Early Greek Dialectology – Methods and Perspectives

Ladies and gentlemen

The Greek language has a special position among the ancient Indo-European languages. When we work with archaic Greek inscriptions or the earliest poetry it becomes apparent that the Greek language is in no way homogenous. Rather than being an unity Greek is splitted in a number of local dialects in the first half of the first millennium B.C. These dialects function as a literary language in a certain area and in a certain social context. It was not until the Hellenistic period that linguistic diversity was reduced by the universal use of Attic-Ionic as a common language called „Koiné dialektos”. The individual dialects or their successors subsequently lost their status as written languages and were used only as spoken languages. From that period on their are hardly tracables and disappear from the surface.

At the beginning of the first millennium B.C. up to thirty dialectal regions can be differentiated on the basis of the inscriptions on the Greek mainland, the Aegaean islands and the colonies (I refer to the map on your handout under number 1). This number of up to thirty different dialects does not include the literary dialects such as the language of the Homeric poems, which differ from any of these local dialects.

Today there is no doubt that these individual dialects or dialect regions can be classified as parts of the following major dialect groups on account of common features or isoglosses. You can see the groups on number 2 of your handout.

1. First: Doric-North West Greek
2. Second: Attic-Ionic
3. Third: Arcado-Cypriot
4. Fourth: Aeolic

This classification reflects the synchronic situation. It corresponds to the synchronic impression which we get if we compare the interdialectal isoglosses quantitatively, not taking into account their diachronic value. In his article „The dialect geography of Ancient Greek” published in the Transactions of the Philological Society of 1963 Coleman arrives at the same classification. Coleman collects all known dialectal features from
the seventh to the third centuries and subsequently adds all the isoglosses between the individual dialects. The result of this synchronic analysis: The dialects which share the greatest number of isoglosses can be grouped among the four major dialect groups mentioned above.

Looking at the fact that these four dialect groups exist on a synchronic level it is not surprising that already the Greek grammarians on the whole shared our view. Whoever there is one important exception: In antiquity an Arcado-Cypriot group was never taken into consideration.

Looking with the eye of a modern dialectal geographer at this synchronous dialectal map the geographical distribution of the four main groups leaves open questions (3). The main groups extend over areas which partly do not connect. It is particularly noticeable …

… that first the Arcado-Cypriot group is split in two areas, one in the center of the Peloponnese and the other on Cyprus.

… and that second the Aeolic group is split into three different distant areas in Boeotia, Thessaly and the island of Lesbos as well as the mainland of Asia Minor.

It is known from a historical dialectal geography that this type of inhomogenous picture points to past migrations. Therefore there has been hope since the beginnings of Comparative Philology that the historic dialectal geography of Greek can contribute to our knowledge of Early Greek history. And can shed light on the Early Greek period before 1500 B.C. as well as the dark ages between 1200 and 800 B.C. There have been two central questions which relate to each other:

– First: Which genealogical relationships exist among the four dialect groups mentioned above?

– Second: How have the individual groups or their predecessors emerged from an unified Early Greek?

This leads us to the central point of my lecture. I intend to discuss three major points today:

– First I want to show how the methods of historical Greek dialect geography have evolved and which methods have proved particularly valuable.
Following this I shall give a summary of the present discussion and our present knowledge. I want to mention one point beforehand: Our glance on the historical map of Greek dialects has shown that the geographical distribution of the Arcado-Cyprian and the Aeolic dialects leads to open questions. In the following it will become apparent that these questions in particular have not been solved to the present day.

As a third and last point I shall attempt to give answers to these open questions. For that sake I will further develop the existing method.

Let's start with the method of Greek dialectal geography (4). This method has developed significantly in the previous century. In the years after 1900 Comparative Philology still tried to correlate the genesis of Greek dialects and their groupings directly with the history of the Greek tribes. I remember a saying of the Austrian Indo-Europeanist Paul Kretschmer who was a leading figure in the investigation of the history of the Greek language: „Our present view on the earliest history of the Greek dialects is based on the knowledge that tribal history and dialectal development go parallel and are to be seen in a natural connection.“ Kretschmer made this statement in 1909. Yet soon afterwards it became apparent that the conclusions derived from a linguistic-historical comparison were unsatisfactory. We had to realize that the reports of ancient historians regarding Early Greek history are very unreliable in the light of a progressing historical and philological investigation.

It was necessary to change the old paradigm and the breakthrough was made in the late forties (5). It was my teacher Ernst Risch who applied modern methods of dialectal geography to the Greek dialects. Risch’s major article appeared in 1949. Risch based his work on the tool of dialectal maps which was well known to him from the investigation of the Swiss German dialects. As a first step he entered the distribution of each single dialectal feature on a individual map. He then compared these maps of isoglosses and could recognize three recurrent constellations. I quote Risch: „Basically we find three types of constellations. First constellations with a distribution of the various dialect forms which fit the groupings of the old tribes. Second constellations where the groupings of the old tribes is concealed but which show correspondences between hometown and colonies. And third less frequent constellations in which also the connection bet-
ween hometown and colony is broken.” Risch concluded that these three types of constellations were dependant of the age of the individual dialectal features.

To illustrate this I want to give one example for each one of these three different constellations Risch found on his dialectal maps:

(1) First: Constellation of type one (6): The distribution of the various dialect forms matches the groupings of the old tribes or the four major dialect groups respectively.

Example: The temporal adverbs. In Attic-Ionic as well as in Arcado-Cypriot they end in /-te/ (type τότε „then?”, πότε „when?”). In contrast in Aeolic they end in /-ta/ (type τότα, πότα), in Doric-North West Greek however they end in /-ka/ (type τόκα, πόκα). The table on your handout proves: the distribution of the varying formations of these temporal adverbs maps the four dialect groups directly.

(2) Second: Constellation of type two (7): The distribution of the various dialect forms do not match the major four dialect groups. But in case the dialect has continuations in the colonies founded between 800 und 600 B.C., the hometown and the colony share the same dialect form.

Example: The accusative plural of the second declension: The Doric dialects of Argos and Central Crete preserve the original form /-ons/ with /ɔns#/ at the end of the word. I refer to Argivian τονς υιονς and Cretan τονς υιους. Otherwise /ɔnɔ/ disappears with or without compensatory lengthening or diphthongization: Arcadia, Argolis outside Argos and Thessaly as well as most of the southern Doric islands have /-オス/ with a short vowel. In Lesbian and in Elean there is /-oις/ with diphthongization. All other dialects have /-ος/ ending in a long vowel written -ως with Omega or /-ος/ with a closed long vowel represented as diphthong <OY> in writing. The table on your handout shows clearly that the development of the accusative plural ending /-ons/ cuts apart the four dialectal groups.

It ist to be noted, that the colonies show the same data as the hometowns. In our case for instance Herakleia in Southern Italy has the same ending -ως with a long vowel as the Laconian dialect of Sparta. Likewise Cyrene shares the short vowel-ending -ος with her hometown Thera.
(3) Third: Constellation of type three (8): As in constellation two the distribution of the various dialect forms do not match the major four dialect groups. Furthermore there are also differences between the hometown and the colony in case the dialect has continuations in the colonies founded between 800 und 600 B.C.

In these cases the difference between hometown and colony is caused by regional individual developments such as ἔποιεξε „he did” in Sparta where the intervocalic /s/ is aspirated contrasting with ἐποίησε generally found in Greek. In contrast to their hometown Sparta the colonies Tarentum and Herakleia share this common Greek form ἐποίησε.

From the typology of these constellations shown on dialectal maps Risch derived an external relative chronology (9):

- Dialectal forms or isoglosses corresponding to constellations of type one belonged according to Risch to a first phase in which the major dialect groups were not yet split up into individual dialects or during which the individual dialects still existed in neighbouring regions and therefore were in close contact to each other.

- Dialectal forms or isoglosses corresponding to constellations of type two go back to a subsequent phase after the split of the major dialect groups involving geographical distance of the individual dialects. As a terminus post quem of the second phase Risch saw the destruction of the Mycenaean palaces as well as the following changes and migrations. That is a date around 1200 B.C.

- Dialectal forms or isoglosses corresponding to constellations of type three according to Risch can be attributed to a third phase after the great wave of colonization of the eighth to the sixth centuries B.C. During that period Greek colonies were founded particularly in Sicily, Southern Italy and along the coast of the Black Sea.

However despite of the clear advantages of this methodology there remained an uncertainty (10). Risch’s method is based on the central assumption – which is by the way not clearly formulated – that linguistic divergence is caused by a process of geographical separation: If a dialectal area is split through the migration of certain parts of the population to other areas or if new groups arrive, the linguistic continuity is interrupted. As the time of separation goes, new individual dialects emerge. Risch’s assumption was certainly obvious. It corresponds with the findings of modern dialectology. Yet
it remained problematical for the history of Greek dialects as the supposed geographical separation or the migrations could not be demonstrated in the same measure for all three phases:

- For the third phase there existed a terminus post quem which is archaeologically and historically well founded: the great wave of Greek colonization from 800 to 600 B.C. Divergences like εποτέλε in the Laconian dialect of Sparta and ε-μετρησαμες in the colonies Tarentum and Herakleia could be explained by the geographical distance involving separate developments after the separation. This means that the intervocalic Aspiration of /s/ to /h/ must have taken place after the Spartan colonists have migrated to Southern Italy.

- Also the first phase could be fixed with a terminus post quem relating to an event in the historical record: the immigration of the Indo-European Hellenic tribes to Greece. According to what we know today this immigration is not likely to have taken place long before 1700 B.C. The individual Greek dialects must have formed from that period onwards.

- The second phase however remained unclear. The destruction of the Mycenaean palaces was a historical and archaeological fact. But there is no prove that it is caused by the immigration of new Greek tribes coming from the north. For an immigration of Northern Greek tribes at the end of the Mycenaean period (that is in the early phase of Late Helladic IIIC after 1200 B.C) cannot be proved in archaeological terms.

Apart from this lack of archaeological evidence the methodological uncertainty was reinforced by a second factor: For the second phase there are no linguistic data available. The transition to the first phase becomes transparent by the comparison of the reconstructed Indo-European forms with Early Greek (as the smallest common denominator of pre-dialectal Greek). The transition from the second to the third phase is shown by contrasting the dialects of the hometowns and their colonies. For the second phase however any type of comparable concrete data cannot be provided.

If we look back to the beginnings of the fifties we can summer the situation as follows: The borderline for a second phase could neither be shown by outer evidence nor
by linguistic data. And this was the underlying methodological weakness in the model put forward by Risch.

Now I come to the second point of my lecture: the present position of the discussion on the development of the Greek dialects (11). The methodological weakness which affected Risch’s method suddenly disappeared in 1952. This was caused by the decipherment of the Linear script B by the British architect Michael Ventris and the discovery of the Mycenaean dialect which gave us a totally new data basis. In particular the decipherment proved that around 1200 B.C. a Greek dialect was spoken on the Peloponnese (more precisely in Argolis and Messenia) as well as in Attika and Boeotia. For the distribution of the Mycenaean findings I refer to the map on your handout. This Mycenaean dialect corresponds in its essential features with Attic-Ionic as well as Arcado-Cypriot. The table on the handout (12) informs you about the main isoglosses and common features between these three dialect groups. These features are in particular …

… the so-called assibilation of */ti/ to */si/;

… the development of original */tʃ/ to simple */ʃ/ in ancient lexical items such */tʃo-/*totʃo-/* „so many” to */tʃo-/*.

… the formation of temporal adverbs in */-te/ which we already mentioned as example for a constellation of type one (compare handout point 7).

Form this table you can see that in these cases as well as in others Mycenaean, Attic-Ionic and Arcado-Cypriot show identical features.

The importance of the discovery of Mycenaean Greek cannot be valued highly enough (13). For through this discovery the method worked out be Risch gained full validity. Indirectly an immigration of Northern Greek tribes in post-Mycenaean times was now proven by the fact that the Doric-North West Greek dialects of the region could not be derived from Mycenaean. Accordingly speakers of Doric-North West Greek dialects must have immigrated into the Peloponnese in post-Mycenaean times. In Greek dialectology the transition between the first and the second phase could be now determined comparing Early Greek Mycenaean with the dialects of the first millennium. The discovery of the Mycenaean dialect made it possible to establish a chronological evaluation and classification of the individual dialectal features. Thus the answers could be found to the questions which were asked at the beginning of the lecture: the questions
how the four major dialect groups are interrelated and how they emerged. I will formulate the answers in the present tense as they represent the actual state of our knowledge:

- Mycenaean shares remarkable isoglosses with Attic-Ionic and Arcado-Cypriot. It therefore follows that these dialects have a common source which only dissolved in post-Mycenaean times. As Mycenaean is widely attested in Southern Greece and in Crete around 1200 B.C, the term „Southern Greek dialects” for this group seems evident.

- Opposed to this Southern Greek dialect group are the Doric-North West Greek dialects as well as the Aeolic dialects, which are consequently are termed „Northern Greek dialects”. It was only after the destruction of the Mycenaean palaces and the consequent shifts in Southern Greek that speakers of Northern Greek dialects appear to have migrated to Southern Greece and the Aegaean forming a superstratum over the former Southern Greek dialect area. This expansion which is commonly known as the „Doric migration” has thus after 1100 B.C. formed the basis for the dialectal landscape of the classical period.

This two-fold division suggested by Risch reduces the four major dialect groups of the first millennium to two original groups in the second millennium. It was commonly accepted in a short time and is presently the common opinion.

I am now at the end of the second part of my lecture. I hope that I have been able to give you a short summary on the present knowledge about historical Greek dialectology. Furthermore I hope that you formed an impression on how important the results of historical linguistics have been for our knowledge of Ancient Greek history.

Lets pass to the third and last part of my lecture. I have given a hint at the beginning that critical voices opposing our common opinion have not been missing to the present day. Just to remember: The common opinion as established by Risch counts Arcado-Cypriot among the Southern Greek group, the Aeolic dialects to the Northern Greek group. What concerns Arcado-Cypriot I have demonstrated the criteria for this classification in 10 on your handout. What concerns the Aeolic dialects the attribution to the Northern Greek dialect group is based on the view that the Aeolic dialects do not share any ancient features with Southern Greek. Just following the standard theory the
Southern Greek as well as the Northern Greek group substantially disintegrated not until the fall of the Mycenaean kingdoms around 1200 B.C.

Among the most prominent critics of this common opinion are C.J. Ruijgh and M. Peters (14). Their alternative views on the dialectal landscape of Greece in the second millennium B.C. can be summarized as follows:

- For C.J. Ruijgh it is not at all certain that the Arcadian and Cyprian dialect as well as the Aeolic dialects formed only in a post-Mycenaean period. In several monographies and articles which have appeared since the nineteen-sixties Ruijgh has tried to show that there are ancient Mycenaean-Arcado-Cypriot as well as ancient Aeolic isoglosses. Isoglosses which go back to a pre-Mycenaean age. According to Ruijgh the differences between the unit Arcado-Cypriot-Mycenaean and Attic-Ionic consist in the development of syllabic */r/ (to arcad.-cypr. /ro/ versus att.-ion. /ra/) and the result of the first compensatory lengthening (which resulted in a new closed long vowel in Attic-Ionic as in */ēmi/ ēimí versus arcad.-cypr. /ēmi/ ήμι, both from */(h)esmi/). By the way Ruijgh terms the supposed Mycenaean-Arcado-Cypriot group “Achaean dialects”. The same criteria as in the case of the Achaean dialects are supposed by Ruijgh to have separated the Aeolic dialects from the Doric-North West Greek dialects as early as the beginning second half of the second millennium B.C: so syllabic */r/ became /ro/ in Aeolic versus /ra/ in Doric-North West Greek; */(h)esmi/ developped to Aeolic */emmi/ ēimí with a geminate consonant versus Doric-North West Greek */ēmi/ ēimí with compensatory lengthening and a new closed long vowel. Thus according to Ruijgh the Greek dialectal landscape in the Mycenaean era already shows the fourfold division as later in the first millennium B.C. However Ruijgh does not doubt the genealogical divisions of Greek dialects of two original groups Southern Greek versus Northern Greek. He only places back the period of a homogenous Southern Greek and Northern Greek dialect group by several centuries.

- Other than Ruijgh Martin Peters in an article published in 1986 as well in an unpublished monography radically doubts the commonly accepted model proposed by Risch. Similar to Ruijgh Peters postulates a Mycenaean-Arcado-Cypriot unity which he also calls „Achaean“. According to Peters these Achaean dialects go back to a fusion of an ancient early-Ionic (called „Old-Peloponnesian“) and Aeolic lay-
er. As main support for his thesis Peters sees an Aeolic substratum which he wants to find in the classical period in various Doric-North West Greek dialects of the mainland and the Aegaean islands.

Today I do not wish to enter into a detailed discussion of the arguments of Ruijgh and Peters. I have discussed their views implicitly and explicitly in several publications which you find mentioned on the handout. What is important for us today is the following: The theories of Ruijgh as well as of Peters aim at the status of Arcado-Cypriot and the Aeolic dialects – and thus deal with questions which are not conclusively answered by Risch and his successors.

From this point I want to go on to the perspectives of historical Greek dialectology. We have seen that according to the standard theory there existed only two Greek dialects in the late Mycenaean Bronze Age: Southern Greek and Northern Greek. I want to start with Southern Greek (15). The question which we are going to discuss in the following is: Are we really right in assuming a homogenous Southern Greek dialect group in the second half of the second millennium B.C? As we have seen Ruijghs and Peters answer to this question is No! They postulate in fact – despite all divergences – the existence of a separate Achaean dialect group consisting of Mycenaean, Arcadian and Cyprian. The reasons why I start treating Southern Greek and Mycenaean are obvious:

– The first reason is that our knowledge of the Mycenaean dialect has considerably improved through new linguistic evidence and individual studies of recent years.
– The second reason is that Mycenaean has now acquired an evident chronological and spatial dimension based on this new linguistic evidence and a more precise dating of the tablets and their findings spots. The table on your handout contains the relevant data.

In contrast to earlier times a stratification of the Mycenaean dialects is now at least theoretically possible. If linguistic differences were manifest in the Mycenaean language of the Greek mainland this could be evidence for an earlier dialectal split within Southern Greek. Thus we have to find out ...

… first whether a differentiation between earlier and later Mycenaean is possible (which would lead to a chronological dimension).
... second whether there are linguistic differences between the individual scribal hands of a center or between the individual centers of Mycenaean language themselves (which would lead to a spatial dimension).

To make the answer short: We shall see that Mycenaean is in no way homogeneous either chronologically and spatially. In fact we find clear evidence of linguistic differentiations within the Mycenaean corpus. These differentiations point to the evolution of individual dialects during the Mycenaean period. I will present you three of these differentiations in the following.

A first differentiation is found in the inflection of the “Verba contracta” on -ώ or -έω. Few verbal forms of this class have been found in Mycenaean texts. Until recently the two following stems from mainland-texts were our only evidence:

- First the 3.pers.sg. act. te-re-ja and the respective infinitive form te-re-ja-e as in PY Ep 613:

  1 ne-qe-wo e-da-e-wo ka-ma ọ-pe-rof du-ʃwo-u-pi , te-re-ja-e ,
  2 e-me-de te-re-ja to-so-ʃde , pe-mo GRA 10 T 1

  „Land of Nekēus, of the Edaēus (a title?): having the obligation to fulfill tribute with two ?, he fulfills tribute with one ?. So much seed ...”.

  It is not quite clear what this passage means. Most interpreters however agree on the sense of the verb te-re-ja*: It means something like „fulfilling tribute“. The inflection is clearly athematic. The third person singular te-re-ja is to be taken as /teleijā/ in accordance with the Aeolic type γελαί „he laughs“ attested by grammarians. The infinitive te-re-ja-e is to be taken as /teleiża-hen/; the ending /-hen/ from */-sen/ is normally found in thematic verbs of the type myc. e-ke-e /hekē-hen/ corresponding to classical Greek ἔχειν.

- Secondly the present participle medium to-ro-qe-jo-me-no attested in PY Eq 213:

  1 o-wi-de , a-ko-so-ta , to-ro-qe-jo-me-no , a-ro-u-ra , a2-ri-sa
  „Thus saw Aksotās, making an inspection to count the arable land.”

  to-ro-qe-jo-me-no is to be read as thematically inflected /trokēiomenos/.
So far mainland Mycenaean has attested side by side athematically inflected */teleia̱-mi/ beside thematically inflected */trok√i-√/. This evidence was not unexpected as it corresponds to the inherited state:

- Athematic verbs in */-a-mi/ go back to a factitive type as it is clearly attested in Hittite. A well known example is the verb neµahh- „to renew” form */neµah√-/. Its 3rd pers.sg. neµahhi corresponds exactly to Mycenaean /teleia̱i/. */teleia̱-mi/ is therefore derived from an adjective /teleijos/ (τέλειος) and has the function of later τελειόω.

- Thematic verbs in */-eo/ go back to original deverbal iteratives/intensives with o-grade in the root. The proportion of Mycenaean */trok√ejo-mai/ (hom. τροπέομαι) to the verb */trok√ejo-mai/ (klass. τρέπομαι) on which it is based is the same as of classical φορέω to φέρω.

But the opinion that Mycenaean has preserved the original inflection types in the case of the „verba contracta“ must be modified in the light of the new reading of the tablet PY Eq 36[+]887 (17). In line Zeile 13 we now read according to J.T. Killen …

IPA-ra-jo, po-ne-to-qe-mi

An interpretation /... palai̱on ponētoi-ḵe-min/ „... old land and he cultivates it” seems very attractive. po-ne-to /ponētoi/ appears now as athematically inflected 3rd pers.sg. med. of a verb */ponēmai/, which is later attested in homeric πνέομαι. The athematic inflection of an original thematic verb */ponējo-mai/ of the type */trok√ejo-mai/ from earlier intensive/iterative */(s)ponh-êje/o-/ is a derivation from the inherited state. Therefore it is an innovation. This innovation is not exclusively found on the tablet PY Eq 36 by Hand 1. An inflection on athematic */-êmii/ instead of thematic */-êjo/ is attested with certainty at least in Aeolic: I point out athematic forms like literary Lesbian κάλημι, ο’κημι or the thessal. infinitive γαορθιμεν /-ê-men/. This kind of inflection is further supposed to exist in Arcado-Cypriot on the basis of Arcadian forms as (inf.) κα-τυφονηνοι oder (part.) αδικημεν. Finally reflexes of this athematic type are found in pre-Doric substrate in the Doric-North West Greek dialect area: compare for instance argiv. (Opt.) οικειη oder el. (part.) τελεσφορεντες.
A second differentiation within Mycenaean can be noted with the ending of the feminine nomina agentis (18). The Mycenaean scribes interchange two forms of the suffix in this nominal class:

(i) In Pylos hand 1 writes <-ti-ri-ja> in me-re-ti-ri-ja PY Aa 764 ̷women grinding corn̸ or o-ti-ri-ja PY Aa 313 ̷(a female profession)̸.

(ii) In contrast the Pylian hand 21 uses <-ti-ra2> and writes the same profession -nouns as me-re-ti-ra2 PY Ab 789.B or o-ti-ra2 PY Ab 417.B.

With this change of suffix the following is important:

– The form of the suffix of the feminine nomina agentis <-ti-ri-ja> is to be read as */-triã-/ and continues the stem */-tr-íab2-/ of the oblique cases. The syllabification as */¬C¬RU¬V0°/ (instead of expected †/¬C¬RU¬V0°/ conform to the law of Sievers) goes back to the proto-language. As a parallel I give the rigvedic (gen.sg.) urv(i)yãb /urjãs/ (instead of †/urjãs/ expected following Sievers law).

– The alternating form of the suffix <-ti-ra2> is to be read as */-tirr√a/ and continues the stem */-tr-íab2/ of the nominativ/accusative. As intermediate stage I assume */-tirã/. As parallel for the phonological development and the rising of a short e-penthetic vowel */i/ I give oiktríō /to pity/ from */oikt-je/-o/ as denominal verb to the adjective oiktróς.

Thus in Pre-Mycenaean we can expect a paradigm for the feminine nomina agentis – taking into consideration all later specific Greek developments – as shown in the table under 19 in your handout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nom.</th>
<th>acc.</th>
<th>gen.</th>
<th>dat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>*/-tirrã/</td>
<td>*/-tirrán/</td>
<td>*/-triãs/</td>
<td>*/-triãi/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>*/-tirrai/</td>
<td>*/-tirrãns/</td>
<td>*/-triãhōn/</td>
<td>*/-triãsi/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This means that the stem form */-tirrã/ is justified in the nominative and accusative cases, the stem form */-triã-/ in the genitive and dative cases. Evidently there are deviations from this inherited distribution in certain areas and with certain scribes. The scribes behave in two different ways:
(i) First we find a generalisation of */-trĩǣ-/: When used in the nominative plural the ending */-trĩǣ-/ extends beyond its original inherited area of use. So for instance by hand 1 or hand 4 in Pylos in forms as me-re-ti-ri-ja /meletriai/.

(ii) Secondly we find also a generalisation of */-tirrā(-)/: This is the case in genitive plurals as me-re-ti-ri-2a-[o /meletirra[Œ]on/ or pe-ki-ti-ra-2-o /pektirra[Œ]on/ „women who pluck wool” by hand 23 or in the dativ singular a-ke-ti-ri-2-o /akestirraĩ/ once attested at Thebes. In the genitive plural as well as in the dativ singular it is */-tirrā(-)/ which extends beyond the inherited area uf use.

We can see that both forms of the suffix are interchangable in mainland Mycenaean. Both generalisations mentioned are innovations. But these innovations are of different relevance: The generalisation of */-trĩǣ-/ is trivial. It leads to the spread of the phonetically easier variant of the suffix and the post-Homeric state where -tρια and its derivation -τρις are the standard. The generalisation of */-tirrā(-)/ is totally different and not trivial at all. It leads to a state which is different to later standard Greek and is only found in the Aeolic dialects of the first millennium. Examples are thessal. Αογ[ετ]ταρρα (an epithet to Athena) with */-tarrα/ from */-terrα/, the glosses να(έ)ερρα · δέσποινα and ναίτερα · οικοδέσποινα cited by Hesych and finally δότερ[η]ν in Alcaeus. Furthermore */-tirrα(-)/ is continued as an Aeolism in Homer. Homer uses feminine nominative ending in -τερρα, which has been explained already by Jacob Wackernagel as an ionized form for */-terrα(-)/. In these forms */-tɛr̥ā(-)/ or */-terrα(-)/ replaces */-trĩā/ which is difficult to use in the hexameter. Phonetic developments like thessal. κρεννεμεν from */krippinen/ or lesbi. Δαμοκρετω from */krito/- show that homeric-Aeolic */-terrα/ can be directly derived from */-tirrα(-)/ as attested in Mycenaean.

A third differentiation within Mycenaean is attested in the development of ancient */eṇo/ (20). A development of */eṇo/ to */iṇo/ is ascertained in the following two items:

– First in ti-mi-ti-ja from te-mi-ti-ja PY On 300.10 (C ii). The relative geography of the Pylian empire shows that te/[i]-mi-ti-ja is closely connected to a place known as *ti-mi-to a-ko – if not identical with that place. Therefore an interpretation of te/[i]-mi-ti-ja as /Tʰemistiā/ ~ /Tʰimistiā/ and accordingly of *ti-mi-to a-ko as /Tʰemistos Argos/ containing /tʰemis, -stos/ as in later δέμις is very plausible.
– Secondly in (dat.sg.) \textit{a-ti-mi-te} PY Un 219.5 /Artimitei/ from \textit{\={a}-t{a}-me-to} PY Es 650.5 /Artemitos/.

A change of /\textit{en}\textsuperscript{{\textcircled{\textdegree}}}\textit{n}/ > /\textit{in}\textsuperscript{{\textcircled{\textdegree}}}\textit{n}/ is not attested otherwise in Mycenaean. The Mycenaean dialect of Pylos shows /\textit{en}\textsuperscript{{\textcircled{\textdegree}}}\textit{n}/ in standard words and endings of grammatical categories: compare the preposition /\textit{en}/ in e-ne-e-si PY En 609.2 oder the participle medium /-menos/ in de-de-me-no, o-ro-me-no etc. It is therefore plausible that the forms with /\textit{in}\textsuperscript{{\textcircled{\textdegree}}}\textit{n}/ are borrowed. The origin of these borrowings may be located in later Arcadia. The place /\textit{T\^{e}mistiå}/ \textit{~ /T\^{i}mistiå}/ is situated in the so-called „Further Province“ of Pylian kingdom, approximately in the area of later Triphilia in Elis. Cults to the goddess Artemis did exist in later Arcadia – in particularly in places like Lousoi or Orkomomenos which are already mentioned in Mycenaean texts. There are therefore good reasons to assume an Arcadian origin of the in-forms.

In fact /\textit{en}\textsuperscript{{\textcircled{\textdegree}}}\textit{n}/ regularly changes to /\textit{in}\textsuperscript{{\textcircled{\textdegree}}}\textit{n}/ in Arcado-Cypriot. I cite as examples the arcad. preposition \textit{\={i}v}, the participle \textit{\={a}p\={e}x\={o}m\={i}n\={o}s} and the Cyprian personal names, kypr. \textit{Mi-no-ke-re-te-se} /Minokret\={e}s/ and \textit{A-ra-ko-mi-ne[=se]} /Ark\={o}min\={e}s/. The same change is also attested in the pre-Doric substrat in Doric-North West dialects: so for instance we find \textit{\={i}v} in Northern Central Crete as well as \textit{\={t}i\={c}} in Pamphylia.

The differentiations discussed show that mainland Mycenaean was not a homogeneous unit (21). It shows special developments which are found in the first millennium …

(i) … first in the Aeolic dialects as in Arcado-Cypriot: for instance the athematic inflection of the „verba contracta“ in /-\textit{\={e}m}i/.

(ii) … second exclusively in Aeolic dialects: for instance the generalisation of the ending /-\textit{\={t}irr\={a}}/ with feminine nomina agentis.

(iii) … third exclusively in Arcado-Cypriot: for instance /\textit{in}\textsuperscript{{\textcircled{\textdegree}}}\textit{n}/ instead of original /\textit{en}\textsuperscript{{\textcircled{\textdegree}}}\textit{n}/ in names which apparently have been borrowed of the area of later Arcadia and Triphilia.

Additionally some of these features are found in the pre-Doric substratum underlying Doric-Nothwestern Greek dialects.

How can we judge these inner-Mycenaean differentiations? In principle they seem to tell us that in later Mycenaean times – that means between 1300 and 1200 B.C. – there must have evolved a dialectal differentiation within Southern Greek.
What regards Arcado-Cypriot this assumption is not very radical as it has already been suggested by independent evidence. Thus the oldest Cyprian inscription found on an obelos of the 11 century B.C gives us a terminus ante quem for the formation of an Arcado-Cypriot dialect group. This inscription has a genitiv singular-form o-pe-le-ta-u /Op'elestau/ from */Op'eleståo/ and thus already shows the change of final */-ɒ #/ to */-ū #/ which is one of the characteristics of Arcado-Cypriot. The time span between this terminus ante quem around 1100 to 1050 B.C. and the end of the Mycenaean period around 1180 B.C. is very short – in my eyes too short for the evolving of the Arcado-Cypriot dialect group and the emigration of its speakers to the island of Cyprus. There is a further argument. In an article published in 1988 I supposed that there may be not one, but two different Southern Greek substrata underlying the Doric dialect of Central Crete. In my opinion one of these substrata is characterised by the sound change /en/ to /in/ as found in Arcado-Cypriot and discussed above. This substratum extends to the area of Axos/Lyttos/Eleutherna. In my article I have attributed this substratum and the change /en/ to /in/ to a later immigration wave from the mainland – a wave which established a new Mycenaean kingdom in the west of the island after the fall of the dynasty at Cnossos around 1380. I have equated these immigrants which the Kúδoνεζ mentioned once in Homers Odyssee. A few years after the publication of my article this theory has been strongly supported by spectacular findings of a Linear B archive at Kydonia (modern Chanià). These Linear B-inscriptions of Western Crete are at least 100 years later than the corresponding inscriptions from Cnossos. If I am right attributing the sound change /en/ > /in/ in later Crete dialect to the founders of the archive of Cydonia there must have been a predecessor of the Arcado-Cypriot dialect on the Greek mainland as early as the beginning of the 13th century B.C.

But how have we to interprete those inner-Mycenaean differentiations which are reflected in later Greek particularly in the Aeolic dialects? Conclusions drawn of these differentiations are highly speculative. As mentioned before there is a general consensus that Aeolic has a strong connection to the Doric-North West Greek dialects. That ist the reason why representatives of the standard theory account Aeolic among the Northern Greek dialects. It is to be noted however that in many investigations it has been pointed out that Proto-Aeolic has diverged very early form the Northern Greek dialects, that means directly in the Post-Mycenaean phase after 1150. The most likely place for
the evolvement of a proto-Aeolic dialect is in Thessaly. Our findings do not radically change this opinion but force us to the following revision: Proto-Aeolic is that part of the Northern Greek dialect group spoken on the fringe of the Mycenaean linguistic area. Around 1250 B.C. Proto-Aeolic took a convergent development with the Mycenaean dialect or the Mycenaean local dialects. It must have isolated by 1150 in the post-Mycenaean phase from the remaining Doric-North West Greek dialects. This definition describes the actual situation of Aeolic pretty well. For apart from innovations as the a-theematic inflection of the verba contracta in /-ēmi/ oder the suffix /-tirrā/ with feminine nomina agentis as found in Mycenaean Aeolic is characterised in particular by the preservation of archaism: for instance the geminated consonants or patronymic adjectives which are archaism and are typically turn up also in Mycenaean.

As I have stressed this definition of Aeolic is a hypothetic and requires a thorough check. It can be added that my theory may have consequences for the judgement of the Homeric language and in particular for its so-called Aiolisms. With these perspectives I wish to end. Thank you for your attention!
Part one: Introduction

1. In classical Greek up to 30 individual dialects can be distinguished from a synchronic point of view:


The individual dialects can be classified as parts of the following major groups:

- Arcado-Cypriot
- Aeolic
- Attic-Ionic
- Doric-NW Greek

Nota bene: These four dialect groups exist on a synchronic level. Cf. quantitative analysis by R. Coleman, The dialect geography of Ancient Greek, TPhS 1963, 58-126.
The main groups extend over areas which partly do not connect:

i. Arcado-Cypriot: split in two areas (center of the Peloponnesse, Cyprus).

ii. Aeolic group: split into three areas (Boeotia, Thessaly, Lesbos/mainland of Asia Minor).

This type of inhomogeneous picture points to past migrations. Two questions are central:

- First: Which genealogical relationships exist among the four dialect groups mentioned above?
- Second: How have the individual groups or their predecessors emerged from an unified Early Greek?

### Part two: Methods of historical dialectal geography

First phase after 1900: attempts to correlate the genesis of Greek dialects with the history of the Greek tribes. Cf. Paul Kretschmer, Zur Geschichte der griechischen Dialekte, Glotta 1(1909), 9-59:

„Our present view on the earliest history of the Greek dialects is based on the knowledge that tribal history and dialectal development go parallel and are to be seen in a natural connection“ (l.c., p. 9).

Problem: The reports of ancient historians regarding Early Greek history are unreliable.


Risch’s methodological procedure:

- Use of dialect maps to locate each dialectal isogloss and to get an overall view of the distribution of the individual isogloss.

- Comparison of the single maps and typology of the constellations shown on them. Cf. Risch, l.c., p. 23: „Basically we find three types of constellations. First constellations with a distribution of the various dialect forms which fit the groupings of the old tribes. Second constellations where the groupings of the old tribes are concealed but which show correspondences between hometown and colonies. And third less frequent constellations in which also the connection between hometown and colony is broken.“

For the individual constellations cf. 6 - 8.

**Constellation of type 1**: The distribution of the isogloss matches the groupings of the old tribes viz. of the four dialect groups.

Cf. distribution of the temporal adverbs:

- Attic-Ionic = Arcado-Cypriot: type τότε „then?“, πότε „when?“ in /-te/.

- Aeolic dialects: type τότα, πότα in /-ta/.
**Constellation of type 2:** The distribution of the isogloss does not match the major four dialect groups. But the hometown and the colony show the same dialect form (in case the dialect was spoken in colonies founded between 800 and 600 B.C.).

Cf. distribution of the **accusative plural endings** of the 2\(^{nd}\) declension:

- Archaic Doric dialects of Argos and Central Crete: preservation of the original form */-ons/> <-ONΣ> (cf. argiv. τονς υπονς, cret. τονς υπονς).
- Arcadia, Argolis outside Argos, Thessaly, most of the southern Doric islands: */-ons/> */-/ōs/.
- Lesbos, Elis: */-ons/> */-/ōis/ <-OIΣ> (diphthongization).
- All other dialects: */-ons/> */-/ōs/ <-ΟΓΣ> (compensatory lengthening, partially resulting in a closed long vowel).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Doric-NW Greek</th>
<th>Attic-Ionic</th>
<th>Arcado-Cypriot</th>
<th>Aeolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*/-te/</td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/-ta/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/-ka/</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Nota bene:** Colonies show the same endings as their hometowns. Cf. Herakleia = Sparta (both -ως), Cyrene = Thera (both -ος) etc.

**Constellation of type 3:** The distribution of the isogloss does not match the major four dialect groups. Furthermore the hometown and the colony show different dialect forms (in case the dialect was spoken in colonies founded between 800 and 600 B.C.).

Cf. ἐποίησε „he did” at Sparta with */οVσVο/> */οVbVο/ versus unchanged ἐποίησε in the Spartan colonies Tarentum and Herakleia.

From the typology of these constellations shown on dialectal maps one can derive the following relative chronology (according to Risch):

- Isoglosses which give constellations of type 1: 1\(^{st}\) phase in which the major dialect groups are not yet split up into individual dialects viz. during which the individual dialects still exist in neighbouring regions.
- Isoglosses which give constellations of type 2: 2\(^{nd}\) phase after the split of the major dialect groups involving geographical distance of the individual dialects. Terminus post quem: destruction of the Mycenaean palaces around 1200 B.C.
- Isoglosses which give constellations of type 3: 3\(^{rd}\) phase after the great wave of colonization (8\(^{th}\) - 6\(^{th}\) centuries B.C. with focus on Sicily, southern Italy and the coast of the
Methodological uncertainty: Risch’s method is based on the central assumption that linguistic divergence is caused by a process of geographical separation. But …

- … supposed geographical separation or migrations cannot be demonstrated in the same measure for all three phases mentioned sub 9.
- … there are no (direct or indirect) linguistic data available in the same measure for all three phases.

Cf. the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Terminus Post Quem</th>
<th>Linguistic Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>exists: ca 1700 B.C.</td>
<td>archaeological/historical evidence by immigration of Indo-European Hellenic tribes to Greece available: data provided by comparison of reconstructed Indo-European forms with Early (pre-dialectal) Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>does not exist:</td>
<td>no archaeological/historical evidence for immigration of Northern Greek tribes in early Late Helladic IIIC after 1200 B.C. not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>exists: 800-600 B.C.</td>
<td>historical evidence by great wave of Greek colonization available: data provided by contrasting the dialects of hometowns and colonies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ Underlying methodological weakness in Risch’s model: The borderline for a second phase can neither be shown by outer evidence nor by linguistic data.

Part three: Present position on the development of the Greek dialects

1952: Decipherment of the Linear Script B by Michael Ventris and discovery of the Mycenaean dialect → Around 1200 B.C. a Greek dialect was spoken on the Peloponnesse (Argolis, Messenia), in Attica, Boeotia and Crete.

Mycenaean
1: Orchomenos
2: Creusis
3: Thebes
4: Eleusis
5: Mycene
6: Tiryns
7: Pylos
8: Cydonia
9: Cnossos
10: Olympia

Cyprian
11: Palaepaphos
The Mycenaean dialect corresponds in its essential features with Attic-Ionic & Arcado-Cypriot:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mycenaean</th>
<th>Attic-Ionic</th>
<th>Arcado-Cypriot</th>
<th>Doric-NW Greek</th>
<th>Aeolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>/ti/</em> &gt; <em>/si/</em> (“assibilatation”)</td>
<td>(3rd pers.pl. di-dosi / didonisi / „they give” &lt; <em>/didonsi/</em>)</td>
<td>(3rd pers.pl. att.-ion.-ousi &lt; <em>/-ousi/</em>)</td>
<td>(3rd pers.pl. dor.-ousi)</td>
<td>(3rd pers.pl. thessal./boeot. -ousi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>/so</em>-o-, toto-* / „how/so many” &gt; <em>/oso-, toso-/</em></td>
<td>(to-so / toson/)</td>
<td>(tosoç)</td>
<td>(arcad. ososç)</td>
<td>(standard dor. osoç, tosoç)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporal adverbs in <em>/-te/</em></td>
<td>(o-te /ote/* &lt; <em>/so-te/</em>)</td>
<td>(ion.-att. ote)</td>
<td>(arcad. tote, cypr. o-te /ote/)</td>
<td>(dor. oka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(boeot. pokα, lesb. ótα)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discovery of Mycenaean Greek solves methodological weakness of Risch’s model mentioned in 10:

- Historically immigration of North Greek tribes in post-Mycenaean times is now proven by the fact that the Doric-North West Greek dialects of the region cannot be derived from Mycenaean. → Speakers of Doric-North West Greek dialects must have immigrated into the Peloponnese in post-Mycenaean times.
- Linguistically the transition between the 1st and the 2nd phase can be determined comparing Early Greek Mycenaean with the dialects of the 1st millennium B.C. Furthermore the relationship between the four major dialectal groups can be established in the following way:
  
  i. In regard of Mycenaean, Attic-Ionic and Arcado-Cypriot isoglosses (cf. 12) these dialects must have a common source which only dissolved in post-Mycenaean times after 1200 B.C. → „South Greek (dialects)”.
  ii. In contrast the Doric-North West Greek as well as the Aeolic dialects are termed „Northern Greek (dialects)”. In the post-Mycenaean period around 1150 B.C. speakers of Northern Greek dialects migrated to southern Greece and the Aegean forming a superstratum over the former South Greek dialect area (so-called „Doric migration”). Afterwards the North Greek dialect group disintegrated.

Part four: Perspectives in Greek dialectology

Alternative theories on the dialectal landscape of Greece in the 2nd millennium B.C:

- C.J. Ruijgh: The Greek dialectal landscape in the Mycenaean era already shows the fourfold division as later in the 1st millennium B.C. Cf. for the isoglosses named by Ruijgh the following table:


(Nota bene: For an implicit discussion of some of the arguments put forward by Peters and Ruijgh cf. I. Hajnal, Sprachschichten des mykenischen Griechisch, Salamanca 1997 [= Supl. a Minos, Núm. 14]).

Theories of Ruijgh as well as of Peters aim at the **status of Arcado-Cypriot and the Aeolic dialects**. They deal with questions which are **not conclusively answered** by the standard theory sub 13.

As seen in 14, Ruijgh & Peters postulate an independent Achaean and Attic-Ionic dialect group as early as 1400 B.C. → **Main question to be discussed**:

„Are we right in assuming a homogeneous South Greek dialect group in the 2nd half of the second millennium B.C.?”

The question could be answered in view of a possible linguistic differentiation in Mycenaean. **If linguistic differences were manifest in the Mycenaean language of the Greek mainland this could be evidence for an earlier dialectal split within South Greek.**

Nota bene: Linguistic stratification of Mycenaean is now possible:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>chronological dimension</th>
<th>spatial dimension (place, scribal hand, inscription)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1650-1550 (MH III)?</td>
<td>Kàfkània (OL Zh 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1420-1400 (LM/H IIć)</td>
<td>Cnòssos („Room of the chariot tablets”: hand „124”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1375-1350 (LM/H IIIć)</td>
<td>Cnòssos, Pylos (hand 91: PY Ae 995/Xa 1419/Xn 1449), inscr. stirrup jars (KN Z 1715, KH Z 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1280 (LM/H IIIbcc)</td>
<td>Thebes (inscr. stirrup jars, sealings), Mycène, Chanià</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1220-1180 (LM/H IIIbcc)</td>
<td>Pylos, Thebes, Mycène (Oi 701-706, 708/X 707/Fu 711), Tiryns (?) inscr. stirrup jars (Tiryns, Kreusis, Orchomenos, Eleusis, Mycene …)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer: **Mycenaean is in no way homogeneous** neither chronologically nor spatially. **There is clear evidence of linguistic differentiations** within the Mycenaean corpus in the following features discussed in 16-20.
Evidence for the Myc. inflection of the „verba contracta” in -άω or -έω:

a) (3rd pers.sg.) te-re-ja, (inf.) te-re-ja-e as in PY Ep 613:
   .1  ne-qe-wo e-da-e-wo ka-ma jo-pe-ro[ du-]wo-u-pi , te-re-ja-e ,
   .2  e-me-de te-re-ja to-so-jde , pe-mo GRA 10 T 1

   „Land of Nekéus, of the Edaeu̇us (a title?): having the obligation to fulfill tribute with two, he fulfills tribute with one. So much seed …”.

   → **Athematic inflection** (3rd pers.sg.) te-re-ja /telei̇ja-i/ (cf. Aeolic gramm. γέλαι) vz. (inf.) te-re-ja-e /telei̇ja-b-en/.

b) (part.pres.med.) to-ro-que-jo-me-no PY Eq 213:
   .1  o-wi-de , a-ko-so-ta , to-ro-que-jo-me-no , a-ro-u-ra , a2-ri-sa

   „Thus saw Akosţas, making an inspection to count the arable land.”

   → **Thematic inflection** (part.pres.med.) /trok#ejo-menos/.

Mainland Mycenaean attests so far athematically inflected */telei̇ja-mi/ versus thematically inflected */trok#ejo-ō/. This evidence corresponds to the inherited state:

- Athematic verbs in */-ā-mi/ go back to a factitive type: cf. hitt. neuhh- „to renew” < */neuah2/- with (3rd pers.sg.) neuhhi = myc. /telei̇jāi/. → Myc. */telei̇ja-mi/ „fulfill tribute” is derived from the adjective /telei̇jos/ ~ τέλειος (and has the function of later τέλειος).

- Thematic verbs in */-ēo/ go back to deverbal iteratives/intensives. → Myc. /trok#ejo- mai/ (~ hom. τροπέομαι) : /trok#o-mai/ (class. τρέπομαι) = φορέω : φέρω.


.13  /pa-ra-jo , po-ṇe-to-que-mpi
   /... palai̇on ponễtoi-k#e-min/ „... old land and he cultivates it”

   → po-ṇe-to /ponễtoi/ is an athematically inflected 3rd pers.sg.med. of a verb */ponēmai/ ~ hom.πονέομαι. The athematic inflection of an original thematic verb */ponējo-mai/ of the type /trok#ejo-mai/ (< intensive/iterative */(s)ponh-ē-jo/o-/) is an innovation.

Nota bene: Innovated athematic /-ēmi/ instead of thematic /-ējo/ is also found in Aeolic and Arcado-Cypriot: cf. (literary Lesbian) κάλημι/ούκημι, Thessal. (inf.) γαργείμεν /-ē-men/, Arcad. (inf.) κατωφορνήμαι/(part.) αδικημένος.

Evidence for the ending of the feminine nomina agentis. The Mycenaean scribes interchange two forms of the suffix:

- Pylian hand 1 writes <ti-ri-ja> in me-re-ti-ri-ja PY Aa 764 „women grinding corn” or o-ti-ri-ja PY Aa 313 „(a female profession)”.

- Pylian hand 21 writes <ti-ra> in me-re-ti-ra PY Ab 789.B or o-ti-ra PY Ab 417.B.
Interpretation of the writings:

- \(<-tirija> = /-tria-/ < */-tr-iah2-/ of the oblique cases. Cf. for the syllabification as */°CRUV°/ (instead of expected †/°CRUV°/) RV (gen.sg.) urv(i)yah /urμiás/ (instead of †/urμiás/ according to SIEVERS).
- \(<-tira2> = /-tirrā/ < */-tr-ih2/ of the nominative/accusative. Nota bene: */-tr-ih2/ > */-trih2/ (> /-tirrā/) with epenthetic *// as in oiktīrō < */oiktr-je/o/- (to adj. oiktρός).

### Expected Pre-Mycenaean paradigm for the feminine nomina agentis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nom.</th>
<th>acc.</th>
<th>gen.</th>
<th>dat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>*/-tirrah/</td>
<td>*/-tirrān/</td>
<td>*/-triās/</td>
<td>*/-triāi/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>*/-tirrai/</td>
<td>*/-tirrāns/</td>
<td>*/-tirrhōn/</td>
<td>*/-tirhsi/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deviations from the inherited distribution:

- **Generalisation of /-tria-/** when used in the nominative plural (cf. Pylian hand 1 and 4 with me-re-ti-ri-ja /meletriai/).
- **Generalisation of /-tirrā(-)/** when used in genitive plural (cf. Pylian hand 23 me-re-ti-rar-α/o /meletirrhōn/) or in the dativ singular (cf. TH Of 36.1.2 a-ke-ti-rar-/akestirrāi/).

Nota bene:

- Generalisation/innovation (i.) of /*-/trai/- is trivial and leads to standard Greek /-tria/-.
- Generalisation/innovation (ii.) of /*-/tirrā(-)/ is only found in Aeolic dialects: cf. thessal. Ἀγ[εί]ταρρα (with */-tarrar/ < */-terrα/), να(ἐτ)ερρα · δέσπονα and ναίτερα · οἰκοδέσπονα (Hesych), δότε[π]ρων Alcaeus. Furthermore /-/tirrā(-)/ survives as Aeolic in Homeric -τερρα /-tērrα/ (cf. the sound change cf. Thessal. κρεννεμεν < */-krinnemen/, Lesb. Δαμοκρετω < */°κριτω-/).

### Mycenaean °iN°/ instead of °eN°/:

- **ti-mi-ti-ja** PY Aq 64.6 (hand 21)++ /Thimistiāl/ < /Themistiāl/ as attested in te-mi-ti-ja PY On 300.10 (C ii). Cf. also °ti-mi-to a-ko /Thimistos Argos/ with /θemis, -stos/ (~ class. θέμις).
- (dat.sg.) a-ti-mi-te PY Un 219.5 /Artimitei/ < °/Artemitei/ as attested in (gen.sg.) a-te-mi-to PY Es 650.5 /Artemitos/.

Nota bene: No change of °eN°/> °iN°/ in Myc. standard words or endings of grammatical categories (cf. /-en/- in e-ne-e-si PY En 659.2, /-menos/ in de-de-me-no, o-ro-me-no etc.).

Forms with °iN°/ are borrowed. Possible origin of these borrowings: Arcadia/Triphylia. Cf. also regular °en°/> °in°/ in Arcado-Cypriot as in Arcad. (prep.) TV/(part.med.) απεχομινος, Cyprian A-ra-ko-mi-nes/-/Arkominës/.
Conclusions from the evidence presented in 16 - 20:

- Mainland Mycenaean is not a homogeneous unit. In fact it shares innovations …
  - ... with the Aeolic dialects and Arcado-Cypriot: cf. athematic inflection of the „verba contracta” in /-ěmi/.
  - ... exclusively with the Aeolic dialects: cf. generalisation of the suffix */-tirră/ with feminine nomina agentis.
  - ... exclusively with Arcado-Cypriot: cf. /°iN°/ < /°eN°/ in names apparently borrowed of the area of later Triphylia or Arcadia.
  - ... with the pre-Doric substratum underlying some Doric-North West Greek dialects (for example Elean, Cretan).

- These innovations shared with Aeolic and/or Arcado-Cypriot prove that a dialectal differentiation within South Greek is evolving between 1300 and 1200 B.C.

How plausible is the assumption of an early dialectal differentiation within South Greek?

- For Proto-Arcado-Cypriot there is independent evidence of an early genesis:
  - Early terminus ante quem for the formation of Proto-Arcado-Cypriot: cf. the earliest Cyprian inscription ICS 18g o-pe-le-ta-u /Opbeltau/ < */Opbeltăo/ with Arcad.-Cypr. */-o #/ > *-u #/ from the 11th century B.C.

- For Aeolic now changes of the standard theory are necessary:
  - Proto-Aeolic is spoken on the fringe of the Mycenaean linguistic area (probably in Thessaly). It forms part of the Northern Greek dialects.
  - Around 1250 B.C. Proto-Aeolic takes a convergent development with the Mycenaean local dialects. → Common innovations with Mycenaean as verba contracta in /-ěmi/ (cf. 17) or the suffix */-tirră/ (cf. 19).
  - In the post-Mycenaean phase (by 1150) Proto-Aeolic must have isolated from the remaining Doric-North West Greek dialects. → Preservation of archaisms as geminated consonants (type */emmi/ ἔμμι) or patronymic adjectives (also found in Mycenaean).