

THE COMING OF THE GREEKS

By the late ERNST GRUMACH, D. Phil.

FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE HUMBOLDT UNIVERSITY, BERLIN

Prefatory Note

by

Sinclair Hood, M.A.

Formerly Director of the British School at Athens

THIS is the text of a series of three lectures delivered by the late Professor Ernst Grumach at the University of Birmingham in September 1966.

Grumach had long been convinced that the first Greek-speaking tribes, bearers of the historic Greek dialects, only found their way into Greece at the end of the Bronze Age c. 1200 B.C. instead of, as usually assumed, some seven hundred years or more earlier. It was his intention to write a book developing the arguments for this view. These lectures were a summary of work in progress.

It must be emphasized that these lectures represent work that was in the opinion of Grumach himself still very much in a formative state. Some of the views put forward here might therefore have been modified or altered in the light of further discussion and consideration. But there is little doubt that Grumach would have continued to uphold his main conclusion, namely that the first Greek-speaking tribes only came into Greece at the end of the Bronze Age, as the destroyers rather than as the bearers of Mycenaean civilization.

This view is not one that is widely held at the moment. Grumach, however, draws attention to the arguments recently put forward by Hampl and Heubeck in favour of it. At the same time, in these lectures he has gone more exhaustively into the question, and many of the arguments which he has brought forward here are new ones. In spite of the fact, therefore, that the lectures represent work in an unfinished state, and work that Grumach himself would certainly not have considered as ripe for publication,

it has seemed to many of us who were his friends that they ought to be published. Dr. Renate Grumach has kindly given her consent for this at our solicitation.

The lectures were delivered in English. The translation into English from the original German was made by Professor Arthur Beattie of Edinburgh University. This English translation I have adapted with the help of Mr. William Brice of Manchester University who has added the headings. A few of the references were given in the English translation. Professor Beattie, Professor Palmer of Oxford University, and Dr. Renate Grumach, have given generous assistance in tracking down others.

I. VARYING OPINIONS

When in 1876 Schliemann came upon the shaft graves at Mycenae, he was convinced that he had found the graves of Agamemnon and Clytemnestra, just as he believed that he had discovered in Troy II the city of Priam. Schliemann was, of course, inspired by a simple faith in Homer to whose descriptions he applied, as has been said, "the measure of reliability and exactitude of an ordnance map". His theories met with strong opposition from the archaeologists of his time, but through the influence of Furtwängler and Tsountas two things have survived to the present day as part of Schliemann's legacy: the habit of describing the mainland civilization which he discovered as Mycenaean; and the belief that this civilization was created and supported by Greeks. Much has happened, incidentally, to strengthen these beliefs, especially after the discovery at the turn of the century of a second sphere of Bronze Age civilization—the Minoan civilization of Crete. The distinctions, elaborated especially by Karo, Rodenwaldt, Schweitzer and Matz, between the mainland and Minoan cultures—the differences in plan between the Minoan palaces and the Mycenaean citadels; the *megaron* of the mainland, which, it was at one time thought, could be derived from a northern origin; assumed contrasts in artistic form and style described as "tectonic" and "atectonic"; real differences in dress and armament and even in physical type (so far as it is known to us from artistic representations)—all

these seemed to show that the civilization of the mainland belonged, if not to Greeks, then at least to a non-Minoan population, however close the relations between Crete and the mainland might be from time to time. An additional factor was Nilsson's attempt to prove that the Greek cycles of myth were attached to the centres of the Mycenaean world; another was his bold theory that the Mycenaean kingship was reflected in the structure of the society of the Homeric gods and the position of Zeus¹; and finally in the early 1950s there came Ventris's decipherment of Linear B,² which has not indeed remained undisputed, but which has nevertheless convinced many scholars and proved to their satisfaction that by the second half of the second millennium B.C. an archaic form of Greek was already spoken on the mainland.³

This decipherment helped to strengthen belief that the Greeks—or the first Greek-speaking tribes—moved into Greece as early as the beginning of the second millennium B.C. As is well known, on the Greek mainland in the second millennium there is only evidence for two horizons of destruction which permit any deductions concerning movements of peoples. The first of these used to be dated to the end of the Early Helladic III period, though Caskey has now shown that there were really two destructions, of which the most catastrophic was earlier, at the end of Early Helladic II c. 2100 B.C.⁴ But after the end of the Early Helladic period there is no major horizon of destruction until the end of Late Helladic III B, shortly before 1200 B.C., at the time when a great ethnic tidal wave broke destructively on Greece. This we describe as the Aegean migration or, with reference to the Egyptian sources, as the expeditions of the Sea Peoples, the traces of which can be followed not only in Greece

¹ M. P. Nilsson, *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology* (Cambridge, 1932); *Homer and Mycenae* (London, 1933), p. 269.

² M. Ventris and J. Chadwick, "Evidence for Greek Dialect in the Mycenaean Archives", *J.H.S.*, lxxiii (1953), 84-103. Cf. Id. *Documents in Mycenaean Greek* (Cambridge, 1956).

³ This view was argued in a classic paper by J. B. Haley and C. W. Blegen, "The Coming of the Greeks", *A.J.A.*, xxxii (1928), 141-54. Cf. A. J. B. Wace, in Ventris and Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, p. xx.

⁴ J. I. Caskey, "The Early Helladic Period in the Argolid", *Hesperia*, xxix (1960), 285-303; "Greece, Crete and the Aegean Islands in the Early Bronze Age", *C.A.H.* rev. ed., vol. i, chap. xxvi (a) (Cambridge, 1964).

but also in Anatolia, Syria and Palestine, where the advance of the Sea Peoples was brought to a halt c. 1190 B.C. by Ramses III.

It was concluded that between these clearly marked breaks around 1900 and 1200 B.C. no other new element of population flowed into the Greek area.¹ By contrast, the transition from Middle to Late Helladic, that is to the Mycenaean period proper, was accomplished without any visible break ; and the discovery of the earlier Grave Circle B at Mycenae has shown that what we describe nowadays as Mycenaean culture, in the narrower sense, had already begun to take shape before the end of the Middle Helladic period. Hence, the Middle Helladic peoples must be ancestors of the Mycenaeans ; and, if Mycenaean civilization belonged to Greeks, the conclusion that the first Greeks must have arrived in Greece as early as 1900 B.C.—or as suggested by Caskey² even before the end of the third millennium—becomes compelling.

This theory of Greek immigration, which is by now classic, has two weaknesses. The first is that the so-called “Minyan” ware and the “matt-painted” ware—which came into use in Greece, the first after the disaster at the end of Early Helladic II c. 2100 B.C., the second after that which marks the end of Early Helladic III c. 1900 B.C.—have parallels in Anatolia but not in the northern regions of the Balkans, from which, as will be argued in the latter half of this paper, the Greeks must have come. The second weakness is that Macedonia and Thessaly, areas through which the Greeks must have moved, were relatively little affected by the destructions of c. 2100 and c. 1900 B.C. The origin of “Minyan” ware, therefore, remains an unsolved problem ; and accordingly there is no archaeological proof that it was the Greeks who spread this ware through Greece, or who arrived in Greece with the destruction wave of c. 2100 B.C.

Three new theories of immigration seek to overcome this difficulty. The first is the theory developed by James Mellaart and Seton Lloyd, that the Greeks arrived in Greece, not from the

¹ The point is emphasized by F. Matz, *Crete and Early Greece* (London, 1962), p. 163.

² *Hesperia*, xxix (1960), 302.

north, but from Anatolia.¹ This theory has not met with general acceptance since insuperable difficulties confront it, namely :

1. There are no indications of a corresponding east-to-west migration within Asia Minor and from Asia Minor to Greece at this period.

2. A migration across the north Aegean, as Mellaart himself declares, would only be possible if the Greeks had been already by then a people with knowledge and experience of sea-faring, whereas they appear to have learnt about the sea and sea-faring only after their arrival in Greece, as will be shown (p. 83).

3. The ethnic and linguistic situation in west and north-west Anatolia at that time is virtually unknown.

4. In the light of what we know about the geographical distribution of Indo-European dialects, we can say with a high degree of probability that the Greeks before their arrival in Greece could not have been in Anatolia but must have been in the northern part of the Balkan region, in very near contact with the Armenians and the Indo-Iranians who were close to them on the east, and whom we have to think of as living north of the Black Sea at that time. (The relevant evidence will be presented in the concluding half of this paper.)

The second theory is one, strongly influenced by Mellaart, which Palmer² developed and which Heubeck has adopted in his *Praegraeca*.³ According to this, it was not Greeks but Luvians, or (in Heubeck's view) a proto-Indo-European-Hittite stratum ("West Hittite"), who came from Anatolia to Greece c. 1900 B.C. This Luvian wave is supposed to have brought Parnassos and the other -ss- names to Greece, and also to have been responsible for certain elements, presumed to be Luvian, in the Cretan Linear A tablets ; while the Mycenaean Greeks, that is the people who spoke the language of the Linear B tablets, according to Palmer and Heubeck, only arrived at the beginning of the Late Helladic period. This theory, too, meets with

¹ E.g. J. Mellaart, "The End of the Early Bronze Age in Anatolia and the Aegean", *A.J.A.*, lxii (1958), 9-33.

² L. R. Palmer, "Luvian and Linear A", *Trans. Philol. Soc.*, 1958, pp. 75-100. Cf. Id. *Mycenaeans and Minoans* (London, 1961, ² 1965).

³ A. Heubeck, *Praegraeca : Sprachliche Untersuchungen zum vorgriechisch-indogermanischen Substrat* (Erlangen, 1961).

insuperable difficulties—leaving aside the fact that the alleged Luvian readings of the Linear A tablets are entirely hypothetical. The arguments against it are :

1. There is no sign of a break showing the arrival of the Mycenaean Greeks at the beginning of the Late Helladic period. But admittedly it is not necessary to assume that every migration must have left its traces in the archaeological record.

2. The Luvians themselves, whom we first learn about from Hittite texts of the middle of the second millennium B.C., did not arrive in Asia Minor until the beginning of the millennium, and came there from the east.¹

3. The stratum of *-ss-* and *-nth-* names which, since Forrer and Götze, it has been customary to connect with the Luvians, belongs in all probability to the third millennium B.C. and extends into areas which the Luvians cannot have reached.²

4. Palmer and Heubeck are at pains to explain why “Minyan” ware, which ought to be the type fossil of this Luvian horizon, is absent just where, according to their theory, it should be expected, namely in Crete.³

5. Lastly, it must be noted that the Luvians, when they first appear in the light of history, are certainly a different people from the Minoans, and that the so-called Luvian pictorial script, which the Luvians probably adopted from an earlier population, is not identical with the Minoan script, which arose in Crete about the same time.

In addition, *both* theories (that of Mellaart as well as that of Palmer) are open to question owing to the fact that the origin of “Minyan” ware, as I have already mentioned, is not yet explained, and that the nature of the connections between the Helladic and Anatolian branches of this ware are by no means

¹ Palmer argues that the Luvians may have come by sea through the Dardanelles, some of them settling in mainland Greece, while others afterwards moved east into Anatolia (*Trans. Philol. Soc.*, 1958, p. 97).

² F. Schachermeyr, in *Anadolu Araştırmaları* II, İstanbul Univ. Edebiyat Fak., 1965 (H. T. Bossert Memorial Vol.), pp. 395 ff.

³ To meet this difficulty Palmer suggests that Crete was only occupied by Luvians at the beginning of Middle Minoan III c. 1700 B.C., and that they came from South Anatolia or Syria where those who had not stayed in Greece two hundred years earlier (c. 1900 B.C.) had settled (*Trans. Philol. Soc.*, 1958, p. 97). Cf. *Mycenaeans and Minoans* (London, 1961), p. 248 (2 1965, p. 351).

clear. Mylonas,¹ in his criticism of Palmer's theory, pointed to the sharp distinctions between the Helladic and Anatolian branches of "Minyan" ware, and Matz² thinks that archaeological reasoning speaks against the linking of "Minyan" ware with Anatolian ware. Nevertheless, Matz, like most archaeologists today, upholds the Greek character of Mycenaean civilization and accepts an early date for the Greek immigration; but he frankly admits that the question of the identity of the first Greeks, and of the archaeological evidence for them before the immigration, still awaits a solution.³

This is the starting-point for the third theory, which is that the first Greeks arrived in Greece, not at the beginning of the Middle Helladic period nor at the beginning of the Late Helladic, but only with the wave of migration that overwhelmed Greece at the end of Late Helladic III B. The most definite expression of this view is that of F. Hampl in his paper on "The Chronology of the Greek Tribes and the Problem of the Nationality of the Bearers of Mycenaean Civilization".⁴ Hampl tries to prove, with arguments which are in part very forceful, that the Greek tribes, or, to put it more exactly, the bearers of those Greek dialects that are still identifiable in historic times, may only have reached Greece in the period between the thirteenth and eleventh centuries B.C. But Hampl accepts the decipherment of Linear B as Greek, and is therefore driven to assume that Greek was already spoken in the main centres of the Mycenaean world before the period of the migration between the thirteenth and eleventh centuries B.C. Hence he believes—in curious contradiction to his main thesis—that something like a Greek "advance-guard" reached Greece as early as 1600 B.C., or even as early as 1900 B.C. These Greeks usurped the throne of the king of Knossos, only to be expelled from Crete about 1400 B.C., when they established extensive principalities on the mainland, from which they were ultimately driven out again at the end of the

¹ G. E. Mylonas, "The Luvian Invasions of Greece", *Hesperia*, xxxi (1962), 284-309.

² *Gnomon*, 1961, p. 629.

³ F. Matz, *Crete and Early Greece* (London, 1962), esp. pp. 159 ff.

⁴ F. Hampl, "Die Chronologie der griechischen Stämme . . .", *Mus. Helveticum*, xvii (1960), 57-86.

thirteenth and in the twelfth centuries B.C. by the great tribes of the Arcado-Cypriot, Ionian and North Aeolian dialect groups, which at that time broke into Greece from the north. In brief, the distribution of the Linear B tablets in Crete and on the mainland compels him to assume a series of complicated movements and events, for which, as he himself shows in his investigation, there is no trace whatever of historical proof.

Hampl's bold initiative has attracted little attention among scholars. Only Heubeck¹ has gone into Hampl's thesis with care, and in his important review of Desborough's book, *The Last Mycenaeans and their Successors*,² he has himself taken up a position which in part corresponds to that of Hampl. He there explains that the invaders of c. 1200 B.C. were Greek tribes set in motion by the major population movements of that period in the lands of the Eastern Mediterranean.

For anyone who has followed the literature subsequent to the decipherment of Linear B, it is most interesting to observe how the rôle of the Achaeans has changed. For generations of archaeologists, historians, and students of literature, it was self-evident, through the compelling influence of Homeric ideas, that Homer's Achaeans were the bearers of Mycenaean civilization. Ventris and Chadwick, too, started on their decipherment from the presupposition that the language discovered by them in the Linear B tablets was the language of Nestor and Agamemnon, and hence they called it "Old Achaean".³

Heubeck, like Hampl, is a convinced adherent of the decipherment. Nevertheless, he believes that the Achaeans arrived in Greece c. 1200 B.C. together with other Greek tribes, and were not the bearers but rather the destroyers of Mycenaean civilization; they, as he says, entered upon the Mycenaean heritage, especially in the Argolid. This, of course, also implies that the Homeric picture of a Greece dominated by Greek princes is not a reflection of the Mycenaean world in its heyday, but only of late Mycenaean or post-Mycenaean conditions. This view rests on the recognition, elaborated in the last few years

¹ A. Heubeck, "Zur dialektologischen Einordnung des Mykenischen", *Glotta*, xxxix (1961), 159-172.

² *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, xxi (1964), 338.

³ *J.H.S.*, lxxiii (1953), 103.

by Finley, Page, Kirk, and Heubeck himself, that there is a deep cleft separating the Homeric world from the Mycenaean and also, of course, from the Minoan.

Since Heubeck, at the same time, adopts Palmer's Luvian theory, he apparently reckons with three distinct waves of immigration—that of his proto-Indo-Europeans c. 1900 B.C., that of the Linear B Greeks c. 1600 B.C., and, finally, that of the historical dialect groups around and after 1200 B.C. Those historians who support Kretschmer's theory of three strata of dialects¹ (see p. 98) also believe in three waves of immigration. Following Kretschmer, the immigration of the Ionians is usually set c. 1900 B.C., that of the Aeolians c. 1700 B.C., and that of the Dorians c. 1200 B.C. or later. Still more complicated is the theory of Pisani, who believes in migrations not only at different times, but from different starting points; thus the Ionians and Mycenaean are supposed to have come from Asia Minor, the Aeolians from the Thracio-Phrygian area, and the Dorians from Albania.²

In regard to the question of Greek immigration, we are therefore faced today with a very confused situation and must endeavour to clarify it ourselves. For this purpose we have at our disposal, leaving on one side for the moment the Linear B tablets, three distinct sources:

1. The archaeological data, which are defective and hard to interpret just at the most critical points;

2. the linguistic evidence, i.e. what we can conclude from the Greek language itself, from its relation to the other Indo-European languages, and from the dialectal divisions which we find in Greece in historic times; and

3. the mythological and historical traditions of the Greeks, including not only those traditions recorded by the later historians, but also what has been called the "epic recollection" of the Greeks.

We must be clear that none of these sources is sufficient by

¹ P. Kretschmer, "Zur Geschichte der griechischen Dialekte", *Glotta*, i (1909), 9-59.

² V. Pisani, "Die Entzifferung der ägäischen Linear B-Schrift und die griechischen Dialekte", *Rhein. Mus.*, xcvi (1955), 1-18.

itself, and that we can reach relatively sure historical results only if we succeed in combining and reconciling these quite distinct types of evidence. Prehistory and archaeology can establish cultural entities and determine their origins and ends, and their changes or movements, but these cultural entities remain nameless and dumb so long as they cannot be connected with the linguistic entities defined by linguists. Krahe was unfortunately right in stating that it is quite uncertain whether the cultural communities defined by archaeology and linguistic entities presumed by the science of linguistics will necessarily be reconcilable.¹

II. LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE FOR GREEK INTRUSION INTO THE AEGEAN AT A LATE DATE

In the pages that follow I shall attempt something like a synthesis of the results obtained from the various disciplines. I hope to be able to show that in this way we can reach a firm, consistent picture of the wanderings of the Greek tribes.

But, before turning to this question, we must first satisfy ourselves that the Greeks really moved into Greece at all and were not always there; for this too has occasionally been asserted. In this connection I will only mention Valmin, who, on the basis of the results of his excavations at Dorion (Malthi), believed that the "Neolithic population of Greece was already in many respects Greek", and went on to say that the "Greeks were what they claimed to be : autochthonous".²

Proof to the contrary is most easily obtained on the linguistic side.

1. Greek belongs to the family of Indo-European languages, and the Greeks must therefore have parted at some time or other from the other Indo-European peoples and must have wandered into the Mediterranean region (see Part II).

2. Throughout Greece and the islands of the Aegean we find an extensive layer of place-names which cannot be explained from Greek or Indo-European and which have their nearest

¹ H. Krahe, *Sprache und Vorzeit* (Heidelberg, 1954), pp. 5-6.

² N. M. Valmin, *The Swedish Messenia Expedition* (Lund, 1938), p. 404.

parallels in Anatolia. These are the names already mentioned (p. 78) ending in *-ss-*, as for example Parnassos, Ardettos, Lykabetos, etc.; those with the suffix *-nth-*, such as Tiryns (Tirynthos), Korinthos, Saminthos, Zakynthos, etc.; those ending in *-ēnē*, *-enai*, e.g. Athenai, Mykenai, etc.; and names like Thebai, which can be recognized by their roots as pre-Greek.

3. In addition, the Greek language itself is riddled to a very great extent with pre-Greek loan-words taken from one or more substratal languages. These loan-words, as is indicated by their suffixes and also by their roots, are related to the previously mentioned classes of pre-Greek place-names.

A. THE NATURE OF LOAN-WORDS IN GREEK

In this connection it has long been recognized that certain areas of meaning are particularly affected by pre-Greek loan-words; and this permits us to make certain deductions about the cultural level of the Greeks on their arrival in Greece and about their cultural dependence upon the pre-Greek population. The fact that maritime terminology is one of these areas—beginning with *θάλασσα*, the sea itself; *αἰγιαλός*, the shore of the sea; *αἶγες*, the waves of the sea; and extending to words such as *κάλως*, a ship's cable; *κυβερνᾶν*, to steer, etc.—justifies the conclusion, first drawn by Jacob Burckhardt, that the Greeks were originally settled inland and away from the sea, and only came to know about the sea and sea-faring and shipping after they had pushed into the Mediterranean area.¹ The observation that the names of items of Mediterranean flora and fauna and those of various minerals and rocks were taken over from the substratal layer leads to the same conclusion. Still more important for the question of immigration is the large number of pre-Greek loan-words dealing with aspects of a superior civilization. At the risk of repeating much that is already common knowledge, I may remind you that pre-Greek loan-words are found above all in the spheres of house-building (particularly where stone-masonry is involved) and household utensils, trade and commerce, war, hunting and fishing, physical culture and luxury, food and cooking, religion and ceremony, music, dancing and games.

¹ J. Burckhardt, *Griechische Kulturgeschichte*, vol. i (Berlin, 1898).

As remarked above, we cannot know whether *all* these loan-words come from one and the same language; and in some cases, e.g. ὀπυίω (see p. 88), they were evidently derived, not from a substratal language, but from the language of some other people migrating at the time of the Sea Peoples. But the majority of these words obviously belong to the same substratal layer as the place-names I have mentioned—that is to say, to the layer which the Greeks suppressed at the time of their arrival in Greece. This proves that the Greeks migrated *against the trend of civilization*, or in other words, that they were half-civilized migrants who burst into an area of comparatively advanced civilization. In view of what we know through the loan-words about the nature and character of this civilization, it cannot be that of the Early Helladic people; and for this reason alone immigration at the end of Early Helladic III or Early Helladic II can be dismissed. The civilization of Middle Helladic Greece is even less acceptable, since this was a relatively simple peasant culture of peaceful character. So by process of elimination only the Mycenaean civilization remains, and to this some of the cultural loan-words clearly point. Therefore I believe that Hampl is entirely justified in claiming that the relatively civilized world which we can infer from the linguistic layer under discussion—the words for bath-tub, gaming pieces, limits of a racecourse, umpire in games, chariot-body, breast-plate, helmet-plume, frieze, bridge, etc.—is clearly not the world of the Early Helladic people, but *that of the Mycenaean civilization*, which, in the light of this evidence, is seen to be a world that is still essentially pre-Greek.¹ I regard this argument of Hampl's as compelling and would like to amplify it by drawing attention to three areas of meaning which deserve particular attention from this point of view.

In the first place there is the field of building and, in particular, that of stone-masonry, which I have already mentioned. There we find large numbers of words important in architecture; e.g. μέγαρον, καμάρα, πύργος, πλίνθος, θριγκός (τριγκός, θριγγός, θριγγός), γείσων, γέφυρα, βλήτρον, which were apparently all taken over from the substratal language or languages. This shows that the Greeks on their arrival were ignorant of some of

¹ *Mus. Helveticum*, xvii (1960), 79.

the basic essentials of stone-masonry, and first learned about them from the earlier population. Remember that the period following the destruction of the Mycenaean citadels is marked by a virtual absence of stone-masonry. As Desborough says: "Following on the densely-populated Mycenaean Greece, and its splendid architectural achievements, one must accept not only a serious drop in population at this time, but also an almost complete loss of the ability to build in stone."¹ Thus two lines of evidence converge here, supporting and amplifying each other—on the one hand archaeological evidence, which shows that the invaders of c. 1200 B.C. did not bring with them a knowledge of stone-masonry, but had to learn this gradually from the previous population; and, on the other hand, linguistic evidence, which shows that the Greeks on their arrival in Greece actually learned the essential elements of stone-masonry from the earlier population. This likewise suggests that the Greeks—or the first Greek tribes—came into Greece with the wave of migration which destroyed the Mycenaean citadels at the end of Late Helladic III B.

The second area of meaning is that of pottery and pottery making, which contains a strikingly large number of pre-Greek loan-words beginning with *κάμινος*, the potter's kiln, and *κέραμος*, potter's earth, and extending to names of vessels such as *ἄμβιξ* (*ἄμβυξ,-υκος*), *ἀρύβαλλος*, *βῆκος*, *δέπας*, *κάνθαρος*, *κελέβη* *κισσύβιον*, *κύθων*, *λήκυθος*, *φιάλη*. This, too, is an important body of evidence, since it shows that the Greeks at the time of their arrival took over to a very considerable extent the pottery of the land they occupied. This weakens one objection which has frequently been raised against a late dating of Greek immigration, namely the absence of any break in the development of late Mycenaean pottery. Kimmig, in his important paper on the Sea Peoples and the Urn-field Culture,² explained this continuity, rightly remarking that, of all the material possessions of

¹ V. d'A. Desborough, *Proc. Prehistoric Soc.*, xxxi (1965), 214 f. Cf. Id. *The Last Mycenaeans and their Successors* (Oxford, 1964), p. 31. But note the reservations made by P. A. Ålin, *Gnomon*, xxxvii (1965), 724 f.

² W. Kimmig, "Seevölkerbewegung und Urnenfelderkultur", in *Studien aus Alteuropa*, i (Cologne, 1964), 252.

migrating peoples, pottery is the most fragile. If migratory groups took pottery in any substantial quantity with them it was bound to be lost fairly quickly. If they had to obtain replacements, they would get them in the first instance from the land which they had occupied, and would only think of starting production themselves after they had settled down anew. Kimmig cites as an example the so-called "Philistine" ware, which is known to be directly linked to the "Close Style" of Late Helladic III C, and which accordingly provides a good parallel. Here we see that another of the migrating tribes of this period actually took over the Mycenaean pottery in their new home, exactly as must have happened in the case of the Greeks, to judge from the evidence of Greek loan-words in the sphere of pottery.

Still more important, however, for the question that is occupying our attention is a third area of meaning, that of political and social organization. It is well known that we have here a strikingly large number of pre-Greek loan-words, such as βασιλεύς, and βασίλινα (with a pre-Greek suffix), *Φάναξ* and *Φάνασσα*, *πρύτανις* (which is to be compared with Etruscan *purthne*, "magistrate"), *τύραννος* (which has been compared with Etruscan *Turan*, "the great mistress", Aphrodite, and with the *séranim* of the Philistine cities); as well as words like λαός, people; λαοί, warriors; *πρεσβευτής*, *έρμηνεύς*, *δοῦλος*, *είρήνη*, etc. And in addition to these pre-Greek loan-words we have formations like ἀδελφ(ε)ός, "born of the same mother", "brother", which are indeed Greek but betray a concept of family law unknown to the later Greeks.¹ All this shows that the Greeks, who brought with them a political entity composed loosely of families and family groups (brotherhoods, *φρατρία*), uniting the peoples of one race and language, took over forms and institutions of a political and social order that evidently belonged to the Mycenaean world. Krahe expresses this as follows²: in the Greek immigration, the nature of the state underwent a reformation which is clearly

¹ This has been worked out most clearly by G. Thomson, *Studies in Ancient Greek Society: The Prehistoric Aegean* (London, 1949), pp. 145 f.

² H. Krahe, *Die Indogermanisierung Griechenlands und Italiens* (Heidelberg, 1949), p. 22.

recognizable in linguistic terms : the ancient Indo-European kingship had to give way to a new order : in place of the Indo-European *rex* comes the Mediterranean βασιλεύς ; and similarly most of the other designations of political domination which we find in the Greek language are borrowings from pre-Greek linguistic material. And Porzig observes that the basic notions of political structure, βασιλεύς, βουλή, δῆμος, and in addition ἱερεὺς and the title ἀναξ, are common Greek. They are common Greek, but perhaps not all belong to an Indo-European heritage.¹ At the same time he points to the fact that the Greeks do not share the important West Indo-European cognate for “community”, “people”, Oscan *touto*, old Irish *tuath*, Gothic *þiuda* (Deutsch), Illyrian *teuta* (see also Part II). Here, as Porzig says, the effect of Mycenaean political organization can be traced at a critical point.

This line of enquiry, therefore, also serves to confirm that the Greeks entered upon the inheritance of the Mycenaean world and took over forms of political and social organization from the Mycenaeans—which implies forms that they did not create themselves. At the same time, this take-over can only have happened in a period when these forms were still in use and when the Greeks still saw the Mycenaean model living before them. This remarkably self-contradictory body of evidence can only be explained in one of two ways. Either (1) the Greeks must already have been settled during the Mycenaean period inside the limits of the Mycenaean civilization, or within range of its influence ; or (2) they must have entered upon the heritage of the Mycenaean princes.

The first variant of the first alternative leads us back to the idea of immigration c. 1900 B.C. or earlier, and the problems which this raises (see p. 75-76). If on the other hand it is assumed that the Greeks were not actually in Greece during the Mycenaean period but within range of Mycenaean influence, then there is the problem of where and how the geographical contact which this implies occurred ; since the evidence of the cultural loan-words shows quite clearly that the Greeks (like the Hittites)

¹ W. Porzig, “ Sprachgeographische Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Dialekten ”, *Indog. Forsch.*, lxi (1954), 147-69.

were settled before their arrival *outside* the cultural range of the Near Eastern and Mediterranean worlds.

The second alternative points with compelling necessity to one, and only one, period in which the take-over could have been achieved—that is to say, to the period following the destruction of the Mycenaean citadels and before the final collapse of Mycenaean culture. In archaeological terms, this would be the Late Helladic III C period, which nowadays we are learning to understand more and more as an aftermath of the Mycenaean civilization. If this argument is correct, then the view represented by Hampl, Heubeck and Hood is once again confirmed, namely that the pre-Dorian tribes came into Greece with the great wave of peoples which overwhelmed the Mycenaean world at the end of Late Helladic III B. We can then say at once that it was the subsequent movement of Dorian and North-west Greek tribes about the middle or in the second half of the eleventh century B.C. that brought this transitional period to an end, and created the conditions which we find in Greece in historic times.

One last point: it was observed long ago that the verb *ὄπιω*, “take to wife”, is connected with the root *puia*, “wife, woman”, which is preserved in Etruscan. Krahe concluded from this that marriages with the earlier Aegean inhabitants occurred amongst the immigrating Greeks, and that such marriages must have been so frequent that they were able to construct a verb of their own, meaning “to marry”, on the basis of the Tyrrhenian *puia*.¹ As to this, it should be noted that Tyrrhenian is not an Aegean substratal language, but the language of another nation which was on the move in the time of the Sea Peoples. The verb *ὄπιω* indicates in the first place marriage ties between Greek men and Tyrrhenian women. The well-known story of the seizure of women of Attica by Tyrrhenians or Pelasgians who came from Lemnos has its converse in the tale of the Argonauts and the Lemnian women (Pindar, *Pyth.*, IV. 251 sq.). Marriages between Greek men and non-Greek women at the time of the migration into Greece must have been just as frequent as they were to be later during the course of the Ionian settlement in Asia Minor.

¹ H. Krahe, *Sprache und Vorzeit* (Heidelberg, 1954), p. 155.

This suggests that the Greeks arrived in Greece, not indeed without women, but perhaps—like other migrating peoples—with few women of their own; and at the same time it explains how so many native words were adopted into the Greek vocabulary—through the language of the mothers, who brought up the next generation—while Greek, the language of the fathers, and the Indo-European structure of Greek were preserved in a remarkable degree.

B. THE QUESTION OF GRAMMATICAL CHANGE

This brings us to another phenomenon, which is of importance for the question of immigration. It is something to which Schachermeyr has drawn attention, noting that, in coming to terms with the native idiom, the Greek language successfully maintained itself, to the extent that it kept its grammar by and large, and that the native vocabulary was only preserved in some degree in the form of cultural loan-words and a stock of proper names.¹ Schachermeyr explains this by arguing that even the earlier movements of Greeks into Greece were numerically very strong—strong enough to ensure victory over the native idiom. This is surely an attempt to support one hypothesis, namely the early date of the immigration, by a second hypothesis, an immigration that was numerically strong; but for an immigration of this kind there is no proof whatever. On the contrary, the large-scale retention of pre-Greek place names (especially in Boeotia, Attica and the Argolid), the vigorous survival of pre-Greek religious cults, and much else, can only be explained on the hypothesis that at the outset Greek overlords imposed themselves in relatively small numbers upon an original Aegaeon stratum that was more numerous, and very vigorous and persistent and, moreover, culturally superior, and that the Hellenization of Greece was only brought about slowly. Hellenization was indeed a process that was not yet entirely complete even in classical times. For instance, as late as the fifth century B.C.

¹ F. Schachermeyr, "Prähistorische Kulturen Griechenlands", in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realenc.*, xxii. 2, col. 1489.

the oracle of the Ptoian Apollo still gave its answers in "Carian speech".¹

This deduction is confirmed to a large extent by the archaeological evidence, since Desborough's investigations have demonstrated a remarkable continuity of Mycenaean settlement in the Argolid, and, in Achaea and Kephallenia on the one hand and in eastern Attica and the Aegean islands on the other, an actual increase of Mycenaean settlement during the period following the destruction of the Mycenaean citadels. It is further confirmed by anthropological evidence. On the basis of an evaluation of the graves in the Kerameikos cemetery at Athens, Breitinge declared that a thorough-going change of population in late Mycenaean and post-Mycenaean times was in no way attested.² In the same way the graves in the Athenian Agora show only a restricted increase in the number of unusual skulls and skeletons during the transition from late Mycenaean to sub-Mycenaean; and the measurements carried out by E. Fischer, K. M. Fürst and the American anthropologist J. L. Angel have brought similar results.³ As Hampl notes, these measurements reveal quite unambiguously, apart from individual skulls and skeletons, which are perhaps to be called "Nordic", a predominantly Mediterranean population of small stature, with various unusual intrusions for the Middle Helladic and also for the Mycenaean and sub-Mycenaean periods.⁴ If the new measurements made by Angel are reliable, the average height of 1.63 metres for men and 1.50 metres for women did not change at any time in the second millennium. It later changed to the average height of 1.70, which is still the average in Greece today, during the Protogeometric period, that is to say, in the context of the Dorian migration, with which a more thorough Hellenization of the country begins. In these circumstances, it is impossible

¹ *Hdt.*, VIII. 135. Cf. Paus. ix. 23, 6. For other references see Pauly-Wissowa, *Realenc.*, xxiii. 2, col. 1546 s.v. Ptoion.

² E. Breitinge, in W. Kraiker and K. Kübler, *Kerameikos*, i (Berlin, 1939), 254.

³ E. Fischer, in G. Karo, *Die Schachtgräber von Mykene* (1930), pp. 320 ff. K. M. Fürst, *Zur Anthropologie der prähistorischen Griechen in Argolis* (Lund Univ. Årsskrift N. F. Avd., 2 Bd. 26, Nr. 8 (1930)). J. L. Angel, *Hesperia*, xiv (1945), 279 ff.

⁴ *Mus. Helveticum*, xvii (1960), 70.

to account for the preservation of the Indo-European structure of Greek in terms of the numerical strength of the Greek immigrants, as Schachermeyr would argue.¹ On the contrary, we must rather deduce that, since it is evidently a question at the outset of relatively small groups of Greeks taking over the leadership of the Helladic area, the preservation of Greek linguistic form can only be explained on the assumption that the Greeks came into contact with the earlier population of the Aegean area at a late date.

From this point of view, it is instructive to compare Hittite, which was in a similar situation, being in contact with a substratal language that was closely related in certain respects to that of the Aegean area. Although we encounter Hittite in the Boghaz-Köy texts only three or four centuries after its arrival in Asia Minor—an event which, following the studies of Annelies Kammenhuber,² can now be dated to the period c. 2000 B.C.—in this case a remarkable impoverishment of grammatical form can be discerned, as compared with the original Indo-European. If we accept the view recently stated by Puhvel,³ Hittite lacks the common Indo-European grammatical equipment, parts of the plural paradigm of nouns, the feminine gender, the aorist system and the optative mood; to which must be added the loss of adjectival comparison and other losses which, for the most part, can be traced to the influence of the Anatolian substratum. In the same way, Friedrich⁴ traces the reduction of the genders to two (a feature that cannot be observed in the older Indo-European languages) to the fact that the language substratal to Hittite in Asia Minor either knew only the difference between animate and inanimate or knew no distinctions of gender at all. In support of this he cites Armenian, which has no gender and which also at some point moved across Asia Minor.

¹ See n. 1, p. 89.

² A. Kammenhuber, *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Sprachforschung*, 77 (1961), pp. 31 ff.

³ J. Puhvel, "Dialectal aspects of the Anatolian branch of Indo-European", in H. Birnbaum and J. Puhvel (ed.), *Ancient Indo-European Dialects* (California, 1966), p. 237.

⁴ J. Friedrich, *Hethitisch und "Kleinasiatische" Sprachen* (Berlin, etc., 1931), p. 36.

Now it might be assumed that the numerical relationship between the invaders and the native population was more unfavourable to the invaders in Asia Minor than it was in Greece and, in addition, that the substratum in Asia Minor was even more vigorous and more resistant than the Aegean substratum. Bittel, the leading expert on Anatolian conditions, has repeatedly pointed to the high capacity for survival in the native population, which has consistently absorbed and assimilated all intrusive elements in the history of Anatolia, a country where there have been so many intrusions. Yet even if we take into account all these possibilities, the relation between Hittite, which certainly arrived c. 2000 B.C., and Greek, which hypothetically arrived at the same time, cannot be explained satisfactorily. It is precisely because, in comparison with Hittite, the structure of Greek is so rich and complicated, that we must at least consider it improbable that the Greeks reached the Mediterranean region as early as the beginning of the second millennium B.C. Indeed, we may safely say that Greek could not have kept the form that we find in the eighth century B.C. if the Greeks for as much as 1200 years before this date had been living together with a native population strong in numbers, vigorous and, moreover, culturally superior—a population which has impressed its mark so clearly on the vocabulary of Greek. If this were the case, then this influence would necessarily have affected not only the vocabulary but also the phonetics and grammar of the Greek language. But only a few examples of this kind can be cited. One possible instance is the formation of the Greek perfect, which is still unexplained, and which some scholars would like to connect with Tyrrhenian-Etruscan. In addition, there is the special case of the Ionian and Arcado-Cyprian change of *ti* to *si* which, doubtless, follows from the phonetic usage of the substratal population and which can be compared with the Luvian-Hittite change of *ti* to *zzi*. Apart from this partial phenomenon, Greek is encountered in the eighth century B.C. in a form so intact and—I repeat—so rich and complicated that three assumptions are necessary to explain it :

1. that Greek came into contact with the earlier Aegean population very late ;

2. that for a long time Greek was the language of a proud and exclusive aristocracy, and
3. that before the immigration Greek was domiciled in a sheltered territorial pocket.¹

C. PROXIMITY OF THE DIALECTS

The same deduction—that is, a late date for the Greek immigration—also follows from a consideration of the distribution of the dialects which we find in Greece in historic times. Many questions in this field are admittedly once more in a state of flux today, and the introduction of a new dialect, the Linear B language, as we shall see, has served to confuse rather than to illuminate matters. Nevertheless, we can regard one thing as securely established: the Greek dialects are so alike and are so closely interrelated that they cannot have been long separated from one another. This is especially true if we follow Risch² in thinking that some of the features which separate the dialects only arose in post-Mycenaean times, and in part only in the first millennium B.C., so that in the late Mycenaean period the dialect groups must have been closer together than they were eventually to become. As Hampl stresses, this is valid not only for the relations of the pre-Dorian dialects to each other, but also for the relations of the Dorian and North-west Greek dialects (which were the last to arrive at the end of the second millennium B.C.) to the dialects of the Ionians, Aeolians and South Achaeans, although these relations are, broadly speaking, less close than those of the last-named dialect groups to each other. Accordingly, Hampl regards it as hardly credible that the pre-Dorian tribes moved into the areas which they occupied in historic times some 700 or 800 years earlier than the Dorians.³ Risch, too, regards it, from his own quite different standpoint, as improbable that Dorian should have developed independently of the other Greek dialects for almost 1000 years.⁴

¹ These thoughts occurred to me chiefly in the course of discussion with the Indo-European scholar, G. Neumann.

² E. Risch, "Die Gliederung der griechischen Dialekte in neuer Sicht", *Mus. Helveticum*, xii (1955), 61-76.

³ *Mus. Helveticum*, xvii (1960), 80-81.

⁴ *Mus. Helveticum*, xii (1955), 76.

The best proof for this is the influence of the pre-Greek substratum. If the pre-Dorian dialect groups had arrived 700 or 800 years earlier, the substratal language would necessarily have affected these much more strongly than it did the Dorian and North-west Greek groups. We find, however, as I have already observed, only one difference in this respect between the two groups—the East Greek change of *ti* to *si*—which shows that this group was exposed to a longer or stronger influence from the substratal language than Dorian and North-west Greek.

For various reasons the Dorian invasion is nowadays dated about the middle of the eleventh century B.C. (see Part II). I believe, therefore, that Hampl is entirely right when he thinks that the evidence of the dialects compels us to bring down the date of the arrival of the pre-Dorian tribes by some centuries. Accordingly, along this line of reasoning also it appears that the first Greek tribes may not have arrived earlier than the thirteenth and twelfth centuries B.C.

D. OBJECTIONS

1. *The Decipherment of Linear B*

Against this late date for the Greek immigration only two objections can be raised. One is that, in the view of many scholars, the decipherment of Linear B appears to provide certain proof that an early form of Greek was already spoken in Crete and on the Greek mainland in the middle and in the second half of the second millennium B.C. Hampl, as we have seen, is compelled by his acceptance of the decipherment to assume something like a Greek advance-guard—an advance-guard which, in spite of his own thesis, arrived in Greece about 1600 or even as early as 1900 B.C.

Here I come up against a difficulty, not so much because I myself do not believe in the decipherment of Linear B but because Mycenaean scholars have not so far succeeded in classifying the language of the Linear B tablets in relation to the historic dialects. If someone who knows the material as well as Heubeck can observe that the discussion on this decisive question has been continued since the decipherment with extraordinary

intensity but without certain results being so far achieved,¹ an outsider is bound to give up right away. The difficulty, if I understand the situation correctly, lies not so much in the epigraphic material and in the peculiar Mycenaean orthography which make specific features of dialect indistinguishable, such as, for instance, compensatory lengthening of vowels. It lies rather in what has been called "the confusing multiplicity of isoglosses which connect Mycenaean with the historically attested dialects". I need only remind you that a scholar as distinguished as Pisani can connect Mycenaean with Ionian and with the non-Achaean component of Arcado-Cyprian²; while the decipherers on the contrary believed that they had discovered "Old Achaean", the language of the Homeric heroes, and considered Arcadian to be the direct successor of this "Old Achaean".³ This latter view has become more or less the established one, and there are in fact close resemblances between Mycenaean and Arcado-Cyprian; but it must be kept in mind that there are also fundamental differences between them, which Tovar has indicated in his important paper, "On the Position of the Linear B Dialect".⁴ Among these are:

1. The well-known genitives in *-oio* (*-oi*) which occur in Homer and in the inscriptions of Pelasgiotis and Perrhaebia, that is only in East Thessalian, but not in South Achaean;
2. the nominatives in *-eus* which occur in Linear B and in *all* the other dialects, but are represented in Arcado-Cyprian by formations like *φονής*, *ιερής*, etc.;
3. the use in all dialects, except Arcadian (and Macedonian), of *en* instead of *in*, and
4. finally, the patronymics in *-ios* which we find in North Achaean (Thessaly, Boeotia, Lesbos), and in Mycenaean; while they are lacking in Arcadian and Cyprian.

These differences are so pronounced that Hampl is fully justified in claiming that it is impossible to speak of the Linear B

¹ A. Heubeck, "Zur dialektologischen Einordnung des Mykenischen", *Glotta*, xxxix (1961), 159-72.

² See n. 3, p. 81.

³ *J.H.S.*, lxxiii (1953), 103.

⁴ A. Tovar, in *Mycenaean Studies*, ed. E. L. Bennett (Madison, 1964), pp. 141-6.

dialect as identical with Arcado-Cyprian, or even to say that the language of Linear B is a direct precursor of Arcado-Cyprian.¹ And this observation can be applied in a still greater degree to the relationship between Mycenaean and the other dialects. Mühlestein accordingly declared, as early as 1955, that Mycenaean cannot be a direct ancestor of any dialect of the alphabetic period, but must represent in some sense a dead-end in dialectal development.² Similarly, Heubeck now says in his review of Desborough (in contrast to what he had said earlier) that the dialect of the Mycenaean tribes certainly shows substantial resemblances to Arcadian and Cyprian, and also to Ionian and Aeolic; it is, however, improbable that any of these later dialects simply presents the subsequent development of the Mycenaean idiom.³

In brief, Mycenaean has not fulfilled the hopes that were originally pinned on it. It does not offer, as was expected—and rightly expected, in view of the historical situation—an older form of Greek and thereby an earlier stage of the historic dialects. Rather, it has the appearance of a special dialect, which contains distinctive dialectal elements and combines both old and new features in a curious fashion. An old feature of Mycenaean, for instance, is the medial ending *-to* which is comparable with Arcadian *-toi*; and a very archaic feature is the preservation of the labiovelars, which have not yet become identical with labials and dentals (since we find, e.g. *quetoro* instead of *tettara*). On the other hand, such Mycenaean forms as *ekōsi* = *ekhōnsi* and *dososi* = *dosōnsi* show the East Greek change of *ti* to *si*, which, as we saw, is an innovation; while the Doric and Northwest Greek dialects, which were the last to arrive, preserved the original *-ti*, *-nti*. And, to our great surprise, there are instances where the Linear B language has more recent forms than any other Greek dialect, e.g. in ethnics which are derived from local names ending in *-nthos*. Here Mycenaean has ethnics with the termination *-sijo* such as *korisijo*, that is *Korinsijos*, for the inhabitants of *Κόρινθος*, while all the other Greek dialects preserved the

¹ F. Hampl, *Mus. Helveticum*, xvii (1960), 82.

² H. Mühlestein, *Mus. Helveticum*, xii (1955), 127.

³ A. Heubeck, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, xxi (1964), 338.

original form *Κορίνθιος*. Tovar has pointed to a recent formation, doubtless dialectal in nature—namely *ἀγρέω* instead of *αἰρέω*, in Mycenaean *akereše* (PY Sn 64, 7); and he is therefore quite right in saying: “We observe that Mycenaean still possesses signs for labiovelars and forms keeping the ending *-to* (*-του*), as it is posited for Indo-European. But the impression of being closer to proto-Greek is obscured when we observe that Mycenaean forms are clearly ‘dialectal’, and mostly cannot be identified with the original form from which the divergent historical forms derive”.¹

In short, the somewhat disappointing result of Mycenaeanological endeavour in the last fourteen years is that the Linear B language does not contain an older form of Greek, but a *dialect*—one that combines archaic and recent features, the relationship of which to the historic dialects cannot be explained; and that must have disappeared without any trace at the time of the arrival of the historic dialect groups.

This presents a puzzle. Mühlestein thinks that the Mycenaean dialect simply died out, and Heubeck in his review of Desborough’s book declares that it is an obvious supposition that the language of the bearers of Mycenaean culture was extinguished with that culture itself.² This, however, is an unsatisfactory explanation, since, as Heubeck himself, following Desborough, notes, there can be no question of the extinction of the bearers of Mycenaean culture after the destruction of the Mycenaean citadels; in the Argolid a continuation of Mycenaean settlement can be observed, and in West Greece and East Greece alike, as remarked above, an actual strengthening of it. If, then, as Heubeck himself assumes, the Achaeans and the other pre-Dorian tribes belonged to the wave that invaded Greece c. 1200 B.C., or were themselves the destroyers of the Mycenaean citadels, they must have lived alongside the Mycenaean population for at least 150 years. This is in any case the only way to account for their acquisition of cultural loan words and of important political and social forms and institutions (see 83-89).

The disappearance of the Linear B language at a time when the other Greek tribes were already in Greece—a time which

¹ See Tovar (n. 4, p. 95), p. 141.

² See Heubeck (n. 3, p. 96), p. 338.

actually falls in the early dawn of Greek history—thus presents a problem, as does also the complete disappearance of the name of these early Greek arrivals. For we must be clear about this: the practice of designating these people as Linear B Greeks, or as Mycenaean Greeks, is simply an expression born of despair, because amongst the many names of peoples and tribes in Greek tradition there is none that can be assigned with certainty to this stratum. This means that as far as *history* is concerned we cannot for the moment do anything with the Mycenaean language. So as a matter of method we must proceed on the basis of leaving the language of the Linear B tablets alone until such time as Mycenaean scholars succeed in bringing it into a clear relationship with the historic dialects. We must therefore as a start limit ourselves to the question of *when* and *in what order* the *historic* Greek dialects reached Greece.

2. *Theories of Second-Millennium Greek*

As already noted (p. 81), the classic theory proposed by Kretschmer makes the Ionians precede the Aeolians, or Achaeans, and the Aeolians (Achaeans) precede the Dorians.¹ According to this theory the arrival of the Ionians is to be placed c. 1900 B.C., that of the Aeolians c. 1700 B.C., and that of the Dorians at c. 1200 B.C. or later. This is still the position of Hampl, except that the three waves of migration are compressed by him into the period from the thirteenth to the eleventh century B.C. instead of being distributed over the second millennium. Kretschmer's theory of three layers has not yet been shaken. It is not even affected by the discovery of "Mycenaean", simply because it cannot be proved that Mycenaean forms a special substratal layer to one or other of the historic dialects, and because Mycenaean remained without any obvious influence on these, contrary to what one would expect if it had been spoken for centuries in Central and Southern Greece.

There would, however, be a serious objection to Kretschmer's theory (and at the same time also to Hampl's) if Risch² were correct in his opinion that the three great tribal and dialect

¹ *Glotta*, i (1909), 33.

² See n. 2, p. 93.

groups, which we, like the ancients, distinguish, were actually of recent formation. In particular, Risch regards Ionian and Dorian as quite recent dialects, which acquired their characteristic stamp only after the Dorian migration and partly in the first millennium B.C. Hence these dialects cannot simply be projected back into the second millennium, in which Risch assumes there were only two main dialect groups, North Greek and South Greek; the latter, in his opinion, having become tangible for us in the form of Mycenaean.

Risch's theory has been adopted by Chadwick, who in the last few years, after various intermediate stages, has developed it further into the thesis that instead of three distinct Greek migrations, there was only *one* migration at some time during the Middle Helladic or Early Helladic III periods. This migration strictly speaking ought to be described as proto-Greek, or common Greek, since Greek in Chadwick's opinion only developed later than 2100 B.C. on Greek soil or at least in the southern Balkan area.¹ Chadwick also admits only two dialect groups within the second millennium, and following Porzig he names them East and West Greek. Like Risch he explains the multiplicity of dialects which we find in historic times as the outcome of post-Mycenaean developments.

3. *Counter-arguments*

Against these theories some fundamental objections may be raised. These are :

1. That proto-Greek, or a common Greek language, may indeed be *postulated*, but no-one knows whether, when or how it existed; or whether rather the earliest Greek, in the words of Wilamowitz, never existed at any time except as a language divided into dialects of varying sound-patterns.² As a matter of fact, linguistic science at the present time has a marked tendency towards the view that in the beginning there was not unity but multiplicity, and that the linguistic entities of historic times were

¹ J. Chadwick, "The Prehistory of the Greek Language", *C.A.H.* rev. edn., vol. ii, chap. xxxix (Cambridge, 1963), pp. 15-17.

² F. Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin, 1921), p. 23.

formed by the amalgamation of many small, and indeed minute, dialect groups.

2. There is no proof whatsoever that a common Greek stage ever existed on Greek soil, and the layer of *-ss-* and *-nth-* names, to which Chadwick¹ appeals, only attests the unity of the *pre-Greek* substratum and says nothing as to the unity or multiplicity of the Greek superstratum. So, here too there is nothing to contradict the view that the Greek dialects (or some Greek dialects) existed *before* the period of immigration; and even Chadwick, in the most recent presentation of his views, arrives at the opinion that by the Late Helladic III period, and probably earlier, "the Greek language was . . . already divided into at least two dialects"—East and West Greek.² He overlooks here the fact that the change of *ti* to *si*, which he regards as the principal feature of East Greek, must originally have arisen on Greek soil, since it reflects the influence of the Aegean substratum.

3. But the main objection to the theories of Risch and Chadwick is that only a few features of dialect can be dated with relative accuracy, and then only those that are quite recent—such as, for instance, the disappearance of digamma from Ionic and the Ionic-Attic change of *a* to *e*. On the other hand, none of the features of dialect that Risch himself calls old can be dated at all. As an example I mention again the East Greek change of *ti* to *si*. Risch puts it before the middle of the second millennium B.C., because it can be observed in such Mycenaean forms as *ekosi*, *dososi*, etc. This, however, only provides us (if we accept the evidence at all!) with a *terminus ante quem*. And Adrados³ is certainly right in thinking that most of the other dates put forward by Risch also only provide us with a *terminus ante quem*, while for dating a dialectal innovation we should have to know the *terminus post quem*, and this is almost always unknown.

This means that we cannot determine the age of the main dialect groups at all; and we are therefore clearly not in any

¹ *London Mycenaean Seminar, Minutes, Meeting of 9 November 1960.*

² See Chadwick (n. 1, p. 99), p. 17.

³ F. R. Adrados, "Achäisch, Ionisch und Mykenisch", *Indog. Forsch.*, lxii (1956), 240-8.

position to assert that Doric and Ionic were only formed after the Dorian migration. It is certainly relevant that it is precisely those innovations that were particularly characteristic of Ionic, such as the loss of the digamma and the change of *a* to *e*, that are relatively late—this, after all, we knew even before Risch's paper—but this does not mean that Ionic (or more accurately the proto-Ionic from which the later Ionic of the colonies developed), did not already exist on the Greek mainland. The emergence of later Ionic cannot be explained at all on any other view.

The theories of Risch and Chadwick indeed repeat, with only a difference of argumentation, the old theory of Busolt and Eduard Meyer, namely, that the Ionians and Ionic did not exist before the Ionian migration. This theory was answered by Kretschmer long ago, in his famous essay on the history of the Greek dialects, with the question of how in these circumstances can Ionic have arisen, and why in this case "does the Ionic dialect not agree in the same way with pre-Dorian (that is the Achaean of the Peloponnese) as Aeolic agrees with Thessalian in the North?"¹ In other words, the emergence of Ionic as such presupposes an original Ionic stage and also a population on the Greek mainland related to the later Ionians—a population whose traces we can demonstrate in Attic. And Szemerényi rightly says that the very fact that we find *-tt-* in Attic, in contrast with *-ss-* in the eastern Mediterranean as a whole, "may well present a mortal threat to our present contentment with a unified Mycenaean Greek".²

Modern attempts to argue the inconvenient Ionic dialect out of existence seem to me, therefore, useless. Chadwick's theory that Attic-Ionic arose from the amalgamation of a Mycenaean dialect with North-west Greek elements, which he supposes to have been brought to Attica by invading Dorians, is not convincing, if only because the presence of Dorians in Attica is completely unattested; and his suggestion that Ionian was not a tribal designation, but merely the name for a branch of the Mycenaean "ruling class", can only be described as illusory.³

¹ *Glotta*, i (1909), 11, with references.

² See *Minutes* (n. 1, p. 100), p. 218 sq.

³ *Greece and Rome*, iii (1956), 49.

Further considerations, however, which in my opinion make Kretschmer's position unassailable, are not only the fact that the basic Ionian stratum on the mainland (or, as Porzig would say, the Early East Greek stratum) can be demonstrated in terms of dialect traces, but also that Greek historians and geographers preserved memories of certain parts of the Peloponnese and Central Greece being occupied at one time by a people related to the historical Ionians.

The overlaying of these Peloponnesian Ionians by Achaeans and then by Dorians is attested by the well-known tradition that Tisamenos and his sons were pressed back after the Dorian conquest of the Argolid towards Achaëa, where they defeated and suppressed, in campaigns lasting many years, the Ionians who had dwelt there before them and who thereafter fled to Athens. Ionians—or forerunners of the later Ionians—are also attested for the region of Megara by Strabo (IX 1, 5), for Epidaurus by Pausanias (II 26, 1), for Kynouria in the eastern Peloponnese by Herodotus (VIII 73, 3), and for the western Peloponnese by the part which Pylos played in the Ionian migration. (The tradition that the Neleids fled at first from Pylos to Athens and from there went on to Ionia is indeed to be regarded—as Kretschmer¹ saw—as a motivated fabrication of late date, designed to ensure for Athens primacy over *all* Ionian cities).

Chadwick would dismiss these pieces of information as “legends”.² But such traditions cannot be a matter of late invention or erudite fabrication; for the simple reason that an Ionian settlement in the Peloponnese, regarded in the light of *later* conditions, would have been quite paradoxical. But above all, our historical information agrees with the results of dialectal analysis, and we have here one of those rare cases where historical tradition and linguistic evidence concur. When Chadwick says: “obviously Herodotus could not have known the dialect spoken by prehistoric peoples”,³ that is, of course, correct. We must, however, draw the correct conclusion; namely, that what Herodotus and the other historians tell us can no longer be a

¹ P. Kretschmer, “Zur Geschichte der griechischen Dialekte”, *Glotta*, i. (1909), pp. 9 ff.

² See Chadwick (n. 1, p. 99), p. 12.

³ *Ibid.*

matter of prehistoric events but of events which really fall in the dawn of Greek history.

The historical memory of the Greeks nowhere reaches back to early Mycenaean or pre-Mycenaean times (i.e. into the middle or still less into the first half of the second millennium B.C.), and even the memories of late Mycenaean and post-Mycenaean events have not always survived. No Greek historian, as Finley recently observed, knows of the most decisive event in early Greek history, the catastrophic destruction of Mycenaean civilization near the end of the second millennium B.C., or of the profound discontinuity between Mycenaean civilization and Greek civilization proper. No Greek historian knows of the arrival of the Ionians and Aeolians, and even the Dorian migration is known only in semi-mythical form as "the return of the Heraklidae". If, therefore, some reminiscences—and very definite ones—have survived in later times that certain parts of the Peloponnese were once occupied by a population related to the later Ionians, that this population was subdued by Aeolians or Achaeans, and that the Achaeans themselves were later suppressed by the Dorians, this can only refer to conditions and events in late Mycenaean and post-Mycenaean times. This is also confirmed by the fact that the story of Tisamenos, which attests Ionian settlement on the north coast of the Peloponnese, can be placed no earlier than the middle of the eleventh century B.C.¹

¹ The second part of this article will appear in the next number of the BULLETIN.