

REVISIONS

Studia Mycenaea, Proceedings of the Mycenaean Symposium, Brno April 1966, edited by Antonín Bartoněk. Universita J. E. Purkyně. Brno 1968. 262 pages.

This volume contains almost all the communications submitted to the Mycenaean Symposium held at Brno in April 1966. They concern different subjects: language of the tablets (Szemerényi, Petruševski, Grinbaum), interpretation of the texts (Ruijgh, Mühlestein, Deroy, Chadwick, Gérard, Whatelet, Olivier), graphical problems (Doria, Fischer), history of Mycenaean civilization (Harmatta, Calderone, Tegye), a functional study of the Attic consonant system (Lupas). It includes, in addition, a bibliography of Mycenaean works published in the Eirene-Countries from 1953 to 1966 (Appendix II, pp. 211-252).

Szemerényi (pp. 25-36) deals with the Mycenaean evidence compared with the data we can obtain by means of the comparative method in Greek Dialectology and Indo-European Linguistics. There are some peculiar features in Mycenaean one cannot account for, according to S. if we try to explain them by the comparative method. For instance, how to explain *w* in the alternant Mycenaean spellings *meujo* / *meujo*? S. is right in stating that we should rather expect the spelling* **meyyos* instead of the forms that actually appear. So, one question is raised: Where did the Mycenaean form *meujo* get its *w* from? Szemerényi's suggestion is that IE **newo-* along with its comparative **newyōs*, and IE **yuwōn*, «young» may have contributed to reshaping the original form ***meyyōs* to the Mycenaean *meuyōs*. This point of view is, in our opinion, worth being taken into consideration.—Petruševski's contribution is a paper (pp. 59-64) on the vowel alternation *u* / *e* in Mycenaean. P. points out that this strange alternation must be considered as *substratum pelagicum*.—Grinbaum (pp. 76-86) compares the composed nouns found in Pyndar's odes with the proper nouns that can be recognised in Mycenaean. His conclusion is that they must have had a common source.—Doria (pp. 59-64) makes an approach to the graphic problem why *pe-ma* is to be read [*sperma*]. Following Bartoněk's ideas on the spelling of monophonemic and biphonemic diphthongs in Mycenaean (*Minos* 8, 1963, pp. 51-61), D. states that clusters like *sp-*, *st-*, etc., are to be considered as monophonemic, a fact which would explain the orthographic rule.—Fischer (pp. 65-70) attempts to show how Mycenaean writing distinguishes between voiced and unvoiced dentals. Some other writing systems have that distinction as well. Dental stops are the most frequent stops in Mycenaean. Their functional yield and their frequency could explain the need to make such a distinction in Mycenaean writing.—Ruijgh (pp. 98-102) takes into account Mycenaean *a-mo-te-jo-na-de*, where suffix *-eyōn-* is to be explained as analogical to such forms as (**χαλκείων*) Ion. *χαλκεών*, Att. *χαλκών*, quoted by Herodian.—Gérard (pp. 103-4), Whatelet (pp. 105-11) and Mühlestein (pp. 113-16), make interesting contributions to the study of the meaning of some difficult Mycenaean words.—Olivier presents a new interpretation of the *oka*-tablets (pp. 95-97). According to him *o-ka* should be

interpreted as «the fact of receiving» in connection with the meaning of the verb ἔχειν, as used in some Mycenaean tablets, (v. gr. PY Na 334 *wanaka eke* «the king receives»).—Chadwick (pp. 10-26), with his usual clearness, offers us a most important and stimulating study on the organization of the Mycenaean archives, full of new suggestions for further research.—Interesting, too, are the contributions of Harmatta (pp. 117-24), Calderone (pp. 125-29), Korževa (pp. 131-41) and Tegyej (pp. 143-46), and, in a different field, Lupas's paper on the Attic consonant system (pp. 83-93).

Amongst the questions dealt with in this Symposium, great attention was paid to Greek dialectology after the decipherment of Linear-B. There is a contribution of Bartoněk dealing with the dialectological classification of Mycenaean (pp. 37-51). After making an introductory approach to the *état de la question*, he sets forth his own hypothesis: Mycenaean might be an «interdialect» that was formed in Mycenaean centres of Southern Greece for a «supradialectal function». According to B. Mycenaean is not the result of the mixing of two or more different dialectal units, but rather a *koiné* made up on the basis of a single dialect with integration of some elements proceeding from others, something like Hellenistic *koiné*. In order to discuss the problem alluded to in his communication, the author offers those scholars interested in Greek dialectological research a list of questions to be answered, concerning dialectal differentiation in Ancient Greek. The answers are to be found in Appendix I, pp. 155-210. In our opinion, the following points of view should be submitted to further criticism: 1) Wathelet (p. 181) states that Mycenaean is a «common language», not to be identified with the ancestor of the dialects of Arcadia and Cyprus; thus, there are some discrepant features between Arcadian and Mycenaean, on the one hand, and between Cypriot and Mycenaean, on the other: v. gr. Arc. -ης, Myc. -εϋς; Cypr. -ω, Myc. -o-jo. However, we believe that none of these discrepancies should be taken as insuperable: with regard to the former; Arc.-Cyp. -ης, could be a later innovation of these dialects; the latter could be accounted for if we suggest that Myc. *-oyo or *-oyyo yielded *-oo in its first millenium successors. 2) Doria (p. 183) states as a specific concordance between Mycenaean and Aeolic the ending -oio < IE *-osyo, of Genitive singular of thematic stems, regarding *-oo as a development of IE *-oso. We think it more satisfactory to derive -oio and *-oo from one and the same IE ending *-osyo. 3) As to the place of Aeolic in the Mycenaean world, Cowgill (p. 182) suggests that Lesbian -σ1, can be a typical Aeolic feature and not (as Porzig does in *IF* 61 (1954) p. 154) a borrowing from Minorasiatic Ionic. He wonders why Lesbian has not borrowed other features as well, if we suppose that Lesbian -σ1 can be explained as an influence from its neighbouring Ionic. However, we believe that there are more points in which Lesbian differs from East Thessalian, and comes near to Ionic. 4) If we suppose that Mycenaean was a *koiné*, then we have not to search for its direct descendants in the first millenium. But, at any rate, we should not forget: a) that Mycenaean shares some dialectal peculiarities with Greek dialects spoken in the first millenium B.C.; b) that from the beginning of the first millenium B.C., there was a growing set of dialectal differences. These conclusions are emphasized by Risch (pp. 207-10), who maintains the views he had already defended in some of his earlier papers.

To sum up: there is still much that can be done in Greek Dialectology. But the present book is an important contribution as a basis for further work in this field.

It only remains for this reviewer to state our indebtedness to Prof. Bartoněk for the profitable task he undertook in organizing this Symposium and editing its proceedings.

ANTONIO LÓPEZ EIRE