THE MYCENAEAN GREEK *ME-TA-QE, PE-I* AND ITS CORRESPONDENCES IN THE LANGUAGE OF HOMER'S EPIC

Professor Alexander J. Zaicev was among the few scholars in this country who contributed to cultivation of knowledge of Greek of the II millennium BC, the so-called Mycenaean dialect, by publishing works on interpretation of Mycenaean texts and promoting his students' interest in the Mycenaean culture.

His effort can hardly be underestimated against the background of a general decline of studies in the Mycenaean Greece felt especially acutely after the vivid interest shown by the previous generation. Until 1980 he was almost the only scholar who kept pace with the contemporary Mycenological research. His interest was primarily caused by a course in the history of the Greek language, which he sometimes found burdening. He handed it over to me in the late eighties and to Tatiana Putilova in the end of the nineties. Mastery of Mycenaean materials was also essential for his enthusiastic study of the history of the Greek metre. This topic, especially the genesis of the Greek hexameter, remained one of his life-long favorites.

Professor Zaicev by no means shunned direct comparisons of Mycenaean and Homeric data. Among his own works, stands out a short note "Iphimedeia, the Mother of the Aloades: a Pre-Greek Deity in Homer's Epic"[1] published in 1975 where he convincingly demonstrated continuity and preservation of the Mycenaean oral tradition across the Greek Dark Ages on the basis of coincidence of the Mycenaean *e-pe-me-de-ja* and Homer's Ἰφιμέδεια (Homer's metrics do not allow restitution of the initial *w-).

The author of this note pursues a similar goal, this time not on the level of religious tradition but in the domain of linguistics, focusing on the traditional usage.

The Mycenaean expression *me-ta-qe* occurs in a set of Pylos tablets of military content (PY An 657, An 519, An 654, An 656, An 661, An 724). All these tablets have the same structure: distinct sections of description are separated by a one-line interval. The researcher, therefore, faces several uniform blocks of information which, on the syntactic level, can be described as composite sentences.

---

[1] А. И. Зайцев, "Ифимедия, мать Алоадов: догреческое божество в гомеровском эпосе". *Античная балканистика 2. Предварительные материалы* (М. 1975) 9–11.

2 Заказ № 309

The first tablet of this set of documents, PY An 657, begins with a heading:

.1   *o-u-ru-to, o-pi-a₂-ra, e-pi-ko-wo*

"this is how the sea shore is guarded by the auxiliary troops".[2] After the heading, different troops are listed, each entry including the chief's name and the location of the troop, e. g.

.2   *ma-re-wo, o-ka, o-wi-to-no.*

The following words are obviously a list of the officers of one troop:

.3   *a-pe-ri-ta-wo, o-re-ta, e-te-wa, ko-ki-jo,*
.4   *su-we-ro-wi-jo, o-wi-ti-ni-jo, o-ka-ra₃*   VIR 50
.5   *vacat.*

A one-line interval indicates the end of a paragraph. In the next sections, after an ordinary description of a troop (its commander, location, number of soldiers: .10 *a₃-ta-re-u-si, ku-pa-ri-si-jo, ke-ki-de* VIR 10), new information appears: "And with them is *ekʷetās Aerikʷhontās* the son of *Kerkos* at Deer Harbour":

.11   *me-ta-qe, pe-i, e-qe-ta, ke-ki-jo,*
.12   *a-e-ri-qo-ta, e-ra-po, ri-me-ne.*

A comparable additional phrase occurs in text An 657.13, "and with them is *ekʷetās Aigotās*":

.13   *o-ka-ra, o-wi-to-no* VIR 30 *ke-ki-de-qe, a-pu₂-ka-ne,*
.14   VIR 20 *me-ta-qe, pe-i, a₃-ko-ta, e-qe-ta,*
.15   *vacat.*

As noted in the comment in *PTT* 1,[3] line 15 appeared after the document was filled, its conceivable purpose being to separate one block of information from another. The scribe evidently tried here to separate two entries, thus providing, from a linguistic viewpoint, a syntactical segmentation of the text. I have dwelled on the use of segmentation of text into lines in Mycenaean documents as a peculiar punctuation mark.[4] Here is a list of some other more or less uniform examples:

---

[2] For the interpretation of *e-pi-ko-wo* accepted here see: В. П. Казанскене, "Симмахия микенского времени (к интерпретации текста PY An 657)", *MOYΣEION. Профессору А. И. Зайцеву к 70-летию* (СПб. 1997) 31–37.

[3] *PTT* 1 = Emmett L. Bennett, Jr. and Jean-Pierre Olivier. *The Pylos Tablets Transcribed, Part I: Texts and Notes* (Roma 1973).

[4] Н. Н. Казанский. "Читать по-микенски". *Res Linguistica.* Сборник статей в честь В. П. Нерознака (М. 2000) 10–23.

An 519	.14	*pi-ru-te, ku-re-we*	VIR 50

An 519 .14 *pi-ru-te, ku-re-we*   VIR 50
.15 *me-ta-qe, pe-i, e-qe-ta, ro-u-ko*
.16 *ku-sa-me-ni-jo,*   [
.17   *vacat* [
PY An 654 .6 *u-pi-ja-ki-ri-jo, ku-re-we*   VIR 60
.7 *me-ta-qe, pe-i, e-qe-ta,*
.8 *a-re-ku-tu-ru-wo, e-te-wo-ke-re-we-*
.9 *i-jo,*
.10   *vacat*
PY An 656 .1 *wa-pa-ro-jo, o-ka, ne-wo-ki-to,*
.2 [[*di-wi-je-u,*]] *e-ri-ko-wo, a₂-di-je-u,*
.3 *a-ki-wo-ni-jo,* [[   ]]
.4 *wa-ka-ti-ja-ta, ke-ki-de, sa-pi-da*
.5 *me-ta-qe, pe-i, e-qe-ta,*
.6 *pe-re-qo-ni-jo, a-re-i-jo,*
PY An 656 .7 *ne-wo-ki-to, wo-wi-ja, ko-ro-ku-ra-i-jo,*
.8 VIR 20 *me-ta-qe, pe-i, e-qe-ta,*
.9 *di-wi-je-u,*
.10   *vacat*
.11 *du-wo-jo-jo, o-ka, a-ke-re-wa,*
.12 *a₂-ku-ni-jo, pe-ri-me-de,* [[   ]]
.13 *pu₂-ti-ja, a-pu₂-ka-ne, ke-ki-de, po-ra-i* 20
.14 *me-ta-qe, pe-i, e-qe-ta, di-ko-na-ro, a-da-ra-ti-jo*
.15 *u-wa-si, ke-ki-de, ne-wo*   VIR 10
.16 *me-ta-qe, pe-i, pe-re-u-ro-ni-jo, e-qe-ta,*
.17   *vacat*
.18 *a-ke-re-wa, ko-ro-ku-ra-i-jo*   VIR 80
.19 *me-ta-qe, pe-i, e-qe-ta, ka-e-sa-me-no,*
.20 *a-pu₂-ka,*
.21   *vacat.*

Line PY An 656.17 yields direct evidence of the use of the same marker for segmentation of the text: the scribe seems to have begun writing a line earlier, noticed that he had forgotten to leave a blank line and erased the sign (as the publisher notes, ".17 perhaps an erased sign at beginning of line, possibly [[*a*]]").

Situation appears to be similar in text PY An 661.8 where line 8 seems to be left empty after the words in question:

PY An 661 .1 *e-ki-no-jo, o-ka, e-o-te-u*
.2 *a-ti-ro-[.], i-da-i-jo, e-se-re-a₂,*
.3 *e-na-po-ro, i-wa-so*   VIR 70
.4 *.]-o-ri-jo, ko-ro-ku [-ra-]i-jo*   VIR 30
.5 *ka-ra-do-ro, ko-ro-ku-ra-i-jo*   VIR 10
.6 *za-e-to-ro, ko-ro-ku-ra-i-jo*   VIR 20

.7   *me-ta-qe, pe-i, e-qe-ta, wo-ro-tu-mi-ni-jo*
.8   ],
.9   *e-ko-me-na-ta-o, o-ka,*
.10 *ti-mi-to a-ke-i, ma-i-u, ro-qo-ta,*
.11 *a-ke[ ]u, a-ke-wa-to.*
.12 *a -ka-a -ki-ri-jo. u-ru-pi-ja-jo.*
.13 *ne-do-wo-ta-de* VIR 30 *me-ta-qe, pe-i, e-qe-ta,*

In Homer's epic, the functional counterpart of Myc. *me-ta-qe, pe-i* is μετὰ δέ σφισιν, the sole difference being the replacement of the particle -*qe* of the former by an adversative δέ in the latter. These expressions are metrically equivalent. It is worth noting that in the Greek poetry μετὰ δέ σφισιν occurs exclusively after a long syllable of the third hexametric foot, while the expression μετὰ δέ σφι occurs in the middle of the second foot with the same regularity, usually after the fourth syllable.

As the expression μετὰ δέ σφισιν is attested only twice, I will quote both contexts here.

Il. 2. 91:

ὣς τῶν ἔθνεα πολλὰ νεῶν ἄπο καὶ κλισιάων
ἠϊόνος προπάροιθε βαθείης ἐστιχόωντο
ἰλαδὸν εἰς ἀγορήν· μετὰ δέ σφισιν ὄσσα δεδήει
ὀτρύνουσ᾽ ἰέναι Διὸς ἄγγελος· οἳ δ᾽ ἀγέροντο.
95   τετρήχει δ᾽ ἀγορή, ὑπὸ δὲ στεναχίζετο γαῖα
λαῶν ἰζόντων, ὅμαδος δ᾽ ἦν· ἐννέα δέ σφεας
σχοίατ᾽ ἀκούσειαν δὲ διοτρεφέων βασιλήων.

It is striking that in the following instance containing an absolutely analogous construction publishers suggest a somewhat different interpretation, a *comma* instead of a *colon* before μετὰ δέ σφισιν.

Il. 4. 1:

Οἳ δὲ θεοὶ πὰρ Ζηνὶ καθήμενοι ἠγορόωντο
χρυσέῳ ἐν δαπέδῳ, μετὰ δέ σφισι πότνια Ἥβη
νέκταρ ἐοινοχόει· τοὶ δὲ χρυσέοις δεπάεσσι
δειδέχατ᾽ ἀλλήλους, Τρώων πόλιν εἰσορόωντες·

In this second fragment, although it seems to represent a later linguistic stage (cf. πὰρ Ζηνί, δεπάεσσι, etc.), μετὰ δέ σφισιν is used precisely in the same way as in Mycenaean Greek: a preceding simple sentence is followed by a uniform reference to a prominent person with a special marking of his role. As Mycenaean and Homeric examples show, in all cases a new person is not merely added but also distinguished from the rest. Thus, in Mycenaean texts, an *ek"etās*, a high rank official, is introduced after a description of the group of people he is in charge of, and precisely the same

manner is used by Homer who sticks to this peculiarity in his poems: ὅσσα, who is Διὸς ἄγγελος, Zeus' heraldess at the Achaians' assembly, and Hebe, who pours wine, are specially marked, and their outstanding role is made salient in the text. In all these cases, the pronoun is enclitic, which is proved, apart from the tradition represented in Greek manuscripts, by explicit testimonies of Greek grammarians, e. g. the way Herodianus regards the enclitic status (κατ᾽ ἔγκλισιν) of the pronominal form σφισι in *Il.* 4. 2.

A similar case is the Homeric use of the formulaic μετὰ δέ σφι with the pronoun in the form σφι. This phrase is used regularly after the caesura dividing the second foot of hexameter. In the above quoted examples, the poet thus distinguishes one particular person from the rest members of the group – Pylaemenes, the grieving father who accompanies the body of his son Harpalion; Odysseus whose role in the sack of Troy was crucial; Achilles, the closest friend of Patrocles at the latter's funeral. There are nine such places: *Il.* 11. 709; 13. 658; 15. 8; 18. 604 (sometimes seen as an interpolation: the *Odyssey* contains a fully coinciding verse); 23. 14; *Od.* 2. 173; 4. 17; 13. 27, and here I will quote only one of them (*Il.* 13. 656):

> τὸν μὲν Παφλαγόνες μεγαλήτορες ἀμφεπένοντο,
> ἐς δίφρον δ᾽ ἀνέσαντες ἄγον προτὶ Ἴλιον ἱρὴν
> ἀχνύμενοι· μετὰ δέ σφι πατὴρ κίε δάκρυα λείβων,
> ποινὴ δ᾽ οὔ τις παιδὸς ἐγίγνετο τεθνηῶτος.

In all Homer's passages quoted a phenomenon which I would like to define "deixis emphasizing respect" can be clearly seen. It is worth noting that in Mycenaean texts, too, a respectful attitude towards the *ek^wetās* is obvious – he is mostly referred to by the name and patronymic unlike the troop commander. We witness a certain continuity on the level of standard usage: the syntactic structure is obvious; the meaning of μετά, from the viewpoint of lexicology, is also clear. The correspondence between the Greek epic and the Mycenaean usage is not only interesting, but shows the vitality of the Mycenaean standard. It should be emphasized that such peculiarity of discourse (distinguishing a prominent person from the rest by his addition to a list of his subordinates) has no parallels in modern languages where the phrase "and X [is] with them" does not imply any special marking of respectability. Particularly instructive is the following example where the name of Poseidon is introduced by μετὰ δέ σφι (*Il.* 15. 1):

> Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ διά τε σκόλοπας καὶ τάφρον ἔβησαν
> φεύγοντες, πολλοὶ δὲ δάμεν Δαναῶν ὑπὸ χερσίν,
> οἳ μὲν δὴ παρ᾽ ὄχεσφιν ἐρητύοντο μένοντες
> χλωροὶ ὑπαὶ δείους πεφοβημένοι· ἔγρετο δὲ Ζεὺς
5 Ἴδης ἐν κορυφῇσι παρὰ χρυσοθρόνου Ἥρης,

στῆ δ' ἄρ' ἀναΐξας, ἴδε δὲ Τρῶας καὶ Ἀχαιοὺς
τοὺς μὲν ὀρινομένους, τοὺς δὲ κλονέοντας ὄπισθεν
8   Ἀργείους, <u>μετὰ δέ σφι</u> Ποσειδάωνα ἄνακτα·

The above examples show a continuity of linguistic tradition from My-
cenaean to the Homeric poetry. Hence, it is legitimate to reconstruct two
formulaic expressions *meta (kʷe) sphehi / *meta (de) sphi for the earliest
stage of the Greek heroic epic. In my opinion, both variants are likely to go
back to a single Mycenaean expression *meta (kʷe) sphehi.

The form σφεσι, recently discovered in the Arcadian dialect, corre-
sponds perfectly to the Mycenaean pe-i[5] with an analogical restitution of
the intervocalic -σ- in Arcadian.[6]

The pronominal stem occurs in Greek in three forms descending from
*sbhe, *sbhi, *sbho; thus, the Dualis of the stem *sbh- appears with personal
pronouns of the second person only as Nom.-Acc. σφώ or σφῶι and Gen.-Dat.
σφῶϊν or σφῶιν. The same stem recurs in the possessive pronoun σφός
(Homer, Sappho, Pindar) and σφέτερος (Homer and the Attic dialect) used both
in a direct- and oblique-reflexive sense. It is important that P. Chantraine[7] de-
rives both forms from a plural stem σφε- whose traces are reliably attested in
σφέτερος. The form σφός, which may be seen as an innovation, fits, then, into
the pattern σφός – σφέτερος, ἁμός – ἁμέτερος (Lesb. ἄμμος – ἀμμέτερος,
Ion.-Att. ἡμέτερος), ὑμός – ὑμέτερος. Declension, as Homer's and Myce-
naean forms show, is based on the stem σφε- and not σφ- as P. Chantraine
wrote (p. 140). The form σφε is identical with the old accusative form.

The hypothesis that *sw-bhi is the source of σφι is also prone to doubt,
as νόσφι < *nos-bhi invoked as a parallel[8] does not have the zero grade in
its root and the Arcadian form σφεσι demonstrates an old stem *sphe- from
which it is impossible to derive the form σφι.

Apart from σφεσι, the Arcadian dialect knows the form σφεις, which
may have been built analogically according to the thematic declension pat-
tern.[9] The Arcadian form σφεσι requires to read the Mycenaean pe-i as
/sphehi/ – a form reconstructed for Mycenaean as early as 1957 by M. Ven-
tris and J. Chadwick[10] and, somewhat later, by P. Ilievsky.[11]

---

[5] F. M. J. Waanders, "L'arcadien θεσμοτόαρος et σφεσιν", BCH 111 (1987) 190.

[6] M. Meier-Brügger, Griechische Sprachwissenschaft II (Berlin – New York 1992) 92.

[7] Morphologie historique du grecque (Paris 1961) 140, § 157.

[8] Meier-Brügger (see n. 5) 93.

[9] L. Dubois, Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien (Louvain-la-Neuve 1988) 123–124.

[10] M. Ventris, J. Chadwick, Documents in Mycenaean Greek. 2nd ed. by J. Chadwick (Cam-
bridge 1973) 189.

[11] P. H. Ilievski, "Il sincretismo dei casi in miceneo. È sincretizzato lo strumentale con il
dativo?" // SMEA 12 (1970) 103

It is conceivable that Homer's σφισι in the characteristic contents discussed above conceals the original Mycenaean /*sphehi*/. Hence, Homer's text originally contained a formulaic *meta kʷe/de sphehi*. Naturally, this supposition requires Homer's μετὰ δέ σφισιν to be a later coinage.

The Mycenaean data bears evidence in favour of the hypothesis of two series of I.-E. personal pronouns differentiated only by the presence/absence of accentuation. The same is supposed to be true for the genetically related forms of the reflexive pronoun. It is possible to reconstruct a mixed paradigm on the basis of Mycenaean and Homeric data. In this paradigm, an erstwhile opposition of tonic and atonic forms is already eliminated:

Gen.	*sphe	*sphehōn
Dat.	*sphei	*sphehi
Acc.	*sphe	*sphehas
Abl.	*sph-et	

Word division in Mycenaean texts points unequivocally to an accentual autonomy of the form /*sphehi*/. This autonomy is, however, contradicted by the testimony of the ancient Greek grammarians who insisted that σφισι was atonic. This problem may be solved in two ways: 1) by interpreting the Mycenaean form as tonic, or 2) by assuming that the Mycenaean writing does not always mark atonic clitics adequately. In my opinion, the second solution is more plausible, especially since the variants *te-ko-to-na-pe* / *te-ko-to ' a-pe* point to a possible confusion in writing atonic words.

In Proto-Greek we find forms **sphe* and **sphi* which serve as the basis for building paradigms in the further history of Greek.

As may be seen, the examples quoted above show continuity from the Mycenaean usage on to the language of epic poetry. In later literature such expressions never occur. One of the characteristic features of this continuity is the "deixis emphasizing respect" shared by the Mycenaean and Homer's examples. The uniform syntactic role of the second clauses of composite sentences containing μετὰ δέ σφισιν is quite obvious. A uniform punctuation is, therefore, desirable for editions of Homer's poems whereby μετὰ δέ σφισιν is preceded by a *comma* rather than a *colon*.

Nikolai Kazansky

Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Linguistic Studies,
St Petersburg

В группе пилосских табличек PY An 657, An 519, An 654, An 656, An 661, An 724 после перечисления отрядов, названных по имени предводителя и по месту дислокации, прибавляется *te-ta-qe, pe-i, e-qe-ta*, "и с ними эквет". В гомеровском эпосе микенскому выражению *te-ta-qe, pe-i* по функции соответствует μετὰ δέ σφισιν (*Il.* II, 93; IV, 2), отличающееся только заменой частицы -*qe* на противительное δέ, а также μετὰ δέ σφι (*Il.* XI, 709; XIII, 658; XV, 8; XVIII, 604 [если только это не интерполяция: в *Одиссее* имеется полностью совпадающий стих]; XXIII, 14; *Od.* II, 173; IV, 17; XIII, 27). В микенских текстах и во всех перечисленных гомеровских пассажах так вводится некто, почитаемый более других, упомянутых прежде. В статье предлагается назвать это явление "дейксисом уважения", а также реконструировать два формульных сочетания *meta (kʷe) sphehi* / *meta (de) sphi*, восходящие к мик. *meta (kʷe) sphehi*.

Можно думать, что гомеровское σφισι в рассмотренных выше характерных контекстах скрывает исконное микенское /sphehi/ и что первоначально гомеровский текст содержал формульное *meta kʷe/de sphehi*.

Единая синтаксическая роль второй части сложносочиненных предложений, содержащих μετὰ δέ σφισιν, видна вполне отчетливо. Очевидно, что при издании гомеровских поэм желательно соблюдать во всех этих случаях единую пунктуацию, ставя перед μετὰ δέ σφισιν запятую, а не колон, как делают издатели в *Il.* II, 93.