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Secondary sources have informed us that a comedy, “Macedonians,” written by Strattis circa 410 BC contained a piece of conversation between an Attican and a Macedonian, each speaking in his own dialect. From the few saved words and other lexical evidence, Hoffman and Ahrens had identified the Macedonian speech as Aeolic, similar to Thessalian and Lesbian. Romiopoulou (1980) thought that Doric might have been a second dialect in pre-Hellenistic Macedon in addition to a Macedonian dialect.

The lead scroll known as the Pella katadesmos, dating to first half of the 4th century BC, which was found in Pella (at the time the capital of Macedon) in 1986, and published in the Hellenic Dialectology Journal in 1993, changed this view. Based on this scroll, Olivier Masson expressed his opinion in the Oxford Classical Dictionary that the Macedonian dialect was one of the northwestern dialects, an opinion that is echoed by Emmanuel Voutyras (cf. the Bulletin Epigraphique in Revue des Etudes Grecques 1994, no. 413). Brixhe and Panayotou (1994: 209) agree, although they have not ascertained whether it was the dialect of the whole kingdom. James L. O’Neil (2005) categorized the dialect as 4th century BC Northwestern, whereas Prof. Edmonds of Bryn Mawr College suggests a 3rd century BC date.

On the historical side, Hammond has expressed the view that Upper Macedonians, being Molossian (Epirotan) tribes, spoke a northwestern dialect while Lower Macedonians spoke Aeolic. He based his opinion on archeological and literary evidence of ancient sources referring to Hellenic migrations before and after the Trojan War. Heurtley (BSA 28 (1926), 159-194), also basing his theory on archeological evidence, cites the specific migration of the Macedonians through the Pindus mountain range to Pieria as ending by the mid-11th century BC.

Katadesmos proves to be a challenge due to the deteriorated condition of the scroll, the vocabulary, grammar, and syntax of its dialectal form, as well as the location in which it was discovered. Nevertheless, the fourth century BC spell written in a Northwest Hellenic dialect reinforces Livius’ statement in the History of Rome that “Aetolians, Acarnanians and Macedonians [were] men of the same speech.” In this paper, I will appraise the scroll, analyze the script from a linguistic standpoint, and compare and contrast it with other Hellenic dialects, while stressing the significance of the Dorian migrations in the Hellenic dialectology.
Hellenic Migrations and Katadesmos:
A Paradigm of Macedonian Speech

Historical Background

The Deluge

It is a valid argument that Deucalion’s deluge was the cause for the migration of Hellenic tribes in the middle of the second millennium BC. Deucalion’s deluge took place in 1527 BC forcing King Deucalion and his family to move from Lycoria on Mt. Parnassus. Deucalion’s deluge took place in 1527 BC forcing King Deucalion and his family to move from Lycoria on Mt. Parnassus. It is believed that the deluge was the result of an earthquake that tore asunder Mt. Olympus and Mt. Ossa opening a gate between them, called the Tempe Vale, freeing the waters to the Aegean Sea. Until then, Thessaly was a lake. The earthquake exposed approximately 8,000 to 10,000 sq km additional arable land, which later became the cradle of the Hellenic civilization.

Deucalion and his family moved north to Dodona where they inhabited the area under the name Graeki. At that location, the Graeki changed their name to Hellenes (`Ellines = Greeks) after Deucalion’s son, Hellen (`Ellin). The migration of Hellen’s clan to the new land of Thessaly took place after the old lakebed dried up. In Thessaly they built the city of Hellas, which was located approximately 11.5 kilometers from the present day town of Old Pharsalus and less than two kilometers from Melitaea on the other side of the Enipeus River. It was built by Hellen, not the son of Deucalion, but by the son of Phthius, son of Achaeus and of Chryssipe, daughter of Irhus. Early on Thessaly was divided into four parts: Phthiotis, which occupies the southern parts; Hestiaeotis, which occupies the western parts and lands between Pindus and Upper Macedonia; Pelasgiotis, which borders on Lower Macedonia; and finally, Thessaliotis. Aristotle also divided Thessaly into four parts. At that time, by Thessaly one meant only the dry lake not the mountain of Pelion, while Thucydides considered the mountains west of Thessaly as Pindus.

1 Eusebius, Chronicles, 71 & 183.
2 Herodotus, Histories, 7. 129, 1-4; Apollodorus Bibliotheca 1.7.2; Strabo, Geographies IX, 5.2.
3 Aristotle, Meteorologika, I, 13.
4 Scholiastes on Pindar, Pythia, III. 59.
5 Strabo, IX. 5. 5-6.
6 Stephanus Byzantius, Ethnica, s.v. Hellas.
7 Strabo IX, 5. 3.
8 Harpokration, Words of Ten Orators s.v. Tetrarchy (Αρποκρατίων, Λέξεις των Δέκα Ρητόρων s. v. Τετραρχία)
9 Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War, VII, 129.
Ancient historians i.e., Herodotus, Thucydides, Pausanias, etc. offer some information on the whereabouts of various migrations starting with the Hellenes who moved from the area of Phthia to Histiaeotis or Histaeotis\(^{10}\) on the western slopes of Olympus. Pushed by the Cadmeians, they moved west to the Pindus Mountain range near their ancestral land.\(^{11}\) Herodotus' appellation of the Makednoi as Dorians makes both the same ethnos. Their Doric speaking neighbors called them Makednoi or highlanders\(^{12}\) because of their mountainous habitation.

The time of the migration of the Dorus Hellenes to Pindus had to have taken place early enough to allow for the move and the concentration in the area of Doris, probably circa 1350 - 1300 BC leaving a branch of Hellenes (Mirmidones) in Phthia.\(^{13}\) When the Trojan War started Homer says they were in Phthia.\(^{14}\) Had both the Hellenes of Dorus and the Mirmidones of Achilles departed at the same time to move north to Histaeotis, Achilles’ Mirmidones would have been with the Hellenes and all of them would have known as Makednoi. But it did not happen. On the other hand, if the Hellenes of Dorus had stayed back with the Mirmidones of Achilles, both would have left for Troy. That did not happen either.

The invasion of the Peloponnese by the Dorians took place at two different times and from two different geographic areas. The story about the leadership of the first invasion is a follows: Aegymios (Αἰγύμιος),\(^{15}\) the king of the Dorians, had two sons, Pamphylos (Πάμφυλος) and Dymas (Δῦμας), but after Heracles'\(^{16}\) death, Aegymios adopted Hercules' son Hyllus (Ὅλλος). The above story is collaborated by Strabo who divides the Makednian tribe, previously known as Makednoi, into three tribes: Hyleis (Ὕλλεις), Pamphyloi (Πάμφυλοι), and Dymanes (Δύμανες).\(^{17}\)

It is generally accepted that the Trojan War started in 1193 BC, and Troy was taken ten years later in 1183 BC. Having that date as our starting point, Hyllus was killed circa 1113 BC in the

---

\(^{10}\) Greek: Ἑστιαιώτις or Ἱσταιώτις
\(^{11}\) Herodotus I, 56.
\(^{12}\) From the Aeolic and Doric word for length, but also height.
\(^{13}\) Herodotus I, 3.
\(^{14}\) Homer, Iliad 2. 683.
\(^{15}\) Stephanus Byzantius, s.v. Aegymios
\(^{16}\) Aka Hercules, or Ηρακλῆς.
\(^{17}\) Herodotus V, 68, 2; Compare to Stephanus Byzantius s. v.
battle of Helos (Ἑλος)\(^{18}\) by Echemus (Ἕχεμος), son of Aeropus (Ἀέροπος) in a one-on-one battle at the latter’s request.\(^{19}\) His followers promised not to return for 100 years and they migrated north.\(^{20}\) They returned later about 80 years after the fall of Troy, circa 1003 BC, and their return is known as the "Returned of the Heracleides."\(^{21}\) Heracleides were a clan descending from Heracles or Hercules who was an Achaean, not a Dorian. Their connection to the Dorians is historic going back to the help they provided to the Dorians under Aegymios in Thessaly against the Lapiths in exchange for one third of the land as their reward.\(^{22}\)

The first invasion of Peloponnesus by a group led by Hyllus took place 20 years before the campaign against Troy in 1193 BC. Homer affirms the location of Helos, which at that time was an Achaean town on the coast,\(^{23}\) as «οἱ τ’ ἄρ’ Αμύκλας εἶχον Ἑλος τ’ ἐφαλον πτολίεθρον» (these had their home in Amyclae,\(^{24}\) and in Helos the town by the seaside).\(^{25}\) Temenos, grandson of Hyllus, son of Hercules, led the second invasion of the Makednian tribe into Peloponnesus 80 years after the fall of Troy\(^{26}\) assisted by his younger brothers Aristodemos and Kresphontes.\(^{27}\) Upon passing into Peloponnesus at the point of Rhium - Antirhium,\(^{28}\) the Makednoi received their exonym Dorians, probably from the invaded inhabitants of Peloponnesus.\(^{29}\)

Before the Dorian invasion, Aeolic speakers inhabited various parts of Greece such as Thessaly,\(^{30}\) Boeotia,\(^{31}\) Corinthia,\(^{32}\) and South Aetolia.\(^{33}\) Then things changed. Herodotus states that the Doric speaking Thesprotians, an Epirotan tribe, under the leadership of Thessalus, son of Heracles or Hercules, migrated from Thesprotia to Arne, near present-day Sofades, Thessaly,
Greece displacing the Boeotians to Cadmeis, later called Boeotia. Thucydides reinforces Herodotus’ statement by explicitly stating that 60 years after the Trojan War, the Boeotians were pushed out of Arne. The migration of the Dorians created various mixed dialects swaying toward Doric or Aeolic influence depending on the tenacity of the invaders and the resistance of the invaded residents. However, the invasion of the Dorians to Arne affected only Thessaliotis. Histaeotis, Pelasgiotis, and Phthiotis remained Aeolic.

After returning from Troy around 1183-2 BC, the Mirmidones under the leadership of Achilles’ son Neoptolemos, on their way to Epirus, had to be co-located with at least one branch of the Hellenes who by now were called Makednoi. Among the Hellenic tribes, and especially Epirotan and Northwestern Dorian, the name termination determined the proximity of their habitation. Expanding the above to the remaining of the Greek tribes, the Makednoi must have had the name termination changed to Makedones while in their physical proximity with Mirmidones and Pelagones on Mt. Pindus. While the Myrmidones moved west to the area of Northern Epirus, the Makednoi, now under the exonym Makedones, moved north to Lebaea. Note that the presence of the Makedones in Epeirus has been confirmed by Stephanus Byzantius who informs us of a town in the area of Dodona named Macedon, which probably was the point in which the term Makedones (or Macedonians) was coined.

W. A. Heurtley’s excavations brought to light pottery with similar geometrics. He discovered pottery that was less sophisticated and of low quality dated 2300 BC and also the most sophisticated, high quality pottery dated circa 900 BC. Pottery found in Thessaly circa 2300 BC progressively extended to South Greece even to the island of Lefkas, in Lianokladi, near Phthia, and is dated as about 2000-1600 BC. Similar pottery that was found in Central Macedonia and Chalkidiki (dated about 1650 BC) and in Thermon, Aetolia (dated circa 1600-1400 BC) is probably the debris left on the route that Makednians/Dorians followed or from their staging.

34 Thucydides, I, 12; compare I, 3 and IV 42.
35 Herodotus, VII 176.
39 Aeschylus, Suppliant Women 255.
40 Strabo, VII. 6; Herodotus VIII. 137-139. Lebaea aka Boubousti is the modern day Platania, Prefecture of Kozani, Macedonia, Greece.
41 Stephanus Byzantius, s.v. Makedon.
areas. The pottery found in Lebaea of Macedonia has been dated circa 1150 BC and in northern Thessaly about 1050 BC. This pottery shared geometric designs even while the quality got better as time passed. Because of the migration pattern of people, it is obvious that these people were constantly moving, however keeping in contact with other Greek tribes.\(^{42}\)

Caranus (or Karanos) along with his brother Pheidon lived at the end of the 9th or the beginning of the 8th centuries BC.\(^{43}\) Paterculus states that Caranus was eleventh in descent from Hercules, while “Alexander the Great was descended in the seventeenth generation, and could boast that, on his mother’s side, he was descended from Achilles, and, on his father’s side, from Hercules.”\(^{44}\) Caranus became the first king of the Macedonians and the founder of the Temenidae Macedonian dynasty before the first Olympiad (776 BC).\(^{45}\) Herodotus states that Perdicas had three sons: Gauanes, Aeropus, and Perdiccas.\(^{46}\) Considering the possibility that the names Caranus and Gauanes in Greek ΚΑΡΑΝΟΣ and ΓΑΥΑΝΕΣ through the change of K for Κ and P for Ψ are practically identical and since Gauanes was the first of the bothers it is natural to be considered as the founder of the Temenid Macedonian dynasty.\(^{47}\)

Circa 800 BC the Dorian tribes whom Heurtley identified as Macedonians moved from Lebaea to the area of the Pierian Mountains, aka Macedonian Mountains\(^{48}\) where they used its rich pastures and slowly expanded north.\(^{49}\) Archaeological evidence indicates that Doric tribes moved between Macedonia to Thessaly, and even to Aetolia.\(^{50}\) Such movements give rise to the school of thought that the Macedonian tribes were nomadic tribes just as were the Vlachs and the Sarakatsans. All literary and linguistic evidence points to the same conclusion.\(^{51}\) In addition, the

\(^{43}\) Strabo VIII, 3,33; Eusebius in Chronicles states that they lived circa 800 BC; Pausanias VI, 22.
\(^{44}\) Marcus Velleius Paterculus, *History of Rome*, I, 6, 5.
\(^{45}\) Eusebius, 227: “Before the first Olympiad, Caranus was moved by ambition to collect forces from the Argives and from the rest of the Peloponnesian, in order to lead an army into the territory of the Macedonians. At that time the king of the Orestae was at war with his neighbours, the Eordaei, and he called on Caranus to come to his aid, promising to give him half of his territory in return, if the Orestae were successful. The king kept his promise, and Caranus took possession of the territory; he reigned there for 30 years, until he died in old age.”
\(^{46}\) Herodotus, VIII. 137.9.
\(^{49}\) The northern area of Thessaly and the area of Diom are only about one day ride on horseback from Aegai, the first capital of Macedonia.
\(^{50}\) Marcus Templar, Interview with Dr. Georgia Karamitrou-Mentesidi, July 14, 2009.
\(^{51}\) W. A. Heurtley, Prehistoric Site, 192-3.
Makedones and the Thessalian Magnetes (East Greek speakers) and Aenianes (West Greek speakers) in historic times engaged in a vigorous war dance in full armor called καρπαία by the Thessalians and καρπέα by the Macedonians. Additionally, the Makedones and the Magnesians both had cults of Zeus Hetaireios and engaged in the same war dance.

Traditional Sarakatsan hut made by the Archeologist and Director of the Museum of Aiane, Dr. Georgia Karamitrou – Mentesidi. Macedonian huts must have been built in a similar manner (July 14, 2007).

Daskalakis surmises the beginning of the Macedonian Kingdom: “Caranus, evicting Midas, who owned part of Macedonia, and dethroning some other kings, united the kingdoms of Macedonia into a single realm, and laid firm foundations for his expanding power.”

The migration pattern we see in general indicates that before the Trojan War the invaders were incapable of defeating the local tribes of Aeolians, Achaeans, or Pelasgians until after these states were weakened by the Trojan War. Successful invasions took place only during or after the Trojan War not only because of social discontent and military weakness, but also because of the shift that took place in the society of the invaders from pastoral or rural ways to a more sophisticated urban mentality that enabled them to understand the use of and the manufacturing of iron weapons. The Bronze Age in Greece was over.

53 Hammond, Establishment and Consolidation, 64.
The Macedonians, continuing their wandering over Pindus and then east to the north part of Thessaly behind Pieria, delayed their development into a solid urban and military force until the reign of Philip II, as Alexander the Great put it in his speech in Opis:

vagabonds and destitute of means, most of you clad in hides, feeding a few sheep up the mountain sides, for the protection of which you had to fight with small success against Illyrians, Triballians, and the border Thracians. Instead of the hides he gave you cloaks to wear, and from the mountains he led you down into the plains, and made you capable of fighting the neighboring barbarians, so that you were no longer compelled to preserve yourselves by trusting rather to the inaccessible strongholds than to your own valor.55

Characteristic of the above part of Alexander’s speech is that he calls Illyrians, Triballians, and Thracians neighboring barbarians. The present-day Hellenic nation is the result of the social, civic, and linguistic amalgamation of more than 230 tribes speaking more than 200 dialects56 all claiming descent from Hellen, son of Deukalion.

Popular belief presumes that the concept of democracy sprang from Greece and, although it is true in a general sense, it applies only to one tribal state of the Greek world, Athens. Democracy as a concept formulated in Athens because traditionally no citizen of the city was worthy to replace Athens’ last king Kodrus (killed circa 1091 – 1088 BC) who sacrificed his own life for his city.57 The Athenian polity did not change overnight, but it was the result of a continuous evolution that took centuries to materialize. Other tribal states of Dorian or Aeolian background continued their monarchic polity (in some cases their dual monarchy. i.e. Sparta and Elimea) and that is exactly what was happening in Macedonia.

Wilcken, reflecting on the above, feels that taking into consideration the way of life of the Macedonians, their political institutions, religion, and morals, his conviction that the Macedonians were a Greek tribe strengthens. Any differences in development are due to the geographic position of the Macedonian Homeland.58 Historians have assessed the Macedonian state of affairs in a similar fashion. The Macedonians were as Greeks as the Spartans, Elians, Locrians, and others belonging to the Western Greek ethnic group.59

55 Arrian, Anabasis, VII, 9. Greek Ὄπις, Akkadian Upi or Upija, later Ctesiphon.
56 Aristotle’s Works, passim.
57 Pausanias, I, 19,5; I, 10,1.
59 Stephen G. Miller, Letter to President Obama by more than 346 Classicists.
Borza, agreeing with Hammond states, “[f]irst, the matter of the Hellenic origins of the Macedonians: Nicholas Hammond's general conclusion that the origin of the Macedonians lies in the pool of proto-Hellenic speakers who migrated out of the Pindus mountains during the Iron Age is acceptable.” The reason Borza does not consider the Macedonians being Greeks is because they left from the main corpus of the Greeks very early in the history of Greece, at the beginning of the Iron Age; Buck alludes to the same. To the contrary, the fact is that both Macedonians and Arcado-Cyprians were part of the same pool of proto-Hellenic tribes although the Arcadians migrated to Cyprus during the Bronze Age and the Macedonians during the Iron Age. Besides, Buck basing his opinion on 200 Greeks names found in Asia Minor states, “we may accept now as a matter of record the existence of a Greek colony in Asia Minor as early as the fourteenth century BC”

However, if the Arcado-Cyprians were Greeks, although they left earlier than the Macedonians, and the 200 Greek names alone establish the presence of the Greeks in the 14th century BC in Asia Minor, how is it possible that the Macedonians who left a couple of hundred years later could not be considered Greeks? In addition, the Macedonians constantly came in contact with the rest of the Greeks something that one cannot state for those Greeks who migrated to Cyprus and Asia Minor. Most importantly, the first name of the Macedonians was Hellenes or Greeks?

Thucydides explains what happened to the previous inhabitants of Macedonia,

The Macedonians incorporated the territory of the native people into Macedonia and forced the Pieres, a Thracian tribe, out of the area Bottiaia to Mt. Pangaeum and the Bottiaiei. They further expelled the Eordi from Eordaia and the Almopes from Almopia and they similarly expelled all tribes (Thracian, Paeonian, Illyrian) they found in areas of Anthemus, Crestonia, Bysaltia and other lands. The Macedonians absorbed the few inhabitants of the above tribes that stayed behind. They established their suzerainty over the land of Macedonia without losing their ethnicity, language, or religion.

Strabo’s description about the inhabitants of Upper Macedonia is that they were Epirotans, speaking a Northwest Greek Molossian dialect based on inscriptions stating, “and in fact the

---

60 Eugene Borza, Makedonika, Ethnicity and Cultural Policy at Alexander’s Court (Claremont: Regina Books), 149.
62 Herodotus, I. 56.
63 Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War, II, 99.
regions about Lyncus, Pelagonia, Orestias, and Elimeia, used to be called Upper Macedonia.”⁶⁴ The inhabitants of Lower Macedonia were the Macedonians par excellence and the evidence thus far shows they spoke some type of Aeolic, the exact characteristics of which are yet to be determined.

Regarding the term barbarian, the fact is that it had a dual meaning in the ancient times. Although it started with the word barbarophonos or "speaker of incomprehensible speech," aside from meaning a non-Greek speaker, the term barbarian has been used by Greek tribal states or people to ridicule and scorn other Greek tribal states or people for political reasons or because they deemed them unsophisticated in their use of the Hellenic language and culture.⁶⁵ When Demosthenes verbally attacked Philip II of Macedon, he deemed “Philip and his present conduct, though he is not only no Greek, nor related to the Greeks, but not even a barbarian from any place that can be named with honor, but a pestilent knave from Macedonia, whence it was never yet possible to buy a decent slave.”⁶⁶ Thucydides claimed that the Euritanes “were most unintelligible in speech and are said to eat raw meat,” making another Greek tribe barbarian.⁶⁷ Demosthenes was using a political attack on his personal enemy and was not referring to the Macedonian speech. In response to Demosthenes’ political accusations, Aeschines reminded the Pnyx⁶⁸ that Philip’s father, Amyntas, was invited as a Greek to sit at the Peace Conference of Greek States of 371 BC which took place in Sparta because as a Greek “he was entitled to a seat.” Amyntas participated through an ambassador and actually voted in favor of Athens. The relevant text is as follows:

For at a congress of the Lacedaemonian allies and the other Greeks, in which Amyntas, the father of Philip, being entitled to a seat, was represented by a delegate whose vote was absolutely under his control, he joined the other Greeks in voting to help Athens to recover possession of Amphipolis. As proof of this, I presented from the public records the resolution of the Greek congress and the names of those who voted.⁶⁹

---

⁶⁴ Strabo, Geographies, 7, VII, 8.
⁶⁵ Liddell & Scott s.v. βαρβαρός.
⁶⁶ Demosthenes, Philippic III, 31.
⁶⁷ Thucydides, III, 94. Original use of the word barbarian defines the person who sounds barbarophonos or someone whose speech is so unintelligible it sounds like bar-bar-bar. The Homeric Dictionary by Georg Autenrieth defines the barbarophonos as rude (outlandish) of speech, which does not necessarily mean a foreigner, a non-Greek. See Homer Iliad, II.867.
⁶⁸ Athenian Parliament.
⁶⁹ Aeschines, On the Embassy, 32.
There is no record whatsoever that anyone in Pnyx or anywhere else, not even Demosthenes, refuted Aeschines’ claim, which makes Aeschines’ response that the Macedonians were Greeks an undisputable fact. To this day nobody has disputed Amyntas’ participation at the Pan-Hellenic Peace Conference. If the father and his state were considered Greek, his offspring were also Greek. At that time, the state of Macedonia was too insignificant and contemptible to demand respect or require appeasement. The above invitation of the Spartans to the Macedonians to participate to a Peace Conference intended solely for Greeks without anyone’s objections means that the other Greek tribal states considered the Macedonians as Greeks. In addition, the Persians considered the Macedonians as Yauna or Greeks as attested in the inscriptions of Behistun dated circa 521 BC and in Naqš-i Rustam dated circa 490 BC along with the Daiva inscription dated circa 479-478 BC.  

---

The Macedonian Dialect

Ancient grammarians divided the Greek language into four dialects (five if one adds the Attic Koine) based only on the number of literary dialects. However, the fact is that literary dialects of ancient Greece represent only a few of the spoken Greek dialects; a plethora of other dialects come to us through a wealth of inscriptions and, in some cases, from scattered glosses and a number of lexica.⁷¹

Non-Hellenic glosses found in lexica referring to the Macedonian dialect can be explained by the geographic location of Macedonia, the ethnicity of the people living in the land of Macedonia before the Macedonian migration to what later became the Macedonian homeland (this is especially true for toponyms), and the expansion of Macedonia with the conquest of lands in the Middle East and Central and South Asia.

In addition, the sixty three glosses attributed to unidentified Macedonians found in the lexicon of Hesychius include erroneous copyist spellings. Besides, Hesychius always states Macedonians; it does not state Macedonian dialect. Hesychius' Lexicon has never recorded a single word stating that it belonged to a Macedonian dialect. This means that the dialect itself did not necessarily include those glosses, but certain unidentified Macedonians living anywhere in Macedonian conquered lands uttered them. The 51,035 lemmata of the lexicon of Hesychius do not constitute, philologically speaking, part of the mainstream speech, but only localisms, colloquialisms, slang, jargon, or individual preference.

In his attempt to classify the Macedonian dialect, Buck observed that from the scanty remains found by his time that the Macedonian dialect was a form of Greek, which was “detached in such an early period that it is best not classed as one of the Greek dialects in the ordinary sense.”⁷² However, he accepted Hoffmann’s conclusion that the Macedonian dialect showed notable points of agreement with Thessalian.⁷³ This statement echoes that of Wilcken's on the Macedonians as a group.⁷⁴

---

Buck’s contention that the Macedonian dialect cannot be classified as one of the Greek dialects is based on the argument that it was separated very early from the Greek corpus. However, the Macedonian dialect had separated from the Greek linguistic corpus after the Arcado-Cyprian (1350 BC). But if the Arcado-Cyprian has been classified as one of the Greek dialects, there is no scientific reason not to consider Macedonian as also being a Greek dialect. Statements made by Buck and Wilcken ignore Heurtley’s discoveries in Macedonia which dates the existence of Dorian/Macedonian settlements just north of Thessaly between 1150-1050 BC.75

The material from Histiaiotis and Perrhaebia is very scanty and the archaic inscriptions from Magnesia are limited to few fragmented specimens. The inscription IG IX.ii.199 from Phthiotis conclusively shows that the dialect was Thessalian. Most of the Magnesian inscriptions are of the late period and in Attic κοινή and that is exactly the case with the Macedonian inscriptions. How is it possible for one to conclude from scanty fragmentary inscriptions that the Magnesian dialect is Greek and accept it as such, but for the Macedonian, having more than a few inscriptions (more than 6,000) the result is inconclusive?76

More inscriptions categorized as Aeolic and Northwest Doric written in the Macedonian dialect are now available than at the time of Hoffmann, Buck and Meillet. The remaining inscriptions found in Macedonia are in either Classical Attic or Attic κοινή and belong to the late Macedonian or even Roman period. Hoffmann’s view that the Macedonian dialect had “some notable points of agreement” with Thessalian is not clear as to which Thessalian he is referring to, since Thessalian included two dialects, one of Thessaliotis which was a mixture of Northwest Doric and the other of Pelasgiotis which was almost pure Aeolic.77 He probably meant the one of Thessaliotis.

In his review of Hoffmann’s book, Buck explains that the Macedonian dialect was not readily understood by other Greeks as it appears in various historical documents, such as in the case of Philotas in Q. Curtius VI. 9.35, is not strange because “the same must have been true of several of the Greek dialects. A speech as delivered in Thessalian, Elean, etc., in their earlier form, before

75 W. A. Heurtley, Prehistoric Site, 190.
77 Carl D. Buck, Introduction, 135, ff 1.
they were tempered by κοινὴ influence, would not have been readily followed, we may be sure.”

Meillet indicates that the Macedonian dialect shows voiced stops where Greek has voiceless aspirated as δωράξ for θώραξ. He furthermore accepts ΑΒΡΟΥΤΕΣ corresponding to ΟΦΡΥΕΣ as the copyist error where T renders ρ and mentions, “the voiceless aspirated stops as quite close to the voiced stops because of the weakness of their articulation. Moreover, by passing through a stage of spirant pronunciation, voiceless aspirated sounds may voice; thus, Germ. ḷ is represented by d in German, and certain Bantu dialects present analogous occurrences.”

Hatzopoulos offers an example from the German word Mutter stating, “the sound /t/ in the German gloss ’Mutter’ is not the direct heir of the same sound in the Indo-European gloss *mater, but has evolved from the common Germanic form *moder, which was the reflex of Indo-European *mater.” He continues, “one must be wary of short-cuts and simplifications in linguistics.” As we saw above his views are supported by Meillet’s statement above.

Each dialect developed in its own pace and manner and that was true for the Macedonian dialect. The only reason that I see in the disruption of a development of the Macedonian dialect, unlike other Greek dialects, is the fact that the process was interrupted by the codification of the Attic κοινὴ or koinē dialect. Sapir feels that the Macedonian dialect could have been between Illyrian and Greek based on the likelihood of Macedonian maintaining the prevocalic S. However, if that is the case, how would we account for glosses such as ΣΕΛΗΝΗ (Attic/Ionic), ΣΕΛΑΝΝΑ (Lesbian), ΣΕΛΑΝΑ (all other dialects) or the gloss ΣΕΛΑΣ that every Greek dialect maintains?

Accentuation

Although inscriptions tell us about the dialects they are written in, they mention nothing about the accentuation, their mechanism, and the rules that apply. We do know the accentuation

80 Miltiades Hatzopoulos, VI International Symposium on Ancient Macedonia.
of the Attic and through the Lesbian the Aeolic which was recessive as in πόταμος, σόφος, βασίλευς as it compares to the Attic ποταμός, σοφός, βασιλεύς. Similarly, we have scanty evidence that the Doric accentuation was processive as is ἔλαβον, ἐνδοί, ἐνταυθοῖ, τοῦτῳ instead of the Attic ἐλαβον, ἐνδώ, ἐνταῦθα, τοῦτω. 82 We do not have such evidence from Northwest Greek dialectal text as it is the present Macedonian text and thus I will accentuate the words using the well-known Attic manner.

---

82 Buck, Greek Dialects, 85.
GENERAL

Katadesmoi (sing. katadesmos) or defixios are binding spells cast by an individual in order to incapacitate the opposition, yet written as if a virtuous prayer. The earliest katadesmoi we have is from Sicily dated to the first half of the sixth century and the fifth century BC in Attica.84

“Most often, the spell was inscribed on a lead strip or sheet that was then folded and tied or pierced with a nail and buried in or near a recent grave.”85 Although it is believed that early katadesmoi used in earlier times were engraved on pieces of metal, in time it became a preferable practice to use a durable material such as lead so that they would last indefinitely and along with them the wish. The referred to text was found rolled up in a tomb by the right hand of a

84 Evidence of inscribed binding curses from the Kerameikos of Athens dates as early as the mid-fifth century, e.g. Jordan no. 1. The site of Selinunte in western Sicily has provided even earlier defixiones, with at least four probably dating to the sixth century: M. López Jimeno, Las Tabellae Defixionis de la Sicilia Griega (Amsterdam 1991) nos. 1–4; see also Jordan nos. 94–108 in John M. Marston, “Language of Ritual Cursing in the Binding of Prometheus,” Greek, Roman, Byzantine Studies, 47 (2007) 121-133.
deceased in the cemetery of the Agora, it is the only document we have written by a simple person in the language of simple people.

Before the adoption of the Ionic alphabet, Macedonia was using the Corinthian alphabet due to its proximity to Potidaea in the Peninsula of Cassandra, a Corinthian colony founded in around 600 BC. The scroll’s alphabet is clearly Ionic, which applies to all Northwest dialects at the end of the fifth and beginning of the fourth centuries, but for Macedonia the adoption of the Ionic alphabet took place earlier. Coins minted in Macedonia indicate the use of Ionic alphabet during the time of King Alexander I (495 – 450 BC) attesting that Macedonia had already adopted the Ionic alphabet during the early years of the first half of the fifth century BC, approximately 75 years before Athens.\(^86\) Athens adopted the same under the archonship of Euclides in 403/2 BC.

Scholars have already explained the grammatical and syntactical aspects of the scroll offering their valuable opinion. I will only touch on the points that in my view need more analysis and on one occasion, I hope to offer my contribution to the scroll’s text.

Katadesmos facsimile\(^87\)

1. [ΘΕΤΙ]ΜΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΦΩΝΤΟΣ ΤΟ ΤΕΛΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΝ ΓΑΜΟΝ ΚΑΤΑΓΡΑΦΩ ΚΑΙ ΤΑΝ ΑΛΛΑΝ ΠΑΣΑΝ ΓΥ
2. [ΝΑΙΚ]ΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΧΗΡΑΝ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΡΘΕΝΩΝ ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ ΔΕ ΘΕΤΙΜΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΡΚΑΤΙΘΕΜΑΙ ΜΑΚΡΟΝ ΚΑΙ
3. [ΤΟΙΣ] ΔΑΙΜΟΣΙ ΚΑΙ ΟΠΟΚΑ ΕΓΩ ΤΑΥΤΑ ΔΙΕΛΕΞΑΙΜΙ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΑΓΝΟΙΚΝΙ ΠΑΛΑΙΝ
4. [ΤΟΚΑ] ΓΑΜΑΙ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΦΩΝΤΑ ΠΡΟΤΕΡΟΝ ΔΕ ΜΗ, ΜΗ ΓΑΡ ΔΑΒΟΙ ΑΛΛΑΝ
5. [ΕΜΕ ΔΕ]Ε ΣΥΝΚΑΤΑΓΗΡΑΣΑΙ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΦΩΝΤΙ ΚΑΙ ΜΗΔΕΜΙΑΝ ΑΛΛΑΝ ΙΚΕΤΙΣ
6. [ΜΑΓ-]ΑΝ ΟΙΚΤΙΡΕΤΕ ΔΑΙΜΟΝΕΣ ΦΙΛ[Ο]Ι, ΔΑΓΙΝΑ ΓΑΡ ΙΜΕ ΦΙΛΩΝ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΚΑΙ
7. [....]Α ΦΥΛΑΣΣΕΤΕ ΕΜΗ[ΠΙ]ΩΣ ΜΗ ΓΙΝΕΤΑΙ ΤΑ[Υ]ΤΑ ΚΑΙ ΚΑΚΑ ΚΑΚΩΣ ΘΕΤΙΜΑ
8. [....]ΑΛ< _ _ _ >.ΥΝ Μ_ _ΕΣ ΠΛΗΝ ΕΜΟΣ ΕΜΕ ΔΕ [Ε]Υ[Δ]ΑΙΜΟΝΑ ΚΑΙ ΜΑΚΑΡΙΑΝ


Grammatical and Syntactical Characteristics of Katadesmos:

-α for -η. One of the persistent characteristics of all dialects except Attic-Ionic is that the original α remains unchanged. Glosses such as Θετίμα, ταπινά, ἐρημα, κακά demonstrate the rule. The text maintains the α (long a), something that Ionic and Attic had long lost. The original vowel was α in all dialects, but in Ionic/Attic it developed to the sound of ἑ represented by η. No other dialect followed the example of Ionic/Attic. However, as the Ionic and Attic dialects developed away from each other, Attic partially turned its pronunciation around changing its η (long ἑ) to α only after ρ, ι, and ε as in χῶρα, οἰκία, and γενεά. Ionic did not change its pronunciation at all. Thus although the presence of α is noticed, this α now is not the original α.

The nouns and adjectives falling into the above category, in general, form their genitive plural in α as in τᾶν, ἄλλαν, πασᾶν, χηρᾶν, instead of τῶν, ἄλλων, πασῶν, χηρῶν. Some scholars expressed the opinion that glosses such as γυναικῶν, παρθένων should be γυναικᾶν, παρθέναν indicating Attic influence. Such opinion would be correct if the gloss γυνα in its nominative singular form follows the 1st declension, but it is not. Although the gloss γυνα in its nominative singular form follows the 1st declension,88 the rest of the noun follows the 3rd declension and because of it, the rule does not apply.89 The gloss παρθένων belongs to the second declension with nominative παρθένος and thus it does not fall under the rule. The rule α for η does not always apply.90 In the case of original η which represented the ἑ the η remains unchanged. Thus the Attic/Ionic gloss μήτηρ remained μᾶτηρ in the other dialects.91

-υ for ο is mostly a characteristic of Arcado-Cyprian, but we also have several examples of Lesbian especially before μ as in ἰμοίως for ὁμοίως, ἰμολογία for ὁμολογία. We also see the same in Chalcidian as in υπύ for ὑπό. ἀνορόξασα corresponding to the Attic ἀνορύξασα. It is feminine participle singular nominative. The verb in Northwest is athematic ἀνόργυμα while in

Attic is ἀνορύττω and in Ionic ἀνορύσσω. Lesbian, Arcado-Cyprian, Chalcidian, and Pamphylian dialects bear such tendencies.92

-𝑒 + 𝑜 = 𝑒 or 𝑜. Θετίμα is the Northwest Greek version of the Attic Θεοτίμη. The form reveals an apocope or hyphaeresis of the o sound in order to avoid hiatus. The loss of the o from θεό- is common in Doric glosses that compounded with the gloss θεός, especially in Megarian.93

The rule that governs such hyphaeresis is the following: Θε- appears before a single consonant as in Θετίμα; Θο- appears before two consonants as Θοκρίνης.

-𝑒 for 𝑬, as in διελέξαμι is the Northwest form for the Attic διελίξαμι

**Assimilation** γν = ν. Most dialects prefer ΓΙΝΟΜΑΙ instead of ΓΙΓΝΟΜΑΙ which appears solely in Attic. In Thessalian and Boeotian it is ΓΙΝΥΜΑΙ.94

**Psilosis:** Although there are four glosses in this text that would take spiritus asper in Attic, i.e. ΟΠΟΚΑ, ΙΚΕΤΙΣ, ΥΜΩΝ, ΟΠΩΣ, the text lacks prevocalic Φ,Ξ,Η, or Φ[ι.ε. ΦΟΠΟΚΑ, ΦΟΠΩΣ, ΦΙΚΑΤΙΣ, ΦΥΜΩΝ] pointing to spiritus lenis or psilosis.95

Dialectal interchange **West Greek α = East Greek ε.** The gloss ΙΚΕΤΙΣ instead of ΙΚΑΤΙΣ (ε from α) falls in the dialectal interchange of West Greek α (Northwest Greek, Doric) = East Greek ε (Attic – Ionic, Aeolic and Arcado-Cyprian) and although one could rush to explain it as Attic influence, we must be careful because besides the obvious Northwest text we have seen Aeolic influence as well. In my opinion ΙΚΕΤΙΣ is Aeolic.96 This view is reinforced by other inscriptions found in Macedonia along with the famous exchange found in Strattis’ *Macedonians:*

![Athenian: Σφύσαινα δ’ ἐστὶ τίς;](image)

94 Carl D. Buck, Greek Dialects, 74.
95 English rough breathing; Greek: δασὺ πνεῦμα, δασεῖα.
Macedonian: Κέστραν μέν ύμμες Ωττικοί κικλήσκετε.

The above conversation is about a type of fish. The Athenian is asking what is sphyraînà? The Macedonian responded, "it is what you Atticans call kestrà." Kestra or sphyraînà is the needle-fish, which in Modern Greek is zargada (scientifically Belone belone). The word ύμμες is Aeolic appearing in Sappho (Lesbian or pure Aeolic dialect) while its Doric equivalent is ύμες, ἁμές and the Attic ύμεῖς. The double nasal μμ bears the characteristics of Lesbian and Thessalian dialects.97 In addition, literary evidence indicates that all dialects with the exception of the Ionic/Attic used the ending –μες.98 The verb κικλήσκετε is present of κικλήσκω with the syllable κι being present tense reduplication. It is Aeolic in origin, and it appears in Homer’s Iliad X, 11,99 XV 403.100 The word Ωττικοί is nothing more than a crasis or contraction of οἱ + Ἀττικοί (οι + α =ω).

Optative in conditional form clauses survives in several dialects. In general, use of optative in lieu of subjunctive is an attribute of Northwest Greek. Aorists in optative and imperative moods serve as a “pleading tense.”

καταγράφω is a Doric form for the Attic ἀναγράφω meaning ‘I engrave,’ ‘I incise.’

παρκαττίθεμαι (= Attic παρακατατίθεμαι) apocope of prepositions is common in Doric, and even more so in Aeolic dialects.

Δαίμο-οσι has a termination different from Lesbian, Thessalian, Boeotian, Delphian, Elean, East Locrian which is δαμόν-εσσι. Elsewhere in Northwest dialect and in inscriptions from Corinth, the colonies of Epidamnus, and Syracuse the termination is δαμόν-οις. The Heracleian dialect prefers δαμόν-ασσι. However, Smyth maintains that the termination –εσσι is not Aeolo-Doric because with the exception in the Homeric (Chian) dialect it occurs only in Thessalian and Boeotian. The Peloponnesian Doric has no such termination and in the Helladic peninsula it appears only as far west as Phocis. If such termination were either Aeolic or Doric, it would appear beyond the aforementioned borders.101 Thus, the above termination is not necessarily

97 Carl D. Buck, Introduction, 60.
99 κλήθην εἰς ἄγορην κικλήσκειν ἄνδρα ἐκαστόν.
100 ἡ γέφυρα τις Συρίη κικλήσκεται, εἰ ποῦ ἀκούεις.
Attic nor has Attic influence, but it is a *bona fide* termination of certain Northwest Greek dialects, one of which is Macedonian.

**Ὀπόκα:** The termination –κα of conjunctions of time is one of the characteristics not only of the Northwest Greek group of dialects, but all West Greek. Thessalian and Boeotian being mixed dialects of Aeolic and Doric, but representing the East Greek Division along with Attic – Ionic, Lesbian Aeolic, and Arcado-Cyprian or Achaean seem to compromise between –κα of the Northwest and –τε of the Attic-Ionic rendering –κε. In ὀπόκα, the termination –κα is West Greek equivalent to –τε or αν of the Attic. It is a standard characteristic of West Greek and Boeotian. Thessalian, Lesbian, and Cyprian use –κε. Other examples are ὧκα, τόκα, and πόκα. Ionic and Attic use –τε or ταν as in ὀπότε, ὁτε, σταν, etc. Occasionally we see Attic using –κα as in ἡνίκα, πηνίκα.

**Γάμαι:** The verb appears in all dialects uncontracted as γαμέ ἐω (athematic form) turning into contracted γαμῶ in Attic meaning “to marry.” For the first time one sees it in Homer’s Iliad Χ388, 391. It started as an irregular verb forming its first aorist as ἔγημα, although its Doric first aorist form was γάμενων.102 O’Neil sees it as infinitive of the aorist stating that the -μσ (γᾶμσαι) should normally turn to -μ (γαμέναι);103 therefore, he concludes, it cannot be Aeolic (Thessalian) because it does not have double nasal (-μμ).104 There are two problems with this thought. First, the double nasal or double liquid spelling is not automatic, but it follows certain rules appearing usually before t.105 Second, an infinitive in this case does not make any syntactical sense. In addition, the ending of this athematic infinitive would have been in Lesbian present and occasionally aorist γαμέν. In most cases, the Lesbian aorist infinitive of athematic verbs terminates in –μεναι i.e. γαμέ-μεναι and in Thessalian γαμέ-μεν.107 In my view, it is first person singular, subjunctive mood serving as conditional, middle voice and that is exactly why the adverb τόκα was added. In Attic, this form would have been γῆμαι.108
διελέξαιμι corresponds to Attic διελίξαιμι = I unroll. The substitution of ε for ι is a characteristic of this defixio. In Aeolic, it happens before φ. It is found twice in SEG 38-649 (1988),109 a late fourth century BC tombstone from Pella, which reads ξηστε for ξοτι and Ιθεκρατις for Ιφικρατις. In this inscription, the Aeolic characteristics of double sibilant is apparent.

πάλειν for πάλιν. In line seven of the scroll, Voutyra’s assertion that the writer started to write πάλ{ε}ιν with an E recognizing it as an error, but failing to erase it, is logical. Confusion of long ι and the diphthong -ει is also found as early as the fourth century in Attic. The same happened in the Boeotian dialect due to possible change in pronunciation, which in the fifth century BC oscillated between ει and ι.110

-έμιν is a West Greek (Doric, Northwest Doric) form of the personal pronoun ἐγώ in dative.

-ιμέ is the form for Attic ειμί, Doric ήμι, Lesbian εϊμι, Thessalian and elsewhere ειμι.

In the same line (seven) we observe the gloss ΟΠΩΣ, which is very significant in determining the approximate dating of the text. ΟΣ and ΟΠΩΣ are two widespread terminal conjunctions of the early period which ended at the end of the earlier period. The development of the gloss INA by the Attic-Ionic spread to other dialects in the beginning of the middle period (after 480 BC), and we mostly find it in other than Attic-Ionic dialects in late inscriptions.111 To some extent, Attic influence shows, in most of the Doric dialects, in the fourth century BC.112 Because of its political dealings with Athens and Athenian colonies, Macedonia was influenced earlier than other Northwest speaking areas thus making this scroll older than we think.

(Line 7) ΟΙΠΩΣ ΜΗ ΓΙΝΗΤΑΙ ΤΑΥΤΑ. Here we observe that although the verb is in subjunctive and the spelling of the verb follows the Northwest Greek spelling, there is no grammatical number agreement of the verb with the subject; it is a clear example of Attic syntax. Attic dialect had influenced all Northwest dialects in various degrees. Nevertheless, the basic principle is that the syntax of the scroll in this point is not in a complete subject-verb agreement

---

110 Carl D. Buck, Introduction, 29.
111 Carl D. Buck, Greek Dialects, 104. INA originally meant “where.”
112 Carl D. Buck, Greek Dialects, 176
pointing to the most significant characteristic of the Attic syntax.\(^{113}\) Of course, one might advocate that the syntax is not Attic because the gloss ΤΑΥΤΑ is actually feminine singular under the -α for -ή rule (above) and its meaning renders ΜΟΙΡΑ (μοῖρα) or something similar.

Line 8.

[...]ΑΛ< _ _ _ _[- - -]_ ΥΝ M_ _ ΕΣ ΠΛΗΝ ΕΜΟΣ. I suggest

**In line #8**

Analyzing line eight we see

ΠΛΗΝ: ΠΛΗΝ is a preposition in its Attic form (Northwest Doric ΠΛΑΝ) that usually governs genitive case, but not always. The syntax of ΠΛΗΝ oftentimes follows the syntax of the preceding expression.\(^{114}\) In this case the following ΕΜΟΣ is in genitive.

ΕΜΟΣ: It is genitive case of the personal pronoun ΕΓΩ instead of ΕΜΕΟΣ or ΕΜΟΥ following the preposition ΠΛΗΝ.

Μ_ _ ΕΣ: I am suggesting the gloss ΜΗΘΕΣ or ΜΗΔΕΣ which is nominative for ΜΗΔΕΙΣ and the subject of the main verb and which unfortunately is undecipherable. In ΜΗΘΕΣ, Θ renders Δ because the spiritus asper from the ΕΙΣ or ΕΝΣ in Boeotian converts Δ to Θ.\(^{115}\)

Before the suggested gloss ΜΗΔΕΣ, there are three letters _____ which I suggest they are - ZYN with the archaic letter ἵ (zayin) rendering the sound of Z (zeta). I want to explain that Z renders Δ as we have found such cases in inscriptions and lexicons, e.g. ζέ, ζékα, ζίκαια in Elean, τόζ for τόδε in Rhodian and Πιοζείε for εἰδείη in Argive,\(^{116}\) κοζία for καρδία in Cyprian.\(^{117}\)

\(^{113}\) Under the Attic syntax the subject is a grammatically neuter plural, the verb is required to be in third person singular. The Attic syntax is rather peculiar because it treats the subject as a group instead of as an individual. By using the gloss i.e. children it is as if one says a group (of children) plays. Taking away the gloss for the group, the sentence now changes to children plays.\(^{113}\) Normally the subject ΤΑΥΤΑ require the verb in plural; yet the verb remains in singular ΓΙΝΗΤΑ, a perfect example of Attic syntax.

\(^{114}\) Ἀχιλλεύς Τζάρτζανος, Συντακτικόν τῆς Ἀρχαίας Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης. Αθήναι : ΟΕΣΒ, 1956, 91.

\(^{115}\) Carl D. Buck, Introduction, 57.

\(^{116}\) Carl D. Buck, Introduction, 54.

\(^{117}\) Hesychius.
The matter of the –ΔYN is most interesting because it is the case of present and sometimes aorist infinitive of athematic vowel stems as well as contracted verbs which otherwise follow the athematic type ending in -ν, instead of -μεναι. The athematic inflection of a contracted verb otherwise known as the ‘Aeolic inflection’ is characteristic of the Lesbian, Thessalian, and Arcado-Cyprian.118 One could argue that the infinitive might not fit in the sentence, but missing glosses such as the verb in the sentence make any such argument unprofitable.

**Infinitive - μωδύω**: The missing verb in its infinitive form can be any verb that makes sense in the context terminating in –δυμι (-ζυμι) or in - δυω (-ζυω). The problem is that we do not have the preceding glosses especially the verb of the primary sentence that would help us find the most appropriate infinitive. As an example, I offer the verb μωδύω which is found in the lexicon of Hesychius meaning θάλπω, μωραίνω,.119 In other words, the author of the katadesmos might be stating that “nobody [may take care of Dionysophon], but me.” There are other verbs that could fit the specific infinitive termination as ὀϊζύω meaning I bereave, but such an option does not seem possible and the verb λιβδύω which means I excommunicate is improbable.120

One could suggest glosses as ξύν, κίνδυν, but somehow I doubt whether they could fill the vacuum. The gloss κίνδυν is found in Sappho as accusative case singular of κίνδυνος = danger.

Thus as the final readable sentence in a regular word order, I offer

[...][ΑΛ...]  ΜΗΔΕΣ (undecipherable primary verb) ΜΩΖΥΝ ΠΛΗΝ ΕΜΟΣ

Based on the above, my translation slightly differs from previous translations:

I incise the end of marriage between Thetima and Dionysophon and of all other women, and widows and virgins, but especially Thetima. Moreover, I assign them to Makron and the demons. In addition, after digging [the scroll] up whenever I unroll and read these [words], then Dionysophon may marry me, but not before. He may not take any wife but me, and I may grow old with him but no other woman. I am your petitioner; pity me

---

120 Hesychius, s.v. λιβδύων “to excommunicate.”
dear daemons, for I am weak and abandoned of all friends. Nevertheless, [please] protect me so these [things] do not happen. This and [also] evil Thetima should evilly perish. [lacuna- ΑΛ undecipherable - lacuna] no one may take care [Dionysophon], but me. I am humble (modest) but [I wish] I be fortunate and blessed, [undecipherable].

--- ... ---

Remarks on katadesmos

- The language of the scroll maintains the original long \( \dot{\alpha} \) instead of \( \eta \) which is a very Attic and characteristically Ionic. Although it bears Northwest distinctiveness, it is syntactically influenced by Aeolic and Attic dialects, as does the Thessalian.

- Psilosis on glosses ΟΠΟΚΑ, ΟΠΩΣ, ΙΚΕΤΙΣ, ΥΜΩΝ, because they lack the prevocalic presence of \( \digamma, \varepsilon, \delta, \) or \( \upsilon \).

- The syntax of the gloss ΟΠΩΣ with subjunctive is common in the early times ending in the beginning of fifth century BC in favor of ΙΝΑ with subjunctive.

- The time of the scroll’s text is about the end of the fifth and beginning of the fourth century BC.

- The lexical, grammatical, and syntactical intricacies of the text indicate that the author is local and the textual form is supported by other inscriptions found in Macedonia.

  The syntax of the conjunction of manner ΟΠΩΣ with subjunctive instead of ΙΝΑ with subjunctive denotes syntax of earlier period.

  The presence of the Attic syntax in the scroll demonstrates the influence of the Attic dialect. Athens, due to its political and military superiority over other Greek states forced linguistic dominance over all dialects. Attic had already become in the very early years of the fifth century BC the *kultursprache* of the Macedonian nobility.

  The migration of the Dorian Thesprotians to the Aeolic speaking Thessaly helps us realize that not all Macedonians had passed to the Peloponnese where they received the exonym
Dorians. Had all Macedonians passed on to Peloponnese leaving no elements on the continental Greece, the Macedonian/Dorian Thesprotians would not have existed in Epirus.

The Phoenician 𐤀 (zayin) rendering Z (zeta) brings the date of the script to the end of the last half of the fifth century BC. One could even argue that the inscription’s zayin resembles Ι as in Boeotian ΙΒΒΜ or in Theran ΙΕΒΜ rendering ΖΕΥΣ or Zeus. Boeotia used the zeta by 424 BC while we know that Corinth used it in the fifth century, as well. What we do not know about the Corinthian dialect is the time of conversion from zayin to zeta due to lack of examples.121

---

Conclusion

The Arcadians had migrated to Cyprus in the Bronze Age a few centuries before the Macedonians who migrated north during the Iron Age, and thus any assumption that the Macedonians were not Greeks *par excellence* is baseless and this small inscription written in Northwest Doric by a simple woman, not a member of nobility from Macedonia attests to it.

Historical and archeological evidence reveals that the Macedonians (under the eponym Hellenes) left the Aeolic speaking area of south Thessaly, roved near the west foot hills of Mt. Olympus, wandered to the Pindus Mountain range through the habitats of Northwest Doric speaking Epirotans, went to Lebaea and ended up in the Aeolic speaking Perrhaebia and then to Mt. Pieria. Considering the above route of the Macedonians that lasted a few centuries it is natural that their speech would include elements of both Aeolic and Northwest Doric dialects.

The combination of Northwest Doric with Aeolic elements and the lexical and grammatical intricacies of the text make this dialect similar to Thessalian of Thessaliotis, but we do not know the degree of Aeolic influence on the Northwest dialect and whether the Macedonian was more Aeolic or more Doric than the Thessalian. What we now know is that this is the language which Plutarch (Alexander V, 51.6) invoked in his statement *ἀνεβόα Μακεδονιστὶ* (he called out in Macedonian).
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