

## RECENSIONES

CARLO GALLAVOTTI: *Documenti e struttura del greco nell'età micenea*. Edizioni dell'Ateneo, Roma, 1956; paper covers, unsewn; 2000 lire.

The study of the Mycenaean tablets has developed with alarming rapidity. We have all suffered from the reconsiderations necessitated by the publication of new evidence and new theories. Professor Gallavotti is no exception. He began his book without either the revised transcript of the Knossos tablets or Bennett's enlarged edition of the Pylos tablets. The effort to assimilate all this while the book was in progress has brought it out in a rash of second thoughts, corrections and additions; two chapters seem to have been added to the text. The resultant untidiness may excite our sympathy but not our respect.

It is evident that Gallavotti might have profited by comparing notes with others who have been working on these texts. That in many cases he has reached the same conclusions as contemporary studies by others must stand to his credit. Our attention however must be concentrated on points where he differs from published and generally accepted views.

The discussion of the unidentified signs is not enlightening. The value *nwi* for \*64 is based on a misreading in Bennett's first edition, now corrected; the value *wja* for \*82 has less in its favour than *ja*<sub>2</sub>. For \*43 (*ai*) the value *a*<sub>3</sub> (written *à*) is proposed; this resembles Lejeune's suggestion (*Études Mycéniennes* p. 39-50) but Gallavotti extends it to include all cases of *a* + sonant: viz. *aj, aw, am, an, al, ar*. We can hardly prove him wrong; the more doors you open, the more people will get in. What matters is that they should be the right people. For *ai-ki-no-o* we are now offered the choice of Ἀκίτινος and Ἀλκίτινος as well as Αίτιτινος; the identification of the word as a personal name is not even considered. There is no table of the signs of the script.

The treatment of the ideograms is cursory and inconsistent. WHEAT (no. 120) is regarded directly as a measure of area (AGER), but is occasionally transcribed HORDEUM. WOOL (no. 145) is decomposed into REMA on the theory that ligatures are always to be read downwards; the two forms of no. 133 (A+RE+PA, Pylos Un6.2, Un718.8) should be enough to dispose of this, apart from the probable derivation of the ideogram from the Linear A form. SA is identified as the acrophonic of *sa-pa* or *sa-pi-de* and is taken to mean 'goat' or 'goat-skin'; *ri-no* on Pylos Nn228 is explained as (*w*)*rinon*, though the omission of initial digamma now seems certainly disproved. The ideograms are conveniently transcribed in Latin, but it would be kinder not to mention the word employed to render no. 165 (p. 50).

Two important suggestions require comment. First the proposal that the prefix *o-u-* is a demonstrative pronoun or adverb and that *o-u-ge* is a conjunc-

tion 'and also'. It is superfluous to comment on the suggested etymologies; this is a secondary problem once the meaning is established. Such are the inherent ambiguities of the script and the system of records that a conclusive proof of the negative interpretation is probably impossible. But the following arguments may be used: (1) *o-u-* corresponds exactly to the pan-Hellenic negative οὐ, *o-u-ge* to οὐτε (in sense however nearer to οὐδέ); none of Gallavotti's assumed forms actually occur. (2) In the Knossos *Sd-* tablets *a-ra-ru-ja a-ni-ja-pi* alternates with *o-u-ge a-ni-ja po-si (e-e-si)*. It is hard to see the motive for the variation if both formulas mean virtually the same; a negative interpretation explains it: Greek would hardly say οὐκ ἀραρυῖαι ἀνίαφι. (3) The mathematics of the Pylos *Ma-* tablets suggest that the amount introduced by the formula *o-da-a<sub>2</sub> ka-ke-we* (etc.) *o-u-di-do-si* is a rebate, since it must be added to the amounts paid and owing to balance the assessment, wherever this can be verified; and in one case this entry is actually introduced by *o*. 'deficiency' (Ma225). The substitution of *o-u-* by *a<sub>2</sub>-te-ro we-to* (Ma365) suggests that deferred payment is substituted for a rebate. Gallavotti's explanation is that this is a subsidiary payment, made not to the authority receiving the *a-pu-do-si*, but to another tax-collector, called (curiously) the *khalkeus*; a suggestion also applied to the *Fn-* tablets. (4) The alternation of *o-u-di-do-si* and *e-re-u-te-ra* (etc.) on the Pylos *Na-* tablets appears to be synonymous; in the summations of *Ng-* only *o-u-* appears. (5) The alternation of *wo-ze-ge* with *o-u-ge wo-ze* in Pylos Ep617.3-4 suggests a contrast rather than a synonym; and the use of ὀφείλω in *o-pe-ro-sa... wo-ze-e o-u-wo-ze* Ep704.7 presupposes failure to perform.

The second interesting point concerns morphology. Gallavotti's method is to reconstruct the pre-Greek forms from comparative evidence, and then apply these to the Mycenaean forms. The result is that Gallavotti supposes a number of archaic survivals where we have been content to depart from the classical norm only when there is internal evidence in the tablets. This applies especially to the number of cases in use. A locative may be presumed for Mycenaean; but in no declension does the script show a form distinct from another case. The instrumental however is another matter, for whatever other forms the script may conceal — and the suggested *we-ke = wergē* from ἔργον is not very convincing — there is no doubt that this is the primary meaning of the suffix *-pi*, as of the Homeric *-φι*. Gallavotti believes not only in an instrumental, but also an ablative, and assigns this value to the suffix *-pi* when attached to place-names. This is a plausible explanation of *ku-te-re-u-pi* Pylos An607; in the other cases Lejeune (in an admirable study which is about to appear in the *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique*) prefers to recognise locatives. Certainly there are no clear examples; but if the frequent place-names in *-pi* in the Pylos *Cn-* tablets are ablatives, this agrees with the conclusion that they are lists of tribute sent from these places; by distinction *pa-ki-ja-si* Cn608 must be locative or dative. Jn829, contributions of bronze, has two forms in *-pi*. The *Ma-* and *Na-* tablets, which are again contributions, also show a few *-pi* forms, but the case here may not be entirely consistent, for *e-ri-no-wo* Na106 appears to be nominative in the face of *e-ri-no-wo-to*, *e-ri-no-wo-te*. Vn493 will be another list of ablatives by this test (*e-ra-te-re-wa-pi* line 4).

There is little enough proof; but perhaps enough to suggest that *pa-ki-ja-pi* is not merely an optional variant of *pa-ki-ja-si*. There is no means of testing Gallavotti's suggested ablatives in other forms, since they are all identical with the dative. It is surprising that the Mycenaeans did not resolve this ambiguity, if it existed, by wider use of the suffix *-θεν*, or by prepositional expressions; it should be noted that this method is regular with persons (*pa-ro* + dative).

For the rest a few samples of Gallavotti's interpretations must suffice. The phrase *o-pi Ta-ra-ma-ta-o ge-to-ro-po-pi o-ro-me-no* is translated: 'in the household of T., killed by an animal'; *ὀλόμενος* is preferred to *ὀρόμενος* because the latter should have initial F-. This faith in etymology is touching; elsewhere Gallavotti has fewer scruples over the omission of a digamma.

The tablets which list WHEELS (Knossos *So-*, Pylos *Sa-*) incur Gallavotti's displeasure. He will not have wheels stored separately (to fit the chariot bodies listed in *Sa-*, *Se-*, *Sf-*, *Sg-*), and the Homeric parallel is only mentioned as an afterthought. The fact that at Pylos chance has given us no tablets relating to chariot bodies is a much stronger argument than any Gallavotti uses. The pairs of wheels (*ZE*) are interpreted as two-horse chariots; the entry *MO 1* (never any higher figure) as a one-horse chariot. Archaeological evidence for this sort of chariot would be welcome. This leads to the interpretation of *we-je-ke-e* as a compound of *we-* 'two' (also in *we-pe-za* '[table] with two feet', cf. *ῥί-κατι*, Latin *ui-ginti*) and '*jekos*, that is to say *ζεῖθος* with dissimilation of the *vau* and *jod* preserved in the interior of the word.'

The heading which introduces the Pylos *o-ka* tablets (An657.1) is translated: 'l' equestre signore del mare (ci) protegga.'

The chapters on phonology and morphology contain in each section a summary of the well-known facts of comparative philology, even when not wholly relevant. This will be welcome to those unfamiliar with the subject; but even here an occasional blunder destroys confidence. E. g. Latin *coquos* is explained as due to *progressive* assimilation (p. 86); *πῆμα* is quoted as the Attic form of Doric *πᾶμα* 'property' (p. 111); and the analogical proportion *fēci: factus :: dēdi: datus :: stēti: status* (p. 116) will surprise all who have written Latin verse and some others.

In view of the need for keeping down the cost of technical books it would be harsh to criticise the standard of printing; misprints like *presidenziale* for *predesinenziale* (p. 127 and 128) are unfortunate but not misleading. This however is not true of the numerous cases of the omission or incorrect use of the accents employed to distinguish the 'homophones'; this is an important argument against this convention; subscript numerals are much less easily overlooked.

Cambridge  
39 Causewayside

JOHN CHADWICK