

PETER G. VAN SOESBERGEN

THE COMING OF THE DORIANS*

1. The problem

During the last decade, some archaeologists have questioned the assumption that cultural change should generally be taken as evidence for invasion or migration.¹ A test case is provided by the events at the end of the Bronze Age in the Aegean region. The destruction and abandonment of most of the important Mycenaean settlements in the Peloponnese at the transition from Late Helladic IIIB to IIIC (c. 1200–1180 B.C.) have generally been associated with the southward movement of tribes or groups belonging to the Dorian branch of Greeks or their immediate ancestors. The Greeks of archaic and classical times had a strong tradition that such a movement had taken place fairly soon after the Trojan war: and this tradition has provided a satisfactory explanation of the differences between the groups of Greek dialects as we know them from the sixth to the fourth century B.C., and of their distribution.² In the past ten years the historical reality of the Dorian

* I am grateful to Prof. Ronald A. Crossland who offered me many opportunities for stimulating discussions about several aspects of the problems concerning the coming of the Dorians during the current academic year of my research in the University of Sheffield. I should also like to thank Prof. Olivier Masson and Dr. Emilia Masson for supplying information on recent epigraphic evidence from Cyprus. I thank Mr. John M. Kirk, lecturer in the Department of English Language in the University of Sheffield, for his advice on questions of variant orthographies.

¹ Cf. e.g. C. Renfrew, 'Problems in the general correlation of archaeological and linguistic strata in Prehistoric Greece: the model of autochthonous origin', in: R. A. Crossland and A. Birchall (ed.), 'Bronze Age Migrations in the Aegean' (hereafter BAMA), London 1973; Park Ridge 1974, pp. 263–279.

² Cf. e.g. C. D. Buck, 'The Greek Dialects', Chicago 1955. A. Bartoněk, *Classification of the West Greek dialects at the time about 350 B.C.*, Amsterdam 1972; and in *Studia Mycenaea*, Brno 1968, 37–51, 155–210; BAMA 305–311. W. Porzig, 'Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Dialekten', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 61 (1954), pp. 147–169; E. Risch, 'Die Gliederung der griechischen Dialekte in neuer Sicht', *Museum Helveticum* 12, 1955, 61–76.

migration has been questioned by archaeologists, and since 1975 John Chadwick has claimed that certain linguistic evidence points to an alternative explanation of the final decline of the Mycenaean states in the Peloponnese: namely, a revolt by 'lower class' subjects against their 'upper class' rulers.³

2. The archaeological evidence

The archaeological records reveal total or partial destruction, and sometimes abandonment, of LH IIIB settlements throughout the central and southern mainland of Greece, which might well be regarded as proof of invasion, were it not for the absence of evidence of new artefacts that could be ascribed to the invaders.

V. R. d'A. Desborough has demonstrated that only two artefacts were introduced about this time – the cut-and-thrust sword (Naue II type) and the violin-bow fibula; the contexts of both, however, show that they were used by Mycenaeans and not by invaders.⁴ A. M. Snodgrass has argued likewise.⁵

On the other hand, as M. S. F. Hood has remarked, the Slav penetration of the Peloponnese from the end of the sixth century A. D. onwards left no visible traces save for a cemetery of inurned cremations found by chance on the site of the new museum at Olympia, although references in Byzantine authors, supplemented by the massive legacy of Slav place names still surviving in the south of Greece, make it quite clear that the Slav occupation was on a massive scale.⁶ Further, F. A. Winter has shown that the settlement of Celtic tribes in Asia Minor in the third century B.C. left little material evidence and that

³ J. Chadwick, a. 'Who were the Dorians?', *Parola del Passato* 31, 1976, 103–117; b. 'The Mycenaean Dorians', *BICS* 23, 1976, 115–116; c. 'Der Beitrag der Sprachwissenschaft zur Rekonstruktion der griechischen Frühgeschichte', *Anzeiger phil.-hist. Kl. der Österr. Akad. der Wiss.* 113, 1976, 183–198. Since 1976 Chadwick's theory about the Dorians has received support from various scholars, e.g. J. T. Hooker, *Mycenaean Greece*, London 1976, 146: "... the amounts of pottery which can be identified positively as intrusive even in this period are very small and are not at all consistent with large-scale immigration from the north into the Mycenaean area."

⁴ V. R. d'A. Desborough, *CAH*³ II, Chap. 36 (a), 660–662; 'The Greek Dark Ages', London 1972, 21.

⁵ A. M. Snodgrass, 'The Dark Age of Greece', Edinburgh 1971, 304, 311–312.

⁶ M. S. F. Hood, 'An aspect of the Slav invasions of Greece', *Act. Mus. Nat. Prag.* 20, 1966, 165–171; *BAMA*, 239. Cf. P. Lemerle, 'La chronique improprement dite de Monemvasie', *Rev. ét. byz.* 21, 5–49.

most of what was formerly claimed as such evidence can now be seen to be spurious.⁷ Yet, the Celtic invasions of Central Anatolia are well documented in literary and epigraphic sources. B. Trigger has coined the phrase "archaeologically invisible migrations", in which newly arrived populations leave no evidence other than "signs of war, cultural decline, and fairly rapid cultural change".⁸

The survival of older cultural elements following signs of discontinuity (such as extensive destruction of settlements) does not necessarily mean that the composition of the population remained unchanged, but may reasonably be taken to indicate that the previous population was not entirely wiped out. This pattern of events is likely to apply to 'the coming of the Dorians' as recorded in our ancient literary sources.⁹

3. Linguistic evidence from the Linear B documents

John Chadwick follows and extends E. Risch's view that two dialects were simultaneously in use at all Mycenaean sites: a 'standard' Mycenaean (corresponding to Risch's 'mycénien normal'), closely related to later Arcadian and Cypriot, and a 'substandard' dialect (corresponding to Risch's 'mycénien spécial') spoken among the lower classes and occasionally influencing the written language, especially in the case of certain scribes.¹⁰

a. The occurrence of both *pe-mo* and *pe-ma* = σπέρμο and σπέρμα = 'seed-corn' in Mycenaean Greek is now explained by Chadwick as the result of a different phonetic treatment of $\eta > o$ in 'standard' Mycenaean ('Proto-Arcadian' and 'Proto-Cypriot') as opposed to $\eta > a$ in 'substandard' Mycenaean ('Proto-Doric').¹¹ It is not clear why *pe-mo* is assigned to the alleged 'standard' and *pe-ma* to the 'substandard' dialect. The frequency of occurrence of the two words might have been a criterium, as *pe-mo* occurs 208 times (only at Pylos) and *pe-ma* just 9 times (4 times at Knossos and 5 times at Pylos). The allegation,

⁷ F. A. Winter, 'The Dorian invasion', in: E. N. Davis (ed.), *Symposium on the Dark Ages in Greece*, New York 1977, 60–76.

⁸ B. G. Trigger, *Beyond History*, New York 1968, 43.

⁹ See for the literary evidence N. G. L. Hammond, *CAH*³ II, Chap. 36 (b), 678–706; and F. H. Stubbings, *ibidem* Chap. 27.

¹⁰ J. Chadwick, *op.cit.* note 3a, 112–113; *op.cit.* note 3b, 115. Cf. E. Risch, 'Les différences dialectales dans le mycénien', *Cambridge Coll. on Myc. Studs.* 1965, 150–157.

¹¹ J. Chadwick, *op.cit.* note 3a, 113; *op.cit.* note 3b, 115.

though, that 'standard' and 'substandard' dialects "were simultaneously in use at all sites"¹² is obviously not applicable to this case, since we find the 'standard' form *pe-mo* 208 times at Pylos, but never at Knossos. The view that two dialects co-existed within the same Mycenaean centres is attractive in one respect: it avoids the problem of postulating a simultaneous change of $\eta > o$ or a within one and the same dialect, which many mycenologists formerly admitted without being able to define the exact phonetic conditions of this double treatment. But this theory does not explain why one particular scribe uses both the neuter form in *-o* and that in *-a* ($< \eta$) within one series of documents: PY Ta 711.2 (written by 'hand' 2) gives the form *a-mo-te-wi-ja* derived from a derivative of *a-mo* = ἄρμó¹³ = 'wheel'; whereas PY Ta 713.1.3 and PY Ta 715.1 (both also written by 'hand' 2) give the form *e-ka-ma-pi*, instr. plur. of ἔχμα = 'stay', 'support'¹⁴. Did this scribe write in both 'standard' and 'substandard' Mycenaean?

In fact, it is not necessary to postulate two co-existing dialects within the same Mycenaean palace-centres of southern Greece, for as early as 1967 C. J. Ruijgh gave an elegant and satisfactory explanation of the variants *pe-mo* and *pe-ma* by pointing to the process of analogy. Starting from the principles that a phonetic law can only work one way during a certain stage of development of a dialect, and that exceptions can usually be explained through analogy, he showed that, among the neuter forms in *-η-*, those with a nominative sing. in *-r* originally formed a considerable group which occurs more frequently in Homer than in classical Greek and is very frequent in Hittite. The normal flection in Mycenaean Greek would have produced a nominative ἄλειφορ (phonetic development: *-or* $< -r$), genitive ἄλείφατος (phonetic development: *-α-τ-* $< -\eta-t-$), which would have offered an *o*/*α* alternation within one paradigm, odd in a Greek declension. Consequently one generalized the paradigm either on the analogy of the phonetically expected nominative form, or on that of the expected genitive form, so that two paradigms were formed:

I. nom. ἄλειφορ
gen. ἄλείφατος
etc.

II. nom. ἄλειφαρ
gen. ἄλείφατος
etc.

¹² J. Chadwick, op.cit. note 3b, 115. N. B. the neuter form *a-mo* 'wheel' does however occur at Knossos.

¹³ See for the intervocalic *h* in ἄρμó C. J. Ruijgh, *Etudes sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du Grec mycénien*, Amsterdam 1967, § 34.

¹⁴ The form ἔχμαφι had probably preserved its initial *h*, since 'Grassmann's Law' had presumably not yet been active in the time of the Mycenaean tablets; cf. C. J. Ruijgh, op.cit. note 13, § 21.

Subsequently this double declension was extended to other neuter forms in *-η-*, thus producing σπέρμο, σπέρμοτος next to σπέρμα, σπέρματος.¹⁵

b. The explanation by Risch and Chadwick of *-e / -i* (= *-ει / -ι*) in the dative sing. of the third declension as 'normal' or 'standard' Mycenaean *-ει* and 'special' or 'substandard' Mycenaean *-ι*, respectively, seems to be superfluous. Although Mycenaean Greek did no longer distinguish these two forms in their syntactical functions (cf. PY Es 646.1; al.: *po-se-da-o-ne* = Ποσειδᾶῶνι and PY Un 718.1: *po-se-da-o-ni* = Ποσειδᾶῶνι; both dative forms of Poseidon) and could use both forms as dative as well as locative, from a diachronic point of view the form in *-ει* (cf. Myc. *po-de* = ποδεῖ) actually represents the original Indo-European dative form (cf. Old Latin *virtūtei*), whereas *-ι* (cf. Myc. *po-di* = ποδί) represents the original Indo-European locative. The victory of *-ι* over *-ει* in the first millennium B.C. (*-ει* survived only in some rare cases, for instance, in fifth-century Cypriot ΔιΦείφιλος, ICS 352; Homer already has διίφιλος) can quite easily be explained from a synchronic point of view by a process of analogy, since *-ι* marks the dative form in both the first declension (*-α*) and the second (*-ω*).¹⁶

c. The process of palatalization and subsequent assibilization of the voiceless dental occlusives *τ* and *θ* before *ι* (except in initial syllables and in a position immediately after *ο*) was probably already completed in Mycenaean Greek before the time of the tablets, since the use of the sign *si* in the Mycenaean texts actually suggests that the stage *ʔi* had already been passed in the process *ti* > *ʔi* > *ʔʲi* > *ʔi* > *si*.¹⁷ For linguistic reasons therefore the attribution of the group *-si-* (e.g. *ti-nwa-si-ja*) to 'standard' Mycenaean ('Proto-Arcadian' and 'Proto-Cypriot'), and of *-ti-* (e.g. *ti-nwa-ti-ja-o*) to 'substandard' Mycenaean ('Proto-Doric') is not justified. In fact, *ti-nwa-si-ja* (e.g. the ethnic name ΤινFάνσιαι derived from a toponym in *-νθος*), or ΤινFάσιαι (derived from a toponym *ΤίνFᾶτος or *ΤίνFᾶθος) represents the form to be expected on phonetic grounds, whereas *ti-nwa-ti-ja-o* owes its *τ* or *θ* to restoration on the analogy of the toponym from which it had been derived.¹⁸ The same applies to the ethnic name in the feminine form *mi-ra-ti-ja* (PY

¹⁵ C. J. Ruijgh, op.cit. note 13, § 46.

¹⁶ Cf. E. Risch, op.cit. note 10, 150–157; J. Chadwick, op.cit. note 3a, 113; op.cit. note 3b, 115; C. J. Ruijgh, op.cit. note 13, § 63–64 and notes 58–60.

¹⁷ Cf. C. J. Ruijgh, op.cit. note 13, § 20.

¹⁸ Cf. J. Chadwick, op.cit. note 3a, 113; op.cit. note 3b, 116; C. J. Ruijgh, op.cit. note 13, § 148.

Aa 1180; al.). The τ in Μῖλᾰτιος can most properly be ascribed to restoration on the analogy of the toponym Μῖλᾰτος (Ion. Μῖλητος) from which the ethnikon had been derived.¹⁹ Also the τ in *me-ri-ti-jo'* = e.g. μελίτιος = 'honeyed' (PY Wr 1360. β-γ), derived from *me-ri* = μέλι = 'honey' (KN Gg 702.1.2; al.), can most easily be explained by analogy (cf. gen. μέλιτος).²⁰ The assumption of the existence of a 'substandard' Mycenaean to be equated with 'Proto-Doric' in the palatial centres is therefore not necessary.

Even the names *o-ti-na-wo* = e.g. ὈρτίνᾰΦος (PY Cn 285.14) and *e-ti-ra-wo* = e.g. ἘτίλᾰΦος or ἘρτίλᾰΦος (PY Cn 131.10; al.) which Chadwick claims "must be West Greek, unless the change [sc. of -τι- > -σι-] was still in progress"²¹, can more easily be explained by analogy.²² It is a well-known phenomenon in Greek onomastics that the first and second element in compound names consisting of two elements can often be inverted.²³ The same applies to Mycenaean Greek where we find, for instance, *a-ke-ra-wo* = e.g. ἈγέλᾰΦος (PY Cn 599.3; al.) and (with inversion of the elements) *ra-wa-ke-ta* = λᾰFᾰγέτᾰς = 'commander-in-chief of the army' (PY An 724.7; al.).²⁴ Inversion of the elements in Ἐρτί-λᾰΦος would provide the well-known name Λαέρτης. As the elements Ἐρτί- ('Ἐρσί-) and Ὀρτί- ('Ὀρσί-) are closely related (cf. ἔρση, ἔρέθω, ὄρνυμι), we may assume the τ in both cases to have been restored on the analogy of names such as Λαέρτης (< -έρτᾰς) and Λυκ-όρτᾰς.²⁵ Homer has both Ὀρσί-λοχος and Ὀρτί-λοχος. Yet, as far as we know, nobody has ever seriously maintained that the Homeric epics contain, in addition to Mycenaean, Aeolic and Ionic strata, Doric or West Greek elements. Moreover, it is impossible to explain the name Ὀρτίλοχος as exclusive to persons of Dorian or West Greek stock, and Ὀρσίλοχος to those of non-Dorian or non-West Greek stock, since Homer uses both names indiscriminately for the same man, the father of Diocles of Phraeae in the land of the Pylians.²⁶

¹⁹ Cf. J. Chadwick, *ibidem*; C. J. Ruijgh, *ibidem*, § 151 and note 410.

²⁰ Cf. J. Chadwick, *ibidem*; C. J. Ruijgh, *ibidem*, § 101 and note 116.

²¹ Cf. J. Chadwick, *op.cit.* note 3b, 116.

²² Cf. e.g. C. J. Ruijgh, *op.cit.* note 13, § 218 and notes 102–103.

²³ Cf. F. Bechtel, *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit*, Halle 1917, *passim*.

²⁴ Cf. e.g. O. Landau, *Mykenisch-griechische Personennamen*, Göteborg 1958, 166.

²⁵ Cf. P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, Paris 1968–1977, 823–824; H. Frisk, *Griechisch etymologisch Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg 1954–1972, 422–424, s. v. ὄρνυμαι.

²⁶ Cf. *Iliad* V 546–547 and *Odys.* III 489; XV 187.

Further, in every case where Mycenaean Greek uses either -τι- or -θι- instead of the -σι- which one would expect on phonetic grounds, or -τι- or -θι- as a parallel of -σι-, an explanation through analogy is possible. In those cases, however, where an explanation by analogy would be inconceivable in Mycenaean Greek as the predecessor of Arcadian and Cypriot, the Linear B documents always provide the form which one would expect on phonetic grounds: 19 times *e-ko-si* = ἔχονσι (< *σέχοντι), twice *e-ko-si-qe* = ἔχονσι κ^wε, but never † *e-ko-ti* or † *e-ko-ti-qe*; 16 times *o-u-di-do-si* = οὐ δίδονσι, once *di-do-si* = δίδονσι, once *o-di-do-si* = ὤ δίδονσι (ὤ = Homeric ὦς), once *jo-do-so-si* = γω δώσονσι (γω = Att. ὦς), but never † *o-u-di-do-ti*, † *di-do-ti*, † *o-di-do-ti*, or † *jo-do-so-ti*. This last observation may also apply to an alternative explanation mentioned casually by Chadwick in his phrase "unless the change was still in progress" (v. *supra*). If the change of -θι- and -τι- > -σι- was still in progress in the time of the tablets, it must have been in its last stage, since the vast majority of the cases offer -σι- instead of -θι- or -τι-. But we can go one step further and conclude that the process had probably already been completed before the time of the Linear B texts. For, if the process had still been working, we should, on the basis of a statistical calculation of chances, have expected to find exactly the same proportion of 'older' -θι- and -τι- forms next to the 'new' -σι- forms in those cases where an explanation by analogy is *not* conceivable as we actually have in those cases where it *is*.

We conclude that in all cases where we do find -θι- or -τι- in the Mycenaean texts, instead of the -σι- that was to be expected on phonetic grounds, we are not dealing with 'older' forms preserved during the process of palatalization and assibilization, but with forms restored by analogy. One might think of only one exception: loanwords and names of non-Greek origin possibly containing alien phonemes. There are, however, many examples of the extension of Greek phonetic laws to names of non-Greek origin (cf. e.g. *ko-ri-si-ja*, *ka-pa-si-ja*, *za-ku-si-jo*).²⁷

d. Chadwick considers that the 'history' of the signs transcribed *za*, *ze*, *zo* confirms that 'substandard' Mycenaean was a source of West Greek. According to him, these signs represent /ts//dz/ in 'standard' Mycenaean. Here he agrees with most mycenologists (except L. R. Palmer) in assessing the phonetic value of the *z*-signs, though he limits its validity to his 'standard' dialect. At the same time, however, he assumes that the

²⁷ Cf. the author, 'Thracian names in Linear A and B', *Kadmos* 18, 1979, 32–37; cf. corrigenda in *Kadmos* 19.1, 1980.

series *za*, *ze*, *zo* represents /k'/ (a palatalized dorsal occlusive) in 'sub-standard' Mycenaean. It was L. R. Palmer who first put forward the hypothesis that "all the signs of this series <should be> given values of palatalized stops: *k'e*, *k'o* etc."²⁸ He based his view largely on the assumption of an interchange of *ke* and *ze*, for instance in *ke-i-ja-ka-ra-na* (PY Nn 228.3) and *ze-i-ja-ka-ra-na* (PY Xa 70), and *a-ke-ti-ri-ja* (KN Ai 739.1; al.) and *a-ze-ti-ri-ja* (KN Ap 694.3; al.).

More recently, he proposed to interpret Αἰσχρός as the name of an ox **a₃-zo-ro* (cf. KN Ch 1034: **a₃-zo-ro-qe*).²⁹ Chadwick accepts Palmer's hypothesis concerning the value of the *z*-series for his 'substandard' dialect. Pointing to the proposals for *a-ke-ti-ri-ja*, *a-ze-ti-ri-ja* and **a₃-zo-ro* he remarks that "all cases of *z* = *k* may be for *sk*", supposing that "if *ze* remained *k'e* in substandard, then the palatalization would have been neutralized where *s* preceded (cf. Slavonic)". Thus he explains *a-ke-ti-ri-ja* as a 'standard' and *a-ze-ti-ri-ja* as a 'substandard' orthography of ἀσκήτριοι.³⁰

The first question is whether we are certainly dealing with words of the same root when interpreting *a-ke-ti-ri-ja* and *a-ze-ti-ri-ja*, and whether ἀσκήτριοι is the only possible interpretation of *a-ke-ti-ri-ja*. The answer is that there is no such certainty. It is quite possible to read *a-ke-ti-ri-ja* as ἀσκήτριοι, since according to orthographic conventions nonocclusives such as /s/ are disregarded in consonantal clusters before occlusive consonants.³¹ To justify the reading ἀσκήτριοι, C. J. Ruijgh remarks: "Chez Homère, ἀσκέω concerne des métaux et des textiles; les *a-ke-te-re* sont une espèce de forgerons, tandis qu'on trouve aussi le féminin *a-ke-ti-ri-ja* (PY Aa 85; al.) dans un contexte qui fait penser à la fabrication de textiles (donc ἀσκήτριοι)." However, this is by no means the only possible interpretation. One could, for instance, treat *a-ke-ti-ri-*

²⁸ L. R. Palmer, 'Observations on the Linear 'B' tablets from Mycenae', BICS 2, 1955, 41.

²⁹ L. R. Palmer, 'Context and geography: Crete', in: E. Risch et H. Mühlestein (eds.), Colloquium Mycenaeum 6°, Geneva 1979, 43-64.

³⁰ J. Chadwick, op.cit. note 3b, 116; cf. op.cit. note 3c, p. 194, note 8. A value /k'/ and even more so a value close to /k/ (cf. *infra*) for the *z*-signs would be entirely incompatible with forms such as *to-pe-za* = τόπεζα, where *za* is the graphic representation of the phonetic result of /dya/, and *ze-u-ke-si* = ζεύγεσ(σ)ι (result of /y/; cf. Latin *iugum*). A more extensive discussion on the phonetic value of the *z*-signs in Linear B will be published elsewhere.

³¹ Cf. e.g. *ko-ni-jo* (PY An 610.14), perhaps ethnicon Σχοίνιος, derived from toponym *ko-no* (PY Eq 213.6), possibly gen. Σχοίνων of nom. plur. Σχοῖνοι (Σχοίνος is attested as toponym in historical times); cf. *ko-no* (MY Ge 602.5; al.), σχοῖνος 'some aromatic bulrush'.

ja as well as *a-ke-ti-ra₂* (PY Aa 815; al.) as the feminine form of *a-ke-te-re* (PY Jn 832.1) and its possible doublet *a₂-ke-te-re* (KN V 118, where *a₂-* is actually written over *a-*), signifying ἀκεστῆρες = 'repairers'. In the context, ἀκίστριαι 'women in charge of the repair of textiles' makes as much sense as ἀσκήτριαι 'women dealing with the fabrication of textiles'. It is to be noted that the original aspiration of *ἀκέομαι is attested in the Phocian form ἐφακῆσθαι (*Del.* 325,37,41) and that the loss of the aspiration in the Attic form may well be due to the influence of a dialect such as Ionic where *psilosis* was a regular phenomenon.³²

After expressing this reservation about the interpretation of *a-ke-ti-ri-ja*, we shall now – for the benefit of a further evaluation of the argument – assume *ex hypothesi* that the Mycenaean scribes actually meant ἀσκήτριαι when writing *a-ke-ti-ri-ja*. It is not plain why *a-ke-ti-ri-ja* is styled 'standard' Mycenaean and *a-ze-ti-ri-ja* 'substandard'. If the relative frequency of the words is a reason, the difference of occurrence does not seem to be significant.³³ The suggestion that palatalization of /k/, in a position after /s/, was neutralized is not unreasonable in itself, in the given phonetic context. But what is the consequence of this observation? Would neutralization of the palatalization of dorsal occlusives after /s/ not have preserved or produced a phonological sequence pronounced as /sk/ (or /sk^h/)? In that case, what reason would the scribes have had to use a different orthography *a-ze-ti-ri-ja*, if this should be interpreted as ἀσκήτριαι as well? In other words, why did they not use the conventional orthography *-ke-* to express the sequence /ske/?

It is preferable to regard *a-ze-ti-ri-ja* not as an alternative 'sub-standard' orthography of ἀσκήτριαι, but as a graphic and phonic variant with different reflection of the non-Greek affricate. These variants can be explained better through the probably non-Greek origin of the forms in question than by assuming the contemporary use of 'standard' and 'substandard' dialects within all Mycenaean palatial centres.

³² Cf. C. J. Ruijgh, *op.cit.* note 13, § 30, note 40. N.B. *ra₂* = ρια or λια; *a₂* = ᾱ; *a* = ᾱ or ᾱ. Cf. also L. R. Palmer, *op.cit.* note 28, 37.

³³ If we take the forms *a-ke-ti-ri-ja* and *a-ze-ti-ri-ja* as such, the first occurs three and the second seven times in the texts (the second only at Knossos). Only if we take into account the related forms such as *a-ke-ti-ri-ja-i*, *a-ke-ti-ri*[-], *a-ke-ti-ra₂-o*, *a-ke-ti-ra₂*, *a-ke-ti-ra₂*, *a-ke*[-*ti-ra₂*], and *ja-ze-ti-ri*[-], then the score appears to be slightly in favour of the first. In more evolved writing systems it is easier to decide whether graphemic variants are due to real differences of etymology or to mere vagaries of spelling or even to different sources of introduction of a word into a language. *Jail* and *gaol* came separately from dialectal variants in Old French through Middle English into Modern English.

e. Mycenaean Greek shares the temporal suffix *-τε* in *o-te* (PY Ta 711.1) = *ὅτε* both with Arcado-Cypriot and with Ionic-Attic, whereas Aeolic offers *-τα* (cf. Lesbian *ὄτα*) and West Greek and Doric provide *-κα* (cf. *ὄκα*). This is a tiny piece of evidence against the hypothesis of co-existing 'standard' and 'substandard' dialects in all Mycenaean centres. The suffix *-τε* occurs, however, only once in the Linear B documents so that one might well claim that it is entirely accidental that the reflection of an alleged 'substandard' suffix of the temporal correlative adverbs is not attested in Mycenaean Greek.

f. Mycenaean Greek displays one conspicuous feature which it alone shares with the Arcadian and Cypriot dialects of the first millennium B.C. Whereas all the other dialects of historical times use the forms *-ται* and *-νται* for the third person sing. and plur. present middle, only Mycenaean Greek and Arcado-Cypriot offer the more archaic forms *-τοι* and *-ντοι*, for instance Mycenaean *u-ru-to* (PY An 657.1) = *Φρύντοι*, 'they protect'. Since it is, however, in the absence of second millennium documents from relevant areas, uncertain whether Proto-Ionic-Attic, Proto-Aeolic and Proto-Doric might already have substituted *-ται* and *-νται* for *-τοι* and *-ντοι* by the time of the Linear B tablets, it is not appropriate to use the exclusive occurrence of the archaic forms *-τοι* and *-ντοι* in Mycenaean Greek as evidence against the alleged existence of a Proto-Doric, 'substandard' dialect within the Mycenaean centres.³⁴

4. The literary tradition and epigraphic evidence

One view is that "there is no reason to postulate Dorian invasions to explain the linguistic facts" and that "traditions are only secondary sources, as compared with the contemporary evidence of archaeology and linguistics";³⁵ the other is that ancient literary sources tell about the coming of the Dorians and that one would need very strong evidence to deny the historicity of such a tradition.

The dialectal unity of Arcadian and Cypriot in historical times can best be explained by postulating a social-economic (and maybe ethnic and political) unity in southern Greece before the Dorian and West Greek tribes moved in.

³⁴ Cf. C. J. Ruijgh, *op.cit.* note 13, § 14, note 6.

³⁵ Cf. e.g. J. Chadwick, *op.cit.* note 3a. 105; *op.cit.* 3b, 116.

This unity must have been established in Mycenaean times, for it is only after the end of LH IIIB that signs of disintegration appear.

As to the *terminus ante quem* of the arrival of Mycenaean Greek settlers in Cyprus, and as to which parts of the island they occupied, we may refer to the recent discovery at Kouklia-Paphos of three obeloi dated to the end of the eleventh century B.C. of which one carries a syllabic inscription.³⁶

This inscription, possibly the 'missing link' between the Cypro-Minoan and archaic-classical Cypriot syllabaries, Madame E. Masson transcribes as *o-pe-le-ta-u* and interprets as a personal name in the genitive form Ὀφέλtau, probably signifying the owner of the obelos, Ὀφέλτας (a name already known in Linear B as *o-pe-ta* (KN B (5) 799 + 8306.6)).³⁷

It should be noted that Madame Masson applies the orthographic conventions of the Classical Cypriot syllabary. If, however, Linear B conventions are to be applied, it is possible to interpret *o-pe-le-ta-u* as a genitive of e.g. Ὀφελέστας (cf. PY An 209.3: *o-pe-re-ta*; Iliad VIII 274: Ὀφελέστης.). The phonological and morphological evidence provided by the inscription is significant, since the genitive in -āv, typical for Arcado-Cypriot in classical times (cf. Arcadian Καλλίαυ and Cypriot Ὀνασαγόραυ)³⁸, may well point to a dialectal unity of Arcadian and Cypriot as early as the end of the eleventh century B.C.

Now Pindar (Nemean Ode IV, 44–48) refers to the tradition that Teukros colonized Salamis in Cyprus, and Pausanias (VIII, 5, 2) informs us that the Arcadian king Agapenor founded Paphos and built the sanctuary of Aphrodite (probably to be equated with Astarte) at Old Paphos after the storm that had overtaken the Greeks on their way home from the capture of Troy carried him and his Arcadian fleet to Cyprus.³⁹ According to Pausanias (VIII, 5, 3) contact between the island and Arcadia was maintained in the next generation or generations.⁴⁰ In VIII, 5, 1 he tells that the first (unsuccessful) attempt of the Dorians to return to the Peloponnese, under the leadership of Hyllos, took place in the time of Agapenor's predecessor, Ekhemos, that is just before the Trojan

³⁶ V. Karageorghis, 'Recent excavations at Old Paphos' (lecture given at Univ. Coll. London on 28.11.79); cf. *Comptes Rendus Acad. Inscr. et B.-L.* for 1.2.1980.

³⁷ E. Masson, 'Literacy in Cyprus during the Late Bronze Age' (paper read at the meeting of the London Mycenaean Seminar on 21.11.79).

³⁸ Cf. C. D. Buck, 'The Greek Dialects', Chicago 1955, 27.

³⁹ Cf. also Strabo, *Geog.* XIV, 6, 3 and Scholion on Lycophron, *Alexandra* 479ff.

⁴⁰ It is also interesting to find that there was a temple of the Paphian Aphrodite founded by Laodike, a descendant of Agapenor, at Tegea in Arcadia (cf. *Paus.* VIII, 53, 7).

war.⁴¹ When Agapenor did not return home from Troy, Hippothous succeeded to the Arcadian throne, and it was during the reign of his grandson Kypselos that the Dorian expedition returned to the Peloponnese, not (as three generations before)⁴² across the Corinthian Isthmus, but by sea to a place called Rhion (Paus., VIII, 5, 4–6). This means that Arcadian settlement in Cyprus had taken place at least two generations before the successful second Dorian invasion across the Corinthian Gulf.

Thucydides's remark that "the Dorians in the eightieth year after the Trojan War, together with the Heraclidae, occupied the Peloponnese" is fully in accordance with Pausanias's account, and certainly does not contradict an identification with Proto-Dorian tribes of the people responsible for the destruction of the Mycenaean palaces. One might even claim that Thucydides's use of the aorist ἔσχεον is significant evidence that the Dorians, as distinct from the Heraclidae, had not been resident on the Peloponnese before.⁴³

It is difficult to grasp whether the 'return' in the ancient tradition applies only to the Heraclidae or also to the Dorians. Herodotus observes that people of Dorian stock first moved to the North-West as they went from Phthiotis to Histiaiotis beneath Ossa and Olympus and, driven thence by the Kadmeans, settled in that part of Pindos called Makednos before they eventually came down to Dryopis (the old name for Doris) and thence to the Peloponnese.⁴⁴ Alternatively, the term 'return' may reflect only the usual political claim of conquering people to a legitimate right of occupancy.

As to the relationship between Dorians and Heraclidae, the tradition about the Heraclidae seems to refer primarily to one royal family expelled from its Mycenaean residence in the Peloponnese and desperately forcing its way back. Such a family might have relied heavily on armed forces recruited in the north and might even have swept whole tribes down to the south. Similarly in later times, the Thracian army recruited by Pisistratus on the Thracian Chersonese enabled him to regain power at Athens. Alternatively, an independent tradition about the return of the Heraclidae might have been adopted into their own history by Dorian cities for reasons of propaganda.

⁴¹ Cf. also Hdt. IX, 26; Diod. Sic. IV, 57, 2 – IV, 58, 4; Apollodorus II, 8, 1–2 (N.B. there is a lacuna in § 2).

⁴² Note that Pausanias counts Hippothous as belonging to the same generation as Agapenor.

⁴³ Thuc. I, 12, 3. Cf. also Clem. Al., Stromata I, 138, 1.

⁴⁴ Cf. Hdt. I, 56, 3.

5. Some conclusions and suggestions

It is sometimes argued that there is not enough room inside the frontiers of Greece for the huge numbers of people needed to effect the massive replacement of the population of Mycenaean Boeotia, Argolid, Messenia and Crete (Knossos) and the change from an East to a West Greek dialect.⁴⁵

However, we remark first that a change of dialect may sometimes be imposed on a subjugated population by their new rulers, with no significant 'replacement' of population. Second, 'the frontiers of Greece' in the Late Bronze Age may have included parts of Macedonia, as Herodotus's remarks (I, 56, 3) seem to suggest, and maybe parts of Epirus and West Thrace as well.⁴⁶ Thirdly, there are plenty of historical parallels for mountainous areas, such as the North-West boundary of the Late Helladic world, that were apt to produce more population than they could normally support.⁴⁷

A. Bartoněk has argued convincingly⁴⁸ that Proto-Doric would have been readily intelligible to those who lived in the centres of Mycenaean civilization. If the Proto-Dorian tribes had arrived in 'Greece' at about the same time as the other Proto-Greeks, they would have lived, with other North-West Proto-Greek tribes, along the North-West border of the Late Helladic world, in contact with the Mycenaean centres in the south. Though a clear division between Proto-Doric and the other main groups of Proto-Greek dialects can be observed, the comparatively close affinity between all these groups points to this conclusion.

In brief, the 'Dorian invasion' of ancient tradition can be described as a partial and secondary migration southward of one fraction of the Proto-Greek population⁴⁹. The Late Helladic material, found as far

⁴⁵ Cf. e.g. J. Chadwick, *op.cit.* note 3b, 115.

⁴⁶ Cf. N. G. L. Hammond, 'Prehistoric Epirus and the Dorian Invasion', *BSA* 32, 1932, 131–179; R. A. Crossland, *op.cit.* note 2, *Studia Mycenaea*, Brno 1968, 163–164; and in: 'Retrospect and Prospects', *BAMA* 343.

⁴⁷ Cf. e.g. H. W. Parke, *Greek Mercenary Soldiers*, Oxford 1933, 14. Cf. the author, 'Colonisation as a solution of social-economic problems in fourth-century Greece', shortly in *Ancient Society*.

⁴⁸ A. Bartoněk, *op.cit.* note 2, *BAMA*, 307–308.

⁴⁹ The 'rowers tablets' (Docs. 184–5) are said to indicate that Pylos was expecting an attack from the sea, and one of them, PY An 1.1, mentions 'the rowers going to Pleuron'. The Rhion ('Cape') mentioned in the literary tradition as the landing-place of the Dorians invading the Peloponnese stands on the north coast of the Peloponnese near Patras and opposite Naupaktos. Moreover, there is a Pleuron on the coast of the

north as Central Macedonia, may be due either to some degree of 'mycenaeanization' of the North-West Proto-Greek tribes, or to a long-lasting cultural affinity of the Proto-Dorians with their fellow-Proto-Greeks.

Calydonian Gulf not far west from Naupaktos and Molykreion, and Homer (Il. II, 638-640) says that this Pleuron belonged to Aetolian territory. When the Dorians sailed from Naupaktos and/or Molykreion, they crossed the sea with the Aetolian Oxylos as their ally and guide (Strabo VIII, 3, 33).