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Introduction: The problem of Classical Greek dialect geography

§66.1 A longstanding problem of Ancient Greek dialectology is the geographical distribution of the dialects as they are first attested in the Aegean in the Classical period (Figure 1). Since the groundbreaking studies of the dialect geography by Porzig (1954) and Risch (1955), most mainstream accounts of the dialects tend to admit the existence of four main subgroupings consisting of Attic-Ionic, Arcado-Cypriot, Northwest Greek / Doric, and Aeolic. In Porzig and Risch's analyses these four groups may further fit more broadly into West Greek (Risch: North Greek) and East Greek (Risch: South Greek), although the exact alignment remains a perennial topic of debate. A peculiar feature of Ancient Greek dialect geography is that it is characterized by two major dialect continua, namely those of Northwest Greek / Doric and Attic-Ionic, accompanied by four major dialect enclaves represented by Boeotian, Thessalian, Lesbian, and Arcadian.
The main conundrum posed by the dialect geography here are the sharp discontinuities of these dialect enclaves. There is a need for a realistic historical hypothesis that can best explain the linguistic data in the geographic space that they are attested. The discontinuities are strongly suggestive of some kind of more recent disruption from a previous geographical distribution which would have preceded it in the late second millennium and early first millennium BCE, likely in connection with the general social and political disruptions in the Aegean following the collapse of the Bronze Age palatial economies. The lack of clear evidence for dialects other than Mycenaean and the apparent dialectal uniformity of Mycenaean Greek across sites, unfortunately, does not provide much to elucidate this picture. To return to the

---


17 Much ink has been spilled on the old question of linguistic variation within Mycenaean, particularly with reference to the concepts of ‘mycénien normal’ vs. ‘mycénien spécial’ first distinguished by Risch (1966). See also Nagy (1968), Woodard (1986), Thompson (1996–1997), Palaima (1998–1999), Thompson (2002–2003). There is no widely agreed scholarly consensus on these phenomena currently. Some early studies attempted to invoke the at the time growing field of sociolinguistics to explain the differences as upper vs. lower class varieties of second-millennium Greek (Chadwick 1974, see also Wyatt 1970), but with a complete lack of evidence for non-Mycenaean Greek dialects in the second millennium BCE, a hypothesis of sociolinguistic class registers necessarily must remain speculative. One possible explanation, following an idea proposed by Palaima (2011:124–125), may be connected with the suggestion that the profession of Linear B tablet-writing was treated like other craft skills and passed on from parent to child, possibly of ‘Minoan’ ethnic origin. In such a case, one could imagine a dialectal continuity among the tablet-writers as they came to serve at different sites. On the other hand, if the tablet-writers spoke a different dialect from other people around the regional palatial centres, one would expect to see a lot more variation from other dialects.
picture of the first millennium BCE, some early literature attempted to use the Greeks’ own historiographic traditions about migrations at the end of the Bronze Age as an explanatory device for the attested dialect geography,18 but the invocation of these traditions have since, quite rightly, been criticized, since much of the narratives from ancient authors claiming earlier migrations are closely bound up with the Classical Greeks’ constructions of ethnic identity that they were projecting onto mythic prehistory.19 That said, it is nevertheless clear that the collapse of the Mycenaean palatial economies did entail great social upheavals in mainland Greece, and the dialect geography of the Classical Greek dialects may in itself provide some small clues towards broader historical processes.

§ 66.3 For the remainder of this article, I would like to focus on the evolution of a single linguistic feature which may provide us an interesting case study to probe the limits of what the dialect geography of the early first millennium BCE may be able to tell us about the late second millennium, namely the evolution of the Proto-Greek labiovelar stops. The first reason for focusing on the labiovelars is that their loss is common to all Greek dialects of the first millennium BCE and demonstrably a late, post-Mycenaean development in most, if not all the first-millennium dialects. Secondly, the palatalization processes affecting the labiovelars appear to be spread throughout the dialects as an areal sound change irrespective of previous divergent evolution, and any discrepancies in the outcomes of the labiovelars may give indications of alternative relative chronologies in their development and have implications for the early history of the dialects. To this end, I will examine the evidence for labiovelar developments on the Greek mainland and propose that the developments in the dialects as attested in the first millennium BCE suggest two alternative relative chronologies of development: the first of these was a common Greek set of developments that affected most of the dialects, which the second chronology affected specifically the Aeolic dialects (Boeotian, Thessalian, and Lesbian). I will further argue that the first-millennium dialect geography is strongly suggestive that the Aeolic relative chronology applied earlier than those that affected the rest of the dialects. This has historical implications for the Aeolic dialect group as a whole and is of significance for interpreting some of the first-millennium discontinuities in Ancient Greek dialect geography.

§ 67 The labiovelars as an Ancient Greek dialectal isogloss

§ 67.1 To recapitulate the basic facts as can be found in the reference handbooks, Proto-Greek inherited a series of velar consonants from Proto-Indo-European with labial coarticulation creeping in over generations. I do not believe the question of the apparent uniformity of the Mycenaean dialect can be satisfactorily resolved at this time.

18 See, e.g., the approaches of Hoffmann (1891–1898), Kretschmer (1909), among others.
(Proto-Greek *kʷ, *gʷ, *kʷh from PIE *kʷ, *gʷ, *gʷh and secondarily labialized sequences of *kʰu, *ɣu, *ɣʰu) conventionally called labiovelar stops. It was realized early on in the comparative investigation of the Greek dialects that the labiovelars as reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European were retained in Proto-Greek on the basis of their differing sound correspondences among the attested Classical Greek dialects, for example:

1) PIE *kʷetʰr- ‘four’ > Attic τέτταρες, Ionic τέσσαρες, Doric τέτορες, but Thessalian and Boeotian πέτταρες (cf. Latin quattuor, Sanskrit catavārah, Old Lithuanian keturi, etc.)

2) PIE *gʷelbh- ‘womb, belly’ > Phocian and Attic-Ionic Δελφοί ‘Delphi’, etc., as a composition-member in Ionic ἀδελφάς < *sʰm-ɡʷelbh-elo- ‘brother from the same mother’ (cf. Sanskrit sagarbhya- ‘brother of the same mother and father’), but cf. Boeotian Βελφοῖς ‘Delphi’ (dative plural at IG VII 2418.23, etc.), Thessalian Βελφαῖο ‘the Delphian’ (genitive singular at IG IX,2 257.10), Lesbian Βελφοῦς ‘Delphi’ (accusative plural, Etymologicum Magnum 200, 27).

3) PIE *gʰwehr- ‘wild animal’ > PGk. *kʷhεhr- > Attic θήρ, but Lesbian φήρα (accusative singular at Alcaeus fr. 286b.3 Voigt); as a lexical Aeolism in Homeric φηρίν ‘wild beasts; centaurs’ (dative plural at Il. 1.268, etc.); cf. also the verbal derivative attested via Thessalian πεφειράκοντες (perfect participle active, nominative singular three times in IG IX,2 536, cf. Attic τεθηράκωτες).

In addition to this, as Michael Weiss points out, there is also strong evidence from East Ionic to consider that the labiovelars were retained in East Ionic at the time of the colonization of Asia Minor to judge from the basis of a sound law restricted to East Ionic which appears to have dissimilated labiovelar stops when occurring between two back vowels, e.g. Ionic ὁκώς ‘how’ (cf. Attic πῶς), and additionally there is an outcome of a labiovelar which can be found the loanword πάλμυς (e.g. accusative singular πάλμυν in Hipponax fr. 3 West) < Early Ionic *kʷálmu- ultimately borrowed from Lydian qalμlμu ‘king’ (Weiss 2020:100, cf. Hawkins 2013:188–190). In total, the internal evidence from the Classical dialects points to the retention of the labiovelars, being lost only relatively recently by the time of their earliest attestation.

---

22 Cf. GEW, DELG, EDG s.v. τέσσαρες.
23 The Attic equivalent would be *δελφαίος. In the context of the inscription this is a pars pro toto referring to the temple of Apollo. Apollo Delphaios is also known from a third century dedicatory inscription from Larisa reported by Gallis (1975: 303): Ἀτλουνί Δελφαίοι (i.e. Ἀπόλλουνι Δελφαίῳ).
24 Cf. GEW, DELG, EDG s.v. Δελφοί, ἄδελφος.
25 Cf. GEW, DELG, EDG s.v. θήρ.
§67.2 By the mid-twentieth century, the decipherment of Linear B as Mycenaean Greek through the cumulative efforts of Emmett Bennett Jr., Alice Kober, Michael Ventris, and John Chadwick led to the discovery that the labiovelars remained intact in the Mycenaean dialect and were represented using the q-series syllabograms, for example:

4) PIE *gʷoɣ-kʷóll(h₁)o- ‘cowherd’ : Mycenaean qo-u-ko-ro /gʷoɣ-kόlos/ (TI Ef 2, etc.), Attic βουκόλος (cf. the nearly perfect cognate match to be found in Middle Irish búachaill, Middle Welsh bugail < Proto-Celtic *bou-koli-); 26 but

5) PIE *h₂m̥bʰí-kʷóll(h₁)o- ‘attendant’ : Myc. a-pi-qo-ro /ampʰí-kʷolos/ (TH Of 34.1, etc.), Attic ἀμφίπολος (Lat. anculus ‘servant’, cf. Skt. *cárá- in pari-cárá- ‘servant’, etc.) 27

We may also note that while the labiovelars are intact here in early Greek, already one sound change has already occurred affecting them, since the labiovelar present in the compositional member *-kʷóll(h₁)o- has regularly become a plain velar in the environment of a preceding *u or *u. 28 The discovery that the labiovelars were preserved almost completely intact in Mycenaean still in the late second millennium BCE (with the exception of this early dissimilation) may also corroborate the earlier adduced evidence that the loss of the labiovelar stops was relatively recent in the Classical Greek dialects; however, I would urge exercising some caution since we cannot assume that the state of affairs as attested in Mycenaean is the same in other second-millennium dialects that are unattested but we can assume to have existed on the basis of the first-millennium dialect geography.

§67.3 The main distribution of the outcomes of the labiovelar stops in Attic-Ionic and in West Greek which overwhelmingly appear to be the ‘normal’ outcomes are summarized in Table 1 below: 29

---

26 Cf. GEW, DELG, EDG s.v. βουκόλος; Matasović (2009) s.v. *bow-koli-.
27 Cf. GEW, DELG, EDG s.v. ἀμφίπολος.
28 This discrepancy between the compositional member -πολος versus -κόλος was explained in this way already by de Saussure (1889:161–162). This dissimilation likely predated Proto-Greek itself, if it was not already of Proto-Indo-European date; see Weiss (1994), Beekes & de Vaan (2011:62). The compound formation found in Proto-Celtic *bou-koli- via Middle Irish búachaill and Middle Welsh bugail ‘shepherd’ shows that this sound change also occurred in the prehistory of Celtic (cf. Matasovic 2009:72).
29 Because I am primarily concerned in this article about the spread of areal sound changes and their interaction within contiguous dialect geography, for our present purposes I omit discussion of the developments in Cypriot, for which see the thorough treatment of Egetmeyer (2010:205–213). The outcomes in Cypriot may potentially be different from the rest of Greek in this environment because, e.g., it attests si-se /sís/ (ICS 217.10, etc.), instead of Pan-Greek τίς. See also Hesych. σ 570 (Hansen) οἱ βόλε· τί θέλεις, Κύπριοι.
Table 1: The Reflexes of the Proto-Greek Labiovelars in Attic-Ionic and West Greek Dialects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>e(ː)</th>
<th>i(ː)</th>
<th>V[+back]</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*kʷ</td>
<td>τ</td>
<td>τ</td>
<td>π</td>
<td>π</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kʷh</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td>φ</td>
<td>φ</td>
<td>φ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gʷ</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before *e(ː) the labiovelars become dentals with phonetic features corresponding to their original voicing and aspiration: ³⁰

6) *-kʷ-e 'and' > τε 'and' (Latin -que, Sanskrit ca, etc.) ³¹
7) *sm-ɡʷelbʰ- in ā-δελφ-ός 'brother' (cf. Sanskrit sagarbhya- 'brother of the same mother and father') ³²

Before *i(ː) the distribution is split: The voiceless labiovelar *kʷ also has a dental reflex /t/ as before *e(ː), for example in the case of the relative-interrogative pronoun:

9) *kʷis, *kʷid > τίς, τί 'who, what' (Hittite kuiš, kuit, Latin quis, quid, etc.) ³⁴

Exceptionally, however, voiceless aspirated *kʷʰ and voiced unaspirated *gʷ have labial outcomes:

10) *ɡʷʰi₃-o- > βίος 'life' ³⁵
11) *h₃egʷʰi- > δφίς 'snake, serpent' (Sanskrit āhi-, Avestan aži-) ³⁶

³⁰ For these and more textbook examples, cf. Lejeune (1972:43–50), Rix (1976:85–88), Sihler (1995:160–165). Note that these examples ignore the cases where labials are found for reasons of paradigmatic levelling, e.g. 1.sg. ἕπομαι 'I follow' < *sekʷ-o-, but 3.sg. ἔπεται 's/he, it follows' instead of ἔπεται expected from the strict application of the sound laws < *sekʷ-e-, cf. Sihler (1995:164).
³¹ Cf. GEW, DELG, EDG s.v. τε, LIPP s.v. 1. *-(s)kʷ-e 'und'.
³² Cf. GEW, DELG, EDG s.v. ἀδελφεός.
³³ Cf. GEW, DELG, EDG s.v. ἀδελφεός.
³⁴ Cf. GEW, DELG, EDG s.v. τίς, LIPP s.v. 1. *kʷo-, *kʷi- 'wer?; irgendwer'.
³⁵ Cf. GEW, DELG, EDG s.v. βίος. Regarding the nominal formation of βίος see Klein (1988:268–269).
³⁶ Cf. GEW, DELG, EDG s.v. δφίς. This is possibly the only certain example of this environment in Greek. Due to scarcity of attestation the dialectal distribution of this reflex is not entirely certain outside of Attic-Ionic but it is positively attested in the West Greek dialect used at Epidauros (δφίς IG IV²,1 121.113, δφίν IG IV²,1 122.78) indicating that West Greek and Attic-Ionic agree in this outcome.
Typically the dental reflexes that are found before \( *e(\ddot{\iota}) \) and \( *i(\ddot{\iota}) \) are explained as the result of a typologically common process of palatalization occurring before front vowels. In a typical palatalization process the place of articulation of a preceding consonant is moved forward in the mouth as a result of it being affected by the articulatory properties of a following mid- or high-front vowel.\(^{37}\) The distribution before high-front \( *i(\ddot{\iota}) \) in the majority of the Classical Greek dialects is split with the reflex of the voiceless labiovelar exhibiting a voiceless dental /t/, while the voiced and voiceless-aspirated labiovelars failed to undergo the same palatalization process. The split distribution of the labiovelars before \( *i(\ddot{\iota}) \) is a separate problem which will be further addressed at §5 and §6 below. For now I will turn to the outcomes in Arcadian in §3 and in Aeolic in §4, since I will further argue below that the process of this unusual distribution in Attic-Ionic and West Greek can be better understood through comparison with the outcomes in these dialects and the nature of how the palatalization of the labiovelars was spread.

§68

The special case of Arcadian \(<\upsilon>\) (and other unusual spellings)

§68.1

It is well known that archaic Arcadian inscriptions occasionally attest a special character tsan, which I have transcribed here as \(<\upsilon>\), and other unusual spellings whose precise phonological values remain unclear, but appear to represent an intermediary state of development of sounds that reflect labiovelars etymologically.\(^{38}\) These are most famously attested in a fifth-century inscription from Mantinea recording judgements of persons guilty of sacrileges to the temple of Athena Alea (\(IG\ V,2\ 262\), see Figure 2), but now with certainty four additional times in a new festival calendar from Arcadia (Heinrichs 2015, Carbon and Clackson 2016).\(^{39}\)

---

38 I follow Carbon & Clackson (2016:140) in referring to this letter as tsan. There is not currently a dedicated Unicode code point for this letter. I have transcribed it using \(<\upsilon>\) Greek Capital Letter Pamphylian Digamma (U+0376) as an approximation to its appearance in \(IG\ V,2\ 262\). Carbon & Clackson (2016:140) transcribe with \(<\upsilon>\) Greek Small Letter Koppa (U+03DF) which is a closer approximation to the epigraphic appearance of the character as appears in the new festival calendar. \(IG\ V,2\) and Buck (1955:198) transcribe using a sigma with a combining macron below \(<\upsilon>\). See also the discussion of Jeffery (1990:212–213).
39 The secondary provenance of the bronze tablet remains very uncertain. In the initial pre-publication by Heinrichs (2015) it is only given as “Allegedly it was in English private ownership and acquired around 1965 in a London flea-market for a moderate sum” (Heinrichs 2015:3n7).
To make my general point I will restrict myself to discussing the evidence of <k> for the palatalization of the labiovelars in archaic Arcadian inscriptions but see especially Dubois (1986a:64–70) and Duhoux (2006) for more extensive discussions of these forms and other unexpected spellings of Arcadian forms using <z> epigraphically and in glosses.\textsuperscript{40}

12) Examples of *kʷi- > ἴ-
   a. ἴ[ν] (τινά) (IG V,2 262.23)
   b. ἴς (τίς) (IG V,2 262.25, 27)

13) Examples of *kʷe- > ἐ-
   a. εἴι (εἴτε) (IG V,2 262.26)
   b. εἴς (εἴτε) (IG V,2 262.26, 27, 28, 29, 31)
   c. ὄμεδι (ὅτεωι) (IG V,2 262.14)

14) Examples of *gʷe- > ἐ-
   a. ὄμελό ‘two obols’ (nom.-acc.du.) (Clackson & Carbon 2016:122, l.13) < Proto-Greek *ogʷelό (cf. Attic ὑβολός < *ogʷolό)
   b. ὄμελόν ‘obol’ or ‘spit’ (contextual sense unclear) (acc.sg.) (Carbon & Clackson 2016:122, l.19)

\textsuperscript{40} See especially at Pheneos (Dubois 1986b:195–202, Phé 1): ὄς for ὅς (l.4), ζ for τ (l.4) possibly to be interpreted as an elided τε, and ζέραυον possibly reflecting *θέραυον (l.1) and if so a rare example of a reflex of Proto-Greek *kʷʰ. For this inscription see Dubois (1986b:195–202, Phé 1) with detailed linguistic commentary and references to previous literature, cf. also Buck (1955:196–197, No.16), Jeffery (1990:208–209, Pl. 40 No.2). In addition to these, there is possibly a mixed form τζέτρακάται (Attic τετρακάσιοι) in the Arcado-Laconian Bronze from Tegea (IG V,2 159.10) where the first compound element τζετρα- shows an initial reflex potentially comparable to the spellings found at Pheneos, but the non-assibilated ‘hundreds’ morpheme proper to West Greek (cf. Dubois 1986a:67).
15) Other examples of <ν> 
   a. ἀπυνεδομίν[ος] (ἀποδεδομένους) (IG V,2 262.19)
   b. Ἱεσθνάρῳ ‘four’ (gen.pl.) < kʷetγρ- (Carbon & Clackson 2016:122, l.11)

On the basis of these examples, we may observe that <ν> is writing a sound that is intermediate and show an ongoing process towards the dental outcomes that are found in other Arcadian dialect inscriptions. It is notable that tsan is very likely being used primarily to distinguish what is probably a feature of affrication which is not phonemically identical in all cases, since the attested examples are used regardless of etymologically expected voicing contrasts (cf. εἴνε (εἶτε) ‘and if’ versus ὦνελόν ‘obol; spit’ above) or even specifically the affricates specific to the outcome of palatalized labiovelars (cf. <ν> in the spelling of Ἱεσθνάρῳ ‘four’ reflecting the intermediate outcome of *-tγρ-, possibly via *-stγ-).

§68.2 Later Arcadian from the 4th century onwards attests dental forms in these environments congruent with the outcomes found in Attic-Ionic and West Greek, for example:

16) Examples of *kʷi- > τι- 
   a. τί ‘what’ (IG V,2 3.5), etc.
   b. τιμαιόν (Dubois 1986b:61–63, Té 4 l.17), abstract derivative of Arcadian *τιμά < *kʷi-meh₂

17) Examples of *kʷe- > τε- 
   a. τετόρταυ ‘fourth’ (gen.sg. f. IG V,2 6.104), cf. Attic τετάρτης from stem *kʷetγρ-το-

18) Examples of *gʷe- > δε- 
   a. ὀδελός ‘obol’ (IG V,2 3.19, 24), cf. (14) above.

---

41 The use of tsan in the form ἀπυνεδομίν[ος] is difficult to explain since etymologically δε- is expected from the reduplicated syllable of the perfect stem. This may well be a hypercorrection where the letter-cutter might not be so familiar with the use of this unusual character, but see Dubois (1986a:69–70), Dubois (1986c:24n435), and Duhoux (2006:33–36) for discussion of different possibilities of interpretation for this form.


44 Cf. GEW, DELG, EDG s.v. τιμή, τίω.
h. ἐοδέλλοντες ‘throwing’ < as though continuing *eks-gʷelh₁-je/o- (IG V,2 6.49), cf. Attic ἐκ-βάλλοντες\(^{45}\)

§68.3 Individual problems in interpreting the granular phonetic data aside, we may nevertheless assume that the spellings using tsan represent an intermediary step to what also happened in Attic-Ionic and West Greek, given that the reflexes in later Arcadian are congruent with all other Greek dialects with the exception of Boeotian, Thessalian, and Lesbian.\(^{46}\) The further implicature of this, taking the attested dialect geography into consideration, is that the sound changes associated with the palatalization of the labiovelars passed through the dialect geography as an areal sound change, regardless of existing isogloss boundaries or other linguistically divergent evolution. The fact that Attic-Ionic and West Greek agree on these outcomes was already suggestive of this, but taking the Arcadian evidence where the sound change only came to completion in the mountainous interior of the Peloponnese by the fifth century BCE is further strong evidence of the nature of the propagation of these developments.

§69 The outcomes of the labiovelars in Boeotian, Thessalian, and Lesbian

§69.1 As for the outcomes in the Aeolic dialects, there is a mixture of dental and labial reflexes between front vowels that need to be sifted and sorted. Elsewhere I have collected and analyzed the attested examples (Scarborough 2023:68–88, with full references from documentary sources). The main synopsis of the attested forms may be found in Table 2 and Table 3.\(^{47}\)

\(^{45}\) The actual etymology of Arcadian -δέλλοντες is somewhat more complicated. It is generally accepted that the Arcadian variant reflects an initial labiovelar on the basis of this form, which is usually considered to be backformed from a full-grade thematic aorist *(h₁e)-gʷelh₁-t which was secondarily thematized (LIV² 208n4 s.v. *gʷelh₁-, cf. Harðarson 1993:180, EDG s.v. βάλλω), where the original strong-stem thematized root aorists are only circumstantially attested via three unattributed glosses from the lexicon of Hesychius: ξέλλειν ἐβαλον (ἐ 597 Latte-Cunningham), ξέλλειν: βάλλειν (ξ 106 Latte-Cunningham), and κατέβαλε κατέβαλε. (κ 73 Latte-Cunningham). The present stem βάλλω attested elsewhere either reflects a secondary thematization of the weak-stem nasal present *gʷ₁n-h₁· > *gʷ₁alne- with analogical retention of -n- and later assimilation to -λ- (LIV² 208n4 s.v. *gʷelh₁- following Harðarson 1993:161n69), or simply a Proto-Greek zero-grade yod-present *gʷ₁e/o- (cf. EDG s.v. βάλλω). Unfortunately, the only external comparison from outside of Greek to decide between the possibilities for the original derived present stem (Old Irish atbaill ‘dies’) remains uncertain (LIV² s.v. *gʷelh₁-, EDG s.v. βάλλω, cf. also Schumacher 2004:211–212 s.v. Proto-Celtic *bal-ni-, pace Matasović 2009:53 and Vendryes 1959:98). Regardless of these broader etymological issues, the assumption for root-initial *gʷ and secondary full-grade root vocalism in the Arcadian present stem is still likely to be the best explanation for ἐοδέλλοντες.

\(^{46}\) For a survey of the linguistic features characteristic of the Aeolic subgrouping see Méndez Dosuna (2007:460–472), Woodard (2021:287–337), and with a focus on the innovations Scarborough (2023:60–129). Woodard (2021) passim additionally discusses a substantial amount of comparative cultural and archaeological evidence arguing for a westward spread of the Aeolic dialects from Asia Minor. While this hypothesis differs from my own views on the
## Table 2: Synopsis of Labial Reflexes of Labiovelars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root/Lexeme</th>
<th>Boeotian</th>
<th>Thessalian</th>
<th>Lesbian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>kw</em>í-</td>
<td><em>kw</em>íj-</td>
<td>-πισάτω (?)</td>
<td>-πίσοι (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gw</em>í-</td>
<td><em>gw</em>íj-</td>
<td>βίος</td>
<td>βίος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kw</em>íj-</td>
<td><em>kw</em>íj-</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gw</em>íj-</td>
<td><em>hw</em>g*íj-</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kw</em>é-</td>
<td><em>kw</em>éj-</td>
<td>πέτταρ-</td>
<td>πέτταρ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gw</em>é-</td>
<td><em>gw</em>éj-</td>
<td>(πέντε)</td>
<td>πέμπε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kw</em>el(h)</td>
<td><em>kw</em>el(h)-</td>
<td>Πειλε-</td>
<td>Πειλο-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kw</em>ej-</td>
<td><em>kw</em>ej-</td>
<td>-πισάτω</td>
<td>απ-π-είσαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sek</em>-</td>
<td><em>sek</em>-</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gw</em>é-</td>
<td><em>gw</em>éj-</td>
<td>βειλώνθη</td>
<td>βέλλειτε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gw</em>el-</td>
<td><em>gw</em>el-</td>
<td>ὅβελος</td>
<td>ὅβελλον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gw</em>elh-</td>
<td><em>gw</em>elh-</td>
<td>Βελφοίς</td>
<td>Βελφαίο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gw</em>eh-</td>
<td><em>gw</em>eh-</td>
<td>-φεστος</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gw</em>eh-</td>
<td><em>gw</em>eh-</td>
<td>Φετταλός</td>
<td>(Πετθαλός)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gw</em>eh-</td>
<td><em>gw</em>eh-</td>
<td>Φετταλός</td>
<td>(Πετθαλός)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gh</em>mehr-</td>
<td><em>gh</em>mehr-</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>πεφειράκοντες</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hw</em>emgh*-</td>
<td><em>hw</em>emgh*-</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the labial reflexes of the labiovelars in the Aeolic dialects, I note that there are only two potential examples attesting a labial reflex for the labiovelars before high-front *i(ː)*, namely in Boeotian ἀποπεισάτω ‘let him pay’ (SEG 22:407.33, 3rd c. BCE, = Attic ἀποτεισάτω) and ποταποπιάτω ‘let him pay besides’ (IG VII 3172.85, ca. 222–200 BCE, = Attic προσαποτεισάτω). However, these two examples are not secure because they postdate the Boeotian narrowing of high-mid /e:/ to high /i:/, and on the basis of comparison with other dialects the continuation of a full-grade form *ἀποπεισάτω* is expected here. Thessalian only attests a single counterexample ἀπ<π>-ιοσαι (IG IX,2 1202.5, undated, archaic script), but in several other places the expected full-grade aorist forms are attested: infinitives ἀπεπιβία (IG IX,2 1226.10–11, 5th c. BCE) and ἀπ<π>-είσαι (Giannopoulos 1934–1935, No.1.11, 6th c. BCE?), and the third singular aorist imperative ἀπεπισάτου (IG IX,2 1229.28, early 2nd c. BCE), so it is more likely that ἀπ<π>-ιοσαι of IG spread of the Aeolic dialects from mainland Greece (Scarborough 2023 passim, based on relative linguistic chronology), a westward spread of the Aeolic dialects from Asia Minor would still be compatible with the linguistic argument for the Aeolic dialects labializing the labiovelars earlier and independently of the other Greek dialects which I will advance further in this paper.


49 See also Arcadian ἀποτεισάτω in exx. (17) above.
IX,2 1202 is a one-off misspelling. Consequently, there are no clear examples for labial reflexes of original *kʷi-* > πι- in Thessalian or Boeotian. In the remaining environments before high-front *i(ː) dental reflexes are found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root/Lexeme</th>
<th>Boeotian</th>
<th>Thessalian</th>
<th>Lesbian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*kʷi-</td>
<td>*kʷi-</td>
<td>τίς / κίς</td>
<td>τίς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kʷi-meh₂</td>
<td>τιμά</td>
<td>τιμά</td>
<td>τιμα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*kʷe-</td>
<td>*kʷe</td>
<td>τε</td>
<td>τε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*penkʷe</td>
<td>πέντε</td>
<td>πέντε (πέμπε)</td>
<td>πέντε (πέμπε)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gʷe-</td>
<td>*gʷelbʰ-</td>
<td>ἀδελφός</td>
<td>ἀδέλφος, Δέλφοισι(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gʷʰe-</td>
<td>*gʷʰer-mo-</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>θέρμαν(?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Synopsis of Dental Reflexes of Labiovelars

While the outcomes of labiovelars in the Aeolic dialects before front vowels are largely in favor of labial outcomes (except *kʷi- and *gʷʰi- where there are no clear examples for labials), a small handful of dental reflexes remain. The most prominent examples before high-front *i(ː) are the relative-interrogative τίς, τί < *kʷis, *kʷid, and Lesbian τιμα, Boeotian and Thessalian τιμά ‘compensation, payment’ < *kʷi-meh₂ (Attic τιμή), never attested as ἡπίς, ἡπι or ἡπίμα/πιμά. Additionally difficult is the regular form of the enclitic conjunction τε < *kʷe, never surfacing as τπε. The occasional reflexes of PIE *penkʷe ‘five’ and derivatives of PIE *gʷelbʰ- ‘womb, belly’ have counterexamples with the more marked labial outcomes elsewhere. There is also a single early example for *gʷe attested in θέρμαν (Alc. 143.10 Voigt), albeit in a fragmentary context.50

§69.2 To assess the comparative value of labial vs. non-labial reflexes of labiovelars in the Aeolic dialects, it is clear that the labialized examples before *e(ː) strongly outweigh the evidence for dental reflexes in the same environment. The enclitic conjunction τε < *kʷe is the most puzzling counterexample, and the most economical hypothesis to account for it would be to assume an early loss in these dialects, and then a re-borrowing from the literary or Homeric oral-poetic register. Short of setting up a restricted sound law that applies only to this environment for clitics (cf., e.g. Stephens & Woodard 1986:147, Lejeune 1972:45), the hypothesis of supradialectal borrowing seems to me to be the most plausible solution, given that it seems

50 There are additional attestations of the same root, predominantly in reference to the sanctuary of Artemis Thermia at Mytilene in later Roman period dialect-revival inscriptions. See Scarborough (2023:86) and Scarborough (2023:86n134) for attestations and further discussion.
methodologically difficult to justify an entire sound law for which this is the only example, in addition to the observation that cross-linguistically connectors are the grammatical structures most susceptible to borrowing.\[^{51}\] The Aeolic treatment of \(kʷi \rightarrow τι\) in Boeotian and Thessalian τιμά, Lesbian τίμα, and especially in the relative-interrogative pronoun τίς, τί, which is far less likely to be a borrowing,\[^{52}\] strongly points to the regularity of this sound correspondence in this environment.\[^{53}\]

§70 Remarks on the observed distribution of the labiovelars

§70.1 To simply consider the attested sound correspondences, in addition to the ‘normal’ outcomes summarized in Table 1 above, we may add the synopsis of the observed ‘Aeolic’ outcomes in Table 4 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(k^w)</th>
<th>(e(:)</th>
<th>(i(:)</th>
<th>(\nu[+\text{back}])</th>
<th>(\text{C})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\pi)</td>
<td>(\tau)</td>
<td>(\pi)</td>
<td>(\pi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\varphi)</td>
<td>(\varphi)</td>
<td>(\varphi)</td>
<td>(\varphi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\beta)</td>
<td>(\beta)</td>
<td>(\beta)</td>
<td>(\beta)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Observed Reflexes of the Labiovelars in Boeotian, Thessalian, and Lesbian

As discussed at §69.1 and §69.2 above, the main distribution of the labiovelars in the Aeolic dialects tends towards complete labialization, but a small number of difficult exceptions remain. Most of these can be attributed to a concession to broader supradialectal tendencies and isolated dialectal loanwords, but the cases of the relative-interrogative \(kʷi-is \rightarrow τις\) and \(kʷi-meh₂ \rightarrow \text{Boeotian, Thessalian τιμά, Lesbian τίμα are more difficult to dismiss for \(k^w\) developing to }

\[^{51}\] Matras (2007:54–56). Stephens & Woodard (1986:147) consider a loan of τε to be unlikely and assume that the specific treatment of τε in Aeolic was due to its status as a clitic but note the observation of Parker (2013:134n23) that the dialects do vary in their use of connectives and that Mycenaean exclusively uses -\(q\)e to the exclusion of καί. It would not be unthinkable to imagine a possibility where the clitic conjunction fell out of use in favor of another coordinating conjunction. See also recently García Ramón (2020:306) arguing for supradialectal influence in the use of τε to the exclusion of unattested \(\pi τ\).

\[^{52}\] In the results of the Loanword Typology Project carried out at the former Department of Linguistics of the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology the semantic concept ‘who?’ was found to be within the 100 most borrowing-resistant concepts in the meaning list used in the in the overall study (Tadmor 2009:65–68), cf. The World Loanword Database (WOLD) at https://wold.clld.org/.

\[^{53}\] Observed already by Lejeune (1972:50), see also Stephens & Woodard (1986:147). Note that East Thessalian shows κίς, κί which is usually interpreted as a secondary dissimilation in proximity to a round-back vowel in collocations like *ο\(\ddot{o} \rightarrow k^wiz, \) cf. Lejeune (1972:45), Rix (1976:86). Elsewhere in Thessaly τίς is attested, e.g. in IG IX,2 257 (5th c. BCE, Thessaliots), SEG 36:548 (3rd c. BCE, Hestiaiotis, Metropolis), SEG 31:572 (2nd c. BCE, Pelasgiotis, Kranon), and Béquignon (1935: 37–51, No.1), (2nd c. BCE, Pelasgiotis, Kranon).
the voiceless dental /t/ before high-front /i/. Meanwhile, the ‘normal’ outcomes as found in Attic-Ionic, West Greek, and later Arcadian exhibit the outcomes described at §67.3 above, where the labiovelars are regularly palatalized to dentals before *e(:), and the voiceless labiovelar *kʷ is palatalized to a dental before *i(:). The first observation I make from this distribution is that there seems to be something special about the restricted environment of the voiceless labiovelar *kʷ before high-front /i/, where this appears to be not only the regular outcome in most of the dialects, but also in Aeolic where labialization appears to be regular in all other environments.

§70.2 The second observation that I would make following upon the previous one, is that the split distribution before *i where *kʷ palatalizes while *gʷ and *kʷʰ do not, despite regularly palatalizing before *e, is typologically unusual if one is expecting a simple palatalization process. To put it another way, the relative ability of a vowel to palatalize a consonant is on a gradient on the front-high axis of the vowel space, since this is the area of the vowel space where the tongue moves closer to the hard and soft palate of the mouth. Because of this the high front vowel /i/ gives the narrowest constriction to the palate, and so is the vowel that is most likely to palatalize a preceding consonant, and this effect becomes less likely the further back and low the articulation of the vowel is (see Figure 3).54

---


---

Figure 3: A Reconstruction of the Proto-Greek Vowel Space with a Typology of Typically Palatalizing Environments Overlaid

With this held in mind the crux of the matter is: if /i/ is the vowel that is prototypically more susceptible to palatalizing consonants, why do *gʷi-, *kʷʰi- escape palatalization while the
labiovelars become palatalized before /e/ in the non-Aeolic dialects? Both observations from §70.1 and §70.2 appear to point to a much more complicated story in Aeolic and the other Greek dialects in the Aegean.55

§71 A proposed solution for Attic-Ionic, West Greek, and Arcadian

§71.1 The most economical solution to deal with the problem of the split reflex of the labiovelars before /i/, to my knowledge, was a proposal made by H. N. Parker (2013) which is the solution I adopt here and will outline in brief. Parker, however, has earlier argued against the historical unity of the Aeolic dialectal subgrouping and so the broader historical implications of his analysis in view of the dialect geography and the non-arboREAL propagation of the palatalization of the labiovelars before /e/ in most of the dialects may be productively further expanded upon.56

§71.2 The first part of these developments addresses the first observation made in §70.1, namely that in all dialects, even Aeolic, the voiceless unaspirated labiovelar stop *kʷ has palatalized to a dental. The first stage of these developments therefore ought to be an early palatalization of only the voiceless unaspirated labiovelar *kʷ specifically restricted to the typologically most palatalizing environment preceding long or short *i (19).

19) *kʷ > *tʲ > t / _i(c)

A similar early palatalization of this specific environment was also proposed by Stephens & Woodard (1986:133) where the sequences of *kʷhi and *gʷi may have been less susceptible to palatalization because of their additional phonetic properties (cf. Stephens & Woodard 1986:143–145 with typological parallels). In effect, this restricted sound change uniquely removes the voiceless unaspirated labiovelar *kʷ and sends it down an alternative sequence of developments from the other two labiovelars in this environment from the very beginning.

55 Cf. Sihler (1995:164) “There is no obvious explanation for the discrepancy between the behavior of *kʷ and the other two labiovelars” echoing the earlier statement of Buck (1933:129) “There is no satisfactory explanation of this divergence from the development of qʷ to τ before i in τίς, τῑμή, etc.”

56 For Parker’s attempt to dismember the Aeolic group, see Parker (2008), against which see especially Scarborough (2023:40–49) and passim.
The crucial intermediary step is the beginning of a palatalization process of the remaining labiovelars before i(ː) and e(ː). In these environments the labial element of the labiovelar stops would become labiopalatal in articulation:

20) \(*k^w > *k^u / \{e, i\}(ː)\)

But crucially, following the argument of Parker (2013: 223), before long or short /i/ the labiopalatal element [i] did not fully delabialize in the sequence [iv] because it would have created a cross-linguistically disfavored sequence [ii]. In this environment new learners could have reanalyzed these retained sequences of [iv] as allophones of the labiovelars that were still independent phonemes in the phonological system, and so in the specific environment before *i(ː) the labiovelars were restored. The remainder of the labiopalatals which continued to exist before *e(ː) would lose the labial feature and proceed down a familiar path of palatalization, eventually merging with the affricates and developing with them.

§71.4 Once the labiopalatals were restored to labiovelars before /i/ the remainder of the labiovelars would have lost their velar co-articulation in all environments giving the remainder of the labial outcomes. Cross-linguistically, at least among the early Indo-European languages this is a common sound change with parallel developments in the Sabellic languages and in some varieties of Celtic. This is likely to have occurred in most dialects prior to the resolution of the palatalizations which took place as described at §71.3, since this wave of labialization is already present in the early Arcadian inscriptions which attest tsan as a grapheme, e.g. φονές ‘murderer’ < *gʷom-es- (IG V,2 262.26, 30; cf. Attic φονεύς), βεν ‘ox’ < acc.sg. *gʷðm (Carbon & Clackson 2016:122, l.7), etc. (see Table 6).

---

Table 6: The approximate state of affairs as attested in early Arcadian

Following the state which we have attested in early Arcadian, the only remaining change necessary to arrive at the pan-Greek ‘normal’ outcomes of the labiovelars is the resolution of the phonemes represented in early Arcadian through tsan (via de-affrication?) as dental stops, completing the palatalization process and is congruent with the observed outcomes as outlined in Table 1 at §67.3 above.

§71.5 An approximate relative chronology of the entirety of the developments concerning the palatalization and labialization of the labiovelars in Attic-Ionic, West Greek, and Arcadian is schematized in Figure 4.

Figure 4: A Schematized Relative Chronology for the Labiovelars in Attic-Ionic, West Greek, and Arcadian

§72 The relative chronology of the labiovelars in Aeolic versus other dialects

§72.1 At §69.2 and §70.1 I argued that the observed outcomes of the labiovelars in Boeotian, Thessalian, and Lesbian appears to regularly reflect *kʷi > τι, with full labialization in all other environments. The simplest solution to account for this distribution would be an
assumption of a different rule ordering first assuming a pan-Greek palatalization of the voiceless unaspirated labiovelar *\( k^w \) in the restricted environment when followed by high-front *\( i \) (§71.2), followed by a subsequent labialization of all the labiovelars in all remaining environments (§71.4), bypassing the process of the second palatalization before front vowels entirely (§71.3).

§72.2 If this is the best explanation for the linguistic facts alone, then the dialect geography must also be addressed, particularly because it appears evident that the second palatalization (§71.3) was an areally spread sound change (cf. §68). Thessalian and Boeotian are centrally placed in the dialect geography of the Classical dialects, and Boeotia in particular stands at the crossroads of Northern and Northwest Greece, the Peloponnese, and Attica. It seems reasonable to ask, given the centrality of Boeotia in mainland Greece, why the second palatalization did not apply in Boeotian (and to a certain extent also in Thessalian). While alternative explanations may be possible, the lack of the second palatalization of the labiovelars in Boeotian is suggestive that the full labialization occurred earlier and independently from the labialization which occurred in other dialects after the beginning of the second palatalization of the labiovelars began elsewhere. Essentially, the environments that would have been affected were lost before the process of the second palatalization could apply. Parallel to the developments schematized at §71.5, I offer a relative chronology for Boeotian, Thessalian, and Lesbian in Figure 5 below.

---

Figure 5: A Schematized Relative Chronology for the Labiovelars in Aeolic
§73 Conclusions

§73.1 To conclude, the dialectal distribution of the observed reflexes of the Proto-Greek labiovelar stops in the Aegean may be best reconciled by assuming two separate relative chronologies for their development. There is the first one, described in §71 which applied in the majority of dialects, and the separate developments which applied in Boeotian, Thessalian, and Lesbian described in §72. Given that the developments of the second palatalization ($\S$71.3) were areal, the attested dialect geography has implications for their relative interpretation, and I have argued that, as a consequence of this, the full labialization of the labiovelars in Boeotian, Thessalian, and Lesbian was likely to have been earlier and independent of the remaining Greek dialects. While loss of labial coarticulation is a typologically not uncommon way for labiovelars to be lost in other attested Indo-European languages ($\S$71.4), it is especially notable that the shared relative chronology for the elimination of the labiovelars in Boeotian, Thessalian, and Lesbian prior to the areally spread second palatalization is a stronger argument for the labialization found in the Aeolic dialects being a non-trivial sound change. This is because the opposite hypothesis would require the assumption that all three dialects underwent an alternative series of sound changes in an order different from the rest of the Greek dialects two or three times independently, and crucially the intersection of the attested dialect geography and the areal nature of the spread of the second palatalization of the labiovelars allows a more nuanced view of this isogloss to be possible. Finally, if this scenario is correct and it points to an earlier unity of the Aeolic dialects, it will be necessary to come up with a concrete historical hypothesis that can explain the discontinuous dialect geography of Boeotian and Thessalian around the Malian Gulf, but for now I will leave that question as a matter for further research.
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Discussion following Scarborough’s Presentation

§75 Matthew Scarborough started the discussion by remarking that while he offered a compelling narrative based on linguistic facts, an explanation still needs to be provided for why the highlighted differences were distributed over the examined area in this particular way.

§76 Scarborough reflected on how it is possible to account for this apparent discontinuity in the dialect geography between Thessalian and Boeotian.
Specifically, Scarborough pondered about the possibility to form an idea of the historical context in which these changes were taking place through an archaeological perspective.

Rachele Pierini asked Scarborough if he could provide further thoughts on the broader implications that he mentioned at the end of his talk.

Scarborough pointed out that he analyzed the issue from a linguistic angle, i.e., by looking at linguistic facts. Scarborough added that, however, it is not easy to interpret the discontinuity between Thessalian and Boeotian when looking at classical dialect geography, and wondered how it would be possible to explain it in terms of a non-linguistic historical process.

Greg Nagy focused on the geographical area highlighted by Scarborough on the map provided during the presentation and pointed out that this area, which corresponds to the same territory where the Copais Lake or Marsh was situated, was a Mycenaean territory in the second millennium BCE. Nagy observed that the second millennium site of Gla is located in this same area. Gla, Nagy added, overshadowed Mycenae in terms of its vast buildings—but the site has the characteristics of a storage center and is hardly palatial.

According to Mycenaeologists, Nagy specified, the Mycenaeans were extraordinarily able engineers and were the first to succeed in draining that marshland for agricultural purposes. Never again was the Marsh drained—till the nineteenth century CE.

Returning to the linguistic issue, Nagy drew the participants’ attention to an article by Charles de Lamberterie on the Linear B onomastic ko-pe-re-u, supposedly the equivalent of Κοπρεύς (de Lamberterie 2012). This transcription, Nagy stressed, raises a question: why is the name spelled with a ‘p’ rather than a ‘q’?

Nagy then pointed out that the name could be interpreted as ‘Mr Manure’, as it were—which would be far from a derogatory term. Nagy added that manure was not viewed negatively, as it was a very precious material used as fuel in the past. Nagy highlighted a detail preserved in the first millennium BCE from Mycenaean mythology: Kopreus was the name of the agent of King Eurystheus, overking of Mycenae, and it was Kopreus who transmitted the commands of Eurystheus to Herakles when the latter had to perform his Twelve Labors. Nagy noted what de Lamberterie argues: if the name actually came from the same root as the word for ‘manure’, it should have a /q/ and not a /p/ in the Linear B spelling. After all, in Sanskrit the
word for ‘manure’ is śakṛt, which shows that the word was shaped with *kw rather than /p/ in Indo-European.

§84 According to de Lamberterie, Nagy reported, it is possible that the term in Linear B was not derived from the word for ‘manure’, but rather from the same root as in κόπτω, meaning ‘the Striker’ or some similar onomastic.

§85 Nagy noted the possibility that second millennium elements of a myth continued into the first millennium BCE. He highlighted the fact that, in the one attestation of the name Kopreus in Homeric Greek, he is described as ‘the man from Mycenae’. All this, Nagy noted, harks back to Woodard’s theory that dialectal traces are already visible in Linear B spellings (Woodard 2021).

§86 Palaima asked whether Nagy supported the etymology that would connect the onomastic in question to the term for ‘manure’.

§87 Nagy confirmed that he supports this etymology and added that one additional element of interest is the fact that the name Kopreus is connected with the Labors of Heracles, specifically the myth where the hero has to shovel manure from the Augean stables, and the location is associated by Nagy with Pisa, not with Elis.

§88 Roger Woodard remarked that Nagy’s idea is very intriguing and added that, in his opinion, the change examined by Scarborough did not extend to Aeolia because the Aeolians were settled in Anatolia when the change was happening. Woodard then referred to his forthcoming monograph, especially Chapter 17, where his thoughts on the matter are summarized (Woodard forthcoming).

§89 Brent Vine intervened by asking Scarborough’s thoughts on the so-called Aeolic phase of Homeric composition. Vine contextualized the question by pointing out that, in recent years, there has been a reassessment of the alleged Aeolic elements in Homer, for instance in forms like πίσυρες ‘four’.

§90 Matthew Scarborough observed that the ‘diffusion’ model, in which the Aeolic material in the Homeric epics, is thought to be the result of contact between dialects with different poetic traditions at the time of the compositions. This, Scarborough added, is a more plausible explanation for the Aeolisms than the so-called ‘stacked-phase’ model. Scarborough specified that he does not believe that this particular problem can influence the ideas regarding the historical developments of Aeolic, as mentioned in his presentation. In particular, he referred
to the recent argument for this position by Jones (Jones 2012), though noting that the debate around this question remains lively (Janko 2012), Scarborough concluded.

§91 Rachele Pierini asked Scarborough what implications his research has on the developments of the Proto-Indo-European labiovelars in Mycenaean, especially in case of dissimilation in words like *qo-u-ko-ro* or ‘cowherd’.

§92 Scarborough replied that there is evidence for these specific developments in Mycenaean happening at a very early stage of the development into Mycenaean. Examples of the labiovelar dissimilation in Mycenaean, Scaraborough remarked, can be seen when comparing the words, *a-pi-qo-ro* ‘attendant’ and *qo-u-ko-ro* ‘cowherd’. Scaraborough then specified that, etymologically, they share the second compound member, but in *qo-u-ko-ro* < *gʷow-kʷolos*, the second labiovelar *kw* is dissimilated to a plain velar *k* since it is adjacent to the labial *w*. In *a-pi-qo-ro* < *ampʰi-kʷolos*, there is no adjacent labial sound and thus no dissimilation.

§93 Roger Woodard raised the question of the palatalization of consonants, remarking that the phenomenon began even before 1200 BCE in highly palatalizing environments, such as between two front vowels. We have no orthographic evidence for this, Woodard clarified, but that might be due to the general tendency for conservative orthographic conventions in the attestations.

§94 Scarborough agreed that this is an interesting question, specifying that he does not have an opinion on the limited examples in support of this theory or, more precisely, on when the development would have occurred.

§95 Following up on this question, Tom Palaima emphasized the conservative nature of orthography by discussing the potential dialectal divide within Mycenaean into a ‘normal’ and ‘special’ type, where the latter is considered to be a chancellery dialect used by and shared among scribes.

§96 Scarborough noted that, regarding the question of ‘normal’ and ‘special’ Mycenaean, he follows Robert Thompson’s works on the issue. Concerning the uniformity of the ‘special’ dialect, Scaraborough then mentioned Palaima’s chapter in the second volume of The Companion to Linear B, where Palaima argues that the scribal profession might have been hereditary (Palaima 2011). Scarborough, in fact, highlighted that this could have been one of the possible reasons for the uniformity.
§97  Tom Palaima further explained these ideas by comparing the absence of evidence for a Mycenaean scribal school to scribal traditions that existed in the Near and Middle East at the time. Palaima also reasoned around the supplementary syllabic signs we find in the scribal dialects, which seem to be separate from the ‘core’ Cypriot script. In this respect, Palaima argued that the scribal profession might have been passed down within clan groups, similar to other professions.

§98  Gregory Nagy pointed out his diverging opinions with Rupert Thompson on the matter of traces of other dialects in Linear B.

§99  Nagy returned to the word Κοπρεύς as referring to the herald of King Eurystheus of Mycenae, which would provide evidence for Aeolic traces in the Mycenaean-speaking area (cf. Woodard 2021). The presence of the Aeolic palatalized reflex π/p/ from PIE *kw in Κοπρεύς, Nagy concluded, shows this word to be an Aeolic form.

§100  Scarborough’s Bibliography
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