

Questions on the origin of Mycenaean

In: *Studia Mycenaea : proceedings of the Mycenaean symposium, Brno, april 1966*. Bartoněk, Antonín (editor). Vyd. 1. Brno: Universita J.E. Purkyně, 1968, pp. [175]-193

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/119956>

Access Date: 30. 11. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

Questions on the Origin of Mycenaean

1. *How would you characterize the dialectal area in which the Linear B language originated? Or what were the dialectal elements on which Mycenaean was based?*

There seems to me much force in the argument that Linear B was a composite language, elaborated perhaps as the court language, and perhaps based upon more than one local dialect. The details are too obscure, but I should hesitate to accept the suggestion that it was the speech of a single area. It is possible on archaeological grounds that the Argolid set the pattern; certainly the Greek of Crete must have been transplanted from the Mainland. (J. CHADWICK.)

In spite of the phonological opaqueness of the Linear B Script and the grammatical jejuneness of the corpus to date, a plausible list of characteristic features of Mycenaean has been compiled (see Vilborg's *Tentative Grammar*, pp. 19—23). If we exclude for the present the uniquely Mycenaean phenomena in the list, there still remains enough evidence to establish the predominantly Eastern character of the dialect: The conjunction *o-te*; the change of **/ti/* to */si/* in *e-ko-si*, *ra-wa-ke-si-jo*, and *do-so-si* with *-so-* not *-seo-*, all rule out any normal West Greek attribution.

On the other hand no Mycenaean feature links the dialect exclusively with any of the attested groups within East Greek. *qe-to-ro-po-pi* shows the same reflex of **/r/* as Arcadian *τετόριαν* and Thessalian *πετροετηρίδα* (from Pelasgiotis, where also *πέτταρα*). *e-u-ke-to*, if it is a present form, shows a feature which, though attested elsewhere only in Arcado-Cyprian, is generally presumed to be inherited and must therefore have been far more widespread in the prehistoric dialects. *a-pu* occurs in Lesbian and Thessalian, as well as in Arcado-Cyprian, where in any case it may be related to the general change of final **/o/* to */u/*: cf. *qi-ri-ja-to*, *de-ka-sa-to* and *ἐγάμανν*, *γένοιρν*. *po-si* may be connected with Arcadian *πός*, if this is apocopated and not an original *-s* form, but it is certainly connected morphologically with West Greek and Thessalian *ποτή*. *to-so-ne*, though partially similar to Arcadian *τωινν*, as against Ionic *τωιδε*, etc., has its nearest parallel again in Thessalian *τόνε*. Finally the case usages with prepositions have been claimed as unique parallels to Arcadian and Cyprian; but the latter are more complex phenomena than was once assumed, as A. Morpurgo-Davies has now shown, and in any event *Mycenaean* itself probably reflects a pattern of variation which was general among the prehistoric dialects.

Two pieces of evidence may be adduced against a specific identification with *Arcado-Cyprian*. The first is the replacement of *-ēus* by *-ēs*: e.g. *λερός* and *i-j e-re-se*

against Linear B *i-je-re-u*. The Arcadian and Cyprian developments are unlikely to belong to their independent history, since they do not conform to any discernible pattern of diachrony in the inherited long diphthongs of the two dialects. It is therefore probable that the change took place when Arcado-Cyprian was still a unified dialect. However we cannot be certain how soon after the period of our Mycenaean documents the disruption of this unity occurred. Moreover the great majority of nominative forms of *-ēu-* nouns comes from Pylos, which has been thought to show other traces of dialectal differentiation within Mycenaean; so we cannot rule out the possibility that the Arcado-Cyprian forms already occurred in Mycenaean. More conclusive evidence is provided by the thematic infinitives *e-ke-e*, etc. as in Lesbian, at Pharsalus, in Ionic-Attic and a number of West Greek dialects. The Arcado-Cyprian forms *ἐχεν* etc. can hardly have replaced earlier *ἐχεν* etc.

Nor do the peculiarly Mycenaean features help us to place the dialect. Many of these can be plausibly assumed for the early stages of other dialects also, e.g. the retention of a labio-velar reflex distinct from the other occlusives; *o-pi* against *ἐπι* (the *o*-form is implicit *δπιθεν* etc. and Thessalian *δπελ* beside *ἐπειδελ*); the survival and extension of the inherited consonant- and *ā*-stem instrumental **-phi* in instrumental and ablative functions (cf. Homeric *-φι*); the survival of the inherited consonant-stem dative **-ei* and locative **-i* as allomorphs of one case. Other features are attested spasmodically in later dialects, e.g. the allomorphic variation *-eio-* (or *-eo-*)/*-io-* in the adjectival suffixes *wi-ri-ne-o*, *po-ni-ki-ja*, for which we can compare, as a partial parallel at least, Thessalian *-eios* in *Ἀριστοῦνειος*, *Πιδῶνρειος* beside the patronymic in *-ios* which is regular in other dialects; the *ā*-stem dual in *-ō*: *to-pe-zo*, *ke-ke-me-no*, beside Attic-Ionic feminines *τώ*, *μεγάλω*; and the survival of reflexes of both instrumental and locative forms from the inherited *o*-stem case system: *te-o-i* and (if the Knossian form is instrumental) *de-so-mo*, for which we may compare, in Ionic, *λεγοῖσιν* at Miletus beside *ρόμοις* at Oropus.

The exclusively Mycenaean features are few in number. *su-za*, *ka-za*, *ai-za* and *ko-ri-si-jo*, *za-ku-si-jo* indicate a palatalization more extensive than is attested in any other dialect, even though isolated traces of the tendency can be found e.g. in Lesbian *ζα*, *Ζιορί(στος)* and the Cyprian gloss *κόρζα·καρδία*. The widespread use of the **-iā* and **-ēus* agent suffixes in Mycenaean, *to-ko-so-ta*, *ze-u-ke-u-si* etc. has often been noted, but the fact is that there is just not enough lexical material from most of the historically attested dialects to say with confidence how peculiar this feature was.

To sum up, we do not possess any evidence to identify *Mycenaean* with any other dialect area of *East Greek*. Each of the features which establish its East Greek character associate it with one or more Eastern dialects in turn. Although it shows, if anything, a slightly higher correlation with *Arcado-Cyprian* than with others, the data examined above show that it is best to regard *Mycenaean* as an Eastern dialect distinct from the others. This conclusion is perhaps supported by the fact that such correlations as can be established between *Mycenaean* and *West Greek* dialects, viz. with *Laconian*, *Rhodian*, *Argive* and *Corinthian*, differ appreciably from those obtained for other Eastern dialects, though, significantly, the closest pattern is that for *Arcadian*. This conclusion obviously entails a rejection of the theory that *Mycenaean* had any direct descendants among the historically attested dialects; which is at any rate consistent with the fact that few of the sites that have so far yielded evidence of Mycenaean dialect were settled in historical times by East-Greek speakers. (R. COLEMAN.)

I agree with those who hold that Mycenaean belonged to a dialect area which included the ancestors of later Attic-Ionic, Arcadian, and Cypriote, but that the language of the tablets is not directly ancestral to any of these. I do not think that the tablets so far uncovered show any significant features of agreement with the later Aeolic dialects. (W. COWGILL.)

Three hypotheses seem possible as the evidence stands at present:

(i) "Mycenaean" (the dialect of the LB tablets) was a dialect in use without considerable differentiation from Thessaly southward to the Peloponnese and Knossos; i.e., it was the "southern" dialect envisaged in A 4 above.

(ii) "Mycenaean" was similarly in use from Euboea and Attica southward to the Peloponnese and Knossos, proto-Aeolic as well as proto-N.W.-Doric Greek being distinct from it.

(iii) "Mycenaean" was one dialect of a south-eastern group, which included an already differentiated proto-Attic-Ionic, and it was in use over all or part of the Peloponnese, and had also been introduced at Knossos.

It is probable that the 2nd millennium precursor of Aeolic had the suffix *-ti* without assibilation. If this is believed, hypothesis (i) above is excluded. (R. A. CROSSLAND.)

Il miceneo, si è detto, è la continuazione di un dialetto [non di un gruppo dialettale, v. A 4] che si era già differenziato, in epoca precedente alle nostre attestazioni, dagli altri dialetti che noi, praticamente, non conosciamo, e di cui possiamo farci un'idea più o meno pallida nei modi elencati in A 4. La coesistenza del miceneo con i dialetti suddetti è un'esigenza insopprimibile, nata dalla semplice constatazione che esso non può essere il progenitore di alcuno dei dialetti o gruppi dialettali del I millennio. Caratteristiche che già da sole contribuiscono a definire il miceneo come un dialetto a se stante, in quanto esse non compaiono attestate altrove, sono: 1) L'assenza dell'aumento [per un'eccezione v. B 5]. 2) Il passaggio di *σ* o *σ* + vocale a *σ* + vocale (es. *a-sa-ti-ja*, *ku-ru-sa-pi*). 3) *p* — *q* tendente a *q* — *q* (es. *pe-re-go-ta/qe-re-go-ta*), 4) *θ* > *σ* (*o-pi-ko-ru-si-ja*). L'unicità, per ora assoluta, di queste peculiarità potrebbe un giorno essere infranta dal loro comparire in qualche altro dialetto coevo non classificabile come „miceneo“; ciò non toglie, però, il loro alto grado di indicatività. Altre isoglosse tengono unito il miceneo ora all'uno e ora all'altro dei proto-dialetti ricostruiti, ed è proprio la combinazione, del tutto particolare ed irripetibile, di queste isoglosse che concorre ad assegnargli una fisionomia sua propria. Il Coleman (p. 125), in base all'analisi delle linee di forza, ha, abbastanza convincentemente, collocato il miceneo in una posizione intermedia tra il gruppo arcado-cipriota, quello ionico-attico ed il „ponte“ costituito dei dialetti lesbico, tesalico, beotico e panfilio.

Quanto all'area in cui esso fu originato, noi non possiamo dir nulla a causa degli inevitabili spostamenti di popolazioni operatosi nel momento dell'immigrazione. Del resto le premesse di un suo primo sviluppo risalgono senz'altro ad epoca preimmigratoria. Solo la *koiné* amministrativa micenea [v. B 5] va considerata come formazione più o meno recente. (M. DORIA.)

Микенский не является самостоятельным диалектом. Его нельзя считать и предшественником какого-либо из греческих диалектов. Это южная разновидность микенской койнэ, возникшей первоначально в северной Греции и распространенной впоследствии на Пелопоннес. В её основе лежат ахейско-ионийские элементы. Первые относятся, главным образом,

к области фонетики и морфологии и часть из них удается обнаружить в надписях Фессалии, вторые — больше к лексике. В отличие от северной койнэ, испытавшей на себе влияние эолийского диалекта, микенский подвергся определенному влиянию аркадско-кипрского, равно как и местного субстрата Пелопоннеса и о. Крита. (Н. С. ГРИНБАУМ.)¹

Die Linear B-Texte vermitteln uns einen ungefähren Einblick in die Struktur eines der in mykenischer Zeit in Griechenland gesprochenen Dialekte. Diese Kenntnis vermag vielleicht bis zu einem bestimmten Grad die Rekonstruktion des Bildes zu ermöglichen, das die aus späterer Zeit bekannten Dialekte in der mykenischen Epoche Griechenlands gehabt haben mögen. (Wir bezeichnen hier diese erschlossenen Vorstufen der „klassischen“ Dialekte in mykenischer Zeit durch ein vorangesetztes M-) Nur diese erschlossenen M-Dialekte, also M-Ionisch (-Attisch), M-Arkado-Kyprisch, M-Aiolisch und M-Dorisch (-Nordwestgriechisch) können sinnvollerweise mit dem Mykenischen der Tafeln verglichen werden. (Da gewisse Verschiedenheiten zwischen dem in Mykene und dem in Pylos gesprochenen Dialekt, sowie die von E. Risch vollzogene Trennung zwischen „Mycénien normal“ und „mycénien spécial“ in Pylos die Annahme nahelegen, dass „Mykenisch“ vielleicht nur eine Art Sammelbegriff darstellt, ist der Terminus nur mit gewissen Vorbehalten anzuwenden; wo er im folgenden erscheint, ist in erster Linie das pylische „mycénien normal“ gemeint.) Der Unterzeichnete glaubt nun, dass ein solcher — zweifellos nur partiell und in Annäherungswerten zu ziehender — Vergleich etwa folgende Ergebnisse zeigen würde:

1. Es gibt Isoglossen, die das Mykenische mit dem M-Ionischen, andere, die es mit dem M-Arkado-Kyprischen, und wieder andere, die es mit dem M-Aiolischen verbinden.

2. Die Unterschiede zwischen Mykenisch, M-Ionisch, M-Arkado-Kyprisch, M-Aiolisch und M-Dorisch sind im Vergleich zu den in archaisch-klassischer Zeit bestehenden Unterschieden relativ gering. Dass eine einigermaßen deutliche Trennungslinie zwischen M-Dorisch und der Gesamtheit der übrigen Dialekte bestanden hat, ist wahrscheinlich.

3. Trotz der relativ engen Zusammengehörigkeit der nichtdorischen M-Dialekte ist die Identität von zwei oder gar drei dieser Dialekte unwahrscheinlich.

4. Wenn dementsprechend auch das Mykenische mit keinem der anderen M-Dialekte identisch ist, muss angenommen werden, dass es nach dem Ende der mykenischen Zeit verschwunden ist; keiner der späteren Dialekte setzt das Mykenische fort. (A. HEUBECK.)

Mycenaeen must have shared most of the innovations of the other dialects (slightly differentiated already) at the time of the Mycenaean III B period. (H. KODZU.)

¹ = Le „mycénien“ n'est pas un dialecte indépendant. Il ne peut, non plus, être considéré comme précurseur d'un dialecte grec quelconque. C'est la variété-sud de la koiné mycénienne, créée d'abord au nord de la Grèce et répandue ensuite sur de Peloponnèse. Elle est fondée sur les éléments achéens et ioniens. Les premiers se rapportent principalement à la phonétique et à la morphologie et une partie fut découverte dans les inscriptions thessaliennes, les seconds — plutôt au lexique. A l'encontre de la koiné du nord influencée par le dialecte éolien, le „mycénien“ a subi une certaine influence de l'arcado-cyprien et du substrat local du Peloponnèse et de la Crète. (N. S. GRINBAUM.)

Dass — um Bartonéks Worte (S. 42) zu gebrauchen — „Mycenaeen appears to be ... a Greek dialect with features that at one time give the impression of being Aeolic, at another of being Attic-Ionic, and nearly every time Arcado-Cypriot“, ist keineswegs ein sicheres Zeichen dafür, dass die Sprache von LB aus diesen Dialekten „gemischt“ gewesen sei (vgl. zu B 5), sondern ist m. E. am ehesten als Kriterium dafür zu werten, dass alle Einzelheiten, die Äolisch, Ionisch-Attisch und Arkadisch-Kyprisch mit LB gemeinsam haben, alt sind, d. h. in diesen Dialekten auch in der mykenischen Zeit schon vorhanden waren; während die Unterschiede, soweit sie zugleich Abweichungen von LB sind, auch erst später entstanden sein können. Jedenfalls dürften die Unterschiede nach der mykenischen Zeit größer geworden sein. — Die Sprache von LB war also ursprünglich ein Dialekt, der sich wenig von den übrigen Dialekten unterschied (über greifbare Unterschiede vgl. Merlingen a. a. O. 165, 168 f.). Allmählich hatte sich aber ein sozialer Unterschied entwickelt: die Sprache von LB war die „Schriftsprache“ in doppeltem Sinne, nämlich auch die Sprache der führenden oder wenigstens zum Teil maßgebenden Schichten geworden [s. u.]. (W. MERLINGEN.)

Die mykenischen Archive bezeugen weder einen einheitlichen Dialekt noch einen Mischdialekt, sondern ein Nebeneinander verschiedener Dialekte. Denn Schreiber aus verschiedenen Teilen der damaligen Gräzität standen manchmal im Dienst ein und desselben Herrn und schrieben am gleichen Hof ein jeder seinen eigenen Dialekt. Allerdings mögen die Schreiber, die doch gewiss als Spezialisten den Ort wechseln konnten (ob frei oder gezwungen), durch ihre Schulung, durch ihre Wanderungen und durch ihr Zusammenwirken mit Kollegen anderer Mundart beeinflusst worden sein (wie spricht ein Berner nach zehn Jahren Aufenthalt in Zürich!), sodass sie ihren Dialekt nicht mehr rein sprachen und schrieben, sondern wenigstens Ansätze zur Dialektmischung auftraten, oder doch Unsicherheit. Indessen sind für uns diese Verwischungen und Anfälligkeiten zur Dialektnivellierung gerade nicht das Interessante, sondern wir suchen die Mundart, die der Schreiber bei seiner Mutter, in seinem Tal noch gesprochen hat, und von der doch noch viel in seine Berufspraxis eingeflossen ist. Wir suchen also die Unterschiede. Dann aber ergibt sich für die Methode: Vorerst die einzelnen Schreiber durch nichtsprachliche Kriterien identifizieren, auf dem Weg weiterschreitend, den Bennett für Mykene und Pylos schon weit gegangen ist, und den, wenn ich es recht weiss, nun Olivier für Knossos geht: Also nach dem Duktus der Handschrift, subsidiär nach der orthographischen Praxis, allenfalls auch nach der Wahl der Formulare (bei gleichen buchhalterischen Gegenständen) die einzelnen auseinanderhalten. Erst *nachher* sind die Sprachvarianten auf die verschiedenen Schreiber zu verteilen und kann man (mit guten Gründen übrigens!) hoffen, mykenische Dialektgruppen auseinanderzuhalten. Und erst nochmals später (so etwa, wie Risch es kürzlich begonnen hat) wird man die intern-mykenische Dialektvielfalt mit der allgemein griechischen Dialektologie, Sprachgeschichte und Wanderungsgeschichte in Beziehung bringen. Für jetzt ist also der erste Punkt der dringlichste, und das ist Arbeit über den Tafelchen, mit Lupe, Bleistift, Photoapparat. Sogar die Fingerabdrücke der Schreiber sollten in einigen Fällen helfen können!

Dass die Archive Schreiber verschiedener Dialekte nachweisen, habe ich mehrmals geäußert: *Mus. Helv.* 12 [1955], 121 f., Anm. 19; *Mus. Helv.* 12 [1955], 125, Anm. 40; *Études Myc.* 1956, S. 95, Anm. 3; *Oka-Tafeln*, 1956, S. 11, Anm. 11; *Überprüfung einiger Lin.-B-Texte an den Originalen*, 15. 1. 1963, S. 2 (zu KN 973); *Gnomon*

35 [1963], 277; *Bibl. Orient.* 22 [1965], 196b; *Studi Mic. ed Egeo-Anat.* II [1967], 41 ff. (H. MÜHLESTEIN.)

Le dialecte grec mycénien, selon moi, comprend des parlers des anciens Achéens, dont nous avons des restes et des traces sûrs dans les inscriptions et les glosses de l'Arcadie, de Chypre et de Pamphylie. (M. D. PETRUŠEVSKI.)

Le mycénien appartient à l'achéen [voir A 2—3, 4]. Comme il n'est guère possible de déterminer de façon précise des différences dialectales à l'intérieur de l'achéen de l'époque mycénienne, on pourrait, d'un point de vue pratique, identifier le mycénien à cet achéen, qui est l'ancêtre de l'arcadien et du chypriote [voir cependant B 4—6]. (C. J. RUIJGH.)

Я склонен, вместе с Вами, поддерживать теорию, согласно которой язык микенских документов представляет собой некое койнэ, в котором, однако, центрально-греческие элементы (не тронутые еще лабиовелярные, родительный падеж на *-οιο* и т. д.) играют весьма значительную роль. Охотно принимаю Вашу поправку о том, что койнэ следует рассматривать, как наддиалектную норму. Наличие вариантов в пелопоннесском микенском я вполне допускаю. И главное: я считаю возможным постулировать наряду с документальным койнэ также и поэтическое койнэ микенской эпохи. (И.М. ТРОНСКИЙ.)¹

There is one problem which seems to me useful to bring up, that of the Homeric language. A thorough knowledge of it is necessary to the study of Mycenaean and even of the whole prehistory of the Greek tongue. This Homeric language is the result of the long evolution in the tradition of formulaic composition. It should therefore not be studied as the language of one single author (Plato for instance). No doubt the great majority of philologists and linguists accept the formulaic composition of the Greek epic, but having clearly stated their opinions, few have troubled to analyse fully the epic formulae and to use them in their research. Further the wrong use of the Homeric language can easily lead either to confusion or to delaying the possible solution of certain problems.

Some philologists in fact put forward differences between the Mycenaean language and Homer's (for instance the use of the word *βασίλευς*). Such differences undoubtedly exist between the language of the minstrel we call Homer, who probably lived about 800 B.C., and the language of the Linear B tablets. On the other hand, if we study keenly the most ancient epic formulae we must deduce that, taking into account our present knowledge, they are expressed in very much the same language as that of the tablets [cf. the genitive singular in *-οιο* (scanned *-ō-ō* or *-oiō*, but never contracted); the dative singular in *-ι* or *-ει*; the thematic dative plural in *-οις*; the thematic infinitive in *-ε-εν* uncontracted; the absence of *καί* meaning "and"; the use of *ιδέ, ἦδέ* etc.].

¹ = Ich bin geneigt, mich den Forschern anzuschließen, die die Sprache der mykenischen Dokumente als eine Koine auffassen, in welcher jedoch die zentralgriechischen Eigentümlichkeiten (intakte Labiovelare, Genitiv *-οιο* usw.) eine beträchtliche Rolle spielen. A. Bartonéks Berichtigung, daß diese Koine als supradialektale Norm anzusehen ist, pflichte ich gerne bei. Das Vorhandensein von Varianten im Peloponnesisch-Mykenischen halte ich für durchaus möglich und, was die Hauptsache ist, halte ich es für berechtigt, neben der Dokumentalkoine eine poetische Koine im mykenischen Zeitalter zu postulieren. (I. M. TRONSKIJ.)

Some grammatical features are more in evidence because they fitted into the dactylic hexameter. Others are less common because the post-Mycenaean minstrels found them metrically inconvenient and difficult to understand for their non-Mycenaean audience.

The similarity of the two languages — the Mycenaean of the Linear B tablets and that of the oldest formulae — tends to underline the importance of Mycenaean. The administrative language of the palaces of Pylos, Mycenae, Knossos, and others was also a literary language understood probably in all the Greek civilised world of that time. This language was so well rooted that the post-Mycenaean minstrels, in order to preserve the epic literature were in the main obliged to preserve its language.

Such ideas would tend to support the suggestion that A. Bartoněk so aptly stated, that the Mycenaean language was a *κοινή*, in other words an unified language common to many. <Ad B 5.>

It is still very difficult to place this *κοινή* exactly among the Greek dialects, particularly since many characteristics of the Greek dialects of the first millennium B.C. seem to be of a later period than the Mycenaean. Nevertheless Mycenaean seem to diverge from the Aeolic dialects on several points: dative plural in *-σι* (Aeolic probably *-εσσι*); ancient *-σσ-* kept in Aeolic, simplified in Mycenaean; probably absence of assibilation in Aeolic. (Dialectal data on assibilation might be explained in several ways, but the presence of *ποτί* in the epic text seems to indicate that some post-Mycenaean minstrels used a dialect without assibilation; they probably all replaced the Mycenaean *ποσι* by *ποτί* to make themselves more easily understood; their Ionian successors kept *ποτί* because their Ionian only used *πρός* which could not be substituted for *ποτί* on metrical grounds. Other analogous cases can only be explained by the intervention of Aeolic minstrels whose dialect did not yet contain assibilation.) <Ad B 2.>

The same conclusion might be reached about the relationship between Mycenaean and Attic-Ionic (perhaps **r* > *o* very often in Mycenaean, > *a* in Ionic; some differences in vocabulary might also be quoted here; etc). <Ad B 3.>

The language of the tablets and that of the most ancient epic formulae resemble most the dialects of Arcadia and Cyprus. The epic words which are also found in the Cypriot tongue appear, in the most ancient formulae, inextricably mingled with Mycenaean. It seems therefore reasonable to suppose that Mycenaean was a common language sprung essentially from the tongues of the Peloponnese. It follows, therefore, that between Arcadian and Mycenaean on the one hand and Cypriot and Mycenaean on the other there does not exist total identity. Arcadian nouns in *-ης* correspond to Mycenaean *-εύς*; the Cypriot genitive singular in *-ω* (*o* + *o*), corresponds to the Mycenaean *-o-jo* (which is probably *-owo*). <Ad B 4.> (P. WATHELET.)

The Linear B language presumably, in fact doubtlessly, originated where it has been found, in the Peloponnese. It is that variety of proto-Greek (or proto-South-Greek) which developed in the Peloponnese as a result of the imposition on a non-Indo-European population of the Indo-European proto-Greek (or proto-South-Greek). (W. F. WYATT.)

B

2. *What was the place of Aeolic in the Mycenaean world? What form of the original suffix -ti- can be assumed for the Mycenaean precursor of Aeolic?*

It is just possible that Aeolic as a whole is a post-Mycenaean development, due to hybridisation of Mycenaean and Doric. But this hypothesis encounters obvious difficulties, and I think it is more satisfactory to regard it as an independent group already differentiated, but not markedly, in Mycenaean times. If in some ways it agrees with West Greek (-*ti*) and in others with Mycenaean (*apu*, etc.), this may indicate an intermediate position, e.g. in Thessaly. (J. CHADWICK.)

See B 1 above; cf. also A 4, esp. on p. 172 (R. COLEMAN.)

I would guess that the inhabitants of Late Helladic sites in Thessaly used a dialect of Aeolic type, and that if Linear B tablets are ever found in that area they will turn out to exhibit this local dialect (perhaps overlaid by Southern features from an administrative koiné).

At least some subdialects of this Aeolic must have preserved *-ti* unchanged. But it is not easy to suppose that the *-si* of Lesbian was borrowed in Asia Minor from Ionic; if a feature as central as this had been borrowed, one would expect many others to have been borrowed as well. Perhaps rather Aeolic was already differentiated in this feature in the second millennium, and the speech of the Asiatic colonists reflects a variety of Aeolic into which the wave of assibilation from the South had penetrated, while in Thessaly and Boeotia varieties which had resisted this wave won out (perhaps with help from the neighbouring West Greek dialects).

(W. COWGILL.)

See B 1 above. (R. A. CROSSLAND.)

L'eolico svolgeva, in epoca micenea, una parte assai simile a quella degli altri dialetti del suo tempo, ed il discreto numero di isoglosse che esso condivide con il miceneo potrebbero essere la spia di una sua posizione non molto marginale rispetto al mondo miceneo. Comunque, esse possono sempre andar intese nel senso della risposta data in A 4, quindi essere molto antiche, e conservatesi anche dopo che tra eolico e miceneo si fossero incuneate genti parlanti altri tipi dialettali. Ma poiché l'eolico continua a premere sulle lingue del Peloponneso (particolarmente sull'arca-

dico, così affine al miceneo) anche in epoca postmicenea [v. risposta al punto C 3], è da presumere che questi contatti eolico-micenei non venissero a cessare completamente dall'epoca delle immigrazioni in giù.

Le concordanze specifiche miceneo-eoliche sono le seguenti: 1) Genit. in *-oio* < **-osyo* (cfr. tessal. *-oio*, *-oi* contro l'**-oo* < **-oso* di tutti gli altri dialetti). 2) Aggettivi di materia, ed assimilabili, in *-ioç* (cf. lesbico, tessalico, contro *-ε(j)oc* degli altri dialetti). 3) Aggettivi patronimici in *-ioç* [v. A 2]. 4) *o* tendente ad *v* in vicinanza di labiale (es. *u-pi-ja-ki-ri-jo*, *du-ma* ed eol. *ὄπισσα*, *ὅμοιος*¹. 5) *ἀγρέω* "prendere" (eolico, ed anche eleo). 6) *ᾠπλ* (cfr. tessal. *ὀπιδελ*) [v. A 2]. (M. DORIA.)

В микенскую эпоху прото-эолийский диалект был ограничен территориально северной Грецией. Первоначально — в той форме, в какой мы его застаем в Фессалии — он характеризовался суффиксом *-ti*. Затем под влиянием длительного воздействия прото-ионийского первоначальное *-ti* перешло в *-si* на о. Лесбосе и на побережье Малой Азии. Связи микенского с эолийским относятся к этой более поздней стадии его развития.

(H. C. ГРИНБАУМ.)²

Siehe B 1. (A. HEUBECK.)

Die Hauptunterschiede zwischen den griechischen Dialekten haben sich m. E. erst in nachmykenischer Zeit herausgebildet, und zwar durch Archaismen (Bewahrungen) ebenso wie durch Verluste und durch Neuerungen [s. o. zu A 4]. Erklärungsbedürftig sind m. E. die ionischen Abweichungen von den übrigen Dialekten mehr als umgekehrt. — Die Dialekte mit *-ti* statt *-si* bilden ein wirkliches Problem, da sie ja hier eine Altertümlichkeit bewahrt zu haben scheinen, die die Sprache von LB 1000 Jahre vorher (in den betreffenden Fällen) nicht mehr hatte. Aber vielleicht war diese Altertümlichkeit nur scheinbar: hinter der Schreibung *-ti* kann sich eine Aussprache *-çi* oder dgl. versteckt haben (vgl. etwa das *t* in franz., engl. oder deutsch *nation*). Hier sei daran erinnert, dass es wohl überhaupt nicht angeht, hinter den Buchstaben der griechischen Alphabete überall die gleichen Lautwerte zu erwarten (und darauf weitreichende Theorien aufzubauen). (W. MERLINGEN.)

Quant au terme „éolien“, je ne crois pas qu'il soit correct pour le grec de l'époque mycénienne et en ce qui concerne la forme „éolienne“ du suffixe *-ti* je ne saurais dire rien de certain et je voudrais éviter les hypothèses. (M. D. PETRUŠEVSKI.)

Le proto-éolien de l'époque mycénienne était intermédiaire entre l'achéen (= mycénien) et le grec occidental [voir A 2—3]. Il est difficile de décider si *-ti* y était

¹ L'isoglossa è attestata in verità anche per l'arcadico, ma solo per la varietà settentrionale di Orcomeno, quindi è imputabile alle pressioni eoliche esterne di epoca postmicenea [v. C 3]. Il passaggio comunque compare un paio di volte anche per l'argolico (*ἐπαγγελία*, *πανόδομοι* < *πα(ν)οδόμοι*): data la spontaneità, nelle condizioni suddette, di un oscuramento di questo genere, potrebbe darsi che abbiamo a che fare con una di quelle isoglosse innovatrici assai poco indicative ai fini della dimostrazione di una affinità genetica specifica.

² = A l'époque mycénienne le dialecte proto-éolien se limitait au territoire de la Grèce du Nord. D'abord, quand nous le trouvons en Thessalie, il est caractérisé par le suffixe *-ti*. Puis sous la durable influence du dialecte proto-ionien le *-ti* primordial est changé en *-si* sur l'île Lesbos et sur la côte de l'Asie Mineure. Les rapports du „mycénien“ avec l'éolien datent de cette phase plus avancée de son développement. (N. S. GRINBAUM.)

encore intact ou non, mais il nous paraît plus probable que *-ti* y avait déjà abouti à *-si*. (C. J. RUIJGH.)

См. В 1. (И. М. ТРОНСКИЙ.)

See B 1. (P. WATHELET.)

We will probably — barring great good fortune at Iolkos — never be able to fix the position of Aeolic in the Mycenaean world. It was certainly more like West Greek at that time (i.e., was more conservative), and indeed may have been a somewhat aberrant Doric dialect, resulting from the amalgamation of proto-Greek with the non-Greek inhabitants of Thessaly. *-/ti/* was almost certainly the form of the suffix at that time, since the merger of *-/ti/* = *-/si/* affected only the Peloponnese and Attica of mainland Greece. (W. F. WYATT.)

B

3. *What was the relation of Mycenaean to the precursor(s) of Classical Attic-Ionic?*

If Mycenaean was a *koiné*, then it need not have had any direct descendants; but the local dialects on which it was built are presumably the precursors of the Arcado-Cypriot group. I believe Proto-Ionic was another such Mycenaean-type local dialect, which underwent considerable modification as the result of West Greek incursions into West Attica c. 1125—1050 B. C. (J. CHADWICK.)

See B 1 above, esp. on p. 178. (R. COLEMAN.)

It seems clear that in Southern Greece P.I.E. *r and *l had already developed two different sets of reflexes, *or*, *ro*, *ol*, *lo* and *ar*, *ra*, *al*, *la*, by the time of the Linear B tablets. To the extent that it has both, Mycenaean must reflect some dialect mixture. But the preponderance is certainly for the *o*-forms, and in my opinion this represents a substantial difference between Mycenaean and the ancestor of Attic-Ionic. (W. COWGILL.)

"Mycenaean" may well have been the lineal precursor of Arcado-Cyprian. The precursor of Attic-Ionic was probably differentiated from it, at least slightly. (R. A. CROSSLAND.)

(i) Per le relazioni specifiche *miceneo-ioniche* valga in via di massima quanto detto per l'eolico. Esse non sono numerose e, per giunta, la maggior parte insicure: 1) Tematicità dei verbi in *-éjw* (*to-ro-qe-jo-me-no*), ammesso che tale atematicità non vada invece intesa come tratto conservativo (indoeuropeo). Si osservi inoltre, a questo proposito, che se lo *j* intervocalico era, in questo genere di forme, ancora conservato, un passaggio di questi verbi alla categoria di quelli atematici con tema uscente in vocale (tipo *τῶθῆ-μι*), diventa assai problematico. 2) Pronome dimostr. *to-to* = att. *τότο* (?), 4) *ku-su* = *ξύν*. <Ad B 3.>

(ii) Anche per le relazioni specifiche con l'*arcado-cipriota* vanno ripetute le considerazioni d'ordine generale già fatte a proposito delle altre concordanze. In ogni caso essi sono un po' più numerose e sicure di quelle stabilite per lo ionico-attico: 1) *ἀπύ* [v. A 2]; 2) desin. di III sg. (plur.) dei tempi principali in *-(ν)τοι* (nel caso che essa non sia da intendere un fenomeno di conservazione); 3) *pe-i* = *σφεῖς*; 4) *po-si*

(cfr. arcad. $\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ e v. A 2); 5) *di-pa δίπας* = cipr. *ti-pa-se*; 6) *e-we-pe-se-so-me-na* con $\epsilon\upsilon$ - = $\epsilon\pi\iota$ (ma $\epsilon\upsilon$, comparando isolato, e a Micene, potrebbe essere un elemento „anomalo“ del miceneo) [v. A 2]. <Ad B 4.>

(iii) Mi si permetterà di aggiungere ancora alcuni tipi di concordanze, non previste dal formulario, ma a cui vorrei dare il loro debito rilievo. Fra queste vanno considerate innanzitutto le concordanze che il miceneo mostra con un dialetto la cui classificazione in seno alla situazione dialettale del I millennio resta controversa, il *panfilio*. Esse sono: 1) ϵ tendente ad ι in vicinanza di labiale (es. *a-ti-mi-te*, panf. „*Ἀρτιμις*“); 2) **upr* (mic. *u-po-ra-ki-ri-ja*, *u-pa-ra-ki-ri-ja*, panf. *ὑπαρ*) al posto di *upér*. Come si è già accennato in A 2 esse sembrano risalire ambedue ad epoca preimmigratoria.

(iv) In secondo luogo non vanno neppur trascurate le concordanze che il miceneo intrattiene con *più gruppi dialettali* (comprese il dorico), il che sta a dimostrare la complessità della sua posizione dialettale, pur trovandosi esso al cospetto di „protodialetti“ ridotti all'osso quanto a numero di caratteristiche loro assegnate dalla ricostruzione. Di queste concordanze esistono diversi tipi:

a) Isoglosse che abbracciano il miceneo, l'arcado-cipr. e l'eolico: 1) $\pi\tau$ - in $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\varsigma$ e $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$ (per $\pi\tau$ - nell'arcadico si veda comunque C 3); 2) $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ al posto di $\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{o}$ ($\acute{\alpha}\nu$ comunque è da escludere dal beotico) [v. A 2]; 5) *pedá* (limitatamente all'arcadico, lesbico e beotico). Poiché il miceneo ha anche *metá* (cfr. got. *miþ*), per *pedá* si dovrà pensare senz'altro ad una innovazione, in tal caso altamente significativa.

b) Isoglosse in comune con arcado-cipr. e ionico-attico: 1) $\tau\iota$ > $\sigma\iota$ nel caso che il passaggio non appartenga anche al protoeolico; 2) *ieρός* [v. A 2].

c) Isoglosse in comune con arcado-cipr. e dorico: 1) dat. plur. *-οις*, *-αις* (così, e non altrimenti, vanno letti i grafemi micenei *-o-i* ed *-a-i*).

d) Isoglosse in comune con arcado-cipr. eolico e ionico-attico: 1) Avverbi in *-τε/-τα*; 2) „*Ἀρτεμις* (contro dor. „*Ἀρταμις*“); 3) Futuri in *-σω*. Per $\tau\iota$ > $\sigma\iota$ v. b 1.

e) Isoglosse in comune con ionico-attico, eolico e dorico: 1) Nom. sg. in *-εύς* (contro arcado-cipr. *-ής*). (M. DORIA.)

Микенский базировался на нескольких диалектах: северо-ахейском, следы которого сохранились в надписях Фессалии, и прото-ионийском. Кроме того, он, как южная разновидность микенской койнэ, впитал в себя ряд черт собственно аркадско-кипрского. (Н. С. ГРИНБАУМ.)¹

Siehe B 1. (A. HEUBECK.)

I believe that Ionic dialect was formed in Asia Minor, and that dialectal innovations came from Asia Minor through the islands to Attica, not vice versa. (H. KODZU.)

Die Sprache von LB mag — als die Schriftsprache — einige Spuren in jenen Dialekten hinterlassen haben, die dann die Vorfahren der späteren griechischen Dialekte geworden sind (Risch, Heubeck); aber die Sprache von LB gehört selbst nicht zu diesen Vorfahren, sondern ist nach ihrer Blüte ohne Fortsetzung ausgestorben (Risch, Heubeck usw.; Merlingen a. a. O. 168f.). (W. MERLINGEN.)

¹ = Le mycénien était basé sur quelques dialectes: sur l'achéen du nord, dont les traces se sont conservées dans les inscriptions de la Thessalie, et sur le proto-ionien. Outre cela, étant une variété de la koiné mycénienne du sud, il s'est pénétré de quelques traits particuliers de l'arcado-cyprien lui-même. (N. S. GRINBAUM.)

La réponse se trouve en partie dans A 1 et en ce qui concerne l'ionien-attique, je crois qu'il y a des traces et des restes indiquant des relations entre les parlers des anciens Achéens et ceux des anciens Ioniens. (M. D. PETRUŠEVSKI.)

Le mycénien était bien distinct du proto-ionien, précurseur de l'attique et de l'ionien (cf. myc. *ro*, ion.-att. *ra* < **r*), quoique les différences puissent avoir été moins nombreuses que celles qui existent plus tard par exemple entre l'attique et l'arcadien. (C. J. RUIJGH.)

См. В 1. (И. М. ТРОНСКИЙ.)

See B 1. (P. WATHELET.)

All these dialects are descendants of a uniform proto-dialect. Beyond this it seems impossible to go, save perhaps to say that Doric and Aeolic were not part of this form of Greek: i.e., that there was a bipartite division into innovating (Mycenaeen, Attic-Ionic, Arcado-Cypriote) and conservative (Doric, Aeolic) dialects, more or less localizable geographically as South and North Greek respectively. (W. F. WYATT.)

B

4. *What was the relation of Mycenaean to the precursor(s) of the Classical Arcado-Cypriot?*

See B 1 above. [R. COLEMAN (esp. on pp. 177-8), A. HEUBECK, И. М. ТРОНСКИЙ.]

See B 3 above. (J. CHADWICK, R. A. CROSSLAND, M. DORIA, H. C. ΓΡΗΓΟΡΑΚΗΣ, H. KODZU, W. MERLINGEN, M. D. PETRUŠEVSKI.)

As A. Bartoněk rightly points out, some Arcado-Cypriote innovations seem to reach back to the second millennium but apparently are lacking in Mycenaean, while a few apparent innovations of Mycenaean are lacking in later Arcadian and Cypriote. But I would not include Myc. *-nsijo-* from **-nthio-* among these; rather the Mycenaean form is probably that which was regular throughout the entire *si-* area, but in later dialects was almost entirely replaced by an analogically restored *-nthio-*. (W. COWGILL.)

Le mycénien peut pratiquement être identifié au précurseur de l'arcadien et du chypriote [voir B 1]. Ceci dit, il reste naturellement bien possible qu'il y ait eu, dès l'époque mycénienne, quelques différences plus ou moins subtiles entre le mycénien des tablettes, le parler des Arcadiens et celui des Achéens de Chypre. (C. J. RUIJGH.)

a) I have tried to show (MNHMH2 XAPIN II 172) that the Arcado-Cypriot type *ιερής* is a late innovation and does not speak against descent from Mycenaean.

b) The range of Myc. *-(n)sijo-* is shown by Attic *Προβαλλιος*; *-inthios* is a normal rejuvenation.

c) There is no Myc. material suffix *-jo-*: *kaza* is *khalkija* — only *-ejo-/ijo-* exist as in historical times. (O. SZEMERÉNYI.)

B

5. What do you think of the idea of the LB language being a kind of Mycenaean Koine?

See B 1 above. (J. CHADWICK.)

The disappearance of *Mycenaean* — alluded to on pp. 177-8 — is less surprising, if in fact it was originally just one dialect of East Greek, the dialect of the rulers of Mycenae, which owes its diffusion entirely to the usage of the administrators sent out to the various cities of the Mycenaean allegiance. For once the period of the ascendancy was past, what remained of the Mycenaean dialect would quickly be submerged in the local East or even West Greek dialects that had continued as the majority speech of the areas right through or, where the local speech was not Greek at all, would be lost altogether. The bureaucratic and perhaps cultural *Koine* which *Mycenaean* must have been throughout the period of the ascendancy may well have had some influence on the local Greek dialects; though this would depend on how widespread bidialectalism was in these areas. (R. COLEMAN.)

The language of the tablets may well reflect some mutual approximation of different varieties of Southern Greek, but there is no need to go farther afield and find distinct Aeolic components. (W. COWGILL.)

This seems possible. But the vernacular Greek dialects of the Peloponnese and of the places which were colonized from it in Mycenaean times (e.g. in different ways Knossos, Rhodes and perhaps part of Cyprus) were probably not much differentiated. (R. A. CROSSLAND.)

Sono intimamente persuaso che la lingua degli archivi di Cnosso, Pilo e Micene sia una specie di *koiné*, o meglio di interdialetto, dovuto all'innesto di alcuni elementi dialettali abnormi (ossia esterni) su di un ceppo dialettale specifico, il cosiddetto „miceneo“. E' probabile che proprio in base al diverso grado di integrazione si debbalno anche le lievi diversità dialettali tra Cnosso, Pilo a Micene e tra i vari scribe all'interno di uno stesso Palazzo.

Le caratteristiche comprovanti tale carattere di *koiné* sono le seguenti: 1) impiego simultaneo di *ἐπί* od *ὀπί* (ed *εὐ*(?) a Micene), 2) Intrusione di forme con aumento (es. *a-pe-do-ke*), 3) **y* ora conservato ora eliminato sia all'inizio che all'interno di

parola (es. pron. rel. *jo-* alternante con *o-*, *to-ro-qe-jo-me-no* contro *a-e-ri-go-ta*, ecc.). 4) Aggettivi di materia (e assimilabili) uscenti ora in *-ios* ed ora in *-ε(j)ος*, 5) Desin. di dat. sg. dei sostantivi atematici uscente ora in *-ει*, ora in *-ι* (la frequenza di *ι*, generalmente più raro, è diversa nei tre Palazzi). 6) Patronimici in *-lδās* (presenti solo come relitti, v. *Anviamiento* p. 75, n. 20) ed in *-ios*. 7) Doppione *φιέλα/φιάλα*, 8) Doppione *ἀμφορεός/ἀμφιφορεός*.

Quanto alle alternanze di timbro vocalico nella resa di *r*, *l*, *m*, *n* sillabici, nulla di sicuro si può ancora sostenere. L'ipotesi più cauta parrebbe consistere nell'ammettere che detti suoni non erano ancora evoluti negli esiti storicamente documentati, che le sonanti, insomma, persistevano ancora come tali. Ma con ciò si va incontro a varie difficoltà, soprattutto di ordine cronologico. Si noti comunque che per *η* ed *η* l'esito *o* è insolitamente frequente e che negli esiti di *γ* ed *λ* c'è, a pare mio, una certa disparità di trattamento tra appellativi e forme verbali da una parte e nomi propri (personali e toponimi) dall'altra: la risonanza *o* sembrerebbe essere più comune tra gli appellativi (es. *to-pe-za*), quella *a* nei nomi propri (es. *ta-ta-ke-u* *Σταργαγός*, *ka-ra-su-no* *Κράσσνος*, topon. *a-pa-ta* *Ἀσπαρτα*, ecc.). Unitario sotto qualsiasi aspetto è invece l'esito delle cosiddette sonanti lunghe e delle medesime al grado semiridotto (sempre timbro *a*). (M. DORIA.)

CM. B 4. (H. C. ΓΡΗΘΑΥΜ.)

Siehe B 1. (A. HEUBECK.)

Die Sprache von Linear B muss wohl die Koine ihrer Zeit gewesen sein, allein bedingt durch Schriftgebrauch und Schriftunterricht, der einer Sprache eine sehr grosse Lebenskraft verleiht (auch über ihren eigentlichen Tod hinaus.) Jedoch eine Koine im Sinne Bartoněks (S. 18. f.), wobei also das Charakteristikum einer Koine nicht die Gemischtheit, sondern die überdialektische Funktion ist. [Eine Koine kann natürlich gemischt sein, aber in keinem anderen Sinne, als dass ja jede Sprache mehr oder minder gemischt ist; vgl. etwa die jetzige deutsche Schriftsprache, ein westliches Oberdeutsch mit mittel- und norddeutschen Ingredienzien; vgl. aber auch das Mittelhochdeutsche, eine verhältnismässig einheitliche Koine, von der man keineswegs sagen kann, dass sie ein Mischprodukt aus den — stark zerklüfteten — althochdeutschen Dialekten sei.] (W. MERLINGEN.)

Siehe B 1. (H. MÜHLESTEIN.)

Je ne crois pas à l'existence ni au besoin d'une koine à l'époque mycénienne, vu que les différences dialectales des Achéens n'étaient pas considérables; c'étaient de petites différences des parlers locaux au sein d'un seul dialecte des anciens Achéens. (M. D. PETRUŠEVSKI.)

Si on admet une différenciation légère de l'achéen [voir B 4], il se peut bien que le mycénien des tablettes ait été une espèce de *κοινή*, fondée par exemple sur le dialecte de Mycènes de la même façon que la *κοινή* hellénistique repose sur celui d'Athènes. Dans ce cas, cette *κοινή* mycénienne pourrait être considérée comme la langue des cours royales et des administrations palatiales de l'époque mycénienne. (C. J. RUIJGH.)

There is no demonstrable mixture of Aeolic and Ionic elements in Mycenaean.
(O. SZEMERÉNYI.)

См. В 1. (И. М. ТРОНСКИЙ.)

See B 1. (P. WATHELET.)

Impossible, if by Koine one intends something like Hellenistic Greek. (W. F. WYATT.)

B

6. *To what extent are you willing to admit the existence of differences within Peloponnesian Mycenaean and what do you think of their character?*

Some differences are visible between different scribes at one site; this suggests that Risch may well be right in his view of special and normal dialects. The special dialect might perhaps be the local variant, the normal the koiné. (J. CHADWICK.)

The reverse influence to the one mentioned in B 5, i.e. that of local dialects on Mycenaean itself, could be one factor in the diversification of the dialect. Although such sub-dialectal variation is *a priori* not implausible, the evidence so far available seems very inconclusive, e.g. the extension of instrumental *-pi* to *o*-stem plurals at Knossos and Pylos. For the examples are so rare (and at Pylos debatable anyway) that the non-occurrence at Mycenae could be accidental. Similar reservations may be made about the change of */e/* to */i/* before labials, which is frequent, though not universal, at Pylos. For the phenomenon appears also at Knossos (*di-pa, ti-mi-to*) and is furthermore confined to nouns and proper names of non-Greek origin or disputed I.E. etymology. The reflexes of **/ŋ/* and **/r/* are also difficult to base a convincing argument upon, since the variations occur not only diatopically but, apparently, according to phonological context, within the same locality. In the present state of our knowledge it seems best to suspend judgement, while admitting the *possibility* of differentiation between Pylos (and Knossos) and Mycenae. (R. COLEMAN.)

See B 5. (W. COWGILL.)

I see no evidence for any considerable differences [even if "Peloponnesian" here is taken to include "Knossian"]. (R. A. CROSSLAND.)

V. A 4. (M. DORIA.)

См. B 3. (H. C. ГРИНБАУМ.)

Siehe B 1. (A. HEUBECK.)

Die peloponnesischen Dialektunterschiede der mykenischen Zeit dürften nicht mehr feststellbar sein. (W. MERLINGEN.)

Une différenciation légère de l'achéen du Péloponnèse nous paraît bien possible [voir B 4]. D'autre part, il n'a guère été possible jusqu'ici d'établir des différences dialectales entre les tablettes de Mycènes et celles de Pylos, mais cela pourrait précisément tenir à l'usage d'une *κοινή* dans l'administration palatiale [voir B 5]. (C. J. RUIJGH.)

См. В 1. (И. М. ТРОНСКИЙ.)

See B 1. (P. WATHELET.)

There must have been at least minor local dialect differences, but the standard dialect of the scribes effectively obscures most of them. (W. F. WYATT.)

