

This pdf of your paper in *The Legacy of Michael Ventris. Progress and Perspectives in the Field of Aegean Scripts and Mycenaean Studies* belongs to the publisher Istituto di Scienze del Patrimonio Culturale (Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche) and it is its copyright.

As author you are licensed to make up to 50 offprints from it, but beyond that you may not make it available on the Internet until 12 months from publication (March 2025).

CNR

ISTITUTO DI SCIENZE DEL PATRIMONIO CULTURALE

INCUNABULA GRAECA

VOL. CVIII

DIRETTORI

MARCO BETTELLI · MAURIZIO DEL FREO

COMITATO SCIENTIFICO

JOHN BENNET (Sheffield) · ELISABETTA BORGNA (Udine)
ANDREA CARDARELLI (Roma) · ANNA LUCIA D'AGATA (Roma)
PIA DE FIDIO (Napoli) · JAN DRIESSEN (Louvain-la-Neuve)
BIRGITTA EDER (Wien) · ARTEMIS KARNAVA (Berlin)
JOHN T. KILLEN (Cambridge) · JOSEPH MARAN (Heidelberg)
PIETRO MILITELLO (Catania) · MASSIMO PERNA (Napoli)
FRANÇOISE ROUGEMONT (Paris) · JEREMY B. RUTTER (Dartmouth)
GERT JAN VAN WIJNGAARDEN (Amsterdam) · CARLOS VARIAS GARCÍA (Barcelona)
JÖRG WEILHARTNER (Salzburg) · JULIEN ZURBACH (Paris)

PUBBLICAZIONI DELL'ISTITUTO DI SCIENZE DEL PATRIMONIO CULTURALE
DEL CONSIGLIO NAZIONALE DELLE RICERCHE

DIRETTRICE DELL'ISTITUTO: COSTANZA MILIANI

THE LEGACY OF MICHAEL VENTRIS

PROGRESS AND PERSPECTIVES
IN THE FIELD OF AEGEAN SCRIPTS
AND MYCENAEAN STUDIES

THE LEGACY OF MICHAEL VENTRIS

PROGRESS AND PERSPECTIVES
IN THE FIELD OF AEGEAN SCRIPTS
AND MYCENAEAN STUDIES

edited by

Francisco Aura Jorro
Maurizio Del Freo
Juan Piquero



CNR – ISTITUTO DI SCIENZE DEL PATRIMONIO CULTURALE
ROMA 2023

Published with the contribution of the
Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovacion y Universidades, Spain
(research project PID2020-118204GA-I00)

The rights of translation, electronic storage, reproduction and total or partial adaptation by any means (including microfilm and photostatic copies) are reserved for all countries. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed or transmitted in any form without the written permission of the Publisher, with the exception of short citations incorporated into reviews or other non-commercial uses permitted by copyright law

Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche
Istituto di Scienze del Patrimonio Culturale
© Cnr Edizioni, 2023
Piazzale Aldo Moro, 7 - 00185 Roma

ISSN 1126 7348
ISBN 978 88 8080 612 7 (print edition)
ISBN 978 88 8080 613 4 (electronic edition)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword.....	IX
Bibliographical abbreviations	XI

Linear B and Aegean Scripts

A. P. JUDSON, <i>The undeciphered syllabograms of Linear B</i>	3
Y. DUHOUX, <i>The undeciphered logograms of Linear B</i>	25
F. DÍEZ PLATAS, <i>Words, images, and logograms: Linear B texts and iconography</i>	45
M. DEL FREO, <i>Linear A and Linear B syllabograms: formal similarities and possible homophonies</i>	65
M. PERNA, <i>Counting and measuring in Cretan linear scripts</i>	89

The Mycenaean dialect

E. R. LUJÁN, <i>Mycenaean between Indo-European and 1st millennium Greek</i>	103
P. GUIJARRO RUANO, <i>Mycenaean and Greek dialects</i>	123
J. M. JIMÉNEZ DELGADO, <i>Mycenaean Greek syntax: a diachronic perspective</i>	161
F. AURA JORRO and A. BERNABÉ, <i>Mycenaean texts and Greek lexicon</i> ..	189

The Mycenaean documents

C. VARIAS GARCÍA, <i>Understanding Linear B inscriptions: the need for a multidisciplinary approach</i>	215
A. J. DOMÍNGUEZ, <i>Mycenaean institutions and society</i>	235
J. PIQUERO, <i>Mycenaean texts and Greek religion</i>	261
V. PETRAKIS, <i>Linear B texts and archaeology</i>	297
F. ROUGEMONT and J.-P. VITA, <i>The Mycenaean world and the Near East</i>	321

FOREWORD

The year 2022 saw the coincidence of two important anniversaries for Mycenaecology: one hundred years since the birth of Michael Ventris and seventy years since the decipherment of Linear B. This double anniversary inspired various initiatives and gave rise to several commemorative events. This volume, in the wake of these celebrations, wishes to add a further tribute to the brilliant figure of Ventris, offering readers some considerations on the impact that the decipherment of the Linear B script had on the study of the origins of Greek civilisation.

The implications and consequences of Ventris's decipherment have been many and varied, and have directly or indirectly affected various disciplines. Needless to say, the contributions in this volume do not claim to address this issue exhaustively. They simply wish to summarise the main advances made as a result of the decipherment and indicate some possible research perspectives.

The book is divided into three sections: one on Linear B and more generally on the Aegean scripts, one on the linguistic characteristics of the Mycenaean dialect, and one on Mycenaean documents as historical sources.

In the first section, more weight is given to certain questions which were raised by the decipherment and are only partially resolved, such as those concerning the phonetic values of the non-transliterated syllabograms and the meaning of the uninterpreted logograms of Linear B, or that of the possible phonetic values of the homomorphic syllabograms of Linear A and Linear B, or that of the values of the metric signs commonly used in the two scripts.

In the second section, the Mycenaean dialect is analysed in the light of its phonetic, morphological, syntactic and lexical characteristics. Throughout the contributions in this section, great importance is given to the diachronic perspective and the historical relations of the Mycenaean dialect with those of the 1st millennium BC.

Finally, the contributions in the third section attempt, with concrete examples and methodological considerations, to show the weight that Linear B documents have, also in conjunction with the coeval Near Eastern texts, for

the reconstruction of the social, religious and material history of the Greek world of the Late Bronze Age.

We are very grateful to all the authors who took part in this project for their efforts to illustrate in their contributions the extraordinary value of Ventris's decipherment for the progress made over the past decades in their respective fields of investigation as well as for the unsolved challenges still looming at the horizon. For this, we would like to express our gratitude and appreciation to all of them.

We would also like to thank here all the colleagues and institutions that generously granted us their permission to reproduce the images in this volume, and in particular the *Department of Classics of the University of Cincinnati*, the *Institute of Classical Studies of London*, the *École Française d'Athènes*, and the *Corpus der minoischen und mykenischen Siegel* in Heidelberg.

Finally, special thanks are due to the reviewers of the manuscript for their suggestions, critical remarks and material corrections that helped to considerably improve the form and content of this volume.

For Linear A and Linear B, the fonts *Noto Sans Linear A* and *Noto Sans Linear B* have been used, which are freely available on the web under an OFL licence.

Alicante – Roma – Madrid, December 2023

F.A.J – M.D.F. – J.P.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS

I. EDITIONS

- ARN* = L. Godart – A. Sacconi, *Les archives du roi Nestor. Corpus des inscriptions en linéaire B de Pylos. Vol. I: Séries Aa-Fr; Vol. II, Séries Gn-Xn (Pasiphae XIII-XIV)*, Pisa-Roma 2019-2020.
- CIV* = A. Sacconi, *Corpus delle iscrizioni vascolari in lineare B (Incunabula Graeca LVII)*, Roma 1974.
- CMS* = I. Pini *et al.*, *Corpus der minoischen und mykenischen Siegel*, Berlin 1964-.
- CoMIK* = J. Chadwick – L. Godart – J. T. Killen – J.-P. Olivier – A. Sacconi – I. A. Sakellarakis, *Corpus of Mycenaean Inscriptions from Knossos (Incunabula Graeca LXXXVIII)*, 4 vols., Cambridge-Roma 1986-1998.
- FDC I* = V. L. Aravantinos – L. Godart – A. Sacconi, *Thèbes. Fouilles de la Cadmée. I. Les tablettes en linéaire B de la Odos Pelopidou. Édition et commentaire (Biblioteca di Pasiphae 1)*, Pisa-Roma 2001.
- FDC IV* = V. L. Aravantinos – M. Del Freo – L. Godart – A. Sacconi, *Thèbes. Fouilles de la Cadmée. IV. Les textes de Thèbes (1-433). Translitération et tableaux des scribes (Biblioteca di Pasiphae 4)*, Pisa-Roma 2005.
- GORILA* = L. Godart – J.-P. Olivier, *Recueil des inscriptions en linéaire A (Études Crétoises XXI)*, 5 vols., Paris 1976-1985.
- KT⁶* = *The Knossos Tablets. Sixth Edition*. A Transliteration by José L. Melena, with the collaboration of Richard J. Firth, Philadelphia 2019.
- MT II* = E. L. Bennett, Jr., *The Mycenae Tablets II (with an introduction by A. J. B. Wace & E. B. Wace; translation and commentary by J. Chadwick) (TAPhS 48:1)*, Philadelphia 1958.
- MTT* = J. L. Melena, *The Mainland Tablets Transcribed. The Tablets and Nodules in Linear B from Iklaina, Iolkos, Midea, Mycenae, Thebes and Tiryns*, with the collaboration of Richard J. Firth, (Veleia. Anejos. Series Maior 15), Vitoria-Gasteiz (forthcoming).
- PT³* = J.L. Melena, *The Pylos Tablets. Third edition*, with the collaboration of Richard J. Firth (Veleia. Anejos. Series Maior 14), Vitoria-Gasteiz 2021.
- PTT* = E. L. Bennett – J.-P. Olivier, *The Pylos Tablets Transcribed. Part I: Texts and Notes (Incunabula Graeca LI); Part II: Hands, Concordances, Indices (Incunabula Graeca LIX)*, Roma 1973-1976.

*PTT*² = J.-P. Olivier – M. Del Freo, *The Pylos Tablets Transcribed. Deuxième édition*, Padova 2020.

SM I = A. J. Evans, *Scripta Minoa I. The Hieroglyphic and Primitive Linear Classes*, Oxford 1909.

SM II = A. J. Evans, *Scripta Minoa II. The Archives of Knossos. Clay Tablets in Linear Script B, edited from notes and supplemented by J.L. Myres*, Oxford 1952.

TITHEMY = J. L. Melena – J.-P. Olivier, *TITHEMY. The Tablets and Nodules in Linear B from Tiryns, Thebes and Mycenae. A Revised Transliteration* (Minos Supl. 12), Salamanca 1991.

TT II = Th. G. Spyropoulos – J. Chadwick, *The Thebes Tablets II* (Minos Supl. 4), Salamanca 1975.

II. FURTHER ABBREVIATIONS

Acta Mycenaea = *Acta Mycenaea. Actes du cinquième Colloque international des études mycéniennes, tenu à Salamanque, 30 mars - 3 avril 1970* (Minos 11-12), 2 vols., M. S. Ruipérez (ed.), Salamanca 1972.

Aegean Scripts = *Aegean Scripts. Proceedings of the 14th International Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies, Copenhagen, 2-5 September 2015* (Incunabula Graeca CV), M.-L. Nosch, H. Landenius Enegren (eds.), Roma 2017.

Atti Pavia = *Atti del 2° Colloquio Internazionale di studi Minoico-Micenei, Pavia 1-5 IX 1958* (Athenaeum n.s. 36, pp. 295-436), P. Meriggi (ed.), Pavia 1958.

Austin Colloquium = *Proceedings of the 11th Mycenological Colloquium, Austin, 7-13 May 2000*, T. G. Palaima, C. W. Shelmerdine (eds.) (unpublished).

Cambridge Colloquium = *Cambridge Colloquium. Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies*, L. R. Palmer, J. Chadwick (eds.), Cambridge 1966.

Colloquium Mycenaicum = *Colloquium Mycenaicum. Actes du sixième Colloque international sur les textes mycéniens et égéens tenu à Chaumont sur Neuchâtel du 7 au 13 septembre 1975*, E. Risch, H. Mühlestein (eds.), Neuchâtel-Genève 1979.

Colloquium Romanum = *Colloquium Romanum. Atti del XII Colloquio internazionale di micenologia, Roma, 20-25 febbraio 2006 (Pasiphae I-II)*, A. Sacconi, M. Del Freo, L. Godart, M. Negri (eds.), Pisa-Roma 2008.

- Companion 1* = *A Companion to Linear B. Mycenaean Greek Texts and their World I* (BCILL 120), Y. Duhoux, A. Morpurgo Davies (eds.), Louvain-la-Neuve-Dudley, MA 2008.
- Companion 2* = *A Companion to Linear B. Mycenaean Greek Texts and their World II* (BCILL 127), Y. Duhoux, A. Morpurgo Davies (eds.), Louvain-la-Neuve-Dudley, MA 2011.
- Companion 3* = *A Companion to Linear B. Mycenaean Greek Texts and their World III* (BCILL 133), Y. Duhoux, A. Morpurgo Davies (eds.), Louvain-la-Neuve-Walpole, MA 2014.
- DMic.* = F. Aura Jorro, *Diccionario Micénico*, 2 vols. (DGE Anejos I-II), Madrid 1985-1993.
- DMic.Supl.* = F. Aura Jorro – A. Bernabé – E. R. Luján – J. Piquero – C. Varias García, *Suplemento al Diccionario Micénico* (DGE Anejo VII), Madrid 2020.
- Docs* = M. Ventris – J. Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, Cambridge 1956.
- Docs*² = M. Ventris – J. Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, 2nd ed., Cambridge 1973.
- EAGLL* = *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, 3 vols., G. K. Giannakis (ed.), Leiden-Boston 2014.
- Economy and Administration* = J. T. Killen, *Economy and Administration, Collected Papers on Linear B* (Incunabula Graeca CIV), 3 vols., M. Del Freo (ed.), Roma 2015.
- Economy and Politics* = *Economy and Politics in the Mycenaean Palace States, Proceedings of a Conference held on 1-3 July 1999 in the Faculty of Classics, Cambridge (TPhS Suppl. 27)*, S. Voutsaki, J. T. Killen (eds.), Cambridge 2001.
- EDG* = R. Beekes, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, Leiden – Boston 2010.
- Espace civil, espace religieux* = *Espace civil, espace religieux en Égée durant la période mycénienne* (TMO 54), I. Boehm, S. Müller Celka (eds.), Lyon 2010.
- Études* = C. J. Ruijgh, *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*, Amsterdam 1967.
- Études mycéniennes* = *Études Mycéniennes. Actes du Colloque international sur les textes mycéniens, Gif-sur-Yvette, 3-7 avril 1956*, M. Lejeune (ed.), Paris 1956.
- Études mycéniennes 2010* = *Études mycéniennes 2010. Actes du XIIIe colloque international sur les textes égéens, Sèvres, Paris, Nanterre,*

- 20-23 septembre 2010* (Biblioteca di Pasiphae 10), P. Carlier, C. de Lamberterie, M. Egetmeyer, N. Guilleux, F. Rougemont, J. Zurbach (eds.), Pisa-Roma 2012.
- Evidence* = M. Ventris – J. Chadwick, “Evidence for Greek Dialect in the Mycenaean Archives”, *JHS* 73, 1953, pp. 84-103.
- Floreat* = *Floreat Studia Mycenaea. Akten des X. Internationalen Mykenologischen Colloquiums in Salzburg vom 1.-5. Mai 1995* (ÖAW, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Denkschriften 274), S. Deger-Jalkotzy, S. Hiller, O. Panagl (eds.), Wien 1999.
- Greek Dialects* = *Studies in Ancient Greek Dialects: from Central Greece to the Black Sea*, G. Giannakis, E. Crespo, P. Filos (eds.), Berlin – New York 2017.
- IDA* = F. Vandenabeele – J.-P. Olivier, *Les idéogrammes archéologiques du linéaire B* (Études Crétoises XXIV), Paris 1979.
- Interpretation* = L. R. Palmer, *The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts*, Oxford 1963.
- Introducción* = A. Bernabé – E. R. Luján, *Introducción al griego micénico: gramática, selección de textos y glosario*, 2nd ed., Zaragoza 2020.
- Ko-ro-no-we-sa* = *KO-RO-NO-WE-SA: Proceedings of the 15th Mycenological Colloquium 21-24 September 2021, Athens*, J. Bennet, A. Karnava, T. Meißner (eds.), Crete (forthcoming).
- Kosmos* = *KOSMOS: Jewellery, Adornment and Textiles in the Aegean Bronze Age, Proceedings of the 13th International Aegean Conference, University of Copenhagen, Danish National Research Foundation's Centre for Textile Research, 21-26 April 2010* (Aegaeum 33), M.-L. Nosch, R. Laffineur (eds.), Leuven-Liège 2012.
- LfrgE* = B. Snell et al., *Lexicon des Frühgriechischen Epos*, Göttingen 1979-2010.
- LGM* = J. Piquero, *El léxico del griego micénico. Index Graecitatis, étude et mise à jour de la bibliographie* (Études anciennes 73), Nancy 2017.
- Linear B: A 1984 Survey* = *Linear B: A 1984 Survey. Proceedings of the Mycenaean Colloquium of the VIIIth Congress of the International Federation of the Societies of Classical Studies, Dublin, 27 August-1st September 1984* (BCILL 26), A. Morpurgo Davies, Y. Duhoux (eds.), Louvain-La-Neuve 1985.
- LSJ* = H. G. Liddell – R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon. With a Revised Supplement*, Oxford 1996.
- Manuale* = *Manuale di epigrafia micenea. Introduzione allo studio dei testi in lineare B*, M. Del Frego, M. Perna (eds.), Padova 2016 (2nd ed. 2019).

- Mémoires I* = M. Lejeune, *Mémoires de philologie mycénienne. Première série (1955-1957)*, Paris 1958.
- Mémoires II* = M. Lejeune, *Mémoires de philologie mycénienne. Deuxième série (1958-1963)* (Incunabula Graeca XLII), Roma 1971.
- Mémoires III* = M. Lejeune, *Mémoires de philologie mycénienne. Troisième série (1964-1968)* (Incunabula Graeca XLIII), Roma 1972.
- Mémoires IV* = M. Lejeune, *Mémoires de philologie mycénienne. Quatrième série (1969-1996)* (Incunabula Graeca XCIX), Roma 1997.
- Metaphysis* = *METAPHYSIS. Ritual, Myth and Symbolism in the Aegean Bronze Age, Proceedings of the 15th International Aegean Conference* (Aegaeum 39), E. Alram-Stern, F. Blakolmer, S. Deger-Jalkotzy, R. Laffineur, J. Weilhartner (eds.), Leuven-Liège 2016.
- MGL* = A. Morpurgo, *Mycenaeae Graecitatis Lexicon* (Incunabula Graeca III), Roma 1963.
- MGV I* = J. Chadwick – L. Baumbach, “The Mycenaean Greek Vocabulary”, *Glotta* 41, 1963, pp. 157-271.
- MGV II* = L. Baumbach, “The Mycenaean Greek Vocabulary II”, *Glotta* 49, 1971, pp. 151-190.
- Mycenaean Studies* = *Mycenaean Studies: Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium for Mycenaean Studies Held at Wingspread, 4-8 September 1961*, E. L. Bennett, Jr. (ed.), Madison 1964.
- Mykenaiika* = *MYKENAÏKA. Actes du IX^e Colloque international sur les textes mycéniens et égéens organisé par le Centre de l’Antiquité Grecque et Romaine de la Fondation Hellénique des Recherches Scientifiques et l’École française d’Athènes (Athènes, 2-6 octobre 1990)* (BCH Suppl. XXV), J.-P. Olivier (ed.), Paris 1992.
- One State, Many Worlds* = *One State, Many Worlds: Crete in the Late Minoan II-III A2 Early Period. Proceedings of the International Conference Held at Khandia, Μεγάλο Αρσενάλι, 21st-23rd November 2019* (SMEA NS Suppl. 2), A. L. D’Agata, L. Girella, E. Papadopoulou, D. G. Aquini (eds.), Roma 2022.
- Palatial Economy* = *Palatial Economy in the Ancient Near East and in the Aegean: First Steps Towards a Comprehensive Study and Analysis. ESF Exploratory Workshop Held in Sèvres (France), 16-19 Sept. 2010* (Pasiphae XI), P. Carlier, F. Joannès, F. Rougemont, J. Zurbach (eds.), Pisa-Roma 2017.
- Phonétique* = M. Lejeune, *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*, Paris 1972.

- PoM IV* = A. J. Evans, *The Palace of Minos. A comparative account of the successive stages of the early Cretan civilization as illustrated by the discoveries. Vol. IV*, London 1935.
- Primo Congresso* = *Atti e Memorie del 1° Congresso Internazionale di Micenologia, Roma 27 settembre – 3 ottobre 1967* (Incunabula Graeca XXV), 3 vols., Roma 1968.
- Pylos Comes Alive* = *Pylos Comes Alive. Industry + Administration in a Mycenaean Palace, May 4-5 1984*, C. W. Shelmerdine, T. G. Palaima (eds.), New York 1984.
- RCT* = J. Driessen, *The Scribes of the Room of the Chariot Tablets at Knossos. Interdisciplinary Approach to the Study of a Linear B Deposit* (Minos Supl. 15), Salamanca 2000.
- Res Mycenaee* = *Res Mycenaee. Akten des VII. Internationalen Mykenologischen Colloquiums in Nürnberg vom 6.10. April 1981*, A. Heubeck, G. Neumann (eds.), Göttingen 1983.
- Rethinking Mycenaean Palaces* = *Rethinking Mycenaean Palaces. New Interpretations of an Old Idea* (The Cotsen Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Monograph 41), M. L. Galaty, W. A. Parkinson (eds.), Los Angeles 1999 (revised and expanded second edition: [Monograph 60] Los Angeles 2007).
- Secondo Congresso* = *Atti e Memorie del Secondo Congresso Internazionale di Micenologia, Roma-Napoli, 14-20 ottobre 1991* (Incunabula Graeca XCVIII), 3 vols., E. De Miro, L. Godart, A. Sacconi (eds.), Roma 1996.
- Sintaxis* = J. M. Jiménez Delgado, *Sintaxis del griego micénico*, Sevilla 2016.
- Studia Mycenaea* = *Studia Mycenaea. Proceedings of the Mycenaean Symposium, Brno, April 1966*, A. Bartoněk (ed.), Brno 1968.
- Ta-u-ro-qo-ro* = *TA-U-RO-QO-RO: Studies in Mycenaean Texts, Language, and Culture in Honor of José Luis Melena Jiménez* (Hellenic Studies 94), J. Méndez Dosuna, T. G. Palaima, C. Varias García (eds.), Washington, DC 2022.
- Thalassa* = *THALASSA. L'Égée préhistorique et la mer. Actes de la 3e Rencontre égéenne internationale de l'Université de Liège, Station de recherches sous-marines et océanographiques, Calvi, Corse, 23-25 avril 1990* (Aegaeum 7), R. Laffineur, L. Basch (eds.), Liège 1991.
- Texte aus Theben* = *Die neuen Linear B Texte aus Theben: ihr Aufschlusswert für die mykenische Sprache und Kultur. Akten des internationalen Forschungskolloquiums an der Österreichischen Akademie der*

-
- Wissenschaften* 5.6. Dezember 2002 (ÖAW, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Denkschriften 338), S. Deger-Jalkotzy, O. Panagl (eds.), Wien 2006.
- The New Documents = The New Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, J. T. Killen (ed.), Cambridge (forthcoming).
- The Role of the Ruler = The Role of the Ruler in the Prehistoric Aegean. Proceedings of a Panel Discussion presented at the Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America, New Orleans, Louisiana, 28 December 1992 with Additions* (Aegeaeum 11), P. Rehak (ed.), Liège-Austin 1995.
- Thronos = Thronos. Historical Grammar of Furniture in Mycenaean and Beyond* (Eikasmos. Studi 32), R. Pierini, A. Bernabé, M. Ercoles (eds.), Bologna 2021.
- Tractata Mycenaea = Tractata Mycenaea. Proceedings of the Eight International Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies, held in Ohrid, 15-20 September 1985*, P. Hr. Ilievski, L. Crepajac (eds.), Skopje 1987.
- Understanding Relations = Understanding Relations Between Scripts: The Aegean Writing Systems*, P. M. Steele (ed.), Oxford – Philadelphia 2017.
- Work Notes = M. Ventris, Work Notes on Minoan Language Research and Other Unedited Papers* (Incunabula Graeca 90), A. Sacconi (ed.), Roma 1988.
- 55 Años de Micenología = Actas del simposio internacional: 55 Años de Micenología (1952-2007)* (Faventia Suppl. 1), C. Varias García (ed.), Bellaterra 2012.

MYCENAEAN AND GREEK DIALECTS

Paloma Guijarro Ruano
(Universidad Complutense de Madrid)

*1. The decipherment of Mycenaean and its impact on Greek Philology*¹

Within the linguistic landscape of modern Greek dialectology, Mycenaean Greek studies came into its own from the second half of the 20th century. The Greek nature of Linear B texts was officially acknowledged thanks to the publication in 1953 of Michael Ventris and John Chadwick's seminal work, *Evidence for Greek Dialect in the Mycenaean Archives*. With this programmatic title, both authors demonstrated that "the language of the Knossos, Pylos, and Mycenae tablets is not only Indo-European but *specifically* Greek",² supporting similar conclusions previously drawn from historic facts with linguistic data. The decipherment was a turning point in the holistic description of the Greek language and in the classification of the historical dialects,³ but its expansive wave also touched upon other disciplines, such as Historical and Indo-European Linguistics along with Archaeology, Ancient History, etc.⁴ The new evidence from the 2nd millennium enormously enriched linguistic discussion and naturally raised new issues which, in Anna Morpurgo Davies's words, "belong of right with the rewriting of Greek historical grammar which has had to take place after the decipherment of Linear B".⁵

¹ This article was written within the project *Onomástica y contactos lingüísticos en griego antiguo*, Grant PID2020-114162GB-I00, funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033. The following editions of Mycenaean texts have been used: *KT⁶*, *PT³*, *FDC IV* and *TITHEMY*. I would like to express my gratitude to María Luisa del Barrio Vega, Alberto Bernabé Pajares and the editors of this volume for their kind work on this contribution. Any mistakes, of course, remain my own.

² *Evidence*, p. 85.

³ For the state of affairs of the Greek language before decipherment, see Meillet 1930³. Georgiev 1953 was one of the first detractors, arguing that Mycenaean was a different Indo-European language closely related to Greek.

⁴ See Luján, Domínguez Monedero and Petrakis, this volume.

⁵ Morpurgo Davies 1988, p. 83. In this line, see García Ramón 2018, p. 30: "the current main questions of Greek dialectology [...] have mainly remained the same since the early times of

Due to the far-reaching impact of the discovery and to close scientific collaboration since the dawn of the discipline, the linguistic variety of Mycenaean Greek early on became part of the dialectal descriptions in the main reference works on Greek language.⁶ General volumes on Mycenaean civilization often included specific sections devoted to the study of the language as well,⁷ and today we have at our disposal complete and updated grammars exclusively focused on Mycenaean Greek which also deal with its characterization within Greek dialects.⁸ We also often come across studies which describe Mycenaean language from a linguistic – and dialectological – perspective. The contributions of Warren C. Cowgill, Antonín Bartoněk, Ernst Risch and Morpurgo Davies are still paradigmatic for approaching the actual influence of the Mycenaean decipherment in Greek Dialectology.⁹ The respective updating of Martín S. Ruijff's in 1972, José Luis García Ramón's in 1980 and 1984, and Eugenio R. Luján's in 2008 are also worth mentioning. They present different approaches to which the present work may be combined. This chapter essentially attempts to present both a diachronic and synchronic overview of the evolution of Mycenaean investigation in Classical Philology after Ventris and Chadwick's decisive contributions, which must be taken together with the revolutionary studies of Walter Porzig and Risch in subsequent years.

Diachronically, the dating of the Mycenaean language in the 2nd millennium BC made it possible to reconstruct a missing link in the transmission chain from Indo-European to the 1st millennium dialects afterwards. It shed light on the relative chronology from common Greek to the 2nd millennium Mycenaean Greek (§2) and from Mycenaean to the historic dialects (§3), as a Southeast variety (§3.1.1), but also in comparison with Aeolic (§3.1.2), Arcado-Cypriot (§3.1.3) and Homeric language (§3.2). In more synchronic terms, the varying spellings in LB tablets in this dialectological context has also led scholars to explore the possibility of the existence of linguistic varieties among the different archives (§4).

this discipline, and even of the broader fields of historical and comparative linguistics in general. In fact, only two fields of Greek dialectal research are 'properly' new, namely Mycenaean and Macedonian".

⁶ See Thumb – Scherer 1959², pp. 314-361. Chantraine 1961; *Phonétique*; Rix 1976; Duhoux 1983; and more recently, Colvin 2007, pp. 3-15; 2014, pp. 32-51; Thompson 2010; Horrocks 2010, pp. 9-24; and Miller 2014.

⁷ See, for instance, Ruijff – Perpillou 2008b, 2008c; Marazzi 2013; and García Ramón 2016.

⁸ Vilborg 1960; *Études*; Bartoněk 2003; Risch – Hajnal 2006; and *Introducción*, which we use as the reference grammar throughout this work (this is the revised and augmented version of Bernabé – Luján 2006, cf. Guijarro Ruano 2021).

⁹ Cowgill 1966; Bartoněk 1968a; 1996; Risch 1976; Morpurgo Davies 1988.

2. From Indo-European to Greek: Mycenaean as the touchstone for diachronic studies

The decipherment of Linear B texts challenged previous hypotheses concerning the prehistory of Greek, particularly those related to its differentiation from PIE as a separate linguistic branch. It was a turning point concerning: (a) the relative chronology for some specific linguistic changes (as *terminus ante* and *post quem*); and (b) the reassessment of dialectal varieties in the 2nd millennium and their subsequent fragmentation and evolution into the historical dialects of the 1st millennium.¹⁰

Prior to the deciphering of Mycenaean texts, modern studies on Greek dialectology were underpinned by Paul Kretschmer's well-known theory of the three migration waves.¹¹ According to this outdated theory devoid of archaeological support, the first wave (ca. 2000 BC) comprised speakers of proto-Attic-Ionic, the second (ca. 1700-1600) Achaeans (= proto-Arcado-Cyprian, Aeolian, and Pamphylian)¹² and the third (ca. 1200) Dorians. Within this framework, Mycenaean civilization would have emerged during the second wave and disappeared in the third, under the influence of Dorians. However, after the epoch-making contributions of Porzig in 1954 and Risch in 1955, which first relied on dialect geography (§3.1), linguistic research changed drastically. It was taken for granted that isoglosses reflected shared innovations,¹³ so that they also sustained the historical reconstruction of the Greek language following a family-tree model.¹⁴ Scholars were then impelled to revisit the traditional evolutionary phases which distinguished the Greek linguistic branch from the Indo-European

¹⁰ See, for instance, how Risch's 1979 and Bartoněk's 1979 works on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the decipherment of Linear B (1953-1978) complement one another according to this diachronic conception.

¹¹ Kretschmer 1909; 1923. Archaeology only supports the arrival of two waves, the first identified with the arrival of proto-Arcado-Cypriots together with proto-Attic-Ionians (ca. 2000 BC), the second with Dorians (ca. 1200 BC). For a recent discussion on historical, archaeological, and linguistic approaches to migrations, see Janko 2018, pp. 107-111. A complete description of the beginnings of Greek dialectology as a discipline can be found in Colvin 2010, pp. 204-206; Finkelberg 2014 (see also §3.1).

¹² On Pamphylian, see n. 48.

¹³ For an assessment of earlier hypotheses, see García Ramón 1980, pp. 10-15, and also García Ramón 2018, pp. 67-69 for an evaluation of isoglosses with reference to the classification of Greek dialects.

¹⁴ For critical work, see Horrocks 2010, pp. 16-17; García Ramón 2018, pp. 82-85. General accounts on the historical development of Greek dialectological studies can be found in Cowgill 1966; and García Ramón 1975. A general account of the historical development of Greek dialectological studies is summarised in Finkelberg 2014; on their specific relation to Mycenology, see Cowgill 1966 and the bibliography in Morpurgo Davies 1988, pp. 96-98.

and their defining linguistic features to fix the position of the Mycenaean dialect (§3.1). Diachronic dialect studies established four chronological phases so that Mycenaean naturally contributed to shaping the linguistic landscape: (1) the Common Greek stage, in which Greek differentiated from PIE; (2) the Mycenaean period until the end of the Bronze age (XVI-XIII cent. BC); (3) the Iron Age phase, from the collapse of Mycenaean civilization until the emergence of the first alphabetic inscriptions (XII-VIII cent. BC); and (4) the historical-dialect stage, from the Archaic period onwards.

Scientific contributions were then aligned into two perspectives drawing on the position of the Mycenaean dialect within a diachronic approach¹⁵ or on the prehistory of Greek.¹⁶ As a result, according to Morpurgo Davies, linguistic methodology applied to the study of Mycenaean was biased by an exclusively Indo-European or Greek approach.¹⁷ The former was mainly based on the analysis of archaisms in contrast with the latter, focused on innovations and parallel/independent developments among Greek dialects.

2.1. *Proto-Greek, Common Greek and Mycenaean*¹⁸

The answer to *when* and *where* Greek language differentiated from PIE and how the different linguistic varieties emerged from a common Greek period has caused rivers of ink to flow.¹⁹ Leaving aside old-fashioned terminological debates on ‘Proto-Greek’ (*Urgriechisch*) and ‘Common Greek’ (*Gemeingriechisch*),²⁰ the term ‘pre-dialectal’ Greek applies to a phase of Greek language before the dialectal differentiation, deemed as a former continuum with its own linguistic characteristics distinctive from PIE. Mycenaean, as a 2nd millennium dialect, exhibits some diagnostic features which distinguish it from PIE, among which the most salient are:²¹

¹⁵ Ruijgh 1958; 1996; Ruijgh – Perpillou 2008a.

¹⁶ Chadwick 1956; 1963; Wyatt 1970; Garret 2006.

¹⁷ Morpurgo Davies 1988, p. 77.

¹⁸ For the sake of clarity, we present the transcription of Mycenaean forms with alphabetic Greek. For the phonetic interpretations, C = consonant, T = plosive, R = resonant, N = nasal, V = vowel. Similarly, ‘Myc.’ is used for 2nd millennium Mycenaean as opposed to ‘Gr.’ referring to historical dialects. PN = anthroponym.

¹⁹ On the linguistic account, see Horrocks 2010, pp. 9-10; Miller 2014, pp. 8-10, pp.18-24; and Filos 2014.

²⁰ We use ‘Proto-Greek’ in a broad sense, such as ‘Common Greek’ and ‘pre-dialectal Greek’. See also Lejeune 1972, p. 13; García Ramón 2006, p. 65.

²¹ Other possible features, such as the early loss of word-final occlusive sounds or the alleged retention of PIE resonants in Mycenaean, are much more debated. See *Introducción*, pp. 148-149 and pp. 193-197, respectively. See also Luján, this volume.

- (a) Voiced aspirates have already become voiceless aspirates (cf. *tu-ka-te* θυγάτηρ ‘daughter’ from **d^hugat-* instead of ***du-ka-te* or *te-o* θεός ‘god’ from **d^hes-*).
- (b) Early palatalization in contexts where **y* appears in postconsonantal position (cf. **tot-yos* > *to-so* τόσ(σ)ος ‘so much’; **meǵ-yos-* > *me-zo* ‘bigger’, cf. Ion. μέζων, Att. μείζων).
- (c) The vanishing of the laryngeals has already triggered new short and long vowels, despite the defectiveness of the writing system to differentiate them (cf. **h₂eg-* > *a-ke* (ἄγει ‘he carries’), **deh₃-* > *-do-ke* (δῶκε ‘he gave’).
- (d) **s-* > *h-* in initial position (cf. *a₂-te-ro* ἄτερον ‘the next (year)’ from **sm-*; *e-qe-ta* ἐκ^wέτας ‘companion’ from **sek^w-*).
- (e) Locative plural *-su* > *-si* with locative and dative values (cf. *ti-ri-si* τρισί ‘three’).

Conversely, as a dialect differentiated from the 1st millennium ones, Mycenaean preserves an earlier linguistic stage of Greek with some PIE retentions which affect phonology and morphology. These are its most salient features:

- (a) Preservation of labiovelars (cf. enclitic *-qe* κ^wε ~ Gr. τε).
- (b) Preservation of *-h-* (< **-s-*) in several medial positions (cf. **φάρφεσα* > acc. pl. n. *pa-we-a₂* φάρφεθα ‘pieces of fabric’).²²
- (c) Preservation of semivowels **w* in all positions and **y* in some contexts, although its phonetic status is debated.²³
- (d) Preservation of *m*-inflection in dat. sg. *e-me* (ἐμεί ‘one’) and in *se-re-mo-* compounds with a first term *σειρεμ^o* ‘siren’ (cf. *se-re-mo-ka-ra-a-pi*, *se-re-mo-ka-ra-o-re*, ‘with siren-like head’ vs. forms with confusion in *n*-stems, cf. Gr. σειρήν, -ῆνος).²⁴

²² The presence of /s/ in Mycenaean and in other 1st millennium dialects is due to analogy or secondary sound changes. The aspiration can safely be reconstructed through the syllabogram *a₂* which permits extending *h-* to other contexts where Mycenaean lacks graphic signs for aspiration (§4.2.). It is traditionally assumed that LB tablets display a graphic hiatus that points to the existence of intervocalic *-h-* (cf. *ko-to-no-o-ko* κτοίνο-ἡόχος ‘landowners’). For the problematic cases in which *-h-* coexists with alternative graphic renderings with *j-* (cf. *ko-ri-a₂-da-na*, *pi-a₂-ra*, *i-e-re-u* vs. *ko-ri-ja-da-na*, *pi-je-ra₃*, *i-je-re-u*), see Melena 2014, p. 75; *Introducción*, pp. 172-174.

²³ Initial **y* started to evolve into /h/ (cf. adv. *o-* ὤς and *jo-* **y*ως) or into *z-* /dz/ (cf. *ze-u-ke-si* ζεύγε(σ)σι, < **yeug-*) and internally it could have been preserved longer. Other authors (cf. Brixhe 1989, pp. 48-52) believe that **y* was completely lost in Mycenaean. On this complex issue, see Duhoux 1990; Melena 2014, pp. 116-119.

²⁴ *DMic* s.v. *se-re-mo-ka-ra-a-pi*.

- (e) *s*-stem inflection for active perfect participles in *-wos-* (cf. nom.-acc. sg. *te-tu-ko-wo-a₂*, *θεθυχφόηα, instead of **τεθυχφότα, cf. Gr. λελυκό(ν)τα) and comparative adjectives in **-yos*, which preserve their primitive elative or intensifier sense (cf. nom.-acc. pl. n. *me-zo-a₂* *μεζοηα ‘bigger’ < *meg-yos-ǎ vs. Att. μείζω).
- (f) Preservation of the triconsonantal sequence *-ksm-* in acc. pl. *a₃-ka-sa-ma* *αικσμάς ‘points of spears’ (reduction by aspiration /ksm/ > /khm/ had not yet taken place in Myc., as we deduce from later Gr. αιχμά/αιχμή with aspiration).

Mycenaean came to cast doubt on old tenets regarding inherited pan-dialectal traits of Proto-Greek.²⁵ The comparative method along with linguistic internal reconstruction allowed us to determine that some of the features were post-Mycenaean (i.e., the elimination of labiovelars, the loss of *y and *w, the Grassmann law, etc.) so that apparent linguistic deviations were explained in an alternative way. This applies for the alternation between *ένεκα/ένεκεν* and *είνεκα-* forms which could no longer be derived from **ένφεκα, due to the absence of *w in Myc. *e-ne-ka*. Therefore, artificial *είν-* forms were then explained through metrical lengthening. Similarly, Myc. *pa-ra-jo* proved that there was no *w in *παλαιός* (‘last year’). Myc. *pa-te* and *do-e-ro* also confirmed that there were neither etymological labiovelar in *πάντες* (**κ^wάντες) nor contraction in *δοηελ-* (cf. *δοῦλος*) despite the etymological problems of this root. Concerning the *pt-/p-* variation, Mycenaean unequivocally displays *pt-* (cf. PN *po-to-ri-jo* Πτολίων; *pi-ti-ro₂-we-sa* *πιτιλόφε(σ)σα ‘winged’).²⁶

Within this diachronic perspective, Mycenaean must have also evolved along its history, from ca. 1450 until the collapse of the civilization in the XII cent. BC, despite the homogeneity of LB texts. Linguistic research has also been interested in the mismatching of a script conceived for a non-Greek language and Mycenaean dialect, whose earlier texts come from the Knossian Room of the Chariots Tablets and extends into the next two centuries.²⁷ One of the first attempts to establish an internal chronology for the creation of Linear B in view of linguistic phenomena was by Michel Lejeune in 1976. He searched for three evolutive phases: ‘*pré-mycénien*’, prior to the creation of Linear B, ‘*proto-mycénien*’, for the period between the creation of Linear B and the time of the tablets, and ‘*mycénien*’ proper. According to the scholar’s proposal, the emergence of this script preceded three specific phonetic developments: **pye* > *pte*, the reinforcement of *y- through ζ- (before *y- > h-), and the convergence

²⁵ See the immediate results of research in Chadwick 1954, pp. 14-15.

²⁶ For the problems with *pt/p* variation in Mycenaean, see Melena 1976.

²⁷ For the chronology of Linear B texts, see Del Frio 2016c.

of the outcome of *-ry-/-ly* and *-rs-/-ls-* to *-rr-/-ll-* (through the interpretation of *ra₂*, as Ruipérez had already posited). Through this analysis, Lejeune attributed this previous phase to ‘proto-Mycenaean’ based on historic spellings in Linear B which do not correspond to the phonetic reality and point to a chronological break between the creation of Linear B and the first written documents. Nevertheless, the linguistic interpretation and the chronology of these spellings is far from being accepted unanimously and research on reception and transition has also been developed.²⁸ Similarly, this issue, which would take us far beyond the confines of this paper, also points to the possibility of linguistic variation that will be examined further below (§4).

2.2. A 2nd millennium Sprachbund in the Balkans?

In this diachronic *parcours*, the reconstruction of the linguistic relationship between (Mycenaean) Greek and other languages is still uncertain due to the meagreness of positive linguistic evidence.²⁹ Nonetheless, Claude Brixhe has recently pointed out that it has been understudied with no advances made after Antoine Meillet’s assertion that nothing could be argued about the linguistic situation between the Indo-European and the historic periods.³⁰ However, Brixhe, making use of Mycenaean as the unique attested 2nd millennium variant of Greek to endorse linguistic comparison, analysed linguistic contact in the Southeast part of the Balkans. He argues that a “conglomérat ‘Greco-Thraco-Phrygien’” existed in this “véritable aire culturelle” because of linguistic equivalences among these three Indo-European languages.³¹ His hypothesis relies on certain shared features³² and on some innovations.³³ Other linguistic changes relevant

²⁸ Palaima 1988, p. 361. See for instance the problematic *-rs-/-ls-* spellings or the *vexata quaestio* concerning the double income of initial *y. For *py-* and *pt-*, see García Ramón 1984, pp. 245-246 and Melena 2014, pp. 69-70.

²⁹ See García Ramón’s methodological details (2018, pp. 75-76, 90-95).

³⁰ Brixhe 2006a, pp. 39-40; Meillet 1965, p. 13. Tentative attempts do exist but they have limited themselves to proposing that the variation between 1st pl. *-μεν/-μες* dated back to this span of time (Bartoněk 2003, pp. 449-450); see Bartoněk 1972a.

³¹ Brixhe 2006a, pp. 39-45 refers to in terms of *Sprachbund*. On the difficulties for underpinning an ancient Balkan *Sprachbund*, see Joseph 2018.

³² Brixhe, 2006a, pp. 40-41. These phono-morphological and lexical equivalences become more evident between Greek and Phrygian in contrast with the unknown Thracian (an account in Guijarro Ruano 2019). See Phryg. *midai lavagtaei vanaktei* [M-01a, 575-550 BC] “Midas the leader of the people lord of the city”.

³³ An enumeration in Brixhe 2006a, p. 40. The specific shared innovations between Phrygian and Mycenaean are limited to the rearrangement of masculine *-a* stems in Phrygian and Mycenaean (nom. *-ās*), which have triggered alternative solutions for the genitive (cf. Phryg. *-avo* (*-āwo*) but Myc. *-a-o* (*-āho* < **-āso*)). For Brixhe, later internal variations in Greek could be traced back due to parallel innovations in the treatment of specific issues, such as the variation in the thematic

to Greek dialectology are related to this “conglomérat” as markers of linguistic fragmentation, such as the preservation of *y in Phrygian and Thracian but not in 1st millennium Greek.³⁴

Despite the accepted linguistic and cultural affinities between Greek and Phrygian and the theoretical plausibility of a linguistic community between these three languages, it is almost impossible to accept this linguistic community based on current linguistic and extralinguistic evidence. First, the nature of these *Sprachreste* hampers the analysis of the supposed isoglosses, which decrease when the focus is only on Mycenaean, not on 1st millennium Greek. Secondly, there is no real evidence of shared features/innovations between Thracian and (Mycenaean) Greek. Indeed, the only feature really discussed is the alleged absence of augmented past forms in Thracian which contrasts with its presence in Phrygian and Greek, which was not mandatory in Mycenaean or in later texts. This forces the author to suggest a pre-Greek phase where augment was not perceived as a necessary marker of the past. Finally, these alleged non-augmented forms are exclusively supported by some instances of *καίε/καε* in Thracian graffiti (etymologically related to Gr. *καίω* ‘burn’) coming from a specific region, Zone, a Samothracian colony on the Aegean coast. Therefore, Brixhe directly assumed that non-augmented forms were the general outcome in the whole Thracian language, throughout its entire geography and time span, so he does not find a positive linguistic connection between Mycenaean and 1st millennium Thracian.³⁵

3. From Mycenaean to historic Greek dialects

It is widely accepted that the dialectal map of the 1st millennium cannot be automatically projected onto the preceding millennium since the linguistic description of the 2nd millennium is exclusively provided through Mycenaean data, the unique Greek variety attested for the period. Until the first alphabetic registers, the linguistic description of the Greek language must necessarily remain in the sphere of speculation as well, although the linguistic continuity between both millennia is ensured through the existence of shared features between Mycenaean and other dialects, as we will see below (§3.1). As a result, the decipherment allowed the isolation of post-Mycenaean innovations and the

genitives (Gr. *-o-jo*, *-oio*, *-ou/-ω*; Phryg. *-owo*).

³⁴ Brixhe 2006a, pp. 48-49. The scholar even suggests that the reinforcement of *y-, rendered by (-)ζ/-/(δ)δ- in alphabetic Greek and by z- series in syllabic Greek, could be due to the influence of another non-Greek language.

³⁵ Brixhe 2015; 2018 challenges traditional views on Thracian linguistics, arguing that Thracian was not a *satem* but a *centum* language. For some sceptical thoughts, see Guijarro Ruano 2019; forthcoming.

reappraisal of the chronology of important phono-morphological processes. In general terms, the following features are considered post-Mycenaean:³⁶

- (a) The evolution of labiovelars into other plosives³⁷
- (b) *-VhV-* > *-VV-* (intervocalic /h/ is the outcome of the lenition of **-s-* and of **-y-*)
- (c) The loss of prevocalic initial **y-*
- (d) The loss of **w* in some historic dialects
- (e) Compensatory lengthenings and vowel contractions
- (f) **ā* > /ε:/ η (only in Attic-Ionic)
- (g) *-m* > *-n* in word-final (Gr. ἐνί) and in morpheme-final positions (cf. Gr. σειρήν-)³⁸
- (h) Almost complete case-syncretism among dative, locative and instrumental
- (i) Creation of the definite article
- (j) Grassmann's Law

3.1. Dialectal fragmentation: pre- or post-Mycenaean?

Before the 1950s' Mycenaean revolution, it was generally believed that dialectal fragmentation occurred prior to the different Greek settlers entering Greece following Kretschmer's theory (§2).³⁹ Accordingly, dialects were classified as 'pure' or 'mixed', depending on the preservation of the linguistic features of one of the three proto-dialects or on their blending. Later on, Porzig's and Risch's contributions demonstrated that fragmentation took place on Greek soil: they recognised two separate linguistic groups in the 2nd millennium according to the distribution of the assibilated/non-assibilated forms: East and West in Porzig's terms; South and North in Risch's system (§3.1.1).⁴⁰ Despite the

³⁶ Enumeration based on *Phonétique*, pp. 21-23, and Filos 2014.

³⁷ Mycenaean labiovelars only experimented some degree of evolution when they were in contact with /u/ in ancient groups, triggering the dissimilation of their labial nature (cf. **-κ^wολος* in *qo-u-ko-ro* **γ^wου-κόλος* 'oxherd'). Exceptions have been explained in terms of analogy: the preservation of the second *-γ^w-* in *qo-u-qo-ta* (**γ^wου-γ^wότᾱς* 'oxherd') must be due to the analogy with βόσκω ('feed') *uel sim.*, as it also occurs in 1st millennium βου-βότᾱς ('oxherd') and συ-βότᾱς ('pigman'). Other forms remain difficult to interpret, many are considered anthroponyms (cf. *a-tu-qo-ta*, *e-u-qo-ne*, etc.), see *Introducción*, pp. 151-153.

³⁸ According to the interpretation of *i-qo-na-to-mo* (PY Eq 146.11) as a sequence in *scriptio continua* conformed by a first term gen. pl. **ἵκκ^wων* and a second unidentified term; see *DMic. Supl. s.v.*

³⁹ On Porzig's and Risch's works, see *infra*. On this whole section, see García Ramón 2006.

⁴⁰ Porzig 1954; Risch 1955; 1979. The divergent terminology depends on the geographical distribution of Greek dialects in the 2nd or in the 1st millennium. The label 'North Greek' rather than 'West Greek' continues to be used (cf. Hajnal 2007, Parker 2008 or Janko 2018). In this

fact that Porzig's main work – published in 1954 – antedated the spreading of Mycenaean evidence, he was the first to challenge the traditional model and to relate Arcado-Cypriot to Attic-Ionic, not to a northern branch of Aeolic.⁴¹ Risch has the merit of: (a) including chronological criteria in the classification of shared features of the different dialects; (b) incorporating Mycenaean data, (c) grouping together Aeolic and Doric under the *Nordgriechisch* group (vs. *Südgriechisch* dialects); and (d) sustaining Porzig's assertion that Lesbian peculiarities among the other Aeolic dialects were due to the influence of Asia Minor Ionic. Since then, the foundations of modern linguistic and dialectological assumptions have been laid.

Afterwards, once the South/East nature of Mycenaean was established, scholars focused on two main issues when referring to the 'dialectal position' of Mycenaean:⁴² from an external perspective its linguistic kinship with other dialectal groups, as we shall see, and, from an internal one, with internal dialectal differentiations, i.e., the existence of subvarieties among Mycenaean Greek across geographic boundaries and time (§4).⁴³ While in the first years of the discipline the external perspective predominated, the second one has won out in the most recent research.⁴⁴

3.1.1. Mycenaean as Southeast Greek

Within the first 19th modern dialectological studies, scholars evinced the

paper, we use 'Southeast Greek' following the terminology employed in more recent works, such as *EAGLL* (cf. Barrio Vega 2014). On the artificial label of 'Central Greek', see Dunkel 1981, contested by García Ramón 1984, pp. 268-269.

⁴¹ Porzig's contribution was published in 1954, although it was written in 1945, before decipherment.

⁴² The concept was first addressed in *Evidence*, pp. 101-103; see also *Docs*, pp. 73-76; and Chadwick 1954, pp. 15-17. It was later reported by Risch at the first Mycenaean Colloquium (April 1956) and then reappraised in later scholarship (Ruijgh 1958; 1961; 1996; Ruijgh – Perpillou 2008a²; Risch 1976; Morpurgo Davies 1988, pp. 95-98; Lejeune 1992²). On dialect classification and Mycenaean, see Bartoněk's accounts (1968b; 1972a; 1972b) in which he reflects the linguistic enquiry of different scholars concerning different problems of pre-classical Greek dialectology (the so-called 'Brno inquiry' later published in *Studia Mycenaea*). For later works concerning dialect classification centred on Mycenaean, see Cowgill 1966; Bartoněk 1968a; García Ramón 2006; Hajnal 2006, pp. 54-58; 2007; Thompson 2010, pp. 198-199. For an overview of the different positions, see Milani 2014; for other references focused on a general classification, see Colvin 2010, pp. 201-212; and Finkelberg 2014.

⁴³ On these internal and external approaches, see Hajnal 2006, p. 53.

⁴⁴ Morpurgo Davies's words are illustrative: "there is yet another way of looking at Mycenaean and Greek. This time the aim is no longer that of tracing the development of Indo-European to Mycenaean or from Mycenaean to First Millennium Greek; it is rather that of exploiting the Mycenaean data to reach a better understanding of later Greek". See Morpurgo Davies 1988, p. 83.

linguistic affinities between Homeric language, Aeolic, Arcadian, and Cypriot (after the decipherment of classical Cypriot script in the 1870s). The label ‘Achaean’ was then coined to encompass non-Doric and non-Ionic dialects, although it was polysemic and its meaning not always transparent.⁴⁵ From the deciphering of Linear B, Ventris and Chadwick pointed “inescapably to an archaic dialect of the ‘Achaean type’.”⁴⁶ Three years later, both authors delved more deeply into “the relation of Mycenaean to the historical dialects”⁴⁷ and, together with Porzig and Risch, they concluded that Mycenaean belonged to the South Greek family, resorting to a more scientific and linguistic label. Nowadays, it is agreed that Mycenaean belonged to the South/East Greek variety, the more innovative one which spread through Attica, the Peloponnese and Cyprus and shared an important number of linguistic innovations. Therefore, it also included the ancestors of Attic-Ionic and the Arcado-Cypriot.⁴⁸ Conversely, the so-called North or West variety, a more conservative one, was essentially located in north-western Greece and covers the same geographic area later occupied by Doric.⁴⁹

Many of the distinctive features of Southeast Greek (Tab. 1) were clearly documented on Linear B tablets (1-5),⁵⁰ although the assibilation (1) constitutes the clearer innovation shared by the whole South Greek group.⁵¹ Other features,

⁴⁵ *Achaean* can refer to: (a) the 2nd millennium dialect group comprised of Mycenaean, Proto-Arcado-Cypriots and Aeolians, (b) the 1st millennium dialect employed in the region of Achaia; and – in non-linguistic terms – to (c) Greeks as opposed to Trojans in the Homeric tradition. See *Evidence*, p. 103 on the ambiguity of this term: “To show that it is the speech of the Ἀχαιοί of Homer, and not the historical Achaea, it would perhaps be as well to follow the scholars who have referred to it as *Old Achaean*”. Some authors even divided this group into North Achaean (Aeolic) and South Achaean (Arcadian and Cypriot).

⁴⁶ *Evidence*, p. 103.

⁴⁷ *Docs*, pp. 73-75.

⁴⁸ The classification of Pamphylian is problematic: along with its own linguistic peculiarities and the influence of neighbouring languages, it displays Southeast features (shared with Arcado-Cypriot) except, for instance, assibilation (in Pamphylian, the retention of **ti* is observed in verb endings and numerals).

⁴⁹ For Brixhe 2006b, South Greek was also spoken in Central Greece because of toponymic and onomastic connections (but see García Ramón 2018, pp. 90-95). It ultimately relies on Chadwick (*Docs*), who argued for the first time for the Aeolian presence in continental Greece, from Thesaly to the Epirus during the Bronze Age.

⁵⁰ See already *Docs*, pp. 73-74.

⁵¹ Mycenaean preserved non-palatalised forms in the same contexts as the other Southeast dialects (*Introducción*, pp. 159-161). Despite the general acknowledgment of assibilation as a South Greek diagnostic feature, Thompson 2008 argues for its pan-Greek character given that forms like βάσις are common to all dialects (never †βάτις). Nonetheless, the pan-dialectal preservation of nouns without assibilation (cf. μάντις vs. †μάντις) forces him to admit that the change was not wholly completed in all dialects and to challenge assibilation as the main criterion to distinguish two dialectal groups in the 2nd millennium; see the convincing critiques in Janko 2018 pp. 112-113.

such as the simplification of -σσ- (6), cannot be confirmed due to the graphic ambiguity of Linear B script. The absence of some of them (7-11) may be simply due to the nature of the documents (i.e., there are no suitable contexts to express the semantics of certain words related to volition or to conditional clauses) or to later developments, such as the creation of the article (8).

	Southeast Greek	
	Mycenaean	1st mill. South dialects
(1) *-τι(-) > -σι(-)	<i>di-do-si</i> (δίδονσι)	Att.-Ion. ἔχουσι Arc. καθέρπονσι Cyp. <i>e-ke-so-si</i> (fut. ἔξο(ν)σι?)
(2) ἱερός	<i>i-je-ro</i>	ἱερός (Cyp. <i>i-je-ro-</i>)
(3) *προτι	<i>po-si</i>	Att.-Ion. πρός Arc.-Cyp. πός (Cyp. <i>po-se</i>)
(4) -τε (adverbs/conjunct.)	<i>o-te</i>	Att.-Ion. ὅτε, πότε Arc.-Cyp. ὄτε, πότε (Cyp. <i>o-te</i>)
(5) athematic infinitives	<i>te-re-ja-e</i> (τελειῖαθεν?)	-vai
(6) *t _s , *t ^(h) j > ss > s		Att.-Ion. -σ- Arc. -σ- (Cyp.?)
(7) *g ^w ol-		Att.-Ion. βούλομαι Arc.(-Cyp.?) βόλομαι
(8) nom. pl. article		οἱ, αἱ (Cyp. <i>o-i</i>)
(9) 1st pl. act. -μεν		-μεν
(10) *ε(Ϝ)ίκοσι		Att.-Ion. εἴκοσι Arc. εἴκοσι Cyp. <i>e-i-ko-so-to-i</i> (εἰκοστοί)
(11) εἰ, ἄν		Att.-Ion. εἰ, ἄν Arc. εἰ, ἄν Cyp. <i>e</i> (= ἦ), <i>ke</i> (κε)

Tab. 1. Southeast features.⁵²

In general terms, the remarkably reduced number of linguistic differences among Greek dialects constitutes the main reason for assuming that fragmentation happened within Greek geographical borders. Even though the classification of dialects is a complex matter, according to Porzig and Risch the features shared

⁵² *i-je-ro*: see also *i-je-re-u* ἱερεῦς as the more recent variant vs. *i-e-re-u* ἱερεύς; see *Introducción*, p. 172; *te-re-ja-e*: doubtful form, understood from *τελειῖαμι 'to fulfil an obligation' (< τελειῖα, cf. τέλος); *a₂-ri-e* could also be another athematic infinitive if its interpretation as ἄλιθεν (cf. ἄλιεῦω 'to fish') is correct. See *Introducción*, pp. 266-269 and *DMic. s.vv. te-re-ja; a₂-ri-e*.

by Attic-Ionic and Arcado-Cypriot corresponded to an early date because of the distribution of the different isoglosses.⁵³ On the contrary, features common to Attic-Ionic and Doric are more recent, after the Doric migration which had to be at the end of the 2nd millennium.⁵⁴ For the authors, shared characteristics of Arcado-Cypriot and Aeolic must be taken as inherited archaisms or at best as independent evolutions although the Aeolic clade has its own classification problems (§3.1.2). Consequently, the distinction of the Attic-Ionic and the Arcado-Cypriot had to be post-Mycenaean like the differentiation between Northwest Greek and Aeolic was.

Today Porzig's and Risch's key assumptions have been broadly accepted and constitute the *theoria recepta* although some of their tenets have been questioned in due course.⁵⁵ Not all the pieces fit in the puzzle: Aeolic dialects caused an important disruption, to the extent that Porzig and Risch held different views on this issue. The existence of divergent features between Mycenaean and Attic-Ionic but convergent with Aeolic also obliged them to explain the former as later innovations of Attic-Ionic and to call on alternative explanations to elucidate the latter. It was first accepted that Arcado-Cypriot were direct descendants of Mycenaean, although later research has yet to reach an agreement on their kinship (§3.1.3).

3.1.2. Mycenaean and Aeolic

The core problem affecting the relationship between Mycenaean and Aeolic lies in the origins of this dialectal group as a separate variety already in the 2nd millennium and in the shared isoglosses with Mycenaean – and, by extension, with Arcado-Cypriot.⁵⁶ The main difficulty of classification owes to the establishment of its exclusively defining linguistic features which also affects the subgrouping of Thessalian, Boeotian and Lesbian and to their pre- or post-Mycenaean chronology as an independent dialect branch.⁵⁷

⁵³ For an overview, see Finkelberg 2014.

⁵⁴ On Dorians and Mycenaean, see Chadwick's outdated 1976 hypothesis. On the problems of the North Greek group and the community of Proto-Aeolians and Proto-Dorians, see Méndez Dosuna 1985, pp. 279-292.

⁵⁵ Palmer 1980. To see how criticism has evolved over the years, see García Ramón 1980, pp. 24-31; 1984, pp. 267-271.

⁵⁶ Another related question concerns the role Aeolic played in the composition of the Homeric texts (§3.2), which is different depending on the Phase Model or to the Diffusion Model, and the interpretation of archaisms shared by Mycenaean, Aeolic dialects and Homer. An excellent account on Aeolic and Homeric tradition can be seen in Passa 2020², pp. 157-163.

⁵⁷ The main classifications differ between García Ramón 1975; 2010; Parke 2008. A more recent account can be found in Scarborough 2023, pp. 63-65. For general accounts on the evolution of the interpretations, see Cowgill 1966; García Ramón 1975; 1980; 1984; 2010, and Scarborough

Before the deciphering, 19th century theories relied on Strabo's consideration of Aeolic as an applicable 'label' for dialectal or ethnic groups different from Attic, Ionic and Doric, except for Franz H. L. Ahrens, who already considered Thessalian, Boeotian, and Lesbian as Aeolic dialects.⁵⁸ Linguistic debate moved forward thanks to the hypothesis of an Aeolic substrate postulated by Otto Hoffmann and Paul Kretschmer on the basis of the dialectal stratification issue of the model of three-migration waves (§2).⁵⁹ In the 1950s, robust linguistic arguments arrived in the dialectal research so that Aeolic was included in the *Nordgriechisch* group before Doric migration ca. 1200 (§3.1). Following Porzig and Risch, isoglosses shared by Lesbian and Ionic (i.e., assibilation) have been generally explained through recent contact after the Lesbian settlement in Asia Minor in the post-Mycenaean period, although a minority of scholars resort to the influence of South Greek on proto-Lesbians before Dorian migration (whereas proto-Thessalian and proto-Boeotian would belong to the West Greek area of influence).

Leaving aside reductionist interpretations of the Aeolic family,⁶⁰ Mycenaean evidence pushed forward the discussion on the dialect geography.⁶¹ An important revolutionary approach came in 1975 from García Ramón as the principal exponent for the post-Mycenaean dating of the Aeolic group. His tenets were contested by Holt Parker on the grounds of the absence of positive data for a post-Mycenaean Aeolian migration to Asia Minor and a disproportionate scepticism on the value of shared innovations.⁶² García Ramón responded, claiming the predominance of the comparative method and the principle of cumulative evidence.⁶³ More recently, research in this field has attempted to reconcile both approaches through quantitative analysis, as it mirrors Matthew Scarborough's recent 2023 publication, who ultimately confirms the linguistic kinship of Boeotian, Lesbian and Thessalian following the traditional classification.

2023, pp. 1-39. For an overview on Aeolic, see Méndez Dosuna 2007.

⁵⁸ Strabo 8.1.2. Ahrens 1839-1843, who furthermore considered Elean and Arcadian pseudo-Aeolic.

⁵⁹ Hoffmann 1882; Kretschmer 1909; 1923.

⁶⁰ We mainly refer to Gallavotti's 1958 and 1968 hypothesis that Mycenaean was the direct ancestor of Lesbian, and Doria 1979 on Mycenaean as an Ionic-Aeolic koine forerunner of Homeric Greek. The existence of the Aeolic group has been also contested by Coleman 1963; Wyatt 1970; Brixhe 2006b; Parker 2008.

⁶¹ *Evidence*, pp. 101-102; *Docs*, pp. 74-75; Cowgill 1966. Mycenology also benefited from new sociolinguistic approaches (Wyatt 1970) and quantitative methods (Coleman 1963).

⁶² Parker 2008. See also Rose 2008. In dialectological terms, shared innovations constitute the main evidence of a phase of specific community of two dialects; see Adrados's seminal work of 1952.

⁶³ García Ramón 2010. See the scepticism already expressed by Morpurgo Davies 1988, pp. 96-97 concerning García Ramón's hypothesis. For an overview, see García Ramón 1980; 1984; and 2006. More recently, Hajnal 2006, pp. 57-58; Scarborough 2023, pp. 20-21, 32-36.

We do not find the characteristic Aeolic forms in Mycenaean, such as the labial reflex for labiovelars before /e/ (cf. Aeol. πέλομαι vs. Myc. *qe-ro-me-no* < **k^wel-* ‘to become’), the -εσσι datives extended to the athematic declension, perfect participles in -οντ- or the feminine ἴα (= μία ‘one’). They can be directly understood as later innovations. However, there are three clearly common features: (1) the outcome ορ/ρο from syllabic resonants (cf. Lesb. στρότος, Boeot. στροτός ‘army’ ~ στρατός; Myc. *to-pe-za* *τόρπεζα ‘table’); (2) patronymic adjectives in -ιος (cf. Myc. *e-te-wo-ke-re-we-i-jo* *Ἐτεφοκλέφειος < PN Ἐτεφοκλέφης); and (3) thematic genitives in -οιο, exclusively common to Mycenaean and East Thessalian.⁶⁴ In 1953 Ventris and Chadwick posited that Mycenaean was the ancestor of Arcado-Cypriot and Aeolic. Their essential argument relied on the /o/ outcome in Mycenaean, Arcadian and Aeolic and, in their opinion, the alleged Aeolisms in Homer ultimately had to be Mycenaean forms.⁶⁵ Nevertheless, this issue is not that simple, and dialects, including Homer, do not convey a unique vocalic reflex. Today there is general agreement that /a/ vocalism is predominant and the unconditioned reflex in Mycenaean and in Arcado-Cypriot, while /o/ emerges within a labial environment (cf. §3.3).⁶⁶ In essence, the proposal of a unique linguistic filiation for Mycenaean and Aeolic, leaving aside other Southeast dialects, is excluded.⁶⁷ The discussion remains open without a satisfactory explanation, but, apart from the delicate question of the syllabic resonants, these features common to Aeolic and Mycenaean are better understood in terms of shared inherited forms which add to others, such as the preservation of **ā* and *(-)w-.

Recently, Ivo Hajnal has put forth once again the so-called ‘Aeolic idea’ in the 2nd millennium according to three possible isoglosses shared by the Aeolic dialects and Mycenaean:⁶⁸ (a) the athematic inflection of *verba vocalia* (cf. Myc. *po-ne-to(-qe)* /pónētoi/ from an athematic */pónēmai/ vs thematic /ponéjōmai/); (b) the diffusion in Mycenaean of fem. -ti-ra₂ /-tirrǎ(-)/ with -RRV- outcome

⁶⁴ The outcome of the first compensatory lengthening is problematic. While in Thessalian and Lesbian we find -VRR- and in Boeotian the lengthened vowel, it is difficult to establish the actual state of affairs in Mycenaean: forms like *me-no* or *o-pe-ro-sa* cannot display -Rs- since we would have expected ***me-so* (**μηνσός) and ***o-pe-no-sa* (**ὀφέλλονσα). But *a-ke-ra₂-te* probably conceals ἀγέφαντες (*-VRs- > -VRh-), although it might be a graphic archaism of a later lengthened (ἀγέφαντες) or geminated (ἀγέρραντες) form.

⁶⁵ *Evidence*, pp. 101-103.

⁶⁶ Morpurgo Davies 1968; Bernabé 1977. For Mycenaean, see Bartoněk 2003, p. 135 and *Introducción*, pp. 194-197. According to van Beek 2022, pp. 117-120, 501-503, the /o/ vocalism in the Aeolic dialects seems to be the unconditioned reflex of the syllabic resonants.

⁶⁷ See García Ramón 1984, pp. 268-269.

⁶⁸ Hajnal 2006, pp. 64-66. See the previous works of Peters 1986 and Ruijgh 1996 quoted in Hajnal 2006, pp. 57-58.

among the oblique cases of *nomina agentis* instead of */-triā-/*,⁶⁹ and (c) the thematic variant *-u-jo* (TH Gp 227.2) in Thebes for Gr. *υῖός* ‘son’ (§4.2), in connection with the 1st millennium thematic forms attested in Boeotian and Arcadian (along with Northwest Greek and Argolic). Nevertheless, the evidence is still weak, and the expected Theban is uniquely grounded on the athematic or thematic dialectal distribution for Gr. *υῖός*, which did not contribute to consolidate the linguistic contact between Mycenaean and (proto-)Aeolic. In Hajnal’s opinion, the debate, not yet settled, would open the door to a “mykenisch-nordgriechisches” transitional zone in the continental Greece at the end of the LH III B.

3.1.3. Mycenaean and Arcado-Cypriot

No one today questions that Mycenaean, Arcado-Cypriot and Attic-Ionic are South/East dialects. However, there is no consensus concerning the linguistic kinship between Arcado-Cypriot and Mycenaean: do they conform a linguistically unified dialectal branch in the 2nd millennium or two linguistically differentiated dialectal entities? In this second case, proto-Arcado-Cypriot is generally deemed post-Mycenaean, although it has also been proposed that it was contemporary to Mycenaean.⁷⁰ The answer to this question is directly linked to the old tenet that historical Arcadian was the direct successor of Mycenaean as already stated by Ventris and Chadwick in 1953 and 1956.⁷¹ Until the late 1970s, scholars were divided among three main positions: (a) those who supported a direct continuation of Mycenaean in the 1st millennium through Arcado-Cypriot or the so-called *mycénien special* (§4.2); (b) those who accepted its indirect continuation in the 1st millennium through its filiation with the Southeast group/Achaean; and (c) those who refused any 1st millennium survival of Mycenaean and deemed it an extinct variety (or at least somehow belonging to a form of koine or *Mischsprache* without further independent entity).⁷²

Ventris and Chadwick’s principal tenets were definitely challenged by Morpurgo Davies in 1992, who established that no innovation was exclusively shared by Mycenaean and Arcado-Cypriot (admittedly, the 3rd person middle *-(v)τοῖ* isogloss constitutes a retained archaism). Furthermore, according to the author, only 12 of the 25 “main Arcado-Cyprian isoglosses” date back to the

⁶⁹ Cf. dat. sg. *a-ke-ti-ra₂/asketirrāi/* (TH Of 36.1.2); gen. pl. *me-re-ti-ra₂-[o/meletirrā^hōn/* (PY Ad 308). On these forms, see previous interpretations in García Ramón 1984, pp. 248-249.

⁷⁰ On Arcado-Cypriot, see Panayotou 2007 and 2014.

⁷¹ See also Chadwick 1954, p. 17. They were followed shortly thereafter by Tovar 1964 or by *Études*, pp. 35-41.

⁷² For clarity, we have summarised Hajnal’s illuminating 2006 diagram, p. 55, but see further developments in García Ramón 1980, pp. 24-30; 1984, pp. 267-271.

2nd millennium; of these, only seven features are common to Mycenaean and Arcado-Cypriot:⁷³

- (1) assibilation of *-ti(-)*
- (2) *-āo* genitives in masculine a-stems
- (3) 3rd. sg./pl. *-(v)τοι* for primary middle endings
- (4) *ἀπό* preverb/preposition
- (6) Preposition/adverb Myc. *po-si*, Arc.-Cyp. *πός*
- (5) temporal adverbs in *-τε* (Myc. *o-te*, Arc. *τότε*, Cyp. *o-te*)
- (7) *ἱερός* (Myc. *i-je-ro*, Arc. *ἱερός*, Cyp. *(h)iero-*)

Therefore, exclusive common features of Arcadian and Cypriot must have relied on a common proto-Arcado-Cypriot subgrouping already differentiated from Mycenaean before their migration towards Cyprus.⁷⁴ The independent character of Mycenaean in the 2nd millennium with regard to (proto-)Arcado-Cypriot was also highlighted by Morpurgo Davies, who considered – in a much more cautious assumption – that the latter was the descendant of a proto-dialect very close to the former. Had the reconstruction of proto-Arcado-Cypriot totally corresponded to Mycenaean, it would have not proved their complete linguistic identity. In this way Morpurgo Davies contributed to a previous debate, like the one in García Ramón's 1984 contribution where he discusses the previous idea of the autonomous differentiation of Mycenaean.⁷⁵ Reducing the proposed number of alleged 'Mycenisms',⁷⁶ he argues for the common origin of the Southern dialects or, at best, its equal status with them.

More recently, Laurent Dubois has proposed that Proto-Arcado-Cypriot was contemporary to Mycenaean Greek on the grounds of isoglosses and indirect evidence.⁷⁷ He bases his hypothesis both on the isoglosses /en/ > /in/

⁷³ Morpurgo Davies 1992, pp. 425-426. She leaves the possibility of a common usage of Myc. *pa-ro* (~ *παρά*) with dative rather than with genitive as Arc.-Cyp. Arc. *ἀπό* and *ἐξ*.

⁷⁴ These features comprised (a) /en/ > /in/, (b) /o/ > /u/, (c) assibilated treatment of labiovelars before /e/ and /i/ (but see Hajnal 1997, pp. 131-138, 142), (d) athematic infinitives in *-(ε)ναι*, (e) athematic inflection of vowel-stem verbs, (f) demonstrative pronoun in *ὄν-* (cf. Arc. *ὄνι*, Cyp. *ὄνε* and Arc.-Cyp. *ὄνυ*), (g) *ὄν* for *ἀνά*, (h) *κάς* for *καί* and (h) *ἐν/iv* + accusative. Discussion of the isoglosses can be found in Morpurgo Davies 1992, pp. 422-427. For Brixhe 1989, pp. 39-40, the lack of /o/ > /u/ in Mycenaean (out of prepositions/preverbs) resorts to extra-linguistic and non-verifiable sociolinguistic conceptions: this raising would have characterised lower classes' speech. They would have been responsible for its later diffusion in Cyprus. On the linguistic and writing relations between Crete and Cyprus, see Morpurgo Davies – Olivier 2012.

⁷⁵ Adrados 1976; Melena 1976; Heubeck 1979; Dunkel 1981.

⁷⁶ García Ramón 1984, pp. 266-267. For the author, there are just three 'Mycenisms' (i.e., the dissimilation of labiovelars, the *i-jo/i-ju* forms for 'son', the reduplication in *ke-ke-me-na* and the frequency of the *-e-ja* /*-eya*/ suffix) and they do not constitute any solid proof that might "conferir una entidad dialectal independiente".

⁷⁷ Dubois 1997, p. 88.

and /-o/ > /-u/ and on some mythical information concerning Arcadia. However, linguistic support is not firm enough and he goes so far as to identify a direct linguistic connection between proto-Arcado-Cypriot and the dialect of Tegea. On a separate issue, Yves Duhoux explores the possibility of the existence of three dialect groupings before ca. 1190 on the account of two linguistic phenomena: assibilation and tmesis.⁷⁸ Therefore, he opposes (1) Proto-Doric, non-assibilating, to a second assibilating group comprised of (2a) Mycenaean, where the preverb would be still joined, and (2b) Proto-Attic-Ionic, in which tmesis occurs. Nonetheless, tmesis, whose absence in Mycenaean has different explanations,⁷⁹ does not suffice to support a further internal differentiation between Mycenaean and proto-Attic-Ionic.

3.2. Mycenaean and the Homeric language

One of the direct consequences of the deciphering resulted in the linguistic comparison of Linear B texts with the extant Homeric tradition and its archaeological and historic context. There is an enormous bibliography on this issue and has increased remarkably over the years, in particular in view of the post-Mycenaean findings during the so-called Dark Ages, above all from Lefkandi culture (X-IX cent. BC) and from Cyprus.⁸⁰ Archaeological and historical interpretations have benefited from the linguistic and philological analysis of the texts, primarily with regard to lexicon, as Mycenaean and Homeric texts have conveyed specific terms related to the material culture of the Bronze age (cf. Myc. *wa-na-ka*, Hom. (Ἰ)άναξ ‘king’; Myc. *di-pa*, Hom. δέπας ‘goblet’; Myc. *a-ro-u-ra*, Hom. ἄρουρα ‘arable land’; etc.).⁸¹ This also applies to specific lexicon, such as to several weapons already dated from the XV cent. BC, as specific kinds of swords and daggers (cf. Myc. *pa-ka-na* φάσγανα and *qi-si-pe-e*, nom. du. of *κ^wσίφος, Gr. ξίφος). Interestingly enough, metrics have contributed to preserving these terms in Homeric formulae, suggesting the existence of quite old dactylic formulae: cf. φάσγανον ἀργυρόηλον / ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον ‘silver-studded sword’ ((-) ~ - ~ - ~ - ~), or ἄσπιδος ἀμφιβρότης ‘shield that covers the whole man’ (- ~ - ~ - ~).

In pure linguistic terms, the fact that Homeric and Mycenaean Greek (and Arcado-Cypriot) share a significant amount of linguistic features led scholars to assume the existence of a real Achaean phase of the Homeric text, rather than a

⁷⁸ Duhoux 2014.

⁷⁹ Cf. n. 92.

⁸⁰ For an overview, see Driessen 1992. On this topic, we refer to the series of *Archaeologia Homerica* (Göttingen) and to more recent works such as Bennet – Sherratt 2016.

⁸¹ An overview in Risch – Hajnal 2006, pp. 171-174. On lexicon, see the first systematic studies in *MGVI* and *MGVII*. See *LGM* for more recent work.

simple Achaeian influence, as it was first defined by Meillet.⁸² These features can be broadly summarised as follows:

- (1) Non-contracted forms in *s*-stems (cf. Myc. acc. pl. n. *pa-we-a₂* φάρφρα ‘pieces of fabric’; Hom. φάρρα ‘wide cloak’), *ā*-stem genitives (cf. gen. pl. *ko-to-na-o* κτοινάων; gen. pl. *a-ra-ka-te-ja-o* ἄλακατειῶων) or common words (Hom. φά(φ)ος, ἄ(φ)εθλον).⁸³
- (2) Vocalic reflex /o/ for syllabic liquids and nasals (cf. Myc. *qe-to-ro-po-pi* κῶετρόποφι ‘quadrupedal’ < **k^wtwr-*; Hom. aor. ἤμβροτον from ἀμαρτάνω, etc.), although this is not the unique vocalic outcome in Mycenaean or in the Epic-Ionic tradition (§§3.1.2; 4.1).⁸⁴
- (3) Preservation of *(-)w- in all contexts, despite its metrically ensured absence in the most recent parts of the Homeric text (§2.1).
- (4) πτ- clusters vs. simple π- (cf. Hom. πτόλις ‘city’, πτόλεμος ‘war’; in Myc. is mainly preserved in onomastic formations with a first element *po-to-*, §2.1).
- (5) Thematic genitives in Myc. *-o-jo* (Hom. *-oio*).⁸⁵
- (6) Instrumental -φι, but with new syntactic values in Mycenaean⁸⁶ and in Homer, where it is also extended to all declensions, singular and plural (and sometimes conditioned by metrical convenience).
- (7) Dual forms, well-attested in Mycenaean (du. *di-pa-e* δίπαε, etc.) and in Homer.

⁸² Meillet 1965, p. 183. For whole linguistic accounts of features shared and not shared between Mycenaean and Homeric Greek, see Wathelet 1962; Negri 1981; Ruijgh 1988; 1995; 2008c²; 2011; Driessen 1992; Risch – Hajnal 2006, pp. 159-181.

⁸³ Myc. *do-e-ro* and *do-e-ra* (vs. Hom. δούλι-) in formulae such as δούλιον ἤμαρ ‘the day of slavery’ evince the more recent character of the Homeric text, where non-contracted forms, such as **δοέλιον ἤμαρ do not fit into the verse.

⁸⁴ These /o/ forms are deemed Aeolisms in the Epic-Ionic tradition. See discussion in Chantraine 1958³, pp. 23-25.

⁸⁵ In Myc., there are also *-ō* forms which could be read as genitives, but there is no consensus on its interpretation nor on the morphological ending under *-o*. They are mainly reduced to temporal expressions with the name of the month, see *Introducción*, pp. 215-217; Thompson 2017. However, it has been suggested that these types of genitives are also attested in the *Odos Pe-lopidou* tablets, in syntagms understood as “the son of X”, i.e., possessive genitives. See Pierini 2018; Jiménez Delgado, this volume.

⁸⁶ *Sintaxis*, pp. 91, 98-99. See also Jiménez Delgado, this volume.

- (8) Non-augmented verbs, which are overwhelmingly attested in Mycenaean (with only a pair of double forms *a-pe-do-ke* ἀπέδωκε and *a-ru-do-ke* ἀρύδωκε);⁸⁷ in Homer its presence is optional and depends on metrical requirements.⁸⁸
- (9) Patronymic adjectives in -ιος (cf. Myc. *e-te-wo-ke-re-we-i-jo* Ἐτεφοκλεφέγιος; Hom. Τελαμώνιος, Νηλήιος, etc.; cf. §3.1.2).
- (10) Absence of the definite article: total in Mycenaean, whereas in Homer the pronoun ὁ, ἡ τό assumed the demonstrative values.

Thus far, the existence of shared features between Mycenaean and the Homeric tradition have conditioned the debate on the distinct phases of the composition of the Homeric texts. From the 1950s, these linguistic affinities led to the conclusion that the Homeric tradition had an Achaean origin so that the Aeolisms were reduced or even overridden, as Ventris and Chadwick pointed out.⁸⁹ Despite the complexity of this topic, these common features are generally defined as archaisms, rather than as pure Achaean forms, as Cornelius J. Ruijgh has held, owing to the lack of positive evidence pointing towards an Achaean epic tradition.⁹⁰ In fact, many of them were also attested in Aeolic dialects (§3.1.3) and as such invalidated the idea of an Achaean (= South Greek) phase.⁹¹ Conversely, the diverging features have been explained as the result of pre-Mycenaean developments, although the debate on these forms is still open. It applies to tmesis absent, in principle, in Mycenaean although well-exploited in Homer,⁹² and to the outcomes for syllabic liquids (**r > or/ro*). While Mycenaean had already created a vocalic reflex – as is widely accepted –,⁹³ this syllabic

⁸⁷ For an alternative interpretation of the augmented *a-pe-do-ke* as /ap-es-dō-ke/, see *DMic s.v.* and Bartoněk 2003, p. 337. For *a-pe-e-ke* as an augmented aorist (ἀπέηκε), see *DMic s.v.*

⁸⁸ Non-augmented words were inherited from the Indo-European injunctive mood and reinterpreted as past tenses when the mood lost its value in Greek. In Greek Epic, non-augmented verbs were metrically convenient, as in Homeric poems. In Mycenaean it is generally acknowledged that the injunctive had already disappeared, but see García Ramón 2012, pp. 441-448.

⁸⁹ *Evidence*, p. 103.

⁹⁰ Ruijgh 1988. The most complete works for and against this Achaean phase are those of Ruijgh 1955 and Peters 1986, respectively. For the different models of composition of the Homeric texts, see n. 56.

⁹¹ For a reassessment of the different phases of the Homeric texts based on Mycenaean data, also see Adrados 1981; Crespo Güemes 1977; 2003; Ruijgh 2011.

⁹² Its absence in Mycenaean, as opposed to Epic, has been explained in terms of chronology (Horrocks 1980) or style (Morpurgo Davies 1985, pp. 86-88; Hajnal 2004). For an overview, see Hajnal 2004 with previous bibliography.

⁹³ But Heubeck 1972, later followed by García Ramón 1985; 2016, p. 216 argues for the preservation of the vocalic value of **r* in Mycenaean. An overview in Risch – Hajnal 2006, pp. 201-218.

liquid in the Homeric poems is preserved infrequently, as we deduce from the scansion of ἀνδροτήτα (~ ~ - ~) in the final hexametric clause λίπους ἀνδροτήτα καὶ ἦβην “leaving virility and vigour aside” (*Il.* 16.857, 22.363). The apparent metrical inconsistency of ἀνδροτήτα is better explained as it stands for an older **anrtāta*, where **r* is the syllabic nucleus.⁹⁴

As far as prosody is concerned, some authors have proposed that some metrical irregularities owe to the phonetic status of the aspiration coming from the lenition of **s* and **j* on the basis of Mycenaean evidence.⁹⁵ Accordingly, these oddities in some Homeric formulae would be resolved through the reconstruction of an aspiration, such as πόντια Ἥρη “mistress Hera”, where there is an irregular hiatus between both words, or βέλος ἐχεπευκές “sharp-pointed arrow”, where the last syllable of βέλος needs to be a heavy one. This initial *h*- must have avoided hiatus (πόντια Ἥρη - ~ ~ - -) and lengthened the last syllable of βέλος (**βέλος* *hechepeuchēs* ~ - ~ ~ - ~). However, there is no consensus on this interpretation since they have been alternatively explained as artificial lengthenings.

As we have seen here briefly, the decipherment not only shed some light on the material culture portrayed in the Homeric world, but it also balanced the debate about the older phases of the Homeric poems. To this effect, scholars even searched for the positive written evidence regarding the identification of metrical cola in Linear B (or even earlier, in pre-Mycenaean period) to reconstruct the history of the hexameter as an external loan since it does not fit well into the natural rhythm of Greek.⁹⁶

However, all these issues are far from precluding further discussion and it is again evident that more evidence is required to respond to the new queries that have arisen with the advent of Mycenaean in dialectological studies.

4. Linguistic variation in Linear B documents

One of the objectives of dialectal studies is to analyse linguistic variation in a given language and the existence of subvarieties. Within Mycenaean Greek, linguistic variation has been approached from the existence of alternative spellings in Linear B tablets, which can affect: (a) the whole Mycenaean language,⁹⁷

⁹⁴ The form also precedes the creation of the epenthetic consonant in the medial position. The same principle also applies to the previously quoted ἀμφιβρότης, scanned - ~ ~ - when it corresponded to **amp^himrtās*.

⁹⁵ Ruijgh 1988.

⁹⁶ Ruijgh 1988, pp. 225-231; 2008c², pp. 495-500. In his opinion, the loan must come from the Minoan world.

⁹⁷ We refer, for instance, to the double treatment of **yV-*, reinforced (cf. *ze-u-ke-si* ζεύγε(σ)σι, < **yeug-*) or with initial aspiration (cf. *o-* and *jo-* for (y)ός), cf. §2.1. See Duhoux 1990.

(b) specific series of tablets,⁹⁸ (c) concrete scribal habits,⁹⁹ (d) variations among the distinct administrative centres or (e) internal differences within a specific place. The core question is whether these alternative spellings constitute mere graphic variants or whether they reflect representative linguistic variants for intradialectal reconstruction.¹⁰⁰

From the very first studies, Ventris and Chadwick already highlighted that “the dialect appears to be extremely uniform and that the differences which have been found are more likely matters of orthography than phonetics”.¹⁰¹ This uniformity is due to the intrinsic characteristics of Linear B tablets, which were written within the sphere of the palaces for and by the elite, offering an official written discourse. This striking homogeneity has been justified on the grounds that some scribal schools must have existed despite the lack of positive evidence in this sense.¹⁰² Nevertheless, today it is believed that alternative linguistic subvarieties must have existed across time and space as is generally expected for any language. From a strictly methodological point of view, however, the brief nature of Linear B documents and their unequal distribution along with the partially extant evidence considerably restricts linguistic reconstruction and is insufficient to draw any firm conclusions on real linguistic subvarieties; it would be preferable to be cautious and refer to linguistic/dialectal internal tendencies.

In the following sections, we will focus on the most significant aspects as they have been underscored adopting both a geographical perspective, searching for dialectal variants among the palatial centres which have provided Linear B texts (§4.1), and a diastatic and diaphasic view due to the conditioned nature of texts, which reflect a chancellery language and are the product of particular scribes (§4.2).

⁹⁸ Hesitant spellings are particularly frequent in the tablets of the S-series of Knossos. They concern graphic variants in (a) material adjectives in *-e-jo* (-ειος) which emerge along with *-e-o* (-ειος) (cf. *e-re-pa-te-jo* ἔλεφαντέγοις ‘made of ivory’ vs. the minoritarian *e-re-pa-te-o* ἔλεφαντέχοις [KN Se 1007.2, Xf 8107]; etc. For different interpretations of Knossian *-e-o* forms as “Schnellsprechvariante” for *-e-jo* (*l-(C)ejo-*), see Risch – Hajnal 2006, pp. 234, and on (b) *-tu-we/-twe-* and *-ku-we-/ke-we-* (cf. *o-da-tu-we-ta* [KN So 894.3] and *o-da-twe-ta* [KN So(1) 4430.b, 4432, 4436.1, 4440.b, So 8561] for ὀδατφεντα vs. *o-da-ku-we-ta* [KN So 4435.B] and *o-da-ke-we-ta* [KN Sf 1811.5.6, So(2) 4446.1] for ὀδακφέντα, ‘provided with teeth’).

⁹⁹ The practice of using alternative spellings by the same hand is not infrequent, as we see in the Pylian graphic variants *-ti-ri-ja* and *-ti-ra₂* attested in the same form and by the same hand (cf. *a-ke-ti-ri-ja* PY Aa(2) 717 (H 1), but *a-ke-ti-ra₂* in PY Aa(2) 815 (H 1)). For an overview, see Palaima 2011; Palaima – Bibee 2014, and Del Frio 2016b, pp. 199-208.

¹⁰⁰ For an exclusive graphic approach, see Del Frio 2016a.

¹⁰¹ *Docs*, pp. 75-76.

¹⁰² Ventris and Chadwick already used “scribal schools” (*Docs*, pp. 75-76) and attributed the outstanding linguistic uniformity of Mycenaean Greek to them. On the training of Mycenaean scribes, see Del Frio 2016a, pp. 163-164.

4.1. Mycenaean subvarieties and the issue of ‘normal’ and ‘special’ Mycenaean

In 1965, during the Cambridge Colloquium, Risch proposed the existence of two differentiated subdialectal varieties in Pylos according to the observable graphic fluctuations in the LB texts.¹⁰³ They affected (1) the oscillation between /o/ and /a/ vocalism as the outcome of syllabic nasals, (2) the vocalic alternation between /e/ and /i/ in some words (cf. dat. *a-ti-mi-te* Ἀρτιμίτει vs. gen. *a-te-mi-to* Ἀρτέμιτος) and (3) dat. sg. -ει vs. -ι in athematic stems (cf. *po-se-da-o-ne* vs. *po-se-da-o-ni* for Ποσειδάωνι). The scholar deemed the first variety ‘mycénien normal’ (MN), which presented /o/ < *Ń, /i/ vocalism, and dat. -ει, and the second as ‘mycénien special’ (MS), with /a/ < *Ń, /e/ vocalism, and dat. -ι. Afterwards, two more features were added: first the assibilation in MN vs. the non-assibilation in MS (4) by Gregory Nagy, rejected by Risch, and, second, the difference in spelling of words which contain *(-)TRC- by Thomas G. Palaima. Here we find an alternative vocalization of /o/: cf. *to-no* /t^hor.nos/ in MN but *to-ro-no-wo-ko* /t^hro.nos/ in MS for Gr. θρόνος (5).¹⁰⁴ Similarly, later research enriched the dossier with evidence from Knossos, Mycenae and Thebes.¹⁰⁵

	<i>Normal Mycenaean (MN)</i>	<i>Special Mycenaean (MS)</i>
(1)	/o/ vocalism from syllabic nasal in labial environment	/a/ vocalism from syllabic nasal in labial environment
(2)	/i/ vocalism in some words in a labial environment (dat. sg. <i>a-ti-mi-te</i> /Artimitei/)	/e/ in some words in a labial environment (gen. sg. <i>a-te-mi-to</i> /Artemitos/)
(3)	dat. sg. -e (-ει) in C-stems	dat. sg. -i (-ι) in C-stems
(4)	Assibilated (*-ti(-) >) -σι(-) /si/	Unassibilated (*-ti(-) >) -τι(-) /ti/
(5)	*TRT > TVRT (<i>to-no</i> /t ^h ornos/)	*TRT > TRVT (<i>to-ro-no</i> /t ^h ronos/)

Tab. 2. Differences between ‘normal’ and ‘special’ Mycenaean.¹⁰⁶

The ‘normal’ forms were conceived of as the characterising features of the ‘chancellery’ language of the upper social groups, more conservative, whereas the ‘special’ were interpreted as local deviations closer to the everyday language

¹⁰³ Risch 1966.

¹⁰⁴ Nagy 1968; Risch 1979; and Palaima 1998-1999.

¹⁰⁵ For Knossos, see Woodard 1986; for Mycenae, Varias García 1993; 1994; 1994-1995, and for Thebes, Morpurgo Davies 2006; Hajnal 2006.

¹⁰⁶ On the so-called ‘liquid metathesis’ (5), see van Beek 2021, pp. 37-38.

of the lower classes. Thus explained in diastratic terms, only one of these variants would have survived after the palatial collapse according to Risch: “L’une est tombée avec la catastrophe qui a détruit les palais mycéniens, tandis que l’autre a survécu.”¹⁰⁷

This hypothesis has a long following among scholars and gave rise to Chadwick’s later hypothesis that MS, whose features resembled West Greek dialects, was the substandard employed by proto-Dorians.¹⁰⁸ Therefore, Doric speakers would have already been present in the Peloponnese before the traditional post-Mycenaean date for their arrival. Chadwick explained their presence in Pylos as a population subjugated to the speakers of MN, a Southeast variety (§3.1.1) which characterised the language of higher social groups. However, the linguistic arguments were already contested by Risch, who dismissed all these ‘special’ features as proper West Greek characteristics.¹⁰⁹ Furthermore, linguistic differences found alternative explanations that today challenge Chadwick’s tenets. For Brixhe, linguistic variations result from ongoing changes, as we deduce from the syncretism of cases or the coexistence of *-ει* and *-ι* datives.¹¹⁰ Additionally, he resorts to marked sociolinguistic explanations for some linguistic traits that exceed the extant evidence: for instance, he gratuitously resolved that *-ι* datives were preferred by lower classes of Mycenaean society.¹¹¹ In another vein, ‘special’ forms should have been mere diachronic variants according to Hajnal, so that MS was the more innovative one.¹¹² As for Rupert Thompson, he questioned the subdialectally-characterising features of MS and MN. Alternatively, the variants can be analysed in terms of ongoing morphological and phonetic changes (3), sometimes lexically restricted (1, 5). They can also be justified as non-Greek origin terms (2) or because of the onomastic nature of the words, largely limited to proper names and ethnics, more exposed to analogy and linguistic conservatism (4).¹¹³

¹⁰⁷ Risch 1966, p. 157.

¹⁰⁸ Chadwick 1976; 1985.

¹⁰⁹ Risch 1979, p. 279. See also Parker 1993.

¹¹⁰ Brixhe 1991, p. 253.

¹¹¹ Brixhe 1991, p. 257. Following this premise, Brixhe 1989, pp. 39-40 attributes the absence of the raising [o] > [u] in Mycenaean but observed in Arcado-Cypriot and Pamphylian to its use by these lower classes; the phenomenon, not attested or avoided in textual evidence, would have arisen later within the new settlements of this 1st millennium population.

¹¹² Hajnal 1997. Concerning Thebes, Hajnal 2006, p. 58 concludes that the linguistic features traditionally defining ME also emerge in Thebes, but that they have to be attributed to chronological or sociolect variation, not to extra-dialectal or foreign influence.

¹¹³ Thompson 1996-1997. In Thompson 2002-2003, the author responds to the criticisms expressed by Palaima 1998-1999 to his first work. In Thompson 2021, the author questions that these special features could stand for a substandard variety of Mycenaean Greek given that many accounts resort to the low frequency of some of these items to see them as substandard forms.

4.2. Linguistic and graphic variation in Mycenaean centres

As things currently stand, we can assume that there were no major differences between palatial centres so as to support clearly cut subdialectal varieties in LB tablets. While some scholars still play down these graphic and linguistic variations,¹¹⁴ they remain frequent enough for them to be prone to accept at least some linguistic preferences between Pylos and Knossos, as Dubois already highlighted.¹¹⁵ The distribution of the more noteworthy features can be summarised as follows:

	<i>Pylos</i>	<i>Knossos</i>
(1)	/ha/ regularly written through <a ₂ >	<a ₂ > /ha/ is almost absent
(2)	More regular preservation of *-IyV-	More regular writing of (*-IyV- >) -VV-
(3)	Less regular writing of the second element of <i>i</i> -diphthongs (e.g., <i>ko-to-na</i> /ktoinā/)	Regular writing of the second element of <i>i</i> -diphthongs (e.g., <i>ko-to-i-na</i> /ktoinā/)
(4)	<i>pe-mo</i> (<* <i>sper-mḡ-</i>) as the prevalent outcome, but <i>pe-ma</i> in the scribe 24	<i>pe-ma</i> (<* <i>sper-mḡ-</i>) as the prevalent outcome
(5)	Very limited use of <i>-i-jo</i> (-io-) forms for material adjectives	Extensive use of <i>-i-jo</i> (-io-) together with <i>-e-jo</i> (-εio-) and <i>-e-o</i> (-εο-)
(6)	Athematic dat. sg. mostly in <i>-e</i> (ει) but also <i>-i</i> (-ι)	Athematic dat. sg. always in <i>-e</i> (-ει)
(7)	Use of <i>-wont-</i> suffix	Absence of <i>-wont-</i> suffix
(8)	Use of <i>to-so-de</i> (τό(σ)σονδε)	Extremely low use of <i>to-so-de</i> (τό(σ)σονδε)
(9)	Low use of the preposition <i>o-pi</i>	More extensive use of preposition <i>o-pi</i>
(10)	<i>me-ta</i> μετά ‘with’	<i>pe-da</i> πεδά ‘towards; with(?)’
(11)	Exclusive use of the introductory particle <i>o-da-a₂</i> (and <i>o-a₂</i> and <i>o-de-qa-a₂</i>)	Total absence (like in the rest of centres)

Tab. 3. Differences between Pylian and Knossian documents.¹¹⁶

These variations concern phonetics (1-4), morphology (5-7), lexicon and syntax (8-11). From the linguistic differences argued for the existence of MN

¹¹⁴ Bartoněk 2003, pp. 454-457.

¹¹⁵ Dubois 1987; 2007.

¹¹⁶ On (11) see Duhoux 1987, pp. 117-118. For their complex interpretations, see *DMic. s.vv.* and Jiménez Delgado, this volume.

and MS (§4.1), only the athematic dative ending constitutes a salient feature (6) to linguistically distinguish Knossos and Pylos. Other linguistic traits could be added to these list,¹¹⁷ such as the Pylian tendency to form an athematic adjective *a-no-we* (ἀνώρες ‘without handles’) and to use *wo-ka* φογά for ‘chariot’ (< **weg^h-*, cf. ὀχέομαι, lat. *veho*),¹¹⁸ in comparison with the Knossian thematic formation *a-no-wo-to* ἀνώφοτον, with the further addition of a suffix, and the term *i-qi-ja* ἰκκ^{wiā} for ‘chariot’ (< **ek^wo-*, cf. Gr. ἵππος ‘horse’).¹¹⁹ However the number and frequency of examples are not significant enough to represent real (sub)dialect-marking features.¹²⁰ On the whole, ‘Cretan’ Mycenaean differs very little from the continental Mycenaean. Therefore, variants have been explained through the earlier dating of the Cretan Linear B texts and through the Minoan adstratum¹²¹ and through divergent dialectal developments after the separation of Cretan and continental Mycenaean from Pylos, as was already suggested by Ventris and Chadwick.¹²²

One of the most revealing examples of the difficulty of interpreting these graphic variants is the case of <a> and <a₂> (1). While the latter represents aspiration /ha/, <a> can represent both /a/ and /ha/.¹²³ In continental Pylos and Thebes, both <a> and <a₂> are displayed in documents, and even though <a₂> it was not compulsory it was constant in the initial position. There also exists a unique example in Knossos of *a₂* as word initial and it is quite telling since the original *a-ke-te-re* (KN V(1) 118) was later corrected by the scribe introducing *a₂-ke-te-re* with initial aspiration. It can be explained *ad hoc* as a mere amendment of the standard form with aspiration (*a₂-ke-te-re*) in a period when **h* was (or was starting to be) lost,¹²⁴ but it has also served to propose that the weakening of /h/ (< **s*) in Knossos was more advanced than in other centres. Torsten Meissner has recently held that the loss of /h/ might have occurred earlier in Knossos because

¹¹⁷ Risch 1979, pp. 97-101 (= 1987, pp. 275-279).

¹¹⁸ This hypothesis has been contested by Bernabé 2016, p. 523 in favour of the previous interpretation as φογά ‘manufacturing’. For a discussion on the meaning of *wo-ka*, see *LGM s.v.* ἔργον.

¹¹⁹ *Introducción*, p. 326.

¹²⁰ For a methodological point of view based on frequency and statistics, see Duhoux 1987.

¹²¹ On the oldest character of Cretan Mycenaean, see Hajnal 1997, pp. 213. For Driessen (*RCT*, p. 193) the linguistic evidence coming from the so-called ‘Room of the Chariots Tablets’ “too shares the same language and dialect as well as an amount of spelling deviations with the other tablet collections”.

¹²² *Docs*, pp. 75-76; see also Duhoux 1987; 2007b; Hajnal 1997, p. 233. For Mycenaean in Mycenae, see Varias 1994-1995 (cf. §4.1).

¹²³ Melena 2014, pp. 73-78. Together with <a₂>, only the extremely rare <pu₂>/p^hu/ renders aspiration in LB texts as opposed to <pu>, which stands for /pu/ and /p^hu/ (Melena 2014, pp. 71-73).

¹²⁴ This issue became even more relevant due to the psilotic character of 1st millennium Cretan (although the details concerning the transition from a South dialect to a Doric one in the 1st millennium are still obscure).

of the regular writing of a non-phonemic *j*-glide in intervocalic position where /ha/ was expected.¹²⁵ In any case, it should be noted that *a*₂ is only attested on the oldest Knossian tablets: those found in the Room of the Chariots Tablets (RCT) and in the North Entrance Passage (NEP).¹²⁶ Marie-Louise Nosch considers that “at Knossos we can observe that the psilosis process is underway in the RCT and NEP, and we can date its completion to the phases after the NEP”.¹²⁷ Given that the psilotic character of Cretan Mycenaean relies on this isolated example of *a*₂, many authors have questioned the linguistic nature of the change since they preferred to explain it as a graphic phenomenon caused by scribal preferences.

Following the expected publication of the new tablets found in Thebes, scholars seized on the opportunity to search for specific regional features. Especially relevant were the works of Morpurgo Davies and Hajnal.¹²⁸ The former argues that Theban data may speak to linguistic tendencies in qualitative terms even though, quantitatively, there are few instances. From the scarce extant data, Morpurgo Davies noticed the following preferences observed on Theban tablets in reference to Dubois’s study of 1987: more regular absence of intervocalic glide (cf. *qe-te-o*, *qe-te-a*₂ vs. *qe-te-jo*)¹²⁹ (2); non-writing of the second element of *i*-diphthongs (cf. *wo-ko-de* φοϊκόνδε, *po-te-u* (PN) vs. KN *wo-i-ko-de*, *po-i-te-u*)¹³⁰ (3); absence of *to-so-de* (cf. *to-so-pa* τό(σ)σοσ πάνς, *to-so-ku-su-pa* τό(σ)σον ξύμπαν(τ))¹³¹ (7). There is also an increasing tendency to use *a*₂ instead of plain *a* (1), as in Pylos, and the prevailing *-e* (-ει) ending for dative-locative (6).¹³²

In dialectological terms, Theban documents also provided new parallels and non-attested forms which enriched our knowledge of Mycenaean, of which we might highlight:¹³³

- (a) A non-assimilated sequence of labiovelars in dat. pl. *i-qa-po-qa-i* (ικκ^wο-φοργ^wοϊη ‘ostlers’; seven examples in TH Fq) vs. dissimilated ones (cf. *i-po-po-qa-i* ιππο-φοργ^wοϊη

¹²⁵ Meissner 2007. In mainland centres, the preservation of graphic hiatuses, where *a*₂ could have been used, prevails indicating that the aspiration was preserved.

¹²⁶ Nosch 2022.

¹²⁷ Nosch 2022, p. 157.

¹²⁸ Morpurgo Davies 2006, p. 123, who also compared the state of affairs described by Chadwick 1970 and 1975.

¹²⁹ *qe-te-o* (TH Wu 49.β; 50.β; 53.β; 63.β), *qe-te-a*₂ (TH Wu 51.γ; 65.γ; 96.γ), *qe-te-jo* (TH Gp 109.1; 147.1.2).

¹³⁰ *wo-ko-de* (TH Of 36.2), *po-te-u* (TH Ug 41).

¹³¹ *to-ʃo-pa* (TH Ft 140.8), *to-so-ku[-su-pa]* (TH Fq 236.8, cf. *DMic.Supl. s.v.*).

¹³² *-e-i* only occurs in s-stems (*-εσι > -ει), except for *a-dwe-e* (TH Wu 99); see Morpurgo Davies 2006, p. 122. The interpretation of this term is, however, unclear. See *DMic.Supl. s.v.*

¹³³ We do not take into consideration aberrant forms once attested, such as PN]*ta-me-je-u* (TH Av 106.5) *Ταμειεύς (see *DMic.Supl. s.v.*) instead of *ta-mi-je-u* (PY Jn 310.3) *Ταμειύς.

- PY Fn 79.10)**¹³⁴
- (b) Possible evidence of two different dative singular endings of *i*-stems: *-e* (-ει) in *ma-di-je* and *-i* (-ι) in *pa-pa-ra-ki* (**TH Of 25.2**) if the latter belongs to this declension.¹³⁵
 - (c) Possible evidence of two different dative singular endings of *u*-stems: *-we* in PN *de-u-ke-we* (-φει) and *-u* in PN *ko-ru* (Κόρυ).¹³⁶ If dat. *ko-ru* is correctly interpreted, it will match another Knossian couplet, i.e., *e-ri-nu* Ἐρινύι (**KN Fp(1) 1.8**) and *e-ri-nu-we* Ἐρινύει (**KN V 52 lat.inf.**).
 - (d) Thematic declension in Theban variant *-u-jo* (**TH Gp 227.2**) for ‘son’ (**suHju-*, Gr. υἰός), along with *i-jo* and *i-**65 forms from Knossos, Pylos and Mycenae (§3.1.2).¹³⁷
 - (e) Further examples of *o-te* (ὄτε),¹³⁸ attested only once in Pylos (**PY Ta 711.1**).

According to Morpurgo Davies, linguistic variation in Theban documents cannot be disregarded since “there may be more unexpected variation” because “alternations which are based on a mixture of archaisms and innovations point to a language which is not fossilized”.¹³⁹ Indeed, the archaism dat. pl. *te-ka-ta-si* τέκτασι ‘carpenter’ from τέκτων – with zero-grade – (<**tektḥ-si*, **TH Fq 247.3; Gp 112.1, 114.2**) came across more recent forms pointing to an evolving regional language. Hajnal stressed that deviant forms, especially those associated with the ‘Mycénien special’ (§4.1), turned out to be chronologically conditioned

¹³⁴ In *FDC I*, p. 202, it is hypothesised that Pylian *i-po-po-qi* constitutes an early example of the later 1st millennium development **k^w* > /p/ (cf. ἵππος) as opposed to the Theban *i-qi-po-qi*, which renders the archaism, but this hypothesis has no grounds, so we have to refuse his interpretation of *i-po-po-qi* as a substandard dialectal form.

¹³⁵ Morpurgo Davies 2006, p. 121; Hajnal 2006, pp. 58-60. *ma-di-je* is better attested in Thebes (11 ex.), whose nom. *ma-di* is attested in **KN As(1) 603.2** (see *DMic.Supl. s.v. ma-di*).

¹³⁶ For *de-u-ke-we* see *DMic.Supl. s.v.* The term *ko-ru* (Κόρυ) appears in **TH Fq 254.4** and written *ko-ru* over a previous *[[ko-ru-we]]* in **TH Fq 126.3**. See also Morpurgo Davies 2006, p. 122 and Sacconi 2005, along with the doubts cast by Hajnal 2006, p. 60, since as Killen 2015, pp. 1116-1118 points out these forms can be nominatives of rubric rather than datives in *-u*. Furthermore, Theban texts also endorsed previously known deviant forms; see, for instance, dat.-loc. sg. of the *u*-stem *e-u-te-re-u* (**TH Ft 140.2**) compared to *-a-ke-re-u* (**PY Cn(1) 441.2-3**) vs. dat.-loc. *a-ke-re-we* (**PY Un 1193.3**).

¹³⁷ See discussion in Hajnal 2006, pp. 64-66 with previous bibliography, and Duhoux 2007a. For the interpretation of the syllabogram *65 as *ju*, see Judson, this volume: in Thebes, the athematic form *i-**65 probably also appears in the Fq and Gp series provided that Palaima were right in reading the sign which the editors interpret as logogram *129 (FAR) as the syllabogram *65 (See Palaima 2006).

¹³⁸ **TH Fq 126.1, 130.1, 254.1.**

¹³⁹ Morpurgo Davies 2006, pp. 123-124.

linguistic variants.¹⁴⁰ Be that as it may, it is clear that Chadwick's words, prior to the discovery of the new Theban tablets, are still valid: "There is still far too little evidence upon which to assess the Theban variety of the Mycenaean dialect".¹⁴¹ As we can see, all of this documentation now offers us a more vivid and dynamic linguistic depiction.¹⁴²

5. Mycenaean and its future within dialectological studies

The decipherment of Linear B has proven to be significant and vital for the study of Greek dialects and their evolution, chronology and classification as we have seen through this overview which necessarily cannot delve more into each issue. Over these pages, also suitable for non-specialists, we have attempted to show how the progressive scholarly incursion into Mycenaean Greek thanks to the first works of Ventris, Chadwick, Porzig, Risch and Adrados laid the foundation of the discipline and pushed forward many aspects of Greek dialectology which until then remained obscure or blurred. Nonetheless, its irruption into the field resulted in new linguistic challenges to be addressed as is to be expected from such a thrilling breakthrough.

Many questions remain unresolved, as were highlighted by García Ramón: the degree of dialectal differentiation in the Mycenaean period, the dialect map of the linguistic forerunners of the 1st millennium historical dialects and internal linguistic differentiation, not only among the palatial centres known until now, but also within the same administrative centre.¹⁴³ It is our sincere hope that future findings and publications – such as the new texts from Ayios Vasilios (Laconia) – allow us to resolve these uncertainties, or at least some of them...

¹⁴⁰ Hajnal 2006, p. 64.

¹⁴¹ *TT II*, p. 97.

¹⁴² Hajnal 2006, p. 67 draws the same conclusion. Theban evidence remains disappointing as far as proto-Aeolian is concerned, cf. §3.1.2.

¹⁴³ García Ramón 1980, p. 31.

Bibliographical references

- Adrados, F. R. 1952, *La Dialectología griega como fuente para el estudio de las migraciones indoeuropeas en Grecia*, Salamanca.
- Adrados, F. R. 1976, “Micénicos, dialectos paramicénicos y aqueo épico”, *Emerita* 44, pp. 65-113.
- Adrados, F. R. 1981, “Towards a new Stratigraphy of the Homeric Dialect”, *Glotta* 59, pp. 13-27.
- Ahrens, H. L. 1839-1843, *De graecae linguae dialectis*, Göttingen.
- Barrio Vega, M^a. L. 2014, “Southeast Greek”, *EAGLL* II, pp. 260-267.
- Bartoněk, A. 1968a, “Greek Dialectology After the Decipherment of Linear B”, in *Studia Mycenaea*, pp. 37-51.
- Bartoněk, A. 1968b, “Dialectal Classification of Mycenaean in the Opinion of Various Scholars”, in *Studia Mycenaea*, pp. 155-210.
- Bartoněk, A. 1972a, “The Brno Inquiry into the Problems of the Dialectal Classification of Mycenaean”, *Minos* 12, pp. 346-360.
- Bartoněk, A. 1972b, “The Relevance of the Linear B Linguistic Phenomena for the Classification of the Mycenaean”, in *Acta Mycenaea*, pp. 329-345.
- Bartoněk, A. 1979, “Greek Dialects between 1000 and 300 B.C.”, *SMEA* 20, pp. 113-130.
- Bartoněk, A. 1996, “The Mycenaean Language and Dialect”, in *Secondo Congresso*, Vol. I, pp. 7-23.
- Bartoněk, A. 2003, *Handbuch des mykenischen Griechisch*, Heidelberg.
- Bennet, J. – Sherratt, S. (eds.) 2016, *Archaeology and the Homeric Epic*, Oxford-Philadelphia.
- Bernabé, A. 1977, “La vocalización de las sonantes indoeuropeas en griego”, *Emerita* 46, pp. 269-298.
- Bernabé, A. 2016, “Testi relativi a carri e ruote”, in *Manuale*, pp. 511-550.
- Bernabé, A. – Luján, E. R. 2006, *Introducción al griego micénico. Gramática, selección de textos y glosario*, Monografías de Filología Griega, Zaragoza.
- Brixhe, Cl. 1989, “Morphonologie ou morphographémie? A propos de quelques variations graphiques en grec ancien”, *BSL* 84, pp. 21-54.
- Brixhe, Cl. 1991, “Du mycénien aux dialectes du Ier millénaire: quelques aspects de la problématique”, D. Musti (ed.), *La transizione del miceneo all’alto arcaismo: dal palazzo alla città (Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Roma, 14-19 marzo 1988)*, Roma, pp. 251- 271.
- Brixhe, Cl. 2006a, “Préhistoire et début de l’histoire des dialectes grecs”, *ILing* 29, pp. 39-59.
- Brixhe, Cl. 2006b, “Situation, spécificité et contraintes de la dialectologie

- grecque: à propos de quelques questions soulevées par la Grèce centrale”, in C. Brixhe, G. Vottéro (eds.), *Peuplements et genèses dialectales dans la Grèce antique*, Paris, pp. 39-69.
- Brixhe, Cl. 2015, “Langue et écriture”, in P. Tsatsopoulou-Kaloudi, Cl. Brixhe, Ch. Pardalidou (eds.), *Αρχαία Ζώνη I: Το Ιερό του Απόλλωνα*, Vol. 1, Κομοτηνή, pp. 282-306, 385-412.
- Brixhe, Cl. 2018, “Thracian”, in J. Klein, B. Joseph, M. Fritz (eds.), *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics, HSK 41.3*, Berlin-Boston, pp. 1850-1854.
- Chadwick J. 1954, “Mycenaean: a newly discovered Greek dialect”, *TPhS* 53, pp. 1-17.
- Chadwick J. 1956, “The Greek Dialects and Greek Pre-History”, *Greece & Rome* 3, pp. 38-50.
- Chadwick J. 1976, “Who were the Dorians?”, *PP* 31, pp. 103-117.
- Chadwick J. 1963, “The Prehistory of the Greek Language”, in I. E. S. Edwards, C. J. Gadd, N. G. L. Hammond, E. Sollberger (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*³, Vol. II.2, Cambridge, pp. 805-819.
- Chadwick J. 1985, “I Dori e la creazione dei dialetti greci”, in D. Musti (ed.), *Le origini dei greci: Dori e mondo egeo*, Bari, pp. 3-12.
- Chantraine, P. 1958³, *Grammaire homérique. Tome 1, Phonétique et morphologie*, Paris.
- Chantraine, P. 1961², *Morphologie historique du grec*, Paris.
- Coleman, R. 1963, “The Dialect Geography of Ancient Greek”, *TPhS* 62, pp. 58-126.
- Colvin, S. 2007, *A Historical Greek Reader: Mycenaean to the Koine*, Oxford.
- Colvin S. 2010, “Greek Dialects in the Archaic and Classical Ages”, in E. J. Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, Malden, pp. 200-212.
- Cowgill, W. C. 1966, “Ancient Greek Dialectology in the Light of Mycenaean”, in H. Birnbaum, J. Puhvel (eds.), *Ancient Indo-European Dialects*, Berkeley-Los Angeles, pp. 77-96.
- Crespo Güemes, E. 2003, “Los eolismos en la lengua homérica”, *Nova Tellus* 21, pp. 15-46.
- Crespo Güemes, E. 1977, *Elementos antiguos y modernos en la prosodia homérica*, Salamanca.
- Del Freo, M. 2016a, “La scrittura lineare B”, in *Manuale*, pp. 123-166.
- Del Freo, M. 2016b, “Gli scribi micenei”, in *Manuale*, pp. 199-208.
- Del Freo, M. 2016c, “I find-spot e la cronologia dei documenti in lineare B”, in *Manuale*, pp. 185-197.
- Doria, M. 1979, “Riflessioni sulla cronologia relative di alcuni mutamenti fonetici del Greco premiceneo”, in O. Carruba (ed.), *Studia Mediterranea Piero Meriggi dicata*, Pavia, pp. 121-141.

- Driessen, J. 1992, "Homère et les tablettes en Linéaire B. Mise au point", *L'Antiquité Classique* 61, pp. 5-37.
- Dubois, L. 1997, "L'arcadien et le chypriote: deux dialectes cousins", *CECC* 27, pp. 83-91.
- Duhoux, Y. 1987, "Linéaire B crétois et continental: Éléments de comparaison", in *Tractata Mycenaea*, pp. 105-128.
- Duhoux, Y. 1990, "La situation du yod en grec mycénien", *BSL* 85, pp. 539-365
- Duhoux, Y. 2007a, "Le nom du 'fils' en linéaire B", in F. Lang, C. Reinholdt, J. Weilhartner (eds.), *ΣΤΕΦΑΝΟΣ ΑΠΙΣΤΕΙΟΣ. Archäologische Forschungen zwischen Nil und Istros. Festschrift für Stefan Hiller zum 65. Geburtstag*, Wien, pp. 95-103.
- Duhoux, Y. 2007b, "Le linéaire B note-t-il une langue vivante ou figée? Les leçons de Cnossos", *L'Antiquité classique* 76, pp. 1-23.
- Duhoux, Y. 2007c, "Greek and Pre-Greek Languages: Introduction", in A.-F. Christidis (ed.), *A History of Ancient Greek. From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, pp. 220-222, 363.
- Duhoux, Y. 2014, "Mycenaean Script and Language", *EAGLL* II, pp. 471-478.
- Dunkel, G. 1981, "Mycenaean and Central Greek", *Kadmos* 20, pp. 132-142.
- Filos, P. 2014, "Proto-Greek and Common Greek", *EAGLL* III, pp. 175-189.
- Finkelberg, M. 2014, "Dialects, Classification of", *EAGLL* I, pp. 461-468.
- Gallavotti, C. 1968, "Il miceneo come dialetto eolico", *SMEA* 5, pp. 42-55.
- Gallavotti, C. 1958, "Il carattere eolico del greco miceneo", *RFIC* 36, pp. 113-133.
- García Ramón, J. L. 1975, *Les origines postmycéniennes du groupe dialectal éolien*, Salamanca.
- García Ramón, J. L. 1980, "El dialecto micénico 1966-78: doce años de investigaciones", *Estudios Clásicos* 85, pp. 5-31.
- García Ramón, J. L. 1984, "El Micénico: 1972-1983", in A. Martínez Díez (ed.), *Actualización científica en filología griega*, Madrid, pp. 239-274.
- García Ramón, J. L. 1985, "The spelling *Ta* and *Ta-ra* for inherited *Tr* in Mycenaean: sound law, phonetic sequence and morphological factors at work", *Minos* 19, pp. 195-226.
- García Ramón, J. L. 2006, "La fragmentación dialectal griega: limitaciones, posibilidades y falsos problemas", *Incontri Linguistici* 29, pp. 61-82.
- García Ramón, J. L. 2010, "On the genetic classification of Ancient Greek dialects: comparative reconstruction versus hypercriticism and atomism at work", in *Proceedings of the annual meeting of the Department of Linguistics, School of Philology, Faculty of Philosophy, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (May 2-3, 2009)*, Thessaloniki, pp. 219-236.
- García Ramón, J. L. 2012, "En travaillant à une grammaire du mycénien: 1. *a-pi-e-qe/amp^henk^we/*, «(on) mentionna, (on) énuméra». 2. Absence

- d'augment et mode injonctif. 3. *di-ri-mi-jo*: Drimios, fils de Zeus”, in *Études mycéniennes 2010*, pp. 435-454.
- García Ramón, J. L. 2016, “Il greco miceneo”, in *Manuale*, pp. 211-244.
- García Ramón, J. L. 2018. “Ancient Greek Dialectology: Old and New Questions, Recent Developments,” in *Greek Dialects*, pp. 29-106.
- Garret, A. 2006, “Convergence in the Formation of Indo-European Subgroups: Phylogeny and Chronology”, in P. Forster, C. Renfrew (eds.), *Phylogenetic Methods and Prehistory of Languages*, Cambridge, 139-151.
- Georgiev, V. 1953, *Проблемы минойского языка* (= *Problèmes de la langue minoenne*), Sofia.
- Guijarro Ruano, P. 2019, “The Northern Coast of the Aegean Thrace: A Linguistic Overview”, *Linguarum Varietas* 8, pp. 63-84.
- Guijarro Ruano, P. 2021, “Notas a la nueva edición de la gramática micénica de A. Bernabé y E. R. Luján (2020)”, *CFC(g)* 31, pp. 339-348.
- Guijarro Ruano, P. forthcoming, “Déplacements et contacts culturels dans l’onomastique du sanctuaire d’Apollon à Zôné”, in F. Réveilhac, R. Oreshko (eds.), *Déplacements, migrations et contacts culturels en Méditerranée orientale dans le miroir de l’anthroponymie*, Paris.
- Hajnal, I. 1997, *Sprachschichten des mykenischen Griechisch. Zur Frage der Differenzierung zwischen ‘Mycénien spécial’ und ‘Mycénien normal’* (Minos Suppl. 14), Salamanca.
- Hajnal, I. 2004, “Die Tmesis bei Homer und auf den mykenischen Linear B-Tafeln: ein chronologisches paradox?”, in J. H. W. Penney (ed.), *Indo-European Perspectives: studies in honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*, Oxford, pp. 146-178.
- Hajnal, I. 2006, “Die Tafeln aus Theben und ihre Bedeutung für die griechische Dialektologie”, in *Texte aus Theben*, pp. 53-69.
- Hajnal, I. 2007, “Die Vorgeschichte der griechischen Dialekte: ein methodischer Rück- und Ausblick”, in I. Hajnal (ed.), *Die Altgriechischen Dialekte. Wesen und Werden, Akten des Kolloquiums Freie Universität Berlin 19.-22. September 2001*, Innsbruck, pp. 131-156.
- Heubeck, A. 1972, “Syllabic *r* in Mycenaean?”, in *Acta Mycenaea*, pp. 55-79.
- Heubeck, A. 1979, “Remarks on the Sign-Doublets ro_2 , ra_2 , ta_2 ”, in *Colloquium Mycenaeum*, pp. 239-257.
- Hoffmann, O. 1882, *De mixtis graecae linguae dialectis*, Dissertation, Göttingen.
- Horrocks, G. 1980, “The Antiquity of the Greek Epic Tradition: Some New Evidence”, *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 26, pp. 1-11.
- Horrocks, G. 2010, *Greek: A History of the Language and Its Speakers*, Chichester.

- Janko, R. 2018, "The Greek Dialects in the Palatial and Post-Palatial Late Bronze Age", in *Greek Dialects*, pp. 107-129.
- Joseph, B. 2018, "Linguistic contact in the Ancient Balkans: A Sprachbund, or something else?", in *Greek Dialects*, pp. 197-211.
- Kretschmer, P. 1923, "Sprache", in A. Gerke, E. Norden (eds.), *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, Leipzig.
- Killen, J. T. 2015, "The Language of the Religious Texts: Some fresh thoughts on old problems", in *Economy and Administration*, pp. 1109-1134.
- Kretschmer, P. 1909, "Zur Geschichte der griechischen Dialekte", *Glotta* 1, pp. 1-59.
- Lejeune, M. 1976, "Pré-mycénien et proto-mycénien", *BSL* 71, pp. 193-206.
- Lejeune, M. 1992², "La posizione dialettale del greco miceneo", in G. Maddoli (ed.), *La civiltà micenea, Guida storica e critica*, Paris-Bari, pp. 121-132.
- Luján, E. R. 2008, "Micenología", in F. R. Adrados, E. R. Luján, J. R. Somolinos (eds.), *Veinte años de filología griega (1984-2004)*, Madrid, pp. 273-312.
- Marazzi, M. 2013, *Scrittura, epigrafia e grammatica greco-micenea*, Roma.
- Meillet, A. 1930³, *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque*, Paris.
- Meillet, A. 1965⁷, *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque*, Paris.
- Melena, J. L. 1976, *Sobre ciertas innovaciones tempranas del griego: (el tratamiento de Yod inicial y la alternancia pt-/p-)*, Salamanca.
- Melena, J. L. 2014, "Mycenaean Writing", in *Companion* 3, pp. 3-186.
- Meissner, T. 2007, "Notes on Mycenaean spelling", *Cambridge Classical Journal* 53, pp. 96-111.
- Méndez Dosuna, J. 1985, *Los dialectos dorios del noroeste: Gramática y estudio dialectal*, Salamanca.
- Méndez Dosuna, J. 2007, "The Aeolic Dialects", in A. Ph. Christidis (ed.), *A History of Ancient Greek. From the Beginnings to the Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, pp. 460-474.
- Milani, C. 2014, "Variation in Mycenaean Greek", *EAGLL* III, pp. 456-458.
- Miller, D. G. 2014, *Ancient Greek Dialects and Early Authors: Introduction to the Dialect Mixture in Homer, with Notes on Lyric and Herodotus*, Berlin.
- Morpurgo Davies, A. 1968, "The Treatment of *r̥ and *l̥ in Mycenaean and Arcado-Cyprian", in *Primo Congresso*, pp. 791-814.
- Morpurgo Davies, A. 1988, "Mycenaean and Greek language", in *Linear B: a 1984 Survey*, Louvain-la-Neuve, pp. 75-125.
- Morpurgo Davies, A. 1992, "Mycenaean, Arcadian, Cyprian and some questions of method in dialectology", in *Mykenaiika*, pp. 416-432.
- Morpurgo Davies, A. 2006, "Linguistic Evidence from the Thebes Texts in Linear B (Handout)", in *Texte aus Theben*, pp. 118-124.
- Morpurgo Davies, A. – Olivier, J. P. 2012, "Syllabic scripts and languages in the second and first millennia BC", *British School at Athens Studies* 20, pp. 105-118.

- Nagy, G. 1968, "On Dialectal Anomalies in Pylian Texts", in *Primo Congresso*, pp. 663-669.
- Negri, M. 1981, *Miceneo e lingua omerica*, Florence.
- Nosch, M.-L. 2022, "Observations on the Linear B Sign a_2 - in the Various Chronological Phases of the Knossos and the Mainland Tablets", in *Ta-u-ro-qo-ro*, pp. 141-170.
- Palaima, T. G. 1988, "The Development of the Mycenaean Writing System", in J.-P. Olivier, E. L. Bennett (eds.), *Texts, tablets, and scribes, studies in Mycenaean epigraphy and economy, offered to Emmett L. Bennett, Jr.*, Salamanca, pp. 269-342.
- Palaima, T. G. 1998-1999, "Special vs. Normal Mycenaean: Hand 24 and Writing in the Service of the King?", *Minos* 33-34, pp. 269-342.
- Palaima, T. G. 2006, "*65 = FAR? Or *ju*? and other interpretative conundra in the new Thebes tablets", in *Texte aus Theben*, pp. 139-148.
- Palaima, T. G. 2011, "Scribes, Scribal Hands and Paleography", in *Companion I*, pp. 33-136.
- Palaima, T. G. – Bibee, W. 2014, "Scribes, Mycenaean", *EAGLL* III, pp. 265-272.
- Palmer, L. R. 1980, *The Greek Language*, London.
- Panayotou, A. 2007, "Arcado-Cypriot", in A.-F. Christidis (ed.), *A History of Ancient Greek. From the beginnings to late antiquity*, Cambridge, pp. 417-426.
- Panayotou, A. 2014, "Arcado-Cypriot", *EAGLL* I, pp. 154-158.
- Parker, H. N. 2008, "The Linguistic Case for the Aeolian Migration Reconsidered", *Hesperia* 77, pp. 431-464.
- Parker, V. 1993, "Gab es wirklich. Dorier auf der mykenischen Peloponnes? Das 'mycénien spécial' und die dorischen Dialekte", *PP* 48, pp. 241-266.
- Passa, E. 2020², "L'Epica", in A. C. Cassio (ed.), *Storia delle lingue letterarie greche*, Firenze, pp. 99-144.
- Peters, M. 1986, "Zur Frage einer 'achäischen' Phase des griechischen Epos", in A. Etter (ed.), *O-o-pe-ro-si. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*, Berlin-New York, pp. 303-319.
- Pierini, R. 2018, "Syllabogram *65 or logogram *129 (= FAR)? The sign \mathbb{K} on Thebes tablets, AB 65 in Linear A, and some remarks on the *o*-stem genitive singular in *-Xo*", *SMEA NS* 4, pp. 111-129.
- Porzig, W. 1954, "Sprachgeographische Untersuchungen zu den griechischen Dialekten", *IF* 61, pp. 147-169.
- Risch, E. 1955, "Die Gliederung der griechischen Dialekte in neuer Sicht", *MH* 12, pp. 61-76.
- Risch, E. 1966, "Les différences dialectales dans le mycénien", in *Cambridge Colloquium*, pp. 150-157.

- Risch, E. 1976, “Il miceneo nella storia della lingua greca”, *QUCC* 23, pp. 7-28 (= 1981, A. Etter, M. Looser (eds.), *Kleine Schriften*, Berlin-New York, pp. 527-548)
- Risch, E. 1979, “Die griechischen Dialekte im 2. vorchristlichen Jahrtausend”, *SMEA* 20, pp. 91-111 (= 1981, A. Etter - M. Looser (eds.), *Kleine Schriften*, Berlin-New York, pp. 269-289).
- Risch, E. 1987, “Betrachtungen zur Entwicklung der griechischen Dialekte”, *Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure* 41, pp. 165-176.
- Risch, E. – Hajnal, I. 2006, *Grammatik des mykenischen Griechisch* [retrieved from https://sprawi.at/de/content/mykenisches_griechisch (20 December 2023)].
- Rix, H. 1976, *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen: Laut-und Formenlehre*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaft Buchgesellschaft.
- Rose, C. B. 2008, “Separating fact from fiction in the Aiolian migration”, *Hesperia* 77, pp. 399-430.
- Ruijgh, C. J. 1958, “Les datifs pluriels dans les dialectes grecs et la position du mycénien», *Mnemosyne* 11, pp. 97-116.
- Ruijgh, C. J. 1961, “Le traitement des sonantes voyelles dans les dialectes grecs et la position du mycénien», *Mnemosyne* 14, pp. 193-216.
- Ruijgh, C. J. 1988, “Le mycénien et Homère”, in *Linear B: a 1984 Survey*, pp. 221-247 [143-190].
- Ruijgh, C. J. 1995, “D’Homère aux origines proto-mycéniennes de la tradition épique”, in J. P. Crielaard (ed.), *Homeric Questions. Essays in Philology, Ancient History and Archaeology*, Amsterdam, pp. 1-96.
- Ruijgh, C. J. 1996, “Sur la position dialectale du mycénien”, in *Secondo Congresso*, pp. 115-124.
- Ruijgh, C. J. 2011, “Mycenaean and Homeric Language”, in *Companion 1*, pp. 253-298.
- Ruijgh, C. J. – Perpillou, J.-L. 2008a², “Le mycénien entre le proto-indo-européen et le grec historique», in R. Treuil, P. Darcque, J.-C. Poursat, G. Touchais (eds.), *Les civilisations égéennes du Néolithique et de l’Age du Bronze*, Paris, pp. 327-335.
- Ruijgh, C. J. – Perpillou, J.-L. 2008b², “Description du dialecte mycénien”, in R. Treuil, P. Darcque, J.-C. Poursat, G. Touchais (eds.), *Les civilisations égéennes du Néolithique et de l’Age du Bronze*, Paris, pp. 335-347.
- Ruijgh, C. J. – Perpillou, J.-L. 2008c², “La langue et l’écriture”, in R. Treuil, P. Darcque, J.-C. Poursat, G. Touchais (eds.), *Les civilisations égéennes du Néolithique et de l’Age du Bronze*, Paris, pp. 491-505.
- Ruipérez, M. S. 1972, “Le dialecte mycénien”, in *Acta Mycenaea*, pp. 136-169.
- Sacconi A. 2005, “I dativi in -ei e in -i nelle tavolette di Tebe e la teoria del “mycénien spécial”, *ZAnt* 55, pp. 75-83.

- Scarborough, M. (2023). *The Aeolic Dialects of Ancient Greek*. Leiden, The Netherlands.
- Thompson, R. J. 1996-1997, "Dialects in Mycenaean and Mycenaean Among the Dialects", *Minos* 31-32, pp. 313-333.
- Thompson, R. J. 2002-2003, "Special vs. Normal Mycenaean Revisited", *Minos* 37-38, pp. 337-369.
- Thompson, R. J. 2008, "Mycenaean non-assibilation and its Significance for the Prehistory of the Greek Dialects", in *Colloquium Romanum*, pp. 753-766.
- Thompson, R. J. 2010, "Mycenaean Greek", in E. J. Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, Malden, pp. 189-199.
- Thompson, R. J. 2017, "The Mycenaean *o*-stem Genitive Singular in *-o:* A Re-Evaluation", in *Aegean Scripts*, pp. 575-589.
- Thompson, R. J. 2021, "Mycenaean Scribes and Mycenaean Dialect: Interpreting Linguistic Variation in the Linear B Documents", in J. Bennet (ed.), *Representations: Material and immaterial modes of communication in the Bronze Age Aegean*, Oxford, pp. 309-327.
- Thumb, A. – Scherer, A. 1959², *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte. Zweiter Teil*, Heidelberg.
- Tovar, A. 1964, "On the position of the Linear B Dialect", in *Mycenaean Studies*, pp. 141-146.
- Van Beek, L. 2022, *The Reflexes of Syllabic Liquids in Ancient Greek*, Leiden.
- Varias García, C. 1993, *Los documentos en lineal B de Micenas. Ensayo de interpretación*, Tesis doctoral, Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona, Bellaterra.
- Varias García, C. 1994, "El dativo singular atemático en las inscripciones en lineal B de Micenas", *Faventia* 16, pp. 7-21.
- Varias García, C. 1994-1995, "A Tentative Analysis of the Dialectal Differences in the Linear B texts from Mycenae", *Minos* 29-30, pp. 135-157.
- Vilborg, E. 1960, *A Tentative Grammar of Mycenaean Greek*, Gotemburg.
- Wathelet, P. 1962, "Mycénien et grec d'Homère", *L'Antiquité Classique* 31, pp. 5-14.
- Wyatt, W. F. 1970, "The Prehistory of the Greek Dialects", *TAPhA* 101, pp. 557-632.
- Woodard, R. 1986, "Dialect differences at Knossos", *Kadmos* 25, pp. 49-74.

