

Cretan Studies, Edited by W. F. Bakker & R. F. Willetts, General Editor: C. Davaras, vol. 5, Adolf M. Hakkert Publisher, Amsterdam 1996, pp. IV+218, XXII plates.

The fifth issue of *Cretan Studies* is worth reviewing for two reasons. Firstly, it is a special volume dedicated to Prof. Sinclair Hood, the distinguished archaeologist and the author of *The Minoans* (London 1971) and many works on Cretan antiquities, who – according to Sir Colin Renfrew's opinion – has always been „a notable figure in that great succession which leads from Evans through Pendlebury and Hutchinson” (p. 1). Secondly, the series of *Cretan Studies* is still insufficiently known and made use of, at least in Poland¹.

The volume is divided into two parts. The first one contains some of the papers presented at the conference 'Crete and the Aegean World in the Bronze Age: Invasions, Migrations, Influences' held in honour of Sinclair Hood at Rewley House, Oxford, from 15 to 17 April 1994. The following contributions are published in the whole:

(1) Colin Renfrew (Cambridge): „Who were the Minoans? Towards a Population History of Crete” (pp. 1–27).

(2) Lucia Vagneti (Roma): „The Final Neolithic: Crete enters the Wider World” (pp. 29–39).

(3) Elizabeth Schofield (Cambridge): „Migration Theory and the Minoans” (pp. 41–50).

(4) Christos G. Doumas (Athens): „Early Helladic III and the Coming of the Greeks” (pp. 51–61).

(5) Olivier Dickinson (Durham): „Minoans in Mainland Greece, Mycenaean in Crete?” (pp. 63–71).

(6) Stefan Hiller (Salzburg): „Knossos and Pylos. A Case of Special Relationship?” (pp. 73–83).

(7) Jan Bouzek (Prague): „Mycenaean Greece and Minoan Crete: the Problem of Migrations” (pp. 85–90).

(8) Eliezer D. Oren, Jean-Pierre Olivier, Yuvan Goren, Philip P. Betancourt, George H. Myer & Joseph Yellin: „A Minoan Graffito from Tel Haror (Negev, Israel)” (pp. 91–118).

Before reviewing the contributions, it is worth emphasizing that the term 'Minoan', which simply means 'pertaining to the prehistoric inhabitants of Crete', is an invention of Sir Arthur Evans (1905), who has pointed to the myths and stories surrounding the legendary ruler Minos and the possible use of his name as a dynastic rather than as a personal term (like 'pharaoh' or 'caesar'). But we must remember that this is our modern designation, and not a true ethnic name or ethnonym. However, most researchers suggest that the term *Keftiu* was used in Egypt for people who may have come from Crete. I disagree with the scholars who believe that the inscriptions with the name of *Keftiu* in the period of Amenophis the Third may refer to the Aegean in general, not specifically to the Minoans². Renfrew (p. 4) correctly thinks that the Egyptian term *Keftiu* does

¹ See, however, a review of the third volume of *Cretan Studies* by E. Kaczyńska and K. T. Witzczak, which appeared in *Eos* 82, fasc. 2, 1994 (publ. 1995), pp. 336–337.

² See K. T. Witzczak, „An Egyptian Itinerary of the Aegean Sea from 14th century B.C.”, *Živa Antika* 44:1–2, 1994, p. 65–71.

not of itself imply that the prehistoric Cretan had a shared ethnonym for themselves, even if it referred actually to people from Crete, or from some part of Crete. In fact, „it could be no more than an externally imposed name” (so Renfrew).

Renfrew asks: who were the prehistoric inhabitants of Crete? Where did their ancestors come from? What were their genetic affinities? Was Crete linguistically homogenous in bronze age times? Most scholars (e.g. Branigan, Warren, Hood and Renfrew himself) argue for some movement of neolithic people in Crete from the west Anatolia. According to Renfrew (s. 10), „it is possible, in view of the apparent cultural continuity, that the principal language of Crete as spoken in Early and Middle Minoan times was descended from that of the island’s first inhabitants following the initial colonisation episodes”. In my opinion, Renfrew’s conclusion on the linguistic unity of Minoan Crete seems wrong for three reasons. Firstly, the neolithic immigrants from Anatolia might have represented various linguistic strata³. Secondly, the famous Homeric reference (*Odyssey* XIX, 175) states that Archaic Crete was inhabited by five various nations: Achaeans, Eteocretans, Cydonians, Dorians and Pelasgians⁴. Thirdly, each particular Cretan script was probably used by various nations.

Renfrew is inclined to accept a general consensus that the development of Minoan Crete from the beginning of Early Minoan I to the end of Late Minoan I B took place without the significant intrusion of large populations from outside Crete.

The problem of migrations and relations between Crete and the rest of the Aegean is broadly discussed by most contributors. It is well known that Sinclair Hood, a scholar celebrating his jubilee, has often explained the expansion of Minoan influence in terms of forcible expansion of Cretan power and the establishment of Cretan colonies in other parts of the Aegean. Dickinson does not accept the theory of a Minoan colonisation, garnisoning, or domination in the Helladic continent, concluding that from the historical view-point there are „no obvious motives for Cretan attempts to conquer parts of mainland Greece” (p. 65). According to him, the Greek rulers in the Argolid, and especially in Mycenae, had some close links with Knossos and accepted Minoan politico-cultural influence in a peaceful form. A similar opinion is expressed by Schofield, who (as well as Bouzek) summarizes the various theories and/or aspects of (im)migrations, and turning to the archaeological evidence she suggests a small Cycladic colonisation movement into Crete in the Early Bronze Age. Schofield thinks that intensive contacts between Crete and the Cyclades were gradually re-established in the Middle Bronze Age. In the Late Bronze I the persuasive Minoan influence into the Cyclades has extended into architecture, wall-painting, the metric system, stone vases, weaving, but the local practices and traditions continued to exist, so there was no major displacement of the indigenious Cycladic populations. Though migrations almost always move in two directions,

³ In my opinion, Anatolian lexical elements, as well as Hurro-Urartian ones, may be detected in the Cretan vocabulary and onomastics, cf. K. T. Witczak, „Non-Greek Elements in the Animal Terminology of the Ancient Polyrrhenians”, *Eos* 83:1, 1995 (publ. 1996), pp. 17–25. Note that the Cretans adopted also many Semitic and Egyptian words as early as the Minoan-Mycenaean times.

⁴ Both the Achaeans and the Dorians were of Greek origin, but all the remaining nations, mentioned by Homer, were most probably survivals of Minoan non-Greek populations, cf. R. A. Brown, *Evidence for Pre-Greek Speech on Crete from Greek Alphabetic Sources*, Amsterdam 1985, pp. 1–4.

Schofield concludes: „If [in the Late Bronze I Period] there were Cycladic immigrants in Crete, they seem generally to be archeologically invisible” (p. 48).

The decipherment of the Linear B script by Michael Ventris documented an earlier suggestion that the intrusion of the Greek was sometime prior to Late Minoan III B. Colin Renfrew, following Sinclair Hood, interprets the destruction of the Late Minoan I B palaces in Crete in terms of a Mycenaean conquest and an intrusion of Greek-speaking Mycenaeans from mainland Greece. The third invasion of the Dorians is dated by different authorities between c. 1100 and 800 B.C. Dickinson believes, however, that the Greeks settled gradually in the prestigious Minoan centre at Knossos and were ready to assimilate themselves to the Minoan culture to a great extent. Thus Mycenaean Greeks could take over Knossos and all the rest of the island by means of peaceful living together. A different point of view is expressed by Doumas, who treats the Greeks as an autochthonous nation, concluding that „the coming of the Greeks is archaeologically a non-existent event. It is an intra-Aegean episode” (p. 61). Bouzek, however, follows the traditional point of view, according to which the Greek newcomers came from the eastern part of central Europe, more exactly from either the Pontic steppes (so Gimbutas, Mallory, Sakellariou), or the area northeast of the Adriatic Sea (so Miložčić, Harding and Bouzek himself). The latter case is more promising, for the earliest phase of the Kurgan cultures represents – in my opinion – not an Indo-European ingredient, but exclusively the semi-nomadic ancestors of the Indo-Iranians (including the Dardic and Kafir populations).

As regards the relationship between two centres of Minoan-Mycenaean civilization, Knossos and Pylos, Hood has proposed a kind of Minoan immigration or colony at Pylos in the Mycenaean times, whereas Hägg has thought about „an aristocratic Minoan element in the population of Early Messenia”, Dickinson (p. 71) does not agree any kind of „domination by a Minoan ruling class [...] in the south Peloponese”, and finally Hiller lists all the preserved archaeologically similarities, as well as literary sources (i.e. Linear B texts and legendary traditions recorded in the Homeric poems), refraining from an answer (p. 76).

Four papers presented at the Oxford conference are to be published elsewhere and here the authors have provided only short abstracts. Two concern the Minoan influence in the Northern Islands - Kythera and Samothrace:

(9) J. A. Sakellarakis (Athens): „Minoan Religious Influence in the Aegean: the Case of Kythera” (pp. 119–120).

(10) Dimitris Matsas (Komotini): „Aspects of Relationships between Crete and the Northeastern Aegean in the Middle Bronze Age” (pp. 121–122).

Two other abstracts (11–12) by Manfred Bietak („The Toreador Scenes in Avaris / Tell el-Dab’a”, pp. 123–125) and by Nanno A. Marinatos („The Feline Scene from Tell el-Dab’a”, p. 127) describe fragments of Minoan wall paintings unearthed in the remains of a citadel of the Fifteenth Dynasty (c. 1640–1530 B. C.) within the ancient city of Avaris (now called Tell el-Dab’a), which is unanimously assumed to be the Hyksosians’ capital.

The second part of the fifth volume of *Cretan Studies* comprises 6 contributions written in honour of Sinclair Hood and submitted separately by the authors as their personal offerings. These are the following:

(13) Paul Faure (Paris): „Des chiffres et des lettres” (pp. 131–136).

(14) Paul Faure (Paris): „Deux inscriptions en écriture linéaire A découvertes r Troie par Schliemann” (pp. 137-146).

(15) Eleni Georgoulaki (Athens): „Cleaning of the Minoan Tomb at Matalia (Kato Kephala), near Hagios Georgios Siteias” (pp. 147–150).

(16) K. Kopaka (Heraklion): „Arkhaiotetes apo ten Knoso. Enas katalogos tou 19ou aiona” (pp. 151–161).

(17) Gareth Alun Owens (Heraklion): „Evidence for the Minoan Language (1): The Minoan Libation Formula” (pp. 163–206).

(18) Gareth Alun Owens (Heraklion): „‘All Religions are One’ (William Blake 1757–1827). Astarte / Ishtar / Ishassaras / Asasaram: The Great Mother Goddess of Minoan Crete and the Eastern Mediterranean” (pp. 207–218).

Two of the above articles are connected with the Cretan archaeological findings, three refer to the Linear A script and one to the Minoan religion. Both papers by Owens are most interesting, but I cannot agree with the author that the Linear A form **(j)a-sa-sa-ra-me** (written separately as **a-sa / sa-ra-me** in the Cretan Pictographic Script) denotes a ‘Great Mother Goddess’, whose name is related to the Hittite goddess **Išhaššaraš**. The reasons for my objections are the following: the Linear B religious inscriptions from Knossos demonstrate the most popular formula **pa-si-te-o-i = pansi theoihi** ‘to All the Gods’ (15 attestations), which never appears in the Linear B texts of the Helladic Continent. This Greek expression seems to be a formal equivalent (i.e. a translational calque) of the Minoan item **(j)a-sa-sa-ra-me** (note that both are most popular in the religious texts and both are written down as a single-word in the two Linear scripts). An alternative form in the Minoan Libation Formula is **ja-su-ma-tu-re** (SY Za 2) ‘to the Mother of the Gods’ (= Linear B **ma-te-re te-i-ja** i.e. *Matrei Theijai*). The initial element **ja-su-** must be a declension form of **(j)a-sa-** with the meaning ‘god(s)’. The final item **-ma-tu-re** represents probably the dative sg. of the Indo-European term for ‘mother’ (see Myc. Gk. **ma-te-re**). The same word is well attested in the Linear A formations **i-da-ma-te** (AR Za 1; AR Za 2) and **i-da-ma-ta-ra** (SY Za 1), denoting the ‘Ida-Mother’, a Minoan ancestor of *Demeter*, the Greek goddess of fertility⁵, cf. the parallel sequences **i-da-a** ‘to the Idaean (Gods)’ and **[i]-da pi-te-ri** ‘to the Ida-father’ (written separately in PK Za 11b), both appearing as equivalents of **(j)a-sa-sa-ra-me** in the Minoan Libation Formula. Two words ***ma-te** ‘mother’ (with declensional forms: ***ma-ta-ra**, ***ma-tu-re**) and ***pi-te** ‘father’ (attested in a declensional form: **pi-te-ri**) allow us to identify the Minoan language as Indo-European, cf. Sanskrit *mātá* and *pitá*, Latin *mater* and *pater*, Greek μήτηρ and πατήρ, English *mother* and *father*, etc. Both terms are probably the most representative terms in the related Indo-European languages (but significantly they do not have cognates in Hittite and Luwian). Owens is certainly right in concluding that: „The Minoan language [...], as recorded by Linear A c. 2000–1425 B.C., can now be identified as a distinct branch of Indo-European” (p. 202). For Linear A religious texts, as well as Linear B inscriptions, attest a number of gods and goddesses (note that archaeological findings suggest no essential difference between the Minoan and Mycenaean cults) and there is no actual evidence for one dominating figure in the sort of a ‘Great Mother Goddess’, I believe that the Minoan term **a-sa-sa-ra-me** means nothing more than Mycenaean Greek **pa-si-te-o-i** and Latin *Omnibus*

⁵ See recently G. A. Owens, „New Evidence for Minoan ‘Demeter’”, *Kadmos* 35:2, 1996. pp. 172–174.

Deis. That is why I willingly follow Maurice Pope, who many years ago wrote an obituary for the Great Mother Goddess of Minoan Crete⁶.

Krzysztof Tomasz Witzczak
Chair of Classical Philology
University of Łódź

MOURAVIEV SERGE N. (textes réunis, établis et traduits par), *Héraclite d'Éphèse. La tradition antique & médiévale. A. Témoignages et citations. I. D'Épicharme à Philon d'Alexandrie.* Academia Verlag, Sankt Augustin, 1999, pp. 269, 8⁰.

Книгата на уважениот зналец во хераклитологијата, Серж (Сергеј) Муравјев*, е дел од амбициозниот проект *HERACLITEA* кој подразбира критичко издавање на комплетните сведоштва за животот и делото на Хераклит од Ефес како и на остатоците од неговиот спис и трагите од неговата мисла. Со оглед на тоа што оваа посебна книга може да биде правилно согледана само во рамките на проектот, ќе се задржиме на неговата општа замисла, задачи и цели.

Авторот тргнува од констатацијата дека до денес во светот немаме исцрпно издание на античките текстови коишто се однесуваат на Хераклит, туку само бројни едиции на неговите „фрагменти“, понекогаш проследени со најважните доксографски сведоштва. Запоставувањето на контекстот во кој се дадени фрагментите како и потценувањето на неговото толковно значење се само некои од причините што имаме сосема различни интерпретации на учењето на овој антички философ. Извесна методолошка наивност откриваме во многу толкувања каде што најчесто се мешаат филолошкиот и философскиот пристап, текстологијата и херменевтиката. Муравјев истакнува дека прв услов за правилно разбирање на Хераклит е да се подготви полно критичко издание на сите извори за неговиот живот и дело (хронолошки и систематски обработени), како и на сите останати податоци што на кој и да е начин се однесуваат на него.

Авторот на книгава во оваа насока работи скоро триесет години, при што има обработено многу конкретни проблеми од хераклитологијата. Меѓутоа, тој и самиот признава дека иследувањата во оваа област можат да бидат плодносни доколку се пристапи кон сеопфатно и филолошки засновано издание со јасно изградена методологија. Меѓу

⁶ M. Pope, „A Minoan Goddess *Asasara*. An Obituary”, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London* 8, 1961, s. 29–31.

* Сергеј Н. Муравјев (1938), доктор на Парискиот универзитет IV (Сорбона), е автор на 140 научни статии (од кои шесетина се однесуваат на Хераклит) и пет книги. Освен со грчката философија, тој научно се занимава и со историја на писмото (потеклото на кавкаскиот алфавет), историска географија (Кавказ и централна Азија во антиката) и со теоретска и применета лингвистика. Објавува на руски, француски, англиски, италијански и на ерменски јазик.