

André Martinet

THE INDO-EUROPEANS AND GREECE

Even in scientific usage there are terms that we believe we understand and when we try to pinpoint what they refer to we notice that these terms do not have a precise meaning. This applies, in linguistics, to the term Indo-European. Mostly, when used as an adjective, it seems to apply to those languages that derive, hypothetically, from a disappeared idiom which some scholars for nearly two hundred years have been trying to reconstruct. Thus, it is said that Sanskrit, Greek and Latin are Indo-European languages. When this epithet is applied to French it causes surprise. From a comparative viewpoint, French is usually seen as a Romance language and only Romance languages taken together or, better said, Latin from which they derive, seem to merit the epithet. When used as a noun, “Indo-European” may designate the disappeared language itself. But serious scholars give it a precision in this case like *commun* in French, *proto* in English

Translated by Paul Mankin

The Indo-Europeans and Greece

or *Ur-* in German. Does this imply that we may designate as Indo-European the sum of the individual languages of this family, whether they still exist or have disappeared? One may indeed take a chance and do it, but not without startling or even shocking one's public.

By means of certain precautions, it is possible to agree more or less about the value of Indo-European in reference to languages. But when, by extension, the term is made to apply to human beings, generally in groups, then the door appears to open up to manifold imprecisions and mistakes. Can one say that an Indo-European is someone who speaks or spoke an Indo-European language? This would have the advantage of neatness if one were willing to forget that there are bilingual and plurilingual people who speak several languages concurrently. But, once again, who would risk saying that a Frenchman is an Indo-European without the fear of being accused of racism, that same racism that made the term of Aryan so hateful some time ago? Would we say perhaps that an Indo-European was one of those who spoke a common Indo-European? Here we see the problem of what the word "common" precisely means. For a long time, without being explicit, common Indo-European was conceived as a perfectly homogeneous language which came to an end at the moment when each branch we identify took off in its own direction, losing from then on any contact with its congeners. This naive conception of a sudden, total and definitive diaspora is today unacceptable. When, in 1917, Hittite was identified as an Indo-European language, it forced comparatists to put their attempts at reconstruction into a dynamic perspective. Undoubtedly there have been efforts to minimize and by-pass certain embarrassing divergences, like the absence of distinction between masculine and feminine, or the opposition of the "perfect" to the "present-aorist", not as two aspects of the same verb, but as two distinct and parallel verbal types. But it was clearly necessary to give in to the evidence that between the Hittite and the other formerly attested languages there was not that obvious parallelism found between Greek and Sanskrit which had been the source of the comparatist enterprise.

Of course the lesson of the new data was not drawn all at once, but the mythic vision of the sudden crumbling of a monolithic Indo-European, in time and in space, was staggered. Indo-

European, at all points in its prehistory, was a language like any other, undergoing the pressure of changing needs, of the influence of neighboring languages, in space and in society, therefore in a perpetual state of evolution.

In an attempt not to undermine the structure which had been tidied up by Karl Brugmann at the turn of the century, Edgar Sturtevant postulated an Indo-Hittite protolanguage preceding the common Indo-European. Few scholars followed in his footsteps. It is thus necessary that we try to replace on the time-axis the linguistic divergences which can be interpreted as signs of scissions and separations into different branches of the primitive *ethnos*. But what does “primitive” mean? Who can assert that at a time of Indo-European linguistic unity the people in question were decidedly racially and thus culturally homogeneous? This uncertainty is indicated by the quotation marks surrounding the noun “Indo-European” in the subtitle of my work *Des steppes aux océans* (1986).

Let us look at the second noun of my present title: Greece. One might think that it is not ambiguous. And, as a matter of fact, it claims here to cover all of Hellas, from Antiquity to our days, since we shall operate hereafter with the contemporary values of certain forms. But the term often refers less to a country than to a people and to a culture. It is therefore necessary to point out that, in the present context, it must be conceived as designating a geographic reality, since, in the first instance, we are dealing with a corner of the world where the language, the culture and the institutions which we call Greek did not yet exist. Even more, it will be wise not to limit the acceptance of this term to strictly peninsular regions, but to include, for instance, Epirus and even Macedonia. It could even be that by a tacit implication it extends as far as Albania and the wildest and least accessible parts of the dinaric Alps.

After thirty or forty years devoted to the synchronic description of language structures, I have come back, thanks to the pressure of my audiences, to the problems that relate to Indo-European comparison. I have then discovered to my pleasure that the progress which was achieved by archaeological research in south-eastern Europe, from the Balkans to the Caspian sea, allowed, for the first time, to bring together, without undue

The Indo-Europeans and Greece

arbitrariness, the new data with those gathered by traditional comparative linguistics. The writings of the American linguist Marija Gimbutas (1982) have been especially inspiring to attempt to locate those who spoke, some 7,000 years ago, what German comparatists used to designate as the *Ursprache*. It is undoubtedly wise to temper the somewhat manichean presentation of this author by referring to others like Homer L. Thomas (1982) or David W. Anthony (1986) to mention only a few of those who try to make archaeological and linguistic data coincide. But too-early reservations might induce us to reject a framework which is indispensable to those wishing to take position concerning essential questions.

At the beginning of the fifth millennium before our era, we situate the “Indo-European” somewhere in Southern Russia. We are dealing with what has been called the people of Kurgans. The Kurgans, pit-graves in English, are burial sites consisting of an excavation lined and covered with rocks and topped with a mound of earth. They are burial grounds of chieftains accompanied in their grave by their wealth, their servants and their women. Since it is highly unlikely that the treasures of the Kurgans were the product of local artisans, it is believed that they came from exchanges—but for what?—or from plunders.

One thing that must have rendered the robbing activities easier for these people is the domestication of the horse. Mounted probably without a saddle and certainly without stirrups, the horse was not yet seen in the battlefield: without stirrups it is impossible to thrust if not to cut, and to allow this to happen one had to wait for the invention of the chariot. The horse’s primary function must have been to escape from the pursuit of those that were robbed. The horse also represented a source of food supply that contributed to check shortages, which, in turn, in a society where natural fertility was the rule, brought about a population increase. This resulted in a tendency to expand at the expense of less favored neighbors. Due to the speed of moving about, this expansion was not limited to the immediate surroundings but might well take the form of distant expeditions. Conditions seemed to prevail that enhanced the exercise of great violence against those populations with which the rider had no link of parentage and of neighborliness. This decisive advance in the matter of speed will

continue for centuries and millennia to our present day. The horse will again allow the conquest of the New World by the Spaniards. But Leif, son of Eric the Red, will have preceded them up to Vinland with his drakkars. And soon afterwards it will be the steam engine, the gasoline engine and the jet that will assure the almost total domination of the world by the Europeans.

It is fitting, for our project, to distinguish between two types of invasion whose linguistic implications differ totally. On the one hand, there is the expedition to far away places, without any intention of returning to the point of departure, carried out by solitary men quite decided upon creating for themselves a domain to their taste and to find somewhere else the women who will assure their descent. These men, who were later characterized as cadets, are thus escaping the absolute authority of the head of the patriarchal family. On the other hand, there is the mass immigration movement, with women, children and goods, illustrated, in the Second century B.C., by the vagrancies of the Cimbers and the Teutons in their search for a new habitat. When the Normans, giving up their horses in favor of small skiffs, left, without women, their Scandinavian shores to conquer Neustria where they would find women, they condemned their language to oblivion and French will be transmitted by the mothers to their children. One may well argue that Gallo-Roman and Latin, hardly distinguishable at that time, were enjoying a considerable prestige even among the Barbarians who had come from the North and that, other languages competing, the women or concubines might gradually have forgotten their own language to the benefit of those spoken by their husband and master.

Whatever the case may be, it is not sure that the cadets' ventures to a distant land did immediately and decisively replace the local languages with those of the conqueror. But in Europe they must have been the prelude to a huge arriving force that finally reduced the native population to serfdom if it did not eliminate it completely.

Research concerning the beliefs of the ancient people of Indo-European language allow us to see, for a prehistoric period, the broad traits of a structure which would reflect that of the society. But they have not led to the reconstruction of a pantheon on the model of what we know through written texts. The only

The Indo-Europeans and Greece

deity whose name recurs in the different ancient languages is Jupiter, in the form of Zeus in Greek, Dyaus in Vedic and Tiw in Germanic. One can also identify, beyond the renewal of the terms, a god of war, whether he is called Mars, Ares or Wotan. We can imagine, according to Dumézil, a protector of the third estate, the one of producers subservient to priests and warriors and we can assign, according to Jean Haundry (1987), a cosmic religion to the Indo-European. Everything reflects a strictly patriarchal society where some rare female goddesses are provided to satisfy the needs of their male partners. In first place figures the goddess who has been called “the warrior’s rest” whether her name is Venus, Aphrodite or Freyja.

As we examine the linguistic data which does not contradict archaeological evidence, we find the suggestion that a first large-scale movement of the Kurgan people took place, undoubtedly to the East of the Black Sea, along the Caucasus in the direction of Asia Minor. This movement can be assigned to the origins of Anatolian civilizations during the two millennia before our era with the Hittites and a few others. It is most likely that the Hyksos left from there when, with their horses harnessed to chariots, they subjugated Egypt and kept it under their sway for several centuries.

Toward the West, probably somewhat later, three successive thrusts occurred. The first, before 4000 B.C., took place at the expense of the populations installed in what is today Southern Ukraine, Rumania, Hungary and up to Austria, all of them plains where horsemen can be manoeuvred at leisure. The invaders met populations of neolithic civilization, given to agriculture and cattle-raising. Excavations have revealed a matriarchal culture with a pantheon at whose head was a goddess of fertility, a cult of earth and nature, both animal and vegetal. Decorative motifs are discovered which could point to an incipient graphic system.

It was probably difficult, for these populations, to oppose the invaders effectively. One may suppose that the latter were able in certain spots, to get established permanently, without however achieving a linguistic Indo-Europeanization of the land. A marked cultural influence does not necessarily imply a change of language. To refer once more to the Norman model, one notices, in the French-speaking Pays de Caux, that rural properties conserve up

to our days structural traits of Scandinavian origin.

A part of the population of these zones conquered by the invasions of the steppe riders probably moved towards the West, but mostly towards the South-West, in the mountainous regions where horsemen, losing some of their mobility, will hesitate to venture.

It is remarkable that the two subsequent thrusts—before and after 3000 B.C.—did not touch the most precipitous sections of the Balkan Peninsula, namely the range of Pindus and peninsular Greece. If these movements start with the horsemen's invasions, they are certainly followed by mass displacements, probably already with ox carts some remnants of which are found in tombs and which will play an important part up to fairly recent periods. These movements could only have had a decisive linguistic influence with the participation of women and children. It is often thought that such traces of advances can be found as far as Italy, but the definitive Indo-Europeanization of that peninsula occurs certainly at a later date. Once more the plains and the valley of the Danube must have attracted the invaders. But the most decisive incursions probably took place mostly toward the North-West, along the Carpathian mountains, in areas of easy access, through the plains of Poland and Northern Germany as far as the Baltic and the Rhine. It is into these areas that one can place the ancestors of the Germanic speakers, the Celts and the Italics. The latter may have been on the southern fringes of these parts, in contact with those who became the Greeks and the Indo-Iranians. The Venetians must also have been located in this plain of Northern Europe. They were later found assimilated to the Celts in the Armorican peninsula, related by language to the Latins in Northern Italy and known as the Wends, to the East of the Germanic speakers.

Western Europe and notably today's France did not seem to be affected at that time. Is one to think of an effective resistance by the representatives of the megalithic civilization or of a counterpush by archers carrying bell-shaped goblets? Nearly 2,000 years will elapse before the "Indo-Europeans" of the West, known henceforth as the Celts, penetrate Gaul on their way toward the British Isles and Spain.

In the Danube basin and to the North-West of the Black Sea

The Indo-Europeans and Greece

were probably those who would later become the Indo-Iranians, the Greeks, the Illyrians and the other people of Indo-European language of the Balkan peninsula and the western parts of Asia Minor.

This overview leaves on the sideline, at the border of Ukraine and White Russia those who later on will be the Slavs and the Balts, without mentioning all the people who never affirmed themselves historically as such and must have been absorbed by their neighbors.

I am aware that this distribution, which can be dated to the beginnings of the third millennium, remains quite hypothetical. It is obviously based on linguistic data about which I cannot go into detail here. One single example, nevertheless: the Indo-European languages, by way of a slow process which started after the departure of the Anatolians, have combined two or three verbs into one. It is the phenomenon to which it would be worth while reserving the term of "conjugation." The combinations have been made in different ways according to the branches of the family. The opposition is clear among the languages which, like Greek and Sanskrit, have combined three verbs, a durative, a punctual and an accomplished, and others like Germanic, Celtic or Italic where one finds only two, a non-accomplished and an accomplished, the *infectum* and the *perfectum* of Latin. Adding this to observations relating to the vocabulary, one has reasons to suppose that Greek and Indo-Iranian on one hand, Germanic, Celtic and Italic on the other, have evolved independently for several centuries.

This does not imply that, in this prehistoric Europe, all dialectal borders, all the "isoglosses," have coincided. Greek, like Celtic, Germanic and Italic, keeps the old *k* and *g* (for "to know," *gi-gnò-skò*, Latin (*g*)*nò-scò*, Old English *cnàwan*), and yet our distribution puts it into the same camp as the eastern languages that have changed them into hisses (Russian *zna-t*) or hushes (Sanskrit, *jānā-ti*). Italic must have shared certain evolutionary processes with Greek. One may think, for instance, of the maintenance of the aspiration with the conservation of an old **b*⁴ which afterwards evolves in parallel fashion in Latin and in Greek, through the intermediary "ph," toward "f." In an entirely different direction, Germanic and Celtic have eliminated the aspiration and kept the "b." This, ultimately, gives the Latin *ferò*, the Greek *pherò*,

to the Gothic *baira* and the old Irish *berim*. It will also be noted that Germanic, alone in its case, seems not to have participated in the creation of a durative past, the one that is designated as the “imperfect.”

During the first centuries of the third millennium, according to the hypothesis that we are starting from, the people of Indo-European language had not yet penetrated into what was traditional Greece. At most they could have reached Macedonia via the valley of the Vardar. There is undoubtedly another version of the facts according to which the Pelasgians, believed by the Greeks to be the former habitants of their country, would represent a first wave of Indo-European conquerors. Some, like Vladimir Georgiev (1981) attribute to them certain Hellenic forms of toponymy and vocabulary where is to be found a trace of a consonant mutation reminiscent of those found in Armenian and in Germanic. But, supposing that these forms, the one of *Korinthos*, “Corinth,” for instance, are really Indo-European, couldn’t they be the result of a later contribution? These Pelasgians, who were seen by the ancient Greeks not as autochthonous but as people who had come from somewhere else, could have been Danubians, who under pressure from repeated invasions by the horsemen from the steppes, had withdrawn to the South and imported to Greece the ethnic cults which, with Demeter, Cora and many others will co-exist with the gods of Olympus during the whole time of pagan Greece.

Only at the turn from the third to the second millennium will the people of Indo-European language, firmly established on the Danube and as far as Thrace, penetrate toward the South-West. For Greece, these datings vary a little, but they are around 2000 B.C. It is not impossible that there may have been successive invasions of Ionians, Achaeans and Eolians. If one takes the orography of the peninsula into consideration, one may think that it is by way of Thessaly, easily accessible via Macedonia, that the invaders were able to penetrate to the heart of Greece. Mount Olympus, very close by, must have been the first center of resistance which they had to overcome and it was there that they established their pantheon. The interest shown to the Greeks of the second millennium comes from the Achaeans who were the representatives of the Mycenaean culture. The Anatolians seem to

The Indo-Europeans and Greece

have identified the newly arrived as Achaeans.

In Albania, the arrival of the Illyrians is placed around the year 2100 B.C., namely toward the time when the Hellenes entered Greece. It is probably too early to take advantage of the archaeological research which is currently being done in Albania, but we can hope that some day they will permit us to understand better what happened in this part of the world at the dawn of the second millennium.

It is known what kind of a drama the invasion of the Dorians, toward 1200 B.C., represented for Greece. An entire culture disappeared which slowly rose from its ashes again in the following centuries. Traditionally scholars are not inclined to doubt that the Dorians were Hellenes, in the same way as the three other composing forces of ancient Greece. But the linguist may legitimately ask about the real identity of these invaders. It has not been established that, in the third millennium, the ancestors of the Achaeans and of the Dorians belonged to the same branch of the Indo-European family. Had this been the case, contacts would have been interrupted for nearly 1,000 years and it is not conceivable that the Dorians in their habitat of departure could have participated in any way in the development of a Mycenaean culture. When we try to imagine the evolutionary rhythm of Indo-European languages of 3,000 or 4,000 years ago, we cannot believe that what was called Dorian Greek at the classical period could be the continuation of the invaders' language. The linguistic conditions which we can imagine then, do not allow the supposition of serious difficulties of comprehension between Athenians and Lacedaemonians, during the expedition of the ten thousand, for example. Wouldn't it be better to suppose that those who pillaged Greece, were, rather than new tribes that arrived *en masse* to occupy new territories, predators like our Normans who did not establish a linguistic base but let women, chosen from among the settled populations, raise their children in their own language. In this case, the conditions would only have had the effect of slowing down the evolution which one notices in the speech of those cantons of Hellas that had avoided being enslaved.

The Dorian irruption in Greece occurs at the moment when, toward the West, the second wave of Celts and Italics are making their appearance. The first wave—the one that had led some to

Ireland and Spain and others as far as Latium and Sicily—kept the primitive labiovelars, therefore such interrogatives as **k^wis* or **k^wo*. The second wave will reach Great Britain,—pushing the predecessors toward the West—occupy Gaul, not without leaving traces of the first invaders, and, in Italy, they will infiltrate Emilia toward the South, along the Apennines. Those who take part in this new drive have changed **k^wis* to *pis* and **k^wo* to *po-*. One may think that the Dorians were also part of it and that, without imposing their language upon their predecessors they made them participate in the mutation of the labiovelars. We know that the Mycenaean distinguished in writing the labiovelars from the other occlusives. The results of this mutation, in Greek, vary from one dialect to the other, with traces of maintaining the velar and particular treatments before the frontal vowel, with *tis* for the ancient **k^wis* but *po-* in a derivative like *pote*.

Better than archaeology, the examination of the religious traditions of the Hellenic world can permit us to decipher the originality of how Greece was populated and to oppose this originality to what was going on, at the same time, in the other European countries that underwent the domination of the steppe people. In pagan societies, religion appears like a mirror of the vision of the world that prevails in each community. Along the lines of Dumézil's research, one finds there the broad characteristics of the social structures of the people studied. If we think that the three estates of priests, warriors and producers must be conceived for a period of the common Indo-European, the reason is, clearly, that it applies not only to what we can reconstruct or imagine for the steppe people, but also because this conception was found at the two extremes of the ancient Indo-European world, the Indian and the Latin societies. Certain intermediary zones have shown themselves to be more innovating. That is the case in the Germanic North, with a non-identifiable substratum, where the warriors have won over the priests and where, facing the serfs, we find the binary opposition of the nobleman, the jarl, to the karl, the free man.

In Greece one notices not even a reduction of the three estates to two, but, parallel to society models that have varied in time and in space, the coexistence of two religious schemes.

One of them, inherited from the steppes, was imposed by the

The Indo-Europeans and Greece

conquerors. It is the one with Zeus and the Olympus. It has, however, annexed certain deities of the rival scheme and it has become thereby considerably richer. It represents, as it were, the society's framework and it reaps the benefit of all public consecrations.

The other leads a subterranean life. It is maintained by popular tradition and fed by colleges of devout participants initiated in mysteries of which those of Eleusis are by far the most famous. Although the celebration is reserved to the chosen, there is nothing clandestine about it. There does not seem to be, in the classical age, a conflict between this celebration and the cults in which the entire population participates. This second scheme touches upon the relationship between life and the beyond, between Demeter and Persephone, Orpheus and the underworld. Tradition connects Orpheus with Thrace. The same applies to Dionysos, who is integrated as his name indicates, with the Olympians, but who, by means of the vine which is his primary attribute, finds himself more fittingly among the gods of fertility. One may think that this localization out of the properly Hellenic territory, shows a pre-Indo-European cultural contribution, coming from the Danubian regions under the pressure of the first invasions by the horsemen arriving from the East. Undoubtedly, to explain everything that distinguishes the Greek world from the other areas of Indo-European language, one cannot deny the decisive influences exercised by Crete. Neolithic culture which includes the domestication of alimentary plants, comes undoubtedly from Mesopotamia, through Asia Minor. But it must have reached Greece only belatedly, since Greece is a harsh country, poorly adapted to cultivation of the soil, and probably via the Danubian regions rather than the Aegean Sea. One can hardly be surprised, under these circumstances, that people were tempted to attribute to neighboring Thrace those innovations that came from the North.

One can expect to find, in popular legends and beliefs, some traces of the conflict that opposed invaders and former residents. Undoubtedly there will be myths that will present, in a favorable light, the elimination of local resistance, myths that defend the viewpoint of the conquerors. Elsewhere a syncretism of ancient and new beliefs will be found, as one can still find today in certain

regions of Latin America where Christianity is profoundly tainted by the old myths of the local populations. Wherever syncretism is blocked by the intransigence of the strongest, the old beliefs are perpetuated under different forms, in the humblest strata of the population often disavowed but with interesting resurgences. A *modus vivendi* may also be established which probably undergoes periods of conflict but which finally results in a more or less peaceful coexistence. Such was the case in the Germanic North with the opposition of the Ases and the Vanes where the former could represent the pantheon of the newly arrived and the Vanes the old chthonic deities of the natives.

All these types seem to be represented in Greece: the defeat of the Titans, slain by Zeus and precipitated into Tartarus, symbolizes the victory of the steppe people upon adversaries that are ever so frightening since they evoke the terror felt by plains people toward mountainous retreats whence these enemies would emerge. But there is a frequent coexistence with the mysteries which at the beginning are probably practiced in secret but which, in the course of time, have acquired squatter's rights. Most of the time, however, this coexistence is hidden by annexation. Demeter, who is at the center of the Eleusis mysteries, the goddess of fertility, outstandingly chthonian, undoubtedly an avatar of the central figure in the Danubian matriarchal pantheon, nevertheless occupies a stellar place with the Olympians, the equal of Hera and Aphrodite. One cannot be too careful to be sure to integrate her fully in the court of Olympus: at times she is supposed to be Zeus' sister, at others the daughter of his sister; but she is also, incestuously, the woman who will lie with him to give birth to Persephone, the link between hell and the outside world. Another way of annexing the indigenous divinities is to make them issued, be it from the head, as in the case of Athena, be it from "Jupiter's" thigh as in the case of Dionysos. In all of these cases, was there a hesitation to postulate a more natural form of birth?

The fronton of Artemis' temple in Corfu illustrates one of the modalities of this process of integrating the pre-Hellenic deities. Corfu, in the Ionian Sea, facing the coast of Epirus and Albania, was probably Illyrian before it was colonized in the seventh century, by the Corinthians. The Greeks erected there a temple dedicated to Artemis. A fronton of that temple is left, in good state

The Indo-Europeans and Greece

of conservation and very well restored. Today it is the most beautiful ornament of the city's archaeological museum. At the center of this fronton can be seen the Gorgon who is dominating by its impressive mass several lateral motifs. On the right we find a discreet reminder of the struggle between Zeus and the Titans. The Gorgon is not the resplendent Medusa of the legend, but a powerful matron with heavy traits. She appears such as the adorners of the daytime heaven could imagine a chthonian goddess. But this vision was, undoubtedly, not universally shared. Still today, in Greek, *gorgogna mou*—my Gorgon—is, in a lover's language, a proof of admiration for his mistress. She is shown to be fully alive, impressive by her body's strength. The fate that is reserved for her is simply suggested, on the left, by Pegasus and Chrysaor who will be born from her blood when she will be put to death, a fate reserved for witches of subsequent eras. But let us not forget that this monumental fronton belongs to the temple of Artemis, *Artamis*, in the local "Dorian." Artemis is simply an avatar of the Gorgon. She too has been annexed by the Olympians. Zeus is her given father, but her mother is Leto, a chthonian descendent of a Titan. In the Corfu museum, behind the hall where the fronton is located, one enters a more modest room. A dozen figurines are seen there, representing Artemis armed with her bow, certainly, but always accompanied by an animal which she protects. It is never the huntress eager to kill, but the one who protects the fauna against predators.

The Greeks are certainly not the only ones who have enriched the primitive pantheon of the Indo-Europeans. Let us not forget, by the way, that ancient paganism implies that any force of nature, any active entity can be adored and this implies a constant dynamic. When the Latins, learning from the Greeks, enlarged the roster of their great deities, they seem to have had little difficulty in finding the equivalents of the Hellenic models right there. It is true that the Etruscans, their masters, had preceded them in this path. As soon as the steppe people found a new climate, new nature, they necessarily had to broaden the roster of the powerful forces whose help they had to assure for themselves. This could be done by extending the competency of the already available gods. But, once the arrogance of the Conquerors was stilled, wasn't it natural to adopt the found deities for the new things? It is therefore

fitting, I think, for each branch of the Indo-European family to show the gap between what religion owes to the established cultural community and what it needed to create or borrow to adapt it to the new habitat.

It seems, nevertheless, that only in Greece such an enrichment of myths can be found. Undoubtedly, with the exception of Rome, it is in Greece that we are best informed, which may create a false impression. But as we revisit the Greek myths by the light of the discoveries of contemporary archaeology, one is struck by their wholly composite and harmonious character. Here we find a synthesis which is the trademark of the whole of Greek culture, a remarkable amalgam of creative power and expansionist vigor, probably issued from the symbiosis of Danubian fertility and nomadic aggressivity. This symbiosis exists actually only where there has been participation with the cultures of the Aegean world. Other "Indo-Europeans," about whom one thinks that they may have, during the course of their wanderings, spent some time in the basin of the Danube, do not participate in this amalgam at all, or, like the Latins, know it only in form of borrowings or belated adaptations. These are undoubtedly the circumstances to which one owes what has been called, in a slightly lyrical but very suggestive manner, the Greek miracle.

André Martinet
(*École pratique des hautes études, Paris*)

REFERENCES

- ANTHONY, DAVID W. (1986). "The Kurgan Culture', Indo-European Origins, and the Domestication of the Horse: A Reconsideration," *Current Anthropology*, 27, N. 4, p. 291-304.
- GEORGIEV, VLADIMIR. (1981). *Introduction to the History of Indo-European Languages*, Académie bulgare des sciences, 3ème éd.
- GIMBUTAS, MARIJA. (1982). "Old Europe in the Fifth Millennium B.C. The European Situation on the Arrival of the Indo-Europeans," *The Indo-Europeans in the Fourth and the Third Millennia*, ed. Edgar C. Polomé, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1-60.
- HAUDRY, JEAN. (1987). *La religion cosmique des Indo-Europeans*, Milan-Paris, Archè, "Les belles lettres."
- MARTINET, ANDRÉ. (1986). *Des steppes aux océans, L'indo-européen et les "Indo-Européens"*, Paris, Payot.

The Indo-Europeans and Greece

THOMAS, HOMER L. (1982). "Archaeological Evidence of the Migrations of the Indo-Europeans," *The Indo-Europeans in The Fourth and Third Millennia*, ed. Edgar C. Polomé, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 61-86.