

Bartoněk, Antonín

Greek dialects of antient Apennine peninsula

In: *Classica atque mediaevalia Jaroslao Ludvíkovský octogenario oblata*.
Češka, Josef (editor). Vyd. 1. Brno: Universita J.E. Purkyně, 1975, pp.
17-36

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/121165>

Access Date: 17. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

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

Antonín Bartoněk

Brno

GREEK DIALECTS OF ANCIENT
APENNINE PENINSULA

In the work entitled *Greek Dialects of Archaic Sicily: Their Integration Tendencies*, Graecolatina et Orientalia 5, Bratislava 1973, pp. 71—89, we have tried to delineate the developmental tendencies which may be observed in the world of the ancient Greek dialects in Sicily, while in the present study we intend to deal with the same problems with respect to the Greek areas in the Apennine Peninsula. Our treatment of the subject will at first be analogical with that about Sicily, and occasionally we shall not be able to avoid repeating certain arguments and formulations; nevertheless, from the very beginning we shall be aware of one distinct difference between the two topics: in contrast to Sicily, in the Apennine Peninsula we encounter two clearly separate colonization areas, i.e. A) the area about the Gulf of Naples in the west and B) the area of the southern projection of the Peninsula.

The course of the most important events in the history of the Greek colonization in Italy renders according to the ancient tradition roughly the following chronological picture, which finds confirmation also in the results of the latest archaeological research:¹

Colony ² (+ principal dependent settlements)	Coloni- zation area	Founded by colonists from	ca. ... B. C.	Dialect spoken
Pithekoussai ³	A	Chalkis (Euboia) Eretria (Euboia)	770?	Ionic
Kyme	A	Chalkis (Euboia) Eretria (Euboia) Kyme (Aiolis) Pithekoussai	757/6?	Ionic

¹ We have not taken here into account the Greek settlements, or trading stations, on the Adriatic coast of the Valley of Po (Adria, Spina)—as settlements situated outside the Apennine Peninsula, nor do we deal with the later colonization activity of the Syracusan tyrant Dionysios I on the Adriatic coast of Central Italy (Ankon).

² The chronological data are in principle based on T. J. Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks*, Oxford 1968, p. 485. Concerning Pithekoussai cf. G. Vallet, *Région et Zankle*, Paris 1958, p. 56.

³ There was probably no regular Greek colony on the Isle of Pithekoussai.

Colony ² (+ principal dependent settlements)	Coloni- zation area	Founded by colonists from	ca. ... B.C.	Dialect spoken
Rhegion	B	Chalkis (Euboia) + Messenians	730	Ionic
Sybaris (Kerilloi, Laos, Skidros, Temesa, etc.)	B	Helike? (Achaia) ⁴	720	Doric
Kroton (Krimissa, Petelia, Skylletion, Terina, etc.)	B	Rhypes? (Achaia)	708	Doric
Taras (Hydrous, Kallipolis)	B	Sparta (Lakonia)	706	Doric
Poseidonia ⁵	B*	Sybaris	700	Doric
Metapontion	B	"Achaians" ⁴ Sybaris Krisa? (Phokis)	690—680?	Doric
Siris (Pyxous, Sirinos)	B	Kolophon (Ionia)	680—670?	Ionic
Lokroi Epizephyrioi (Hipponion, Medma, etc.)	B	Western or Eastern Lokrians	673	Doric
Kaulonia	B	Aigion? (Achaia)	675—650	Doric
Hyele/Elea	B*	Phokaia (Ionia)	535	Ionic
Dikaiarcheia	A	Samos (Ionia)	531	Ionic
Neapolis	A	Kyme	shortly after 500	Ionic
Thourioi	B	Athens etc.	444/3	Ionic
Herakleia	B	Taras	433/2	Doric

As we can see from our survey, the basic network of Greek colonies was formed in the Apennine Peninsula during the first 120 years of the Greek colonization activity between ca. 770 and 650 B.C., and in about the following 200 years it was extended by a large number of secondary settlements. In this way there had been formed approximately by 450 B.C. the two above-mentioned important and rather extensive Greek settlement areas:

A) that of the Ionic settlements founded on the northern flank of the Gulf of Naples in Campania,

B) that of the both Ionic and Doric (or partly called "Achaian") settlements in the most southern part of Italy, with the primary colonies lying mainly on the coast of the Ionian Sea and the secondary ones situated for the great part on the Tyrrhenian coast ("Magna Graecia").

⁴ The term Achaia, or Achaians, denotes here the North-Peloponnesian region called Achaia, or its post-Mycenaean inhabitants, speaking a West-Greek [= Doric] dialect (see p. 20 below).

⁵ The explanation of the sign B* may be found on p. 19.

B*) Let us add that on the Tyrrhenian coast, between the two main areas, two other important Greek colonies were founded beyond the immediate political reach of any of them—the Ionic Hyele/Elea and the “Achaian” Poseidonia (though the latter was a secondary colony of Sybaris).

The Italian Greek dialects—like their Sicilian cousins—are as a rule registered in the dialectological compendia along with the dialects of their mother cities or mother areas. This attitude is no doubt correct from the historical point of view, but one would wish to have a sufficient number of linguistic documents from the earliest periods of existence of the Italian colonies to check its correctness. Unfortunately, however, a great number of the Italian Greek inscriptions—as was the case in Sicily, too—are of a rather late date, coming from the period of Roman domination for the most part. In H. L. Jeffery’s work *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, Oxford 1961, pp. 234—241, 244—245, 248—262, 279—288, only 82 basic epigraphical items are registered as dating from the time before the end of the 5th cent. B.C., their geographical and chronological distribution being as follows on p. 20.⁶

Like in Sicily, even in Italy there are considerable gaps in the documentation of archaic dialects, and above all, one meets with a lack of documents from the time directly succeeding the foundation of the individual colonies. This is why the primary guide-posts for any attempt to outline the dialectal development in the Italian Greek settlements have to be the reports of ancient authors concerning the ethnical origin of the colonists that founded them.

According to these authors we have to do in each of the above-mentioned colonization areas with a different ethnical background as to the origin of the Greek colonists:

A. To the area of the Gulf of Naples Greek colonists came mainly from the West Ionic Isle of Euboea, esp. from Chalkis; they settled at first on the Isle of Ischia (Greek Pithekoussai), but their first regular colony was Kyme on the opposite mainland. Besides the Euboian settlers, also some other ethnical elements came here, esp. the colonists from the Aeolian Kyme, giving the Italian Kyme the name of their mother city, but they left practically no traces of their Aeolic dialect; further there came also the East Ionians from Samos who were supposed to have founded Dikaiarcheia, a Greek colony situated farther to the east—and possibly also the Rhodians, who were said to have been the first settlers in the area of Naples and founders of the half-mythical Parthenope, the predecessor of Neapolis. In any case, the Samians certainly spoke a dialect very close to that of ancient Euboea.

B. In the southernmost part of the Apennine Peninsula (Bruttium, Lucania, Calabria) the majority of the Greek colonists were from the Doric areas of the Peloponnese. The Lakonians settled in Taras, the Tarantines establishing later several secondary settlements, esp. Herakleia, an independent Tarantine colony. The emigrants from North Peloponnesian Achaia, who were descendants of the local Doric population, possibly with a rather strong Old Achaian, i.e. pre-Doric ethnical admixture, founded at first several colonies on the south-eastern coast of South Italy (Metapontion, Sybaris, Kroton, Kaulonia); and soon especially the Krotoniates and the Sybarites settled down in a number of other places in the adjacent coastal areas, while some other groups of the Sybarite and Krotoniate colonists crossed the South Italian territory where the peninsula narrows to several tens of miles and settled on the Tyrrhenian coast, founding even there a number

⁶ Some Jeffery’s items contain more inscriptional units, esp. items representing the documentation of coins.

	Non-coinage inscriptions from the time ca. . . . B.C.					Coins from ca. . . . B.C. onwards ⁷	Total
	700 -600	600 -550	550 -500	500 -450	450 -400		
Ionic							
<i>Campania</i>							
Pithekoussai	1						1
Kyme	3 ^a	3	2-3	5-6	1	500	16
Neapolis						450	1
<i>West Lucania</i>							
Hyele/Elea						490	1
<i>„Magna Graecia“</i>							
Rhegion				7	2	510	10
Thourioi					1	443	2
Siris		1					1
total	4	4	2-3	12-13	4	5	32
Doric:							
<i>„Magna Graecia“</i>							
Taras			2	6	1	550	10
Sybaris						550	1
Laos ⁹			1 ¹⁰			525	2
Pyxous, Sirinos ¹¹						525	1
Metapontion			3	2	1	550	7
Kroton ¹²			1	1		550	3
Krimissa				1			1
Petelia				1			1
Temesa ¹³						500	1
Terina						500	1
Pandosia ¹³						450	1
(unidentified)				1			1
Kaulonia				2		550	3
Lokroi Epizephyrioi			3 ¹⁴	4	1		8
<i>West Lucania</i>							
Poseidonia			5 ¹⁵	2		550 ¹⁶	8
total			15	20	3	11	49 81¹⁷

⁷ All archaic coins from the same colony represent only one epigraphical item (cf. Note 6).

⁸ Inscription No. 24 (Kyme) has been included here as having been tentatively attributed to Kyme by Jeffery.

⁹ Inscriptions from the dependent settlements are registered below the respective mother city.

¹⁰ This inscription was found at S. Agata dell' Esaro, lying inland not far from Laos.

¹¹ Both Pyxous and Sirinos seem to have been originally dependent Sirite settlements; after the destruction of Siris about 530 B.C. they passed into the possession of Sybaris.

¹² No. 23 (Kroton) has not been included here as being quite unintelligible and nowadays completely lost.

¹³ Both Temesa and Pandosia were originally dependent Sybarite settlements; after the destruction of Sybaris about 510 B.C. they passed into the possession of Kroton.

¹⁴ No. 8 (Lokroi) has been included here as having been tentatively attributed to Lokroi by Jeffery.

¹⁵ Sub Nos. 5, 5bis, two epigraphical items from Poseidonia are registered in Jeffery's work.

¹⁶ A number of coins of similar character were found also at various sites between Laos and Poseidonia.

¹⁷ This figure is lower by one, when compared with the total sum of Jeffery's items, as we have left out No. 23 from Kroton (see Note 12).

of dependent settlements (only the Sybarite colony Poseidonia, founded at the Gulf of Salerno, had an independent character from its beginning). The third group of the Doric colonists, coming from the Lokrian regions in Central Greece, founded Lokroi Epizephyrioi on the southern flank of the "Achaian" colonization territory and established later several secondary settlements on the Tyrrhenian coast as well. Let us add that during and after the Messenian Wars an extensive stream of scattered groups of Messenian refugees was moving to the west and found especially in the Ionic Rhegion a new home.

Nevertheless, there were also colonists of Ionian origin that settled in the southernmost part of the Apennine Peninsula. The earliest of them were the Ionian colonists from Euboeia (Chalkis again) who founded Rhegion near the southernmost top of Italy about 730 B.C. (shortly before, the colonists of the same origin settled at Zankle on the opposite Sicilian coast [cca. 734]). Other Ionian settlers, coming from Kolophon in Asia Minor, wedged into the "Achaian" territory on the coast of the Tarantine Gulf, establishing here Siris ca. 675 B.C., the Greek colony that was destroyed by her "Achaian" neighbours after a little more than a century of her existence. In 535 B.C. the Phokaian mariners—after a short intermezzo in Corsica—settled at Hyele/Elea on the Tyrrhenian coast of the Peninsula south of Poseidonia, while in 444/3 B.C. the colonists from various Greek towns immigrating under the Athenian aegis founded the "pan-Hellenic" colony Thourioi in the area of the meanwhile destroyed "Achaian" colony Sybaris.

The spreaders of the Greek colonization in the Apennine Peninsula were, thus, according to the ancient authors, either members of the Dorian tribes, speaking the West Greek dialects [i.e. Doric in a wider sense of the word], or they were of the Ionian origin.

The former came, as it has been already indicated, partly from North-Peloponnesian Achaia, partly from South-Peloponnesian Lakonia (or occasionally from Messenia) and partly from Lokris, a region situated in Central Greece. The archaic Ionian colonies had their mother cities first of all in Euboeia (esp. Chalkis), while only some isolated groups of East Ionian colonists came from Asia Minor (Kolophon, Phokaia) or the adjacent islands (Samos).¹⁸

Thus even in the Apennine Peninsula—like in Sicily—only a considerably small fraction of the Greek mother dialects was represented, that is to say

a¹) the Euboian Ionic [*West Ionic*], spoken in Kyme and its settlement area (Neapolis) as well as in Rhegion;

a²) some isolated *East Ionic* vernaculars spoken in Siris, Hyele/Elea, Dikaiarcheia;

b¹) the North-Peloponnesian "*Achaian*", being an evidently West Greek [= Doric] dialect and spoken in the colonization areas of Metapontion, Sybaris, Kroton and Kaulonia;

b²) the old *Lakonian* dialect, spoken in Taras and in its colonization area (esp. in Herakleia) — as well as *Messenian* being very close to Lakonian and partly spoken in Rhegion, both of them being West Greek [= Doric] dialects;

b³) the *Lokrian* dialect, belonging to the so-called North-West group of West Greek [= Doric] dialects and spoken in Lokroi Epizephyrioi and in the adjacent colonization area.

This very low number of mother dialects involved could induce us to the unsubstantiated conclusion that the tracing of the Greek dialectal development in the Apennine Peninsula would not be a very complicated undertaking. A detailed analysis, however, of the archaic phase of the said metropolitan dialects is not

¹⁸ The "pan-Hellenic" colony Thourioi has not been here taken into account.

without difficulties. Taking into account the time when the colonies were founded we should naturally try to reconstruct the five dialects roughly within the period of 770—650, i.e. prior to the date when all the primary Italian colonies were already founded, but written documents belonging to this period are extremely scanty also in the metropolitan Greece. We may admit, of course, that a significant influx of further colonists from the mother cities was sure to continue even in the succeeding generations and that the colonies were possibly following the same line of dialectal development with their mother areas, for some time at least: but the event of the quick Lakonian phonological development, especially from the 5th cent. B.C. onward, hardly justifies us in joining each of the Greek colonial dialects of Central or South Italy with its metropolitan ancestor into one and the same fully identical linguistic unity after, let us say, the end of the 6th cent. B.C.

Anyhow, the majority of the metropolitan dialects involved were documented in a more or less sufficient extent by 500 B.C. already, the most distinct exception being the North-Peloponnesian "Achaian" with only one very short archaic inscription from Achaia itself (some archaic documents, however, of the assumed "Achaian" character were discovered on the islands Kephallenia and Ithaka, generally believed to belong from an early period to the "Achaian" settlement area).

Under these circumstances we shall take for the starting point in our subsequent comparative analysis, which will deal with the five above-mentioned metropolitan dialects, the situation that is assumed to have existed in them a little before, i.e. roughly about 600 — 550 B.C.

The relations between the said dialects may be reconstructed for this period as follows:

I. A distinct contrast between the Doric and Ionic dialects sprang from a number of outstanding differences, which were mostly of old, often already Late Helladic [Mycenaean] origin, and definitely existed before the colonization era. The differentiation phenomena in question are specially the following ones:

Ionic

Innovation $\bar{a} > \bar{\epsilon}$ (Nom. Sing. *νίκη*)
 \bar{a} - result of the $\bar{a} + \bar{\epsilon}$ contraction
 (Inf. *νικᾶν*)
 \bar{o} - result of the $\bar{a} + \bar{\delta}$ contraction
 (Ἀτρεΐδ(ε)ω, -ov, οἰκι(έ)ων)
 1. Pers. Plur. Act. in -μεν (*φέρομεν*)
 Innovation -τι > -σι (*φέρουσι*)
 Fut. in -σω
 Conditional conjunction εἰ
 Modal particle ᾶν

Doric

- \bar{a} preserved (*νίκα*)
 $\bar{\epsilon}$ - result (*νικῆν*)
 \bar{a} - result (Ἀτρεΐδᾶ, οἰκιᾶν)
 -μες (*φέρομες*)
 -τι preserved (*φέρουτι*)
 Fut. in -σέω (innovation)
 αἰ
 κα

All these differences were, no doubt, characteristic features also of the relation between Italian Ionic, represented by the dialects of the Ionian settlers from Euboea (West Ionic) as well as of those from Asia Minor and the adjacent islands (East Ionic), and between the Italian Doric dialects, so that we may quite safely assume that the language of the Ionian colonists of the 8th—7th cent. B.C. distinctly differed from the dialects spoken by the Italian Dorians. Of the enumerated differences it must have been above all the Ionic secondarily arisen $\bar{\epsilon}$ (e.g. in *νίκη*), that in contrast to the Doric original \bar{a} (in *νίκα*) was, due to its high

frequency, a distinctive feature betraying in nearly every sentence of the Ionian speaker his Ionian origin.

Besides, one has to take here into account that even some other important innovations may either have been accomplished or their accomplishment may have been in progress in the early colonization period already; principally we have in mind some specific West or East Ionic innovations, or some more general West or East Ionic innovations that were a part of wider isoglosses: most likely the $\tau\tau$ - substitute of the proto-Greek $t/h/j$, $k/h/j$ asserted itself already in West Ionic [= Euboian] (and in Attic and Boiotian as well) before 600 B.C.,¹⁹ while the East Ionic (and also Central Ionic [= Cycladic] and Attic) phonological shift $\tilde{a} > \tilde{u}$ may have been still in progress about that date.²⁰ Rather improbable, in any case, seems to be an early accomplishment of the Euboian rhotacism (this phenomenon is confined to the Euboian town Eretria and to the near Oropos on the Attic-Boiotian border, the first examples dating from the 5th cent. B.C.).

II. As indicated in the preceding paragraph, there were also some intra-Ionic differences, differentiating East Ionic from West Ionic with an increasing intensity. At the time of the foundation of the earliest Ionic colonies in Italy, however, there were still very rare differences between the two groups, so that vernaculars of Pithekoussai, Kyme and Rhegion must have been very similar to that of Siris. Even if later the number of the local differences may have increased (e.g. with the foundation of Dikaiarcheia, Hyele/Elea, and especially of Thourioi, but also through the internal linguistic development), there are not many of them inscripturally documented (see more esp. on pp. 26 f. s.v. *Kyme*).

III. The intra-Doric differences are rather late, too, all of them being practically post-Mycenaean and finding frequent analogies also in other Greek dialectal groups. In this way some or other Doric dialects occasionally acquired various secondary innovation associations with some or other non-Doric dialects, e.g. with the Ionic ones. All this implies the probability that some Doric dialects displayed of necessity greater differences from West or East Ionic than others.

We published a list of the principal intra-Doric differentiation features in our work *Classification of the West Greek Dialects*, Prague 1972, pp. 130 ff.; these, of course, concern primarily the 4th century B.C. For the 8th—7th cent. B.C. the differences cannot be precisely reconstructed; in any case they must have been then substantially less numerous.

The most outstanding intra-Doric differentiation feature was no doubt the qualitative difference in the \tilde{e}/\tilde{o} - results of the early Doric compensatory lengthenings (I: type *esmi* > *ēmi*; II: type *tons* > *tōs* and *pheronsa* > *pherōsa*; III: type *ksenwos* > *ksēnos*) and of the isovocalic contraction of $e + e$, $o + o$ (e.g. *hippoō* > *hippō*).²¹

On the basis of the thorough analysis of the said difference, we felt justified in *Classification* 116 ff. in dividing all the West Greek (= Doric) dialects at the time limit of about 350 B.C. in conformity with their long-vowel development into

¹⁹ Cf. A. Bartoněk, *Vývoj konsonantického systému v řeckých dialektech* (Opera Universitatis Purkynianae Brunensis — Facultas philosophica, vol. 77), Praha 1961, pp. 54 and 145.

²⁰ Cf. A. Bartoněk, *Development of the Long-Vowel System in Ancient Greek Dialects* (Opera Universitatis Purkynianae Brunensis — Facultas philosophica, vol. 106), Praha 1966, pp. 110 ff.

²¹ Cf. A. Bartoněk, *Development* pp. 62 ff. See most recently also A. Bartoněk, *Ancient Greek Long-Vowel Systemic Development in a Short Survey for the Didactical Purposes*, SPFFBU, E 17 (1972), 65 ff.

three principal groups, which could be denoted, essentially in accordance with Ahrens's²² terminology, as *Doris severior*, *Doris mitior* and *Doris media*;

A. *Doris severior* disposed of only one phonemic \bar{e}/\bar{o} -pair, having not arrived at distinguishing the primary \bar{e}/\bar{o} from the secondary \bar{e}/\bar{o} which originated through compensatory lengthening and isovocalic contraction (Lakonian, Messenian, Cretan, Cyrenaean, maybe also the dialect of the Peloponnesian Achaia, and partly even Elean).²³

B. *Doris mitior* possessed two phonemic \bar{e}/\bar{o} -pairs, the primary \bar{e}/\bar{o} being open, whereas the secondary \bar{e}/\bar{o} originated through compensatory lengthening and isovocalic contraction, was close (North West dialects, Korinthian, Megarian, East Argolic).

C. *Doris media* disposed of two phonemic \bar{e}/\bar{o} -pairs, too, but its open \bar{e}/\bar{o} -pair comprised not only the primary \bar{e}/\bar{o} , but also some secondary \bar{e}/\bar{o} -realizations, esp. those resulting from the first compensatory lengthening [type *esmi* > *ēmī*], and partly also those from the second and third compensatory lengthenings [types *pheronsa* > *pherōsa*, *ksenwos* > *ksēnos*] (Doric dialects from the East Aegean insular area, e.g. from Thera, Melos, Kos, Rhodes, as well as from the adjacent coast of Asia Minor, and also the West Argolic dialect).²⁴

Of the West Greek [= Doric] dialects that got a footing in the Apennine Peninsula after the accomplishment of the colonization, Lakonian (together with Messenian) and Achaian belong to type A (*Doris severior*), Lokrian to type B (*Doris mitior*), while the mixed type C has no representatives among the Italian Doric dialects.²⁵

The post-Mycenaean chronology of the above \bar{e}/\bar{o} -vowels differentiation has been rather safely established: the latter became manifest after the Doric migration to the south of the Balkan Peninsula, while certain Doric dialects appear to have been in good keeping with some non-Doric dialects since the early post-migration centuries. Thus especially the Doric dialects of the "mild" type B, spoken on a broad stripe of territory stretching from Aetolia eastwards as far as Megaris, had their two \bar{e}/\bar{o} -pairs distributed in a similar way as the Attic-Ionic dialects.

Taking into account this important typological differentiation and considering the possibility of an early existence of some other intra-Doric differences as well, we may draw the following conclusions when attempting to classify the West Greek [= Doric] dialects of the Apennine Peninsula according to their mother city origin:

1. There are no important dialectal differences to be found between *Lakonian* and "*Achaian*" in the early centuries of the 1st millennium B.C. In *Classification* 186 we expressed our opinion that "*Achaian*" is a dialect of the "strict" Doric type in origin (with only one \bar{e}/\bar{o} -pair), and that only in the course of time it was increasingly influenced by its "mild" Doric environment in the east and north so that the inscriptional documentation from Achaia proper (including some "*Achaian*" inscriptions from other parts of the Peloponnese) shows almost exclusively a late and rather integrated Koine dialect of "mild" Doric type, called usually "*Achaian Koine*", which was the official language of the Achaian League.²⁶ I must admit,

²² Cf. H. L. Ahrens, *De Graecae linguae dialectis*, Gottingae 1839—43, esp. I 2 and II 3f.

²³ In Elean the primary \bar{e} was different from the secondary \bar{e} , as the former had been shifted to the position of the very open \bar{a} in some very early period of the Elean history.

²⁴ For details cf. Bartonek, *Development* 50 ff., *Classification* 117 ff. and *Short Survey* 70 ff.

²⁵ In Sicily it was Rhodian that belonged to this less frequent type. Concerning the alleged Rhodian colonization activity in Italy see p. 20 below.

²⁶ We have discussed the problem of Peloponnesian Achaian in detail in *Classification* 79 ff.

however, that the said conclusion, expressed in the *Classification* (about originally a „strict” Doric Achaian), is based on a rather scanty inscriptional evidence from the islands Kephallenia and Ithaka and from the “Achaian” colonies in South Italy, so that the danger of a *circulus vitiosus* may arise. But since the “strict” Doric character of the early inscriptions from the two above-mentioned islands, as well as from the “Achaian” colonization area in South Italy can be hardly due to the influence of any other “strict” Doric element (e.g. of the Lakonian Taras, which was “comparatively small and unimportant in the archaic period”,²⁷ or of the Messenian refugees in Rhegion), the assumption of the original “strict” Doric character of the West Greek dialect of North-Peloponnesian Achaea seems to be fully justified in the early centuries of the 1st millennium B.C.

2. The *Lokrian* dialect, on the other hand, was a West Greek dialect that was more different from both Lakonian and “Achaian”:²⁸

a) Lokrian disposed from the early post-Mycenaean centuries of two long \bar{e} - \bar{o} -pairs, belonging thus to the “mild” Doric group of the West Greek dialects.

b) Lokrian was closely linked to the dialects of the Greek north-west, forming with them a clearly distinct group of North-West dialects: West and East Lokrian, Phokian, Aitolian, as well as the Greek vernaculars spoken in Akarnamia, Epeiros and in a number of the inland areas of Central Greece. With these dialects — or at least with most of them—Lokrian shared several specific linguistic features, e.g. the preservation of the prepositional form $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ with Acc., the tendency to open short e into a before r (cf. $\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$), and the innovating part. praes. med. of contract verbs in $-\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ (instead of $-\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$, $-\acute{\omicron}\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$). All these North-West phenomena are well documented in the West Lokrian dialect, which was spoken in the territory of the *Lokroi Ozoleis*, situated on the northern coast of the Corinthian Gulf and held by Strabo VI 1, 7, p. 259, for the original home of the Lokrian colonists who founded Lokroi Epizephyrioi in South Italy. This West Lokrian inscriptional documentation, however, does not mean that all the above-mentioned North-West Greek linguistic features must have existed in West Lokrian already at the time of the Lokrian colonization adventure. Besides, there are some indications that might rather favour the opinion of Ephoros (quoted, but rejected by Strabo, 1. c.) that the Lokrian colonists came from the territory of the *Lokroi Opountioi*, adjoining the Euboian Gulf and wedged in between Phokis and Boiotia. Yet, in East Lokrian the local presence of the above-said linguistic features at such an early period as the beginning of the 7th cent. B.C. is still more limited: the East Lokrian inscriptional documentation is very scanty in general, altogether lacking some of the said phenomena even in later periods.

Let us add, on the other hand, that even some typical Lakonian peculiarities, e.g. the geminate $\delta\delta$, occurring in the local inscriptions as the substitute for the proto-Greek gj , dj , $j-$, were evidently not so old as to have been present in the speech of the Lakonian Partheniai, who left Sparta for Taras about 706 B.C. The inscriptions from Herakleia on Siris, a Tarantine colony founded in 434/3 B. C., show the affricate ζ in such cases, i.e. apparently an older stage of development, which preceded the gemination;²⁹ this may only mean that the said affricate was still in its full vigor in Lakonian at the time of the foundation of Taras.

Under such circumstances, one can hardly assume the existence of a too sharp

²⁷ A. G. Woodhead, *The Greeks in the West*, London 1966, p. 64.

²⁸ The problems of the West and East Lokrian dialects have been discussed in *Classification* 69 ff.

²⁹ Cf. Bartoněk, *Vývoj* 61 and 148.

differentiation contrast between Lokrian, on the one hand, and Lakonian (or "Achaian"), on the other hand, at the time of the early colonization activity in South Italy, the only rather certain differentiation phenomenon being here that of the different systemic development of their secondary \bar{e} - and \bar{o} - sounds, as discussed above. At the same time, however, a number of very important Doric conformities — as enumerated above on p. 22 — linked up together both Lakonian (and "Achaian") and Lokrian, contrasting distinctly with the respective Ionic differentiation phenomena.

We may conclude from the above brief discussion that — just as this was the case in Sicily — the main dialectal difference which existed in the Italian colonization area was that between the Doric and the Ionic settlements, whereas the dialects of the Doric colonies were in the main so akin that they made an extensive process of linguistic integration possible quite soon.

In the next paragraphs we shall try to demonstrate by an analysis of the Greek inscriptions from the Italian colonies whether the above assumption is justified. We shall attempt briefly to characterize the development of the inscriptional documentation in each of the principal Greek communities founded in the Italian area, on the background of their political development during the pre-Roman period. We shall particularly follow to what extent the ups and downs of the political fortunes of the Greek settlements may have resulted in a retreat of the original dialect and in a more extensive linguistic levelling.

For the purposes of this study it will be convenient to deal separately with the dialects of each of the two main settlement areas, A) that adjoining the Gulf of Naples and B) that stretching over the southernmost part of the Italian mainland.

A) Greek settlements in the area of the Gulf of Naples:

Pithekoussai: The oldest post-Mycenaean Greek settlement both in Italy and Sicily evidently arose on the Isle of Pithekoussai (Ischia) in the northern part of the Gulf of Naples (cf. Liv. VIII 22), probably about 770 B.C. The island was colonized by both Chalkidians and Eretrians (Strabo V 4,9, p. 247), and the Euboian settlement continued here for some time even after Kyme had been founded on the near mainland shore, but later it gradually lost its importance. Besides a fragmentary inscription, containing only four letters, which is possibly according to M. Guarducci³⁰ the most ancient Greek alphabetical document at all (ca. 750 B.C.), it is specially a graffiti inscription on a skyphos of Geometric type from a grave, composed partly in verse, that ranges among the most important archaic Greek inscriptions (so-called Nestor's Cup: Jeffery, pl. 47, 1; ca. 700?).³¹ The text shows the typical Ionic form Ἀφροδίτης , but presents no specific Euboian peculiarity.

Kyme: About the middle of the 8th cent. B.C. (ca. 757 already) some of the Euboian settlers of Pithekoussai moved to the mainland and founded a colony, called Kyme, probably with some new settlers from Chalkis and Eretria (Dion. Hal. VII 3) and apparently also from the Aiolian Kyme in Asia Minor, after which the new settlement got its name (cf. Strabo V 4, 4, p. 243). The Italian Kyme was the most important mediator of the Greek civilization to the Central Italian areas, esp. to the Etruscans and later also to the Romans.

From the epigraphical point of view the most valuable evidence of this mediation

³⁰ M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca I*, Roma 1967, p. 225.

³¹ According to Guarducci, *op. cit.*, p. 225, ca. 740—725 already.

is a series of archaic Etruscan abecedaria found in various sites of Etruria, above all the ivory school-tablet from a grave at Marsiliana d'Albegna (Jeffery, pl. 48, 18; ac. 700—650?), which has its counterpart in the fragmentary abecedarium from Kyme, incised on a conical oinochoe together with first letters of a Korinthian abecedarium above it (Jeffery, pl. 18, 2 = 47, 2; ca. 700—675?).³² This is the earliest inscriptional document found in Kyme, the most ancient Kymeian inscription with continuous Greek text being a graffito on a Protokorinthian aryballos (Jeffery, pl. 47, 3; ca. 675—650?), showing the Ionic *E* instead of *A* in *Ταταίε* (Gen. Sing.) and demonstrating the archaic *u*-pronunciation of the letter *Y* by the spelling φ in *λέφυθος*. In the archaic inscriptions of Kyme even some other typical Ionic peculiarities are documented, e.g. *Φειδίλεδ* (Gen. Sing. from *ā*-stems, cf. Att. -*ov* [Jeffery, pl. 47, 8; ca. 500?]).

Typically West Ionic [= Euboian] seem to be the Kymeian forms *τούτῃ* (Jeffery, pl. 47, 7; ca. 525—500?) and *ἐντοῦθα* (SGDI 5270; cf. also Jeffery, pl. 47, 16; ca. 450—425?).³³

On the other hand, the above-mentioned early Kymeian preservation of *u* in *λέφυθος* (see also *ἡνυπό* = *ὑπό* [Jeffery, pl. 47, 7; ca. 525—500?]), as well as the form *φύφνης* = *κύκνος* from a "Chalkidic" vase from Vulci [SGDI 5300; 6th cent. B.C.]), does not tell us anything about the dialect in question, as at the time of the Euboian colonization activity in the West the letter *Y* was still pronounced as *u* in the whole Attic-Ionic area.

Also the occurrence of *-οις* in *τοῖς ἄθλοις* (Jeffery, pl. 47, 8; ca. 500?) is often regarded as a typical West Ionic [= Euboian] feature owing to a nearly complete lack of the ending *-οισι* in Euboia (cf. Thumb—Scherer 271), which was, on the contrary, rather frequent (or quite predominating) in all the other parts of the Attic-Ionic area at early times.

As a matter of chance, some important early Euboian peculiarities are not documented in Kyme (e.g. the geminated *ττ* as opposed to the Central and East Ionic *σσ*), while some other Euboian innovations are absent in Kyme due to their rather late accomplishment in Euboia itself (e.g. the above-mentioned Eretrian rhotacism, which had its parallel also in Oropos on the Attic side of the Petalian Gulf).

Apart from the participation of Kyme in the foundation of Sicilian Zankle (Thuk. VI 4) there are no recorded dates in Kyme's early history until the last quarter of the 6th century B.C., when the Kymeians twice defeated the Etruscans. And in 474 Hieron I of Syracuse won as the ally of Kyme an important naval battle against the same enemy.

In the later fifth century the power of Kyme declined: the city was destroyed by the Samnites, the Kymeian refugees being well received in Neapolis, a secondary colony of Kyme, which soon became the main centre of the region. In the fourth century both Kyme and Neapolis passed into Roman hands, and Kyme never fully recovered again.

Kymeian inscriptions from the later periods are rare and regularly composed in the Hellenistic Koine, but occasionally even they show linguistic features that may be considered as West Ionic in origin (see e.g. the form *ἀρρενικῶν* on the inscription IG XIV 872 from the Roman period; in the Hellenistic Koine it is usually the East Ionic *ρσ* that prevails over the West Ionic and Attic *ρρ*).

³² The oinochoe bears also a third inscription, which appears to be Etruscan (see Jeffery, p. 117, No. 1, and p. 237).

³³ Cf. *τοῦτα* IG XII 9, 189₄₂ (Eretria, ca. 340 B.C.) or *ἐντοῦθα* IG VII 235₁₇ (Oropos, 4th cent. B.C.).

Dikaiarcheia: This was originally a Samian settlement, founded in 531 B.C. according to Hieronymus (Steph. Byz., p. 533) and used as a port by the Kymeans (Strabo V 4, 6, p. 245). After the Second Punic War the Romans established a colony here in 193 B.C. and changed the name of the settlement into *Potioioloí/Puteoli* (Strabo, l.c.).³⁴ All the preserved Greek inscriptional documents are late, coming from the Roman period and being written in the Hellenistic Koine.

Neapolis: According to the ancient tradition, the predecessor of Neapolis was the Rhodian settlement called Parthenope (Strabo XIV 2, 10, p. 654), lacking, however, any extant inscriptional documentation. Early in the 5th century B.C. at the latest, the Kymeans founded in this area their own colony, calling it Neapolis (cf. Strabo V 4, 7, p. 246).³⁵ The new colony soon eclipsed its mother city, especially after Kyme was destroyed by the Samnites about 420 B.C. and the Greek colonists expelled. When in 326 the Neapolitans made a treaty with Rome, the city practically passed into the Roman possession, but owing to the traditional pro-Roman sentiment of its population Neapolis kept for a long time its Greek character.

There are very few Neapolitan inscriptions coming from the pre-Roman period (practically only the early coins, e.g. that with the Ionic legend *Νέη πόλις* [SGDI 5274; end of the 5th cent. B.C.]), the majority of the inscriptional documents being late and as a rule composed in the Hellenistic Koine. Conspicuous non-Koine features occur in the later inscriptions only exceptionally (see e.g. the frequent *ρηητορία* as a characteristic local term of Neapolitan social organization [cf. Lat. *phetrinum*, *phetrís*]). Cf. also the form *ἐν ἀγάρρει* SGDI 5272₁₂ [Roman period], showing the West Ionic (and Attic) gemination *ρσ > ρρ* (against the East Ionic form *ἀγερσις*, while also the Hellenistic Koine generally prefers *ρσ*).

Thus the epigraphic documents from the Kymean area safely prove that the area was essentially Ionic with a predominance of the Chalkidic element from Euboeia. This circumstance determined the distinctly Ionic character of the archaic inscriptions, showing some West Ionic tinge, at the same time. On the other hand, no specific East Ionic features of the Samian colonists are documented in *Dikaiarcheia* and neither are indications of the Doric dialect of the alleged Rhodian colonists in Parthenope/Neapolis.—The later inscriptions betray increasingly traces of the Hellenistic Koine, which, to be sure, did not greatly differ from West Ionic.

Let us add that after the decline of Kyme the Greek cities of Campania were no more the only undisputable mediators of Greek cultural influence to Central Italy: this fact seems to be reflected in that some ancient Greek loan-words in Latin appear to have been taken from the Doric dialects of South Italy, e.g. Lat. *machina* from Dor. *μάχανά* (cf. Att.-Ion. *μηχανή*).

B) Greek settlements in the southernmost part of Italy (*Magna Graecia*)

Whereas in the Kymean area it was practically only Ionic that was spoken by the local Greek population, the situation in the most southern part of Italy was more complicated.

Ionic was represented here by the West Ionic dialect of Rhegion, as well as by the East Ionic vernaculars of Siris and Hyele/Elea (and by Attic-Ionic in general in Thourioi), while Doric was spoken by the colonists coming from Lakonia, North-Peloponnesian Achaia and Central Greek Lokris. Consequently, we have to do in

³⁴ According to Strabo, l. c., the Roman colony was established here during the Second Punic War already (cf. also Liv. XXIV 7); the Roman Puteolans, however, started counting their era from 193 B.C. (cf. CIL X 1781).

³⁵ Concerning the assumed existence of a separate „Palaiopolis“ in this area (cf. Liv. VIII 22), see the sceptical attitude of Th. Mommsen (comm. ad CIL X 170).

the Italian southernmost area with all five Greek dialectal sub-groups which have been enumerated on p. 21 as typical for the Apennine peninsula in general.

a) The Ionic settlements in Magna Graecia

The main object of our investigation will be even in this area to find in what degree we can identify in the archaic inscriptions of the Ionic settlements of Magna Graecia some typical Ionic features, especially the occurrence of the signs *E* (or *H*) for the primary \bar{a} , which was the most distinct feature of the Ionic dialectal group in general:

Siris was founded by the Ionian fugitives who had fled from Kolophon after the attack of the Lydian king Gyges (cf. Strabo VI 1, 14, p. 264; Athenaios XII 25, p. 523c). About 530 B.C. the city was destroyed by the "Achaian" coalition of Sybaris, Kroton and Metapontion.

The only inscriptional document coming from the period before the destruction is a clay loom-weight with the Ionic inscription Ἰσοδικῆς ἔμι (Jeffery, p. 54 below, No. 1; 575—550?), clearly distinguishing the open ξ (η), which goes back to \bar{a} , from the secondary close $\bar{\epsilon}$ ($\bar{\epsilon}$), which arose through the compensatory lengthening of ϵ . A recently discovered inscription, found near Metapontion and attributed to Siris (2nd half of the 6th cent. B.C.) by M. Guarducci, *Atti e Memorie della Società Magna Grecia* 1958, pp. 51 ff., is written in the Achaian version of the Greek alphabet, bears the non-Ionic form $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \theta\epsilon\delta$ and seems more probably to belong to the Achaian resettlers of the destroyed Siris from the period about 475 B.C. (cf. Jeffery, p. 376).

From the assumed dependencies of Siris, Sirinos and Pyxous, only a series of coins is known (cf. Jeffery, pp. 254, 260 [sub 10]; last years of the 6th cent.), which bear the Sybarite bull with joint legend $\Sigma\upsilon\beta\alpha\rho\iota\sigma/\text{Πυξοε}\varsigma$; they apparently come from the period of the Sybarite hegemony after the destruction of Siris.

Rhegion was a common foundation of Zankle and of Zankle's metropolis Chalkis (ca. 730 B.C. already), but an important element of the Rhegine community were Messenian emigrants nearly from the very beginning (cf. Strabo VI 1, 6, p. 257). The most archaic inscriptions are definitely written in Ionic. For instance, the dedicatory inscription from Olympia of the Rhegine official Mikythos, who later retired to settle in Arcadian Tegea (Jeffery, pl. 49, 8; ca. 467—450?), shows the Ionic form $\epsilon\nu \text{Τεγέει}$, while another Rhegine dedication from Olympia (Jeffery, pl. 43, 19; ca. 450—425?) reads $\Gamma\lambda\text{ἄνκλιε}\varsigma \delta \text{Λυκκλίδε}\delta$ and is with its endings $-\epsilon\varsigma < \bar{a}s$ and $-\epsilon\delta < \bar{e}\delta < -\bar{a}\delta$ distinctly Ionic as well. Cf. also Ἐμμενίδεν on an archaic clay pellet from Rhegion (Jeffery, pl. 43, 13; 475—450?). On a similar clay pellet coming from the same period (Jeffery, pl. 49, 14; ca. 475—450?) we find not only the common Attic-Ionic Δεμοφάνης , but also the form Θραρόος , showing the intervocalic Euboian rhotacism $-s- > -r-$, known from Eretria and Oropos.

The long-lasting conflicts with Syracuse during the whole 5th century B.C. led in 387 B.C. to the destruction of Rhegion by Lokroi, a South Italian ally of Syracuse, and to its temporary decline. Afterwards, all the preserved Rhegine inscriptions seem to be written in a "mild" Doric dialect far into the Roman Era: in IG XIV 612, coming from the 1st century B.C., we still read such expressions as $\beta\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, $\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, $\tau\acute{\alpha}\iota \acute{\alpha}\mu\grave{\alpha} \pi\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\iota$, $\tau\acute{o} \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\theta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\upsilon$ (Inf. Praes.), the last of them being with its $-\mu\epsilon\upsilon$ of Rhodian colouring.³⁶

³⁶ The athematic infinitive in $-\mu\epsilon\upsilon$ is confined mainly to Rhodes, its vicinity, as well as to the Rhodian colonies Phaselis, Gela nad Akragas, but it occurs occasionally in some other Sicilian and South Italian colonies (Tauromenion, Rhegion, Kroton), and also in the comedies of Epichar-

Hyele (later Elea), both these forms (*Ῥελη*,³⁷ *Ῥελέα*) being derived from the original Italic name whose form is well preserved in the Latin form *Velia*, was settled ca. 535 by Phokaians who left Corsica soon after the battle of Alalia (Her. I 167). Their earliest documents are inscribed coins bearing the legend *Ῥελητέων*, *Ῥελητῶν* (cf. Jeffery, pp. 287 f. [sub 6]; ca. 490—480?), while their later series show *Ῥελη(τέων)*.³⁸ The Ionic character of the local dialect seems to be ensured by the above-said early coinage legend *Ῥελη-* as opposed to *Ῥελέα*, as well as by such later forms as *Ῥιστή* IG XIV 658. Occasionally even non-Ionic forms occur; cf. e.g. *Νίκας* IG XIV 659, but the following text *τῆς Ζωίλου* shows a genuine Ionic vernacular. Elea became famous through its well-known Eleatic school of philosophers and in spite of its hostile relation to Poseidonia, its Greek neighbour in the north, the city managed to remain independent both of this rich Greek settlement and of the local Lucanian tribes, until the Romans in the 4th cent. B.C. brought the whole country under their domination.

Thourioi was a mixed, "pan-Hellenic" colony, founded in 444/3 under the Athenian leadership in the area of the long before destroyed Sybaris (cf. Diod. XII 10 f.). The inscriptional evidence is very scanty, showing occasional non-Ionic forms; cf. e.g. the words *δαμόσιον Θουρίων* (Jeffery, p. 54, 8; ca. 443—433) on a herald's staff, jointly used by the heralds of Greek Thourioi and Messapic Brentesion during their alleged alliance against Taras.³⁹

The above analysis of the inscriptional documents from the Ionian settlements in South Italy shows that in most of them the Ionic dialectal character is clearly demonstrable. Being, however, for the most part situated in the predominantly Doric area, the Ionic colonies of Magna Graecia were everywhere exposed to strong Doric both political and ethno-linguistic pressure: Siris was totally destroyed by the Achaian coalition about 530 already; Rhegion was subject to a strong Doric influence from the Messenian component of its population, and after it was destroyed in 387 B.C. by the Lokrians, the local Ionic dialect seems to have been superseded by a „mild“ Doric dialect — in the inscriptional documents at least. And since about the dialect of Thourioi we know practically nothing, there is only Hyele/Elea that probably maintained its Ionic vernacular until the coming of the Romans, though the local inscriptional documentation is too scanty to confirm fully this assumption.

b) The Doric settlements in Magna Graecia

1. Laconian colonies

Taras was founded by Spartan emigrants about 706 B.C., but no preserved local inscriptions are older than from the second half of the 6th century B.C.

mos. Such a wide spread of this form as far as from Gela and Akragas does not seem to be too probable; a far better explanation is the possible participation of the Rhodian colonists in settling the Sicilian and South Italian shores near the Straits of Messina.

³⁷ One should expect the accentuation *Ῥελη* from *Ῥελέη* (Collitz-Bechtel SGDI III 2, 690), most probably pronounced as *(h)uelē*.

³⁸ The series showing *Ῥελη-* has sometimes been wrongly classed as the earlier; see Jeffery, p. 287, Note 3.

³⁹ The inscriptional documents registered in IG XIV sub Thurii (Nos. 641—3) are later versions of older Sybarite magic texts.

The earliest datable inscription is the grafitte on an Attic eye-kylix (Jeffery, pl. 53, 1; ca. 540—530), starting with the words *Μελδοσᾶς* (Gen. Sing.) *ἔμι νικατέριον*, which clearly show the non-Ionic—i.e. practically Doric—character of the document. And on a clay die (cf. Jeffery, pp. 280, 283 [sub 2]; ca. 510—500?) one may read among the Greek expressions for numerals the typical West Greek *τέτο(ρα)*, as well as the form *φέξ*, occurring only in a few West Greek dialects (Cret., Phok., Herakl.).

The majority of the archaic Tarantine inscriptions do not reveal more than a Greek dialect with the preserved proto-Greek *ā*. It is only in the later texts, distinguishing *H/Ω* from *E/O*, that we find forms like *ἦμί* (SGDI 4623; after 443 B.C., according to Jeffery, p. 282), which demonstrate a „strict“ Doric colouring of the Tarantine dialect. The Doric forms preserving the primary *ā* are typical also for the early Hellenistic period (cf. *ἡ πόλις ἡ τῶν Ταραν[τίνων]* on a Tarantine inscription found in Dodona [SGDI 1567; early 3rd cent. B.C.]; in any case, there are no extant Tarantine inscriptions written in the Hellenistic Koine. Taras maintained its independence till 272 B.C., when it fell as the last Greek city in Italy into Roman hands.⁴⁰

Herakleia was a Tarantine colony established in 433/2 in the vicinity of the old Ionic settlement Siris as an independent Tarantine out-post settlement against Thourioi, only recently founded farther southwards.⁴¹ Though politically less important than its mother city, Herakleia yielded two extraordinarily extensive Greek inscriptions, both of them coming from the end of the 4th cent. B.C. and containing reports of two commissions, which were appointed to define and mark the boundaries of the lands of two local temples (IG XIV 645). The dialect of the Herakleian Tables is—in spite of some intrusive forms due to the early influence of the Hellenistic Koine—a clear example of the Lakonian branch of Doric dialects; it lacks, of course, a number of innovations which were fully accomplished in Lakonia as late as long after the foundation of Taras (*-s* > Lac. *-h-* > *∅*; e.g. in *νικάδας* IG V 1, 213₃ [5th cent.], against Herakl. *ἐστάσαμες* [often in the Herakleian Tables]; *dj* > Lac. *δδ*, e.g. in *δπι(δ)δόμ[ενος]* IG V 1, 919 [Sellasia, 5th cent. ?], against Herakl. *τερομάζοντι* [IG XIV 645 I₈₆]; the Lakonian thematic infinitive *-ην* < *-een*, e.g. in *ἔχην, ὑπάρχην* IG V 1, 1111₂₉ [Geronthrai, after 146 B.C.], against Herakl. *ἔχεν* [IG XIV 645 I₁₁₆]).⁴²

But, at the same time, the dialect of Herakleia displays also some specific local peculiarities (*eo* > *ew*, *iw* e.g. in *μετρούμεναι* [often in the Herakleian Tables]).

The fact, anyhow, that we find in the text of the Herakleian Tables passages like *ἐπι τῶς χάρως τῶς ἡιρῶς τῶς τῶ Διονύσω* I₈, or forms like *ἐπαμώχη* I₁₄ (3. Sing. Impf. Act. from *παμωχέω*) fully confirms the assumption that the dialect of Herakleia—like that of Taras—was a „strict“ Doric vernacular. Obviously it was still in use when Herakleia was brought under the Roman domination in 281 or 277 B. C.⁴³

⁴⁰ During the Second Punic War Taras rebelled against Rome, was recaptured and sacked. In 122 B.C. a colony of Roman citizens was established here.

⁴¹ According to Strabo VI 1, 14, p. 264, the settlement was a joint foundation of both Taras and Thourioi after a previous long struggle, but the Tarantines apparently soon prevailed.

⁴² However, since the ending *-εν* is already Mycenaean (cf. e-ke-e *ἔχε(χ)εν*), we may have to do here with two very old parallel endings of the thematic infinitive, viz. *-en* and *-een* > *εν* (cf. the co-existence of the two forms in Arcadian: *-εν* in Tegea, but *-ην* in Orchomenos and Lykosoura).

⁴³ The Doric character of the Herakleian dialect was maintained also during the 3rd cent. B.C. Cf. *ἱστῖαι πρὸ ἀνταντᾶς καὶ Ἀφροδιτίας Δορκᾶς ἀνέθηκε* IG XIV 646.

2. Achaian colonies

There are three Achaian settlements in South Italy, which are known to have had their oikists from definite sites in Peloponnesian Achaia (Sybaris: Is⁴⁴ of Helike; Kroton: Myskellos of Rhyepes; Kaulonia: Typhon of Aigion), but Kaulonia was probably founded under the aegis of Kroton—similarly as Metapontion, lying on the northern flank of the Achaian territory, was founded under the aegis of Sybaris, if not directly from Sybaris itself (see below). Sybaris and Kroton, consequently, seem to have been responsible practically for all the other Achaian foundations in South Italy. Nevertheless, taking account of the character and contents of the inscriptional documents, we shall deal here with the following main Achaian settlement areas: Metapontion, Sybaris (including the dependent settlements), Poseidonia (as the only independent colony of Sybaris, established on the Tyrrhenian coast), Kroton (including the dependent settlements), Kaulonia.

Metapontion was the northernmost Achaian colony on the coast of the Ionian Sea (ca. 690—680 B.C.). According to Antiochos, quoted by Strabo VI 1, 15, p. 264 f., Metapontion was founded from Sybaris to prevent expansion by the Lakonian colony Taras, but Strabo's remark (p. 265) that according to Ephoros the oikistes of Metapontion was Daulios, the tyrant of the Phokian Krisa (near Delphi), indicate the possible existence of mixed ethnical elements in this Achaian colony. The archaic inscriptional documentation of Metapontion shows a rather indifferent Greek dialect of non-Ionic character, but not even the later inscriptions are long enough as to characterize the dialect more distinctly; we just realize that we have to do with a Doric dialect (see *Ἐῶξενος Φιλιστιδᾶ* [Gen. Sing.] IG XIV 648; 4th cent. B.C.).

In the second half of the 5th century B.C. Metapontion stood in close alliance with the growing power of Taras. Early in the 3rd century the town passed into Roman hands. After the Roman defeat at Cannae it shook off the Roman rule, but subsequently its name drops from the South Italian history.

Sybaris was founded about 720 B.C., its oikistes Is coming from the Achaian city of Helike (Strabo VI 1, 13, p. 263). According to Aristotle, *Polit.* V 3, p. 1303 a, also a contingent of Troizienians joined the venture, but they were soon driven out by the stronger Achaian element. The only extant inscriptions from Sybaris itself are those on the local coins, bearing the Sybarite bull and the legend *Συβαριτες* or its abbreviations.⁴⁵ In 510 B.C. Sybaris was destroyed by Kroton (Strabo, l. c.; Her. V 45), but a remnant of the population continued to live in the areas of old Sybaris, though under the Krotoniate domination. There is a coin-series with the Sybarite legend from the reoccupation period after the great disaster in 510, but these coins bear on the obverse a tripod and the letters *ῤρο(τῶν)*, so that they properly belong to Kroton. In 453 Sybaris was formally refounded, possibly with an assistance from its secondary colony Poseidonia, but it was destroyed in 448 by Kroton again (Diod. Sic. XI 90, XII 10).

Dependent settlements of Sybaris: Sybaris controlled at its height of luxury and power (from ca. 570 B.C.) a rather large area in the Italian inland as well as on the Tyrrhenian coast (25 subject-towns according to Strabo, l. c.). Its dependent territory stretched on the Tyrrhenian coast from Laos in the north to Temesa in the south, and after the destruction of Siris it included also Sirinos

⁴⁴ Is or Ois; the reading is uncertain.

⁴⁵ But cf. also IG XIV 641-3 (later versions of older Sybarite magic texts, as mentioned above on p. 30, Note 39).

and Pyxous. From Laos we have a series of coins from the end of the 6th century B.C. in the Sybarite style, this Sybarite colony being together with Skidros (and apparently Poseidonia) the only safe places where the Sybarites could find refuge after the fall of their city (Her. VI 21). A votive inscription from about the same period was found on a bronze axe at S. Agata dell'Esaro, lying inland south-eastwards from Laos (Jeffery, pl. 50, 8; ca. 525—500?). On the other hand, the later coin-series discovered in Temesa, originally a colony of Sybaris (early 5th cent.), and in Pandosia, a Hellenized Italic town on the route between Sybaris and Temesa (ca. 450—425?), show by their badge that the said settlements were dependencies of Kroton in the respective periods (cf. Jeffery, p. 254). From the linguistic point of view all the inscriptional documents found in the dependent area of Sybaris are of not much use for the dialectal characterization of the Sybarite vernacular: only the non-Ionic (i.e., in fact, Doric) character of the dialect in question is beyond any doubt (cf. e.g. $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $H\acute{\epsilon}\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ [Gen. Sing.], and $\rho\upsilon\nu\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ [to be pronounced *Kuniskos*] on the above mentioned inscription from S. Agata).

Poseidonia, a secondary colony of Sybaris, was founded as early as about 700 B.C., but it always remained completely out of the reach of the political control of Sybaris. The inscriptional documents demonstrate only a non-Ionic dialect again (cf. $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $H\acute{\epsilon}\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\mu\iota\alpha\rho\acute{o}\nu$ SEG XII 412, see also Jeffery, pp. 252. 260 [sub 3]; ca. 550—500?).⁴⁶ By the end of the 5th century B.C. the town was taken over by the Lucanians and obtained the new name *Paistos*/*Paistom* (Strabo V 4, 13, p. 251).⁴⁷ In 273 B.C. the Romans established here a colony of Roman citizens. After the Lucanian conquest the Greek language fell quickly into oblivion (cf. Athenaios XIV 31, p. 632 a).

Kroton was founded within a few years of Sybaris (ca. 708 B.C.), its oikistes Myskellos coming from Rhyepes (Strabo VI 1, 12, pp. 262 f.). The Krotoniate dominion extended—especially after the destruction of Sybaris—over a large territory along the coast of the Ionian Sea (from Krimissa and Petelia in the north to Skyllation, and apparently as far as Kaulonia, in the south), and westwards across the Italian inland to the Tyrrhenian coast as well (Terina). During the 5th century B.C. the Krotoniates gradually declined from the highest point of their prosperity they had attained when destroying Sybaris; in the last half of the 4th century Kroton was temporarily a part of the empire of the Syracusan tyrant Dionysios I and about 300 B.C. it was held by Agathokles for a time. The town passed into Roman hands shortly before Taras was taken. After the Second Punic War a colony of Roman citizens was established here in 194. The inscriptional documentation from Kroton is very scanty, being limited to a series of local coins and a few inscriptions, linguistically unimportant, which show hardly more than a dialect of non-Ionic character: see e.g. $H\acute{\epsilon}\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\textit{Ἐλευθερίᾱ}$ < ς > on a block from the temenos of Hera Lakinia near Kroton (cf. Jeffery, pp. 257. 261 [sub 22]; ca. 550—500?).

Dependent settlements of Kroton: Besides the series of coins, some mason's marks, numerals and similar inscriptional items from Kaulonia nad Terina, four linguistically interesting inscriptions belong here, all of them being bronze plaques with a text concerning the property of a person:

a) an inscription from Petelia (IG XIV 636, cf. Jeffery, pp. 258 f. and 261 [sub 28]; ca. 475?) with the typical Doric $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\tau\iota$;

⁴⁶ The second part of this inscription runs $\textit{Ῥρονδιτοξάμν}$, i.e. it may be perhaps interpreted as $\textit{Ῥρονδι τόξ' ᾄμν}$ (Guarducci, Arch. Class. 4 [1952], 145 ff.), but Jeffery, l.c., suggested that this may not be Greek at all.

⁴⁷ Strabo, l.c., has *Paistos*, while the neuter form *Paistom*/*Paestum* is the more usual form.

b) an inscription from Krimissa (Jeffery, pl. 50, 30; ca. 475?) with the Doric form *δίδοτι* again;

c) another inscription, bought in the Rhegine area (Jeffery, pl. 50, 29; ca. 475?), very fragmentary and of unknown origin,⁴⁸ with the distinctly Doric colouring of its text; cf. *Ἵνατᾶ δᾶμ[ιοργέοντος]* (Gen. Sing.);⁴⁹

d) an inscription from Terina (Schwyzer DGE 436, 3; shortly before 300 B.C.?) with the typical Doric *τόκα*, the infinitive ending *-εν* in *φυλάσσειν* and with the form *τῶργυρίω* (Gen. Sign.), indicating the "strict" Doric character of the local dialect.⁵⁰

The last of the just-mentioned documents is the only safe Achaian inscription from the South Italian Achaian area that employs the letter Ω (using it both for primary and secondary δ). Let us, however, add that the same spelling practice may be found in an inscription of unknown origin, found in Bruttium (SGDI 1658, 3rd cent. B.C.): cf. esp. *ἀναγιζει Κολλύρα ταῖς προπόλοις τᾶς θεῶ τῶς τρις χρυσέως, τῶς ἔλαβε*. The Achaian provenience of the document is highly probable,⁵¹ since a great part of Bruttium was in Achaian hands, while both Rhegion and Lokroi Epizephyrioi,⁵² the other main Greek centres in Bruttium, altogether lack the "strict" Doric forms in the local inscripational documents.

Kaulonia was an Achaian colony (Strabo VI 1, 10, p. 261) founded on the initiative of Kroton, but the name of its oikistes, Typhon of Aigion, indicates that it was an independent city at the time of its foundation (ca. 675—650). Later the town seems to have been subordinate to Kroton.⁵³ The city was totally destroyed by the Syracusan tyrant Dionysios I early in the 4th century B.C. The preserved documents are linguistically unimportant.

3. Lokrian colonies

Lokroi Epizephyrioi were founded by the Lokrian colonists from Central Greece with the Syracusan help (Strabo VI 1, 7—9, pp. 259 f.) about a generation after the first Achaian colonists settled in South Italy (ca. 673 B.C.).⁵⁴ At some early date the colony expanded across the peninsula, founding its dependent settlements Hipponion, Medma, and perhaps also Metauron. Lokroi lead successful wars with their Greek neighbours, both Kroton and Rhegion—frequently as Syracusan ally; after heavy destructions in the 4th cent. B.C. the town passed early in the 3rd century B.C. into Roman hands.

All the extant inscriptions from the Lokrian territory are short and often fragmentary, revealing hardly more than a dialect with the preserved *ā* (cf. e.g. *Φρασιάδᾶς ἀνέθεκε τᾷ θεῶι* [Jeffery, pl. 54, 4; ca. 500—480?]), and giving no direct confirmation of the assumption that the local dialect was of a "mild" Doric character like the vernaculars of the Lokrian mother areas in Central Greece.

⁴⁸ Though being of unknown origin, the inscription has been classified as Achaian by Jeffery owing to its very close similarity to those of Petelia and Krimissa.

⁴⁹ But cf. the Ionic (?) personal name *Διαϊνῆς* in the same inscription.

⁵⁰ A contemporary fragment of a similar text comes also from Lokroi Epizephyrioi (Jeffery, pl. 54, 3; ca. 500—480?).

⁵¹ Cf. Collitz-Bechtel, Note to SGDI 1658.

⁵² The assumption of Collitz-Bechtel, l.c., that a "strict" Doric dialect was spoken also in Lokroi Epizephyrioi lacks any concrete substantiation.

⁵³ Cf. T. J. Dunbabin, *Western Greeks* 27.

⁵⁴ Concerning the question of the precise origin of the Lokrian colonists see p. 25 above.

From the above analysis we can safely conclude that the dialects of the South Italian Greek settlements founded by the colonists from the Doric areas of metropolitan Greece really display in the light of the inscriptional documents a distinctly non-Ionic character, which practically means in the colonization conditions prevailing in South Italy the same as the Doric dialectal character. At the same time we must admit that the exactness of further intra-Doric classification is gradually disappearing when we proceed from the north to the south along the coast of the Ionian Sea. While the Doric of the Lakonian colonization area appears to be a "strictly Doric" dialect (Taras, Herakleia), the hypothesis about the "strictly" Doric character of the Achaian dialectal area in South Italy finds an only support in the inscription from Terina, the colony of Kroton, apart from an inscription from Bruttium, whose provenience is uncertain, whereas the assumption of the "mild" Doric character of South Italian Lokrian lacks so far any safe documentation. Although we, for our part, take it for most probable that the inhabitants of the Lakonian and Achaian settlements originally spoke "strict" Doric and in the Lokrian settlements "mild" Doric, we cannot altogether exclude the existence of a comparatively early tendency towards mutual dialectal intermingling and levelling. Yet, owing to the lack of contemporary preserved documentation and due to the archaic spelling, which does not make it possible to determine precisely the pronunciation of the local \bar{e} - and \bar{o} - vowels in a number of inscriptions, we are, naturally, unable to comment this integration more minutely and concretely.

In spite of these difficulties we are in our opinion entitled to draw the following conclusions concerning the situation in the dialectal world in the southernmost part of Italy:

The safely verified starting-point was here—like in Sicily—a close connection of the dialect of the oldest generations of colonists with the dialects of their respective mother cities. Yet, in contrast to Sicily, the Ionic settlements in South Italy were not situated on a stretch of continuous territory, which circumstance resulted in their early yielding to the pressure of the Doric neighbourhood. After the defeat and fall of Siris about 530 B.C. and after the destruction of Rhegion in 387 B.C. at the hands of the Lokrians' Syracusan allies Ionic appears to have been spoken on the coast of the Ionian Sea in the newly founded Thourioi alone, and even there only by a part of the population, owing to the mixed character of this "pan-Hellenic" colony. To be sure, on the coast of the Tyrrhenian Sea Ionic of Elea was maintained for a long time in a rather isolated position.

However, even Doric itself got likely rather soon exposed to strong integration pressures, although the latter are linguistically hardly detectable, owing to the lack of documents. We have to take into account the fact that both Lakonian and Achaian, and after all also Lokrian, were in their early phase of colonization dialects that did not depart too far from their common proto-Doric stage. Doric began to undergo the process of dialectal splitting as late as after the arrival of the Dorians in the declining Mycenaean world, while its first more distinct internal differentiation consisted evidently just in the origination of the second \bar{e} - and \bar{o} - pair of vowels in the connection with the first compensatory lengthening of the type *esmi* > $\bar{e}mi$, i.e. in the process of differentiation between "mild" and "strict" Doric. It may be assumed that this differentiation most likely found a reflexion in the South Italian Greek colonization area as well (Lokrian colonists as opposed to Lakonians and Achaians), but it is just the area of Lokroi Epizephyrioi where the existence of "mild" Doric cannot be directly documented. We encounter it, however, after a certain time in Rhegion under the influence of the "mild" Doric

of Syracuse; and if we associate its just mentioned Rhegine occurrence with our assumption of its primary existence in Lokroi, considering in addition the fact that some of the "strict" Doric Achaian settlements disappeared from the political scene in the course of time (Sybaris about 510 B.C.; Kaulonia was destroyed by the Syracusans and Lokrians ca. 387, while Kroton was conquered and annexed for some time at least), we have to admit that the share of "mild" Doric gradually became substantially greater in the South Italian area than one might expect on the basis of the original distribution of the Dorian colonists.

It is a pity that there are only very few inscriptions preserved from the Roman era and that we are for this reason unable to judge what force and vitality the Hellenistic Koine had in this area and what ways it took in asserting itself, especially while we know that due to the existence of the two $\bar{\epsilon}$ - and $\bar{\sigma}$ - pairs the Hellenistic Koine was more akin to the "mild" Doric than to the "strict" Doric dialects.

Anyhow, if we take into account the significant position particularly of Taras in the later history of the South Italian Greek colonies, we certainly cannot assume any distinct retreat of the Doric dialect from the common usage before the more advanced phase of the Roman domination, i.e. practically before the period of establishing colonies of Roman citizens in most South Italian Greek colonies during the 2nd century B.C.

Translated by S. Kostomlatskij