

ANTONÍN BARTONĚK

RELEVANCE OF THE LINEAR B LINGUISTIC PHENOMENA FOR THE CLASSIFICATION OF MYCENAEAN

In the preliminary material submitted to this Colloquium there is also my report on the results obtained by the Dialectological Questionnaire arising from the proceedings of the Brno Mycenological Symposium, held in 1966, the partial results of which were published in *Studia Mycenaea Brno*. An evaluation of the above results, contained in this report, was compiled in the autumn of 1969, and in approximately this form I included it in my lecture on the linguistic character of Mycenaean, a lecture which I delivered at several West German universities between November 1969 and January 1970. During discussions concerned with this subject, however, I became increasingly aware of one important circumstance. On the one hand the linguistic arguments in favour of the Greek character of the Linear B texts are entirely reliable, and as they are combined into a system, they offer increasing possibilities of resolving the doubts of some sceptical historians and archaeologists who are still at a loss whether to accept Ventris's solution or not, and who use the ambiguity of some of the texts as an argument against the correctness of the solution itself. On the other hand, however, such views as might serve as the basis for an objective dialectal classification of Mycenaean have a comparatively weaker foundation, while even some of the frequently repeated arguments in favour of one or other dialectal connection are not so safe as is generally thought, especially in some of the outline hand-books.

This sceptical consideration has induced me to try in my second contribution to subject to a test all the linguistic parallels that are usually mentioned as arguments in favour of one or other dialectal connection of Mycenaean, and to determine the degree of their relevance for the dialectal classification of the language of the Linear B Script.

Among the linguistic parallels of the type in question the following phenomena may be regarded as having *very low relevance*, if any at all:

1. A *precise interpretation* of the Linear B phenomenon is *very uncertain* or *altogether questionable* (often due to very sporadic documentation), so that the classification becomes highly problematic.

Cf. e. g. the question of the realization of the first compensatory lengthening in forms such as Myc. *o-pe-ro-te ophēlontes* (more probable than geminated *ophellontes*, and perhaps even more than *ophelhontes*, but uncertain); the alternative interpretations of Myc. *-o-i*, *-a-i* in dat. plur. of *o-*, *ā-*stems (either *-oi(h)i*, *-ā(h)i*, or *-ois*, *-ais*); the insufficiently founded identification of Myc. *o-n...*, *e-we-...*, *-da*, *-ne* with the later dialectal forms *ὄν-*, *εὐ-* (cf. *ἐπί*), *-δα*, *-νε*; Myc. *to-to* if compared with Att. TOTO; etc.

In our opinion we should include here even the alleged parallel of the Mycenaean *pa-ro da-mo* with Arcado-Cypriot *ἀπύ, ἐξ* + dative (or locative), for the ablative meaning, which is undoubted in the case of these Arcado-Cypriot prepositions, but can hardly be fully substantiated for the Mycenaean *pa-ro*.

2. The phenomenon is on the whole safely documented in Mycenaean, yet, owing to its *limited* (and often only lexically fixed) *documentation* in later Greek dialects *cannot be satisfactorily classified* from the dialectal point of view.

E. g. the preposition (prefix) *o-pi* if compared with Thessalian *ὀπεῖ* and common Greek *ὀπιθεν*.

3. The Mycenaean phenomenon has the character of a provable *archaism*, and for this reason it can tell us nothing about the dialectal interrelations (the Classical dialects sometimes retain the archaism, but often make some innovation).

E. g. Myc. *-o-jo* = *-oj(j)o* in gen. sing. of *o*-stems (cf. Hom. *-οιο* and Thess. *-οι*); *...e-u* = *-eus* in nom. sing. of *eu*-stems; *-si* in dat. plur. of cons. stems; fut. act. *do-so* = *dōsō*; the use of patronymic adjectives; and possibly also the personal suffix of 3rd sing./plur. med. *-(ν)τοι*.¹

¹ A possible archaism is also *pe-i* = *sphe(h)i* or *spheis*, cf. Arc. *σφεῖς*; but even the opposite interpretation cannot be excluded, i. e. innovation.

Nevertheless, irrespective of whether the Myc. and Arc.-Cypr. suffix $-(v)\tau\omicron\iota$ (cf. Myc. *e-u-ke-to* = *eukhetoi*, Arc. τέτακτοι, Cypr. κείτοι) is an archaic IE form, older than $-(v)\tau\alpha\iota$ (M. S. Ruipérez), or represents a specific «Old Achaean» (i. e. Mycenaean-Arcado-Cypriot) innovation, we may take it for granted that we have to deal here with a difference antedating the end of the Mycenaean Era. If it is an innovation, this supposition is fully justified by this fact in itself. Moreover, it appears highly probable even for those who accept Ruipérez's hypothesis because we can hardly imagine that Ruipérez's innovation $-(v)\tau\alpha\iota$, documented alike in the Doric, Aeolic, and Ionic areas in the Classical Era, could have originated only after 1200 B.C. The post-Mycenaean migration drifts throughout the Greek world were so intense and complex that we can scarcely assume, amid the linguistic disintegration then prevailing, that an entirely uniform isogloss originated, affecting the whole extensive Greek territory from Thessaly and the North-West dialects as far as Pamphylia—excepting only Arcadia and Cyprus.

4. In Mycenaean we find *several equivalent variants* documented, while later dialects generally *choose* from among them, or at least prefer, *only one variant*.

Cf. e. g. the co-existence of *me-ta* and *pe-da*, of the thematic and athematic forms with vocalic verbs, of the material suffixes $-e(j)o-$ and $-i(j)o-$ ² and probably also the co-existence of the *a-* and *o-* substitutes for the IE r, l, m, n , which according to the current but inexact opinion displayed *o*-colouring in the Aeolic and Achaean areas but *a*-colouring in the Doric and Ionic areas.

Even though the question of the Greek substitutes for the Indo-European r, l, m, n —and particularly their dialectal relevance—has not yet been satisfactorily solved, we may make in the meantime at least the following statements:

a) The normal development of the IE m, n leads to the reflex *a* in all the Greek dialects, while the few odd exceptions to this rule require special explanations (e. g. with respect to the Arca-

² Similarly ξύν/σύν were most probably two equivalent variants (in Mycenaean, however, only *ku-su-* = *ksun-* is securely attested).

dian ἑκοτόν or the Attic-Ionic -κόσιοι we have to think of the analogy with numerals ending in -κοντα, or with respect to the Mycenaean *pe-ma/pe-mo* < **spermn̥* either likewise an analogy or the influence of a specific consonantal [labial] environment).

b) The *o*-substitute for the IE *r*, *l* seems to predominate over the *a*-documentation only in Aeolic dialects (esp. Lesbian), while in Mycenaean the scales are approximately on a level, and in Arcado-Cypriot *ar/ra* actually prevails; this fact has induced some investigators to think, at least with respect to the Mycenaean-Arcado-Cypriot area, that this dialectal difference is irrelevant for purposes of classification (according to A. Morpurgo Davies³ the occurrence of *or/ro* may in most cases be ascribed to the influence of the preceding *w*, according to M. Doria⁴ there was in origin only one substitute in Mycenaean, articulated between *a* and *o*, but not yet introduced in the phonological system).

If therefore it is possible to make any use of this phenomenon in classification, the only conclusion to be drawn would be that the Mycenaean and Arcado-Cypriot usages in question appear to be in conformity, on the whole. The traditional stressing of a parallel between both the Aeolic, and the Arcado-Cypriot and Mycenaean *ro/lo* springs therefore from an inconsistent approach, considering the Mycenaean occurrence of the substitute *o* (e. g. in *qe-to-ro-* = *kwetro-* < **kwet(w)r-*) to be a phenomenon connecting this dialect with Aeolic, whereas the occurrence of the substitute *a* (e. g. in *pa-we-a₂* = *pharwe(h)a* < **bhrw-*) fails to be stressed as a point of contact with the Attic-Ionic area.

5. In Mycenaean a *more general developmental tendency* is displayed, which can *hardly* be *directly connected* with similar tendencies in dialects of the Classical Era.

Cf. e. g. the alternation *e/i*, esp. the tendency *e > i* before labials, or various instances of the «prononciation rapide», used alongside with the «prononciation normale» (*ka-za* = *khalkja* beside *ka-ki-jo* = *khalkiō*, dual, and *ka-ke-ja-pi* = *khalkeiāphi*, instr., or *a-ke-ti-ra₂* = *-trja* beside *a-ke-ti-ri-ja* = *-tria* [the relation

³ A. Morpurgo Davies, «The Treatment of *r* and *l* in Mycenaean and Arcado-Cyprian», *Atti Roma* II, pp. 790 ff.

⁴ M. Doria, *Avviamento*, p. 75, n. 19 (cf. also A. Morpurgo Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 809).

a-ke-ti-ri-ja : *a-ze-ti-ri-ja* is obscure], or the occasional ending *-e* = *-es* in acc. plur. of cons. stems).

* * *

If we do not take into account phenomena mentioned in the last five paragraphs, we have left only a small number of parallels between Mycenaean and the Classical Greek dialects which can be regarded as relevant for a dialectal classification of Mycenaean. In practice we have to deal with the following fairly safely documented Mycenaean *innovations* or already firmly fixed Mycenaean choices («elections»).

1. The assibilation *-ti(-)* > *-si(-)*, e. g. in *e-ko-si* = *ekhonsi*, including also *po-si* = *posi*; and cf. also *po-se-da-o* = *Poseidāōn*.

Myc., Arc.-Cypr., Att.-Ion., Lesb. *-si-*: Thess., Boeot., Pamph., West Greek *-ti-*. According to the hypothesis of W. Porzig⁵ and E. Risch⁶, the Mycenaean precursor of the Aeolic dialects had its suffix *-ti-* still not changed into *-si-*, which we find documented even in the Classical Era in Thessalian and Boeotian, while Lesbian owed its *-si-* only to the post-colonization influence of neighbouring Ionia.

2. The more progressive assibilation of *t(h)j*, at least of homomorphemic *t(h)j*, e. g. in *to-so* = *tosos* < **totjos*, especially if compared with *k(h)j* (cf. *ka-zo-e* = *katso(h)es* < **kakjoses*).

Myc. *to-so*, Arc., Att.-Ion., Pamph. τόσος, ὄσος etc.: Thess., Lesb., West Greek (but not in Crete) τόσος, ὄσος etc.: Boeot., Cretan ὄττος, ὄπῶττος etc. (in some very early Cretan inscriptions ὄξος).

3. The thematic inf. act. in ...*e-e* = *-e(h)en*, e. g. in *e-ke-e* = *ekhe(h)en*.

Myc. ...*e-e*, Arc. *-εν* (Tegea; but *-ην* in Lycosura, Orchomenos), Phoc., East Locr., Argol., Coan, Ther., Cyren., Cret., Heracl.

⁵ W. Porzig, «Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Dialekten», *IF* 61, 1954, pp. 147 ff.

⁶ E. Risch, «Die Gliederung der griechischen Dialekte in neuer Sicht», *MH* 12, 1955, pp. 61 ff.

-εν: Att.-Ion., Thess. (Thessaliois), West Locr., Corinth., Meg., Rhod. -ειν, Lesb., El., Lac. (and partly also Arcadian) -ην: Boeot., Thess. (Pelasgiotis) -μεν (as well as sometimes in Homer and once in Cretan).—Some instances of this distribution are late (e. g. the difference between the Heracleian -εν and Laconian -ην), others may be Mycenaean in date (e. g. the Arcadian difference between -εν and -ην); the Cypriot -en and Pamphylian -Ev are ambiguous.

4. Myc. *a-pu* = *apu*.

Cf. Arc.-Cypr., Thess., Lesb. ἀπύ : ἀπό in the remaining dialects.

5. Myc. *po-si* = *posi*, if compared with forms having πρ-.

Cf. Arc.-Cypr. πός, Boeot., Thess., West Greek (with some exceptions) πο(τ)ί: Att.-Ion., Lesb. πρός (in the latter case under the Ionic influence), Central Cretan πορτί, occasional Argive προτ', Pamph. περτ', Homeric προτί (beside ποτί and usual πρός).

6. Myc. *o-te* = (*h*)ote.

Cf. Arc.-Cypr., Att.-Ion. ὄτε, ὄτε: Lesb. ὄτα: West Greek, Pamph., Boeot. ὄκα, ὄκα (the Boeotian form seems to be due to West Greek influence).

7. Myc. *i-je-ro* = (*h*)ieros.

Cf. Arc.-Cypr., Thess., Att.-Ion. ἱερός, ἱερός: West Greek, Pamph., Boeot. ἱρός, ἱρός (the Boeotian form, as well as the occasional Thessalian ἱρ-, seem to be due to West Greek influence): Lesb. ἱρος.

8. The initial *pt-* in *ptolemos* and *ptolis*.

In Mycenaean in the personal names only; cf. πτόλεμος and πτόλις, etc., in Homer and Arc.-Cypr. and πτολι- in Thess.)

Since a comparison of Mycenaean with the Classical Greek dialects is naturally justified only if it can be performed—even in a speculative way—on a *synchronic Late Helladic level* the linguistic data of this survey can be accepted only with the following reservations:

a) The first beginnings of the differences that are included in our survey were already *in general terms* associated with the period prior to 1200 B.C.; it is, however, not altogether impossible that some *special cases* of differences between the individual dialectal areas may have occurred even later. Thus for instance the early existence of the difference between the *ti*-dialects and the *si*-dialects can be demonstrated in the Late Helladic period by reference to the Mycenaean *e-ko-si* = *ekhonsi*, yet, it cannot be altogether excluded that let us say in the Attic-Ionic area the assibilation of *ti* > *si* may have taken place later, e. g. as late as shortly *after* the fall of the Mycenaean civilization—in a period when Attica was becoming the place of refuge of the Peloponnesian Achaeans and the main source of the mighty colonization current flowing eastward. (On the other hand, to be sure, we find some support for the theory of the *Late Helladic* origin of the Attic-Ionic *ti* > *si* change in the fact that Arcado-Cypriot and Attic-Ionic are linked by another similar assibilation, shown by the parallel history of proto-Greek «homomorphemic» *t(h)j* (type **totjos* > *tosos*) in both these dialectal groups; see above No. 2.)

b) By eliminating some secondary factors (e. g. the Ionic influence in Lesbos or the West Greek one in Boeotia and Thesaliotis) we can try to approach the Late Helladic dialectal situation as closely as possible. But we can hardly do more than compare Mycenaean with the *supposed precursors* of the four main groups of the Classical Greek dialects (West Greek = Doric in the wide sense of word; Aeolic; Arcado-Cypriot = «Old Achaean»; Attic-Ionic). Such a reconstruction implies, however, the danger of an error arising from the circumstance that in the Late Helladic period there may have existed dialectal formations that left behind no traces whatsoever, and the dividing lines between the main dialectal areas of the Late Helladic period may have taken a different course from what we might anticipate on the basis of retrospective speculative projection of later dialectal interrelations into the Late Helladic past.

In the light of these reservations we can derive from our comparative study as the only reasonably objective outcome an undoubted confirmation of the hypothesis that Mycenaean was an organic member of the proto-Arcado-Cypriot («Old Achaean»)

community. In each of the quoted items Mycenaean is either in full or at least partial agreement with the Arcado-Cypriot situation from the middle of the 1st millennium B.C.⁷ The only demonstrated deviation concerns the thematic suffix of inf. act. (i. e. Myc. ...e-e = -e(h)en), which displays in Arcadian inscriptions fluctuation in the use of -εν/-ην.

This *linguistic* conclusion may be supplemented by a significant *historical* argument: if we combine the traditional and generally accepted thesis about the original genetic unity of Arcadian and Cypriot with the realization that the Late Helladic precursor of Arcadian was spoken in the territory stretching between Argolid and Messenia, i. e. between two significant Mycenaean coastal states and two of the three most important regions where Linear B tablets have been found, and if we further consider that the Achaeans, who were colonizing Cyprus during the Mycenaean Era, came to this island, partly at least, directly from the coastal parts of the Peloponnese, then we can hardly question seriously a *close connection* between the Linear B language and the Mycenaean phase in the development of the Arcadian and Cypriot dialects.

Yet a *total identity* of all these dialects can scarcely be assumed, still less if we accept the view, now meeting with increasing approval, which holds that the Mycenaean of the Linear B texts was in fact either a sort of *spoken supradialectal formation*, perhaps originally based on one of the Aegean dialects (maybe from the Argolid) and possibly betraying slight traces of other dialectal elements, or else that it was just an *official written language*, fixed and rigid, yet displaying some linguistic differences, which occasionally became visible. Likewise some indications of a specific Mycenaean development undocumented in Arcadian and Cypriot warn us against interpreting Mycenaean as an *entirely direct* precursor of Arcado-Cypriot (for instance certain cases of the «prononciation rapide», such as those registered in No. 5, see above).

⁷ We may add that even the «less safe» relevance of the Mycenaean substitutes for IE *ɹ*, *ʎ*, as well as that of the medial suffix -(v)τοι and of the Myc. *pe-i* point in the same direction.

On the other hand, however, these slight (and, in fact, not fully relevant) differences between Mycenaean and Arcado-Cypriot seem to be so unsubstantial that we can without any hesitation characterize Mycenaean as one of the Late Helladic dialects of the proto-Arcado-Cypriot type, while from the historical point of view it is quite logical that after the Dorian immigration these dialects were preserved only in the backward area of Arcadia and in the Cypriot colonization area. To be sure, in both these dialectal areas we can assume some archaic retardation as compared for instance with the Mycenaean of the Argolid (and in the case of Cyprus we cannot exclude the additional possibility of foreign secondary influence).

A close connection of Mycenaean with Arcado-Cypriot imposes upon us the question of the mutual interrelations of *all* the Greek dialects of the Late Helladic period. For this purpose of course *our present comparative material* from the survey given above is quite insufficient, and it has therefore to be supplemented with *further phenomena* demonstrating ancient differences, most likely already present in Mycenaean, i. e. partly with cases in which Mycenaean itself still displayed an *archaic* phenomenon, while in other Late Helladic dialectal areas we perhaps have to assume that some innovation had already occurred (e. g. the Mycenaean *-si*, dat. plur., in contrast to the Early Aeolic *-essi*), and partly with instances when the Mycenaean texts are *silent* or at least do not supply us with any evidence, but where the differences between the Classical dialects appear to be sufficiently ancient for us to feel justified in projecting them retrospectively deep into the 2nd millennium B.C. We have here in mind particularly the following more important dialectal differences:

1. The dat. plur. of cons. stems in $-\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ (Aeol., East Locr., Phoc., Pamph., partly Homeric, with occasional forms in West Locr., El., Cyren. and several Corinthian colonies) as compared with the ancient $-\sigma\iota$ (Att.-Ion., Arc.-Cypr., in most West Greek dialects —and under West Greek influence also in Thessalotis); later especially in Aetol., West Locr., Elean the innovative ending $-\sigma\iota\varsigma$ was preferred.—The agreement between Boeotian, Thessalian, and Lesbian $-\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ in dat. plur. of consonant stems can probably be best explained by its common origin dating back

to a time when the Aeolian settlements were still in contact. As regards the agreement between Boeotian and Thessalian (more precisely Pelasgiotic) $-\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$, we might, to be sure, admit that the phenomenon could have come into existence here as late as after the penetration of the Dorians to the Euboean Gulf as a common Phocian-Locrian-Boeotian-Thessalian isogloss, yet this view is questionable partly because in Thessaliois, the Thessalian region situated between Pelasgiotis and the Doric areas adjoining the Malian and Euboean Gulfs, we still find in the 5th century B.C. the ancient form $-\sigma\iota$, and partly because in this case it would be necessary to consider the Lesbian $-\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ as the outcome of an independent development. It appears therefore to be more appropriate here to side with C. J. Ruijgh⁸ and interpret the ending $-\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ as an Aeolic phenomenon by origin, arising as early as the Mycenaean Age, and to see in its penetration into the Doric world either a substrate phenomenon (East Locris, Phocis, and perhaps also West Locris), or a manifestation of a further, secondary, and in places relatively late spread of this notable and easily applied innovation.

2. The innovating form $\omicron\iota$ of the article in Arc.-Cypr., Ion.-Att., Thess., Lesb., Cretan (here as a substratum phenomenon?; only Itanos has $\tau\omicron\iota$) and Cyrenaean, and also in Homer (beside $\tau\omicron\iota$) in contrast to the original $\tau\omicron\iota$ (West Greek— and Boeotian, and partly also Thessalian [Thessaliois], under West Greek influence).

3. The choice between the IE primary suffix of 1st plur. act. $-\mu\epsilon\varsigma$ (West Greek) and the secondary $-\mu\epsilon\nu$ (Arc.-Cypr., Ion.-Att., Aeol.).

4. The West Greek innovation $\delta\omega\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (fut.) if compared with $\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\omega$ in the remaining Greek dialects (also in Mycenaean).

5. The suffix $-ναι$ as the athematic ending of inf. pres. act. (Arc.-Cypr., Ion.-Att.) when compared with $-\mu\epsilon\nu$ (Boeot., Thess., in the majority of the West Greek dialects), $-\mu\epsilon\iota\nu$, $-\mu\eta\nu$ (in some West Greek dialects) or $-\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ (Lesb.).

⁸ Cf. C. J. Ruijgh, *L'élément achéen dans la langue épique*, Assen 1957, pp. 14 ff.

6. The conjunction εἰ (Arc., Ion.-Att.) or ἦ (Cypr. and perhaps in Crete) versus αἰ (Aeol., West Greek)⁹.

7. The particle ἄν (Arc., Ion.-Att.) versus κε (Cypr., Thess., Lesb.) or κα (West Greek, Boeot. —in the latter case West Greek influence was the decisive factor). The form ἄν seems to be a Mycenaean innovation as to date¹⁰.

8. The *o*-grade in the Attic-Ionic βούλομαι, βόλομαι and Arc.-Cypr. βόλομαι in contrast to the Aeolic and Doric *e*-grade (West Greek δήλομαι, δείλομαι, Boeot. βειλομη, Thess. βέλλομαι, the Lesbian βόλλομαι being probably due to a secondary Ionic influence).

The chronology of these phenomena cannot be very precisely fixed, yet the nature of their geographic extension makes us assume that the innovations or choices («elections») in question were made at the latest shortly before the final disintegration of either the former proto-Doric or the former proto-Aeolic community, which would imply in each case as the respective *terminus ante quem* the time closely following the destruction of the Mycenaean civilization. At the same time, however, we can hardly assume that all the changes just mentioned were accomplished approximately simultaneously, i. e. let us say in the 12th century B.C.¹¹, and for this reason it appears more probable that the beginnings of at least a majority of these differences should be associated with the period before 1200 B.C.

Nevertheless, even if we extend in this way our view of the classification, our knowledge of the dialectal situation in the 2nd millennium B.C. remains so fragmentary that it prevents us from grasping the problems of the relations between the dialects in their totality and forces upon us a «working» schematization which *may* or *may not* correspond with reality. All this considered,

⁹ Boeot. ἦ is a late development of αἰ.

¹⁰ W. C. Cowgill, «Ancient Greek Dialectology in the Light of Mycenaean», *Ancient Indo-European Dialects*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1966, p. 88.

¹¹ The view which admits the possibility of the rapid occurrence of a large number of linguistic changes (with reference to the Attic situation after the Peloponnesian War [Risch]) may be to some extent acceptable in the case of innovations, but it is in our opinion less applicable to the «choices» such as -μες / -μεν.

we believe that from the methodological point of view any attempts at *summing up* either the presupposed agreements or differences relating to individual Late Helladic dialectal groups are premature, while we ourselves in contrast are in the meantime content with a purely *minimal aim*, namely, to find out by analysing the phenomena quoted whether the situation, which is known to us from the 1st millennium B.C. and enables us to classify the Classical Greek dialects from the synchronic standpoint into the four groups given above, is even remotely analogous, that is to say, whether after the retrospective projection of the dialectal situation of the Classical Age into the Late Helladic period there remain any *dividing lines* between the individual dialectal groups which are accepted as valid for the Classical Age. The following six lines of division come into consideration:

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| A) Doric (West Greek) × Aeolic | D) Aeolic × Achaeae |
| B) Doric (West Greek) × Achaeae | E) Aeolic × Ionic |
| C) Doric (West Greek) × Ionic | F) Achaeae × Ionic |

On A): The existence of a Late Helladic dividing line between the Mycenaean precursors of *Aeolic* and *Doric* may be indicated by several distinct and quite ancient differences between the Classical Aeolic and Doric dialects, which *consistently* differentiate the two dialectal groups (displaying at the worst some *secondary* anomalies, which can be explained by specific post-Mycenaean developments). Here we may mention particularly the Doric innovation δωσέω in contrast to the Aeolic (and generally Greek) δώσω, or on the other hand the Aeolic innovation -εσσι in dat. plur. of the consonantal stems (with only a *secondary* spread to some of the Doric dialects), the innovation οί (in place of τοί), documented in all the non-Doric dialects (and in Crete and Cyrene, maybe as a remnant of the Achaeae substrate), or the «elective» relationship between the Doric -μεσ and the non-Doric -μεν.

On B-C): At the same time, from the arguments given above it appears very probable that some lines of division existed even between the Mycenaean precursor of *Doric* on the one hand and *Old Achaeae*, or *Early Ionic*, on the other.

On D-E): Those of course who do not accept Risch's hypothesis about proto-Aeolic as a *ti*-dialect will presumably go on consider-

ing as the main dividing line between Early Aeolic and Early Doric the opposition *si* : *ti*. It is true that in this way they will in turn be deprived of one significant difference between *Early Aeolic* on one hand and *Old Achaeian*, or *Early Ionic*, on the other, but the existence of these two dividing lines may be corroborated also by a few other differences of high antiquity, particularly by those which represent at the same time a secure and specific agreement between Old Achaeian and Early Ionic: e. g. the advanced assibilation of *t(h)j* (type **totjos*), the athematic inf. act. in *-vαi*, the conjunctions *εἰ* (or *ἦ* in Cypriot) and *ὄτε*, and the *o*-grade in *βούλομαι*, *βόλομαι*.

On F): We still have to say a few words about the Late Helladic division between *Old Achaeian* and *Early Ionic*. Both from the point of view of the Classical Age and in the light of the Linear B texts we have to indicate as especially remarkable the difference between the Achaeian suffix *-(v)τοι* in 3rd sing./plur. med. and the ending *-(v)ται* in the other Greek dialects a contrast which must have originated in the Late Helladic period. Of the other differences of older date we may mention in this connection especially the contrast between the Arcado-Cypriot *πός* (and the Mycenaean *po-si*) and the Attic-Ionic *πρός* —even if all these dialects are in mutual agreement on the ending *-s(i)*. Much less relevant, as we have already mentioned, is the argument based on differences in the use of the Achaeian and Attic-Ionic substitutes for the IE *r*, *l*.

The explanation we have expounded here so far shows therefore that we can insert *at least one* sufficiently significant and quite ancient isogloss *between each two* of the four main Greek dialectal spheres, while, as we have pointed out before, we are as yet unable to state with any degree of precision to what extent these may have been joined by *other* isoglosses. Thus the measure of the provable dialectal differences may, to be sure, be regarded as small, yet with the important reservation that our statement is the result of the great dearth of linguistic material at our disposal. This situation permits us, on the one hand, to acknowledge the justification for using even with reference to the Late Helladic period such concepts as proto-Arcado-Cypriot (or maybe better «Old Achaeian»), implying the assumed existence of the forms *pheronsi*, *pheretoi*, *pheromen*, proto-Ionic (*pheronsi*, *pheretai*, *pheromen*),

proto-Aeolic (*pheronti?*, *pheretai*, *pheromen*), proto-Doric (*pheronti*, *pheretai*, *pheromes*); on the other hand, however, we are not in a position to determine how deep these differences had actually gone.

For this reason we cannot pass an objective judgement on M. Doria's¹² interesting view, that the Late Helladic dialectal differences were even deeper than those of the Classical Age. Nevertheless, since Doria has not so far been able to support his opinion with convincing proofs, we have to resort for the time being to the statement that—in the light of what we actually know and can grasp by investigation of the dialectal situation in the 2nd half of the 2nd millennium B.C.—the then existing differences in the Greek linguistic world appear to be comparatively small, and seem to be starting in the same direction that we can trace in the later development of the phenomena of differentiation. We found corroboration of both these features in the course of detailed investigation of the *West Greek* dialects (i. e. Doric dialects in the wider sense) which we recently attempted in a separate monograph that is to be published next year¹³. Inside this dialectal group no essential linguistic differences can be safely demonstrated even towards the close of the Late Helladic period, i. e. prior to the so-called Dorian migration. The whole development of this linguistic branch gives us a picture of a comparatively young differentiation development, and if we do not take into account the few isolated evidences of Achaeian substrate in some of the West Greek dialects, we find that of the local linguistic differences securely proved and comparable on a wider scale there is only one which is evidently older than the first compensatory lengthening of the type **esmi* > *ēmi*, which is generally supposed to have taken place on the threshold of the 1st millennium B.C. We have in mind the Elean shift of the primary *ē* to the open *ā*, which may after all be also of a substrate origin, even pre-Greek in this case¹⁴.

¹² M. Doria, *Studia Mycenaea Brno*, Questionnaire, ad AH.

¹³ A. Bartoněk, *The Classification of the West Greek Dialects*, Amsterdam 1972.

¹⁴ A. Bartoněk, *Development of the Long-Vowel System in Ancient Greek Dialects*, Praha 1966, p. 89.

At the same time it is worth noting that the *Attic-Ionic* group probably remained intact in the Greek dialectal world even longer than proto-Doric. All its inner differences are younger than the beginnings of the Ionic colonization of Asia Minor via the Cyclades. Thus if we fix chronologically the completion of the first phase of the important Attic-Ionic phonological change of $\bar{a} > \bar{a}\bar{e}$ ($> \bar{e}$) approximately by 900 B.C., we must ascribe to the Attic restoration of the long \bar{a} after *r, i, e*, which created a distinct dividing line between Attica and the other Ionic regions, a still later date, and the Attic-Euboean-Boeotian change *ts* $>$ *tt* also seems to indicate by its rather limited geographic extension that it was not accomplished before the beginning of the colonization process. The fact that Ionic seems to have been with respect to some important linguistic features in agreement with Doric may be attributed, as by J. Chadwick¹⁵, mainly to the post-Mycenaean contact of the two dialectal groups in the neighbourhood of the Saronic Gulf (thus for instance first compensatory lengthening of the type **esmi* $>$ *ēmi* took place along a wide strip of territory from the North-West across Locris, Phocis, the Isthmus, and the Megarid —along with the adjacent East Argolic coast— as far as the Attic-Euboean sphere, and finally with the Ionic colonization spread farther eastward by way of the Cyclades to Ionia).

It is necessary, however, to keep in mind that we, as a matter of fact, do not know the dialects of the assumed more ancient Ionic inhabitants of the later Doric territories near the Saronic Gulf and on the Peloponnesian coast (we gather information about them from ancient writers), and thus, what we consider to have been Early Ionic was perhaps in fact **only** one of the dialects of the proto-Ionic group, differing from the Achaean dialects of the Peloponnese and being spoken in Attica, but just on that account surviving the period of confusion after the fall of the Mycenaean civilization so as to provide a starting point for the development of the Classical Attic-Ionic dialects.

As opposed to Doric —and as it appears also to Ionic, naturally with the reservation mentioned above— the beginnings of

¹⁵ J. Chadwick, *The Greek Dialects and Greek Pre-history*, *Greece & Rome* 3, 1956, pp. 42 ff.

the interior break-up esp. of one of the two remaining dialectal groups, i. e. *Achaean*, may already coincide with the Mycenaean Age. In the said case this impression is based in principle on the comparatively great extent and considerable geographical variety of the territory in question, though it gets little reliable and direct support from the available linguistic material (cf. perhaps only the difference between the Arcadian $\check{\nu}$ and Cypriot $\kappa\epsilon$). But our attention is above all demanded by what appears to us to be the result of our recent analysis of differences within the single dialectal groups of the Classical Age; this indicates that the development of both the Doric and the Ionic dialects from their Late Helladic common sources can be followed without any major difficulties, whereas the interior classification of the Aeolic and Achaean dialects cannot be carried out without encountering more serious problems. To be sure, it is not easy to judge to what extent this assertion is objective and how far it may have been influenced by our fragmentary and sporadic knowledge of the more ancient Greek dialectal material.

In order to escape at least to some extent the schematization implied by transferring the relations between the dialectal groups of the Classical Age to the Late Helladic period, we should like —by way of closing this contribution— to formulate our point of view roughly in the following way: the Greek linguistic world presents itself to us at the end of the Late Helladic period as already rather varied. But since the lines of division between the single areas of differentiation are not always distinct enough to enable us securely to document the existence of whole bunches of significant isoglosses here or there, we believe that it is proper to imagine the Late Helladic situation as a dialectally *fairly continuous* territory with several more or less distinct lines of division and transition. In this sense we might perhaps modify and interpret W. C. Cowgill's¹⁶ method of grouping the Late Helladic dialects, i. e. Doric : Aeolic : Achaean : Ionic, yet without his reassociation of Ionic with Doric, because the agreements visible between Ionic and Doric are in our opinion really post-Mycenaean phenomena.

¹⁶ W. C. Cowgill, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

Consequently, even if our knowledge of the formation of dialects in the Late Helladic world is still rather fragmentary, there are a few assumptions that *may* be accepted with some degree of confidence, thanks mainly to the decipherment of the Linear B script. And it is just at the present time that we cherish a hope, or at least express a hopeful wish, that the latest excavations in Thebes may finally surprise Greek dialectology with the disclosure of a dialect differing from the Mycenaean dialect of Knossos, Mycenae and Pylos, i. e. some sort of assumed Aeolic variant of Mycenaean Greek.