From Mycenaean Times to Classical Greece: Continuity or Discontinuity?1

Although the question of the title appears rather general, it has some importance for the historian of Greece, for whom the question, to give it more point, could be phrased: Does Greek History begin with the Mycenaean? Or does it start during the Dark Ages at that point to which the earliest genuine historical memory of the classical Greeks reached back? George Grote, to take but one example, considered Greek history proper to begin in the year 776, the date of the first entry in the list of victors in the foot-race at Olympia. What had taken place before belonged to prehistory and was not touched upon except by unreliable myth. As the Mycenaean Age was but poorly known when Grote was writing and the labours of the archaeologist had hardly begun, the problem which faces us to-day did not yet present itself to the great liberal historian. As against Grote we to-day have historically useful texts from the Mycenaean period, namely the Linear B tablets and sealings from Pylos, Knosos, Kydonia, Mycenae, Tiryns, Midea, and Thebes. Our next earliest texts are the Homeric epics, the

1 This article represents the (now considerably revised) text of a lecture held at the New Zealand classicists' triennial conference held in Palmerston North in 1996. For comment I thank the anonymous reviewer at this periodical. - In the following I use the word "classical" to denote what Mycenologists refer to as the "alphabetic" era in Greek history; broadly speaking the (traditionally defined) "archaic" and "classical" periods. In the translations of Mycenaean inscriptions italicisation of a word indicates that its meaning is only approximately (as opposed to exactly) known.
Iliad and the Odyssey, which, with certain qualifications (e.g. the Peisistratid recension), reached the state in which we have them, in my opinion, roughly in the eighth and early seventh century respectively. Between Linear B on the one hand and Homeric Epic on the other there yawns a gap of four centuries. So we confront the problem of deciding whether or not the Mycenaean texts and the later classical texts from Homer on down document the history of the same people and the same civilisation; whether or not the Mycenaean epoch should be considered a false start, a dead-end in the evolution of the Hellenic nation, one which can profitably be separated from Greek history proper.

One of the most popular recent treatments of the history of early Greece, that by Oswyn Murray, bearing, in fact, the title Early Greece, considers the "Mycenaean World...separate from the world of classical Greek civilization." According to him "discontinuity ... [is] virtually complete." In accordance with this dogma Murray just touches upon the Mycenaean world in passing in a brief 11-page introductory chapter entitled "myth, history and archaeology" before moving on to the real history of early Greece which for him begins towards the end of the Dark Ages. Now, Murray, whom I have perhaps unfairly singled out, is in actuality merely following a curious tradition in modern Greek historiography.

In the closing decades of the nineteenth century Heinrich Schliemann's excavations of pre-classical sites in Greece - Mycenae, Tiryns, Orchomenos - began and succeeded in bringing to scholars' attention evidence of a wealthy pre-classical civilisation. In the words of Gustave Glotz: "Il fallait bien admettre désormais qu'avant l'arrivée des Hellènes dans la péninsule une brillante société y avait vécu." N.b. that Glotz' choice of words presents it as self-evident that this pre-classical civilisation antedated the arrival of the Greeks. Most historians of Greece before the last war were in fact quite uncertain as to whether there were any Greeks living in Greece before the Dark Ages; they were, however, - all

---
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of them - emphatic in declaring the material culture of this pre-classical civilisation to be non-Greek. Such was the power of the archaeological orthodoxy advanced by Sir Arthur Evans who averred that the people on the mainland stood so completely under Minoan influence, that almost all scholars who treated this issue unhesitatingly declared Late Bronze Age civilisation in Greece to be a Minoan import. The rulers of the mainland civilisation were either Minoans in very deed or at least so heavily Minoanised as to be indistinguishable from actual Minoans. If there were Greeks there - which was by no means certain - then a foreign culture had been imposed upon them. All of the standard treatments of Greek history before the war accordingly deal with Bronze Age mainland culture as a curious prefatory incident with no bearing whatsoever on later Greek civilisation. Eventually, of course, archaeologists such as Alan Wace and Carl Blegen established the fundamental independence of Mycenaean civilisation from Minoan. Yet by

4 Evans' dogmatic insistence that the mainlanders were not Greek is doubtlessly rooted (though I have failed to find any explicit statement of his on the matter) in his biological theory of the development of civilisations, viz. that every civilisation passes through a laboured beginning, a glorious middle, and a slow decline - stated e.g. Palace of Minos, I, London 1921, p. 25; on the 'biological' theory see R.A. McNeal, "The Legacy of Arthur Evans," CSCA, VI, 1973, Pp. 205-220. Since "Greek" civilisation rose during the Dark Ages and reached its zenith in the classical period, only to decline in the Hellenistic and Roman ones, it logically could not already have flourished once before in the Bronze Age. Overly strict adherence to this biological explanation of why kingdoms rose and waned seems to me to lie at the root of Evans' violent prejudice against an independent culture on the mainland which might have been Greek; that, and an all too human wish to magnify the importance of the island culture he had brought to light.

5 See e.g. J. Beloch, Griechische Geschichte, I.1, Straßburg 1912, Pp. 120-125 (e.g. "diese nach dem griechischen Festland verpflanzte Kultur [p. 121]"). This is all the more significant as Beloch believed the Indo-European forbears of the Greeks to have arrived in Greece around 2000 B.C. (following, notwithstanding some departures, the arguments of the comparative linguists concerning the evolution of the Greek language).

6 See e.g. J.B. Bury, History of Greece, London 1902, Pp. 40-41: Bury, while adamant that the Bronze Age culture in the Aegean is pre-Greek, does allow for the Greeks themselves to be present when the "Aegean" civilisation was at its height.

7 A.J.B. Wace and C. Blegen, "Pottery as Evidence for Trade and Colonization in
this time the assumption of cultural and historical discontinuity between Mycenaean and Classical times had long since attained the status of orthodoxy.

Having briefly sketched the situation in the period before the decipherment of Linear B in 1953, I would now like to preface the main body of this paper with a few rather obvious observations, so obvious, in fact, that many have failed to appreciate their import. First, the Linear B Tablets were written in Greek. It is a highly archaic form of Greek, at times difficult to understand, but this in itself hardly surprises as these tablets were written four centuries earlier than our next oldest Greek texts. Mycenaean Greek, as we now call it, is closely related to Arcado-Cyprian, the dialect family spoken in Arcadia and on Cyprus in classical times, and probably should be thought of as the ancestress of these classical dialects.8

(Less obviously, and as an aside, it is becoming ever clearer that there was also continuity from Mycenaean to classical times not only in the language as such, but even in the subjective analysis of the Greek language. Both Mycenaean scribes and classical grammarians, at least in practice, defined a “word” — arbitrarily, it scarcely needs saying — as an accentual unit which could consist of any accented lexeme alone or together with any number of unaccented ones. That is to say, in the eyes of later Greek scholars as well as Mycenaean bureaucrats, enclitics and proclitics together

8 That Arcadian and Cyprian are the closest relatives of Mycenaean no-one has ever denied. Debate has, however, revolved around the issue whether Mycenaean stands to them in the relation of a mother or of an aunt (see e.g. A. Bartonek, “Greek Dialects between 1000 and 300 B.C.,” SMEA, XX, 1979, p. 114). For an explanation of some of the major deviations of Arcadian and Cyprian from Mycenaean which squares these with a direct descent from Mycenaean see V. Parker, “Zur Datierung der Dorischen Wanderung,” MH, LII, 1995, p. 130-154.
with the accented lexeme to which they attached themselves formed one "word." After the same fashion both classical grammarians and Mycenaean scribes chose to consider that every medial consonant cluster (geminates alone excepted) with a stop as the first consonant was tautosyllabic and belonged to the following syllable: i.e. according to their interpretation one should say λεπτός, δ-γδοος. What surprises about this interpretation is that it runs counter to phonetic reality. In actuality such consonant clusters were heterosyllabic (e.g. - roughly - λεπτός, δ-γδοος). I am, of course, aware that the practising historian of to-day cannot but view the foregoing comment as arcane; and he will be inclined to dismiss it as immaterial owing to its philological incomprehensibility. I would ask him, however, to consider whether or not it gives any insight into one of the intangible elements of any culture: its mindset, its system of unspoken assumptions; that which another culture is least likely to duplicate. Such mutterings

9 The Mycenaean evidence, thanks to the scribes’ use of the word-divider, is unambiguous: thus (from PY Ep 704) da-mo-de-mi, /Damos-de-mi/, which we of course in a modern edition in accordance with our own view of what a “word” is would print as δάμος δέ μί... - i.e. as three words - was for the Mycenaeans but one. The same applies to e.g. o-o-pe-ro-si, /(h)o-ophellonsi/, “thus they owe,” or o-u-di-do-si, /ou-didonsi/, “they give not.” (PY Ep 704; Nn 228; Ma 90 respectively). For further discussion see A. Morpurgo Davies, “Mycenaean and Greek syllabification,” Tractata Mycenaea, Skopje 1987, Pp. 96-97.


11 The first consonant had to belong (in part, at least) to the preceding syllable as seen in the dictates of quantitative verse: a syllable with a short vowel counted as long if at least two consonants followed; i.e. the first consonant closed the syllable (i.e. as if λεπτός). Classical grammarians, having set the syllable boundary before the first consonant (i.e. as if λεπτός), then had to explain how the now open syllable could count as long in verse. They could not and simply called the vowel long e positione, which does not mean, as we all learnt, “by position” but rather “by definition.” The phonetic reality, incidentally, was that the first consonant of the cluster belonged to both syllables, i.e. the syllable boundary lay neither before nor after, but on the consonant: hence the quandary of the classical Greek grammarians. On Greek syllabification see generally E. Hermann, Silbenbildung im Griechischen, Göttingen 1978 [rep.]).
aside, we clearly have not only linguistic continuity; we even have continuity in arbitrary linguistic analysis as well.)

Second, the Linear B tablets have proved that Mycenaean religion was in all major aspects identical with later Greek religion.\(^{12}\) We now know that the Mycenaeans worshipped Zeus, Hera, Poseidon, Hermes, Artemis, Athena, Dionysus, and Ares.\(^{13}\) Of the major gods Apollo alone is unattested, and he – Nietzsche's opinions notwithstanding – is almost certainly a late import from the Orient.\(^{14}\) We know that the Mycenaeans, as did the classical Greeks, distinguished between gods and heroes – even if not necessarily in the precise same way\(^{15}\); we know that the Mycenaeans' worship centred on sanctuaries and that in these – according to classical custom – assemblages of related gods received offerings (e.g. Zeus, Hera, and an obscure son of Zeus in an apparently large sanctuary of Zeus near Pylos)\(^{16}\); we know that the Mycenaeans – as did the

\(^{12}\) The Linear B tablets do not refine the methodology used by M.P. Nilsson, *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology*: they supersede it. The unreliability of the methods to which Nilsson was driven to have recourse manifests itself in their failure to identify Dionysus as belonging to the original Greek pantheon as well as in their curious "proof" of Apollo's membership in it.

\(^{13}\) Zeus, Poseidon, and Artemis are frequently attested in the tablets. For the others: Hera, i.e. /Hera/, "for Hera," PY Tn 316 v.; Hermes, i.e. *e-ma-\*a\*\*\*, /Herma(h) ai/, "for Hermes," PY Tn 316 v.; Athena, i.e. *a-ta-na-po-ti-ni-ja*, /Athanai Potniai/ or possibly /Anthes Potniai/, "for Mistress Athena" or possibly "for the Mistress of Athens," KN V 52; Dionysus, i.e. *di-wo-nu-so*, /Diwonusoi/, "for Dionysus," KH Gq 5; Ares, *a-re*, /Arei/, "for Ares," KN Fp 14.


\(^{15}\) The Mycenaeans' worship of heroes (as opposed to that of gods) is attested by the divinity entitled ti-ri-se-ro-e, /Tris(h)ero(h)ei/, "to the Triple-hero," PY Tn 316, r. 5.

\(^{16}\) PY Tn 316, v. 8-10: i-je-to, *di-wi-jo, do-ra-qe, pe-re, po-re-na-qe, a-ke, di-\*we\* AUR *213\* VAS\*1\* VAS VAS\*1\* VIR 1 e-ra AUR *213\* VAS 1 MUL 1 di-ri-mi-jo, di-\*wo, i-je-we AUR *213\* VAS 1, i.e. "he sacrifices in the sanctuary of Zeus and both carries gifts and leads porena-men: to Zeus: one golden vase, one male; to Hera: one golden vase, one female; to Drimios, the son of Zeus: one golden vase." In KH Gq 5 'both Zeus and Dionysus receive offerings in the sanctuary of Zeus in Kydonia on Crete.' — The statement of Lord William Taylour, *The Mycenaeans*, London 1983) 46, that "the gods were not venerated in great temples during the Mycenaean period," is quaint, but unfortunately symptomatic of the refusal, fashionable in some quarters, to
classical Greeks – named months after their great religious festivals (e.g. the *di-wi-jo-jo*, *me-no*, /Diwyoio menos/, “in the month of the festival of Zeus”17). In fine, Mycenaean religion was Greek through and through.18 There is, then, from Mycenaean to Classical times both linguistic and religious continuity: in other words the Mycenaecans were Greeks living in a Greek society.

Third, the Linear B documents also provide evidence for cultural continuity from Mycenaean to Classical times. In most pre-modern societies names actually have meanings and are given to children for specific reasons, with specific expectations, and with specific customs and assumptions in mind.19 Now one thing the Linear B tablets give us in abundance is names: most of the texts are, frankly, lists of men and women whom the palace for various reasons kept track of. And these names, covering all strata of society from the nobles of the realm down to the shepherds in the fields, are not only good Greek names, but by and large they are also the same names known from classical times or at the very least names constructed in the same ways on the basis of the same cultural assumptions. To take but a few examples of names which were passed down through the years: *ku-pe-se-ro*, /Kupselos/, “Cliff-Martin”20; *ka-sa-to*, read the Linear B texts. Cf. e.g. “the detailed reconstruction of the Mycenaean world rests therefore on archaeology, and must in general be confined to its material culture” (Murray [n. 2] 7).


18 There is no good introduction to Mycenaean religion. M. Gérard-Rousseau, *Les mentions religieuses dans les tablettes mycéniennes = Incunabula Graeca*, XXIX, Roma 1968) is now outdated i.a. owing to the discovery of new texts.


20 KN Og 4467. For the identification of the exact type of bird see d’A.H. Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Birds*, Oxford 1938, p. 188. (The name “Kypselos” has, of course, nothing to do with the word χυψέλη, “chest”; the ancient commenta-
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/Ksanthos/, "He with the Brown Hair,"
*a-re-ka-sa-do-ro, /*Aleksandros/, "Wards off Men," or a-ke-ra-wo, /Age-lawos/, "Leads the Host." All names tell us something about Greek society, both Mycenaean and Classical: the cliff-martin was a bird associated with some positive quality; brown hair was uncommon and hence noteworthy; and an ability to beat off men, i.e. enemy warriors in battle, or, conversely, to lead a company of one's own men was a most important attribute for a man to have.

The names just presented additionally illustrate the two major categories into which classical names can be divided: those which consist of one stem only (e.g. ka-ra-u-ko, /Glaukos/, "He of the Glittering Eye") or those which consist of two (as the aforementioned /Age-lawos/, Αγέ-λαος). The first category frequently includes names referring to a bodily characteristic, e.g. pu-wo, /Purwos/, classical Πύρρος, "He with the Red Hair," or to an animal whose positive qualities the bearer is to embody, e.g. the aforementioned ku-pe-se-ro, /Kupselos/, Κύψελος; cf. Mycenaean ta-u-ro, /Tauros/, "Bull," or classical Λέων, "Lion." In the second category

itors' connexion of the name with the word for "chest" results from "kling-klang" etymology and inspired the story of how the Corinthian tyrant of this name was hidden away by his mother in a "chest": Hdt. V 92d.)

21 PY An 39. Ξανθός means "brown," instead of "golden, blond": see LSJ s.v. ξανθίζω with references which is decisive. Greek has, in fact, no word for "blond": see Diodorus, V 32,2 where to describe blond hair Diodorus writes πολιός, "white, grey."

22 Actually attested is the corresponding feminine form: a-re-ka-sa-da-ra, /Aleksandra/, MY V 659. Cf. the pair ke-sa-da-ra (PY Ea 828) and ke-sa-do-ro (KN As 1520): /Kessandra/ and /Kessandros/ respectively which correspond to later Κασσάνδρα and Κάσσανδρος which evince regressive vocalic assimilation. /Kessandros/ means "Surpasses (all the other) Men (i.e. esp. as a warrior)."

— Greek women's names, incidentally, are often feminine forms of names whose meaning applies to the male world only — another feature of the onomastic system which remains constant from Mycenaean to classical times.

23 KN Vc 316.
24 PY Cn 285.
25 KN As 1516.
26 KN V 832.
we find subdivisions i.a. into names with the pattern Verb-Object
or Object-Verb: e.g. the aforementioned /*Aleks-andros/ or, of the
other type, ra-wo-qo-ta, /Lawo-k*hortas/, 27 classical Λεω-φόντης,
"Slays the Host (i.e. that of the enemy)." The group Verb-Object
has a further subcategory: those names in which the suffix -ti/si- is
added to the verbal stem: or-ti-na-wo, /Or-ti-nawos/, 28 "Impels the
Ships Onwards"; cf. Homeric' Θρ-τι-λοχος, "Impels the Company
Onwards." Another class of two-stem names consists of Noun and
Adjective and indicates something which the bearer's father wishes
him to possess: e.g. e-u-me-ne, /Eu-menes/, 29 classical Εύ-μένης,
"Good Spirit, esp. Fighting Spirit" or *e-te-wo-ke-le-we, /*Etewo-
klewes/, 30 classicalΈτεο-κλής, "True Renown, i.e. esp. in War."

To conclude this discussion which could be swelled with dozens
of additional examples31: the onomastic system of the Mycenaean
Age is almost exactly the same as that of the classical period. First,
the compositional categories are identical. Second, the thematic
categories are identical. Third, and most importantly for us, the
cultural system of values implied by the names remained the same:
we note with what regularity the names tend to reflect male prowess

27 PY Jn 750.
28 PY Cn 285.
29 PY Ea 757.
30 PY An 654. The name is attested in the form of the patronymic adjective e-te-
wo-ke-re-we-i-jo, /Etewoklewe(h)ios/, "son of Eteocles."
31 As an aside we may also note that we find the same types of mischievous
nicknames attested: Mycenaean si-mo, /Simon/ or /Simos/, “Snubnose” (KN Sc
263) or classical Γάστρος, “Belly”; na-puti-jo, /Naputios/, “Simpleton,” (KN Db
1232) or classical Κόροφος, “Pumpkinhead.” It is unlikely that any father would
name his son “Simpleton” or “Snubnose: in such cases we obviously have before
us a humorous nickname which some hapless soul was eventually compelled to
accept in the place of his real name because everyone called him that anyway. One
may compare with this the different onomastic practices of the Romans where
such “nicknames” appear only as cognomina: the poet Ovid (P. Ouidius Naso)
appearedly had an ancestor with a rather large, well, Roman nose which provided
the distinguishing moniker for that particular branch of the Ouidii; the same holds
true, mutatis mutandis, for the flop-eared ancestor of Ovid’s contemporary, Q.
Horatius Flaccus (Horace). At any rate, here such nicknames serve not to identify
individuals, but rather to denote separate branches of large clans.
in battle either directly or indirectly. Mycenaean society placed a high premium on the same things as later classical society; we have thanks to the onomastic evidence\(^{32}\) per se considerable evidence for cultural continuity as well.\(^{33}\)

\(^{32}\) Onomastic evidence always has particular value provided that no-one in the course of transmission has tampered with it. We learn more about the religious policy of King Ahab of Israel from the names he gave his sons than from all the aspersions cast on him and his much maligned wife by the authors of III. and IV. Rg.: his sons were called Ahaziah and Jehoram, that is, “YHWH seizes (i.e. His enemy)” and “YHWH lifts up (i.e. His faithful worshipper)”. Such names would be unthinkable if Ahab had not honoured YHWH as the patron deity of his house and of his kingdom, a fact which, incidentally, independent contemporary evidence, an inscription of King Mesha of Moab (H. Donner and W. Röllig, Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften, Nr. 181), attests directly. Fortunately, the presence of the theonym “YHWH” spared Ahab’s sons’ names the fate which befell those which contained “Baal” (\textit{stricto sensu} just a word meaning “master, lord”: originally applicable to any divinity, but later effectively the proper name of a specific one): e.g. Saul’s son originally bore the name Ishbaal or “Servant of the ‘Master’”, yet later scribes, in derogation of the divinity named Baal, altered the name to Ishbosheth or “Servant of filth.” In the case of the Mycenaean names, of course, we have no cause to suspect any tampering. — Semitic names additionally illustrate how an onomastic system can reflect the different concerns of a different culture: Names proclaiming a religious programme such as Hebrew Elijah, “YHWH is god,” or Assyrian Shulmanu-asharedu, “(the god) Shulmanu is first,” occur commonly in Semitic languages, but not in Greek where the theophoric element (though often present) serves a different purpose: Theopompus (“the god has sent [i.e. a son]”); Heracles (“may Hera make [i.e. my son] renowned”); Theogenes (“may the god make [i.e. my son] known”); etc. Granted, precisely this type of name does occur in other languages, including the Semitic ones; yet again differences manifest themselves. In Assyrian and Babylonian three-stem names, rare in Greek, are quite frequent: Marduk-apla-iddina, “Marduk has given an heir,” and Nabu-zer-iddina, “Nabu has given seed,” correspond to two-stem Greek names as e.g. Ἡρόδοτος, “Hera has given (i.e. a son)” or Hebrew Jonathan, “YHWH has given (i.e. a son)” for that matter. The differences which appear between the various systems (Semitic, Greek, Roman) make abundantly clear just how unlikely it would be for two societies to produce the same onomastic system independently.

\(^{33}\) There are, of course, non-Greek names attested in the Mycenaean texts, especially those from Crete where Minoan names will have been common. Although on the whole the percentage of non-Greek names in the Linear B material seems to be higher than that in the classical (appearances can deceive: many Mycenaean names have yet to be interpreted convincingly; once interpreted, more might be seen to be Greek), the significant fact is that the entire classical onomastic system – both thematically and morphologically – is already in place in Mycenaean times.
Let us pause briefly to take stock of what we have already covered. The assumption of discontinuity in the past was to a large extent predicated on the then prevailing position that there may not even have been any Greeks in Greece in the Bronze Age owing to the archaeologists' assertion that the material culture of the mainland was a non-Greek, Minoan one. But once we make ourselves comfortable with the hard fact that Mycenaean civilisation was no inferior carbon copy of Minoan, that the Mycenaeans spoke the same language as later Greeks, worshipped the same gods, and held the same cultural assumptions, in short that they were Greeks, then the idea of continuity becomes much more palatable.

Nevertheless, we still have to take into account the destruction of the civilisation which the Mycenaeans had built. By ca. 1200 all the palaces had burnt to the ground, and with them perished the elaborately hierarchical government which had operated from them. The large Mycenaean kingdoms were hewn in pieces to be replaced in later times by scores of states and statelets. Literacy ceased. The bureaucracies which recorded every bull, cow, ram, ewe, billy-, and nanny-goat in the countryside (at times even by name) of necessity disappeared. These circumstances have been alleged as prima facie evidence of discontinuity: attendant upon the downfall of the palaces and the administration emanating from them was the disappearance of Mycenaean culture. As the linguistic, religious, and onomastic evidence however shows, this was simply not the case.

I think we must distinguish carefully between discontinuity and development. Let us recall to mind that four to five centuries pass between the fall of Mycenae and our oldest historically useful alphabetic texts. There will have been much change; doubtlessly much of Mycenaean civilisation fell into desuetude and was irretrievably lost. Yet is this not still compatible with general continuity? For after the fall of the Mycenaean citadels, as now appears likely, it was the same Greeks left to rebuild as had been there before. Their existence may have been meagre as compared to the glorious days of yore, but they still spoke the same language,
brought offerings to the same gods, sang the same songs, and viewed the physical and metaphysical world in much the same way as their parents before the cataclysm had. Is this not continuity? So if, then, we posit a general continuity, we should expect, even after the passage of several centuries, to find in archaic and even classical times evidence of so-called “survivals” from the Mycenaean era. In the remainder of this essay we will attempt to adduce such specific evidence for continuity. Let us begin by asking whether or not there be any indication for continuity in the archaeological evidence.

In stating this question we collide with an odd circumstance: there is scarcely any archaeological evidence for the presence of foreign elements amongst the survivors of the catastrophe.\(^{34}\) This circumstance has created more than one conundrum for historians and archaeologists, but let us apply it only to the question at hand: it is, to say the least, certainly compatible with the assumption of general ethnic and cultural continuity.

Let us, however, look more closely at particular regions of Greece to see if there be any settlement continuity from Mycenaean times into the Dark Ages. First, we have Attica, where settlement continuity from Mycenaean times on down has to my knowledge never been questioned. What has been at issue is Attica’s rôle in Mycenaean times, for on occasion archaeologists have asserted that they see in Attica a settlement pattern which consists of several local centres not subordinate to any dominant regional one. This would mean that Attica was not one of the great Mycenaean kingdoms, i.e. in point of political and administrative organisation not part of the Mycenaean world. Nevertheless, as Wolf-Dietrich Niemeier has pointed out, we find in Messenia, which we know was organised as a united state under the control of Pylos, a pattern of local

centres in all respects exactly identical to that found in Attica.\textsuperscript{35} Furthermore, we now know enough of the order of magnitude of the size of Mycenaean states (Pylos which controlled classical Messenia, Triphylia, and perhaps parts of southern Elis and western Arcadia\textsuperscript{36}; Thebes which controlled most of Boeotia as well as central and southern Euboea\textsuperscript{37}; Knosos which controlled all of central and western Crete\textsuperscript{38}) to be able to divide up the Greek countryside by means of the so-called Thyssen Polygons with which the New Archaeologists have made us familiar.\textsuperscript{39} There is now additional evidence for a Mycenaean state in Laconia\textsuperscript{40}; one may have existed

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item The northern boundary of the kingdom is in dispute, but probably should be put far enough to the North to include all of Triphylia and some of southern Elis: V. Parker, “Zur Geographie des Reiches von Pylos,” SMEA, XXXI, 1993, Pp. 41-54.
\item Control of central and southern Euboea is attested by the Euboean place-names \textit{a-ma-ru-to(-de), /Amarunthos (-thon-de)/ (TH Wu 58 & Of 26) and \textit{ka-ru-to, /Karustos/ (TH Wu 55); control of southwestern Boeotia up to Mt. Helicon by the place name la-mo-de, /Lamon-de/ (TH Of 38, cf. Wu 88: the name is variously attested in different forms in classical times as that of a river or a town in the neighborhood of Mt. Helicon); control of the southern coast perhaps by the place name e-u-te-re-u (Loc. of a digamma-stem! Hence, perhaps /Eutreu/? which might be an early form of \textit{Ευτρης} in southern Boeotia. The place-name ayki-a-ri-ja(-de), /Aigi(h)alia (-lian-de)/ (TH Of 25 & 35) literally means “city on the coast” and may have lain on Euboea or on the coast opposite Euboea or on the Corinthian Gulf.
\item The following place-names (which cover the central and western parts of the island) indicate the extent of Knosos’ control: \textit{a-mi-ni-so, /Amnisos/; tu-ri-so, /Tulisos/; pa-i-to, /Phaistos/; wi-na-to, /Winatos/ = Πυνατος; a-pa-ta-wa, /Aptarwa/ = Απτέρα; ku-do-ni-ja, /Kudonia/.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
in northern Boeotia at Orchomenos.\textsuperscript{41} So, frankly, one would have to adduce reasons why we should not assume a united Mycenaean state in Attica in size on the same order of magnitude as the other Mycenaean kingdoms. On the basis of its material culture we must view Attica as an integral part of the Mycenaean world, and here we have no evidence for anything other than continuity.

The same applies, as we now know, to the Argolid in the narrow sense of that geographic term (i.e. the plain of Argos). The principal Mycenaean sites – Mycenae, Tiryns, Argos – were resettled after the catastrophe. Pottery styles develop imperturbably from Mycenaean to Submycenaean and under Attic influence to Protogeometric and Geometric.\textsuperscript{42} As we have little else in the archaeological evidence whereby we may judge, we probably should accept cultural as well as settlement continuity for the Argolid also. We shall adduce additional evidence from another sphere to confirm this conclusion later on in a most striking fashion.

Nor is evidence for continuity on a regional basis confined to Attica and the Argolid. We may take the case of Pylos, although here our evidence is not entirely of an archaeological nature. According to the latest investigation of the palace at Pylos, the site was re-settled, although the palace itself was not rebuilt. The material culture of the post-palatial residents does not diverge from that of those who had dwelt there while the palace yet stood. Owing to the paucity of archaeological evidence from Messenia in protogeometric times we cannot, however, be certain on this basis alone that the population remained the same from Mycenaean into Geometric times.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{41} This highly tenuous suggestion bases itself primarily on the (genuine? spurious?) remembrance of two Boeotian kingdoms in Mycenaean times, one at Thebes, the other at Orchomenos, in Homeric epic. No place name yet attested at Thebes implies control of northwestern Boeotia. The position of the fortress at Gla – possibly to protect the drainage works of Lake Copaïs against Thebes – might suggest a second Boeotian kingdom beside Thebes.

\textsuperscript{42} Desborough (n. 34) Pp. 69-74, 161-170.

Nevertheless, some other evidence of an historical and linguistic nature may help us. At the end of the Second Messenian War (i.e. ca. 6004) according to Pausanias the denizens of Pylos and Methone fled from the victorious Spartans into the West. A second passage in Pausanias informs us that on the site of Methone the Spartans after the Second Messenian War resettled Nauplians from the Argolid. Now, we can confirm what Pausanias tells us in the case of the Methoneans, for Theopompus records how the Argives drove the Nauplians from their homes and how the latter were resettled by the Spartans in Methone. But whither fled the Methoneans and the Pylians? Pausanias goes on to say that they fled to Rhegium over which at the time the tyrant Anaxilas ruled. However, we know that Anaxilas reigned at the beginning of the fifth century over a hundred years later, so clearly something is amiss in Pausanias' account. I believe that a passage in Antiochus of Syracuse, always our best source for the colonisation of Magna Graecia, helps somewhat in clarifying matters. According to Antiochus, who wrote in the fifth century, "Achaians" who had been driven from Spartan territory were called into the West by the Sybarites who desired them specifically on account of their enmity with the Spartans. The Sybarites chose enemies of the Spartans, because they wished to settle such in the deserted town of Metapontum near the Spartan colony of Taras as a counterweight to that colony.

"Achaians" can be inhabitants of one of the two regions in classical times known as Achaia, or they can be all Greeks of the Heroic Age. For this reason "Achaians" is also used to refer to the pre-Dorian peoples on the Peloponnese. Antiochus must have this

---

for the (unfortunately scarce) evidence for LH III C and Submycenaean inhabitation of Messenia.

45 Paus. IV 23,1.
46 Paus. IV 24,4.
47 Theopompus, FGrHist 115, Fr. 383 = Strabo, VIII 6,11, p. 373.
48 Antiochus of Syracuse, FGrHist 555, Fr. 12 = Strabo, VI 1,15, Pp. 264-265.
latter meaning in mind, for neither region named Achaia lay within Spartan territory so that one could say of its inhabitants that they fled from Spartan lands. Franz Kiechle has concluded, rightly in my opinion, that these “Achaians” were none other than the Pylians and Methoneans whom the Spartans drove from their lands at the end of the Second Messenian War. 49 If we accept this, then we can on the basis of the inscriptions from Metapontum learn something of the linguistic and presumably ethnic affiliation of these Pylian and Methonean refugees whom Antiochus of Syracuse seems to have reckoned amongst the pre-Dorian population of the Peloponnese.

If I have sifted the inscriptions from Metapontum aright (they have been conveniently collected by R. Giacomelli 50), then two dialectally characteristic forms emerge: First, the Metapontines use the typically Arcadian ending -ης for the nominative singular of the digamma-stems. 51 Second, the Metapontine form of the preposition ἐν is ἵν, 52 a dialectal form almost exclusively peculiar to the Arcadians, the Cyprians, and the inhabitants of regions once colonised by them in Crete. These two forms – nom. sg. of the digamma-stems in -ης and ἵν – are utterly incompatible with the often alleged origin of the Metapontines in the Peloponnesian Achaia where a Northwest Greek dialect was spoken. For these reasons we may set the Pylians and Methoneans who settled Metapontum in linguistic terms alongside of the Arcadians who spoke a dialect which is all probability directly descended from Mycenaean Greek. If we may accept an ethnic affiliation along with the dialectal affiliation, then these Pylians and Methoneans will have been the descendants of the Mycenaeans who dwelt in this region in the thirteenth century. In other words, we have settlement

49 F. Kiechle, Messenische Studien, Kallmünz 1959, Pp. 34-45.
51 Ἀχιλλέας ("ē" here indicates the long vowel written "η" in Attic; Giacomelli, Nr. 36); Attic would be Ἀχιλλαεύς.
52 Ἰν ἄνθρωπος ("ο" here indicates the long vowel written "ω" in Attic; Giacomelli, Nr. 39 = LSAG, p. 255 = IG XIV 652 = SGDI 1643).
continuity not only in Attica and Argos, but in the coastal areas of Messenia as well.

Now I do not wish to insinuate that we have settlement continuity everywhere in Greece. The Dodecanese, for example, seems to have lain deserted in the first decades after the collapse of the Mycenaean kingdoms. In some regions, then, we do have settlement discontinuity. It is not, however, a universal phenomenon.

Finally, we must also refer to the Arcadians and the Cyprians, whose dialects are descended directly from the Mycenaeans. If we accept the transmutation of linguistic descent into ethnic descent, then the speakers of those two dialects in classical times were the offspring of the speakers of Mycenaean Greek.

We now come to evidence for continuity of a literary nature. We noted some pages earlier that the survivors of the catastrophe sang the same songs as their Mycenaean forbears had. All of us will, of course, turn first to the Homeric epics as evidence of literature handed down from the Mycenaeans to the classical Greeks. Whereas Homer, as we may for the sake of brevity denote the author or authors of the Homeric poems, in general describes the material and political world of his own day, he does in a few instances preserve genuine details of the Mycenaean period which must have been handed down from oral poet to oral poet over the course of centuries. Nevertheless, in what follows I will confine myself to a few points of correspondence between Homer’s language and Mycenaean Greek, for the poet’s highly traditional language is perhaps a better gauge of the antiquity of the traditions in which he laboured than the material world he describes in his poetry.


Homer preserves, for example, some words otherwise known only from Mycenaean Greek: σίαλος, "fatted hog," or είρος, "wool." These words seem to have formed part of the traditional poetic vocabulary which had otherwise passed out of use in post-Mycenaean times. In other cases it was only the meaning of words which had changed from Mycenaean to classical times, where Homer still has the Mycenaean meaning. One example: εὐχομαι in classical times means "pray, vow," whereas in Mycenaean it meant "declare solemnly, assert, claim," a meaning still attested in Homer. There are points of grammar as well: in some instances Homer does not augment secondary indicative tenses; this grammatical feature is characteristic of Mycenaean Greek. Finally, one phonetic observation may reveal much about the antiquity of Epic poetry: some lines of the Iliad will not scan without the assumption of syllabic "r." II. II 651 and XVI 857 are metrically impossible as they stand, but are transformed into normal hexameters if rewritten in early Mycenaean (i.e. pre-Linear B) Greek with syllabic "r" (represented as "R" below):

Μηριόνης ἀτάλαντος Ἐνυαλίω ἀνδρειφόντη
Meriones hatalantos Enualioi anRk'hontai
Meriones, equal of man-slaying Enyalios (II.II.651)

...λιπουσ' ἀνδροτήτα καὶ ἥβην
...lik"ons' anRtat' ide yeg'an
...leaving manhood and youth (II.XVI.857)

(N.b., for purposes of scansion, treat "R" as one short vowel.)

Now this phoneme had ceased to exist by the time in which the

55 Myc. attestation: PY Cn 608: si-a2-ro, /si(h)alos/.
56 Attested for Mycenaean by we-we-e-a, /werwe(h)ea/, "woolen" (KN Le 178).
57 Myc. attestation: PY Eb 297 & Ep 704: e-ke-qe, e-u-ke-to-qe, e-to-ni-jo, e-ke-e, te-a, /ekhei-k'e eukhetoi-k'e e-to-ni-jo ekhe(h)en theoi/, "she not only holds but also claims that she holds an etonijo-lease on behalf of the god(dess)."
58 Myc. attestation e.g.: o-do-ke, /(h)o-doke/, "thus he gave" (PY Un 267).
Linear B tablets were written,\textsuperscript{60} so these lines were passed down from even earlier times to Homer. And we must remember, these are only the lines which reveal themselves as pre-Linear B through the presence of this sound. As it is unlikely that only those lines are pre-Linear B which contain syllabic “r”, we ought to assume that additional lines also date from such early times. In other words “Homeric” poetry in Greece arose at a very early date.

Yet this does not exhaust the literary evidence in favour of continuity. One can shew that lyric poetry too provides an important link between the classical age and Mycenaean times.\textsuperscript{61} Classical lyric poetry preserves, as does Homeric epic, certain words otherwise known only to Mycenaean Greek: most importantly, we have the titles of two officials, the λαγέτας, i.e. the Mycenaean second-in-command, the ra-wa-ke-ta, \textit{/Lawagetas/},\textsuperscript{62} as well as the ἐπέτας, i.e. a Mycenaean noble of military rank, the e-qe-ta, \textit{/(H)ekw etas/}, literally “follower, Gefolgsmann, \textit{comes}.”\textsuperscript{63} Considering their absence from all other genres (including epic) and presumably the spoken language as well and taking into account that the suffix -etas was not productive in post-Mycenaean times, we can hardly explain these words as anything but carry-overs from Mycenaean times. Lyric

\textsuperscript{60} Although A. Heubeck, “Syllabic R in Mycenaean Greek?” \textit{Acta Mycenaea = Minos}, XII, Salamanca 1972, Pp. 55-79, asserted that this sound existed in Linear B, continuing debate has turned decisively against him: see e.g. A. Leukart, “po-ro-qa-ta-jo , to-sa-pe-mo , a-mo-ra-ma and others: Further evidence for Proto-Greek collective formations in Mycenaean and early alphabetic Greek,” \textit{FS Chadwick = Minos} XX-XXII, Salamanca 1987, p. 360.


\textsuperscript{62} Trümly (n. 61) Pp. 26-29. Lyric attestations: Ibycus of Rhegium, Fr. 166.15 Suppl.; Pindar, \textit{Ol.} I 89, \textit{Pyth.} IV 107, \textit{Pyth.} X 31; Sophocles, Fr. 221.12 Pearson, and possibly Simonides, Fr. 519.52.6 (\textit{λαγετας}). Mycenaean attestations: e.g. PY Un 219 and 718.

poetry, incidentally, preserves augmentless secondary indicative tenses also. In other words a traditional vocabulary of Lyric poetry was handed down from Mycenaean times as well. We have, then, evidence for continuity from Mycenaean to classical times in two literary genres.

Leaving creative literature behind we proceed to the technical terminology of government.64 The major political institutions of Archaic Greece are all present in the Mycenaean period; at least in name. No-one would suggest that things should be confused with names; and, in fact, it is easily enough shewn that the official whom the Mycenaean called a /gw asileus/ was not the same dignitary whose title in later Greek was βασιλέας.65 Yet it need not be coincidence that the kings of archaic Greece bore the same generic title which before them a Mycenaean official had borne. After all, the Mycenaean /gw asileus/ was apparently an official who stood outside of the hierarchical apparatus of officials appointed by the king66: he appears to have been a local magnate whose office was

---


66 At the top stood, of course, the King, beneath him the /Lawagetas/ (on the position of the /Lawagetas/ relative to the King see esp. PY Er 312). The kingdom was divided into two provinces, de-we-ro=a3-ko-ra-i-ja, /Deiwelo-aigo-la(h)ia/, “West of Goat’s Rock,” and pe-ra3-ko-ra-i-ja, /Peraigo-la(h)ia/, “Beyond Goat’s Rock.” The governor of each province may have been the da-mo-ko-ro, /Damokoros/, since in PY On 300 we find this official listed after an enumeration of the districts.
hereditary. As the elaborate hierarchy set up by the palace is clearly an artificial or planned structure, we may consider it secondary and suppose that offices and positions which have no place in it are antecedent to it, that is to say carry-overs from an earlier state of affairs. If then the /gʷasileus/ be a local grandee existing outside of the hierarchy of officials and indeed older than it, then it would not greatly surprise that when the palaces fell and the central authority collapsed with them he remained to lead the survivors in their reduced circumstances. The /gʷasileus/ represents one of the more interesting examples of continuity because he may actually be older than the palaces.

The Council of Elders, well-known from classical times and Homer, is also present in the Mycenaean kingdoms. Finally, the community as an official entity, the /damos/, is attested in the Linear B texts, specifically as the holder of titles to properties not owned by individuals. It is important to remember that the names of the Western Province so that he seems to pertain exclusively to this province as a whole. Each province was divided into districts; the Western Province had nine, the Yonder Province seven, one of which could apparently be divided into two sub-districts. Each district was governed by a ko-re-te (nomen agentis in -τήρ) whose assistant was called a po-ro-ko-re-te: see PY Jn 829. These officials were, it seems, royal appointees: see PY Ta 711, o-te, wa-na-ka, te-ke, au-ke-wa, da-mo-ko-ro, /(h)ote wanaks theke Augewan damokoron/, “when the King appointed Augewas as /Damokoros/.”

The key evidence for the hereditary nature of the office is PY Jn 436,6 where the /gʷasileus/, a man named /Amphigʷotas/, is listed (in a supervisory function) along with his unnamed son (i-ju-qe, /(h)ius-kʷe/, “and his son.” The son’s presence alongside of his father is explicable – on the basis of many parallels in similar Near Eastern texts – if it be assumed that he will succeed his father and should learn the profession by watching his father work; i.e. the position is hereditary. See now P. Carlier, “Qa-si-re-u et qa-si-re-wi-ja,” in R. Laffineur and W.-D. Niemeier (Edd.), Politeia. Society and State in the Aegean Bronze Age = Aegaeum, XII, Liège 1995, p. 358.

PY An 261 lists “councilmen” from councils over which various men (with no title specified) apparently presided: e.g. from l. 13: a-pi-qo[[-ta-o], ke-ro-si-ja, a3-so-ni-jo, /Amphigʷot[a(h)o] geronsia (case unclear!) Aisonios/, “Aisonios, of the ‘Council’ of Amphigʷotas.”

Throughout the E-series in Pylos people are said to hold “leases” on parcels pa-ro, da-mo, /paro damoi/, “at, with the community.” In Ep 704 the /damos/ ap-
are not identical with the things: the institutions will have evolved over the centuries.

However, at least one specific detail of Mycenaean administration seems to have survived into Homeric times unaltered: The King held a parcel of land called a te-me-no, /temenos/. At least one other official – the /Lawagetas/ – could also hold such a parcel. In all probability both held such land by right of office. Such τεμένη are attested in Homer as well and can be held either by the King or by other benefactors of the kingdom. In this case, not only is the name identical, but even the institution itself seems not to have changed.

Most other aspects of the Mycenaean system of landholding, however, do seem to have been subject to enormous change. Thanks to the detailed cadastres from the Kingdom of Pylos we are well-informed as to the minutiae of property tenure there. The technical term for a parcel of land in this kingdom is ko-to-na, /ktoina/; the term appears in Knosos as well, although only fragments of cadastres of the Pylian type have yet been found there. The term will therefore probably be common to all the Mycenaean states.

pears as an active entity opposing a priestess' claim as to the nature of her tenancy on some plots of land: da-mo-de-mi, pa-si, ko-to-na-o, ke-ke-me-na-o, o-na-to, e-ke-e, /damos-de-min phasi ktoinaon kekesmenaon (?) onaton ekhe(h)en/, "but the Community says that she holds a lease on communally-owned parcels."

70 PY Er 312.
71 Τεμένη held by Kings: ll. XII 313-321; XVIII 550-560; XX 391; Od. VI 291-294; XVII 297-299. Τεμένη held (or able to be held) by benefactors of a kingdom: ll. VI 191-195, XX 184-186, IX 574-580, 597-598. In these last three passages we learn who grants someone a τέμενος: in two cases it is the community as a whole (οι Λύκιοι or οι Τρώες) or the γέροντες acting on behalf of the community (οι γέροντες τῶν Ἀλεξάνδρων) respectively.
72 In an influential article M.I. Finley, "Homer and Mycenae: Property and Tenure," Historia, VI, 1957, Pp. 133-159, arguing for general discontinuity, maintained that the Mycenaean and the Homeric τέμενος were two essentially different things. Continuing debate has, however, turned against Finley, and few who have weighed the issue would to-day be prepared to accept his stance. See e.g. Panagl (n. 54) p. 596; or F. Gschnitzer, Griechische Sozialgeschichte, Wiesbaden 1981, Pp. 15-16.
73 KN Uf 1031.
Now this term is known from only one classical state, Rhodes, where it means a territorial subdivision with primarily religious associations. The usage of the term has changed dramatically, but the word itself is exactly the same. Now Rhodes belongs to one of the areas in which, archaeologically, there is discontinuity from Mycenaean to Geometric times; in the Iron Age Rhodes appears to have been settled first by Dorians coming from the Argolis, a region where we probably have cultural as well as settlement continuity from Mycenaean times on down. The Dorians have always remained elusive archaeologically primarily because they seem to have adopted the cultural norms of the communities which they conquered; as conquerors indeed often do. The presence of the term κτοίνα in archaic Rhodes can only be explained by the Dorians' adoption of the practices of the pre-Dorian inhabitants of the Argolis and by their exporting these practices into regions which they colonised. We know this because, first, the suffix *-να was in archaic and classical times no longer productive and, second, κτοίνα is a derivation of a verbal form which no longer existed in classical times anyway: *kti-mi, the athematic verb whence classical thematic κτίζω is derived, otherwise preserved.

74 E.g. IG XII 1, 694.
75 See above, n. 53.
76 The main literary evidence is Pindar, Ol. VII. For the evidence in detail I must refer to my forthcoming monograph on the Dorian Invasion.
77 See above, n. 42.
78 This elusiveness eventually led J. Chadwick, "Who were the Dorians?" PP, XXXI, 1976, Pp. 103-117, to propose that the Dorian Invasion had never taken place. Contra see e.g. V. Parker, "Gab es Dorier auf der mykenischen Pelopon­nese? Das 'mycenien spécial' und die dorischen Dialekte," PP, XLVIII, 1993, Pp. 241-267.
in a few fossilised formations only.\textsuperscript{81} In fact, even in Mycenaean times /ktoina/ was a bit of a fossil already. Originally, the word had meant (etymologically) “settled place or plot.” By the thirteenth century, however, it just meant “plot, parcel”; at some point in time the Mycenaean had taken to distinguishing settled and worked parcels from those which were unworked by calling the former, tautologically, ko-to-na, ki-ti-me-na, /ktoinai ktimenai/, literally, “settled settled-places,”\textsuperscript{82} as /ktimenos/ is just the participle to *ktei-mi. I.e. it had long since been forgotten that /ktoina/ was a derivation from *ktei-mi. Hence, Rhodian κτοίνα can hardly be a new coinage of later times\textsuperscript{83}; it was an old word which the Dorians brought with them when they came to Rhodes from the Argolis where, we have already seen, the archaeological evidence suggests settlement and cultural continuity from Mycenaean times.

However, by broaching the topic of the Dorian Invasion we reach that one historical event which at first glance would seem to betoken actual discontinuity between the Mycenaean and the classical ages. I will refer in what follows only to the Dorians, though the comment will apply mutatis mutandis to the other migrations as well. Whenever the Dorian Invasion did take place – for my part I would prefer a date in the first millennium\textsuperscript{84} –, it did not

\textsuperscript{81} E.g. Homeric περικτίται (“dwellers about”) and ἐδο κτίμενος (“where there is good dwelling”) or Delphic ἄμφικτίονες (with reference to the members of the Pylian Amphictyony). — Κτίζω is a backformation from a zero-grade sigmatic aorist (*κτίσα) which coexisted with a zero-grade root aorist (*κτέω) – cf. (ἐ)στα/ησα beside (ἐ)στα/ην in classical times – on the analogy of e.g. (ἐ)νόμισα from νομίζω. Κτοίνα itself is derived by taking the o-grade of the root *ktei- and adding the suffix *-na; cf. ποίνα from *kw ei-mi. See P. Chantraine, Dictionaire étymologique de la langue Grecque, Paris 1968-1980, s.v. χτίζω; H. Frisk, Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch, Heidelberg 1960-1970, s.v. κτίζω; C.J. Ruijgh, Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du Grec Mycénien, Amsterdam 1967, §327.

\textsuperscript{82} Passim in the Pylian E-series.

\textsuperscript{83} It is surely no coincidence that both Mycenaean and Rhodian also use the same derivation from κτοίνα, namely κτοινέτας (roughly, “man of a κτοίνα”): Mycenaean attestation: PY Ed 901, ko-to-ne-ta, /ktoinetas/; Rhodian attestation: IG XII 1,157.9, cf. IG XII 3, 1270A13 (Syme).

affect all regions of Greece, and it clearly did not bring about the extirpation of the inhabitants of the areas which it did affect. What little we can gather about the process of “Dorianisation” in the cities conquered by them points to the Dorians' inducting pre-Dorians liberally into the ranks: In Sicyon, for example, the pre-Dorians survived the take-over by the Dorians as a new tribe or phyle, the Aigialeis, the members of which could hold important posts in sacral embassies as well as high military office.\(^5\) Simply put, the pre-Dorians took their place beside the Dorians without any distinctions to speak of between the two. Similar situations occur elsewhere in the Peloponnese; we may refer to the pre-Dorian town of Amyclae which eventually became a Spartan obe\(^6\); apparently the Amyclaeans were, at the same time, introduced into the old Dorian tribes of the Hylleis, Dymanes, and Pamphyli.\(^7\) The Dorian Invasion, then, did not wipe the pre-Dorians from the Peloponnese: it merely brought additional Greeks onto it. Finally, it is worth remembering that the Dorians too were Greeks, who in Mycenaean times dwelt outside of the main area of Mycenaean civilisation although they and the Mycenaeans did know of each other (as the Mycenaean man named *do-ri-e-u, /*Dorieus/, “the Dorian,”\(^8\) shews). It is certainly possible that the Dorians were already quite familiar with Mycenaean civilisation and its immediate successor before they appeared on the Peloponnese. For this reason we may suggest that while the Dorian Invasion did bring new ethnic groups to the Peloponnese, these new groups did not supplant those already there with whose culture they were already familiar and


\(^6\) Paus. III 2,6; IG V 1,26.

\(^7\) These tribes still existed in Tyrtaeus’ day (Fr. 19 West), so the Amyclaeans must have been inducted into them. The Amyclaeans’ organisation as an obe and their induction into the tribes probably lies behind the Great Rhetra’s order φυλάξ φυλάξαντα καὶ ὀβάς ὀβάξαντα, “phyle the phyles and obe the obes” (Plut. Lycurgus, 6): V. Parker, “Some Dates in Early Spartan History,” Klio, LXXV, 1993, Pp. 49-50.

\(^8\) PY Fn 867 (attested in the dative: do-ri-je-we, /Doriewei/).
whose material culture – based on the fact that nowhere is there any clear cultural break in the archaeological evidence – they in actuality seem to have adopted. As the case of Rhodian κτούνα shews, they probably adopted elements of the immaterial culture as well. So even the Dorian Invasion probably did not effect a real cultural break between the Mycenaean and the classical age. After all, it was the Dorians who continued and developed the tradition of Lyric poetry which by archaic and classical times had become a purely Dorian genre: when the Athenian tragedians wrote lyric choruses, they were obliged to do so in Doric.

Let us conclude. While the demonstrable differences between classical and archaic Greece on the one hand and Mycenaean Greece on the other can be explained by assuming discontinuity, the thesis of development over the course of four centuries works just as well. It is the latter thesis, however, which corresponds more closely to the evidence. First, the archaeological evidence attests continuity in the material culture before and after the catastrophe of ca. 1200 which swept away the great Mycenaean kingdoms. Second, in some areas of Greece – on the basis of linguistic, historical, and archaeological arguments – settlement together with implied general ethnic continuity can be demonstrated. Third, independently of this we must accept a wide-ranging continuity in religion and language as well as in culture (at least as reflected in the onomastic evidence). Returning then to the question formulated at the beginning of this paper – does Greek history begin with the Mycenaes? – I think we are entitled to answer resoundingly in the affirmative, that the historical development of the Greek people – politically, culturally, and socially – can be traced back to the Mycenaean Age.

Victor Parker
University of Canterbury