-ómaste	-ósaste	-óndane -ótane
5E. Naxos	ˈumu	ˈusu	ˈuda ˈudàne	ˈímesta	ˈeste	ˈuda ˈudàne
5F. Ikaria	ˈumun	ˈusun	ˈeto	ˈímasten	ˈúsasten	ˈundan
5G. Kalimnos	ˈumu	ˈusu	ˈeto	ˈímeste	ˈeste	ˈuddo
6D. Zea	ˈúmuna	ˈúsuna	ˈúdane	ˈímasténe	ˈúsasténe	ˈúdane
6E. Kimolos	ˈumun	ˈusun	ˈundane -ótane	ˈímaste	ˈeste	-óndane
6F. Astipalea	ˈumun	ˈusun	ˈeton	ˈomésta	ˈeste	ˈondo ˈundan
6G. Kos	ˈúmuna	ˈúsuna	ˈundan	ˈímaston	ˈéston	ˈundan
7D. Sphakia	-ómuna	-ósuna	-ótane	-ómaste	-ósaste	-ótane
7E. Santorini	-ómuna	-úsune	-ótane	-úmesta	ˈeste	ˈuda
7F. Karpathos	ˈumun	ˈusu	ˈeto	ˈímeða	ˈeste	ˈutto
7G. Simi	ˈumun	ˈusun	ˈeto	ˈímesta	ˈúsasto	ˈúdda
8D. Aya Galini	-ómuna	-ósuna	ˈúdone	ˈuméstane	-ósaste	-ótane
8E. E. Crete	ˈumune	ˈusune	ˈudo	ˈumèstane	ˈeste	ˈuda
8F. Rhodes	ˈumun	ˈusun	ˈeton	ˈumeston	ˈuston	ˈundon
8G. Cyprus	ˈumun	ˈesun	ˈetun	ˈúmastin	ˈestun	ˈundan

3. Imperfect Passive

It is in the imperfect passive paradigm (see table 5) that we find the greatest range of dialectal variation. As in the case of the present passive it is convenient to consider the six members of the paradigm in groups of two: (1) the first and second persons singular; (2) the third persons singular and plural and (3) the first and second persons plural. The first pair does not raise any point of particular interest,

but discussion of the third person forms requires special consideration of the distribution of dialects which fail to distinguish singular from plural (usually by generalization of the plural member of the pair), and the segmental constitution of the multifarious forms of the third plural poses problems of a taxonomic nature (and, closely related to this, problems of historical provenance). With regard to the first and second persons plural we shall take a somewhat more detailed look than the paucity of data has thus far warranted at the respective roles of augmentation and ending in keeping apart the present and imperfect tenses. Finally, we shall consider briefly the various patterns of stress placement in relation to word length as they are exemplified in the dialectal forms of the imperfect passive.⁷⁾

(1) *First and second persons singular*. Aside from the questions of stress placement which will be raised later, the main point of variation here lies in the vowel sequences of the two endings. Essentially the 'overall' form of the 1S ending has the structure $V_1mV_2n(V_3)$ and dialects can most easily be grouped by specifying the vowel triple which characterizes them; the 2S ending in practically all cases differs only in having $[s]$ instead of $[m]$; where variation in the vowels does occur the second vowel is shown raised in the relevant tables. Tables 6, 7 and 8 specify the choice of first, second and third vowel respectively in the endings of 1S and 2S imperfect passive. For instance, if the entries for a particular dialect in the three tables are u^e , u , \emptyset then the actual forms will be umun , esun . Once again the putative 'underlying' vowels are given in the case of all dialects, which means that for points in northern Greece the entry

⁷⁾ My sources for the imperfect forms are drawn from published studies in the case of the points listed in footnote 1. In other cases my own data are given in Table 5 whether or not they agree with any previously published account. The discrepancies known to me probably spring to some extent from the standardizing slant which tends to infect information given to foreigners, but in some cases there may have been a genuine ousting of earlier usages. For Chios Pernot (1946), citing data gathered in the first decade of the century, gives ume , usu , uton , ómeste , óste , onda . My data (gathered, as are his, from Piryí), look suspiciously standardizing, although I elicited ómeste , óste for the present. For Santorini, Georgakas (1934) cites, in addition to the forms I found, umu , usu and (3P) údane . My information for Lesbos (Plumari and Ayassos) may be compared to that provided by Kretschmer (1905), whose forms are $^um(dan)$, ustan / usna / usun / us , idu , ómasti / ómastan , ósastan / óstati , udan / ódan . I could find no support for the statement in Chatzidakis (1905: 60) that ómane occurs in the Peloponnese and northern mainland.

'o' for an unaccented vowel may represent phonetic [u], and 'u' may represent zero. Thus the *-ómna* : *-ósna* of Arachova (4C) appear in the tables as *o*, *u*, *a*. It is important to notice, however, that, as is clear from the last case, not every instance of underlying /u/ is lost. The conditions under which high vowel loss occurs are unfortunately incompletely understood, but it is in general the case that it fails

Tables 6, 7 and 8. The vowels at first second and third position of 1S and 2S imperfect passive endings

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1		o	o	o	o	o	o
2	o	o	o	o	o	o ^e	o
3	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
4	o	o	o	o	o ^e	o	o
5	o	o	o	o	u	u	u
6	o	o	o	u	u	u	u
7	o	o	o	o	o	u	u
8	o	o	o	o	u	u	u ^e

(6)

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1		u	a	a	a	a	a
2	u	a	a	a	u	u	u
3	u	a	u	a	u	o	u
4	u	u	u	u	a	u	u
5	u	u	u	u	u	u	u
6	u	u	u	u	u	u	u
7	u	u	u	u	u	u	u
8	u	u	u	u	u	u	u

(7)

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1		ø	ø	ø	ø	ø	ø
2	a	ø	ø	ø	a	e	ø
3	a	ø	a	ø	a	e	ø
4	a	a	a	a	e	a ^e	a
5	a	a	a	a	ø	ø	ø
6	a	a	a	a	ø	ø	ø
7	a	a	a	a	a ^e	ø	ø
8	a	a	a	a	e	ø	ø

(8)

where a final dyadic consonant cluster would result. It may, of course, be reasonably asked how we distinguish in the case of a form such as *ʼumun* occurrences of /o/ which are raised by the local phonological rules to [u] and those of /u/ which resist high vowel loss. The answer must be that, while in some cases we cannot recover the underlying structure, in most cases the existence of fluctuation in the pronunciation of local speakers will provide a crucial clue. Thus in many northern dialects both *ʼomun* and *ʼumun* may alternate even in the speech of a single person, which suggests that we have /omun/; the pronunciations listed in table 5 represent the

forms as they were elicited at the time, although experience has shown that under the artificial conditions of the interviewing situation northern speakers are far more likely to provide an underlying rather than normal phonetic vowel when the underlying vowel is directly represented in standard speech. The *-ómone* : *-ósone* of Skiros is unique in having /o/ as second vowel, and it is tempting to posit some sort of hypercorrective phenomenon. The *ˈumu* : *ˈusu* of Kalimnos and elsewhere merely reflect underlying forms with an /n/ which has been lost by the rule which operates throughout most dialects except those of Chios, Rhodes, Cyprus and a few smaller islands and which deletes wordfinal nasals, although not normally on verb forms. The *ˈum* : *ˈus* of Lesbos presumably represents /omun/ : /osun/, but in this case high vowel loss did occur in spite of the threatened creation of an unacceptable cluster; the /n/ was then lost by a cluster simplification rule (not by the rule of final nasal loss as an [n] is realised in other members of the paradigm).

(2) *Third singular and third plural*. The 3S form is in general distinguished from 3P in having a simple /t/, but the plural /nt/ forms are in many dialects borrowed into the singular. Specifically singular forms have the general shape $V_1tV_2n(V_3)$, where $V_1 = /e/$ or $/o/$, $V_2 = /a/$, $/o/$ or $/u/$ and $V_3 = /e/$, zero, or, in the dialect of Kephallonia (3A) and Zakynthos (4A), $/a/$. Of the eighteen forms

Table 9. The third person singular imperfect passive. 1: *-ótan*; 2: *-ótane*; 3: *-ótune*; 4: *-ótuna*; 1*: *ˈetan*; 2*: *ˈétane*; 5*: *ˈeton*; 6*: *ˈetun*; P: same form as in plural

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1		P	P	P	P	P	P
2	3	P	P	P	2	P	P
3	4	P	1*	P	1*	1	P
4	4	P	1	2	2*	2	P
5	2	2	2	2	P	5*	5*
6	2	2	2	P	2/P	5*	P
7	2	2	2	2	2	5*	5*
8	2	2	2	P	P	5*	6*

allowed by this general formula eight actually occur: *-ótan* ('1'), *-ótane* ('2'), *ˈetan* ('1*'), *ˈétane* ('2*'), *-ótune* ('3'), *-ótuna* ('4'), *ˈeton* ('5*'), *ˈetun* ('6*'). Their distribution in terms of the parenthesized numerals is shown in table 9, the entry 'P' indicating dialects where the plural /nt/ form does duty for both numbers of the verb.

The forms which the 3P ending take fall into two broad classes: (1) forms with /*san*/ (Peloponnesian, Old Athenian) and (2) forms without /*san*/ (other dialects). With regard to the second group, classification is straightforward and can be based as in the case of the forms considered thus far in terms of the characteristic vowel triple realized in the overall pattern $V_1ntV_2n(V_3)$. The first vowel is /*o*/ or /*u*/ (compare table 2), the second /*a*/ or /*o*/, and the third /*e*/ or zero. Of the eight combinations allowed for, seven occur: -*unda*(*n*), -*undo*(*n*), -*undane*, -*undone*, -*onda*(*n*), -*ondane*, -*ondo*(*n*). At three points (Skiros, and Sphakia and Aya Galini in Crete) a characteristically singular form was given by informants with plural meaning, and this usage is not entirely unknown in written demotic. Furthermore I have been told in Corfu that besides the normal -*ótune* (sing.): -*óndane* (plural), -*ótane* can be used for both singular and plural. But although -*ótane* was provided as the plural form in both W. Crete (Chora ton Sphakion) and central (Aya Galini), neither Pangalos (1955) nor Anagnostopoulos (1926) cite any plural form other than -*udane*. They provide the singulars 'edo(*ne*) (West) and 'udo(*ne*) (East) while I found -*ótane* at Chora ton Sphakion and -*údone* at Aya Galini. On balance it is likely that the paradigm cited for E. Crete, which is drawn from these authors, and which is claimed by them to be general throughout the island, represents the true dialectal situation.

The variants of the [*san*] forms of the third plural are -*ósane*, -*ósande*, -*óndusan*, -*óndustan*, -*ótsande*, and -*óndisane*, all found in the Peloponnese with the exception of the last, which is found in the Kimi region (apparently as an alternant for -*óndane*, -*úndane* cited by Phavis, 1911). The -*ótstani* of Skopelos (Kretschmer 1905 : 318) and the -*óntsan* of Arachova are presumably northern renditions of /*óndustane*/ and /*óndusan*/ respectively. I have listed in table 5 the forms stated to be most usual at the various points in the Peloponnese, but -*óndusan* appears to be quite common throughout the area, especially in the towns, and when informants cited it as an alternative to -*ósande* etc. they agreed in their relative evaluations: -*óndusan* was invariably claimed to be more 'correct'. At Tripoli and Nafplio I was told that forms such as [*erxósande*] 'they were coming' were typical of 'village Greek' (χωριάτικα). This raises a problem to which there does not seem to be an easy answer, for while most of the morphophonemic reflexes of the personal endings can be traced to a particular local variety of the language, -*óndusan* does not appear to have any clear provenance within existing ver-

naculars. There is one dialect, that of Kimi, in which *-óndisane* seems to represent the unique vernacular manifestation of the ending, and *-óndusan* exists in competition with *-óndune* in Megara, which suggests Old Athenian as a possible source. But the present limited distribution of this dialect in the isolated Megara and Kimi is on the face of it a difficulty. However, there is evidence that Old Athenian was once spoken over a much wider area, including Attica and Southern Euboea, which were since occupied by Albanian-speaking populations. Whatever the local origin of *-óndusan*, its linguistic sources are equally puzzling. It is very difficult to relate it to the *-úsan* of the two oxytone conjugations (Pernot 1946 : 295) for it is precisely in the general area associated with *-óndusan* that the oxytone conjugations show [*ayapáyane*] 'they used to love' and [*zíyane*] 'they used to live' rather than the [*ayapúsan*], [*zúsan*] which this account requires. Perhaps a comparison of the Old Athenian forms *-óndisane* (Kimi) and *-óndune* (Megara) again points in the right direction, and what we have is a blend of an ending *-ísane* (modelled on *ἦσαν*, 'they were'?) and *-óndune*. The synchronic taxonomy in any case must recognise a general structure /*ó(ntu)san(e)*/ with a 'floating' /*t*/ prefixed in some dialects to the final vowel (and probably related historically to the /*t*/ of the second plural ending). The observation of the 'three syllable rule' in the Peloponnese precludes the occurrence of both /*ntu*/ and /*e*/, and the paradigmatic pressure exerted by the other proparoxytone members of the plural requires one or the other, so that we find four cases: (a) /*ntu*/ : *-óndusan*, (b) /*ntu*/ + /*t*/ : *-óndustan*, (c) /*e*/ : *-ósane*, (d) /*e*/ + /*t*/ : *-ósande*. The *-ótsande* of Killini (5A) may represent the influence of northern phonology on /*óntusante*/, the loss of /*u*/ allowing the occurrence of both /*ntu*/ and /*e*/ without violation of the stress rules.

(3) *First and second persons plural*. The main point of interest here lies in the comparison of the imperfect and the present. Reference to tables 3 and 5 will show that in Peloponnesian and most insular dialects no tense distinction is made in the endings of these two persons; thus in the former dialectal area *-ómaste* : *-ósaste* serve both tenses and in the latter *-ómeste*, *-úmeste* or some similar form occurs for 1P in both tenses and *-este* in 2P. There are four points where 2P has the *-este* form of the present and the extended *-ósaste* in the imperfect with no distinction in the 1P; these points are marked with a '1' in table 10. However, there is some doubt about the

validity of the responses I received in Crete in so far as while my own informants at Chora ton Sphakion and Aya Galini made the distinction when questioned specifically on the point neither Pangalos (1955) nor Anagnostopoulos (1926) recognise an extended form of the imperfect 2P for Crete and have *‘este* for both tenses. It is not therefore impossible that the *-ósaste* form of the 2P imperfect is a recent introduction from standard Athenian or that the framing of my question encouraged the preference for greater differentiation than the local reality warranted. The other points at which a present *‘este* was contrasted with imperfect *-ósaste* or its dialectal reflex were Etoliko (4B) and Skiros (3F). The other dialects with a present : imperfect contrast in the persons in question suffix *-an* to both 2P and 1P in the imperfect.⁸⁾ The data I have for Zakynthos indicate as they stand the converse situation with a present in final *-ne*, but there is reason to suspect that the *-ne* is in fact optional there in both tenses, as is the case in Corfu. The entry ‘2’ in table 10

Table 10. Present/imperfect contrast in 1P and 2P. 0: no difference; 1: 2P differs other than in final suffix; 2: 1P and 2P have special suffix in imperfect; 3: special suffix in imperfect is combined with some other difference in 2P; M: miscellaneous

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1		3	3	3	3	.	3
2	0	3	3	3	.	.	2
3	0	3	3	3	3	1	2
4	0	1	0	0	2	1	2
5	0	0	0	0	0	.	0
6	0	0	0	2	0	M	2
7	0	2	0	1	0	0	2
8	0	0	0	1	0	3	M

refers to these dialects, and ‘3’ to those which both use a special suffix in imperfect 1P and 2P and make some other distinction in 2P in the prefinal syllable of the ending. This is sometimes a matter of simply combining ‘1’ and ‘2’ (i.e. adding *-an* in 2P to a contrastively extended *-ósaste*). Thus Aya Triada (3D) has present *‘este* versus imperfect *-ósastan*, and a similar situation is found in other parts of northern Greece. Elsewhere the prefinal contrast in 2P is

⁸⁾ But Lakonia uses *-un* and Rhodes *-on*; Cyprus has present *‘este* versus imperfect *‘estun*.

made slightly differently, some points contrasting a present *‘este* with imperfect *‘ostan* (or their dialectal reflexes).

It may thus be seen that where present 1 P and 2 P are kept apart from their imperfect counterparts at all, this is usually achieved by means of the tense marker *-an* in the imperfect, but that contrast is rare outside northern dialects. Throughout practically the whole of the Peloponnese, for example, the endings for both tenses are *-ómaste*, *-ósaste*, and the insular dialects have *-úmaste*, *-úmeda* or variants of these for 1 P while *‘este* serves both tenses of 2 P. This lack of distinction in inflectional endings is to some extent offset by the full retention of the augment in some dialects, particularly in the insular ones; thus in Karpathos the imperfect corresponding to [*érkeste*] ‘you come’ has the so-called ‘temporal’ augment, giving [*írkeste*], although this possibility does not occur when the initial syllable is unstressed, so that [*erkúmeda*] serves both tenses. Although Triandaphyllidis (1963) has offered a broad outline of the interplay of augment and ending in the distinction of tenses it might be worth while to relate the more detailed information on endings offered above to the available facts regarding the dialect geography of the augment.⁹⁾

Consonant initial verbs are augmented in the past tenses according to one of four possible patterns:

- (a) The stressed form of the augment is *-e* and the unstressed zero. That is, disyllabic forms are augmented, so that we get, for instance, [*éfaya*] ‘I ate’ but [*fáyame*] ‘we ate’.
- (b) The stressed form is *-é* and the unstressed *-e*.
- (c) The stressed form is *-í* and the unstressed *-e*.
- (d) The stressed form is *-í* and the unstressed *-i*.

The main difficulty in plotting the dialectal distribution of the augment arises from the fact that in many areas there is a greater or lesser degree of optionality in the use of the unstressed *-e* form so that it is in particular not always easy to distinguish between dialects of types (a) and (b). I have never noted the occurrence of *e-* in northern Greece, except in one or two cases where the speaker’s

⁹⁾ The relatively rare vowel-initial verbs are not augmented where consonant-initial ones fall into the ‘0’ or ‘0/1’ category. Otherwise the initial vowel tends to be replaced by *i-* or *e-* in stressed and (less frequently) unstressed position in rough accordance with the usage governing consonant-initial verbs. The omission of this class does not seriously affect the discussion.

'register' was clearly 'elevated'; on the other hand in Cyprus, Rhodes and Crete -e is rarely omitted.

However, in many dialects, especially those of the Peloponnese and Corfu it is not possible to give a rigid rule; one of the conditioning factors deleting the stressed and unstressed augment is post-vocalic position, but it is usually dropped initially and postconsonantly, without it being at all clear what extralinguistic factors, if any, control this. Using '0/1' to represent this ambiguous situation, the data may be represented as in table 11. The figures '0, 1, 2, 3' are used to correspond to the situations a, b, c, d sketched above.

Table 11. Preconsonantal augment. 0: *é, ø*; 1: *é, e*; 2: *í, e*; 3: *íi*,

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	0/1	0	.	0	.	0	0
2	0/1	0	0	0	.	.	0
3	1	0	.	.	0	.	0
4	1	0	0	0/1	0	.	0
5	0/1	0/1	0/1	.	3	3	1
6	0/1	0/1	0/1	.	3	3	1
7	0/1	0/1	0/1	1	1	1	1
8	0/1	0/1	0/1	2	2	1	1

A comparison of table 11 with table 10 will suggest a remarkable degree of complementarity in the distribution of the points with augment in all positions (represented by '1', '2' or '3' in table 11) and those with some means or the other of distinguishing the present from the imperfect in 1P and 2P by means of the respective endings. The only point where '0' occurs on both maps is Arachova (4C). While I found no evidence for the use of unstressed augment there, the tenses were not distinguishable by the endings either. That the unstressed augment should be available when required in this particular dialect seems unlikely, for the forms provided there ([*rxómast*] 'we come', [*rxósast*] 'you come') suggest in themselves that both initial and final underlying /e/ tends in general to be lost. In the Peloponnese, although the unstressed augment is occasionally heard even in the speech of unsophisticated villagers, I never found any evidence that in the 1P and 2P imperfect forms the probability of its use increased. Indeed that present versus imperfect distinctions are collapsed was often specifically mentioned in statements such as that '[*vlepómaste*] can be used of now or yester-

day'. It may be added that a similar neutralization of the present and imperfect affects 2P active in those dialects in which (a) the unstressed augment is lost and (b) *'ete* occurs in both present and imperfect, as is the case in Corfu and Kephallonia, as well as in all the insular dialects; imperfect (and aorist) *'ete* is also found in some mainland dialects (Saranda Ekklesies, Velvendos, Sikourio, Germa) although in this case a differential stress pattern may serve as a distinguishing factor. Thus in Velvendos [*δúlivéti*] 'you were working' but [*δuléviti*] 'you work'. In Germa (Georgiou, 1962) the *-an* suffix occurs in the imperfect ([*γράfitan*]).

4. Stress and Word Length

The relationship of stress in verbs to word length (as measured in the number of syllables) can most conveniently be studied by considering the three imperfect passive plural endings. The original state of affairs would be represented by dialects such as that of Kalimnos which has *-úmeste*, *'este*, *'uddo* or that of Karpathos with *-úmeda*, *'este*, *'utto*. That is, the number of syllables displays a 3-2-2 pattern and the stress is regressive, falling in all three forms on the antipenultimate syllable. This historically inherited system has been upset in many dialects by the suffixation of elements such as *-an* and *-ne*, and the extension of *'este* to *-ósaste*; secondly stress has shifted in certain dialects in such a way as to fall with a greater degree of uniformity on syllables whose segmental constitutions are most naturally equated. Thus in many areas the stress of *-ómaste* has shifted onto the last syllable of the verb stem to bring 1P into line with 2P *'este* and 3P *'ontan* or their regional equivalents. To take a concrete instance, Rhodes has as the imperfect plural of *έρχομαι* 'come', [*érkumeston*], [*érkuston*], [*érkundon*]. Because the inflectional markers of Greek are suffixed to stems and not prefixed, what this readjustment of stress amounts to is the introduction of a principle whereby stress location is regulated on verb forms in terms of distance from the beginning of the word and not the end.

Both length, augmentation, and stress shift are liable to cause violations of the three syllable rule of modern Greek (the rule forbidding the occurrence of main stress earlier than the third syllable from the end). Now although such violations occur with enclitic sequences in the standard language (*φέρε μου το* 'bring it to me') and are regular in Cypriot phrases involving proparoxytone nouns and verbs followed by one or more enclitics (*σκότωσε τον* 'kill him',

τὸ φόρεμα μου 'my dress') most dialects apparently find such patterns within single words unacceptable and bring them into line by placing a second stress two syllables ahead of the first stress. This second stress is sometimes described by Greek authorities as *δευτερεύων* 'secondary' rather than as *δεύτερος* 'second', which suggests that it is weaker than the first—whence the occasional use of spellings such as *érxomàste*. In view of the deplorable lack of serious work on the suprasegmentals of standard Greek, let alone its dialectal varieties, dogmatic statements would be out of place. However, such work with speakers of dialects alleged to have 'secondary' stress as I have done (in Thessaly and Crete) suggests that 'secondary' stress is a misnomer. In particular the stress and intonation of Thessalian [*érxumásti*] are indistinguishable from those of a sentence such as *πάτα γκάζι* 'step on the gas!' ¹⁰) and the Cretan [*érxuméstane*] is spoken with a stress and intonation pattern which I failed to distinguish from that of *ἔλα αύριο* 'come tomorrow!' If anything, in a word such as [*érxuméstane*] uttered in isolation the second stress seems to be louder and to correspond to what we would doubtless call 'sentence' or 'nuclear' stress were the grammatical facts different. It is worth while noticing that in those modern Greek dialects which have high vowel loss and raising rules both processes are blocked equally by original and second stress (thus Thessalian [*éfayétan*] 'you ate'). There accordingly seems to be a late phonetic rule in most dialects which acts on words with main stress before the antipenultimate syllable and adds a second stress to the syllable next but one after the carrier of the main stress. If this is true, we can ignore the second stress in so far as it is governed by local phonological rules and is not criterial for the morphological features which concern us.¹¹)

The taxonomic scheme we propose depends on the acceptance of the 3-2-2 pattern as basic in the grouping of dialects in terms of word length and of the proparoxytone stress pattern as basic in their grouping in terms of stress. The other patterns are then

¹⁰) I am grateful to V. Phoris, a native of Kozani, for the example, and for discussing the whole problem with me.

¹¹) A detailed description of the stress patterns of dialectal verb forms would also have to consider the possibility that after the development of a second stress the first is completely lost. This seems to occur in Corfu and Zakynthos, and probably Samos, where 'we come' is [*irxumásti*], the raising of the initial /e/ requiring the assumption that it is stressless; compare also the [*finumástani*] 'we used to appear' cited for Samos by Kretschmer (1905 : 318).

regarded as being derived from the basic pattern by the occurrence of various combinations of four fundamental processes.

(1) Lengthening ('L'). By this a syllable is added to 2P when this is one syllable shorter than 1P and to 3P when this is one syllable shorter than 2P. The stress pattern of the longer form in each case is reproduced on the new extended form. Thus the action of one lengthening on *-ómaste*, *ˈeste*, *ˈonde* would lead to some such re-formulation as *-ómaste*, *-ósaste*, *ˈonde* and a further occurrence to *-ómaste*, *-ósaste*, *-óndane*. This double lengthening is typical of the Peloponnesian dialects (marked 'LL' in table 12). Subsequent lengthenings apply first to 1P, and then again to 2P and 3P in that order but with no further stress shift, presumably because there is no longer any model within the triple of plural endings which could generalize its stress pattern to the newly extended 1P. Thus Zea, with *-úmastene*, *-úsastene*, *-údane* represents the action of four lengthenings while that of Kimi, with *-ómastane*, *-ésastane*, *-óndisane* results from a sequence of five applications and is accordingly represented in table 12 as 'LLLLL'.¹²⁾

Table 12. Number of syllables in relation to stress in the imperfect passive plural. L: lengthening; S: stress levelling; H: haplology; -L: shortening; L*: irregular lengthening

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1		0	SL	SL	L	S-L	0
2	LLLL	L	S-L	SL	?	S	LH
3	LL	S	L	L	LH	LS	LHS
4	LL	LL	LL	LL	LLLLL	LL	?
5	LL	LL	LL	LL	0	L	0
6	LL	LL	LL	LLLL	L*	S	0
7	LL	LL	LL	LL	0/L*	0	LS
8	LL	LL	LL	?	SL*	S	0

(2) Stress levelling ('S'). When stress placement counting from the beginning of the word is shared by two of the three plural forms, the

¹²⁾ The Corfiot *-omástane*, *-osástane*, *-óndane* recorded in Table 5 appear to represent the commonest situation, but *-ómastene*, *-ósastene*, *-óndane* is also possible according to my information. The latter implies 'LLLL' (which is recorded in Table 12), while the former would have to be classified as 'SLLLLS'. That is the 'SLLLL' state (*ˈomástene*, *ˈosástene*, *ˈondane*) undergoes loss of the first stress and then a second stress levelling.

effect of stress levelling is to shift the stress on the third form to bring it into line. Thus its action on *-ómaste*, *‘este*, *‘ondan* would yield *‘omaste*, *‘este*, *‘ondan*. It is worth noting that the relative order in which stress levelling and lengthening occur is crucial. Thus if they applied in this particular order to *-ómaste*, *‘este*, *‘ondan* we would get *‘omaste*, *‘osaste*, *‘ondan*, while the converse ordering would yield *-ómaste*, *-ósaste*, *-óndan*. Both the former (‘SL’) and latter (‘LS’) types of dialect are found.

(3) Shortening (‘L’). Very rarely the principle of length uniformity works in the opposite direction to the normal and has the effect of shortening longer forms. Thus in Raftena (2C) we find *‘umstan*, *‘ustan*, *‘dan* (/untan/), which suggest that the *‘umastan* resulting from stress levelling has been shortened on the model of *‘ustan*.

(4) Haplology (‘H’). 2P occasionally undergoes syncope of presumably dissimilatory origin such that an extended *-ósaste*, *‘osaste* deletes the [sa]. Thus in Samothraki we find the lengthened **-ósastan* reduced by haplology to *-óstan*. It may be observed that attention to the segmental makeup of forms such as the *‘ustan* mentioned just above may suggest a more complex trajectory (and accordingly a more complex classification) than considerations of length and stress alone warrant. Thus we could account for the Raftena *‘umstan*, *‘ustan*, *‘dan* by postulating rather than ‘S -L’ the sequence ‘S L H -L’:

	<i>-ómastan</i>	<i>‘este</i>	<i>‘undan</i>
Stress levelling	<i>‘omastan</i>		
Lengthening		<i>‘osastan</i>	
Haplology		<i>‘ostan</i>	
Shortening	<i>‘omstan</i>		
[Raising, High vowel loss]	<i>‘umstan</i>	<i>‘ustan</i>	<i>‘dan</i>

However, in some cases this would cause difficulties. In Zitsa (1B), for instance, we find *-ómastan* but *‘ustan* and this suggests that the source of the [u] of *‘ustan* may lie rather in 3P. There are various other points which involve the historical development of individual dialects rather than the taxonomy with which we are essentially concerned, and which is intended to be at most suggestive. The classification of dialects in terms of the length and stress patterns of their imperfect passive forms is presented in table 12. A glance at the data of table 5 will show that the singular pattern is a simple function of the plural one in each dialect: it is uniform, with unimportant exceptions, throughout the three persons, and derivable

from 3P. Where the latter has three syllables, the singular forms have three with proparoxytone stress; where it has two, the singular has two, again with proparoxytone stress. Thus in the Peloponnese we find the singular forms *-ómuna*, *-ósuna*, *-ótane* answering to 3P *-óndusan* and in Karpathos *‘umun*, *‘usu*, *‘eto* corresponding to *‘utto*.

The asterisks refer to exceptional types of lengthening. In Eastern Crete lengthening apparently affects 1P in spite of the fact that we have a 2-2-2 syllable pattern. In the other two cases it acts on 3P although we have the same pattern. The queries indicate dialects with quite aberrant patterns which defy simple explanations. In central Crete (Aya Galini) the *‘uméstane*, *-ósaste*, *-ótane* of my informants seem to represent a cross between the ‘LS*’ form for 1P found in eastern Crete, and the Peloponnesian ‘LL’ forms for 2P and 3P. My Samian informants (4G) provided *-umástni*, *-usástni*, *-ódane*, which imply that 1P and 2P have arisen via stress levelling (with development of secondary stress) and one and two lengthenings respectively, followed finally by syncope of the prefinal syllable. That this is correct historically, rather than the assumption of loss of final vowel (as in Arachova) before the suffixation of *-ne* is suggested by the fact that Kretschmer (1905: 318) cites for Samos *-ástani*, *-úsastan*, *-údani*.

An examination of the facts of areal distribution suggests two main hypotheses. Firstly, it appears that stress levelling is to be associated essentially with the northern mainland; this is shown not only by its frequency there but by the fact that where it occurs in conjunction with lengthening it precedes the latter. In the islands (including the northern ones) if it occurs at all it follows lengthening. This combination of circumstances suggests the temporal inference that stress levelling started in the region of Epirus. Lengthening, on the other hand is characteristic of Peloponnesian-Ionian. It is interesting that it occurs in its extreme form in dialects on the periphery of the Peloponnese. Now when an innovation exists in a more extreme form not at the centre of its domain, but on its fringes, there is a temptation to conclude that the innovation tended to be borrowed in a more general form than that in which it occurred in the donor dialect. If the limited data we have here are adequate to such an assumption, then we have an analogue to those changes in segmental rules which are attributed to ‘feature suppression’ (i.e. the conditioning factors for lengthening became less highly specific as the change spread).

5. Standard Athenian

We are now in a position to consider the present and imperfect passive endings of 'standard' Athenian in relation to the dialects. But first of all, we must decide what we are to count as standard. The fact is that published grammars of demotic offer an extravagant range of forms, especially in their accounts of the imperfect passive. During a recent stay in Athens (1969) I attempted to establish current practice among the younger generation of Athenian-born speakers by administering a questionnaire covering certain crucial items; of the people approached fifty who turned out to have been born and educated in Athens were interviewed. Their ages were for the most part between 15 and 35 although a few older speakers were found (with difficulty) who met the conditions. The items relevant to the present study to which responses were sought are listed, with brief comments on the results obtained.

(1) Present passive 1S. Speakers were almost equally divided over whether *Χάνομαι ἐδῶ μέσα* 'I get lost in this place' or *Χάνομαι ἐδῶ μέσα* was what they would themselves say (27 *ome*, 20 *ume*, 3 both). Those who volunteered an evaluation of these variants all thought that the *ume* form was more likely in casual conversation at home.

(2) Present passive 2P. *Γιατί δὲν κάθεστε*; was selected by 39 speakers for 'Why don't you sit down?' as their unique choice. Eleven claimed that they might employ *καθόσαστε*, but not always. *Κάθεστε* was more 'formal' (*τυπικό*).

(3) Present passive 3P. All 50 chose *Φαίνονται εὐτυχισμένοι* 'they seem happy' as opposed to *φαίνονται*.

(4) Imperfect passive 2S. All subjects agreed that *Ἀπὸ ποῦ ἐρχόσωννα*; 'Where were you coming from?' reflected their own usage. Other forms cited in the oxytone conjugations (*φοβόμοννα* 'I was afraid', 'he was afraid') confirmed that the standard forms of the singular passive of barytone verbs are *-όμυνα*, *-όσυνα*, *-ότανε*. One does hear 'truncated' (historically in fact earlier) forms such as [*ερχόmun*] quite rarely, I believe, before consonants, and more commonly before vowels.

(5) Imperfect passive 1P. *Καθόμαστε στὸν ἥλιο χθές* 'We were sitting in the sun yesterday' was selected by all but four speakers, only four regarding *καθόμασταν* as a possible alternative in their own speech for *καθόμαστε*. Several informants asserted that *καθόμασταν*

sounded definitely provincial. However, the *-an* forms are certainly heard, and seem to be quite common on the stage.

(6) Imperfect passive 2P. *Ποῦ καθόσαστε χθές*; 'Where were you sitting yesterday?' was provided by all speakers except for four who had offered *καθόμασταν*. These latter gave *καθόσασταν*.

(7) Imperfect passive 3P. Of the 50 persons asked to select from *Τὰ παιδιά καθόντανε/κάθονταν/καθόντουσαν ἐκεῖ* 'the boys were sitting there', 46 chose *καθόντουσαν*, three *καθόντανε* and one *κάθονταν*. Responses to *φοβόντανε, φοβόνταν, φοβοῦνταν, φοβόντουσαν* 'they were afraid' were consonant with this result, practically everyone choosing *φοβόντουσαν*.

Thus we may conclude that the forms current among the younger generation of Athenian-born speakers are: present *‘ome/‘ume, ‘ese, ‘ete, -ómaste, ‘este, ‘onde*, imperfect *-ómuna, -ósuna, -ótane, -ómaste, -ósaste, -óndusan*.

The dialectal affiliations of these endings may now be summarized:

(a) 1S and 3P. The use of *‘ome, ‘onde* is paralleled within the vernaculars (see table 2) only in a few insular dialects and in Corfu (if we ignore the northern dialects with underlying /o/ realized as [u]). If we seek a vernacular source for the [o] forms of 1S and 3P we must perhaps look to Corfu rather than to the small Aegean islands which can have little if any influence on the growth of standard Athenian. What is rather puzzling, however, is that within the dialects, while *‘ome, ‘unde* occur quite frequently, we do not apparently find dialects with [u] in 1S and [o] in 3P, which corresponds to the practice of many Athenian speakers. It is therefore not impossible that we must in this case take cognizance of learned influence and suppose that the current distribution in educated Athenian of [o] and [u] forms stems from a conflict between learned *‘ome, ‘onde* and popular (especially Peloponnesian) *‘ume, ‘unde*. Because the first person forms are rare in the narrative and expository contexts which one would associate with *katharevousa*, the *‘ume* form has thus far resisted elimination, while in 3P learned *‘onde* has ousted an earlier *‘unde*. That the learned language should have had such a marked influence on passive but not active forms of the verb is to be attributed to the general avoidance of true (semantically) passive forms in colloquial Greek. If this account is correct, then we may suppose that the learned forms of the endings in question carried just sufficient weight to resolve the conflict

between Peloponnesian *‘ume*, *‘unde* and the *‘ome*, *‘onde* of Corfu in favour of *‘onde* but not enough to oust the more typically ‘spoken’ *‘ume*.

(b) Present 2S and 3S. The virtually complete unanimity among the dialects is reflected in the totally stable *‘ese*, *‘ete* of the standard language.

(c) Present 1P. The metathesized *-ómaste* which we saw to be characteristic of Peloponnesian-Ionian has become firmly established in Athens and the other urban centres.

(d) Present and imperfect 2P and imperfect 1P. We noted earlier that in general, dialects either have an extended *-ósaste* in both tenses (Peloponnesian-Ionian) or a simple *‘este* in both tenses. What appears to have occurred in Athenian is a development of contrast by eclecticism. That is, Peloponnesian *-ósaste* has been assigned a purely imperfect meaning while *‘este* has been taken over in a present function, its lowly dialectal status undoubtedly being offset by its obvious affinity to learned *‘esðe*. There does, however, seem to be a little support in the dialects for this distinction and it is crucial that where the distinction between simple and extended 2P is exploited it is always the extended form which is found in the imperfect. The other marker of the imperfect, the *-an* suffix is, as we saw, not unknown in vernacular dialects other than northern ones, and its absence from Athenian is a clear indication of the paramount role played by Peloponnesian-Ionian in the creation of the modern *κοινή*. It may be noted that the Greek spoken in Saloniki, the third urban centre of Greece after Athens and Piraeus, while virtually indistinguishable from Athenian in its phonology, does possess among its grammatical peculiarities the use of *-an* forms in the imperfect passive 1P and 2P: *Ἀπὸ ποῦ ἐρχόσασταν*; ‘Where were you coming from?’, *καθόμασταν* ‘We were sitting’ and similar forms are regular there.

(e) Imperfect singular. Again Peloponnesian-Ionian has provided the forms of the standard language. The northern use of *‘ondan* for singular and plural is normal in Saloniki, even in educated speech, but, as far as I am aware, is unknown in Athens.

(f) Imperfect 3P. The problematic *-óndusan* which was discussed above and which is found in parts of the Peloponnese, has apparently all but ousted its serious competitors at least in familiar speech. It is indeed quite striking that a form which cannot be unambig-

uously identified with any extensively spoken dialect should have established itself as standard, although to judge from the various published grammars, this reflects in all probability a quite recent development.

References

- Anagnostopoulos, G. P. 1926. 'Peri tēs en Krētē homilouménēs kai idiōs peri toū idiōmatos tēs Hagías Barbáras kai perichórōn', *Athēnā* 38, 139–193.
- Andriotis, N. 1930. 'Peri toū glōssikoū idiōmatos tēs Imbrou', *Athēnā* 42, 146–187.
- Blanken, G. 1951. *Les Grecs de Cargèse (Corse)*, Tome 1, Partie Linguistique. Leyden.
- Chatzidakis, G. 1905. *Mesaiōnikā kai néa Hellēnikā*, Vol. 1. Athens.
- Georgakas, D. 1934. *Thēraikā glōssikā A*, unpublished MS in archives of *Historikōn Lexikōn tēs néas Hellēnikēs*, Athens.
- Georgiou, Ch. G. 1962. *Tò glōssikò idiōma Gérma Kastórias*, Hetaireía Makedonikōn Spoudōn, Makedonikē Bibliothékē 23. Thessalonikē.
- Karanastasis, A. 1958. 'Tò idiōma tēs Astypalaías', *Lexikographikōn Deltion* 8, 59–144.
- Kolia, A. 1933. 'Tò glōssikōn idiōma tēs Kéas', *Athēnā* 45, 262–285.
- Koukoules, M. Ph. 1908. *Oinountiakā, ē, Melētē peri tēs historias tōn ethōn kai ethīmōn kai glōssikoū idiōmatos toū dēmou Oinoúntos tēs eparchias Lakedaimonos*. Chania, Crete.
- Kretschmer, P. 1905. *Der heutige Lesbische Dialekt, verglichen mit den übrigen nordgriechischen Mundarten*. Vienna.
- Menardos, S. 1925. 'Kypriakē grammatikē, 3, Rhēmata', *Athena* 37, 35–79.
- Oikonomidis, D. V. 1952. 'Peri toū glōssikoū idiōmatos Aperáthou — Náxou', *Athēnā* 56 215–273.
- Pangalos, G. P. 1955. *Peri toū glōssikoū idiōmatos tēs Krētēs*, Vol. 1. Athens.
- Papachristodoulos, Ch. 1958. 'Morphología tōn Rhoditikōn idiōmatōn', *Dōdekanēsiakōn Archeion* 3, 9–106.
- Pernot, H. 1946. *Études de linguistique néo-hellénique II, Morphologie des parlers de Chio*. Paris. Société d'édition 'Les Belles Lettres'.
- Phavis, V. 1911. *Glossikāi episképseis anapherómenai eis tò idiōma Aulonariou kai Konistrōn*. Athens.
- Psaltis, S. 1905. *Thrakikā, ē melētē peri toū glōssikoū idiōmatos tēs póleōs Saránta Ekklesiōn*. Athens.
- Skiadareisis, S. 1959. *Kephalonítikes Historíes, gramménes stò topikò glōssikò idiōma*. Diphros, Athens.
- Triandaphyllidis, M. 1963. 'He Hellēnikē aúxēsē, ho klonismós tēs, kai tò xechórisma tōn homoéchōn rhēmatikōn týpōn' in *Hápanta Manólē Triantaphyllidē*. Thessalonikē.
- Vogiatzidis, I. K. 1925. 'Kímōlos. Peri tēs glōssēs tōn Kimōlíōn' *Athēnā* 37, 108–160.