

Problems pertaining to the origin of dialectal differences in ancient Greek

In: *Studia Mycenaea : proceedings of the Mycenaean symposium, Brno, april 1966*. Bartoněk, Antonín (editor). Vyd. 1. Brno: Universita J.E. Purkyně, 1968, pp. [159]-173

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/119955>

Access Date: 21. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

Problems Pertaining to the Origin of Dialectal Differences in Ancient Greek

1. *To what extent is it possible to place the origin of Greek dialectal differences as far back as the widely differing I. E. branches, the Greek situation of the Classical Era being an outcome of long foregoing mutual convergences?*

I cannot see that there is any possibility of this, if we believe that the dialects are the result of diversification of a single Common Greek dialect. This is undoubtedly part of the truth, since it is necessary to account for the Greekness of all Greek dialects. But it may not be the whole truth. I have speculated about the possibility that Doric represents the superimposition of Common Greek on another (possibly I.E.) language. In any case the proto-Doric of Mycenaean times may have been much further removed from contemporary East Greek (Linear B) than any classical dialect from its contemporaries. I find it hard to believe that proto-Doric was a non-Greek language which became hellenised as the result of contact between the Dorian invaders and the previous inhabitants after 1100 B.C., since this would leave us with no explanation for the features of classical Doric which are neither I.E. nor East Greek. (J. CHADWICK.)

The assumption that the Greek dialects could have been derived from "widely differing branches" of proto-Indo-European by a series of mutual convergences seems to me untenable for several reasons.

In the first place *convergence* is a term that needs to be used with caution. It can cover two quite distinct phenomena:

(i) *Independent development* in the same direction, as in the changes $*/q^w/ > /p/$, etc. in Oscan-Umbrian, Britanic and Aeolic, or in the change of $*/ti/ > /si/$ in Anatolian and the East Greek dialects. Sometimes, as in the latter instance, the parallel can be plausibly attributed to substrate influence, being due either to the immediate and direct influence of the phonology of a single language formerly common to the whole area (*linguistic substrate proper*) or else to the more long-term effect of the physiology of a homogeneous population continuing to occupy the area throughout the change of languages (*physiological or genetic substrate*). This first type of convergence seldom penetrates the deeper structural levels.

(ii) *Infiltration* of one language structure by another. This can occur in bilingual situations, and seldom affects the deeper structural levels unless the two structures concerned are closely related or dialects of the same language. Convergence of this

kind is often symptomatic of the gradual replacement of one language or dialect by the other, as in the case of the Hellenistic *Koine*, which encroached upon local dialects to their eventual decline. While the *Koine* in particular regions shows signs of reciprocal infiltration from the local dialect, conforming pressures from elsewhere were sufficient to ensure that its uniform character was not ultimately modified by such deviations.

Now whereas the first type of convergence is plausible enough between "widely differing branches", the second is not. And yet it is the second type that we need, to account for the structural characteristics which define Greekness. On the other hand, unless we abandon altogether the concept of a unified (even if already dialectally differentiated) P.I.E., it is hard to see how we can talk of "widely differing branches" for a period that is prior to the emergence of anything that can be called Greek. But if we are envisaging a number of separate I. E. languages (or "branches") much closer to each other in structure than anything that is directly attested in their successors, is it unreasonable to assume that some of these shared enough of the features that in later times characterize Greek, over against other I. E. languages, to enable us to call this group *proto-Greek*?

This is not an attempt to belittle the phenomenon of *convergence* to the benefit of *Stammbaum*; but rather to point to the fact that these are not so much rival concepts but complementary ones. The directly attested diachrony of the Romance and Germanic languages is clear proof that for the broad lines of development in a closely related group of languages *Stammbaum* still provides the best model. But in specific areas, as for instance in the relations between the individual West Germanic dialects brought to England by the Anglo-Saxon invaders, later convergences are often discernible, and the pattern of dialect differentiation is not so much a series of discrete branches but a spectrum, in which beside the clear-cut boundaries there are also blurred ones, with dialects shading off into one another.

My own view, therefore, is that there was at some period a proto-Greek language, differentiated from other I.E. languages by the common possession of a number of innovations and retentions from "the parent speech", which though not necessarily unique if taken individually, were certainly unique as a group.

(R. COLEMAN.)

There is no reason to suppose that Greek as we know it is the result of convergence of widely differing Indo-European dialects. (W. COWGILL.)

The question, as it stands, implies by the phrase "mutual convergences" that Greek as we know it in the Classical period had developed by a "Sprachbund" process, or at least that some of its dialects show clear substrate or adstrate phenomena. There seem to be no good reasons for this assumption.

On the other hand, it is not by any means impossible that some dialects of a historical I. E. language, though not others, may share with one or more other such languages, or with certain dialects of one or more of them, features which indicate prehistoric contact. If such phenomena are observed in the case of Greek, this will indicate that the differentiation of some historical dialects of Greek began in a period in which the people who spoke proto-Greek were in contact with those who spoke the prehistoric form(s) of the other I. E. language(s) in question. (R. A. CROSSLAND.)

Non è possibile in alcun modo identificare le varietà dialettali greche che si possono ricostruire per il periodo miceneo, e di cui sono un'eco le divergenze vernacolari del periodo classico, con rami separati di indoeuropeo confluiti da direzioni opposte sul suolo ellenico. Sono sufficienti a respingere tale teoria le ragioni già esposte dal Bartoněk stesso. Aggiungerò che nel mio *Avviamento* (pp. 54—61) ho elencato ben 27 isoglosse panelleniche (qualcuna potrebbe essermi anche sfuggita) già presenti nel miceneo, senza contare le varie isolessi e lo stabilizzarsi di determinate serie lessicali (ib. pp. 61—65), il cui raggruppamento e conteggio è, pel momento, ancora difficile, ma che risultano senz'altro, ad un primo sguardo, specificamente elleniche nella loro struttura. (M. DORIA.)

I do not believe that the Greek dialectal differences go back into the I. E. period. (H. KODZU.)

Es ist wohl möglich und sogar wahrscheinlich, dass diese und jene Dialektunterschiede schon "vorurgriechisch" sind, im einzelnen aber sicher nicht mehr nachweisbar [s. A 4]. (W. MERLINGEN.)

Je n'aurai pas une réponse précise, faute de données authentiques, et je ne vois que des hypothèses plus ou moins vraisemblables. (M. D. PETRUŠEVSKI.)

Il n'est pas possible de faire remonter les différences dialectales du grec à des langues indo-européennes différentes ni de considérer la situation grecque de l'époque classique comme le résultat d'une longue période de convergences mutuelles. (C. J. RUIJGH.)

Различия между греческими диалектами первого тысячелетия очень часто имеют позднее происхождение, однако некоторые могут быть возведены ко времени, предшествующему переселениям греков в южную часть Балканского полуострова. К числу их относятся, во-первых, такие явления, которые имеют различные индо-европейские связи: I л. мн. ч. *-μες* — *-μεν*; родительный падеж основ на *-ο-*: **-οο* < **ο-σο* и *-οιο* < **ο-σιο*, а с другой стороны такие явления как $\tau > \sigma$, окончания атематического инфинитива, трактовка лабиовелярных и т. д. Распределение этих изоглосс позволяет установить еще до начала греческой миграции три традиционные диалектные разновидности греческого языка, восточную (ионийскую), центральную и западную. Ионийский связан с центральной группой изоглоссой *-μεν* и, вероятно, *-σι* (я не убежден аргументами Порцига и Риша), а с западной трактовкой лабиовелярных и родительным падежом на **οο*. Эти расхождения, однако, столь невелики на фоне единства грамматической и фонетической системы, что мы имеем право говорить о диалектно расчлененном греческом праязыке примерно на грани между третьим и вторым тысячелетием. К теориям возникновения греческого единства путем языковой конвергенции на исторической территории (напр. Пизани) я отношусь отрицательно. Не вижу я также основания отказываться от теории Кречмера о трех волнах, которая представляется мне подтвержденной и античными свидетельствами и лингвистическими фактами. Так, особенности аркадокипрского легче всего объясняются воздействием цен-

трально-греческого (который не может быть отождествляем с историческим эолийским) на протоионийский субстрат.

Как более широкий внутри-индоевропейский ареал, к которому относится греческий язык, я рассматриваю протоиндоиранско-армянско-греческое единство. Непосредственно родственным греческому языку является, вероятно, только македонский. Вопросы о контактах с анатолийскими, фракийско-иллирийскими и другими языками я сейчас не касаюсь. (И. М. ТРОНСКИЙ.)¹

It seems theoretically impossible to do this, since our methods of reconstruction are not able to recapture such chronological distinctions. We can reconstruct only a dialectally uniform proto-Greek, whence derive all later Greek dialects. Minor, possibly inherited, differences like *poti*, *proti* and *apo/apu* are too slight to argue against an earlier unity. All dialect differences post-date the proto-Greek stage, and the proto-Greek stage is later than the proto-Indo-European stage. (See also A 2 below.) (W. F. WYATT.)

¹=Die Eigenheiten der griechischen Sonderdialekte des ersten Jahrtausends haben sich meistens erst spät herausgebildet, einige von ihnen können aber bis auf die Zeit zurückgeführt werden, die der Ausbreitung der griechischen Sprache im Süden der Balkanhalbinsel vorausgeht. Dazu gehören in erster Linie die Erscheinungen, welche eine heterogene indoeuropäische Provenienz haben: I. Pl. *-μες* ~ *-μεν*; der Genitiv der *-ο-* Stämme: *-οο* < **-ο-σο* und *-οιο* < **-ο-σιο*; dann aber auch solche Eigentümlichkeiten wie $\tau > \sigma$, die Endungen des athematischen Infinitivs, die Behandlung der Labiovelaren usw. Die Distribution dieser Isoglossen zeugt meines Erachtens davon, daß schon vor Beginn der griechischen Migration die drei traditionellen Abarten der griechischen Sprache, die östliche (ionische), die zentrale und die westliche zu unterscheiden waren. Das Ionische ist einerseits mit der Zentralgruppe verbunden durch die Isoglosse *-μεν* und vermutlich auch *-σι* (die Beweisführung von Porzig und Risch hat mich nicht überzeugt), andererseits mit der westlichen Gruppe durch die Behandlung der Labiovelaren und den Genitiv auf *-οο*. Diese Differenzen sind jedoch gegenüber der Einheit des grammatischen und phonetischen Systems so gering, dass die Annahme einer dialektal gegliederten griechischen Ursprache in der Zeit um die Wende des 3. Jahrtausends völlig berechtigt ist. Zu den Theorien, welche die Einheit der griechischen Sprache als Ergebnis eines Konvergenzprozesses auf dem historischen Territorium entstehen lassen (z. B. Pisani), verhalte ich mich ablehnend. Ich sehe auch keinen Grund auf Kretschmers Drei-Wellen-Theorie zu verzichten, da sie mir durch antike Zeugnisse und linguistische Data bestätigt zu sein scheint. So können die Eigentümlichkeiten des Arkadokypriischen am leichtesten erklärt werden, wenn man eine Einwirkung des Zentralgriechischen (das mit dem Äolischen der geschichtlichen Zeit nicht identifiziert werden darf) auf ein protoionisches Substrat annimmt.

Innerhalb des Indoeuropäischen betrachte ich das Griechische als einen Teil des protoindoiranisch-armenisch-griechischen Areals. Unmittelbar dem Griechischen verwandt ist wohl nur das Makedonische. Auf die Frage der Kontakte zwischen dem Griechischen und den anatolischen, thrakisch-illyrischen und anderen peripheren Sprachen gehe ich an dieser Stelle nicht ein. (I. M. TRONSKIJ).

A

2. *What would you adduce in support of the theory that some Greek dialectal differences originated still outside Greek soil, but already within some closer I.E. linguistic community, which was later to become the basis of the Greek-speaking world?*

I do not believe in this theory, because I believe in the development of the Greek language on Greek soil after 2000 B.C. [see my chapter in *Cambridge Ancient History*²] (J. CHADWICK.)

Proto-Greek itself would obviously be defined by such features as the devoicing of the inherited aspirates, */bh/ > /ph/, etc., the loss of initial and intervocalic */s/ and of final stops, the emergence of a distinctive infinitival and participial system, and so forth. Some of these developments could have taken place, or at any rate been completed, within the Aegean area. But the probability that the successive waves of Greek-speaking invaders were already differentiated dialectally, to some extent at least, makes it likely that most of the pan-Hellenic features originated outside the Aegean area. How far the dialectal differences among the invaders corresponded to those discernible in the historically attested language is impossible to assess, since some would have been reinforced by linguistic changes common to particular groups, while others would have been eroded by *infiltration* across the older dialect boundaries. In general the phonological isoglosses within historical Greek look recent enough to be dated to the period of Aegean settlement. The grammatical ones, e.g. *-men/-mes* (1st pers. pl.) and the variety of infinitival morphs, look more ancient, and some of these could well go back to the pre-Aegean stage of Greek. (R. COLEMAN.)

On theoretical grounds it is most unlikely that the speech of the invaders who brought the Greek language to Greece was absolutely homogeneous. But I do not see any reason to suppose that any of the divergences between Greek dialects as we know them must have existed already before the invasion(s). (W. COWGILL.)

This question would be more useful if "Greek soil" and "Greek-speaking world" were defined. The answer may be different according to whether one regards Macedonia as "Greek soil" or not. It seems quite probable that the proto-N. W. -Doric dialect of Greek became differentiated there during the 2nd millennium B. C. If the question means: "May some of the differences between Classical Greek dialects have developed within proto-Greek before this language, or any dialect of it, was introduced into Greece?"

then the answer should be "Quite possibly". But we cannot answer the question definitely without 2nd millennium documents from more areas within Greece, unless glottochronological calculations are regarded as valid. (R. A. CROSSLAND.)

Sono invece favorevolmente orientato verso l'ammissione che alcune differenziazioni dialettali greche siano preesistite all'arrivo delle stirpi elleniche in Grecia e abbiano in qualche modo variegato fin *ab antiquo* la fondamentale unità della comunità dei parlanti il greco.

Sappiamo troppo poco della situazione dialettale di epoca micenea per poter affermare che in quel periodo le differenze dialettali erano meno accentuate che nel primo millennio a. Cr. Ora è vero che dall'epoca micenea in giù subentrarono nuovi elementi disgregatori di unità dialettali già discretamente omogenee, e che questi portarono a quel massimo di divergenze che noi effettivamente constatiamo nei sec. VI-V a. Cr. Ma è anche possibile che le singole unità dialettali, operanti nel II millennio, fossero differenziate mediante isoglosse in séguito attenuatesi a tal punto da non poter essere rilevabili o rilevabili appena (ad es. $\epsilon > i$ in vicinanza di labiale, passaggio $\theta i > \sigma i$, preposiz. $\delta\pi i$, ecc.) e che, accanto ai due o tre „proto-dialetti“ ricostruiti dal Porzig e dal Risch, ve ne fossero degli altri - di cui non abbiamo più traccia — non sappiamo *come* e *quanto* differenziati tra loro e del miceneo (il miceneo stesso non si può considerare affatto l'antenato di unità o gruppi dialettali del primo millennio, quindi è già un nuovo dialetto da aggiungere alla lista di quelli ricostruiti). Di conseguenza, dato il numero presumibilmente abbastanza elevato di diversità dialettali esistenti attorno al 1200 (1400) a. Cr., è assai facile giungere, anche solo teoricamente, alla conclusione che un certo numero di isoglosse differenziatrici i Greci le abbiano portate con sé dalle sedi preimmigratorie.

Ed ecco, a parer mio, le prove di tali differenziazioni (differenziazioni che si saranno scaglionate attraverso più epoche, da quella della relativa unità dell'indoeuropeo comune fino a quella dei contatti seriori — sempre preimmigratori — avvenuti tra quel gruppo di popolazioni, che noi chiameremo già elleniche — e le stesse popolazioni indoeuropee ma in ambito e circostanze diverse. A tali contatti sono dovute infatti non solo alcune isoglosse che riguardano tutto il greco — come l'asordimento delle aspirate sonore, comune anche alle lingue italiche, o lo sviluppo delle vocali protetiche, comune anche all'armeno — ma certo anche alcune che investirono solo una parte di cotesta comunità di parlanti): 1. Passaggio di *e* in *i* in vicinanza di labiali (caratteristica del miceneo e del panfilio, condivisa anche dal lidio e dal frigio, cfr. G. Restelli, *Aevum* 35 [1961], 307—311). 2) Uso dell'aumento (attestato in tutti i dialetti greci in accordo con indo-iranico, armeno e frigio, ma assente — o quasi — nel miceneo, dove i pochi esempi riscontrabili sono certo dovuti a mistione dialettale, e ciò in accordo con il resto delle lingue indoeuropee. L'opzionalità dell'aumento in Omero e, parallelamente, nei Veda e nell'Avesta, è certo dovuta ad uno stadio di mistione dialettale più accentuata di quella osservabile in miceneo; dunque anche per l'indiano e per l'iranico sarà necessario postulare, per l'epoca preistorica, varietà dialettali prive di aumento da porsi per questo rispetto sullo stesso piano del miceneo). 3. Patronimici in *-i(y)o-* (miceneo ed eolico in accordo con osco-umbro, messapico, slavo, indo-iranico, celtico) contro *-idā-* (ionico-attico, dorico, miceneo [relitti], osco-umbro e messapico [relitti, per cui v. R. Lazzeroni, *Sulla preistoria del suffisso onomastico gr. -ιδης*, lat. *-idius*, messap. *-ides* ecc., *Studi e saggi linguistiche* 6 [1966], 98—115]). 4) Funzione sintattica di „sopra, accanto, subito dietro“ ecc. resa con $\delta\pi i$ (miceneo e tessalico, d'accordo con latino, osco, celtico, venetico, lituano),

ēpl (miceneo, ionico-attico, dorico, restanti dialetti eolici, illirico, armeno, gotico, celtico) ed *ō/ēv* (miceneo di Micene, arcado-cipriota, cfr. aind. *ū-d*). 5) Funzione sintattica di „a, verso“ ecc. resa con *potl* (miceneo, arcadico, cfr. avest. *pati*), con *protl* (tessalico, ionico-attico, cfr. aind. *prati*, asl. *proti-*), con **petl* (panfilio e, forse, miceneo, lesbico, „Ablaut“ di **pro/e-ti*) e con altre combinazioni che si trovano elencate in R. Coleman, *TPhS* 1963, p. 88ss. 6) Funzione sintattica di „da“ espressa dai doppiini *āpō* (ionico-attico, dorico, beotico, in accordo con latino, germanico ecc.) ed *āpū* (miceneo, arcado-cipriota, lesbico, tessalico, in accordo con aat. *abo* e an. *au*). 7) Particella modale *xe(v)*, *ka* (cfr. lat. *-ce*, itt. *-ka* e *-ki*, *-ka-n*) ed *āv* (cfr. got. *an hwa* „*tl odv*“). 8) Forse *iepōs* (miceneo, ionico-attico, arcado-cipriota), alternante con *iaōs* (dorico, con esito generalizzato *a₁ > a* come in tutte le altre lingue indoeuropee). 9) Funzione sintattica di „oltre“ espressa da **upr-* (miceneo e panfilio, d'accordo con lat. *s-upr-ā*, u. *s-ubr-a*), contro *vπēq* (resto del greco, d'accordo con aind. *upar-i*, lat. *s-uper*, got. *ufar*, celtico [gallico] *uer-*, ecc.). L'elenco è certo ampliabile se estendiamo l'analisi anche ad alcuni tipi di unità lessicali. (M. DORIA.)

See A 1 above. (H. KODZU.)

Siehe A 1. (W. MERLINGEN.)

Voir A 1. (M. D. PETRUŠEVSKI.)

La répartition géographique des dialectes de l'époque classique s'explique très facilement si on admet pour l'époque mycénienne quatre groupes dialectaux occupant chacun une région plus ou moins cohérente: proto-ionien (en Attique etc.), achéen (dans la plupart du Péloponnèse etc.), proto-éolien (en Thessalie etc.), grec occidental (dans les régions au Nord de l'Étolie et à l'Ouest de la Thessalie, en dehors de la civilisation mycénienne). Ces quatre groupes ont été énumérés dans l'ordre de la parenté dialectologique: l'achéen est intermédiaire entre le proto-ionien et le proto-éolien, le proto-éolien entre l'achéen et le grec occidental. Puisque l'esquisse donnée ci-dessus de la répartition géographique de ces quatre groupes pour l'époque mycénienne ne correspond pas tout à fait à leur ordre dialectologique, elle s'explique à son tour très facilement si on admet que ces groupes se sont constitués déjà avant qu'ils aient tous occupé les régions où ils se trouvaient à l'époque mycénienne. Naturellement, il est impossible de déterminer si les ancêtres des Grecs habitaient encore entièrement hors de la Grèce ou déjà partiellement en pays grec pendant la période où cette différenciation dialectale s'est réalisée. (C. J. RUIJGH.)

См. А 1. (И. М. ТРОНСКИЙ.)

There is no support for this position, but if there were, it would consist of isoglosses uniting, say, Aeolic with Italic, or Ionic with Armenian as against isoglosses uniting the Greek dialects. Pisani has argued for this type of development, but without success it seems to me. (W. F. WYATT.)

A

3. *How is one to imagine the occupation of the Greek soil by the ancestors of the Ancient Greeks, and do you find the traditional view about several waves of Greek newcomers sufficiently plausible?*

See A 2 above. (J. CHADWICK.)

The assumption of waves of Greek-speakers entering the Aegean area from the beginning of the second millennium onwards still seems plausible. However we should probably have in mind, as in the case of the Italic speakers entering Italy, a large number of relatively small movements by successive groups of Greek-speakers rather than two or three massive migrations. Even if the cultural break that occurred at the start of the Middle Helladic or Early Helladic III period is identified with a more extensive invasion, as the change that followed the Mycenaean period has usually been, linguistic inferences are hazardous. It would be rash, for example, to assume that the "Dorian invasion" was not preceded and followed by smaller migrations of Dorian speakers, some of whom may well have been established in Western Greece, North and South of the Corinthian Gulf during the Mycenaean period itself. (R. COLEMAN.)

I see no linguistic need to assume three waves. If archaeologists should at some time find archaeological evidence for a plurality of invasions, linguists might then reopen the problem, and see whether they can find any evidence for correlating invasions with later dialects. (W. COWGILL.)

There is nothing improbable in the view that several waves of Greek-speaking immigrants may have entered Greece before c. 1000 B. C. As a matter of economy, one should postulate only so many as may be needed to satisfy the evidence of archaeology, dialectology and plausible ancient traditions: e.g. (1) archaeological evidence indicates large-scale and militant migration into southern and central Greece c. 1900 B.C., but no subsequent similar immigration between that time and c. 1400 B.C. when (*pace* L. R. Palmer) one dialect of Greek at least must have been in use in the Peloponnese; (2) the conclusion that a wave of Greek-speaking tribes moved from Macedonia into central and southern Greece c. 1200—1000 B.C. makes sense of the dialect situation in the Peloponnese in Classical times and explains Classical Greek traditions. There is less reason to postulate large-scale north-to-south

movements between c. 1900 and 1200 B.C., although movements involving smaller numbers of migrants are not unlikely. There seems to be no linguistic reason for assuming the intrusion of non-Greek-speaking elements into Greece, including Macedonia, between c. 1900 and c. 1200 B.C., although pressure of peoples of the Balkan region, non-Greek, but no doubt Indo-European-speaking, may have caused the "Dorian" Greeks to moved southwards. The chances of determining whether any known dialect of Greek was affected by adstrate influences at this time are not good, since so little is known of the languages which might have exerted them (R. A. CROSSLAND.)

Per sostenere quanto esposto in A 2 sono convinto che non è necessario partire dalla teoria delle tre (o due) ondate successive di invasori ellenici. I Greci poterono essere penetrati „in blocco“ in Grecia con le loro differenze tribali e dialettali, secondo un processo di conquista che troviamo attestato presso alcune popolazioni germaniche, ed essersi successivamente suddivisi le loro (relativamente) stabili sedi di residenza. Naturalmente coloro che andarono a risiedere nella zona più appartata del Sud della penisola balcanica (Dori e Greci nord-occidentali) restarono un po' al margine del resto del mondo greco e non subirono quel processo di evoluzione linguistica che subirono i loro cugini venuti a contatto più diretto col mondo egeo.

Alla fine del XIII sec. (o forse dopo), all'epoca del „ritorno degli Ercalidi“, non sappiamo per quale ragione (pressioni esterne? sconvolgimenti politici entro il mondo non dorico?) questi Greci ripresero il loro cammino, occupando le sedi che noi conosciamo per il I millennio. Neppure questa ripresa della loro espansione deve meravigliarci, trovando essa paralleli significativi sia nella storia dei Germani, all'interno della „Germania“ stessa, sia in quella dei Greci stessi, a proposito degli Ioni, se è vero che essi si trasferirono in un paese (costa occidentale dell'Asia Minore) già parzialmente miceneizzato. (M. DORIA.)

Предки древних греков пришли на территорию Греции не позже III тысячелетия до н. э. Первоначально греческие племена захватили северную Грецию. Затем они постепенно стали продвигаться на юг Балканского полуострова и на восток — на острова и побережье Малой Азии. Первыми пришельцами, в течение длительного времени проживающими в Фессалии, считаю прото-эолийцев, прото-ионийцев и прото-ахейцев. На базе продолжавшегося многие столетия (III—II тысячелетия до н. э.) в основном мирного развития, в результате укрепления экономического, политического и культурно-религиозного сотрудничества отдельных греческих областей создаются между ними наддиалектные связи, ведущие к образованию в разных районах Греции смешанных языков — койнэ. Наиболее значительными из них становятся во II тысячелетии до н. э. в северном ареале две разновидности эолийско-ионийской койнэ — материковая и мало-азиатская, легкие (каждая в свое время) в основу образования древнейших греческих литературных языков. В конце II тысячелетия до н. э. вторжение с севера дорийских племен (которые, возможно, находились все время в контакте с эоло-ионийцами и ахейцами) приводит к нарушению былого единства греческих племен и к резкому перемещению населения Греции. (Н. С. ГРИНБАУМ.)¹

¹—Les ancêtres des anciens Grecs sont venus sur le territoire de la Grèce pas plus tard qu'au III-me millénaire av. n. è. D'abord les tribus grecques ont occupé le nord de la Grèce. Puis elles

The ancestors of the Ancient Greeks might have invaded historical Greece in several waves, but they occupied and spread over the area surrounding Greece proper without breaking up, with the result that the dialectal difference must have been gradual, shading from one area to the neighbouring areas. (H. KODZU.)

M. E. hat die erste und einzige Einwanderung der Träger des „Urgriechischen“ im 3. Jahrtausend stattgefunden (mit Bodenfunden in keinerlei Zusammenhang zu bringen). Ihr erstes Siedlungsgebiet war wesentlich kleiner als das historische; nicht mehr lokalisierbar, vielleicht Peloponnes. Von diesem ersten Siedlungsgebiet aus hat später, wohl erst im Laufe des 2. Jahrtausends, die weitere Verbreitung stattgefunden (wohl in mehreren verschiedenen Stößen, vgl. die Ausbreitung der romanischen, germanischen, slavischen Sprachen). — An mehrere „Wellen“ der Einwanderung nach Griechenland selbst, vor allem in Abständen von vielen Jahrhunderten, kann ich nicht glauben. Die „dorische Wanderung“ war ein innergriechisches Unternehmen nach dem Zusammenbruch des mykenischen Zeitalters. (W. MERLINGEN.)

Je crois que les ancêtres des anciens Grecs venaient par ondes, à savoir, d'abord les tribus achéennes et ioniennes et enfin les Doriens, dont il existe une tradition chez les Grecs de l'époque classique. (M. D. PETRUŠEVSKI.)

Voir A 2. (C. J. RUIJGH.)

См. А 1. (И. М. ТРОНСКИЙ.)

I assume that a tribe or group of tribes speaking a single Indo-European dialect differentiated only as other dialects are, settled in Greece towards the end of the Middle Helladic period. I thus agree with Chadwick (*Cambridge Ancient History*² 2: 39) that there was but one incursion of Indo-European intruders, linguistically uniform. (W. F. WYATT.)

ont avancé successivement vers le sud de la péninsule des Balkans et vers l'orient-sur les îles et la côte de l'Asie Mineure. Les nouveaux venus, qui ont habité longtemps la Thessalie, étaient, à mon avis, les proto-Eoliens, -Ioniens et -Achéens. Sur la base du développement en somme pacifique, qui dura plusieurs siècles, comme résultat de la consolidation des liens économiques, politiques, culturels et religieux de certaines régions grecques se sont créés entre elles des rapports supradialectaux, qui ont amené la formation dans les différentes régions de la Grèce des langues mixtes — koinés. Ce sont deux variétés de la koiné éolo-ionienne — continentale et de l'Asie Mineure, qui en deviennent les plus importantes au II-me millénaire av. n. è. à l'aréal du nord. Chacune en son temps fut à la base de la formation des langues littéraires grecques archaïques. A la fin du II-me millénaire l'invasion du nord des tribus doriennes (elles furent, peut-être, en contact permanent avec les Eoliens, Ioniens et Achéens) fit rompre l'unité antérieure des tribus grecques et provoqua un déplacement brusque de la population de la Grèce. (N. S. GRINBAUM.)

A

4. *To what extent was the Greek world dialectally differentiated as early as the Middle Helladic period, and provided it was clearly differentiated, in what degree did this differentiation correspond with that of the Classical Era?*

I very much doubt the presence of any dialects in the Middle Helladic period, since in my view this was the period of the formation of Common Greek; thus any dialect differentiation will have been late in the period and restricted in scope. (J. CHADWICK.)

When we are conjecturing the dialectal situation for the Middle Helladic period, it is salutary to note that even in historical times the picture is not a clear-cut one. If we draw up two lists of features, one for *East Greek* and the other for *West Greek*, we find that the dialects fall into a kind of spectrum. Obviously the number and precise character of the listed features will affect the arrangement, but in general there will be some dialects showing exclusively East Greek features, some showing exclusively West, and unless the lists are very small, a majority showing various admixtures of the two. One survey of this kind, which is admittedly a pioneer study and liable therefore to modification in the light of further research (*Transactions of the Philol. Soc.* 1963, pp. 58 ff.), revealed the following pattern, reading from East to West of the spectrum: *Cyprian* and *Arcadian*; *Ionic* and *Attic*; *Lesbian*, *Thessalian* and *Boeotian*; *Pamphylian*; *Aetolian* and the other *North West Greek* dialects; *Achaean*; *Argive*, *Corinthian* and *Megarian*; finally a compact group of *Dorian* dialects, with *Cretan* and *Rhodian* marking the Western extremity. Just where the boundary between East and West should be drawn is hard to decide, and it is perhaps safest to make *Thessalian* and *Aetolian* the boundary dialects of their respective groups and leave *Boeotian* and *Pamphylian* as "bridge" dialects between East and West. Within this spectrum the Western dialects bunch together more closely than the Eastern, even compared with *Arcadian* and *Cyprian*, which are demonstrably more closely related to each other than to any other dialects. In fact the only Eastern pair which displays anything like the degree of reciprocal correlation found between many pairs of Western dialects is *Ionic* and *Attic*. Hence we may conclude that the Western group continued as a closely unified linguistic entity for much longer than the Eastern group, which seems to have split up successively into *Arcado-Cyprian*, *Ionic-Attic* and *Aeolic*. Moreover of these latter three, *Ionic-Attic* must have remained unified for much longer than either of the other two. One last

point: although it is legitimate to speak in general terms of, say, *Thessalian* as being closer than *Arcadian* to *West Greek*, we can usually point to particular Western dialects which show relatively high correlations with individual dialects of the Eastern group. For *Thessalian*: (after *Boeotian*) *Elean*, *Phocian* and *Coan*; for *Lesbian*: *Aetolian*, *Elean* and *Coan*; for *Ionic-Attic*: *Locrian*, *Aetolian*, *Corinthian* and *Coan*; for *Arcadian*: *Megarian*, *Cretan*, *Argive*, *Laconian* and *Locrian*. For *Cyprian* no West Greek dialect shows a higher correlation than any of the Eastern ones; the nearest is (after *Boeotian* and *Pamphylian*) *Cretan*.

Now although all this refers directly to the historical period, it clearly has a bearing, indirectly, on the relations and distribution of the dialects as early as the Middle Helladic period. After the population movements of the second millennium and the early centuries of the first the opportunities for massive bidialectal contacts between East and West Greek dialects must have been limited to a very few areas, and the likelihood of convergence between the two groups correspondingly reduced. The fact that *East* and *West Greek* exhibit so little disparity at the beginning of our historical records therefore suggests that the two groups remained in close contact for at least the greater part of the second millennium, and even that the stage of proto-Greek unity did not end with the earliest migrations of some East-Greek speakers into Central Greece towards the end of the Early Helladic period. The later correlations noted above between particular Eastern and Western dialects can hardly reflect convergences between originally more differentiated dialect areas. Instead they must point to the fact that the further back in time we probe and the nearer we come to proto-Greek, the more bunched the spectrum of dialectal differentiation will appear and the more blurred the fundamental division into *East/West* will itself become. For instance, although *Mycenaean* already shows **/ti/ > /si/*, there is no reason to assume that the change was already widespread elsewhere in East Greek especially if it is a substrate phenomenon and therefore dependent on the geographical situation of the various dialects. *Thessalian* for instance must have had */ti/* throughout the 2nd millennium, and *Lesbian* may well have retained it until after the trans-Aegean migration.

For the Middle Helladic period we may envisage already a division into *East* and *West Greek*, though less clear-cut than it subsequently became. The Western group would show a more compact and closely knit character than its more diffuse Eastern neighbours, and the assignment to one or other group of the ancestors of many of the historically attested dialects would be much more difficult to make. (R. COLEMAN.)

The theoretical grounds referred to in my answer to A 2 indicate that there must have been dialectal differentiation in Middle Helladic times, even if it should be true that all the isoglosses then existing have been submerged in attested forms of Greek. But arguing by a sort of dead reckoning, it is very likely that some of the differences that we know from later Greek are inherited from Middle Helladic times. Thus we know that the South Greek assibilation of *t(h)i* to *si* and of *t(h)y* to *ss* is earlier than the Common Greek palatalization of *Cj* to *ČČ*, since the latter affected analogically restored *ty* in South Greek. But *Mycenaean* shows both changes, and if we accept a date of 1600 for the end of Middle Helladic and 1400 for the Knossos tablets, 200 years is uncomfortably tight for **ty > ss* → *ty > čč*.

It is likely that several of the dialects existing in Middle Helladic have disappeared with little or no trace in the Classic Era. To mention one possible example, the word

“horse”, Myc. *i-go*, later *ἵππος*, if not borrowed from some non-Greek Indo-European language, must reflect a dialect in which P.I.E. *e had become *i* rather than remaining. But in none of the later-known Greek dialects would this have been regular in a word of the shape *ek'wos. Since Mycenaean already has the *i*, the borrowing was very probably done in Middle Helladic or earlier. (W. COWGILL.)

The differences between N.W./Doric Greek and the south-eastern groups, Attic-Ionic and Arcado-Cyprian, in Classical times seem sufficient to imply at least the differentiation of northern and southern dialects or dialect-groups in the 2nd millennium. It is less clear whether a proto-Aeolic dialect was already differentiated from these at that time. (R. A. CROSSLAND.)

Ho già detto quasi tutto su questo punto nella risposta ad A 2. E sono d'accordo col Bartoněk stesso sulla cautela da lui raccomandata per quanto riguarda la possibilità di una diversa distribuzione geografica dei protodialetti di epoca micenea e premicenea.

A prescindere poi da questa distribuzione, sono convinto che nei periodi suddetti i dialetti greci erano profondamente differenziati tra loro tanto quanto lo erano in epoca classica, e forse ancor di più, ma, è ovvio, non per le medesime cause.

Di quest'epoca noi conosciamo direttamente un solo dialetto (il miceneo, o meglio, ciò che sta alla base della lingua amministrativa, relativamente uniforme, dei centri politici di Cnosso, Pilo e Micene) e, indirettamente, le tre o quattro unità (protodorico, proto-eolico, proto-ionico, proto-acheo) che i glottologi sono riusciti a ricostruire con maggiore o minore approssimazione sulla base della complessa situazione dialettale del I millennio. E' ovvio che questi termini (proto-dorico, ecc.) che abbiamo elencato hanno un significato ben diverso dai termini corrispondenti (dorico ecc.) d'epoca classica, sia dal lato estensivo (il protodorico, il protoionico ecc. saranno stati dialetti locali, non gruppi dialettali estesi), sia da quello qualitativo (le isoglosse che li distinguevano nel II millennio non erano le stesse che li distingueranno nel I millennio) e valgono tutt'al più come semplici etichette, d'uso comodo, ma anche fuorvianti, in quanto dobbiamo costantemente tener presente l'eventualità, anzi la quasi certezza, che nel periodo miceneo esistessero altri dialetti, tutti irrimediabilmente perduti, tranne appunto il miceneo della Lineare B.

Un indizio della pluralità di dialetti greci nel I millennio e di una loro approssimativa distribuzione (Peloponneso?) lo si può cogliere in alcune „anomalie“ soprattutto fonetiche, della lingua della Lineare B. Alcune di queste le ho già elencate in A 3, a proposito delle differenziazioni dialettali preimmigratorie (n. 1—6, 9), alcune altre, risalenti a differenziazioni dialettali più recenti, le elencherò in B 1. Anticiperò qui un'osservazione relativa ad un fenomeno a cui accenna il Bartoněk stesso, il passaggio di *τi* a *σι*. Un esame, anche affrettato, della toponomastica e dell'antroponomia di Pilo ci porta a constatare che proprio qui compare la massima parte degli esempi sicuri di *τi* conservato. Il valore dialettale di questo *τi* dipende innanzitutto dall'accettazione o meno da parte nostra della tesi del Porzig e del Risch sul carattere primitivo dell'eolico. Se anche il protoeolico aveva il *τi* conservato, è evidente che questi *τi* micenei sono ambigui, potendo ascriversi sia ad intrusione dorica che ad una eolica: se invece ammettiamo, contro i due predetti studiosi, che l'eolico avesse *σι* già nella sua fase preistorica, il valore del *τi* miceneo dovrebbe essere, o meglio potrebbe essere, univoco. Ma esiste, indifferentemente se si parta dall'una o dall'altra presa di posizione, anche una terza alternativa, la possibilità che

si tratti di arcaismi del miceneo stesso, cioè forme cristallizzate di fasi anteriori, risalenti all'epoca dei primi stanziamenti, quando nessun dialetto greco, proto-miceneo compreso, aveva ancora mutato τ in σ . Tornando all'alternativa „dorica“ (o „dorico-eolica“) dell'origine di tale τ , essa, comunque, non deve stupirci: è del tutto naturale che le tribù elleniche insediatesi nelle singole sedi dopo l'immigrazione non saranno state tutte etnicamente omogenee. Risultato: Il diverso grado di ricettività, in seno ad una comunità discretamente omogenea, di fenomeni innovatori (dipendenti da cause multiple, non ultimo il sostrato), per cui avremo avuto, in un mare di τ passati a σ , anche qualche caso isolato di τ conservato, specialmente là dove l'attrazione analogica o l'integrazione in un sistema, non aiutavano il generalizzarsi di σ . Sorge spontanea allora la domanda: è lecito chiamare „dorici“ (o „eolici“ o „dorico-eolici“, pur con la limitazione insita in queste denominazioni) questi τ ? Di per sé solo, un fenomeno di conservazione, se non è costantemente accompagnato da un insieme di innovazioni tipiche, non è indicativo di parentela specifica. Tuttavia è nostro dovere tentar di superare, coi mezzi a nostra disposizione, anche questa aporia, soprattutto in vista dell'allettante possibilità (quarta alternativa) di ritenere questo τ come reliquia di uno di quei dialetti condannati altrimenti a restare perpetuamente in ombra. (M. DORIA.)

Образование на разных этапах развития и в разных районах Греции той или другой койнэ не означало, конечно, отсутствия или исчезновения отдельных существенных различий между греческими диалектами. Эти различия были связаны как с особенностями исторического развития каждого из них, так и с неодинаковым влиянием соответствующего субстрата. В среднеэллиадский период этих расхождений было, возможно, не меньше, чем в классический, хотя их характер мог быть различным. Изучение греческих надписей классического времени убеждает в том, что наличие большого количества местных особенностей в каждом из греческих диалектов хорошо уживается и абсолютно не препятствует образованию наддиалектных общих языков (малоазиатская, пелопоннеская, ахейская, аттическая и другие койнэ). (Н. С. ГРИНБАУМ.)¹

See A 3 above. (H. KODZU.)

a) Sicher war das Griechische auch schon in der Mittelhelladischen Periode dialektisch differenziert, aber die tatsächlichen Beziehungen zu den Dialekten der klassischen Ära werden kaum aufzufinden sein, da auch in der späteren Zeit allzu oft nicht mehr feststellbar sein dürfte, welche (dialektischen) Eigenheiten Archaismen und welche Neuerungen sind.

Hier möchte ich wiederholen, was ich im *Anzeiger f. d. Altertumswiss.* XVI, 1963 [1964] (LB-Forschungsbericht), S. 168, zur Stellung der Sprache von LB gesagt

¹ = La formation des koinés dans des phases différentes du développement et dans des régions différentes de la Grèce ne signifiait pas, bien entendu, l'absence ou la disparition des différences considérables entre les dialectes grecs. Ces différences étaient conditionnées par les particularités du développement historique de chacun d'eux et par l'influence inégale du substrat correspondant. A l'époque moyenne-helladique il n'y en avait, peut-être, pas moins qu'à l'époque classique, bien que leur caractère pût être différent. L'étude des inscriptions grecques du temps classique nous persuade, que la présence d'un grand nombre de particularités locales dans chacun de dialectes grecs n'empêche pas et s'accorde bien avec la formation des langues supradialectales communes (les koinés: asiatique, achéenne, peloponnesienne, attique etc.). (N. S. GRINBAUM.)

habe: „Es ist zwar verhältnismäßig leicht, Klassifizierungen nach bestimmten Dialektmerkmalen zu treffen, aber die Klassifizierungen an sich versetzen nicht in die Lage, aus ihnen allein die Entstehungsgeschichte abzulesen. Dialektische Unterschiede bzw. Affinitäten gehen — im großen und ganzen — auf folgende Vorgänge zurück: einseitiges oder gemeinsames Bewahren von Archaismen, einseitige oder gemeinsame Verluste, einseitige oder gemeinsame Neuerungen: welcher dieser völlig verschiedenen Vorgänge liegt in jedem Fall vor und wann ist die Einseitigkeit oder Gemeinsamkeit zufällig oder nicht zufällig? Was ist alt, was ist neu? Es steht ja auch hinter den genannten Theorien, ob nun Ionier-Theorie oder eine andere, wohl meist die stillschweigende Voraussetzung, dass die Dialekte ihre Eigenheiten nur auf früheren Sitzen entwickelt und von dort aus mitgebracht haben können. In Wirklichkeit kann die Sache viel eher umgekehrt sein, daß nämlich die meisten und wichtigsten Differenzierungen erst nachträglich auf den neuen Sitzen entstanden sind (einseitige Bewahrungen, Verluste, Neuerungen). . .“ (Risch, Chadwick).

b) Außerdem glaube ich, daß eine große Rolle die sozialen Dialektunterschiede gespielt haben, die sich ebenfalls in den historischen Dialekten zum Teil widerspiegeln, ohne jedoch im einzelnen als ehemals soziale Unterschiede faßbar zu sein.

c) Übrigens gehen Dialekte auch verloren. So werden auch mittelhelladische, urgriechische und vorurgriechische Dialekte bestanden haben, die später (spurlos) verschwunden sind.

Wie problematisch diese 4 Punkte sind, können Vergleiche mit anderen Sprachen sinnfälliger machen. So könnte man etwa vergleichsweise fragen:

α) Wieweit gehen Dialektunterschiede des Čechischen (Französischen) auf ur-slavische (urromanische) Unterschiede zurück?

β) Wieweit gehen diese Unterschiede auf určechische (urfranzösische) Unterschiede zurück?

γ) Sind die Určechen in einer oder in mehreren Wellen in das čechische Siedlungsgebiet eingewandert? Bilden die Hussitenkriege eine dieser Wellen? (= bildet die „dorische Wanderung“ eine der Wellen der griechischen Einwanderung?).

δ) Wie verhalten sich die čechischen Dialektunterschiede des Mittelalters zu denen der heutigen Zeit? (W. MERLINGEN.)

Dans la période de l'helladique moyen, à mon avis, on ne pourrait pas parler de différences dialectales à défaut de textes. (M. D. PETRUŠEVSKI.)

Il est bien possible que la quadripartition telle qu'elle vient d'être décrite appartienne à l'Helladique Moyenne (± 1900 — ± 1600). Le proto-ionien est l'ancêtre de l'attique et des parlers ioniens, l'achéen de l'arcadien et du chypriote, le proto-éolien du lesbien et du thessalien oriental, le grec occidental des parlers doriens et de ceux du Nord-Ouest. Il va de soi que ces dialectes de l'époque classique ont pu subir mutuellement l'influence de leurs voisins et il y a en outre des dialectes qui résultent d'un véritable mélange, comme par exemple le béotien. (C. J. RUIJGH.)

См. В 1. (И. М. ТРОНСКИЙ.)

In my view the differences, if any, must have been very minor, and cannot have corresponded at all with the dialect differences of the classical period. The traditional view of the date of the arrival of the Greeks (ca. 1900 or even 2300) would, though, almost certainly necessitate assuming dialect differences: these might or might not correspond to the later dialect groupings. (W. F. WYATT.)

