

Proto-Greeks and the Kurgan Theory

A. L. Katona

Athens University

Michael B. Sakellariou deals with the origins of the Proto-Greeks in many publications, and in connection with this topic, also with problems of IE prehistory. His interpretation is close to the Kurgan Theory of Marija Gimbutas. His method is interdisciplinary, combining history and archaeology with linguistics. J. Makkay has published a monograph on the same subject in which startlingly enough, Sakellariou's work is almost entirely ignored. Makkay's negativism towards the Kurgan Theory is shown to be inconsistent, and, to a certain extent, self-contradictory.

This paper presents a survey of Sakellariou's views in favor of extending the force of Kurgan Theory also to Greek soil, with emphasis on his recent publications, and makes an effort to find links between the two approaches.

In 1991 J. Makkay¹ published an excellent survey of the Indo-Europeans, not only from the archaeological but also from a linguistic point of view.² Although the subject of the book is the Indo-European expansion as a whole, a good portion of it is devoted to Greek prehistory and to the arrival of populations later to be called Greeks, known commonly as Proto-Greeks. Not only one of the longest chapters³ deals with this "coming" but also many other parts of the book. The

¹Member of the Editorial Advisory Board of the *Journal of Indo-European Studies* in 1994 and 1996.

²Makkay 1991. A review article of this book is in press in the journal "*Glossologia*" (Athens). His views can be read in a shorter form also in English (Makkay: 1992). The only review of Makkay 1991 I have knowledge of (written by Eszter Bánffy in *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 46 [1994: 427-429], in English) does not contribute to the problem I am going to tackle.

Makkay 1998. This is a 200 pages more revised edition providing a better bibliography. The author is aware here of Sakellariou 1989a (p. 161) but does not draw the conclusion that S. gave a proof of Kurgan invasion. M. continues to reject the Kurgan Theory and on pp. 9-10 gives a very negative assessment of Gimbutas' work.

³Makkay 1991: 97-107.

author is, however, curiously silent about M. B. Sakellariou whom he mentions just once without any commentary.⁴ The bibliography⁵ does not even contain Sakellariou's fundamental book "*Les Proto-Grecs*" (Sakellariou 1980). This is surprising for three reasons. First because S. adopts a similar interdisciplinary method in combining archaeology and history with linguistics, a method warmly to be welcomed in my opinion, although not too popular and rather infrequent in the respective scientific fields.⁶ Secondly, because many of the author's views are identical with or very near to those of Sakellariou, and thirdly because Makkay is decidedly against the "Kurgan Theory", i.e. he must reject Sakellariou's views. But on the pages where he should do so⁷, he alludes only to "some scientists" without giving names, although not overlooking the names of those who share his views.⁸

I think that this is perhaps the only weak point of M.'s otherwise very instructive book, so I would like to contribute to the question, after having read some of Sakellariou's works and having met him personally, with some information about his activity in this field. The Greek scholar who, like for example, W. P. Lehmann,⁹ is favourably disposed towards Marija

⁴Makkay 1991: 83.

⁵Makkay 1991: 287-91. Exactly the same goes for the references in Makkay 1992. Sakellariou 1977 and 1980 can be found, without comments, in a footnote in Makkay 1991: 276(119). Nor do I find Sakellariou's two books among the numerous titles reviewed by Makkay.

⁶Cf. Sakellariou's remarks on methodology (1980: 53).

⁷Makkay 1991: 140 ff.

⁸E.g. A. Häusler (Makkay 1991: 261.286[309]). As a fourth surprise may be added that Makkay 1992: 219-20 depicts the possible arrival route of the later Greeks - though rejecting the Kurgan Theory — in a quite forbearing tone, invoking many references, indeed differently from the militant language — like "no traces under God's canopy" (sic) e.g. — used in Makkay 1991:145 (less combatively on p. 141, and on pp. 233-4). See also fnn. 32.138 of this paper. It is also surprising that Makkay 1992 gives a much better bibliography (pp. 225-38) than Makkay 1991 (five pages in all, though, it is true, he offers there many further references and titles in the footnotes). One gets, however, the uneasy impression that he has a double language and a double system of postulates: one for "inner usage", and another one for the rest of the world.

⁹His German text (Lehmann: 1992) was published in Budapest, Hungary. This is the extended version of an article published in *General Linguistics*, Vol. 30, No. 1, 1990, under the heading "The Current Thrust of Indo-European Studies". An important addendum is the publication of I. N. Djakonov's letter (dated from 5th April 1992), written to Lehmann (pp. 41-2). In this monograph L. deals with the Kurgan Theory with forbearance and expresses

Gimbutas and her Kurgan Theory, thinks that there are clear signs of the presence of both Kurgans and the continuity of populations moving downward through the Balkans and later into Greece itself. He has published a very important article in the *Festschrift* for G. E. Mylonas.¹⁰ The article reports on a “yellowish powder” found in a cup in a Mycenaean tomb. The powder was analyzed in a laboratory and identified as yellow ochre. This and the other grave-goods correspond to Kurgan burial customs¹¹ and their importance lies in the fact that this is the first time that a very clear sign of such customs have been noted in Greece, having been in use during the MH III/LH I period, i.e. between about 1650 and 1500 B.C.¹²

In another article published a few years earlier,¹³ Sakellariou deals with ochre and traces of animal hides as a sign of external origin that are innovations in Greece,¹⁴ with the importance of an existing frontier or *Kulturfront*¹⁵ — from the context it follows that he reckons with this in Greece,¹⁶ — and with a complex of archaeological and mythological innovations (including, among others, the name Danaos, coming from the IE root **dan-*), which he localizes during the transition from EH to MH (2000 B.C.). He further finds that the arrival of the bearers of Proto-Greek and of Kurgan (or Mound) culture coincide and can be put in the EB/EH III period (i.e. between 2300 and 2000 B.C.)¹⁷

In a third recent article Sakellariou gives a critical survey of the theories of Th. V. Gamkrelidze and V. V. Ivanov, C. Renfrew, and I. M. Djakonov, summarizing at the same time his older views and works, “*Les Proto-Grecs*” included.¹⁸ Here he

some reservations against Häusler (pp. 71-2).

¹⁰Sakellariou 1989a.

¹¹Cf. with the description given by Makkay 1991:141.

¹²Sakellariou 1989a:16.

¹³Sakellariou 1986.

¹⁴Sakellariou 1986:126.

¹⁵Cf. Sakellariou 1980: 90.106(4). Makkay accepts elsewhere (1991: 245-6) this notion with a slight reserve but he does not speak about it in the present context. Makkay 1992: 194 accepts the “cultural frontiers” more readily.

¹⁶Sakellariou 1986:127.

¹⁷Sakellariou 1986:135-6.

¹⁸Sakellariou 1991. This was originally a lecture given in Moscow, in the presence of I. Ja. Merpert who largely agreed to Sakellariou’s views (Sakellariou’s personal communication: 13th January 1999). A Greek version of this article exists, too: Sakellariou 1989b. This is the text of a lecture given

again expounds the opinion that the arrival of the Proto-Greeks was linked to two kinds of changes, destructions and innovations (a good but not singular example of which is furnished by Lerna¹⁹), and to two waves of influx: the first one localized in Eastern Greece, mainly close to the coasts, at the end of EH II and the beginning of EH III (i.e. 2300 B.C.), the second from Macedonia southwards at the end of EH III and the beginning of MH (2000 B.C.). The innovations in question originated in three regions: 1. in the Eurasian steppes (e.g. use of ochre and of animal hides in tombs), 2. in the Danube-Balkan area (e.g. intramural burials and apsidal houses), 3. in Central Europe (e.g. stone arrow-straighteners²⁰). Among these, the first element prevails and since they appear in Greece simultaneously one may reasonably suppose that they did not intermingle in Greece but to the north.²¹ As for the ethnicity of the immigrants, he states that among the early ethnic names used for the Greeks (Achaeans, Argives, Danaans) the most remarkable is the last one because this takes us both linguistically and historically (mythologically) to the regions which can be considered as the early homeland of the Greeks: lands neighbouring the Indo-Iranians around the northern part of the Black Sea. The root of this name can be found in a great number of personal as well as river names (names of divinities included) of both populations (e.g. *Danaé*, *Dānu-*, *Dānavā*, and *Eridanos*, *Don* (*Tanaïs*), *Danapris*, etc.). The connection with water is clear in regard to both semantics and myth and the relation among these names is also assured phonemically.²²

at the Goulandris Foundation in Athens, on 16th January 1989.

¹⁹Lerna is situated in the Argolid, the part of the Peloponnese where J. Chadwick (cited *infra*) thinks that the mixture of an IE dialect and a native language took place, resulting in a new language later to be called Greek.

²⁰An arrow-straightener is a stone with a straight groove on one face. Its purpose is thought to have been smoothing, rather than straightening, arrow shafts. Cf. Bray-Trump 1982:23-4.

²¹Sakellariou 1991:183-4.

²²In her writings, Miriam Robbins Dexter arrives at the same conclusions indicating a possible pre-IE origin of the personification of rivers and water, in a society originally supposed to be matriarchal. Cf. e.g. Dexter 1980:20-2. The article gives also an explanation for the change in gender. (Further bibliography in Dexter 1990a:304). On the other hand, neither she nor Sakellariou analyzes the vowel alternance in the root, or the a-vocalism of **dan-*. Does the vocalism reflect a pre-IE linguistic reality, or is there an interference between pre-IE and IE processes? I mention a possible IE solution later. Dexter (1990b:11.42) thinks that **Danu*, personification of a

After a hermeneutical attempt at interpreting the name of Danaé which could mean “sprinkled”, he proceeds to localize a geographical origin between the Don and the Danube and posits a neighbourhood with “Aryans” (Indo-Iranians).²³

In his concluding remarks, he again rejects the views of Gamkrelidze - Ivanov (as he did earlier with Renfrew) but maintains that, if a similar migration took place northwards through the Caucasus, then agreement might be found with their theory. As for Djakonov, he is ready to accept his thesis.²⁴ In this case it must be assumed that the Proto-Greeks brought with them groups bearing the Kurgan culture and were not just one of the people who derived from the creators of this culture, as supposed in “*Les Proto-Grecs*”.²⁵

Last but not least, I had the honour to meet Prof. Sakellariou personally²⁶ where he expounded his views again very clearly, among others on the threefold arrival, a theory launched, by the way, as early as 1977.²⁷ He did not seem to be convinced by the difficulties Makkay finds in recognizing “Kurgan effects in Greece”²⁸ and he defended his older views very vigorously, mentioning, among others, the existence of a *Kulturfront* in the Balkans and in Greece. He drew my attention to some of his earlier publications and was of the opinion that his article “*De l’ochre*” (Sakellariou: 1989a) is decisive. I should like to add that these three “descendences”, remind me of three older views. That from Central Europe is similar to the classic opinion found e.g. in the grammar by E. Schwyzler.²⁹ The third is based, among others, on the synthesis of W. Porzig.³⁰ The second one, which comes before Djakonov’s views, reminds

watery place, was a Proto-IE goddess, perhaps primeval. Littleton (1982: 262) reckons with a PIE root *dā-* meaning “running water” or “earth water”.

²³Sakellariou 1991:185-6.

²⁴As does also Makkay (1991) adopting Djakonov’s views, essentially, everywhere without reservation.

²⁵Sakellariou 1991:186. Cf. Sakellariou (1980:91): “immigrants porteurs de la culture des ‘kourganes’”.

²⁶On 16th December, 1994, in Palaeopsychiko, Athens, and on 13th January, 1999, in his house in Athens.

²⁷Sakellariou 1977:318 ff. Makkay takes no account of this book, either, except for a footnote (v. s. fn. 5).

²⁸So Makkay 1991, with this wording literally, enclosed in quotation marks, on p. 305, referring to pp. 141-3.145.244.247.

²⁹Schwyzler 1953:71 (based on Eduard Meyer).

³⁰Porzig 1954.

me, though it is not exactly the same, of the opinion of J. Harmatta who could trace the Proto-Greeks back to the Western Transylvanian culture (the western neighbor of the Cucuteni-Tripolje culture)³¹, chronologically set about 2800 B.C. Makkay has partly adopted Harmatta's view.³²

Considering the great importance water plays in IE prehistory and the emphasis Sakellariou gives to the name of the Danaans and to its interpretation, one could add also the god Poseidon to the list. Although not ignored by Sakellariou, he has been given a different interpretation in S.'s work.³³ Poseidon, god of the sea and husband of the sea goddess Amphitrite, not only had numerous love affairs, especially with mythological nymphs of springs and fountains but also caused the Lerna river to appear. If the second part of his compound name could be connected to the IE root *dā-/dan (cf. Mycenaean *po-se-da-o-ni do-so-mo* without the digamma) one might ask if the Danaans, or any other ethnic component later to become Greeks, brought this deity with them as especially theirs.³⁴

³¹Harmatta 1975:9. In this paper H., linguist and historian, speaks about a uniform Proto-Greek — Proto-Macedonian — Proto-Phygian linguistic group arriving in Greece, the term alluding to the subsequent tripartition of the group. (With his method, he belongs to the "quelques rares exceptions" whose small number Sakellariou regrets in his "plea" for interdisciplinarity [1980:53].)

³²Again Makkay in a curious fashion approaches the problem: first he excludes categorically every trace of a migration to the south of Vinča (near Belgrade) and then he remarks: "yet we must seek the origin of the Proto-Greeks to the North of the Balkans and in the region of the Lower Danube" (1991: 243). In a less peremptory manner: "hardly any archaeological evidence exists" (ib. p. 258). M. seems to stand under the influence of a preformed idea about archaeological deficiency. In 1991:196 he writes, dealing with a possible eastern localization of the Finno-Ugrian homeland the following: "there are no archaeological traces of passing through the Ural mountains". Compare to this what J. P. Mallory writes reviewing V. V. Napolkskikh's *Uralic Original Home* (1995): "one cannot help but see that the general pattern of theories has been shifting eastwards towards western Siberia and away from the frequently cited identification of Proto-Uralic with the Pit-and-Comb marked culture of northeastern Europe (*Journal of Indo-European Studies* 26 [1998: 201]).

³³Sakellariou 1980:185, Sakellariou 1977:112-3.

³⁴Cf. Littleton 1973:423 ff., Littleton 1982:261-2. If correct, my suggestion could be an addendum to Sakellariou's "Faits d'ordre religieux" in the chapter investigating the Danaans (cf. Sakellariou 1980:195-223,257). Sakellariou (1974:380) ascertains a "sporadic loss of the digamma, still conserved in the other Greek dialects". This detail may not be decisive because he does not

The far-reaching significance of Sakellariou's work warrants a consideration of his earlier writings. The backbone of his work concerning IE - pre-Greek problems is the third volume (the second in chronological order) of a four-part monograph announced in advance. This has much in common with his later, and also earlier publications. Before giving details of these writings, it seems to be expedient to review some of his conclusions on IE expansion, based on Sakellariou 1977. This book concentrates on prehellenic people, thought to be Indo-Europeans. These are, in S.'s opinion, the Pelasgians, the Haimones, the Dryopes and the Achaeans. The latter came to designate a Hellenic tribe only later. The presence of the first two can be proved - according to some scientists - already before the Mesolithic Period. This implies too, that IE unity might be put at the beginning of the Mesolithic, or possibly at the end of the Palaeolithic Period. S. does not accept this position.³⁵ This chronology, however, constitutes exactly the very *backslip of the time-depth*, an archaeological term Makkay posits several times putting IE unity tentatively quite so - into the same two time spans.³⁶ I should think that the *backslip of the time-depth* is a natural concomitant of progress in science. After having examined the "beech" and "salmon arguments" Sakellariou comes to the problem of matriarchy and patriarchy, mentioning some ethnological parallels. It is known that Sakellariou has been engaged also in ethnological questions he refers to,³⁷ but the arguments given on two pages in all do not seem to be enough to prove that matriarchy had ever existed. These two social structures do interest scientists of IE prehistory but there is a gap, as far as I know, between the latter's and the ethnologists' position. Ethnologists working with recent material, have been unable - to my knowledge - to prove the existence of matriarchal societies. It is therefore somewhat surprising when Sakellariou corroborates his arguments with details from ethnology and adopts the existence of matriarchy

mention the name of Poseidon among the different features. These details are not found in Sakellariou 1970.

³⁵Sakellariou 1977: 315. S. thinks that the unity is to be put between 7000 and 3000 B.C., closer to 3000. (Personal communication: 13th January, 1999.)

³⁶Makkay 1991: e.g. 67.72.259 and Makkay 1992:198.199.220-1.

³⁷Sakellariou 1990. This book owes its existence to a debate between Sakellariou and J. Chadwick on the reliability of tradition. Details of their correspondence are published in the Preface (pp. 14-6).

for the IE social structure. Those Indo-Europeans, he continues, who established themselves in the steppes had then to become nomad herdsmen and to pass from matriarchy to patriarchy.³⁸ But if something like this ever happened then perhaps only the transition from matrilineal to patrilineal kinship was more favored than in the western parts of the IE continuum. (The terms "matriarchy" and "patriarchy" should be replaced by the terms "matrilineal" and "patrilineal" kinship, which are more compatible with the available evidence).³⁹ He accepts that the corded ware (*céramique rubanée* or *Schnurkeramik*) is to be associated with the Indo-Europeans and supports the Kurgan arguments with his own thesis about the Danaans: these spoke an IE dialect and brought the elements of Kurgan civilization into Greece.⁴⁰ He concludes that IE elements showed up in the Balkans in the form of infiltration much earlier than the Kurgan people. When these came from the steppes, in Europe they found peoples speaking IE dialects, and in the Balkans peoples speaking IE, "Mediterranean", and perhaps mixed idioms. Their invasion imposed patriarchal structures everywhere.⁴¹

Apart from the Introduction and Conclusions *Les Proto-Grecs* consists of three principal chapters: Linguistic Documentation, Archaeological Documentation, and the Study of the Proto-Greeks and of the Danaans. The main points of the relatively short Linguistic Documentation ("*La documentation linguistique*", pp. 61-69) are as follows: the author investigates the isoglosses between Greek and twelve other languages or groups of languages. As was to be expected, most isoglosses have been found between Greek and Indo-Iranian. Following Porzig he specifies sixteen of them. Some of these date from quite ancient times, others are more recent. From this time-span he draws the important conclusion that the ancestors of the Greeks lived together with the Indo-Iranians for a relatively long time, in any case longer than with others. The territory where the two populations lived together is the north Pontic region, more exactly, to the North of the Sea of Azov and to the

³⁸Sakellariou 1977:319.

³⁹The same critical remark goes also for the otherwise excellent study of Miriam Robbins Dexter (Dexter 1980).

⁴⁰Sakellariou 1977:311-3. (I mention parenthetically that he attaches the "Larissa ware" to the Pelasgians, *ib.* pp. 141.311).

⁴¹Sakellariou 1977:319.

West of the Caspian Sea. Also “innovator” and “conservator dialects” have been observed: Proto-Greek and Proto-Indo-Iranian belong to the first.⁴²

Sakellariou is much more at home in the archaeological documentation (“*La documentation archéologique*”, pp. 71-172). In this part there is an extremely meticulous sifting of data and of arguments *pro* and *contra*, with detailed conclusions. After having indicated in the Introduction that no sign of an arrival exists before the Mycenaean Age (see e.g. pp. 50-51) he proceeds to analyze the indications (“*indices*”), conclusive or not, on the immigration of external elements. The immigration is first studied from the chronological perspective. The first period in question is EH II to EH III, i.e., roughly, the period between 2600 and 2300 B.C., or possibly later. The indications are classified into three groups according to a scale of a more or less “convincing” (“*probants*”), or not “convincing” force respectively. In the first group we find poor, rudimentary, village-like settlements which followed upon solidly constructed, fortified buildings, with or without burnt layers. Examples for the first are Lerna in the Argolid and Pefkakia in Pelasgiotis (in the eastern neighborhood of Dimini) among others, for the second Berbati in the Argolid and Thebes in Boeotia, among many others. If no burnt layer appears, this is to be interpreted that the newcomers encountered no resistance.⁴³ Sakellariou then proceeds moving down the “*probant*” scale arriving at the zero indications. I should like to draw attention to the table on pp. 79-80 which shows the new phenomena in three categories: immigrants with archaeological material, immigrants without material, and material without immigrants. The next period is traced with the same “algorithmic”⁴⁴ method but, depending perhaps on archaeologists, with less chronological accuracy: EH III to MH would imply a time span between 2300 and 1600 B.C. Sites with burnt layer followed by innovations were found e.g. near Larissa, Corinth, in Boeotia, and also in the Argolid. A long list of rebuilt settlements follows (more than a hundred settlements were found south from Olympus only). We again encounter the names of the Argolid, Boeotia, then also Achaea,

⁴²Sakellariou 1980:68.

⁴³Sakellariou 1980:72-3.

⁴⁴This apt remark describing the author’s method comes from Jacques Raison (*Revue de Philologie* 55 [1981], p.145).

Attica (Aphidna), etc., including tumuli and burials.⁴⁵ The next section gives a survey of the innovations between EH and the beginning of MH (pp. 88-142). Sakellariou groups the innovations in two classes, the first of which contains sure indications of an arrival. His main thesis is that certain customs, first of all burial ones, are very conservative. Any change therefore in these gives us the right to suppose that a new ethnic element appeared. The second class contains material which could be brought both by immigrants and by commerce. Following Marija Gimbutas, he locates the material to be analyzed first in the area of Kurgan culture (pp. 90-114) as opposed to the Central European and the Danube-Balkan areas (pp. 114 ff.) and then his discussion is divided into subsections the first of which is the Burial Tumuli ("*tumuli funéraires*", pp. 90-98). He gives a short report on the eastern origin of this culture. Sakellariou connects, like M. Gimbutas, N. G. L. Hammond, R. A. Crossland, R. J. Howell, M. S. F. Hood, F. Schachermeyr, O. Pelon and others, the tumuli in question with the immigrants as a vehicle of the Kurgan culture.⁴⁶ The most ancient tumuli (EH I) have been found in Macedonia, e.g. in the settlement Servia, but also on the island Leucas. Several MH tumuli were found in Albania, e.g. in Pazhok. In the following pages he describes - chronologically - the more recent tumuli. A tumulus on the south slope of the Athenian Acropolis could be quite old (EH III) but the dating is not sure.⁴⁷ The Argolid is always present in the survey: there are nine tumuli, starting with the MH period.⁴⁸ The largest concentration of tumuli of this kind, 34 in all, has been found on the island of Leucas. The continuity from possibly EH II to MH is accompanied by funeral pottery called "sauceboats" ("*saucières*").⁴⁹ The next section deals with the cist-graves ("*tombes à ciste*", pp. 99-104). In the area of the Kurgans there are several burials under a tumulus which have the shape of a cist. This is another aspect of Kurgan burials. This kind of tumuli is to be found in Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Albania. They are present, through Asia Minor, also in Palestine. There is some inconsistency with Sakellariou's dating

⁴⁵Sakellariou 1980:81-8.

⁴⁶Sakellariou 1980:91 (1, with bibliography).

⁴⁷Sakellariou 1980:94.

⁴⁸Sakellariou 1980:95.

⁴⁹Sakellariou 1980:98.

when he states that the most ancient cist-graves of northern origin can be assigned to the EH III period (Thebes, Leucas)⁵⁰, and some pages before he rejects a possible Cycladic origin for these burials. This was proposed on the basis that "Cycladic cists are earlier than those of mainland Greece". His main argument in any case is that a great number of cist-graves are found *intra muros* (within settlements) and this is certainly a feature brought into Greece from the North. One can also mark a difference in the slabs found in the two kinds of constructions to be ascribed to the Cyclades and mainland Greece respectively. On the evidence of these results only very few burials can be thought to represent a Cycladic origin. He then enumerates regions and sites with cist-graves under a tumulus, giving also extensive bibliography. Some of the graves are in Macedonia, Boeotia, Attica, the Argolid, Leucas, etc. A third kind of Kurgan burial, the pit-graves ("*tombes à puits*") is mentioned on p. 104. A tumulus of this kind was found on Leucas from EH III. Other tumuli were found in Albania (Pazbok) and in Macedonia (Servia, perhaps also at Vergina). Sakellariou then discusses the grave-goods. He maintains that the two basic funeral gifts of the Kurgans appear also in Greece. These are animal hides and ochre. Ochre has been found in Servia (end of the local Neolithic) and in Argos (MH). The material found in Argos might be a substitute for ochre. The skeleton of tomb N (Grave Circle B) of Mycenae had been laid on an animal hide (RH I, i.e. c. 1500 B.C.). Traces of a decomposed material were found also at Malthi (Messenia) from the MH period. It must have been either animal hide or a substitute.⁵¹ Writing about the Corded Ware ("*céramique à décor cordé*") he refutes earlier statements rejecting the possibility of associating this pottery with the *Schnurkeramik* and to reconstruct a frontier. The two main arguments are that today we have many more specimens of this pottery than a few decades ago and that its quality is quite poor. The latter implies that logically no commerce can be thought of; we must suppose that it was brought by its creators. A list of sites of provenance follows, ranging from Corfu to Boeotia.⁵² He then investigates mace-heads ("*têtes de massue*") and stone battle axes ("*haches de*

⁵⁰Sakellariou 1980:104. See also p.100.

⁵¹Sakellariou 1980:105-6. The number of such findings has increased since this book was published, see Sakellariou 1989a.

⁵²Sakellariou 1980:107-9.

combat en pierre”). The first are present in the Kurgan culture (phase II and onwards), in Central Europe during the Neolithic Age and then in all Balkan countries, in Troy, and in Asia Minor. No affiliation can be determined with Cretan axes because these existed only during the Neolithic. In Greece they were found in Macedonia, Thessaly, Phokis, Attica, the Argolid, Messenia, and Achaea. The situation with the battle axes is similar. Among the sites where they were found it is worth mentioning that the excavations yielded a miniature terracotta battle axe at Lerna IV.⁵³ The survey is concluded with the hammer-headed pins (*“épingles en bronze à tête en forme de marteau”*), the antlers (*“outils en bois de cervidés”*), and the misinterpretations of “Kurgan features” which are - consequently - not to be attached to this culture. The second area with material worth analyzing is Central Europe, which produced the stone arrow-straighteners (*“polissoirs de flèches”*), from Neolithic times. Their use spread in different directions and also entered the Kurgan area c. 2000 B.C. Within Greece, they were found in Kirrha, Asiné, Malthi, and Skaros (Leucas). One piece came to light also in Troy V or VI.⁵⁴ As for the third area, the Danube-Balkan region, Sakellariou first analyzes the intramural burials (*“inhumation intra-muros”*). This kind of burial existed at Vučedol in Croatia, in Bulgaria, in Troy I, and in Asia Minor at different sites. The earliest examples in Greece are from EH III (Asiné, Berbati, Lerna, Pelikata). Several others belong also to some section of the EH period (e.g. Thebes). All the burials in question are enumerated in a list on two pages.⁵⁵ The following nine pages are consecrated to apsidal houses with rectilinear lateral walls (*“édifices à abside et murs latéraux rectilignes”*, pp. 118-126). Here five construction techniques are examined: 1. trapezoidal buildings, 2. ellipsoidal buildings, 3. buildings with one apse, and several rectangular rooms, 4. buildings curvilinear at one side, 5. horseshoe-shaped buildings. 1-5 are also in chronological order of appearance. The first type, found at Lepenski Vir (Yugoslavia) and Bylani (Bohemia) from the late Mesolithic and early Neolithic, disappeared without continuation.⁵⁶ The second type is to be associated with the I and III phase of the Kurgans (Mikhajlovka and Skelia-

⁵³Sakellariou 1980:109-12.

⁵⁴Sakellariou 1980:114-5.

⁵⁵Sakellariou 1980:116-7.

⁵⁶Sakellariou 1980:118-9.

Kamelomna), and in Greece those at Rini (Thessaly), Tiryns (Argolid), and Malthi (Messenia), being from Subneolithic and MH Periods respectively.⁵⁷ The third one is represented, with a special technique, at Vinča-Pločnik in Yugoslavia, but the earliest type is found in Palestine. This type appears in Greece in the EH I and II (Rachmani, Pefkakia and also on the Aegean islands). For the fourth a line of descent has been established from the Baden culture to Kilikia in Asia Minor. Some EH III sites in Greece are in Pelasgiotis, Boeotia, and the Argolid. MH sites are situated in Phokis, the Argolid, Arcadia, Elis, etc.⁵⁸ The fifth type is represented only in Greece, in Eutresis (EH II/III), Argos, and Malthi (MH). To these a list is added where the affiliation could not be determined.⁵⁹ As for the ellipsoidal type, the arguments in favor of their association with the Kurgans are that they appear in Greece much later (MH), and that the Rini construction can be compared with ("*rapprochée de*") that of Serbia in Macedonia and with constructions of the Thessalian Subneolithic.⁶⁰ The apsidal type is somewhat problematic: there could have been migratory movements from Palestine but then there should have been also other traces in a sufficient amount which is not the case. One possibility is parallel developments and another immigration. In the latter case only the Balkan area can come into question.⁶¹ The horseshoe-type might have developed from the apsidal one.⁶² The perforated stone hammer-axes ("*haches-marteaux perforées*", pp. 126-128) seem to originate in the Balkan area. They can be found in Troy I and II, in Lemnos, Macedonia, Thessaly, Phokis, Messenia, the Argolid, etc. The earliest findings came to light in Thessaly (EH I and II). The aryballoid flasks ("*aryballes incisés*", pp. 128-130) have certain affinities with Yugoslav (Bubanj-Hum Ia = Vinča C-D) and Rumanian (Monteoru) types. In Greece they are represented among others in Thessaly, Phokis (MH), the Argolid (MH), and also in Troy V (AH III/MH). The fourth area examined is Macedonia from where a migratory movement towards Thessaly and the Spercheios valley in the MB Period is shown. Besides

⁵⁷Sakellariou 1980:106.119.

⁵⁸Sakellariou 1980:119-121.

⁵⁹Sakellariou 1980:121-4.

⁶⁰Sakellariou 1980:92.124.

⁶¹Sakellariou 1980:125-6.

⁶²Sakellariou 1980:126.

archaeological findings also the Larissa acropolis is conclusive where new, Macedonian type pottery follows a MB burnt layer (pp.130-131). The fifth area is Thessaly with indications of a movement towards Boeotia, the sixth Albania, the material of which in the present state of knowledge cannot be evaluated for a possible immigration towards Thessaly (p.132). The north-eastern area, seventh and last examined (pp.133-142), refutes alleged migratory movements from eastern direction (Troy or Asia Minor), rejecting the "Minyan thesis"⁶³ and examining different types of Trojan ware, among which e.g. the so called "*depas amphikypellon*".

A very good comparative study follows (pp.142-159) using Sakellariou's well known exacting method, across from EH I to MH, representing findings and sites in each time-span in a frame of reference reminiscent of mathematical co-ordinates, each of the time-spans followed by a map indicating the sites. The concluding chapter again puts the question "Who were the immigrants?" ("*Qui étaient les immigrants?*", pp.159-172). The answer is given as follows: since the homeland of the Proto-Greeks and that of the Kurgan Culture coincide and since the arrival of the Proto-Greeks coincides with the introduction of Kurgan elements into the whole of mainland Greece we must suppose that they participated in developing the Kurgan Culture and they must be identified with those who introduced this culture during EB/EH III and MB/MH.⁶⁴ The Proto-Greeks left their homeland during EB/EH II (i.e. c. 2400 B.C.) and drew near to Greece in the beginning EB/EH III (i.e. c. 2300). The corded ware found in Greece belongs to phase four of this pottery, chronologically close to the above date. It is during the fourth phase of the corded ware that the most Kurgan migratory movements towards Europe and the Balkans are detected. This means that Kurgan features in Greece before EB/EH III were not introduced by Proto-Greeks but by other Indo-Europeans.⁶⁵ These features, conveniently called Balkan features, must be attributed to a fusion of Proto-Greeks and other Balkan elements because several *intramural* tombs (a Balkan feature) have a cist form of *Pontic* origin. The fusion can

⁶³S. emphasizes that first J. Mellaart, himself, recanted his thesis about the eastern provenance of the "Minyan ware" (Sakellariou 1980:29[1].133[11]).

⁶⁴Sakellariou 1980:159. For a slight modification of this position v.s. (Sakellariou 1991).

⁶⁵A recapitulation of these features is given on p.160.

be placed somewhere between Ukraine and mainland Greece. Analyzing the constancy of burial practice and the interplay between the two populations' respective customs the conclusion is that it constitutes a minor change if we suppose that the Balkan people were subordinated to the Proto-Greeks. Unfortunately it is not possible to say if the former were IE elements or other.⁶⁶ The second part of the Conclusions runs under the heading "Migratory movements of the Proto-Greeks and their Balkan partners" (*Le déroulement des mouvements migratoires des Proto-Grecs et de leurs partenaires balkaniques*", pp. 162-172). The Proto-Greeks left the Kurgan area after the fourth phase of the corded ware, by the time EB/EH II had already developed in Greece.⁶⁷ The transition between this period and EB/EH III (towards 2100 B.C.) coincide with the arrival of the first Proto-Greeks. From this period similar pottery can be found both in Rumania (Cotofeni, Glina III) and in Greece (Pefkakia).⁶⁸ The author's conclusion is that it took longer for the Proto-Greeks to arrive in Rumania than it did from there to Greece and that perhaps it was there they superimposed themselves over their Balkan subordinates. He suggests calling this population "Proto-Greeks *bis*".⁶⁹ The Proto-Greeks *bis* arrived, in a *first* wave, at the transition of EB/EH II and EB/EH III and their traces have been found among others in Pelasgiotis, Phokis, Boeotia, Attica, the Argolid, Leucas, and Ithaca. They could have started from roadsteads in the northern Aegean ranging from Chalcidice to the Troad. The Western parts (Leuca, Ithaca) were reached either from this region or from Albania. From the sites mentioned, again it is the Argolid and neighboring Cleonae (modern Zygouries) that show the biggest concentration. Sakellariou cannot find a satisfactory explanation for this fact.⁷⁰ A *second* wave, which then irresistibly continued occupying whole mainland Greece, is supposed to spread to Macedonia, Epirus and Hestiaeotis (Thessaly). Arguments for this movement are given partly in earlier, partly in later parts of the book,⁷¹ and partly, since the *"Ethnè et dialectes grecs à l'âge du Bronze"* has not yet been

⁶⁶Sakellariou 1980:162.

⁶⁷Sakellariou 1980:154-60.163.

⁶⁸Sakellariou 1980:106.160.163.

⁶⁹Sakellariou 1980:163. As for Rumania, cf. Harmatta 1975, *supra*.

⁷⁰Sakellariou 1980:163-5.

⁷¹Sakellariou 1980:130-1.153-9.171.

published, in Sakellariou 1970 and 1974. Sakellariou also recalls the fact that the Ionians originated in Hestiaotis, the Arcadians in Macedonia, the Macedonians from the Makednoi in the Lakmos mountain (Pindos range). The cradle of one part of the Dorians was also the Lakmos mountain; the Boeotians, too, descended from the Pindos (more exactly from the Boion mountain), and the Thessalians from Epirus.⁷² Starting at aforementioned centers continuous southward archaeological movements are located during the transition of EB/EH III and MB/MH, and also during MB/MH itself. In an "algorithmic" sequence we can trace the movements from Thessaly down to Messenia without any break, then westwards in Cephallenia and Kea.⁷³ It is notable that the second wave Proto-Greeks sometimes took hold of habitats occupied by first wave Proto-Greeks as is the case of Pefkakia, Thebes, Berbati, Teichos Dymaiôn, and perhaps also Tiryns.⁷⁴

The last main chapter is "Proto-Greeks and Danaans" (*Proto-Grecs et Danaens*", pp. 173-248), consisting of four parts the first of which is devoted to the identity of the Danaans, the second to their localisation, the third to their dating, the fourth to confronting Sakellariou's views to Homeric usage.

A fourteen-page section deals with the state of the question. S. gives a thorough survey of the different interpretations, mainly Semitic and Iranian ones, and rejects them radically. He finds absurd that legends and literary constructions concerning Danaos, Danaé, and the Danaïdes should be treated equal with historical evidence, and he also misses every mention of Avestan and Vedic facts on the part of the adherents to Semitic interpretation, as well as the hydronymic details of IE philology.⁷⁵ He then emphasizes on several points that the last two names cover water divinities worshipped by the Danaans, Danaos himself being an ancient deity.⁷⁶ It is curious that Sakellariou - conforming to his earlier position - does not want, at this point, to see in *Potei-dan* the same root *dan-, meaning 'fluidity', and stands upon a former

⁷²Sakellariou 1980:165.

⁷³Sakellariou 1980:167-70.

⁷⁴Sakellariou 1980:170.

⁷⁵Sakellariou 1980:184. Dexter's interpretation runs parallel with that of Sakellariou, with the difference that the first posits a female deity (Dexter 1990[b]:44-5).

⁷⁶Sakellariou 1980:173.174.177.184.185.

quite opposite etymology of an alleged meaning “earth”.⁷⁷ I refer to what I write above, based on Littleton 1973 and 1982. An important observation is that Homeric usage of “Danaoi” (together with “Achaean” and “Argeioi”) practically invokes the Mycenaean world, while data concerning the arrival of Danaos prove to be speculations of classical and post-classical authors.⁷⁸ Rejecting three of four proposed etymologies for “Danaoi” Sakellariou decides in favor of the Indo-Iranian option already mentioned, with the meaning ‘fluidity’ and the like. Though their origin is common, Vedic and Danaan mythologies have developed in opposite directions: in the former we find elements impeding benefits of waters, which is not the case of the second. He then corrects an opinion of a passage of the Zend-Avesta: it is not the *Dānu* who were defeated by the protector genii of the Iranians but the Iranian warriors implore the genii to help them against the *Dānu*. These Avestic *Dānu*, together with the Danaans, and the *Dnny* of Adana in Kilikia appear to represent three related branches of an Indo-European population, and at the same time the *Dānu* are proven also to have been a historic people.⁷⁹ The next chapter is a grandiose and very impressive attempt, though not fully convincing in all its details, at interpreting the names of Danaos, Danaides, and Danaé (pp. 195-207). Since the IE etymology of the name of the first is sure, Egyptian links must be regarded as secondary. It was easy, Sakellariou maintains, to attach Danaos to the Nile, and so also to Egypt, because the Semitic god Ba’al (in Greek Belos) had passed for the personification of the river and because formerly, Aigyptos served as a name for the Nile. Now, according to the legend, Belos was the father of Danaos, and the brother of Aigyptos. The key notion is, in this case too, water.⁸⁰ The same key notion goes for the Danaides, whatever their real relation with Danaos. The most probable interpretation of the tradition of the Danaides, taking the life of the Aigyptiades included, is the rain- and water-making as known from ethnology. Sakellariou brings modern Greek, Turkish, Hindu and other parallels. The women must have been water nymphs adored by the Danaans, at the same time there must have existed also a *thiasos* of

⁷⁷Sakellariou 1980:185.

⁷⁸Sakellariou 1980:186-8.

⁷⁹Sakellariou 1980:191-2.

⁸⁰Sakellariou 1980:196-7.

women identifying itself in the magic rituals with the group of the nymphs. This must have been reinterpreted later and have given the form we know from mythology. Since there had been relations between the Argolid and Egypt from the Mycenaean times onwards, even the victims killed in the rite, very probably at the shore of lake Lerna, must have been Egyptians brought over for this purpose, as associated to the great river Nile, source of all the waters.⁸¹ Also Danae - etymologically equally a derivative of *dan-* - is interpreted with the help of modern Greek and other folklore parallels. The popular customs cited seem to be of a very ancient origin and it is clear that they transmit the memory of fertility rites. Such customs must have crystallized at an ancient date in the figure of Danae. It is then shown that the Danaë cycle precedes both the installation of the Danaans in the Argolid and their immigration into the Greek peninsula.⁸²

The author may well be right with this tripartite construction. One would however expect more explanations in favor of the real nature of the Egyptian connection. Why did the "water-people" Danaans want to have their vital element from Egypt and not from elsewhere in the north? Had they just passed the crucial 800-year-limit beyond which there is no memory any more?⁸³ Similarly, what S. writes about the Egyptian origin of the jar of the Danaides (p. 201) is not very convincing. (Independent analogous rituals are supposed which happen not to be documented outside Egypt). Or, why - according to one version of the myth - did Aigyptos go from the Argolid to Egypt? Conversely, if Sakellariou had accepted the etymon *dan-* for Poseidon he could reasonably have benefited by it on p. 197 where he depicts the affair of the god with the nymph Amymone.

In the following chapters the names of Akrisios, Proitos, Perseus, Io, Apis, Apemios, Apesas, Mopsos, and Belos are studied (pp. 207-224). As for Belos, his relation with Danaos was

⁸¹Sakellariou 1980:203-4.

⁸²Sakellariou 1980:206-7.

⁸³As regards memory, this is the conclusion, based on ethnological material, of Sakellariou 1990, mentioned earlier in this paper. S. repeated this insight also personally when I met him. It may not have been S.'s intention to have recourse to chronological considerations at this point but I would like to avail myself of his reasoning. He writes: "I find nothing in ancient Greek literature that can be interpreted as the memory of an event earlier than the chronological horizon of 1500 B.C." (1990: 254).

shown earlier to be a secondary one.⁸⁴ All the other names appear to have been in some sort of connection with the Danaans, this being especially important in the case of Akrisios because he passed for the father of Danaë, and of Perseus since he was her son. The names Apis, Apemios, and Apesas are connected to the root **ap-*, another word for “water”, a well known realization of which is Latin *amnis*. According to this, a name like Apidanos would contain twice the semantically similar element in a hierarchical way.⁸⁵ Mopsos (or Moksos) proves to have been an important god of the Danaans: it is shown in tabular form that he was everywhere present where Danaans can be localized.⁸⁶ In the chapter devoted to the localization of the Danaans (pp. 225-245) thirty-seven regions in- and outside Greece are mentioned, some of which are questioned. A few important ones are the following: Pelasgiotis (with literary and other sources referring to Akrisios Perseus, and Dana [=Danaë]); the Spercheios Valley (reference to Akrisios), Attica (once called Mopsopia); the Argolid; Pamphylia (legend of Mopsos); Kilikia (traces of the Danaans and Mopsos). In the Argolid, the Danaans, and all the associated important mythical characters (Danaos, Danaides, Perseus, Akrisios, Proitos, Io, and Apis) are directly attested by the works of Aischylus, Pindar, Pausanias, Plutarchus, and others, as well as by scholiasts. All sources show Pelasgos, king over Argos, as one preceding the arrival of “Danaos and his daughters”. This proves, in Sakellariou’s interpretation, that the Pelasgian period was earlier than the Danaan one.⁸⁷ Cyprus, Syria, Palestine, and Mesopotamia are also mentioned of which only the last one is questioned as to the presence of Danaans. From the chronological viewpoint (pp. 245-6) it is the Mycenaean Age that comes into question for mainland Greece, the 13th c. B.C. for Asia Minor, and 1365 B.C. for Syria. There is also an attempt at absolute chronology for the Argolid: the Parian Marble gives 1510/1509 B.C.⁸⁸ In confronting his conclusions to Homeric usage (pp. 246-7) Sakellariou establishes three categories: negative, positive, and neutral ones. In the positive category we find that the Danaans I, were

⁸⁴Sakellariou 1980:187 ff. 223.

⁸⁵Sakellariou 1980:211 ff. 214-6.

⁸⁶Sakellariou 1980:221-2.

⁸⁷Sakellariou 1980:230-1.

⁸⁸Sakellariou 1980:232.245.

Indo-Europeans, like the Proto-Greeks, 2, during a certain period they lived in the proximity of the Indo-Iranians, like the Proto-Greeks⁸⁹, 3, it seems that they immigrated into Greece towards the end of EB, like the Proto-Greeks⁹⁰, 4, they can be located in many parts of Greece. That the number is not bigger might be due to deficient documentation. One arrives at the logical inference that the available data either correspond to Homer's usage or do not contradict it, and that the Danaans, once a very large population - their presence in Greece is shown by a map on p. 248 - were identical with the Proto-Greeks.⁹¹ Sakellariou's book ends with a systematization and general conclusions, with references to earlier pages for each important insight (pp. 251-262). A parallel systematization of linguistic (L) and archaeological data (A), as well as of data concerning the Danaans (D) gives the following picture of the Proto-Greeks⁹²: their geographical origin is the North Pontic region (all three factors available). The time of the departure of the Proto-Greeks *semel* is mid EH II (2400/2300 B.C) (L and A available). Their route between Ukraine and Greece can be supposed to have led through Rumania and East Balkans towards the Hebros-valley (North-Eastern Greece). Here they turned to the West (A available).⁹³ In their religious domain we find gods and heroes like Danaos, Apemios, Mopsos, etc. (D available). Their immigration took place in two waves. The first one was between EB/EH II and EB/EH III. These must have been small groups each of which acting on its own and taking hold of coastal sites. The second wave Proto-Greeks concentrated first in Epirus, Macedonia and Hestiaeotis. From there they set out in the beginning MB/MH (A available). Their diffusion in Greece is

⁸⁹Sakellariou 1980:190-1.246.

⁹⁰Sakellariou 1980:49-51.71 sqq. 246. There is a parallelism between the relation of later Greeks and Danaans, and that of the Tyrrhenians and Etruscans. It was M. Pallottino who put forward the idea that it is improper to ask about the "origin of the Etruscans" and that one must speak about "Tyrrhenians" outside Italy and "Etruscans" in Italic contexts.

⁹¹Sakellariou 1980:247.

⁹²Since Sakellariou introduced the term "Proto-Greeks *bis*" (v.s.), I should suggest to call the homeland population "Proto-Greeks *semel*".

⁹³Sakellariou 1980:255-6. I remind of Makkay 1992:204 (writing that "genuine Kurgan burials [...] occupied only a segment of northeastern Bulgaria") and of 1992:220 ("The newcomers pushed first into the wide zone between present Albania [...] and Thessaly [...], and the developments of Greek dialects took place inside this southern Balkan area, and after 2100 B.C.").

traced in twenty regions (with a proportion of 15 A to 20, and 17 D to 20). The Proto-Greeks outside Greece are represented by a, the Avestan *Danavo-* (they could have detached at an early date from the main body), b, of the Danaans. The latter can be traced from Troad to Kilikia in numerous regions of Asia Minor, with a few "Danaan facts" in Armenia as well as elsewhere. They, too, could have either have detached from the main body or have passed the Caucasus (D available).⁹⁴

I now turn to Sakellariou's earlier writings, first to get a picture of the unpublished "*Ethnè et dialectes*", and secondly to see his early formulations accepting and applying the Kurgan Theory. The first formulation in Greek (Sakellariou 1970) and the partly revised and expanded English translation (Sakellariou 1974) may be reviewed together. In the first chapter it is shown that Kadmos did not immigrate from Phoenicia but from Epirus, his name being interpreted from *κέκαδμοι* (verb *καίννυμαι*). The English version has also a new contribution: the name of the Phoinikes is assigned to the Mediterranean substratum.⁹⁵ After phenomena of this substratum Sakellariou comes to the Indo-Europeans (Haimones, Pelasgians, and others). The Proto-Greeks are discussed within this framework. In this first formulation the Danaans are ranged among the Proto-Greeks without a detailed argumentation, followed by the section for the Abantes who are thought to have come together with the Danaans, and the main body of the Proto-Greeks.⁹⁶ The author gives prominence to the carefully excavated Lerna settlement which shows a destruction layer dated c. 2100 B.C. The settlement was then reinhabited. Among the findings of the reoccupation layer third phase Kurgan pottery was found. This phase (2300 B.C. and onwards) was exactly the explosive expansion period which spread the culture from the Ukraine towards the Caucasus, Asia Minor, the Balkans, and Central and Northern Europe. The Lerna region, together with the neighboring ones, is connected with the Danaans through myths and in other ways. E.g., the

⁹⁴Sakellariou 1980:261-2. Here I remind of Sakellariou 1991:186 cited above (crossing the Caucasus, in a reversed sense).

⁹⁵Sakellariou 1974:366-7. In his first formulation the Phoinikes (under the heading Kadmeioi) are thought to be Indo-Europeans (Sakellariou 1970:361). There is also a short survey of the problems of Kadmos and the Phoinikes in Sakellariou 1977:124-6.

⁹⁶Sakellariou 1974:371-4, Sakellariou 1970:357-65.

settlement is not far from the Tanaos river. S. thinks that Lerna was destroyed and reinhabited by the Danaans. Then, with some caution, he connects third phase and fourth phase pottery - the latter found in Eutresis (Boiotia) and in Hagia Marina (Phokis) - to a first and a second invasion wave of the Danaans, thought to have come over the Aegean⁹⁷ The main body of the Proto-Greeks - as seen already in Sakellariou 1980 - had settled in southwest Illyria, Epirus, Western Macedonia, and northwestern Thessaly. In order to trace subsequent dispersion Sakellariou avails himself of the basic Greek dialects and of certain links observed among them, thinking that the earliest dialect differences are an indication of the geographical distribution of the tribes. As basic dialects are considered: Ionic-Attic, Arkado-Cypriot, Aiolic, West Greek, and Mycenaean or Achaian. The links are the following: 1. Arkado-Cypriot-Aiolic. This link has led scientists to suppose the existence of an earlier dialect, called Central Greek. Central Greek must have survived until about 1900 B.C. because since that date there was no geographical proximity between their speakers. The Arkadians (whose name is characterized as totemic and therefore very ancient) together with the Proto-Aiolians are localized in Western Macedonia to the north of the Khasia mountain (at the bend and the upper reaches of the Haliakmon river).⁹⁸ 2. Ionic-Attic-Arkado-Cypriot. This admits of a satisfactory interpretation if assumed that they had a common border also until about 1900 B.C. The Ionians are localized east of Pindos and south of the Khasia mountain, in Northwest Thessaly (there is also a river with the name Ion).⁹⁹ 3. Arkado-Cypriot-West Greek. It is impossible that Western tribes would have influenced Arkadian in the later home of the latter because the colonization of Cyprus had just ended when Western tribes were settling in the Peloponnesos. Contacts must have existed, too, until 1900 B.C., when Western tribes lived in Epirus, Southwest Illyria and Western Macedonia, i.e. in the western neighborhood of the Ionians.¹⁰⁰ 4. Aiolic-West Greek. There are few common features and the contacts do not date

⁹⁷Sakellariou 1974:372, Sakellariou 1970:362-3.

⁹⁸Sakellariou 1974:373-4,375, Sakellariou 1970:364-5. See also the language diagram showing splitting up into dialects (Sakellariou 1974:383, Sakellariou 1970:373).

⁹⁹Sakellariou 1974:374-5, Sakellariou 1970:364-5.

¹⁰⁰Sakellariou 1974:374-5, Sakellariou 1970:364-5.

necessarily from before 1900 B.C. because the dialects had common borders even after this date. I should like to add to this construction that Sakellariou's picture is, even in his first sketchy account, much more detailed than Chadwick's hypothesis cited below.

The events between 1900 and 1150 B.C. are first only hinted at. At the transition from Early to Middle Bronze Age, one section of the main body of Proto-Greeks occupied Thessaly (there is a sharp break in the culture around 1900 B.C.). Another group moved down the Pindos range and Epirus-Aitolia, a third one occupied the territories abandoned by the emigrants. The Danaans in the Argolid retained their independence up to the beginning of the Late Bronze Age. The Proto-Greeks progressively split up into new dialect groups and smaller tribes. Thirty-two Greek tribes of the Mycenaean Age are known.¹⁰¹ Within this frame Sakellariou gives an indication of the formation of the historical Greek people, though - unlike Chadwick - he does not write about what could be called a 'linguistic genesis'. We have this formulation: "The interchange of influences between the Proto-Greeks and the earlier population led to cultural proximity; in some cases, the Proto-Greeks completely absorbed the earlier inhabitants; in other cases, new combinations were formed out of the mingling of exclusively Proto-Greek elements".¹⁰² In the concluding sections a more or less detailed survey of the main tribes mentioned are given. The most important points may be the following: the Ionians worshipped rivers and their name came from **isawones* (root **is-*). Upon leaving Northwest Thessaly (with a small group left there) their dialect could have been closer to common Greek than to later Ionic-Attic. They were moving southwards and reached as far as Triphylia in the Peloponnesos. A map shows the known and the probable settlements of the Ionians after 1900 B.C.¹⁰³ The Arkadians and

¹⁰¹These are: Abantes, Achaians, Ainianes, Aioliens, Aithikes, Aitolians, Arkadians, Arktanes, Athamanians, Boiotians, Dolopes, Dorians, Epeians, Graioi, Hellenes, Ionians, Kephallenians, Kouretes, Lapiths, Lokrians, Macedonians, Magnetes, Minyans, Molossians, Myrmidons, Per(rh)aibians, Phlegyans, Phokians, Phthians, Pierians, Thesprotians, Thessalians. (Sakellariou 1974:374-5, Sakellariou 1970:365-6).

¹⁰²Sakellariou 1974:375, Sakellariou 1970:366.

¹⁰³Sakellariou 1974:375-6, Sakellariou 1970:366-7. An important early contribution to the Ionian question is Sakellariou 1956 which deals also with the Achaeans. This study adopts Carnoy's etymon for the name of the Ionians

Arktanes are supposed to have been the same tribe: the latter were those, together with some other Arkadians, who did not reach the Peloponnesos. The two tribes spoke one or two variants of Central Greek, the common ancestor of Arkado-Cyprian and Achaian-Aiolic. The Arkadians reached the two southernmost Peloponnesian promontories. A map shows their starting point, areas not precisely located with their remnants, their known settlements and maximal distribution.¹⁰⁴ The dialect of the Proto-Aiolians evolved from the northeast variant of Central Greek. The birthplace of the historical Aiolians must have been Thessaly because in historical times the inhabitants of Pelasgiotis (eastern Thessaly) spoke a dialect which was intermediate between Aiolic and Thessalian spoken in Thessaliotis (southwestern Thessaly), and because the Mycenaean dialect has several features in common with Aiolic. This is explained by the fact that the Achaians, bearers of Mycenaean Greek, had emigrated from southern Thessaly to the Peloponnesos and to Crete.¹⁰⁵ The Achaioi are shown as one tribe of the Achaeans. In the Homeric usage the first denotes the Greeks as a whole except for three instances where the name is attributed to three particular tribes each, in the Achaian Phthiotis, in the Argolid, and in Messenia. S. confines himself to discussing the Achaians of the Mycenaean Age. These are generally supposed to have been the ancestors of the Arkadians and of the Cypriots. He does not agree with this opinion for the following reasons: unlike many other regions, Arkadia has no legends about the Achaians. (This is significant because the Arkadians of historical times were the descendants of ethnic groups who inhabited the country before the end of the Mycenaean Age). A passage in Herodotus (IX. 26) tells us that the inhabitants of Tegea differentiated themselves from the Achaians. Nor could it be demonstrated that the ethnic Achaioi on a Cypriot inscription applies to the Cypriots as a whole. Having enumerated several dialectal features of Mycenaean he concludes that this is a separate dialect with certain hierarchic correspondences to other dialects. The connections between Mycenaean and Arkado-Cypriot should be located in the Peloponnesos and be later than those between

and proposes to see in the later outcome of the name *Isawones*, i.e. Ion, not only a river deity but also a healing god.

¹⁰⁴Sakellariou 1974:377-8, Sakellariou 1970:367-8.

¹⁰⁵Sakellariou 1974:377, Sakellariou 1970:368-9.

Mycenaean and Aiolic, which must be placed in Thessaly. (It is known from elsewhere that the Achaians to whom Mycenaean dialect is attributed, came down to the Peloponnesos from Thessaly.) From the connections between Central Greek, Aiolic, and Mycenaean he infers that the latter was an offshoot of Aiolic through which it inherited the characteristics of Central Greek. Then he proceeds to some details of the cult of the Achaians depicting Achilles, Agarnemnon, Pelops, and others as having been deities. According to a hypothesis already mentioned, Sakellariou thinks that one or two Proto-Greek tribes speaking a Pre-Aiolic variant of Central Greek arrived c. 1900 B.C. in southern Thessaly and subdued the resident Pre-Greek Proto-Achaian population. The newcomers absorbed the Proto-Achaians, took their name and at least two of their cults. It was this population that, around 1600 B.C., moved southwards as far as northwest Peloponnesos. Archaeology and legends prove that they peacefully occupied the Argolid (cf. marriages of Achaian leaders with the "daughters of Danaos"). The language of the Knossos tablets tells us, S. argues, that the Achaians who captured Minos' capital came from the Argolid and that they migrated to Crete some time before the first decades of the 14th century B.C., at about the same period when the first Achaian settlements appeared on Rhodes and in Miletos. A map shows the Aiolian-speaking tribes, and how the Central dialect of Proto-Greek was evolved and developed into Aiolic.¹⁰⁶ The next section has the Lapiths originating from West Thessaly and Mount Pindos where they had contacts with Epirus. In the mid Mycenaean Age we find them spread towards Hestiaiotis and Perrhaibia, then they reached also Attica, and further down Laconia, and perhaps Triphylyia.¹⁰⁷ After surveying several minor tribes (Phlegyans, Minyans, Per[rh]aibians, possible other Aiolians [among them the Hellenes], Athamanians, Boiotians, Thessalians, Lokrians, Phokians, Aitolians, Kephallenians of which perhaps the Boiotians and the Thessalians should be emphasized¹⁰⁸), the

¹⁰⁶Sakellariou 1974:378-82.383, Sakellariou 1970:369-72.373. The English version of this section is to a considerable extent revised. It has, among others, a detailed examination of similarities between Mycenaean and other dialects. The problems of the Achaeans and the Arcadians are discussed again in a recent paper: Sakellariou 1988.

¹⁰⁷Sakellariou 1974:382-4, Sakellariou 1970:372-4.

¹⁰⁸Sakellariou 1974:386, Sakellariou 1970:376-7. The Boiotians derived from

author comes to the Dorians. From legends found in Herodotus, Pindar and others which say that the ancestors of the Dorians were the Makednoi (Macedonians) as well as other data, he infers that their name came from that of the region Doris (the eastern neighbor of Phokis) and that they formed themselves into a new tribe by the union with local inhabitants. They must have arrived in Doris before the end of the Mycenaean Age. That the Iliad ignores the Dorians is due to the fact that Homer ignores the central part of the region which is called today Sterea Hellas. During the mid 13th c. B.C. the Dorians settled in the Boiotian town Homole. The Dorian invasion to the Peloponnesos came along with that of the Aitolians in the same direction. A map shows the Makednoi coming from Mt. Lakmos to Doris, together with other tribes of Central Greece during the 14th and 13th c. B.C.¹⁰⁹ The last section deals with the Molossians, the Thesprotians, and the Macedonians. The first advanced towards Attica, Sicyonia, and Arkadia. We can find the name Mounychia in Attica. Mounychos, king of the Molossians, has the same name as the eponymous hero of Mounychia, being a companion of Theseus. The main body of the Macedonians and the Molossians which remained north and northwest of Thessaly were to emerge on the historical scene only after the end of the Bronze Age. The Thesprotians held the Epeirot coast, spread as far as western Macedonia and had a common frontier with the Bryges who lived there. A map shows the Greek tribes at the end of the 13th c. B.C.¹¹⁰ It may be noted that Sakellariou 1974 and 1970 have much better maps than his two books reviewed earlier.

As for the linguistic documentation in Sakellariou's work, I would remark that there are some minor inaccuracies and mistakes of the kind any linguist would very probably make if he dealt in depth with archaeological problems. It is not very important e.g. if S. puts *-ās as IE plural acc. instead of *-eās-ns.¹¹¹ More problematic is what he writes about the quantity of

the Boion mountain in the Pindos range. They had abandoned this region at the same time as Proto-Aiolians moved to Thessaly. The dialect is half Aiolic, half Western. From 1900 B.C. onwards the Thessalians lived somewhere between Thessaly and Epirus, close to the Boiotians. A legend mentions that the Thessalians had been the neighbors of the Thesprotians at an earlier date.

¹⁰⁹Sakellariou 1974:386-8, Sakellariou 1970:375.378-9.

¹¹⁰Sakellariou 1974:388-9, Sakellariou 1970.377.379.

¹¹¹Sakellariou 1980:61.

the root vowel of “*dan-*”. The long “Aryan” vowels are alleged to be less long than the Greek long ones. This would mean that the “difference between long Indo-Iranian *a* vowel (being «short») and that of Greek short one is not decisive”.¹¹² This is certainly a very unhappy wording. It is regrettable when phonemic and phonetic statements risk being confused. (S. writes about “*point de vue phonétique*”). I have checked all three authors he cites: none of them states anything like this. Usener and Focke write clearly that a shortening had occurred in Sanskrit already. (It is without clear context when S. writes *ibidem* that the roots “*dan-* and “*-dan-* have short *a* in Sanskrit *dānu*.) Perhaps Kretschmer’s linguistic explanation has been misinterpreted. Yet Sakellariou himself posits this change earlier, though without any comment: “véd. *dānu* (> ind. *dānu*)”.¹¹³ The Dictionary by Walde-Pokorny, which also Focke - one of Sakellariou’s sources - refers to, has only the root **dā-* and **dē-* without explaining either the quantity or the o-vocalism of “Don” (or the quantity of its o-vocalism).¹¹⁴ But since there is an initial *dā-na* for Sanskrit, isn’t it possible that the root had had a final laryngial originally? The Greek word *δημός* (‘fat’, ‘fodder’, ‘nourishment for beasts’) could possibly be attached to “*dan-*”.¹¹⁵ Then, being analyzed further as **dā-m-*, it would remind of **dā-n-*. Nevertheless, I think that the most plausible explanation is given by W. P. Schmid. He interprets the difference in quantity between *dānu* and *Δαναοί* with quantitative ablaut relations, **danos* being the outcome of the zero grade (*Schwundstufe*). He also brings the forms with -o- with those with -u- together: *dan/dun-* as in Latvian *daņava, duņava* /‘pool, puddle’/. The vowel gradation has then several parallels: e.g. *nox - vύξ*, also *calix - κύλιξ*, Lithuanian *nāgas* /‘nail’/ - *ōvυξ*, etc. It is clear, he writes, that the *Δαναοί* must have had their homeland in the region which had the zero grade form *dan-*, not that of *dā-nu*. Then he proceeds to the conclusion that the later Greeks must have lived west of the Indo-Iranians, in the North-Pontic region.¹¹⁶ Usener’s and

¹¹²Sakellariou 1980:190.

¹¹³Sakellariou 1980:175

¹¹⁴Walde-Pokorny I, 1973:763. For the quantity (“length”) from the phonemic viewpoint, cf. Lass who thinks that “The specification of length is unsettled and difficult” (1988:91-2[5.3.10]).

¹¹⁵Cf. Littleton 1973:435.

¹¹⁶Schmid 1983:408-11. Sakellariou (1980) drew exactly the same conclusion:

Focke's remarks, however, could have been enough for the purposes of Sakellariou. As to the quantity, for a more precise explanation of the Sanskrit and Greek phonological realities he could have consulted the two classic works by W. S. Allen.¹¹⁷ One has sometimes the feeling that he is overzealous with his solutions. It is surprising how aptly he managed to give an IE interpretation to "*Σαπυελατων*", instead of a Semitic one that seemed to be very probable. I am not convinced that all Semitic elements must be kept away from Greek soil. The interpretation in question gives the impression of a *petitio principii*.¹¹⁸ Further, it is not clear what S. means by comparing Danaan to Pelasgian. Should Pelasgian be an "innovator" language? I think that it is misleading to label this language - even if in a restricted sense - innovator because of the sound-shift AMTA it has. According to what the "pelasgisants" claim, attaching this language to Hittite regarding both very archaic languages, the case could be the opposite one.¹¹⁹ For a detailed evaluation of Sakellariou 1980 from the linguistic viewpoint I refer to the long review article by G. Magoulas (*Μαγουλάς* 1982).

Sakellariou has undertaken one of the most difficult tasks of IE prehistory. So his work is certainly challenging. What I find amazing in his work, even in absence of the "*Ethnè et dialects*" - is that he gives archaeological movements together with other related events in a continuous rendering from the beginnings in the early homeland until the "end" in historical times. A rendering, despite several problematic points, very persuasive on the whole. But since Sakellariou has announced a four-part synthesis (of which we have only Sakellariou 1977 and

67-8.253. Should we reckon also with a couple *Danos and *Danu? The latter is posited "arbitrarily" - as for the ending under Indic influence? (Danu being a serpent-goddess in India) - in Dexter (1990b:42). Or with *Danos and *Dana? The name *Dana* is attested epigraphically from Larissa (Pelasgiotis, IG IX, 2, 581) identified by Sakellariou (1980:226) with Danaë (cited supra, localization of the Danaans).

¹¹⁷Allen 1953:85-93, Allen 1987 (Second edition: 1974):62-3. The same unfortunate wording is to be corrected in Sakellariou 1991:185 ("but Indo-Iranian long vowels are not as long as those in Greek").

¹¹⁸He writes: "*Σαπυσελατών* désignerait donc une montagne couverte d'arbres d'une espèce qualifiée de *σαπυσέλατον", referring, among others, to Anglo-Saxon *soeppe* and Latin *sappinus* (Sakellariou 1980:183[2]).

¹¹⁹Sakellariou 1980:224. Cf. *Μαγουλάς* (1982:182) for certain problems of "innovations" (*νεωτερισμοί*) in general. For the "pelasgisants" cf. Sakellariou 1977:9.42.57-67.321, etc. Among them is also J. Harmatta, labelled by Sakellariou a "pelasgisant proprement dit."

1980), no final assessment can be given. I would like to observe provisionally that for the sake of clarity it may be preferable to abandon explicit references to the Kurgan Theory in connexion with the Proto-Greeks. This does not necessarily mean that the theory should be rejected,¹²⁰ but rather that it would be desirable to bypass the superfluous arguments around the pros and cons of the theory, removing the basis for comments like this: "the theory of M. Gimbutas [...] is a popular fallacy in archaeology"¹²¹, and to study rather the *continuity* - a term used by Sakellariou himself as he explained his views to me - in prehistoric movements which can be linked to the later Greeks, and *discontinuity*. I note at this point that the term *continuum* is a very important concept both in IE and Greek linguistics, and in archaeology. Makkay 1992, always rejecting the Kurgan Theory, writes this: "Distribution maps of *genuine* Kurgan burials clearly show that their spread never exceeded the river Tisza in the central Hungarian Plain and occupied only a segment of Northeastern Bulgaria south of the Lower Danube".¹²² The discrepancies between Makkay 1991 and 1992 as well as the arguments of others, encourage the thought that my suggestion is reasonable and would avoid exposing the Kurgan Theory to such summary rejection. Sakellariou does not - by the way - identify the bearers of the Kurgan Culture with the Indo-Europeans which would be a simplification of his views: he states that only a part of them developed this culture.¹²³ At the time of Sakellariou's first

¹²⁰Cf. D. W. Anthony citing Gimbutas who "in her latest formulations [...] has begun to use the term 'Kurgan tradition' rather than 'Kurgan culture'". Then he suggests "to disassemble the 'Kurgan culture' and reassemble its archaeological constituents in a new framework" (Anthony 1986:292).

¹²¹Makkay 1991:275(114). On p.144, he writes this: "the archaeological evidence for supporting Kurgan Theory is partly imaginary, partly unacceptable".

¹²²Makkay 1992:204 (**italics mine**) I wonder what is meant there by "genuine". Cf. also Makkay 1992:210. M. 1992:219 concedes the "pressure" of the Kurgan population: the bearers of "Proto-Greek dialects moved south [...] under the pressure of Kurgan expansions". In a negativistic effusion, Makkay 1991:145, too, misses "genuine Kurgans" in Greece.

¹²³Cf. Sakellariou (1980:26): "*la culture des 'kourganes' n'est pas le fait [...] de tous les Indo-Européens*", also Sakellariou 1977:312 ff. The classic opinion that Kurgan traits were brought by invaders from the Pontic region, and that the newcomers were the people who introduced IE dialects into Europe can be read e.g. in Bray - Trump (1982:135). Littleton (1982:28-31) gives a similar résumé, then, as a *Note to the Second Edition* he adds, among others, that "dates

formulation, J. Harmatta expressed some critical thoughts on this theory. He argues that the Kurgan Theory does not take account of the fact that Western and Eastern IE languages do not have common agricultural terminology. Owing to the difference in terminology, their parting of the ways must have occurred before agriculture made its entry in history. But the Kurgan populations knew both agriculture and stock-breeding. Consequently these populations can be connected to only one part of the Indo-Europeans. Considering the continuity in the evolution of the burial customs on the steppes, these populations can only be either the Indo-Iranians or the Iranians. Then he remarks that the term "Kurgan Culture" is misleading, too, giving the impression that all tumuli are also kurgans which is not the case.¹²⁴ These remarks are constructive and should be correct; they neither contradict Sakellariou's theory nor necessitate strictly rejecting all views on the Kurgans. In this context, it does not then seem probable that the position about "the central place of Proto-Greek and Indo-Iranian within the IE domain"¹²⁵ is acceptable. One should speak of *one* of the IE centers. And it must have been a *recent* center for IE conditions.

As for the immigration of the later Greeks, considering the facts on a mentalistic basis¹²⁶ it is impossible that some sort of

[...] must all be revised sharply upward" (1982:31).

¹²⁴Harmatta 1977:167-8. Compare with this what Sakellariou writes: "*on dispose d'autres données impliquant à la fois que les createurs de la civilisation des -kourganes- descendent d'elements ayant vécu à l'ouest des steppes eurasiatiques et que l'unité des Indo-Européens sur le plan linguistique date d'avant cette civilisation*" (Sakellariou 1977:313, underlining mine). Also Sakellariou 1977:315. Makkay accepts the thesis with some reservations for a different terminology as regards stock-breeding (1991:170).

¹²⁵Sakellariou 1980: 68.254. S. adopts the position of W. Porzig, R. A. Crossland, T. Burrow, A. Birchall, and others.

¹²⁶Since this paper pleads for interdisciplinarity I presume to have recourse to this important *linguistic* principle. Mentalism is a scientific behavior in which linguistics takes a vivid interest, and first of all in America as a counter-reaction to Bloomfield's taxonomic doctrine. As opposed to objectivism, there open two possible ways of approaching a scientific problem. Mentalism is preferred in today's scholarship. Cf. Μπαμπινιώτης 1986:17-8 with further literature on pp. 208.254.258.262.280. He emphasizes that theory can predict certain circumstances which in a given moment cannot be proven by facts. He draws attention e.g. to E. A. Esper's book '*Mentalism and Objectivism in Linguistics*', New York, 1968. Cf. also Lass 1988 on 'psychological reality', though L. is more opposed to mentalism than in favor of it: pp. 9f.103f.191.212f.214ff. Personally, I do not detect any contradiction between

continuity should not exist. Therefore, when Makkay rejects both Kurgan Theory as such and adopting it as a possible aid in investigating Greek prehistory, his criticism is not constructive and contradicts his own thesis authorizing "long-lasting cultural frontiers" in another archaeological context, i.e. the continuum of the Linear Pottery People whom he regards as being Indo-Europeans immediately before their final disintegration.¹²⁷ I find a contradiction between adopting the immigration route of the later Greeks and excluding archaeological traces, and also, as regards the arriving route, between Makkay 1991 and 1992.¹²⁸ Further, considering the extremely rich heritage as seen in the Greek mythology and epic poetry, and also shown by IE mythology in general (depicted graphically by M. Robbins Dexter e.g.), one may not suppose that just one "gang" of a "few conquerors" (with or without "traces") should be reckoned with as e.g. Meillet put it earlier.¹²⁹ A small group is not likely to be the bearer of this very rich spiritual material. One should bear in mind a much more spacious presence and a much more comprehensive "conquest". One has the impression that the "immigrants" knew very well where they were going to and why, and that they arrived in due course. There is however a strange contradiction between the very rich spiritual heritage and the poor archaeological material of the immigrants Sakellariou emphasizes several times.¹³⁰ This needs further investigation. I should suppose that the conquest - and IE expansion in general - must have had, at least in several cases, strong "ideological" motives.¹³¹ It is also clear that the "newcomers" had to

these two approaches and think that each evidence available must be worked up (objectivism), under the constant supervision of theory (mentalism). Sakellariou expresses himself in a very similar way when he writes - under the heading "Methodological questions" - about "*procédés pluridisciplinaires*" and "*pluridisciplinarité*" (1980:56-7).

¹²⁷Makkay 1992:194.

¹²⁸These positions are cited above. One would welcome a comment in Makkay 1992 on a possible change in his position but this does not happen.

¹²⁹"*Le peuple hellénique, pour lui donner le nom sous lequel il est maintenant connu, a été l'un de ces groupes de chefs conquérants* (underlining mine) *qui ont introduit sur de nouveaux territoires l'un des parlers indo-européens*" (Meillet 1975:11).

¹³⁰E.g. Sakellariou 1980:89.

¹³¹Littleton writes (citing "Lipton's speculation"): "that «they [the Indo-Europeans] would pile their goods in ponderous ox carts, burn their huts, and set out on long treks into unknown territory» seems to be close to the truth" (1982: 26-27). In this "speculation" perhaps only the "into unknown territory" might be questioned.

“conquer” huge areas, relatively densely populated by inhabitants with an advanced civilization. With a paraphrase of Sakellariou’s thesis I would dare to ask - though I have no hard evidence at my disposal -, if we should reckon with the presence of the later Greeks - and many other IE populations¹³² - in the Balkans somehow in the sense Chadwick does this with the Dorians. He rejects Kretschmer’s thesis about the “third (Dorian) invasion” and thinks that the latter were throughout present in Mycenaean Greece.¹³³ Sakellariou himself posits intensive cultural and economic exchanges in the north of the Balkans during the Neolithic Period, before IE invasion.¹³⁴ It is clear from linguistic and archaeological contexts that the indo-europeanization of Greece and of the Appenine peninsula were two parallel processes. I should like to draw attention to a term M. Pallottino uses in many of his writings, with various degrees of emphasis. One classic formulation of his is this: “Scholars even went so far as to deny or minimize the invasions, and attributed the establishment of Indo-European languages to the *infiltration* of small groups or to political or commercial contacts, without a change in population in the full sense. These notions were expressed by Patroni’s term ‘linguistic ferments’”.¹³⁵ It seems to me that some sort of infiltration should be borne in mind both in the case of the prehistoric movements as well as the “arrival” of the Proto-Greeks, and of the other directions of IE expansion. As for methodology and fruitfulness or not of cooperation between archaeology and linguistics, I remind that Chadwick wrote as early as 1967 (reviewing S. Hood’s book *The Home of the Heroes: the Aegean before the Greeks*, London, Thames and Hudson, 1967), under the provocative title “Greekless Archaeology”, that the invaders were not Greeks but they spoke an IE language “which as a result of mixing with an earlier unknown language emerged as

¹³²Makkay identifies e.g. the Proto-Slavs with the bearers of the Cucuteni-Tripolde Culture (cf. Harmatta 1975 on Transsylvanian Culture, *supra*), and localizes the Proto-Thracians as the bearers of the Kőrös-Starčevo Culture. As for the latter, we are not informed how they came down to their home known from history (Makkay 1991:257).

¹³³Chadwick 1976:117. Littleton (1982:31) posits similarly “several distinct «Indo-European» communities in the Balkans and elsewhere”.

¹³⁴Sakellariou 1977:319

¹³⁵Pallottino 1975:40 (italics are mine). The term “*infiltrés*” - speaking about Indo-Europeans - is used, in a restricted sense, also by Sakellariou (1977:312 and 319, and 1991:186).

Greek".¹³⁶ This article is, in a near-explicit way, also a plea for interdisciplinarity. Eight years later Chadwick repeated his thesis: "the Greek language arose through the mixture of a group of Indo-European speakers with an earlier population, and this group penetrated Greece at some time during the Middle Helladic or Early Helladic III period".¹³⁷ On the other hand, Makkay has an important detail that he does not develop properly. He localizes an archaeological migratory movement in the Great Hungarian Plain (the eastern part of the Carpathian Basin), turning slowly to the south, that of the late bearers of the Linear Pottery - doubtless Indo-Europeans - whom he observes even cross the Danube near Belgrade approximately in the mid 3rd millenium B.C., then he abandons them stating that no more evidence exists.¹³⁸ This movement, again, reminds of the "second descendance" in Sakellariou's work. The three-quarters-of-a-whole solution put together from Makkay 1991 and 1992 would perhaps throw some light also on the fact why and how the Proto-Greeks, coming down the Balkans, turned to the west as described above in the final systematization of Sakellariou 1980.

It seems to be much more constructive to adopt interdisciplinarity again - in this case between mentalism and objectivism - than to subordinate attempts at explaining the "arrival" of the Proto-Greeks to the acceptance of the Kurgan Theory or to its rejection. The movements of the Linear Pottery

¹³⁶Chadwick 1967:274. Sakellariou (1974:382), too, recognizes a peaceful mixture of populations in the Argolid, that of the Mycenaean Achaians on their way down to the Peloponnesos and of the Danaans. He points out that there are no archaeological signs of violent clashes in the Argolid during the Mycenaean period. This mixture is (linguistically) different from that in Chadwick's construction because according to Sakellariou it took place between two related dialects and peoples.

¹³⁷Chadwick 1975:819. - Subsequently he becomes fully explicit as to interdisciplinarity: "Wenn wir im Verständnis der Frühzeit Fortschritte machen wollen, so müssen wir die verderbliche Gewohnheit (underlining mine) aufgeben. Linguisten und Archäologen in getrennte Abteilungen zu sperren. [...] Ich glaube, daß wir heute am Beginn einer neuen Epoche der Zusammenarbeit zwischen den Disziplinen stehen" (Chadwick 1977:198). The same thesis concerning the Greek language has been repeated here, too: "Es ist [...] eine berechtigte Annahme, daß sich die griechische Sprache erst nach dem Einbruch eines indogermanischen Volkes in den südlichen Balkan am Ende des 3. Jahrtausends v. Chr. entwickelte" (Chadwick 1977:189).

¹³⁸Makkay 1991:243. Also Makkay 1992:208 (without a negativistic attachment). See also fn. 8 supra.

people and the "second descendance", put in their proper archaeological and linguistic context, could perhaps help find continuity.

This survey is far from being a general synopsis of the full scope of Sakellariou's scientific activity. Nor could his writings on migrations of the historical Greek populations be analyzed here properly (there are several other papers besides Sakellariou 1970 and 1974), not to speak of his early papers on Modern Greek history. Here I have limited myself to an attempt at presenting Michael B. Sakellariou as a relatively rare kind of scholar working on an interdisciplinary basis, producing challenging contributions, synthesizing research in the fields of Greek history, archaeology, and Indo-European antiquity.

References

Allen, Sidney W.

- 1953 *Phonetics in Ancient India A guide to the appreciation of the earliest phoneticians* London: Oxford University Press (Reprinted: 1961,1965)
- 1987 *vox Graeca A guide to the pronunciation of classical Greek* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (First published: 1968, Second edition: 1974)

Anthony, David W.

- 1986 The "Kurgan Culture", Indo-European Origins, and the Domestication of the Horse: a Reconstruction [with Comments and Reply] *Current Anthropology* 27: 291-313

Bray, Warwick - Trump, David

- 1982 *The Penguin Dictionary of Archaeology* London: Penguin Books (First published: 1970)

Chadwick, John

- 1967 Greekless Archaeology *Antiquity* 41: 271-5
- 1975 The Prehistory of the Greek Language *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Volume II, Part 2. Pp. 805-19
- 1976 Who were the Dorians? *La Parola del Passato* 31:103-17
- 1977 Der Beitrag der Sprachwissenschaft zur Rekonstruktion der griechischen Frühgeschichte *Anzeiger der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 113, Nr. 7:183-98

Dexter, Miriam Robbins

- 1980 The Assimilation of Pre-Indo-European Goddesses into Indo-European Society *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 8: 19-29
- 1990a The Hippomorphic Goddess and her Offspring *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 18: 285-307.
- 1990b *Whence the Goddesses A Source Book* New York and London: Columbia University, Teachers College Press

Harmatta, János

- 1975 The Prehistory of the Greek Language *Annales Universitatis Budapestinensis De Rolando Eötvös Nominatae Sectio Classica* 3:3-10.

The Journal of Indo-European Studies

- 1977 Irániak és finnugorok, irániak és magyarok / 'Iranians and Finno-Ugrians, Iranians and Hungarians' / in: A. Bartha et al. (eds.), *Magyar Őstörténeti Tanulmányok / 'Studies in Hungarian Prehistory' /*. Pp. 167-82. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Lass, Roger
1988 *Phonology An Introduction to Basic Concepts* Cambridge - New York, etc., C.U.P. (1984)
- Lehmann, Winfred P.
1992 *Die gegenwärtige Richtung der indogermanischen Forschung* Archaeolingua Series Minor 2. Budapest: Archaeological Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences - Innsbruck: Linguistic Institute of the University of Innsbruck.
- Littleton, C. Scott
1973 Poseidon as a reflex of the Indo-European 'Source of Waters' God *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 1: 423-40
1982 *The New Comparative Mythology An Anthropological Assessment of the Theories of George Dumézil*, Berkeley - Los Angeles - London: University of California Press (©1966, 1973, Third Edition: 1982)
- Μαγουλάς, Γ.
1982 ΠΡΩΤΟΕΛΛΗΝΕΣ. Τὸ πρόβλημα τῆς καταγωγῆς τῶν Πρωτοελλήνων - *Glossologia* 1: 173-83
- Makkay, János
1991 *Az indoeurópai népek őstörténete* ['The Prehistory of the Indo-Europeans' / Budapest: Gondolat
1992 A Neolithic Model of Indo-European Prehistory, *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 20: 193-238
1998 *Az indoeurópai nyelvek őstörténete / 'The Prehistory of the Peoples Speaking Indo-European Dialects' /* Budapest: © and Publication by the Author.
- Meillet, Antoine
1975 *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque* 8e édition Avec bibliographie mise au jour et complétée par Olivier Masson Paris: Klincksieck.
- Μπαμπινιώτης, Γεώργιος
1986³ Θεωρητική Γλωσσολογία Εισαγωγή στην Σύγχρονη Γλωσσολογία, Αθήνα: ΓΡΑΦΙΚΕΣ ΤΕΧΝΕΣ Α. ΜΑΥΡΟΜΜΑΤΗ (©1980)
- Pallottino, Massimo
1975 *The Etruscans* Revised and Enlarged Translated by J. Cremona Edited by D. Ridgway, Bloomington & London: Indiana University Press.
- Porzig, Walter
1954 *Die Gliederung des indogermanischen Sprachgebiets*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter
- Sakellariou, Michael B.
1956 ΙΑΦΩΝ, dieu fluvial et éponyme des Iones. In: *Mélanges offerts à Octave et Melpo Merlier II*, Pp. 311-22. Eds. C. Dimaras et al. Athènes: Institut Français d'Athènes
1970 ΟΙ ΓΑΩΣΣΙΚΕΣ ΚΑΙ ΕΘΝΙΚΕΣ ΟΜΑΔΕΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ

- ΠΡΟΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΣ In: *ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΥ ΕΘΝΟΥΣ* τ.1. Pp. 356-79. Διευθυντής Έκδόσεως: Γ. Α. Χριστόπουλος. Ἀθήναι: Ἐκδοτικὴ Ἀθηνῶν.
- 1974 Linguistic and Ethnic Groups in Prehistoric Greece. In: *History of the Hellenic World I*. Editor-in-Chief G. A. Christopoulos. Pp. 364-89. Athens: Ekdotike Athenon.
- 1977 *Le Peuplement de la Grèce et du Bassin Égéen aux Hautes Époques I Peuples Préhelléniques d'origine Indo-Européenne* Athènes: Ekdotikè Athenon.
- 1980 *Le Peuplement de la Grèce et du Bassin Égéen aux Hautes Époques III Les Proto-Grecs* Athènes: Ekdotikè Athenon.
- 1986 Who Were the Immigrants? In: *The End of the Early Bronze Age in the Aegean*. Ed. Gerald Cadogan. Pp. 125-37. Cincinnati Classical Studies. New Series Vol. 6. - Leiden: Brill.
- 1988 Achéens et Arcadiens. In: *The History of the Greek Language in Cyprus*. Proceedings of an International Symposium Sponsored by the Pierides Foundation. Larnaca, Cyprus, 8-13 September 1986. Eds. Jacqueline Karageorghis & Olivier Masson. Pp. 9-17. Nicosia: Zavallis
- 1989a De l'ocre dans la Tombe Γ du Cercle B de Mycènes. In: *ΦΙΛΙΑ ΕΙΠΗ ΕΙΣ Γ. Ε. ΜΥΛΩΝΑΝ, Τόμος Γ'*. Ed. Κ. Γ. Μπόνης. Pp. 15-8. Ἀθήνα: Βιβλιοθήκη της εν Ἀθῆναις Αρχαιολογικῆς Ἐταιρείας Αριθ. 103.
- 1989b Η καταγωγή των Ινδοευρωπαϊών. Κριτική Νέων Θεωριών. In: *Μουσείο Κυκλαδικῆς Τέχνης, Διαλέξεις 1986-1989*. Pp. 135-42. Ἀθήνα: Ἴδρυμα Νικολάου Π. Γουλανδρή.
- 1990 *Between Memory and Oblivion The Transmission of Early Greek Historical Traditions* Athens: Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity - Paris: Diffusion de Boccard.
- 1991 Recent Theories on the Origin of the Indo-Europeans in the Light of Data Concerning the Proto-Greeks. *Acta Associationis Internationalis (Serdicae), Terra Antiqua Balcanica* 6:180-86.
- Schmid, Wolfgang P.
1983 Griechen und Alteuropa im Blickfeld des Sprachhistorikers Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς τῆς Φιλοσοφικῆς Σχολῆς τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης 21: 395-412
- Schwyzler, Eduard
1953 *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik* von Eduard Schwyzler Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, Zweite Abteilung. Erster Teil. Erster Band München: Beck MCMXXXIX /1939/, Zweite, unveränderte Auflage: MCMLIII /1953/, (Berichtigungen und Nachträge: pp. 819-44)
- Walde, Alois - Pokorny, Julius
1973 *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen* Berlin und Leipzig, I. Band: 1930, II. Band: 1927, In. Band:1932, IV+269 (Register. Bearbeitet von K. Reichardt (Berlin-Leipzig: De Gruyter, Nachdruck).