

cured from the quarries of Melos before the island was settled (Vol. 1, p. 116).

I would recommend these volumes to the professional who requires a convenient collection of site plans and illustrations of Cycladic artifact types: many of the drawings are drawn from older excavation reports or from Greek periodicals that are not readily available in American libraries. Vol. 2 may also provide a convenient introduction to less familiar aspects of Cycladic archaeology after the Bronze Age: for the Geometric and Archaic periods no other reasonably up-to-date synthesis is available. For prehistoric matters, however, time would be better spent with R.L.N. Barber, *The Cyclades in the Bronze Age* (London 1987) and P. Getz-Preziosi ed., *Early Cycladic Art in North American Collections* (Seattle 1987).

JACK L. DAVIS

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS  
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO  
BOX 4348  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60680

CORPUS OF MYCENAEAN INSCRIPTIONS FROM KNOSSOS, VOLUME I (1-1063), edited by *John Chadwick, Louis Godart, John T. Killen, Jean-Pierre Olivier, Anna Sacconi and Iannis A. Sakellarakis*. (*Incunabula Graeca* 88.) Pp. xv + 433. Edizioni dell'Ateneo (in co-publication with the Cambridge University Press), Rome 1986.

This is the first of four planned corpus volumes, officially abbreviated *CoMIK*, of the Linear B texts from Knossos. To open the functional 10-page preface, John Chadwick relates the well-known fact that Sir Arthur Evans was first shown a Linear B tablet in 1895. We are told that Evans took then a "careful copy" of this now non-existent tablet, a drawing of which was to be published more than a half-century later in the first formal edition of Linear B texts from Evans's excavations at Knossos: *Scripta Minoa II [SM II]* (Oxford 1952), edited from Evans's notes by J.L. Myres and already incorporating supplemental joins made in the Herakleion Museum in 1950 by E.L. Bennett, Jr. On p. viii, Chadwick provides a convenient bibliographical survey of the five subsequent editions (transcriptions without photographs or drawings) of the Knossos texts and of the published discussions of later joins and improved readings which have made the last of these editions by Chadwick, Killen, and Olivier, *The Knossos Tablets 4 [KT<sup>4</sup>]* (Cambridge 1971), obsolete in part. In the course of preparing the present volume, further fragments have been discovered, studied, and in some cases joined to existing tablets. Discussion of these can be found in *Kadmos* 24 (1985) 26-33, *BCH* 110 (1986) 21-39, and *BCH* 112 (1988) 59-82.

*CoMIK* I then represents the partial culmination of nearly a century of work at editing the Linear B tablets from Knossos; and it fittingly includes the original tablet seen in 1895: *Ga* (2) <34> the text of which is drawn from Evans's own photograph of a squeeze, i.e., from his "careful copy." The editors intentionally chose to offer conservative tran-

scriptions (pp. xi-xii) and properly so. For example, one now correctly reads ΤΕΛΑ instead of TELA (*KT<sup>4</sup>*) in the erasure on the *lat.inf.* of L 647. Subscript dots are also used under partially preserved characters in a lexical unit occurring in the same position and context on three tablets (Uf [3] 981, 1022, 1031) by Hand 123 from area I3, despite the fact that, when the tablets are studied together, the identification of the term as *ko-to-i-na*, this scribe's idiosyncratic and peculiarly Knossian orthographical variant, is virtually certain. Nonetheless this is laudable editorial practice, particularly with Mycenaean texts where virtual certainty can be seductive and short-lived. Witness the most recent changes of readings on tablet Ch 1029, to which new joins have been made: *a3-wo-ro-ge* (*KT<sup>4</sup>*); *a3-wo-ro-ge* (*BCH* 110 [1986] 38); and now *a3-zo-ro-ge* (*CoMIK* I). The *CoMIK* reading is indisputably correct (cf. the photograph and drawing which accompany the transcription) and gives us, by the correction of a single sign, a second occurrence of this boonym of uncertain etymology in the unusual Ch series.

This is the Mycenologist's equivalent of "the difference of an iota," and it is just as important as the original theologically disputed letter. For the interpretation of Mycenaean Greek documents, given their allusive, often opaque, brevity and the troublesome (mainly from our 20th-century non-Mycenaean perspective) phonetic and orthographical conventions of the script, proceeds in large part by adducing contextual or formulaic parallels and constructing multiple series of cross-links and interdependent inferences. Consequently minor errors or less than cautious conjectures can have subtle and harmful ramifications, producing a kind of microbic contamination of scholarship in all areas of Aegean prehistory touched by the Linear B evidence.

Let us take the case of Sk 8100 and Sk 789, two tablets which are now securely grouped in a set of at least five documents by a single scribe (Hand 206) dealing with armor. The set has significant lexical and ideographic parallels with the Pylos Sh series. From a sequence of early readings and conjectures, ending with *KT<sup>4</sup>*, there arose the belief that the word *pa-ra* occurred as a heading term definitely in Sk 8100 and probably in Sk 789. Interpreters set to work. One approach was to see here a term for a leather cuirass (cf. \*pel- "cover" in *πέπλος*, etc.). Another employed the common, and statistically well-justified, *pis aller*: the term *pa-ra* was an anthroponym (A. Morpurgo, *Mycenaeae Graecitatis Lexicon [Incunabula Graeca* 3, Rome 1963] 230). We now have a new reading for Sk 8100 reported in *Kadmos* 24 (1985) 31: *to-ra/*, i.e., *thōrax*. This new reading underscores: 1) the danger of having read this portion of the tablet *sine dubitandis*; and 2) the wisdom of arriving at the most conservative transcription of Sk 789, i.e., a transcription which does not suggest restoration in the apparatus and certainly not in the text proper. On the positive side, the new reading gives us additional evidence for the orthographical treatment of *-ks* nouns and for close parallels between the Knossos Sk series and the Pylos Sh series. But the lexical item *pa-ra* has proved a "ghost" which must be stricken from Mycenaean lexica and glossaries.

The *CoMIK* edition follows the essential prescriptions for *un corpus mycénien* set forth in *Résolution n° 1* of the

acts of the first international colloquium on Mycenaean studies at Gif-Sur-Yvette in 1956 (M. Lejeune ed., *Études mycéniennes* [Paris 1956] 275). Each tablet is presented in three forms: 1) photograph; 2) drawing, derived from photographic study and autopsy of the actual tablet; and 3) transliteration, according to the Wingspread conventions briefly explained on pp. x–xi. Each text is also accompanied by designation of findspot and scribal hand, as established in J.-P. Olivier's *Les scribes de Cnossos* [*Scribes*] (*Incunabula Graeca* 17, Rome 1967), and by abbreviated indication of its current location (see p. xi), if other than the Herakleion Museum. Thus far near-perfection.

The photographs, although not quite of the uniformly high quality of those in the Linear A corpus volumes (reviewed in *AJA* 91 [1987] 336–37), are more than satisfactory when used together with the drawings, to the precision of which this reviewer can attest since he had the opportunity to study some of the drawings for *CoMIK* II as they were being meticulously checked and corrected against the original tablets in the Herakleion Museum. Magnification of the photographs on the pages of *CoMIK* I for close epigraphical study can prove disappointing. The printed dot-patterns blur minute details to such an extent that reference to original photographs and to the tablets themselves will still be necessary for finer points. Still one can now gain from the photographs and drawings an overall impression of the distinctive features of Knossian palaeography: see for example the subtle embellishments to signs *e* and *nu* on tablets (of unknown hand) X 998 and X 999 + 1001. The transcriptions have one technical improvement over those in earlier editions: sufficient space is allotted for complete transcription of even the longest lines without resorting to roll-over: contrast C 902.3 in *CoMIK* I and *KT*<sup>4</sup>.

The conjunction of photographs, drawings and conservative transcriptions on a single page makes *CoMIK* I useful in ways in which the scattered and selected photographs and drawings in *SM* II and *Scribes* have never been. It is ideal for teaching the script and language not as printed pages of a difficult code in Roman characters and Arabic numerals, but as clay accounting documents with phonetic and ideographic signs, inscribed in a considerable array of styles and formats, the complete interpretation of which depends as much on pinacology, epigraphy and archaeology as on linguistics. One can easily examine points of textual and syntactical emphasis relating to the very disposition of phonetic and ideographic characters on the tablet surfaces. This will make unthinkable, or at least unconscionably negligent, “arm chair” interpretation of texts from transcription without attending to their epigraphical details. For example, a purely linguistic conjecture was once made to interpret the sequence ]*ku-ru-so-po-ro-we*[ on tablet X 1014 to yield *ku-ru-so-po-ro*, a compound of the word for gold *khruos* and a common terminal element *-po-ro* (*-φορος* or *-πωλος*). The *CoMIK* I reading, drawing, and photograph make such lexical wishful thinking absolutely impossible.

What more could one desire of an epigraphical corpus than good photographs, precise and clear drawings, and accurate, conservative transcriptions based on the attentive cumulative labors of a large group of scholars? Answer: two

things, one of which, for practical reasons, probably could not have been changed; but the other of which could have been incorporated. The editors, undoubtedly to prevent further delays in completing phase one of this massive undertaking (see A. Sacconi in A. Heubeck and G. Neumann eds., *Res Mycenaee* [Göttingen 1983] 413–14), took refuge in the Gif prescription that texts be presented in the order of inventory numbers rather than according to series classification. And so they are presented in *CoMIK* I from tablet Fp(1) 1 + 31 to Od(3) 1063. Thus one must resort to a personally annotated copy of *KT*<sup>4</sup> to study the texts of the tablets in unified series and sets; and one is deprived, except through photographic memory retention or the aid of xerography, of viewing tablets and drawings of sets or series together. In fact many of these sets will not be fully presented until the fourth volume of fragments and indices appears. And the wait may be long. We have recently been informed that Vol. III of the corpus has been delayed. A hypothetical comparison to the well-intentioned *CoMIK* procedure, or missed opportunity, would be knowing in advance which Attic inscriptions are proxeny decrees, tribute lists, decrees of the boule, grave stelai, dedications, and ostraka, but intentionally choosing to mix them all together in a definitive publication according to the order in which they were excavated and inventoried in the distant past. One may contrast the marvelous utility of the Linear A corpus volumes which do present texts according to typological document classes. One cannot argue that it was necessary to maintain uniformity with the Mycenae and Thebes “corpus volumes.” Their limited numbers of texts do not produce such enormous obstacles to reference and analysis, and they already vary one from the other in regard to the point that follows.

The second shortcoming, only partially remedied elsewhere, mainly in *Scribes*, is the failure to follow the Gif guideline of providing for each document, in conjunction with photographs and drawings, as precise a physical description as possible. *CoMIK* I does not even offer the minimal information about dimensions furnished by the Mycenae “corpus volume.” There are cases like C 902, where, given the formulaic irregularity of the first two extant lines of writing, one would appreciate some estimate of how much of this considerably preserved page-shaped tablet is missing in the area designated now only as *supra mutila*. The same applies to Ce 152 + 8256. An estimate of loss on the recto would tell us how much might be missing on the verso, which was inscribed after diagonal rotation. The decision to compile one universal index in Vol. IV was sensible. But it also means that one must have yet another work at hand in order to exploit *CoMIK* I fully: 1) Olivier et al., *Index généraux du linéaire B* (*Incunabula Graeca* 52, Rome 1973) updated for recent joins; 2) *KT*<sup>4</sup> for studying whole sets and series; and 3) *Scribes* for physical descriptions and supplementary photographs, both available only in part, of tablets in series and sets.

These are the main provisos to keep in mind when deciding whether to acquire *CoMIK* I, which in its primary elements is superbly done. We owe to the editors, to their skills at photography, draftsmanship, epigraphy, palaeography, manuscript editing and museum administration,

and especially to their perseverance and meticulous concern for accuracy, a note of thanks for producing a volume which exemplifies our fundamental need for international scholarly cooperation and which has brought to fruition the labors of all who, since 1895, have helped to discover, preserve and establish the texts of the Linear B tablets from Knossos.

THOMAS G. PALAIMA

PROGRAM IN AEGEAN SCRIPTS AND PREHISTORY  
DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS  
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN  
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78712-1181

BURIAL AND ANCIENT SOCIETY: THE RISE OF THE GREEK CITY-STATE, by *Ian Morris*. (New Studies in Archaeology.) Pp. xii + 262, figs. 62, tables 19, with 2 appendices, bibliography and index. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1987. \$39.50

This volume is the latest in the Cambridge series *New Studies in Archaeology*, edited by Colin Renfrew and Jeremy Sabloff. Most Classical archaeologists will by now recognize the name of Renfrew: the more widely read will also know of Sabloff. Inclusion in this series under the aegis of such editors is a clue to the training, interests, and approach of the author.

An introductory chapter defines the subject of the book: "the rise of the Greek city-state, one of the most remarkable social formations in history . . . the world's first political community . . . the first true slave society" (p. 1). Morris set this development within the wider phenomenon of state-formation. Thus his work is part of a recent body which has sought to place the emergence and features of the polis into a broader, comparative context.

Archaeological data, principally from burials, and literary evidence for the period 1100 to 500 B.C. are combined to achieve a rather radical account of early Greek society. Nearly all the evidence is Attic, reflecting directly the doctoral thesis (*Burial and Society at Athens, 1100-500 B.C.*, Cambridge 1985) on which it is based. The book is divided into three major parts, a total of 11 chapters. Parts 1 and 2 present the archaeological evidence, with a liberal admixture of ancient written sources. Each step of the presentation is accompanied by summaries of the approaches used, which are drawn mostly from post-processual archaeology, with a distinctly Marxist orientation. The structure and ideology of funerals, and a summary of Greek burial practices and underlying attitudes place Greek evidence in methodological and comparative perspective. Spatial relationships between living and dead, the kinship and social structures revealed by the patterning of burials, evidence for exclusion from formal burial based on rank, mortuary variability as an expression of social identity, graves as symbols of rank and prestige, and finally the question of population are all discussed. Morris traces the emergence of a progressively more stratified society, divided into *agathoi* (in his usage, those who are always accounted for in the burial evidence) and *kakoi* (those sometimes excluded from formal burial), which ultimately was to become polarized into slave and free. His

"good" people include "the nobility" as well as peasant-landowners with dependent households who were, however, not part of the governing group; the *kakoi* are defined simply as "the poor" (pp. 94-95). It is the struggle between *kakoi* and *agathoi*, and the accommodation they reached, that produced the city-state. Along the way, both accepted chronologies and the material categories on which they are based are reviewed, challenged, and to some extent rearranged. The last chapter in this section, "Pottery and Population," seeks to reveal the cycle which is widely accepted at present of rapid, explosive growth in the eighth century, followed by decline in the seventh, as "an archaeological mirage."

In Part 3 Morris wishes to argue that what he has so far observed almost exclusively for Attica and Athens is more generally applicable throughout Dark Age Greece. The broader context is a "Mediterranean-wide process of state formation," the consequences of which in Greece include "new ideas of the gods, the past and the organisation of space" (p. 171). Three phases are identified and described: the end of the Bronze Age (ca. 1125-1050 B.C.), the Dark Age (ca. 1050-750), and the Archaic period (ca. 750-500 B.C.). He contends that *ethne* resulted in areas where the *kakoi* did not carry out their revolution during or after the eighth century. After having observed and interpreted the record for Attica to form a model account of the eighth century, Morris then proceeds to argue that Athenian society in the seventh century diverged from the general line of development, and reverted to a pre-political form for nearly a century before citizenship regained its dominance. Particularly arresting is his demolition in Chapter 10 (pp. 196-202) of the "hoplite reform," which he accomplishes by building on recent criticism both of the literary and material evidence. He must draw heavily on written accounts of Solon and Kleisthenes for the Archaic period, and his arguments become circular at times ("Aristotle announces 'all the land belonged to a few' . . . which is of course what we might infer from the reappearance of restrictions on formal burial" [p. 206]). The final chapter summarizes the potential contributions of archaeology, anthropology and history to an understanding of past societies, in which Morris seeks to reconcile what are usually competing and mutually exclusive disciplines (and their several factions).

Morris's systematic application of anthropology, political theory, and textual criticism in research on early Greek society has long been waiting to be done, and he is to be congratulated. The book serves as an intensive introduction and review of much anthropological theory and practice. Morris also presents current issues and controversies in the study of early Greece with his own arguments and conclusions. Although he pledges to "try to write in a manner comprehensible on both sides of what Renfrew . . . has called the 'Great Divide'" (p. 10), the terse and elliptical style, copious tables and graphs, and visually distracting social-science system of references often combine to make for heavy going. Morris's great reliance on the Athenian evidence is as he points out nearly inevitable, given the current state of knowledge, but troubling because of the breadth of his conclusions; equally so his assertion throughout that even the Athenian evidence is complete enough for the analyses to which it is subjected. In spite of long and widespread excavation in Athens and