

## GREEK DIALECTOLOGY AFTER THE DECIPHERMENT OF LINEAR B

The fifties of our century represent in the history of Greek dialectology an exceptionally busy period of transformation and development. The first impulse was the application of a number of new and stimulating dialectological methods adopted from modern linguistics. To be sure, all these new methods meant only a new approach to old and already investigated material. Nevertheless, when we take into account the fact that only seldom in our times is the linguistic material of the Greek dialects in the Classical Era increased by new finds, we have to admit that these new methods, though contributing considerably to our knowledge of the dialectal situation in the 1st millennium B.C., fail in themselves to supply us with adequate information about the dialectal relations in the Greek of earlier periods. A searchlight to penetrate this fog could only be supplied by the discovery of some concrete linguistic material from the 2nd millennium B.C. The correctness of this conclusion finds most convincing support in the well-known work by W. Porzig, published in the *Indogermanische Forschungen* 61/1954/, 147—169 (that is to say subsequent to the deciphering of the Linear Script B), but written a few years before. The work — as it is generally known — express the view that the Arcadian and the Cypriot dialects of Ancient Greek are in fact closely connected with the Attic-Ionic area and not with the Aeolic area, as it was often assumed. It goes without saying that the author arrived at this conclusion by attempting a comparison of the dialects in question, but his merit lies in the fact that he did so by confronting not their later stages, familiar to us from the Classical Era, but their presupposed predecessors, spoken in a period when Greek dialectal divergencies had not yet developed so far.

We shall refrain from going into particulars here; it will be enough to mention that one of the most significant points in Porzig's argument was his suggestion that the Lesbian *-si* in the personal suffix of the 3rd person plur. (and sing). act. must be traced to Ionic influence, while the proto-Aeolic dialect, preserved according to Porzig in Classical Thessalian and Boeotian, had known only the suffix *-ti*; this implies another assumption, namely that one of the most fundamental innovations of early Greek, so important from the dialectal point of view, the change *-ti* > *-si*, was accomplished only in the proto-Attic-Ionic and proto-Arcado-Cypriot areas, which Porzig denoted as East Greek. The Mycenaean culture was, on the other hand, according to him the product of "a small group of Achaean warriors" closely affiliated with the Aeolians and speaking one of the Aeolic dialects. This view of Porzig that there were close relations between the Attic-Ionic and Arcado-Cypriot groups

of dialects, is today shared by a number of experts of Greek dialectology, even if they base their judgement much more on Risch's study published in the *Museum Helveticum* 12 (1955), 61—76, than on Porzig's article.

What is, however, the difference between these two scholars? Essentially the following: Risch was already acquainted with the results of the decipherment of LB, which were not available to Porzig, and together with the great majority of Mycenologists he has pointed out the close relations of Mycenaean to the Arcado-Cypriot dialects of the Classical Era as a basic feature and a very important one from the point of view of classification, since the suffix *-si* can be demonstrated in Mycenaean as well. He drew from his conviction of the correctness of this view as well as from Porzig's hypothesis concerning the proto-Aeolic *-ti* the only possible logical conclusion: that the builders of Mycenaean civilization belonged to Porzig's East Greek dialectal area (Risch himself denotes it as South Greek) and that they had, in fact, nothing in common with the proto-Aeolians, at least as regards affinity of dialects. As for Porzig, he became a victim of a trick of fate, for by the very success of his ingenious attempt to penetrate the screen concealing the dialectal situation of the 2nd millennium B.C. by analyzing with inference and insight the linguistic material of the 1st millennium, he inflicted a mortal blow on his own conception of the Aeolic origin of Mycenaean culture. Thus Porzig the linguist involuntarily defeated Porzig the historian.

By giving this brief recapitulation of the situation we should not like to produce the impression that we see in Risch's theory the only method of tackling the problems of the Greek dialects in the 2nd millennium B.C.; somewhat nearer to the truth appears to be Chadwick's modification admitting Aeolic as a third dialectal factor. This discussion of Porzig's attitude helps us, however, to realize that even the most ingenious linguistic speculation prior to the decipherment of LB could unfortunately not fail to be surpassed by the knowledge of undergraduates studying at present Ancient Greek.

On the other hand, one has to admit that nor was the methodical activity of the Greek dialectologists of the forties and of the early fifties quite fruitless for research into the conditions prevailing in the 2nd millennium B.C., for it was just this productive methodology that paved the way and enabled scholars subsequent to the decipherment of LB to analyse the Mycenaean dialect much more quickly and successfully by the application of the latest linguistic methods.

On the basis of all this new knowledge, both methodical and factual, numerous views have been formulated of the linguistic character of Mycenaean in the last 14 years; these views were, however, often widely different, even antagonistic. These divergencies resulted in an endeavour to survey and classify in some way all these stand-points, yet this classification has so far hardly passed the stage of an elementary listing in the course of which each author who attempted it was listed according to the dialects known to us from the Classical Era with which he felt inclined to associate Mycenaean most closely. Thus, as time went on, there emerged the minima-

---

<sup>1</sup> See esp. the studies of A. Tovar, *Ensayo sobre la estratigrafía de los dialectos griegos*, *Emerita* 12 (1944) 245—337; F. Rodríguez Adrados, *La dialectología griega como fuente para el estudio de las migraciones indoeuropeas en Grecia*, *Acta Salmaticensia, filosofía y letras*, V 3, Salamanca 1952; M. S. Ruipérez, *Sobre la prehistoria de los dialectos griegos (A propósito de un libro de F. R. Adrados)*, *Emerita* 21 (1953), 253—266, as well as E. Risch's article *Altgriechische Dialektographie?*, *Museum Helveticum* 6 (1949), 19—28 — not to speak of the above-said article of W. Porzig, *IF* 61 (1954)

listic Mycenaean-Arcado-Cypriot theory (e.g. Adrados,<sup>2</sup> Ruijgh<sup>3</sup>), the Mycenaean-Arcado-Cypriot-Attic-Ionic theories (esp. Pisani,<sup>4</sup> Risch,<sup>5</sup> Chadwick<sup>6</sup>), the Mycenaean-Arcado-Cypriot-Aeolic theories (particularly Palmer,<sup>7</sup> Tovar,<sup>8</sup> Lurje<sup>9</sup>), and the theory of the Mycenaean Koine, that is to say of a mixed language, originating on the basis of Ionic-Aeolic (especially Georgiev,<sup>10</sup> Grinbaum<sup>11</sup>), not to speak of Marinatos' theory<sup>12</sup> about a kind of administrative language introduced by professional scribes of non-Greek origin. There is no doubt that such attempts at classification are very useful from the practical point of view, leading the student over the threshold of this very complex problem, yet they can hardly help being merely superficial in some respects.

The main reason to be mentioned is the fact that this approach assumes too categorically the supposition that one or other of the Classical dialects had already existed as a more or less independent linguistic formation at the time of the Mycenaean civilization; this attitude represents a temptation to evaluate the dialectal features of Mycenaean against what is a merely prospective background of the dialectal material from the 1st millennium B.C. This can be demonstrated for instance in

<sup>2</sup> F. Rodríguez Adrados, *Achäisch, Ionisch und Mykenisch*, *IF* 62 (1956), 240–249.

<sup>3</sup> C. J. Ruijgh, *Les datifs pluriels dans les dialectes grecs et la position du mycénien*, *Mnemosyne* 11 (1958), 97–116; idem, *Le traitement des sonantes voyelles dans les...*, *Mnemosyne* 14 (1961), 193–216.

<sup>4</sup> V. Pisani, *Die Entzifferung der ägeischen Linear B Schrift und die griechischen Dialekte*, *Rheinisches Museum* 98 (1955), 1–18; idem, *Le lingue indoeuropee in Grecia e in Italia*, *Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo, Parte Gen. e Atti Uff.* 89 (1956), 1–20 [= *Die indoeuropäischen Sprachen in Griechenland und Italien*, *Lingua Posnantiensis* 7 (1958), 25–46]; etc.

<sup>5</sup> See E. Risch's article published in *Museum Helveticum* 12 (1955), quoted in Note 1; cf. also E. Risch, *La position du dialecte mycénien*, *Études mycéniennes* (Colloque mycénien, Gif-sur-Yvette 1956), ed. M. Lejeune, Paris 1957, pp. 167–172 and 249–258; idem, *Frühgeschichte der griechischen Sprache*, *Museum Helveticum* 16 (1959), 215–227.

<sup>6</sup> J. Chadwick, *The Greek Dialects and Greek Pre-history*, *Greece & Rome* 3 (1956), 38–50; idem, *The Prehistory of the Greek Language*, *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Revised Edition of Vol. II, Chapter XXXIX (fasc. 15), Cambridge 1963; etc.

<sup>7</sup> L. R. Palmer, *Mycenaean Greek Texts from Pylos*, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1954, pp. 18–53b, esp. p. 19; idem, *The Language of Homer in: The Companion of Homer*, ed. A. J. B. Wace—F. H. Stubbings, London 1962, pp. 73–178, esp. pp. 84–94; idem, *The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts*, Oxford 1963, esp. pp. 60–64.

<sup>8</sup> A. Tovar, *Nochmals Ionier und Achäer im Lichte der Linear-B Tafeln*, *Mnemosyne* 12 (1955), 141–146; idem, *On the Position of the Linear B Dialect*, *Mycenaean Studies* (Mycenaean Colloquium, Wingspread 1961), ed. E. L. Bennett, Madison 1964, pp. 141–146.

<sup>9</sup> S. J. Lurje, *Jazyk i kultura mikenskoj Grecii*, Moskva—Leningrad 1957, esp. pp. 175–186; idem, *Obzor novejšej literatury po grečeskim nadpisjam mikenskoj epokhi*, *Vestnik drevnej istorii* 1957: 3, pp. 196–213; idem, *Osnovy istoričeskoj fonetiki grečeskogo jazyka s učetom jazyka mikenskich nadpisej*, L'vov 1961 (mimeographed); idem, *Die Sprache der mykenischen Inschriften*, *Klio* 42 (1964), 5–60; etc.

<sup>10</sup> V. Georgiev, *La nouvelle créto-mycénienne*, *Études Mycéniennes* (Colloque mycénien, Gif-sur-Yvette 1956), ed. M. Lejeune, Paris 1957, pp. 173–188; idem, *Issledovanija po sravnitel'no-istoričeskomu jazykoznaniju*, Moskva 1958, esp. pp. 58–111; idem, *Creto-Mycenaean and Homeric*, *Klio* 38 (1960), 69–74; idem, *Das Problem der homerischen Sprache im Lichte der kretisch-mykenischen Texte*, *Minoica und Homer*, Berlin 1961, pp. 10–19; idem, *Mycenaean among the Other Greek Dialects*, *Mycenaean Studies* (Mycenaean Colloquium, Wingspread 1961), ed. E. L. Bennett, Madison 1964, pp. 125–139; idem, *Mycénien et homérique: le problème du digamma*, *Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies* (Cambridge 1965), ed. L. R. Palmer—J. Chadwick, Cambridge 1966, pp. 104–124; idem, *Introduzione alla storia delle lingue indoeuropee*, Roma 1966, esp. pp. 49–81.

<sup>11</sup> N. S. Grinbaum, *Kritomikenskije teksty i drevnegrečeskije dialekty*, *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1959: 6, pp. 78–86.

<sup>12</sup> Sp. Marinatos, *Minos* 4 (1956), 11–21, esp. 15.

Georgiev, who presupposes the loss of *w* as early as in the Mycenaean stage of Ionic.<sup>13</sup> But even if some other authors, e.g. Risch and Chadwick, take care to avoid such anachronistic statements when analysing the prehistoric dialectal situation and eliminate from their survey of the Greek dialectal world of the 2nd half of the 2nd millennium B.C. all the differences that appear to be of a later date, there exists, nevertheless, the possibility that just in this period there may have been altogether different phenomena that were breaking up the community of dialectal Greek of that time, phenomena which later disappeared without any trace.

Be it as it may, there are even some other risks associated with such anachronistic transfer of concepts from the 1st to the 2nd millennium B.C.; let us mention for instance the possibility of grasping the idea "Ionic" either as Ionic of the 1st millennium or as proto-Ionic. For the sake of illustration the following example may be given: When the theory of the Arcado-Ionic-Mycenaean unity is analyzed, its advocates are sometimes<sup>14</sup> classified into three groups, this depending on whether they believe Mycenaean to be more closely affiliated with Ionic (Pisani, Chadwick, Coleman),<sup>15</sup> or with Arcadian (Chantraine),<sup>16</sup> or whether they assume in this respect a neutral position (Risch). It is true that this classification is actually based on formulations published by the above quoted authors, yet these formulations are sometimes not quite as easily comparable as one might believe. If Chantraine e.g. denotes in *Grammaire homérique*, Paris 1958, p. 506, Mycenaean as a South Greek linguistic formation, expressly affiliated with Arcado-Cypriot, then it is not necessary to find in this statement a contradiction of Chadwick, who expresses in *The Prehistory of Greek Language*, Cambridge, CAH<sup>2</sup>, fasc. 15, p. 16, his doubt as to whether the Ionic of the Mycenaean Era differed at all from common Mycenaean. Chantraine namely has in the above allusion surely in mind a comparison of Mycenaean with Arcado-Cypriot of the Classical Era, and at this time the linguistic features of Ionic were sure to bear the marks of either various native innovations or of diverse foreign influences, especially those of West Greek, as Chadwick expressly points out himself. In this connection it might be more appropriate to argue that there appears to be some difference between Chadwick's standpoint and that of Coleman, for Coleman is ready to recognize stronger affinity even between Classical Ionic and Mycenaean than between Mycenaean and Classical Arcadian. In this situation, when it is really hard to be sure whether the wordings found in various publications are fully comparable, owing to the uncertain content of the terms employed, it will, I think, be reasonable not to overestimate such minor differences in formulation. Besides — and this point appears to be still more important — a one-sided classification based on the comparison of Mycenaean with Classical Greek dialects only is not adequate to do full justice to all the aspects of the character of the LB language, especially the problems of its origin, its function, or its chances of entering into the world of Greek dialects of the 1st mill. B.C. The problem of Mycenaean Greek is exceptionally complex, when compared with the dialects of the Classical Era, owing to the fact that the question of its dialectal classification depends at the same time on answers to a number of other questions relating to the prehistory of the Greek language, for instance the question whether one assumes the dialectal splitting

<sup>13</sup> Cf. V. Georgiev, *Mycénien et homérique* — as quoted in Note 10.

<sup>14</sup> M. Doria, *Avviamento allo studio del miceneo*, Roma 1965, pp. 72–77.

<sup>15</sup> R. Coleman, *The Dialect Geography of Ancient Greece*, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1963, pp. 58–126, esp. p. 122.

<sup>16</sup> P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique*<sup>3</sup>, Paris 1958, p. 506.

of Greek on Greek soil only or whether one believes this process to have already commenced outside Greece, the solution one adopts as to the number of Greek migrations, the interpretation one favours of the problem of the so-called Mycenaean Koine, etc., etc. Let us mention one more example. When the standpoints of the scholars favouring the theory of Aeolic-Mycenaean linguistic conformity are estimated, we usually find quoted side by side the views of Lurje, Palmer, Tovar, and Gallavotti,<sup>17</sup> but it is not always sufficiently stressed that Tovar is a resolute advocate of the theory of three waves of Greek newcomers (Mycenaean is an Aeolic dialect with traces of older Ionic substrate), that Palmer, on the other hand, rejects this view (his Aeolic or Aeolic-Achaean determining dialectal features of Mycenaean was not formed until on Greek soil), that Lurje sees in Mycenaean a form of Greek, influenced by pre-Greek elements in the centres of Mycenaean culture and resulting later in the Aeolic and Arcado-Cypriot dialects of the Classical Era, and that Gallavotti differs clearly from all these three scholars in associating Mycenaean directly with Aeolic, while he excludes — in full accord with Porzig — Arcado-Cypriot altogether from this community.

When the classification of the Mycenaean dialect is attempted, a lot naturally depends on what sort of view each scholar has formed of the mutual relations between the Greek dialects of the Classical Era. Thus, above all, it must be made clear beforehand what place the author in question allots to Aeolic. One who holds, with Risch, Aeolic to be more closely affiliated with the West-Greek dialects (i.e. Doric in the wider sense of the word), or one who along with Chadwick at least excludes Aeolic from the group of the *si*-dialects, causing it thus to break away from Arcado-Cypriot and Attic-Ionic, if he at the same time associates Mycenaean with Arcado-Cypriot, as it is commonly done today, is obviously bound either to deny Mycenaean an Aeolic character, or he must at least see in Aeolic-like elements an intrusion. On the contrary, Palmer, Tovar, and other defenders of Aeolic-Mycenaean affinity, who reject Risch's theory, entering in principle Aeolic in the group of the *si*-dialects and, in addition, combining it with Arcado-Cypriot into a higher Achaean dialectal unit, may quite well interpret the generally acknowledged Mycenaean affinity with Arcado-Cypriot as an affinity with Aeolic as well.

To attempt a dialectal classification of Mycenaean means therefore not only to compare the LB language with Greek dialects of the Classical Era, but also to tackle questions of Greek ethnological and dialectal prehistory, both in the pre-Mycenaean and the post-Mycenaean periods. There is no doubt that linguistic erudition alone is not equal to this task and that the co-operation of archaeologists, historians, philologists, and experts in Greek mythology, religion and literature is needed.

Nevertheless, we believe that one thing at least can be accomplished even now, namely to define and discuss the relative set of complex problems and partial questions, without the analysis of which no attempt at a complete linguistic and dialectal characterization of the LB language should in our opinion be made. We shall try to outline such a set in the following paragraphs.

In the first group of questions [group A] we may include problems relating to the origin of dialectal differences in Ancient Greek. These questions had often been treated before the LB Script was deciphered, but the decipherment, naturally, cast a new light upon them. First of all there is the question whether it is possible to place the

<sup>17</sup> C. Gallavotti, *Il carattere eolico del greco minoico*, *Rivista di filologia classica* 36 (1958), 113—133.

origin of these differences as far back as the widely differing branches of Indo-European, the Greek dialectal situation of the Classical Era being an outcome of a long period of mutual convergence in the pre-Greek period [A1]. Even if the main advocate of this view, V. Pisani,<sup>18</sup> is a very keen Mycenologist and was in fact the first to have endorsed Porzig's theory of the Ionic-Arcado-Cypriot affinities, nevertheless, one understands why most Mycenologists do not favour his standpoint, since they are influenced primarily by the study of the LB language. The very fact that Mycenaean appears to be, against the background of the different ethnogenetic theories, a Greek dialect with features that at one time give the impression of being Aeolic, at another of being Attic-Ionic, and nearly every time Arcado-Cypriot, seems to speak in favour of the assumption that the Greek linguistic situation in the 15th—13th B.C. — i.e. in a period not so far remote from the arrival of the Greeks in the south of the Balkan Peninsula — could be characterized rather by comparatively close relations between the precursors of the above-mentioned Classical dialectal groups, than by their alleged essential differences, as Pisani's theory would have it.

If we take a negative answer to this first question for granted, it would not of necessity exclude a positive answer to a somewhat analogical question, viz. whether some Greek dialectal differences had not originated outside Greece, but arose already within some closer I.E. linguistic community, which was later to become the basis of the Greek-speaking world [A 2].

The most important linguistic argument in favour of this view used to be the stressing of the existence of a couple of the personal suffixes of the 1st plur. act. *-mes* (Doric) and *-men* (non-Doric), both of them being taken as a continuation of the I.E. situation (*-mes* is the primary suffix of the 1st pers. plur. act., while *-men* is the secondary suffix). As to the Greek situation, it was suggested that, while still outside Greek territory, in one fraction of the linguistic community that was later to become Greek it was the primary form which had been adopted in all tenses and moods, whereas in the other fraction it was the secondary form. Yet, in our opinion, this explanation is too much dependent on a traditional solution of another question, viz. how one should envisage the occupation of Greece by the ancestors of the Ancient Greeks, and whether the traditional view about several — most likely three — waves of Greek newcomers, namely the Ionians, Aeolians or Achaeans, and Dorians (as commonly suggested), is really sufficiently plausible [A 3].

As long as the majority of scholars were inclined to endorse the theory of the three waves, which assumes a pronounced dialectal differentiation based on migration as early as at the beginning of the 2nd millennium B.C., it really appeared necessary to believe that the origin of the double suffix *-mes/-men* mentioned above must be placed prior to the settlement on Greek soil. If, however, we may do without this hypothesis of several partial and successive migrations — and it is especially the alleged migration about 1600 B.C. that the archaeologists of today do not find sufficiently substantiated — then the situation assumes a different appearance. In such a case we take for granted only the general immigration of the Greeks about 1900 B.C. — or maybe as early as about 2100 B.C. —<sup>19</sup> and the Doric progress southward subsequent to 1200 B.C. Now, with this assumption in mind, we have to admit the possibility that

<sup>18</sup> See Note 4.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. J. L. Caskey, *Greece, Crete, and the Aegean Islands in the Early Bronze Age*, *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Revised Edition of Vol. I, Chapter XXVI [a] (fasc. 24), Cambridge 1964, pp. 18sqq.; idem, *Greece and the Aegean Islands in the Middle Bronze Age*, *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Revised Edition of Vol. II, Chapter IV [a] (fasc. 45), Cambridge 1966, pp. 21 sqq.

some of the most ancient Greek dialectal differences that used to be associated with the 3rd millennium B.C. and with non-Greek territories may have developed in fact much later, in centuries well advanced in the 2nd millennium B.C., and one may also concede that, even as late as this, various innovations may have been superimposed on each other in this loose proto-Greek community, without implying the formation of any specific dialectal affinities, as we know them from the Classical Era. Naturally, we have to emphasize that this conclusion of ours is not meant to affirm that such phenomena as the above-mentioned dialectal distribution of the doublets *-mes/-men* must have originated on Greek soil, and that the ancestors of the Ancient Greeks really spoke a dialectally non-differentiated I.E. language about 2000 B.C.; we are only stressing here the fact that we have so far no sufficient linguistic arguments for the opposite, only theoretically substantiated view.

Now we have to face the final problem of the first group of questions, namely to what extent one may assume that the Greek world was dialectally differentiated as early as the pre-Mycenaean period, and, provided it was clearly differentiated, in what degree this differentiation corresponded with that of the Classical Era, and particularly whether we are entitled to apply to pre-Mycenaean times the later traditional terms "Ionic", "Aeolian", "Doric" [A 4]? In our opinion extreme caution is advisable when we attempt a dialectal characterization of the pre-Mycenaean — or more precisely the Middle Helladic — period. It is necessary to keep in mind that Mycenaean itself supplies us with no documents before the advanced phases of the Late Helladic period and that even the definitely substantiated contrast at this time between Mycenaean as a *si*-dialect and the undocumented but nevertheless undoubtedly existing representatives of the Greek *ti*-dialects somewhere in the North need not have been of a very old, i.e. pre-Mycenaean, date (as fluctuation in the use of the *ti*-forms and the *si*-forms in some of the LB suffixes would seem to indicate).

Taking into account that even the designations "Ionic" and "Aeolic" may have been just coming into use in the Mycenaean Era, if not later still, we had better admit that for the present we are completely unable to penetrate the fog enveloping the Middle Helladic situation. Considering the great probability of the existence of various contemporary substrate factors, we may even count with the possibility of rather different distribution of dialects than that which might be readily assumed; we must not forget that numerous differences of that ancient period may in course of time have been covered by the unifying influence of the Mycenaean civilization and survived to the 1st millennium B.C. only as isolated fossils.

Now let us turn to the second group of problems [B] and thus face directly the question of the origin of Mycenaean, that is to say, the Greek of the Linear B Script. Was this language a continuation of some special dialectal group that had been differentiated before, or was it in its process of formation in an area which up till then had no distinct dialectal differentiation, or was it the outcome of a fusion of various elements of diverse dialectal branches [B 1]? One finds different answers to these questions in the literature. As to our own point of view, we must say that in accordance with the discussion above the only thing we hold for comparatively certain is that Mycenaean was being formed in an area which in the Late Helladic period was characterized by the distinct innovation change *ti* > *si*. That means, of course, that at least the precursors of the Doric dialects are excluded from participation in the origin of Mycenaean. (Naturally, this proto-Doric, which at the time of the Linear B documents most likely represented a dialectal opposite of Mycenaean, must be imagined as a kind of very loose dialectal community, linked probably to a great

extent by negative features, e.g., by the fact that several significant innovation changes, such as the above-mentioned assibilation  $ti > si$ , had not been accomplished in it.) But as for expressing in detail any views about the dialectal character of Mycenaean within the non-Doric area, it is rather a risky undertaking to draw any more definite conclusion, even in reference to the period from which we already have written documentation. We are of course handicapped by one great disadvantage, of which scholars do not always seem to be fully aware: it is the fact that no synchronic comparison can be made of Mycenaean with another documented dialectal community. At the best we can attempt a purely hypothetical comparison with undocumented and artificially reconstructed proto-Ionic, proto-Aeolic, and proto-Arcado-Cypriot, but in connection with this speculative reconstruction we, unfortunately, often encounter essential and mostly irreconcilable divergencies between the views held.

The key to all these differences is, in our opinion, the place of Aeolic in the Mycenaean world, and this problem again is immediately connected with the question what form of the original suffix *-ti* can be assumed for the Mycenaean precursor of Aeolic in Mycenaean period [B 2]. It is interesting that when tackling these problems the researchers resort more often to extreme points of view than to compromise. Radical adherents of Risch's theory try to deny the maximum number of the Aeolic-like elements of Mycenaean their alleged Aeolic character, nor do they take into account other arguments in favour of a separate position for the Aeolians in the Mycenaean heyday (cf. e.g. the occurrence in Homer of Aeolisms whose origin can hardly be traced to Asia Minor, or the Thessalian genealogy of the rulers of Pylos, etc.), reserving for the precursors of the Aeolians in the Mycenaean world a rather peripheral position in the neighbourhood of the Dorians. On the other hand, the advocates of the Aeolic-Mycenaean theory very often come out with detailed arguments to prove that Mycenaean and Ionic of the Mycenaean Era could not have been closely affiliated and that, in contrast to it, certain conformities between Mycenaean and Aeolic should be acknowledged. At the same time, however, they often make no special effort to disprove the basic theses of Risch and Porzig establishing Aeolic as by origin a *ti*-dialect. Yet, both the existence of even a small number of Aeolic elements in Mycenaean and the assignment of the proto-Aeolic dialectal community to the *ti*-type appear to be highly probable and significant facts whose coexistence should induce observers to incline towards a compromise.

All things considered, the following solution offers itself as the most acceptable: to include Aeolic in the group of the *ti*-dialects, but to ascribe to it, nevertheless, during the later phases of the Mycenaean Era the character of an already distinct dialectal community, whose linguistic and cultural influence was penetrating from Central Greece to Peloponnesos where the *si*-type dominated. This solution corresponds essentially with Chadwick's modification of Risch's theory, according to which Aeolic is held to be a special unit which formed itself on the dialectal *ti*-base in Thessaly when this region began to play an important role in the development of Mycenaean civilization. For our part, we should like to add only the following observation: the probable attribution of Mycenaean Aeolic to the *ti*-type of dialects need not imply any closer relation of Aeolic to Doric, as Risch believes. The assibilation  $ti > si$  is an innovation, and the fact of its not having been accomplished in Aeolic (which is an archaic feature) does not of necessity imply close affinity over the entire linguistic area in which it was not accomplished. It may rather be inferred that this change — the Anatolian parallels for which are usually quoted in favour



of the view that it may have extended from the South-East — simply did not progress beyond the Gulf of Corinth and beyond Attica, and if Mycenaean Aeolic appears to be on this account too closely associated with contemporary Doric, it does not actually mean much, for we can only become acquainted with the successors of these two dialects in such a remote future that we are not justified in assuming that there existed no serious differences between them in the second half of the 2nd millennium.

It stands to reason that our discussion of the relation of Mycenaean to Aeolic — in which we have sided with the view that it is not completely possible to link Mycenaean with Aeolic — must not induce us to become so onesided as to fail to be critical also in the other direction, and to leave without critical comment the question of the assumed close relation of Mycenaean to the precursors of the Classical Arcado-Cypriot and Attic-Ionic dialects [B 3-4]. Between these two Classical dialectal groups there exist numerous differences. It is true that Chadwick has been successful in explaining some of them by West-Greek influence on Ionic after the arrival of the Dorians, yet we have to concede that other differences remain unexplained, particularly the very ancient innovations of Arcado-Cypriot (for instance the construction of the prepositions *apu*, *para* with Dative [cf. Myc. *paro* + Dative]), which must have been a difference between Arcado-Cypriot and Ionic as early as the Mycenaean Era. In the light of these facts — in spite of the contrary argument based on ancient reports of Ionic settlements in Peloponnesos — any attempt at identifying the Mycenaean precursor of Ionic with Mycenaean seems to be problematic. We should prefer to formulate the problem as follows: As the Mycenaean precursor of Ionic was most probably also already affected by the innovation *ti* > *si* (like the Mycenaean of Peloponnesos), it has not been possible so far to substantiate any important difference between this dialect and Mycenaean which would justify us in concluding that the earlier history of both these dialectal areas was essentially different (phenomena like the Attic-Ionic *a*-colouring of the substitutes for I.E. *r, l*, as compared to the *o*-colouring of the Arcado-Cypriot substitutes, do not imply much, for Mycenaean itself indicates by its inconsistency in the spellings *a/o* that this situation had not fully crystallized in the Mycenaean Era).

The question may even be raised whether it is possible to identify Mycenaean directly with the precursor of Arcado-Cypriot. Here too we find certain differences, such as the Mycenaean (and Attic-Ionic) (*h*)iereus, on the one hand, and the Arcado-Cypriot innovation *hierēs*, on the other hand, which is very likely an innovation of an older date than the separation of Arcadian and Cypriot; besides we should have in mind also some specific Mycenaean phenomena which are probably innovations, but appear to have no continuity either in Arcado-Cypriot or in any other Greek dialect of the Classical Era<sup>20</sup> (cf. e.g. the frequent Mycenaean occurrence of *-si-jo* = *-(n)sijo-* with the Classical Greek *-nthios*, or also the existence of a special Mycenaean suffix of material *-jo* alongside the "longer" *-ejo-*, *-eo-*, *-ijo-* [cf. *ka-za* = *khalsā?* < *\*khalkjā* with *ka-ke-ja-pi* = *khalkē(j)-āphi* and with *ka-ki-jo* = *khalkio-*]).

By taking a somewhat sceptical standpoint even in reference to Arcado-Cypriot we find ourselves assuming a rather nihilistic attitude as to whether it is possible to fix more precisely the area of the LB language in the Mycenaean dialectal world.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. A. Heubeck, *Zur dialektologischen Einordnung des Mykenischen*, *Glotta* 39 (1961), 159–172.

The perplexities which largely prevent a straightforward solution of Mycenaean Greek, must have given an impulse to special theories concerning the origin and particularly the character of Mycenaean. Among these views the theory about the Mycenaean Koine has attracted much attention. The idea that there existed such a common Mycenaean language is no doubt stimulating. That certain dialectal levelling may actually have occurred more or less extensively in the 2nd half of the 2nd millennium B.C., at least in the centres of Mycenaean civilization, appears all the more probable if we think of the rather analogical levelling process in the Greek of the Hellenistic period. No doubt, even the Mycenaean Era was a period of considerable economic, cultural, and partly also political unity in the entire Aegean area, and we should not wonder if we found that all these unifying factors manifested themselves also in an extensive tendency towards linguistic unity.

It is of importance, however, to determine what linguistic picture each advocate of this theory associates with the term Mycenaean Koine [B 5]. For Georgiev this common Mycenaean language implies the idea of a mixed dialect, originating from at least two or three Greek dialects, most likely from the proto-Arcado-Cypriot (Aeolic) and the proto-Ionic dialects.<sup>21</sup> A similarly mixed character is, according to him, a typical feature of Arcado-Cypriot and of the Homeric language as well, and both these linguistic formations are in Georgiev's opinion direct successors of Mycenaean. If we, however, analyse more minutely Georgiev's Linear B "Aeolic-Ionic" doublets, which serve as the basis for his theory of a mixed Mycenaean dialect, we realize that the existence of them all in Linear B may also be explained in a different way, namely that in each case both members of the respective Linear B "Aeolic-Ionic" pairs may have existed side by side at some early period in the development of Greek, and that it was as a rule only one of these two possibilities that was selected — or at least preferred — by the individual Greek dialects of the post-Mycenaean Era. Essentially similar — i.e. based on two rather different dialectal units — appears to be Grinbaum's conception of Mycenaean Koine, which differs from that of Georgiev in a number of details only.<sup>23</sup>

In our opinion there exists, however, one more possibility of attempting to resolve the seemingly insoluble conflicts between the above theories of the dialectal position of the Mycenaean dialect by reconsidering the problem of Mycenaean Koine. Our above-mentioned sceptical attitude was not equally radical with respect to all the theories concerned: the least weighty arguments could be offered in this connection against associating Mycenaean with Arcado-Cypriot. And it is this idea which brings us to the question of whether there could not have existed some differences within Peloponnesian Mycenaean itself [B 6]. Only a few differences have so far been found in the LB documents, and this may be due also to the unsuitability of the Linear B Script for reproducing the Greek language (these differences being particularly between Knossos and Pylos and less between Mycenae and the two other sites), and without further direct linguistic material we should not overestimate them. Yet we should like to point out that differences within the Mycenaean of

<sup>21</sup> V. Georgiev, *Issledovaniya po sravnitel'no-istoričeskomu jazykoznaniju*, Moskva 1958, p. 69 (cf. V. Georgiev, *Introduzione alla storia delle lingue indoeuropee*, Roma 1966, p. 59, 62sq., 70sq., etc.).

<sup>22</sup> Cf. also A. Bartoněk, *Mycenaean Koine Reconsidered*, *Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies* (Cambridge 1965), ed. L. R. Palmer—J. Chadwick, Cambridge 1966, pp. 95—103.

<sup>23</sup> Nevertheless, N. S. Grinbaum's opinion seems now to be rather different (see our *Questionnaire* on p. 155sq. of this book).

Peloponnesos need not have been determined only by the geographical situation of the place in question, but that they may have been due also to the possible inter-dialectal, or better, supradialectal character of LB Mycenaean — as the linguistic formation predominating in the Mycenaean centres of Southern Greece and being there the product of a certain dialectal levelling. It is in this light that we view the hypothesis of a Mycenaean Koine. In our opinion, it is to be taken into consideration that the solution of such linguistic structures as we call Koine, or in modern linguistic terminology “interdialect”, “common language”, and the like, is not its representing a mixture of two or more dialectal units, but rather its degree of integration — even if on the basis of a single dialect —, and at the same time, not so much its form, which is a mixture of different elements, as its supradialectal function. A demonstration of this view may be found in Hellenistic Koine, which did not originate through a simple process of mixing two or more Classical Greek dialects, but through linguistic integration on the basis of one dialect only, i.e. Attic.

This brings us, however, to our third group of problems [C], the main aim of which will be to follow the possible continuant of the LB language in Greek of the 1st millennium B.C. [C 1].

We have already characterized the Mycenaean Era as a period of considerable cultural and economic unity, and we have expressed the opinion that it would be no wonder if this unity were accompanied by a certain linguistic levelling, at least in the Mycenaean centres, in a way similar to that which occurred much later, towards the end of the Classical Era in the 1st millennium B.C., in different parts of the Greek world, when diverse interdialects were coming into being, covering increasingly the various epichoric dialects, until the latter completely disappeared under the layer of Hellenistic Koine. It is obvious that, on the contrary, in the Mycenaean world such a final victory of the common language was out of the question — due to the sudden destruction of this civilization in the 12th cent. B.C. — and thus, in the light of this hypothesis of ours, we should not be greatly surprised if we were to find that the LB language as the official language spoken and written in the Mycenaean centres had no direct continuant in the Greek dialects of the Classical Era.

Among the concrete linguistic arguments that would seem to support this conclusion we may mention the following two: a) As we have already seen, there are evidently ready objections to any of the attempts made hitherto at introducing Mycenaean into any group of the Classical dialects; in this connection we might refer again to the specific Mycenaean peculiarities mentioned earlier, which were probably innovations, and which had no continuity in any of the later Greek dialects.<sup>24</sup> b) Risch's new hypothesis<sup>25</sup> about “mycénien normal” (the type *pe-mo* < *sperm̃n*; Dat. Sing. of consonantal stems ending in *-e* = *ei*; type *ti-mi-ti-ja*) and “mycénien spécial” (*pe-ma* < *sperm̃n*; Dat. Sing. of cons. stems in *-i*; type *te-mi-ti-ja*) enables us to express the view that in Peloponnesos there existed side by side the rather uniform LB language, on the one hand, this being a kind of Mycenaean Koine par excellence, and some local vernacular *si*-dialect — or several closely affiliated local *si*-dialects — on the other hand, on whose basis Mycenaean Koine had originated through integration, and which (that is to say this dialect [or these dialects])

<sup>24</sup> See Note 20.

<sup>25</sup> E. Risch, *Les différences dialectales dans le mycénien*, *Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies* (Cambridge 1965), ed. L. R. Palmer—J. Chadwick, Cambridge 1966, pp. 150—157.

alone, and not Mycenaean Koine as such) were upon the whole identical with the Mycenaean predecessor [or predecessors] of the Arcado-Cypriot dialectal community of the Classical Era.

If we could really on this basis suppose that Mycenaean, as it is known from the LB texts, had the character of an interdialect current only in the centres of Mycenaean civilization, its sudden and complete disappearance from the Greek-speaking world would, in the light of the drastic destruction of the Mycenaean civilization, be just as easily comprehended as, on the other hand, the continuation of this local vernacular dialect [or dialects] down to the Classical Era.

The comparatively considerable linguistic conformities between the Arcado-Cypriot dialects and the LB language indicate, however, at the same time that even if the hypothesis we have outlined were to prove correct, we could not consider the difference between that supradialectal Mycenaean Koine and the local vernacular proto-Arcado-Cypriot dialect [or dialects] as in any way remarkable. It consisted not in a horizontal, geographical differentiation of dialects, but only in a vertical discrimination of the supradialectal common Mycenaean from its local dialectal basis. From this point of view our hypothesis would rather assume the character of an attempted explanation of the fact that the LB language is probably not completely identical with the precursor of any dialect of the Classical Era, while it is not exactly intended as an argument against the theory of a close affinity between Mycenaean and Arcado-Cypriot.

With the question of the continuant of Mycenaean in the world of the Classical Greek dialects is associated also the question of the transmission of pre-Homeric epic poetry and the problem of dialectal elements in the Homeric language [C 2]. We have in mind particularly the way in which the "Arcado-Cypriot" and the Aeolic elements in the Ionic context of Homer's poetry are explained. Less complicated is the question of the "Arcado-Cypriot" elements because they may — provided that no other explanation is available — be directly ascribed to the Peloponnesian epic tradition of the Mycenaean Era. We face a more complicated situation when we deal with certain Aeolisms in Homer, particularly with those that do not seem to have come from Aeolis. The easiest approach to this problem appears to be to refer it to contemporary cultivation of epic poetry both among the Mycenaean Achaeans of Peloponnesos and the Aeolians of Central Greece, and especially, to the intermingling of these two factors throughout the long centuries in which oral production and transmission of epic poetry was practised. — Whatever the facts, we encounter here once more the problem of Aeolic, this time in connection with poetic activity, the beginnings of which must be traced back to the Mycenaean Era.

To the same set of problems belongs also the question of how to explain the traces of a certain parallel post-Mycenaean development of Arcado-Cypriot and of Aeolic [C 3]. (We have in mind here for instance the parallel development of the *o*-substitutes for the I.E. sonants *r*, *l* in these dialects; if we take into account the variable use of *a* and *o* for these substitutes in Mycenaean itself, a directly Mycenaean origin for this parallel Arcado-Cypriot-Aeolic feature appears to be improbable.) It is to be stressed in the same connection that in the Classical dialects of the Doric Peloponnesos certain phenomena can be occasionally identified that make a strong impression of being Aeolic substrate phenomena.<sup>28</sup> To what extent this is to be attributed to the

<sup>28</sup> Cf. A. Thumb — A. Scherer, *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte II*<sup>2</sup>, Heidelberg 1959, p. 2, 115, 211.

existence of some Aeolic dialect of the *ti*-group that may have penetrated Peloponnesos either in the Mycenaean Era or shortly after the fall of the Mycenaean centres remains, so far, more than open to discussion, and when considering our almost complete ignorance of the development of Greek dialectal relations subsequent to the Doric immigration into Peloponnesos we have to concede that no definite answer to the question appears to be in sight. If such an answer could be hoped for, it might also cast some illumination on the question of Aeolisms in Homer's epic poetry.

One cannot help noticing in how many disputable questions Aeolic has come into our range of vision while we tried to work our way through Greek dialectal prehistory. It is by no means surprising that various scholars throughout several generations were ready to identify its speakers with the representatives of Mycenaean civilization, whether prior or subsequent to the decipherment of the Linear B Script. In our opinion, as stated before, Aeolic, as originally a *ti*-dialect, cannot be directly connected with Mycenaean, which belongs to the *si*-type, yet, on the other hand, the Mycenaean precursor of Aeolic, although figuring somewhere in the background of the Mycenaean world — which after all may be due merely to the fact that LB documents from Central Greece are so far very scarce — was surely not a negligible dialectal community. And thus we find ourselves at the end of this paper returning willy-nilly to Porzig and his emphasis on the Aeolian share in the formation of Mycenaean civilization — even if we refuse to identify Aeolic with the Mycenaean of Linear B.

The dialectal problems of the centuries that lie between the fall of the Mycenaean civilization and the first alphabetic inscriptions have certainly not been exhausted by the questions raised above. A number of other problems remain to be solved, such as the West-Greek influences on Ionic or, for that part, on the Aeolic dialects of Central Greece, but these are problems which stand mostly apart from our present main sphere of interest. No doubt we should discover many an interesting item among them, but when approaching them we should have to bring into play substantially different aspects of research.

We have been discussing several groups of problems and a number of partial questions whose thoughtful treatment might, in our opinion, prove to be a useful aid to a future successful classification of Mycenaean Greek. Now, the author of this paper need not stress that he conceived the points of his paper as mere impulses intended to stimulate thought. They are to serve only as starting points, prompting further and increasing systematic work on these problems — the enumeration of which, to be sure, does not pretend to be complete. In other words, the author is far from seeing in his contribution a real attempt to present anything like his own explanation of the prehistory of the Greek language. Nevertheless, he has endeavoured, as far as it was in his power, at least roughly to formulate his own views of the problems alluded to. He sincerely hopes that other participants of the Conference will as readily take part in such friendly confrontation of points of view. He himself will be most grateful for any criticism, improvement or amplification of the questions he has raised or for any suggestion whatsoever concerning these problems. He would be very happy should his humble contribution result in a response that would mean a further step on the way towards still closer and prompter cooperation between those working in this field.

And now he begs to be excused for taking the liberty of making a purely practical suggestion. He has attached to this paper a kind of summarizing appeal, a list of questions, to which the participants may respond by taking sides, if they think it worth while. They may either do so at once, in the course of the ensuing discussion,

or on any other later occasion at this Conference and all these responses will be reproduced in a special part of the printed Proceedings of this Symposium, comprising all the contributions read at the meetings.

Naturally, the prospects of obtaining valuable results must not be overestimated. A whole volume would probably not be enough today if we wanted merely to list — let alone solve — all the disputed questions of Mycenaean dialectology. Yet, even if no one expects that this arrangement would completely eliminate these disagreements, one thing anyway might be accomplished. We might have available a synchronic survey of standpoints, diverging, to be sure, in opinion but unified as to concretely formulated subject-matter, and also as to time, place and even atmosphere of the moment when they were uttered. I am convinced too that the last-mentioned factor must not be underestimated, for the history of human thought discloses many examples of progress made in the atmosphere of friendly gatherings and stimulating discussion.

### The list of questions to be answered

#### A. *Problems pertaining to the origin of dialectal differences in Ancient Greek.*

1. To what extent is it possible to place the origin of Greek dialectal differences as far back as the widely differing I.E. branches, the Greek situation of the Classical Era being an outcome of long foregoing mutual convergences?
2. What would you adduce in support of the theory that some Greek dialectal differences originated still outside Greek soil, but already within some closer I.E. linguistic community, which was later to become the basis of the Greek-speaking world?
3. How is one to imagine the occupation of the Greek soil by the ancestors of the Ancient Greeks, and do you find the traditional view about several waves of Greek newcomers sufficiently plausible?
4. To what extent was the Greek world dialectally differentiated as early as the Middle Helladic period, and provided it was clearly differentiated, in what degree did this differentiation correspond with that of the Classical Era?

#### B. *Questions on the origin of Mycenaean.*

1. How would you characterize the dialectal area in which the LB language originated? Or what were the dialectal elements on which Mycenaean was based?
2. What was the place of Aeolic in the Mycenaean world? What form of the original suffix *-ti-* can be assumed for the Mycenaean precursor of Aeolic?
- 3.—4. What was the relation of Mycenaean to the precursors of the Classical Attic-Ionic and Arcado-Cypriot dialects?
5. What do you think of the idea of the LB language being a kind of Mycenaean Koine?

6. To what extent are you willing to admit the existence of differences within Peloponnesian Mycenaean and what do you think of their character?

**C.** *Questions pertaining to possible continuants of Mycenaean in the dialectal world of the Classical Era.*

1. What are the possibilities of proving that Mycenaean really had a direct continuation among the dialects of the Classical Era?
2. How do you explain the occurrence of the "Arcado-Cypriot" and Aeolic elements in Homer?
3. How are certain parallelisms in the post-Mycenaean development of Arcado-Cypriot and of Aeolic to be explained? How strong do you find the West-Greek influence on both the Attic-Ionic and the Aeolic dialects of Central Greece after the Dorian immigration?

*A. B.*

