

Towards a new Stratigraphy of the Homeric Dialect

By FRANCISCO R. ADRADOS, Madrid

The progress made since the fifties in the study of the history of the Greek dialects has so far affected our grasp of the history of the Homeric dialect less than might have been thought. We believe that there is a series of *desiderata* in this field which await the response of fresh research.

It should be borne in mind that not so long ago it was a common doctrine that the chief Greek dialects were formed outside Greece and that they had arrived there, from the year 1800 B.C. onwards in a series of successive "waves". This is the theory which found its first precise formulation in Kretschmer¹⁾ and which was also given other formulations²⁾. Nevertheless, after the papers of Porzig³⁾, Risch⁴⁾, Chadwick⁵⁾ and others, it seems clear that the different dialects of eastern Greek were formed in Greece itself, although I believe that some of their traits may be of an older origin.

What is more, it is commonly believed today that the innovations and choices which characterized the Ionic-Attic and Arcado-Cyprian groups are of a later date than the end of the Mycenaean age: roughly, we would say, later than the year 1250 B.C.⁶⁾. I insert below certain modifications and corrections to this idea, but it is doubtless true that the traits which gave a clear and decisive definition to these groups are in effect post-Mycenaean. There are even some scholars who believe that the same is true of Aeolic⁷⁾: and this

¹⁾ P. Kretschmer, "Zur Geschichte der griechischen Dialekte. — I. Ionier und Achäer. II. Die Apokope in den griechischen Dialekten", *Glotta* 1, 1909, pp. 9–59.

²⁾ A. Tovar, "Ensayo sobre la estratigrafía de los dialectos griegos. I. Primitiva extensión geográfica del jonio", *Emerita* 12, 1944, p. 245–335; my little book *Ensayo sobre la estratigrafía de los dialectos griegos como fuente para el estudio de las migraciones indoeuropeas en Grecia*, Salamanca 1953; and other further papers.

³⁾ W. Porzig, "Sprachgeographische Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Dialekten", *IF* 61, 1954, pp. 147–169.

⁴⁾ "Die Gliederung der griechischen Dialekte in neuer Sicht", *MH* 12, 1955, pp. 61–75.

⁵⁾ "The Greek Dialects and Greek Pre-history", *Greece and Rome* 3, 1956, pp. 38–50.

⁶⁾ Cf. "Micénico, dialectos paramicénicos y aqueo épico", *Emerita* 44, 1976, pp. 65–113 (in particular p. 80).

⁷⁾ J. L. García Ramón, *Les origines postmycéniennes du groupe dialectal éolien*, Salamanca 1975.

is certainly true of many of its traits, although I believe that this is not so of others⁸). I shall here disregard western Greek, which Chadwick⁹) thinks was also developed within Greece; I cannot agree with him here¹⁰), although it is true that, within Greece, Doric developed its own new traits and greatly influenced eastern Greek. I cannot, however, discuss my points of view *in extenso* here: for a global view of Greek dialectology and of the most widespread opinions on this subject today, I refer to Bartoněk's¹¹) and Moralejo's¹²) expositions and my two articles of 1976¹³).

Naturally, only when a dialect develops its main innovations or choices, does it attain its final status. Archaisms which were preserved in new dialects are of an earlier date, as likewise often, the two terms of the doublets between which choice was made. Evidently, at an earlier date than the definite configuration, there were also forms which were then eliminated or not chosen. For example, if Ionic-Attic, as is believed, developed its main innovations between the years 1000 and 700 B.C.¹⁴), there is no reason why there should not have existed a pre-form of this dialect at an earlier date: namely, a dialectal area which sometimes differs from that which is the basis of the dialects of Arcado-Cyprian and Aeolic¹⁵). In fact, within eastern Greek, these three areas preserve archaisms, make choices or introduce innovations in a way which both partially coincides and partially differs. On the other hand, the ensemble of these dialects at times coincides with Mycenaean and the archaic

⁸) Cf. "La creación de los dialectos griegos del primer milenio", *Emerita* 44, 1976, pp. 245-278 (cf. p. 257ff.).

⁹) J. Chadwick, "Der Beitrag der Sprachwissenschaft zur Rekonstruktion der griechischen Frühgeschichte", *AAWW* 113, 1976, pp. 183-204; "Who were the Dorians?", *PP* 31, 1976, pp. 103-117.

¹⁰) Cf. against this J. J. Moralejo, "Los dorios: su migración y su dialecto", *Emerita* 45, 1977, pp. 243-267.

¹¹) A. Bartoněk, "Greek Dialectology after the Decipherment", *Studia Mycenaea*, Brno 1968, pp. 37-51.

¹²) J. J. Moralejo, *Recent Contributions to the History of the Greek Dialects*, University of Santiago, 1979.

¹³) Mentioned above in notes 6 and 8.

¹⁴) Cf. A. López Eire, "Los jonios y el jónico-ático", *Zephyrus* 23-24, 1973, pp. 197-207 and "En busca de la situación dialectal del jónico-ático", *Simpósio de colonizaciones*, Barcelona 1974, pp. 247-278, among other publications; and my above-mentioned paper "La creación . . .", p. 269ff.

¹⁵) This triple criterion for dialectal analysis and the assessment of same was expounded in my book *La Dialectología Griega . . .* The criterion of choice is the least followed, unfairly so.

elements of the Homeric dialect, and at others does not. It should moreover be acknowledged that these archaic elements, which spread in a restricted way, at times go back to common Greek. We should point out by the way that the concept of common Greek does not imply absolute uniformity, but neither does this mean that it did not respond to an undeniable reality¹⁶). However, it may be possible to go back to older stages in which Greek formed part of a dialectal group in which Thracian-Phrygian and, most certainly, Macedonian and Illyrian entered, or to an even older phase, the Indoeuropean dialectal group which I have termed Indo-Greek¹⁷).

There was, in effect, a progressive differentiation of the Greek dialects, a differentiation which, as far as common Greek is concerned, had as its chief phases:

- I. 1800–1250 B.C.: The Mycenaean dialect and the para-Mycenaean dialects which were the basis of later eastern Greek.
- II. 1250–1000 B.C.: Pre-forms of Ionic-Attic, Arcado-Cyprian and Aeolic (perhaps in part derived from dialects of the earlier stage and now influenced by western Greek).
- III. 1000–700 B.C.: Definition of the three eastern dialectal groups and of their sub-dialects (this definition still not complete).

There are naturally differences of opinion on whether this or that trait belongs to one or another phase; and one should distinguish between the antiquity of a trait and the choice or rejection of some, the antiquity of an innovation and its generalization. On the other hand, it should be pointed out that, together with the differentiating advances, the unifying one also came into operation: the influence of western Greek on Ionic-Attic and Aeolic in phase II, several influences within a more restricted area during phase III and at a later date, the accomplishment of the whole in the creation of Koiné on the basis of Ionic-Attic as from the 4th century B.C. onwards. It may be said that, on the whole, the general lines throughout the process are quite clear today.

¹⁶) Cf. J. J. Moralejo, *Recent Contributions . . . cit.*, p. 16ff.

¹⁷) Cf. "Arqueología y diferenciación del indoeuropeo", *Emerita* 47, 1979, pp. 261–282 (cf. 271 ff), after other previous publications. Also J. Harmatta, "The Prehistory of the Greek Language", *AUB* 3, 1975, pp. 3–8 (who takes the differentiation to a far too recent date).

However, scant use is made of the Homeric language in interpreting the history of the Greek dialects, as is that made of this latter to interpret in turn the history of the Homeric language. For, on the one hand, it is quite clear that Homeric epic, to judge from its language, formulae, mythic and cultural traditions, derives from the Mycenaean epoch; moreover, epic existed in the epoch of common Greek and in fact goes back to an Indoeuropean date: Indoeuropean epic is today the object of numerous studies¹⁸). But on the other hand, the definite conformation of groups such as the Ionic-Attic and Aeolic ones and of dialects such as Ionian and Lesbian, as also the origin of many of their traits, was staggered as from the year 1250 and, above all, from 1000 B.C. It should also be added that it is quite clear that the content and form of Greek epic were constantly renewed during this latter period: if we keep to form, it will suffice if we refer to Shipp's remarks¹⁹) on the accumulation of recent linguistic forms in the similes (which also contain recent cultural elements) and to what is known of the constant renovation of formulae, which admitted new linguistic material together with the old²⁰).

It is therefore quite legitimate to enquire into the language of epic in its diverse phases. It is also more precisely legitimate to enquire into the language of Mycenaean epic, as the archaic content of Homeric partly coincides with the Mycenaean dialect and partly does not. Furthermore, it coincides with even older epic.

As is well-known, two hypotheses were traditionally used which were made to coincide in a somewhat artificial way. If, for example, one studies a classical exposition, P. Chantraine's *Grammaire Homérique*²¹), one may observe that its conceptual lay-out is based on two pairs of opposed terms: archaism / recent form and Aeolism / Ionism. It is true that at times he adds the criterion that artificial forms are sometimes used; and, of course, the tenet that all or many of the forms are conditioned by the metre.

The conception of the Homeric dialect as one mixed from several "pure" dialects is a tradition which began with G. Hinrichs in

¹⁸) Cf. R. Schmitt, *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit*, Wiesbaden 1967; W. Meid, "Figura e funzioni dei poeti nella primitiva cultura indoeuropea", *Paleontologia Linguistica*, Brescia 1977, pp. 67-87.

¹⁹) G. P. Shipp, *Studies in the Language of Homer*, 2nd ed., Cambridge 1972.

²⁰) Cf. among other bibliography, J. B. Hainsworth, *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula*, Oxford 1968.

²¹) P. Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique*, Paris 1942 (reprinted 1958).

1875²²), and originally with Ahrens²³), and even goes back to the ancient dialectological tradition that there are pure dialects and other mixed secondary ones. K. Meister²⁴) and K. Witte²⁵) are responsible for the idea that the Homeric dialect uses forms of diverse origin, according to metrical demands, even forms created *ad hoc* to this end. I am not going to deny the merits of these ideas, but they seem insufficient today. The concepts of “Aeolic” and “archaic” do not always coincide, neither do those of “Ionic” and “recent”. There are non-Aeolic archaisms: at least the Aeolic we know has no forms like *ἔφθιτο*, *ἄλτο*, *κέλσαι*, *πεφιδέσθαι*, *Ζῆν*; only one Aeolic dialect (Thessalian) has gen. sing. *-οῖ(ο)*, an oblique case in *-φι*; and if we call the letter *Ϝ* “Aeolic”, we do no more than to apply to the whole history of the Homeric dialect a criterion which is only valid for the Greek of the first millenium (and only partially so for this). It is not true that Ionian invariably substituted an earlier Aeolic phase of epic language: there is *φθείρω*, and not *φθέρω*, certain Aeolisms such as *πε-* < **k*e-* are sporadic and even anomalous; others (*-εσσι* alongside *-σι*) are used when the metre requires this; Lesbisms such as the perfect participles in *-ων* are doubtless recent, not remains of an older stratum covered by later “Ionic” forms (the perfect participle in *-ώς* is really Pan-Greek and forms of the type of *βεβληϜώς* are very archaic).

The theory of the successive “strata” of dialects which have left their stamp on the Homeric language is parallel to Ahrens’ theory of the “mixed dialects” and to Kretschmer’s on the Greek dialectal strata (which I criticized in 1952²⁶), even though I admitted dialectal differentiation which was carried out fundamentally outside Greece). In the same way as Kretschmer’s theory is on the decline, so should that which corresponds to it and which is related to the Homeric language also be on the decline. For it explains certain points, but leaves many others unaccounted for. It does not even offer satisfactory results when it adds a new first stratum: Achaeian, established on the basis of certain coincidences between the Homeric dialect on the one hand, and Mycenaean and/or Arcado-Cyprian on the other; neither does this happen even when the concept of Aeolic is split in two: continental Aeolic and Lesbian.

²²) *De Homericæ elocutionis vestigiis Aeolicis*, Berlin 1875.

²³) A. L. Ahrens, *De Graecæ linguae dialectis*, Gotinga 1839–43.

²⁴) K. M. Meister, *Die homerische Kunstsprache*, Leipzig 1921.

²⁵) K. Witte, “Homer, Sprache”, *RE VIII*, col. 22–23ff.

²⁶) Op. cit. in note 2.

In the most fully developed hypothesis, formulated by P. Wathélet in 1970²⁷⁾, the Mycenaean bards would have had as their heirs other continental Aeolian ones (from Thessalia), these latter being emulated by other Lesbian ones and these in turn by the Ionians. M. Durante's position²⁸⁾ is not in fact much different, although he switches the emphasis in the sense of attributing to Aeolic (after the 8th century B.C.) an important part of the Homeric dialect and only a lesser one, often with doubts, to the previous period. There is another possibility, such as when K. Strunk²⁹⁾ denied Homer's Aeolisms: the epic language would have passed directly from the Achæan phase to the Ionic one.

The problems of these theories are of three types:

1. The chronological order in which the diverse dialectal elements supposedly occurred is often refuted by the facts, which rather tend to offer archaic elements and artificial ones which cannot properly be attributed to any concrete dialect; on the other hand, they offer Lesbian and Ionic elements among which there are most often no systematic chronological differences to be observed.

2. The elements of one same dialect at times have wide chronological margins and nothing indicates that they all entered in the same phase of evolution of the epic dialect. For example, the evolution of *-ti* > *-si* already occurred in the Mycenaean age: why should it be attributed in Homer to an Ionic influence³⁰⁾? In the same Mycenaean phase, the vacillation *ɾ* > *ar*, *or* occurred: why, then, speak of respectively Ionic and Aeolic forms³¹⁾? Of course there are sometimes differences in dating: for example, J. L. García Ramón³²⁾ believes that **k^we-* > *πe-*, *ɾ* > *oɾ*, the D. pl. *-εσσι* are later than the arrival of the Dorians (and, therefore, than the Mycenaean age), whereas I believe them to be prior to this.

²⁷⁾ P. Wathélet, *Les traits éoliens dans la langue de l'épopée grecque*, Roma 1970.

²⁸⁾ M. Durante, *Sulla preistoria della tradizione poetica greca*, Roma 1971.

²⁹⁾ K. Strunk, *Die sogenannten Aeolismen der homerischen Sprache*, Colonia 1957.

³⁰⁾ Cf. lately A. Bernabé, "La vocalización de las sonantes indoeuropeas en griego", *Emerita* 45, 1977, pp. 269–298 (with bibliography). As for myself, I have been writing in this sense since *La Dialectología . . .*, quoted p. 41 ff.; more fully in *Estudios sobre las sonantes y laringales indoeuropeas*, Madrid 1973, in which I compile former papers.

³¹⁾ Cf. "Micénico, dialectos paramicénicos . . ." cit., p. 88 ff.

³²⁾ Op. cit., p. 60 ff., 83 ff.

3. Neither is it so simple to define the initial form of the Homeric dialect, the “Achaean” (“epic Achaean”, I have termed it elsewhere). Ruijgh³³) attributed to it a few traits common to Homer and Archaic-Cyprian. Then all or part of the traits formerly termed “Aeolic” were assigned to it (Strunk, Wathelet). In any case, it is clear today that Mycenaean and Arcado-Cyprian are related, but that they are not identical³⁴); and that Mycenaean and the ultimate nucleus of Homer only coincide in part. As for myself, I have given lists of the linguistic traits of Mycenaean, of those dialects which I term Para-Mycenaean (pre-forms of Ionic-Attic, Arcado-Cyprian and Aeolic), and of the most ancient stratum of Homer in order to demonstrate that they are dialects which partly coincide and partly do not³⁵).

I in fact believe that what is important and necessary is a dating of the different forms (archaisms, innovations, double forms between which choice was made and date of the choice) independently of the historical dialects in which they figure. These latter only gradually became perfectly defined; at an earlier date some of their traits may have passed into other dialects which we do not know directly today. It is an error to explain a poetic, artificial language, belonging to oral composition, which evolved from 2000 B.C. (and even before this) to 700 B.C., as a mixed language and the result of the superposition of a few historical dialects (Mycenaean, i.e., the administrative language of the 13th century B.C., and late Aeolic dialects, plus also late Ionic).

What should be studied before anything else is, I believe, the model or mechanism of the constant renovation of Greek epic language. It is implausible that this latter was simply the general language of the Mycenaean age to which successive strata of dialects were added as the bards wandered into the territories of these latter (seemingly abandoning the former dialects, which is quite unfeasible). One should rather analyze: a) what the epic language was like at a specific stage, and b) how it was conceived by the bards and their audiences. Only in this way the mechanisms of its renovation during successive historical periods may be understood: what new linguistic material may have been incorporated into the epic language, how and why.

³³) C. J. R. Ruijgh, *L'élément achéen dans la langue épique*, Assen 1957.

³⁴) Cf. A. Heubeck, “Zur dialektologischen Einordnung des Mykenischen”, *Glotta* 39, 1960–61, pp. 159–172; A. Bartoněk, art. cit. cf. n. 11.

³⁵) In “Micénico, dialectos paramicénicos . . .” cit.

There are reasons to think that the bards and their audiences had always judged epic language as:

a) An artificial, traditional and poetic language which was full of double forms, either distributed according to the metre or having the nature of free variants. It contains anomalous forms which do not exist in any dialect or in any known dialect, alongside other "normal" ones. Thus in the case of the three gen. sing. of the 2nd declension (-οῖο, -όο, -οῦ); it contains other particularly anomalous forms, obviously distorted ones (metric lengthenings, diectasis . . .) although they invariably have a certain linguistic basis and, of course, metrical conditioning.

b) Within this multiplicity of forms, some were doubtless understood to be archaic or distorted: in short, simply as epic forms. But others were understood to belong, at the same time, to contemporary literary dialects: Lesbian and Ionic. An αἰ, a τοί, a ποτί were understood to be Lesbian, although they also exist in other dialects such as Doric, and in fact go back to common Greek. On the other hand, an ἄν, an εἰ were understood to be Ionic, although geographically they surpass the boundaries of this dialect and are older than it. Thus, I believe, doublets such as αἰ/εἰ, τοί/οἰ, ποτί/πρός, ἄν/κε(ν), αῖ/οῖ from *γ, etc., were interpreted. One thing is how a form is interpreted at a specific historical moment, according to the linguistic situation of this latter, and another quite different one is how this form may have been interpreted at an earlier date in which the dialectal panorama was quite different.

It should be noted that an ā in θεά may be understood as Lesbian at one moment (as against archaic Ionic θεός), and as Attic at another: evidently, round about 700 B.C., only the Lesbian interpretation was possible. Of course, this ā or other forms in fact came from common Greek and even from Indoeuropean, but at a certain date they tended to be understood as Lesbian ones. Doric and other dialects were not taken into account in this interpretation.

That is, the dialectal interpretation of a form varied according to the date: it was carried out in each case on the strength of the contemporary contrasting dialects. Unexplained remains of anomalous forms were moreover left, as part of a tradition that was simply accepted but not analyzed.

Therefore, as epic language was conceived in this way, it was possible at any moment to enlarge upon it by means of new forms: either "anomalous" forms constructed along the same lines as the

traditional anomalous forms, or otherwise contemporary dialectal forms belonging to dialects which were thought to be recognized in the traditionally transmitted epic language.

During the last phase of epic, these contemporary dialects were, as I have already said, Lesbian and Ionic. In my above-mentioned paper of 1976, I have already established the renovatory mechanism of epic language³⁶). I should now like to apply this mechanism on a wider scale, namely, to the evolution of all Greek epic language, not only to its final phase. I shall begin, however, with this latter.

The reason for Homer's new Ionisms is the "Ionic" interpretation, not only of archaisms such as those mentioned above but also of choices and innovations which were really far wider spread than Ionic: *-σσ-/-σ-*, *σύ*, *εἰσί*, 1st pl. *-μεν*, *μετά*, etc. In turn, simple archaisms (*-σσ-*, *τοί*, *-μέναι*, etc.) as well as choices and innovations of a relatively wide basis (*-εσσι*, *FF > v*, etc.) were understood to be Lesbian.

Hence the passage of new Ionisms and new Lesbisms:

a) When an older form became obsolete. E.g., the verbs in **-ehrō* < **-erīō* got Ionic phonetic treatment *-εἶρω*, and the same thing occurred in other similar types. When the alternance *-ons/-os* had lost its validity in eastern Greek, the Ionic form *-ovς* became generalized. Once the labiovelars disappeared, **k*e-* received both the Ionic form *τε* and the Lesbian one *πε-*. If **ahme* (< **asme*), having become phonetically obsolete, received Lesbian phonetic treatment (*ἄμμε*), this is because the morphology is different in Ionic (but there are also homometric forms, as likewise others with different metre). Naturally, this does not imply that all obsolete forms, specifically the lexical and morphological ones, were eliminated.

b) Free passage of Lesbisms and Ionisms. There are Lesbian perfect participles in *-ων* where *-ώς* was traditional, metrically unnecessary contractions, etc., etc. But here neither was the substitution of the older forms carried to its ultimate consequences³⁷).

The conclusions to the foregoing could be:

1. We have a basis for the partial reconstruction of the Pre-Ionic and Pre-Lesbian Homeric dialect, as it existed prior to the year 1000, so to speak.

³⁶) "Micénico, dialectos paramicénicos . . ." cit., p. 107ff.

³⁷) Cf. Article quoted (seil. n. 36) p. 90ff.

2. There was no fixed chronology for preferring some dialectal forms to others. For certain forms Ionic was preferred, for others Lesbian, others were substituted both by those of the former and by those of the latter of these dialects.

3. Homer is a valid criterion for establishing the chronology of Lesbian and Ionic (although there is the problem of the later alterations of the Homeric text). Above all, forms came into it that are doubtless archaic Lesbisms which were later eliminated from this dialect (the infinitive in *-μεν*, Nom. sing. in *-α* in the first declension) and late Lesbisms such as *παῖσα* did not come into it. In general, there are no Aeolic forms which cannot be understood either as Lesbisms or as forms prior to the year 1000 B.C. and which therefore would have to be explained in a different manner to that we have just stated.

4. Homer offers forms which in themselves may be understood as Dorisms: they are simple archaisms. That they were not understood in this way, however, but as Lesbisms, is proved by the fact that not Doric (*ἐμέος*, *ἀνροσαντόν*, etc.) but Lesbian innovations appear in the Homeric dialect. This defines the linguistic environment in which the last phase of the Homeric dialect elapsed: Asia Minor where Lesbian and Ionic lived side-by-side. It is remarkable on the other hand that certain Dorisms should appear in Hesiod³⁸), that is in a representative of the continental epic tradition, for the rest greatly influenced by the Homeric epic. Evidently, in this linguistic climate, which was different to that of Asia, certain archaic forms of the epic language of the type of *ροί* and others already quoted may have been interpreted in this sense and may have "attracted" Dorisms.

We should now like to explain that the mechanism we have just described must have worked more than once throughout the history of epic language, for it is based on what this latter was like and how it was interpreted. As already stated, I believe that it was in Asia that the ultimate interpretation and enlargement of the Homeric language took place. But the same process must have occurred more than once at an earlier stage, i. e., the constant "aggiornamento" of epic language. This theory means, at the same time, an enlargement and partial rectification of that expounded in my two articles of 1976 as we shall see.

³⁸) Cf. J. L. García Ramón, "En torno a los elementos dialectales en Hesíodo. I: el elemento occidental", *CFC* 11, 1976, pp. 523-543, with bibliography.

It is certainly less easy today to get an idea of the dialects prior to the year 1000 B.C., than of those later than this date; and on the other hand, what we fundamentally wish to stipulate in this paper is a research method accompanied of course by certain tentative proposals.

As we have stated, the Mycenaean of our tablets, of around 1250 B.C. (as is known, only Palmer dates the Knossus ones at a similar time), that is, the bureaucratic language of the Mycenaean chancelleries, differs from the dialects we have called 'Para-Mycenaean', those which are at the root of Aeolic, Ionic-Attic and Arcado-Cyprian. It is a highly unified language, despite minor differences, which I have attributed to Cretan scribes who doubtless introduced linear B writing into continental Greece. As I say, there must have been in this latter a series of dialects forming the basis of later dialects which were created at the beginning of the 1st millenium. This was on account of the spreading of diverse innovations and choices and also of the acceptance of diverse western isoglosses.

According to my hypothesis³⁹), some of the linguistic traits which later became Aeolic, Ionic-Attic or Arcado-Cyprian, were limited to a restricted area even in the Mycenaean epoch (and of course in the Post-Mycenaean one). There existed an outline of the three groups of later dialects: only an outline, for fundamental innovations and choices were missing and there were doubtless still archaisms which were later lost. For example, if in a certain later Aeolic dialect archaisms such as *-φι*, *-οῖο* and the patronymic adjective were preserved, they also existed in the second millenium during which it is probable that they were already missing in those areas which later became Ionic-Attic and Arcado-Cyprian, but we do not know from what date. Furthermore, if in Mycenaean, Aeolic and Arcado-Cyprian *αφ/οφ* < **r* alternate (the same as in Homer) and if in Ionic-Attic *αφ* prevailed, it is quite feasible that this evolution took place in the second millenium: once more, we do not know the precise date.

All this is connected with what I term epic Achæan, that is, the epic language of the second millenium which as yet lacked the Lesbisms and Ionisms that are really an innovation of a date after 1000 B.C. and not simply a Lesbism or Ionic "interpretation" of traits which are actually older. This language is relatively easy to reconstruct in the abstract, by eliminating these innovations and

³⁹) In "Micénico, dialectos paramicénicos . . ." cit., p. 81 ff., "La creación de los dialectos . . .", p. 257 ff.

replacing them by the previous archaic forms of the later doublets. But it is much more difficult to understand and justify it.

In the papers I have repeatedly quoted here, I considered this type of "epic Achaeae" as one of the three great dialects of the second millenium, together with epigraphic Mycenaean and Para-Mycenaean (and the subdivisions which this latter might have had). I take as my basis for this the fact that, together with coincidences, epic Achaeae presents remarkable differences with respect to the other two dialects or dialectal groups. There are archaisms which belong only to it: both obsolete (*Zḗn*, *ἐφθιτο*, *κέλσαι*, etc.), and forming part of a doublet (facultative augment, *-οῖο/-όο*, *-σσ/-σ-*, etc.); at times, it also presents innovations as against archaisms preserved here and there (nouns in *-εύς*, never *-ής*: 2nd sing. *-εις*, never *-ες*).

But this opinion, despite the fact that it does have some valid points, disregards the fact that a literary dialect as contrived as that of epic cannot be placed on a par with a non-literary, geographically-based dialect. It is certain that in the second millenium the Greek epic was not confined to a limited geographical area: it was Pan-Hellenic and in the diverse courts of Greece the traditional myths of the most varied regions of the Greek world were sung. Proof of this is that in the first millenium the epic language of the Homeric and continental tradition (Hesiod, genealogies, etc.) is fundamentally unitarian, despite slight differences. Epic Achaeae and Para-Mycenaean are not two local varieties of eastern Greek: they lived side-by-side in the same places, the former as a unitarian literary language and the latter as a local dialect.

Epic Achaeae is a traditional literary language the roots of which are plunged in eastern Greek and, through this latter, in common Greek and, in fact, through common Greek, in Indoeuropean. Its conditioning by the formulaic style and metre is well-known. Its chief characteristic was, from the beginning, together with the archaism, the existence of doublets and—on account of them—doubtless, as in its final phase, the admission of contemporary linguistic elements. This occurred in the same way as epic also gradually took in contemporary cultural elements.

If we pass on to the study of the doublets, the conclusion we drew previously now seems somewhat excessive: that its, that the doublets merely belong to the dialect of epic. Of course, any language or dialect has doublets or variants to a greater extent than that which certain linguistic schools are prepared to admit. But apart

from “natural” doublets, epic language has taken in other purely contrived ones by means of the mechanisms we referred to. There are reasons to believe that this is a process constantly reproduced throughout the history of Greek epic language.

This language, which functions through formulae, is conservative. In the same way as it preserves simple archaisms such as those already mentioned, it also preserves doublets, which I call synchronic and which help in the construction of various formulae. For example, a synchronic doublet is the faculty of the secondary tenses of the verb to take augment or not: both possibilities occur simultaneously from a certain phase of Indo-European onwards (that of Indo-Greek); likewise, oppositions such as those of infinitive *-vai/-μεν*, particles *ἄν/κε*, *αἰ/εἰ*, which used different morphologized elements for one and the same function. In the same way, phonetic variants such as *πτ-/π-*, *ξόν/σόν*; and the same goes for alternative phonetic evolutions of the same group such as **-osjo > *-oijo/*-ojo > -oio/-óo*, **r > aq/oq*.

The “normal” geographical dialects tend to reduce these doublets. For example, Mycenaean eliminates augment and other dialects generalize it; hardly any traces are left of the opposition *ἄν/κε* in Arcadian; the doublet *aq/oq* exists in Mycenaean, but Ionic-Attic generalizes *aq* and other Para-Mycenaean dialects tend to *oq* (without managing to totally impose it). The facts are well-known. Now, it is a feature of the Homeric dialect to preserve doublets such as these.

It is even a feature of it to maintain diachronic doublets. This occurs to a certain extent in local dialects, too: a phonetic change, a morphological evolution, takes time and sometimes the older form is slow to disappear. Thus, an evolution *-ti > -si*, which belongs to the ensemble of eastern Greek, leaves traces of *-ti* not only in Homer, but also in Mycenaean and even in dialects of the first millenium⁴⁰).

However, diachronic doublets exist in which Homer preserves forms that have practically disappeared from eastern Greek (at the most, preserved in small relegated areas). He presents, for example, a Nom. pl. of the article *τοί*, future forms in *-έω* without re-introduction of the *-σ-*, secondary 3rd pl. in *-εν*, in fact, forms which do not already belong to eastern Greek prior to the differentiation, but rather to common Greek.

⁴⁰) “Micénico, dialectos paramicénicos . . .” cit., p. 90ff.

In these cases I believe that one should not think that the alternance *τοί/οί*, as likewise the others, belongs to a "normal" geographically-based dialect used in epic. There is no trace at all of *τοί*, outside epic in the Greek of the second millenium. One should think that the epic language of the beginning of the second millenium used forms such as these and that, together with them, there were both synchronic and diachronic doublets such as those indicated; and that there were "interpretations" of those doublets which "attracted" forms from the dialects to which they were attributed.

In general terms, it does not appear that forms of epigraphic Mycenaean were attracted: when coincidences do appear, they seem to be archaisms; and coincidences do not invariably occur. There are Mycenaean archaisms which are missing in Homer and contrarily there are innovations from only one of these two languages. On the other hand, it is worth noting in Homer (and eventually in Mycenaean, too) that forms are found which later belonged to Ionic-Attic, sometimes to Arcado-Cyprian, but not to Aeolic. Thus, the secondary 3rd pl. *-εσαν* parallel to *-εαν* of Arcado-Cyprian and Boeotian, most certainly of the second millenium. Thus, the simplification of *σσ* (preserved in Aeolic). Thus, the generalization (incomplete) of the contract verbs (against the tendency of Aeolic). Thus, *-σι* < *-τι*, *αρ* < **γ*, etc.

It seems that the Ionic-Attic group is that which fundamentally influenced Homeric language, right from the second millenium. Naturally, this means an archaic phase of the former, without later innovations and with survival of doublets such as *ξύν/σύν* (at a later stage Attic *ξύν*/Ionic *σύν*), genitive/patronymic adjective, etc. Its basis surely lies in an "Ionic" interpretation of old forms (both of eastern Greek and even common Greek) such as *ἄν*, *εἰ*, *-ναι*, verbs in *-έω*, *προτί*, etc. From this point onwards, the above-mentioned Ionisms were introduced, among others. This constitutes a first wave of Ionisms (really of wider usage than Ionic). The new "wave", after the year 1000 B.C., sometimes modifies, but does not eliminate, the forms then introduced: *πρός* comes into the language alongside *προτί*, *φιλω* alongside *φιλέω*, etc. In another instance, *-λσ-*, alongside *κέλσαι* a recent form **κελхай* was introduced which must have been general but which was certainly understood as Ionic: proof of this is the entrance into this phonetic group of the Ionic form with compensatory lengthening later on. Nevertheless, at this date, some of the elements of the doublets could be already interpreted as Lesbisms and give rise to the introduction of new Lesbisms.

Of course, all this is provisional and requires further study, for which the formulaic system could be of invaluable help. However it now seems quite possible to detect the influences of Lesbian and Ionic on the epic dialect as from the year 1000 B.C.; as it is possible to a certain extent to reconstruct its fundamental traits before this date as also the Ionic elements (from the earliest Ionic) which were added to it; finally, to try to imagine what it was like before this moment. The process is always the same: preservation of archaisms, "interpretation" of doublets, entrance of contemporary dialectal elements identified with traditional forms and creation of new doublets.

This process implies another: that of the re-elaboration of the older epic formulae. Following J. B. Hainsworth and others, who studied the evolution of the formulae, A. Hoekstra⁴¹⁾ has put forward some examples which show how recent linguistic elements are adaptable to the pre-existent formulaic system, thus modifying it. There are several ways of doing this: the substitution of forms wherever the metre allows this; the use of some to decline or conjugate older formulae; the insertion of new forms in older formulae, etc.⁴²⁾. This may be done, at least in many cases, without eliminating the older forms of the older formulae. The existence of the formulaic system is no impediment to the renovation of epic language, but rather encourages the creation of double forms. This occurs within an evolution which Hoekstra, as likewise the present writer, dates at a much earlier stage than Ionic and Aeolic⁴³⁾.

As for the research method, this includes the exhaustive examination of data and their isolated study, with their possible interpretations and their chronology. All this, without any prejudice of fixed, *a priori*, dialectal classification. In this way I believe that one may arrive at a history of epic language practically from common Greek onwards, although this may be merely an outline. On the other hand, this study could be of use in that of the creation of the various Greek dialects and their chronology. The study of the Homeric language and that of the "geographical" dialects are in fact likely to be of mutual aid to each other. Moreover, after the new step forward to be perceived in Greek dialectology in general, it is now the turn of the study of the Homeric dialect and that of Greek epic language in its various phases, to achieve fruitful results for both fields of research.

⁴¹⁾ *Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes*, Amsterdam 1965.

⁴²⁾ Cf. for instance p. 38 ff., 131 ff., etc. ⁴³⁾ *Op. cit.*, p. 148 ff.