

KO-RO-NO-WE-SA

Proceedings of the 15th international colloquium on Mycenaean studies, September 2021

edited by J. Bennet, A. Karnava & T. Meißner

Ariadne Supplement Series 5, Rethymno 2024, p. 193-206

© The Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Crete, Greece, and the individual authors

**A new tool on Greek lexicography:
*El léxico del griego micénico****

Juan Piquero Rodríguez

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to present to the scientific community of Mycenologists a new instrument on Greek lexicography [henceforth: *LGM*].¹ Following the pattern of Aura Jorro's *DMic*, this new lexicon is also published in Spanish.

The purpose of the lexicon is two-fold. On the one hand, *LGM* presents a comprehensive survey of Mycenaean vocabulary in its current state of research. On the other hand, it enables a comparison between Mycenaean and alphabetic Greek vocabulary of the 1st millennium BC. In this light, its objective is to determine which part of the lexicon has been preserved and to what extent, as well as how much has been lost. The lexicon intends to fill a major gap in Greek lexicographical studies. Due to the syllabic character of the Linear B script and its inherent problems of interpretation, the Mycenaean vocabulary preserved in alphabetic Greek is not treated in sufficient depth in general dictionaries of ancient Greek from a comparative perspective. To address this issue,

* This paper is part of the research project *LERMIC* "Léxico religioso del micénico: conceptos, prácticas, objetos" ("Mycenaean Greek Lexicon: concepts, practices, objects"), which is funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation (PID2020-118204GA-I00).

¹ This recently published tool comprises the results of my PhD research, conducted under the supervision of Francisco Aura Jorro and Alberto Bernabé, and was defended in Madrid in 2017. The final version of the PhD manuscript, enriched with the comments and improvements made by the thesis committee, was published in 2019 in the prestigious collection *Études anciennes*. I would like to thank Massimo Perna for his invaluable help and Guy Vottéro for his enormous patience.

LGM follows an alphabetical lemmatization and introduces the Mycenaean lexicon through alphabetic Greek. Thus, by using a known code, it hopes to facilitate access to everyone who has not had the opportunity to further their studies in the Mycenaean lexicon due to the lack of an updated, systematic and critical work which deals with it.

Conceived as a comprehensive examination of the topic, *LGM* is not only an index of more or less certain Greek correspondences, but approaches the lexicographical study with precision, referring to the context in which each word appears. It is also accompanied by an updated bibliography which covers the years 1990 to 2018, and takes into account not only the interpretation of the terms, but also the documents in which they are listed. Previous bibliography can be consulted in *DMic*.

Predecessors: a brief history of Mycenaean lexicography

The reason for this study can be found in the very origins of the discipline itself, since the question of how the lexicon contained in the Linear B inscriptions compared with its corresponding forms in alphabetic Greek was already raised from the time of the script's decipherment.²

It is well-known that the information provided by the Mycenaean lexicon has contributed to clarifying the etymology of some terms in alphabetic Greek with which a comparison can be made. The evidence from Mycenaean is chronologically earlier than alphabetic Greek and preserves archaic features which were lost in later periods. Examples of these archaic traits include the preservation of the labiovelars (e.g. the attestation of the form *o-te* showed that the etymology of ὄτε 'when' should be reconstructed on the basis of *-te* and not *-qe*; otherwise a form †*o-qe* would be expected in Mycenaean), *wau* (*w*) in all positions (which disproved, for example, old etymologies such as **enweka* for ἔνεκα), or the origin of the *-m* inflection in *e-me* (*ἔμει) 'one' from the Indo-European root **sem* versus the analogical levelling from the neuter forms of the *-n* inflection which took place in the 1st millennium BC.

Throughout the history of Greek lexicography three types of scholarly works have taken into consideration the Mycenaean data: a) general dictionaries of ancient Greek; b) etymological dictionaries of ancient Greek; c) Mycenaean vocabularies and lexica.

² VENTRIS & CHADWICK 1953, 88-101.

Mycenaean vocabulary in general dictionaries of ancient Greek

There are only two standard dictionaries of ancient Greek where the Mycenaean lexicon has been taken into account: the *DGE*,³ and the ninth edition of the *Greek-English Lexicon (LSJ)*.⁴

However, as Adrados himself acknowledged, it is impossible to include the Mycenaean vocabulary in a standard dictionary such as *DGE*.⁵ There are two main difficulties in this respect. First, the problems related to the adaptation of Linear B for writing Greek mean that the same syllabic sequence can be interpreted in two different ways (for instance, *pa-te* could be interpreted as πατήρ or πάντες depending on the context). Second, there are often important semantic changes between Mycenaean and alphabetic Greek (the most characteristic example being the comparison between the Greek βασιλεύς ‘king’, and the Mycenaean *qa-si-re-u* ‘chief’ *uel sim.*). Indeed, one of the major difficulties is that every Mycenaean word must be submitted to critical interpretation: the syllabary does not allow for unequivocal interpretations and the context where a term appears is crucial. No standard dictionary can collect all this information. The need to create a specific tool for Mycenaean lexicography was therefore pressing.

Both *DGE* and *LSJ* include Mycenaean words in the last part of the entries and refer the reader to Mycenaean vocabularies for fuller accounts of Mycenaean vocabulary and its context: *DGE* cites *DMic*; *LSJ*⁹ does the same with the addition of *MGV*.

Etymological dictionaries of ancient Greek

Mycenaean vocabulary occupies a prominent position in the etymological dictionaries of ancient Greek. There are two main reasons for this. On the one hand, the documents written in the Mycenaean dialect are, together with those in Hittite, the oldest testimonies for the reconstruction of the Indo-European language. On the other, this early evidence is crucial for the etymological reconstruction of 1st millennium Greek. Hence, Greek etymological dictionaries, such as Pierre Chantraine’s *DÉLG*, and

³ Compiled by Francisco Rodríguez Adrados and his collaborators; also to be consulted online.

⁴ Compiled by Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones, Roderick MacKenzie and their collaborators and successors; also to be consulted online.

⁵ ADRADOS 1977, 68. With regard to the incorporation of Mycenaean vocabulary in *LSJ*⁹, see VINE 2019.

Robert Beekes' *EDG*, systematically employ Mycenaean vocabulary.

This is not the case, however, with Hjalmar Frisk's *GEW*. Frisk published the first volume of *GEW* in 1960, when the debate about the decipherment of Linear B was still very lively.⁶ By contrast, *CÉG*, the Greek etymology chronicle, always integrates Mycenaean data.⁷

The problems of incorporating the Mycenaean vocabulary into Greek etymological dictionaries are similar to those described above with regard to the general dictionaries. For more information on the Mycenaean data, *DÉLG* refers readers to *MGV*, while *EDG* to *DMic*.

Mycenaean vocabularies and lexica

The issues concerning the inclusion of the Mycenaean lexicon in general dictionaries led from early on to the publication of dictionaries dedicated exclusively to Mycenaean vocabulary. Compared to general dictionaries, lemmatization in these is not alphabetic but is based on the transcription of the syllabograms. Thus, one finds *a-to-ro-qa* instead of ἄνθρωπος.

Vocabulary studies began to be written soon after the decipherment of Linear B. Therefore, already in 1955 Piero Meriggi and Vladimir Georgiev published two lexica.⁸ However, it was only after the publication of *MGL* in 1963 by Morpurgo Davies that Mycenaean lexicography made a breakthrough. From a structural point of view, each transliterated entry includes a comprehensive index of references to the tablets where the term appears, and occasionally a complementary bibliography which justifies the possible interpretations.

The importance of the methodology of *MGL* is well captured by Adrados:⁹ “inaugura la táctica [...] de preferir a las propias opiniones la exposición de las de los otros”. Indeed, up to that moment lexica did not mention other hypotheses than those of their own authors.

MGL remained the most important tool in Mycenaean lexicography

⁶ He recognizes his lack of coherence and tries to justify it in the *Vorwort* of *GEW* (vii). Regarding the context of the decipherment at the early stage, see CHADWICK 1992.

⁷ *CÉG* is published regularly in the *Revue de philologie, de littérature et de histoire anciennes*, under the supervision of Alain Blanc, Charles de Lamberterie and Jean-Louis Perpillou. The last edition of *DÉLG*, published in 2009, has a *Supplément* containing the numbers 1-10 of *CÉG*.

⁸ GEORGIEV 1955a; MERIGGI 1955. GEORGIEV 1955a has two supplements: GEORGIEV 1955b, 1955c.

⁹ ADRADOS 1995, 110.

until the publication of *DMic*. In the 1960s, Adrados put together a team of collaborators and began the preparation of *DGE*.¹⁰ At that time, with the decipherment confirmed, it would have been a serious mistake not to include the Mycenaean vocabulary in the dictionary. However, due to the problems related to the inclusion of this lexicon in *DGE* for the reasons explained above, the solution that was opted for was the creation of a Mycenaean dictionary as a supplement to *DGE*.¹¹ Adrados entrusted this dictionary to Aura Jorro as part of his PhD, which was finally published in two volumes in the years 1985 (A-N) and 1993 (O-*89).¹²

As Aura Jorro admits,¹³ *DMic* was to a large extent indebted to and continued Morpurgo's *MGL*. Moreover, it included information and references to etymological, prosopographical and geographical studies, making *DMic* the main working tool of every Mycenologist. However, there were at least two reasons which made its replacement necessary: the publication of new Linear B texts, and the large amount of books and articles on Mycenaean published after *MGL*.

In addition, despite the publication of all these resources, the problem of the access to the Mycenaean lexicon for those who were not familiar with the system of the Linear B syllabary, as is the case with many Hellenists and historians, remained unresolved. To address this, Georgiev's *Lexique* included in its final pages an index in which the Mycenaean terms are transcribed into alphabetic Greek, although not in a systematic way:¹⁴ the words are sometimes transcribed in the nominative and sometimes in an inflected form, e.g. 'ἄρμοτεύς = *a-mo-te-wo gen.*' vs. 'ἄξονες = *a-ko-so-ne.*' This situation changed in the *Index Graecus* of *MGL*, where "ubi Graeca verba quae ad voces inlustrandas in

¹⁰ On the origins of *DGE* see ADRADOS 1971.

¹¹ ADRADOS 1971, 21: "parece inconcebible, en el día de hoy, redactar un Diccionario griego que no tenga en cuenta el Micénico. Sin embargo, es evidente que este material no puede ser tratado igual que otro cualquiera, incorporándolo sencillamente a los mismos artículos. Son demasiados los puntos dudosos en la interpretación del Micénico para que pueda procederse así. Pero tampoco se puede dejar de hacer referencia en un artículo del Diccionario a la forma micénica de la palabra en cuestión. La solución ha sido ecléctica. El plan es publicar un Diccionario Micénico que ponga al día los existentes, indicando la interpretación o interpretaciones que se consideran más verosímiles; sin separar, claro está, nombres propios de comunes."

¹² *DMic* I; *DMic* II, and both were reprinted in 1999. A *Suplemento (DMicSupl)* has been recently published by Aura Jorro, Bernabé, Luján, Varias and myself.

¹³ AURA JORRO 2012, 45-46.

¹⁴ GEORGIEV 1955a.

lexico laudantur reperies”.¹⁵ However, the most important breakthrough was made with the publication in 1963 of *MGV I* by John Chadwick and Lydia Baumbach. This paper, followed by *MGV II* by Baumbach in 1971, in which she included new terms and an updated bibliography, has served to fill the existing gap until the publication of *LGM*. In *MGV I-II* the Mycenaean lexicon is dealt with in alphabetical entries, so that the relationship between the Mycenaean and alphabetical terms is clearly established. This method involves certain difficulties, since, as Chantraine points out, “ils est vrai que les procédés orthographiques [...] présentent à l’etymologiste une difficulté malaisément surmountable”,¹⁶ but represents the only way to include Mycenaean vocabulary in studies of the Greek lexicon. Despite the problems of the syllabary, it should not be forgotten that the Mycenaean lexicon is part of the Greek lexicon and must be given its rightful place in dictionaries like any other vocabulary. Furthermore, Mycenaean vocabulary is fundamental since “il s’agit des mots grecs que fournissent la première attestation historique dont nous disposons”.¹⁷ Other significant improvements made by *MGV I-II* are the inclusion of morpho-syntactic information in each entry, and a brief bibliographical reference indicating the place where the interpretation is proposed or discussed. In addition, *MGV I-II* has created a way of classifying the degrees of plausibility of the suggested hypotheses, information which is essential for readers. Thus, the highest degree of probability is indicated by the absence of a description, while the terms ‘probably’ (prob.), ‘possibly’ (poss.) and ‘perhaps’ (perh.) indicate different degrees of probability from greater to lesser.

There has been no updated catalogue of Greek words incorporating newly published texts and new interpretations after the publication of *MGV I-II*.¹⁸ In fact, an important gap in *DMic* is the absence of an *Index Graecitatis*. As early as its publication some pointed out the lack of this important instrument,¹⁹ and Aura Jorro himself has continued

¹⁵ *MGL*, xiv.

¹⁶ CHANTRAINE 1962, 7.

¹⁷ CHANTRAINE 1962, 8.

¹⁸ PROBONAS 1978 is based on a similar perspective, but unfortunately only the first volume has been published (ἀ-βέλεμνον).

¹⁹ ADRADOS 1995, 117. Also RODRÍGUEZ SOMOLINOS 2008, 425-426.

to insist on its indispensable elaboration.²⁰ However, despite attempts,²¹ the methodology proved unsuccessful, both because a mere index could not easily indicate the degree of probability of the hypotheses, and because *DMic* was by then dated and the methodology did not allow the addition of vocabulary from new texts or of recent hypotheses about old terms.²² It was therefore necessary to create a complete and up-to-date tool to overcome these difficulties. The result is *LGM*. It is based on the publications of Chadwick and Baumbach and its purpose is none other than to expand, improve and, above all, update the work of these two scholars of the last century in a systematic way.

LGM: the organization of the lexicon

Like *MGV* I-II, *LGM* adopts an alphabetical lemmatization in alphabetical order, as its more important function is to offer access to the Mycenaean lexicon to those unfamiliar with the rudiments of the Linear B syllabary. It includes the entire Mycenaean lexicon except for proper nouns: anthroponyms and toponyms (*infra*).

LGM displays the characteristics of a lexicon in that it provides information about every Mycenaean word and its meaning in the context in which it appears.²³ This latter point is very important in Mycenaean lexicography, as contexts often limit the possible interpretations of a given word.

In terms of methodology, *LGM* is organized as follows. The dictionary lists in alphabetical order the nominative singular of names, adjectives and pronouns, and the 1st person singular of the present active indicative of verbs. When a term is attested defectively (as in a gloss, for example), it is recorded in that way, since there is no certainty about its complete paradigm. In accordance with general dictionaries, Attic is usually preferred, unless a word is only attested in a different dialect.

The syllabograms are presented transliterated and in italics, according to the commonly accepted convention. Graphic variants of the same Mycenaean term are usually given in a footnote. According to the editorial standards of the second volume of *DMic* II,²⁴ terms that are part of a

²⁰ AURA JORRO 2012, 50.

²¹ PIQUERO RODRÍGUEZ 2014.

²² See *LGM*, 18-22 for more details.

²³ LARA 1997, 19-20.

²⁴ *DMic* II, 8.

compound or are attested alongside an enclitic term, without independent attestation, are written in bold (-**qe**, **a₃-zo-ro-**, etc.). Inflected forms belonging to the same paradigm are grouped within the same lemma, always in bold.

When a word has survived in alphabetic Greek in the same form in which we know it in Mycenaean (with the distinctive features proper to the Mycenaean dialect and its writing system), it is inserted under the lemma without any sign. Homographs are distinguished by Roman numerals from ‘I’ onwards.

When there are various attestations of a word in Mycenaean, these are included in the paradigm in parentheses by adding ‘también’ (tb.) followed by the attested forms. Whenever several verbal forms of the same paradigm are attested in Mycenaean in different verbal tenses, these are included under the same lemma with the assignment of a capital letter from ‘A’ onwards.

Information about the grammatical category of a word (noun, adjective, pronoun, adverb, verb) is provided at the beginning of each entry. In nominal forms and participles, the case, number and gender in which the word appears in the Mycenaean documentation is noted. In nouns, gender is mentioned immediately after the category.

ἄναξ

Apel. de pers. masc. Nom. sg. *wa-na-ka* (tb. Gen. sg.]*wa-na-ka-to*;
Dat. sg. *wa-na-ka-te*).

ἀνάμπυξ

Adj. Nom. pl. fem. *a-na-pu-ke*

In personal verb forms, the person, number, time, mood and voice are recorded.

δίδωμι

A. 3^a pers. pl. pres. Ind. act. *di-do-si*

B. 3^a pers. sg. aor. sin aumento Ind. act. *do-ke*

C. Part. perf. med.-pas. Nom. pl. *de-do-me-na*

The derived and compound forms of a term that is not attested in alphabetic Greek are recorded under the heading FORMAS RELACIONADAS. If several terms related to the same lemma are attested in Mycenaean, they are preceded by an Arabic numeral from ‘1’ onwards.

δατέομαι

3^a pers. sg. aor. med. sin aumento **-da-sa-to**

FORMAS RELACIONADAS

1. Adj. verbal Nom. sg. masc. *e-pi-da-to*
2. 3^a pers. sg. perf. Ind. med.-pas. *e-pi-de-da-to*

The transliteration of the Mycenaean term is followed by its phonetic interpretation, which is given in a double transcription: in Latin characters, between slashes (//) and in italics, and in Greek characters (preceded by an asterisk if the term is not documented).²⁵

ἄναξ

Apel. de pers. masc. Nom. sg. *wa-na-ka* (tb. Gen. sg.]*wa-na-ka-to*;
Dat. sg. *wa-na-ka-te*) /*wanaks*/ *ἄναξ

When a compound term is not attested in alphabetic Greek, its elements are always mentioned by means of a parenthesis with a vertical bar followed by an arrow (|→) and the lemma to which one must refer to.

After the double transcription of the term, its translation is presented in single quotation marks (‘’).

ἄναξ

Apel. de pers. masc. Nom. sg. *wa-na-ka* (tb. Gen. sg.]*wa-na-ka-to*;
Dat. sg. *wa-na-ka-te*) /*wanaks*/ *ἄναξ, ‘rey’.

The translation may be accompanied by one or more question marks between parentheses, i.e. ‘(?)’, indicating that the interpretation and, consequently, the translation are questionable. A plus sign in square

²⁵ Regarding the problems on transliteration, see *LGM*, 26-27.

brackets, i.e. '[+]', indicates the existence of other suggested meanings in *DMic* which however have not been addressed in *LGM*, as they have been rejected by scholars.

LGM follows the general consensus regarding interpretations, that is, those supported by the largest number of scholars, unless otherwise stated. The footnotes list the bibliography on which an interpretation is based and the arguments against the options that are considered less likely. Different degrees of probability are indicated as follows: the absence of a symbol indicates a higher degree of probability; one interrogation mark (?) probable; two (??) possible, and three (???) low probability.

The entry continues with an examination of the documents in which the term appears. The number of the tablet or series is always given in the body of the text, although it is sometimes placed in a footnote when this enhances the clarity of the text of the entry for the reader. Cross references to other terms in the *LGM* often appear in this part through the inclusion of the Mycenaean term in parentheses by means of a *sub voce* (*s.v.*) and the lemma that one refers to.

In many cases, the morphology of the term is described after the overview of the documents, especially when the meaning largely depends on it. The reason is that many terms are not attested in alphabetic Greek, so that their meaning must also be reconstructed.

When a Mycenaean term has an exact correspondence in alphabetic Greek, a reference to the alphabetic term is inserted with its meaning in single quotation marks (' '), and the context in which it is attested in parentheses. These references have been taken directly from the general dictionaries *DGE* and *LSJ*⁹, and, with few exceptions, have not been re-examined.

When a Mycenaean word can satisfactorily be interpreted in two ways which correspond to two distinct lemmas in *LGM*, the following sentence is introduced at the end of the entry: '*Vid. tb. s.v. X*'.

An arrow (→) is used to refer to a word in *LGM* which has the same etymology as that of the lemma in which it appears.

Finally, all bibliographical references are given in the footnotes.

The theoretical information presented can be found in the following example:

ἀπυδοσμός

Sust. masc. Nom. sg. *a-pu-do-so*[-*mo* /*apudosmos*/ ἀπυδοσμός, ‘pago’¹, en un documento (KN Nc 4484) que recoge el total del pago en lino (?)², tal vez en concepto de impuesto³, de la localidad cnosia de *a-mi-ni-so*. El término está atestiguado en gr. alf. con el significado ‘venta’ (ἀ[π]υδοσμόν, *IG V 2*, 343.28-29, Orcómeno, s. IV a.C.).

→ ἀποδίδωμι

¹ Melena, *Textos*, 61; Perna, *Recherches*, 256 ss.; Varias García, *Fiscality*, 242; Rougemont, *Contrôle économique*, 88; Luján, *Barter; Money and Coinage*, 25; Santiago Álvarez, *Homenaje Aura Jorro*, 157 («parece un sinónimo de *a-pu-do-si*, pero al ser un *hápax* no es posible averiguar si la diferencia formal respondería a alguna diferencia semántica»).

² Perna, *l.c.* («ces tablettes présentent (tout du moins pour les exemplaires les mieux conservés) un anthroponyme suivi de la notation de poids μ et de l'idéogramme du lin *SA* (quand il est conservé)»).

³ Perna, *o.c.*, 261.

FORMAS RELACIONADAS

1. Sust. masc. Nom. sg.¹ *do-so-mo* /*dosmos*/ *δοσμός, ‘tasa’, ‘impuesto’². Indica la imposición de un pago, no el pago efectivo como *a-pu-do-si* (s.v. ἀπόδοσις). Aparece referido a un impuesto en grano a beneficio del santuario de Posidón y de otros tres destinatarios (serie Es de Pilo)³ y a un pago a Posidón (PY Un 718) efectuado por una parte importante de la sociedad de Pilo⁴, tal vez en concepto de ofrenda para realizar un banquete⁵. El término figura también en la etiqueta (PY Wa 731) de la cesta que contendría las

¹ Para PY Un 718.1 se han propuesto otras opciones: Palaima, *Festschrift Panagl*, 271 (Nom. pl.); *DMic. s.v.* (Ac. sg.). Sobre la posible restitución del término en PY An 1281, v. s.v. ἀρθμός, n. 1.

² Palmer, *WINE*, 103 ss.; Palaima, *Administrative Documents*, 268; Melena, *Textos*, 73; Killen, *Economy and Administration*, 1125; Weilhartner, *Opfergaben*, 110 ss.; Del Freo, *Censimenti*, 166 ss.; Varias García, *Fiscality*, 242; Duhoux, *Companion I*, 309, 345; Perna, *Land and Textiles*, 89 ss.; Luján, *Barter; Money and Coinage*, 25; Santiago Álvarez, *Homenaje Aura Jorro*, 152; De Fidio, *Palatial Economy*, 122 s.

³ *we-da-ne-wo* y *di-wi-je-u-* V. Nakassis, *Individuals*, 233 s., 402 s. El tercer destinatario, *34-ke-te-si, debe probablemente ser interpretado como un apel. masc. V. *DMic. s.v.* En PY Es 644 el destinatario no aparece explícitamente y Es 650 registra terrenos y no grano. V. Del Freo, *l.c.* Sobre la función de estos individuos, v. Rougemont, *Contrôle économique*, 167 s.; Perna, *l.c.* Puede que se trate de ofrendas en lugar de impuestos *strictu sensu*, de acuerdo con Killen, *o.c.*, 856, n. iv.

⁴ Shelmerdine, *DAIS*, 402. Se ha querido ver en este documento un reflejo de la sociedad pilia en prácticamente todas sus clases: Palaima, *THE ROLE OF THE RULER*, 131 ss. («(the) fundamental functional divisions of society»); Nikoloudis, *Coll. Rom.*, 592 ss., pero cf. la crítica de Piquero, *Actas XIV SEEC*, 358 s.

⁵ Palaima, *THE ROLE OF THE RULER*, 131 ss.; Weilhartner, *DAIS*, 419. Pero cf. Killen, *o.c.*, 856, n. v («there is nothing to indicate that the small numbers of animals and amounts of other foodstuffs, etc. listed on this record were consumed at a large, state-sponsored banquet»).

tablillas relacionadas con el impuesto registrado en PY Un 718⁶. Aparece asimismo en un documento (PY Nn 831) que asienta un pago en lino que algunos personajes de la localidad de *ko-ri-to* debían hacer al palacio de Pilo⁷.

⁶ Palaima, *Studies Killen*, 219; Del Freo, *o.c.*, 153.

⁷ V. PofN IV (draft) ([*do-so-mo*]) «was possibly part of the actual text»). V. Perna, *Recherches*, 231 ss.

Limitations of the study

The omission of proper names from *LGM* represents an important limitation of this study. Although the *Index Graecitatis* was initially planned to include anthroponyms, theonyms, toponyms, demonyms and patronymics,²⁶ this vocabulary has been excluded from *LGM* for a number of reasons:

- a) Proper names are mere designations which do not have inherent semantic features and designate single entities.
- b) Most Mycenaean proper names admit different interpretations due to the nature of the syllabary: accordingly, some of the proposals are largely arbitrary. Moreover, shorter proper names allow a larger number of hypotheses (e.g. *a-ne-o*: **Ἀνέθων* / **Ἀνειος* / **Ἀίνεος* vs. *a-re-ka-sa-da-ra*: *Ἀλεξάνδρα*).²⁷
- c) The exclusion of proper names from a dictionary or lexicon is a common feature of Greek dictionaries. Only *DGE* includes this type of vocabulary.²⁸
- d) Toponyms present similar problems but, in addition, are often formed to roots which do not have a clear etymology. There are some exceptions which have been included in *LGM*. Some toponyms, even as designations of places, preserve semantic features, namely relevant lexical information. This is the case of *ti-mi-to-a-ke-e*, whose elements can be divided into *ti-mi-to* **τιρμίνθων* (gen. pl.) ‘terebinth’ and *a-ke-e* **ἀγκέχει* (dat.-loc. pl.) ‘valley’.²⁹

²⁶ PIQUERO RODRÍGUEZ 2014.

²⁷ See *DMic*, s.vv.

²⁸ LARA 1997, 30.

²⁹ See *LGM*, s.vv *ἄγκος* and *τέρμινθος*.

The decision to omit proper names clearly means that some anthroponyms with possible meaning remain unrecorded. Thus, *a-re-ka-sa-da-ra* has a first element ἀλεξ^ο (cf. ἀλέξω) – also probably present in *a-re-ke-se-u* – which does not figure in any other Mycenaean word included in *LGM*. This information is indeed lost. However, the methodological problems involved in the inclusion of proper names were greater than the advantages.

Bibliography

- ADRADOS, F. R. 1971 El Diccionario Griego-Español: estado actual de los trabajos, *Emerita* 39, 1-33.
- ADRADOS, F. R. 1977 Micénico. In F. R. ADRADOS, E. GANGUTIA, J. LÓPEZ FACAL & C. SERRANO AYBAR (eds), *Introducción a la lexicografía griega*, 185-196.
- ADRADOS, F. R. 1995 El *Diccionario Micénico* de Aura Jorro en el contexto de los estudios micénicos, *Estudios Clásicos* 107, 103-122.
- AURA JORRO, F. 2012 La nueva edición del *DMic.* en el marco de la lexicografía micénica. In C. VARIAS GARCÍA (ed.), *Actas del Simposio Internacional: 55 Años de Micenología (1952-2007)*, Bellaterra 12-13 de abril de 2007, Faventia-Suppl. 1, 37-50.
- CHADWICK, J. 1992 *The decipherment of Linear B*.
- CHANTRAINE, P. 1962 Notes d'étymologie grecque. I. Remarques sur le témoignage mycénien. 1, Généralités 2, *ajameno* 3, *eneka*, *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes* 36, 1962, 7-22.
- GEORGIEV, V. 1955a *Lexique des inscriptions créto-mycéniennes*.
- GEORGIEV, V. 1955b Supplément au Lexique des inscriptions créto-mycéniennes, *Annuaire de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Sofia* 51, 1-57.
- GEORGIEV, V. 1955c Second Supplément au Lexique des inscriptions créto-mycéniennes, *Annuaire de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Sofia* 51, 39-94.
- LARA, D. 1997 *Iniciación a la lexicografía griega*.
- LGM* = PIQUERO RODRÍGUEZ, J. 2019 *El léxico del griego micénico. Étude et mise à jour de la bibliographie*, *Études anciennes* 73.
- MERIGGI, P. 1955 *Glossario miceneo (minoico B)*.

- MGL = MORPURGO DAVIES, A. 1963 *Mycenaeae Graecitatis Lexicon*, Incunabula Graeca 3.
- MGV I = CHADWICK, J. & BAUMBACH, L. 1963 The Mycenaean Greek Vocabulary, *Glotta* 41, 157-271.
- MGV II = BAUMBACH, L. 1971 The Mycenaean Greek Vocabulary II, *Glotta* 49, 151-190.
- PIQUERO RODRÍGUEZ, J. 2014 *Instrumenta Mycenaea*. El *Index graecitatis* del *Diccionario Micénico (DMic.)*. In V. GOMIS, A. PARDAL & J. DE LA VILLA (eds), *Ardua cernebant iuuenes. Actas del I Congreso Nacional Ganimedes de investigadores noveles de Filología Clásica*, Estudios Clásicos 2, 69-78.
- PROBONAS, I. K. 1978 Λεξικὸ τῆς Μυκηναϊκῆς Ἑλληνικῆς. Τόμος I: ἄ-βέλεμνον.
- RODRÍGUEZ SOMOLINOS, J. 2008 Lexicografía. In F. R. ADRADOS, J. A. BERENGUER, E. R. LUJÁN & J. RODRÍGUEZ SOMOLINOS (eds), *Veinte años de Filología Griega (1984-2004)*, 413-443.
- VENTRIS, M. & CHADWICK, J. 1953 Evidence for Greek dialect in the Mycenaean archives, *JHS* 73, 84-103.
- VINE, B. 2019 Incorporating new evidence. Mycenaean Greek in the *Revised Supplement*. In CH. STRAY, M. CLARKE & J. T. KATZ (eds), *Liddell and Scott: the history, methodology, and languages of the world's leading Lexicon of Ancient Greek*, 99-104.