DE NOVIS LIBRIS IUDICIA


0. After a foreword (‘forward’ in the table of contents, a good motto for desperate students of Classical Antiquity), the book starts with the addresses to the members of the Symposium (inaugural session, vii-xxviii; closing session, xxix-xl), six of them in English and one in French, and each with a Modern Greek version. Then follow the papers; the order appears to be not strictly chronological. In this review I shall concentrate on the papers dealing with linguistic topics of the period before ca. 200 B.C., with brief mention of the other papers.

1. The first paper in the book, by V. Karageorghis, deals with the archeological background of Greeks and Greek language in Cyprus (p. 1-8); in A. Morpurgo’s words, it is “the best and clearest account of what happened in Cyprus in the early period” (p. 7). The observation is made that, as from the earliest Greek inscription found in Cyprus (on a bronze obelos, 2nd half of the 11th c. B.C., in Cypriot syllabic script) through the Classical, Hellenistic, and Roman periods until the present day the Greek language has been preserved in Cyprus, this island has a ‘Greek’ history of more than three millennia.

2. M. Sakellariou, Achéiens et Arcadiens (p. 9-17), argues that Greek tradition makes it clear that, viewed as an ethnos, the Achaeans are not to be equated with the Arcadians, neither in Mycenaean times nor, obviously, in later times. We should not let ourselves be deceived by the term ‘Arcado-Cypriot’ of dialectology, which relates to linguistic entities, not to ethnè.

3. O. Masson reviews the dialect of Paphos (p. 19-30). Until 1949 the Paphian evidence occupied only a small part of the syllabic Cypriot corpus. Nevertheless, the question whether one had the right to speak of a “Paphian dialect” could be answered in the affirmative, at least from Hellenistic times onwards, witness the fact that glossators were able to distinguish specifically Paphian items from Salaminian and generally Cypriot ones. After the British excavations of 1950-55, Mitford was able to distinguish, on account
of the Paphian signary forms, Early Paphian (7th-6th c. B.C.),
Middle Paphian (5th-4th c. B.C.), and Late Paphian (4th c. until
310, year of the death of king Nikokles). Editions of the texts from
Rantidi-Paphos (Mitford-Masson) and Kouklia-Paphos (Masson-
Mitford) appeared in 1983 and 1986, respectively. Thus, Masson
was able to give an account of the main characteristics of Paphian
at the Larnaca symposium.

First, he deals with the vocalism. I select a few points: For -oρ-
(erroneously -oφ- in M.’s text, p. 21) from vocalic r, we have the
often-quoted Paphian glosses κόρξα and στροπή [στροπά em. Bergk]
(the latter actually with -oρ-, and not -oρ-). e > i before nasal: (epi-
graphic) ι(φ)θάδε and several glosses, e.g. μ-πάτανον; εο > ιο (sup-
pposed by Meister) has not been attested for Paphian: here we have
θεός (Kouklia, Rantidi). For ia, ie, io, the spelling with the glide y is
old (though optional) in -γυ-, recent in -γυε- and -γυο-. M. believes
that there is an immediate connection between the spelling with or
without -γ-, and a pronunciation with or without y-glide; A.
Morpurgo seems to express some doubts on this point (discussion,
p. 26), and I am inclined to share such doubts. Narrowing of
(usually final) o to u is well attested; the bronze obelos of the late
11th c. B.C. (drawing on the frontispiece of the book) already
shows this phenomenon: Ὄφελταν, with -ωφ < -όφ.

Next come the consonants. A few points again: Dealing with ω,
M. remarks that the gloss ύεσιτ(ς) (ὑεστ<τ>τις) shows “une vocalisa-
tion à l’initiale qui n’est pas banale et grec” (p. 22). But is this
really a case of vocalization, or just a way of expressing /w/ in an
alphabet without digamma? As for stops, two glosses point to a
change of θ into a fricative (written σ): σάςαι, καθίσαι (: θάξαι),
σες· ἐλο, θές. In my opinion, σ for θ may represent phonetic [θ],
rather than [s]; cp. Lac. σιός = θεός, for which [θ]- is usually
assumed. The development κανι > σιν, long known from Idalion
(σις), is also found in Late Paphian: σι (?), σινάς (both from
Kouklia). Assimilation of κ to a following s is attested in Paphian
glosses (e.g. σοάνα: ἀξίνη [ξοάνα]), and epigraphically (e.g. Πρασ-
(σι)δάμος). Assimilation of κ to a following l is not known from
Paphian glosses, but attested epigraphically for Kouklia (6th c.), e.g.
Θεμπστώναιτ(τ)ος; this development is also known from (Central)
Cretan.

On the morphological side the most remarkable, and so far ex-
clusive, characteristic of (Late) Paphian is the acc. pl. of κιόνος: κιό-
νώς. Further, a variant nom. sg. -ής for -ήφ is presented by the