In the wake of Bedřich Hrozný’s decipherment of the Hittite language in the year 1915, the Swiss orientalist Emil O. Forrer working on the geography of the Hittite Empire came across the name of the country *Ahhiyā*, which occurred in a number of Hittite documents, and for the first time in 1921 he claimed that it was to be equated with the name of the Achaeans (Gk. Ἀχαιοί < *akʰaiwójí). In the Hittite documents of the 14th-13th c. BC the realm of *Ahhiyā* is described as a neighbouring maritime power of equal standing with the Hittite kingdom, and consequently it was identified by Forrer with Mycenaean Greece – decades before in 1952 the decipherment of the Linear-B script from Southern Greece and Crete made visible the Mycenaean language and its speakers. And on a Linear-B tablet from Knossos also the toponym *a-ka-wi-ja(-de) = /akʰaiwija/ is attested, which represents the original Mycenaean form as a name of a place or a region. And in a letter of a Hittite Great King to the king of *Ahhiyā* Forrer could identify the name of one of the rulers in this realm in its Hittite rendering *Taamalayaš = /ta-emalayaš/ with Gk. Ἕτεοκλῆς < Ἕτεοκλής < *(h)eteroklēyēs, the name of a mythological king in Boeotian Orchomenos, once a centre of the Mycenaean world. And in the treaty dating to around 1280 BC between the Great King of the Hittite Empire *Muḫatalliš II and his vassal Alakšanduš of Ῥιλουςα, the ruler of a small state situated in north-western Anatolia, not only the respective toponym /trilusa/ is reminiscent of Greek Ἰλιος < *ilios, a Greek designation for the city of Troy, but also the personal name Alakšanduš reminds of Ἀλέξανδρος as a name of the Trojan prince Πάρις Ἀλέξανδρος with Πάρις corresponding to the Luvian name *Pari*-LÚ = /pari-zitis/; moreover, the annals of *Tudhalijaš I from the second half of the 15th c. BC mention a campaign against the *Aššuju* coalition including *u-su-ša = /tulisua/ and *ta-ru-(u-)i-ša = /truïsa/ as its northern members, which can be understood as designations of two distinct political entities, but also as ‘the city of Wilusa and the country of Troy’, since Gk. Τροίη < *troya < *troyhā < *tapsā (← Anatolian /truïsa/; a very early loan with Greek s > h before 1500 BC) was originally not the name of the city, but the designation for the country surrounding the city of Ἰλιος.
In Hittite documents we thus find toponyms and anthroponyms stemming from the realm of Mycenaean and, vice versa, in the Homeric Iliad we find Anatolian toponyms and anthroponyms, which have been fossilized in Greek epic poetry from Mycenaean times, thereby surviving the approximately simultaneous collapse of the Mycenaean world and the Hittite Empire and therefore conveying linguistic evidence from the Late Bronze Age.

And this onomastic material, which testifies to the linguistic contact between the Mycenaean and the Anatolian world, has been the topic of the critical examination by Bc. Martin Gális as presented in his master’s thesis. Ever since Forrer’s discovery of the mutual relations between these two linguistic and cultural spheres, the work presented here is the first synopsis of the evidence, which is based on the textual attestations and historical data, and also provided with a thorough up-to-date evaluation of the linguistic facts.


The author first gives a succinct survey of the research history marked by severe disputes (chap. 2), which however is also taken duly into account in the discussion of the single onomastic items (chap. 6 and 7). Then he explains the methodological principles of onomastics (chap. 3), the controversial status of the Greco-Anatolian comparanda in onomastic material (chap. 4), and the question of the compatibility of the linguistic and historical data (chap. 5). The subsequent main part of the work treats the single anthroponyms and toponyms that can be identified with a high degree of plausibility as reflexes of Mycenaean names in Hittite texts or of Anatolian names in the Homeric Iliad (chap. 6 and 7). It is followed by short concluding remarks (chap. 8) and by an enormous bibliography of the literature cited (chap. 9).

The author has been faced with a demanding challenge for the philological, linguistic and historic complexity of the data, which he has mastered, however, on the base of his enormous knowledge of the different philologies involved and by his zeal in considering the enormous research literature on the topic, which in many cases he had to provide from external libraries abroad.

His approach to the material is solid and based on acknowledged principles, and the state of the actual research is taken into account. For the flood of material to be considered, sometimes the coherency of the argumentation is not as stringent as it could be if one considers the well-founded results obtained by the author.
himself in some detail analyses, which would also help clarify the overall argumentation in some points, thereby strengthening certain threads of reasoning and sweeping away divergent views found in the quoted secondary literature. And the formatting of the text is sometimes inconsistent. But these are minor weaknesses, which are more than compensated by the richness of the material presented and its craftsman-like treatment, which shows the candidate’s profound philological and linguistic knowledge. The more so, as he is able to understand in full complexity and analyse with a critical spirit the secondary literature in all major and minor languages used in research. Needless to say, the candidate has also learnt and studied a remarkable number of ancient and modern Indo-European and Semitic languages including the respective language histories.

At the international conference of the GESUS association at the University of Miskolc (Hungary) in May 2017 (25. Jahrestagung der Gesellschaft für Sprache und Sprachen e.V.: “Sprachen, Literaturen und Kulturen im Kontakt”) the candidate already gave a talk on “Anatolia, Mycenae, Troy, Greece: interaction in the late Bronze Age”, presenting some of his results to an audience amongst whom were also internationally leading experts in the field of ancient Indo-European languages, who appreciated his well-structured exposition and argument (e.g. Prof. Dr. Václav Blažek – Brno; Prof. Dr. Eystein Dahl – Tromsø; Prof. Dr. Jón Axel Harðarson – Reykjavík; PD Dr. Sabine Häusler – Halle; Prof. Dr. Martin Kümmel – Jena; Prof. Dr. Vincent Martzloff – Paris Sorbonne).

Therefore the candidate has amply demonstrated his ability to work according to scientific principles and to reach essential results on his own. Without any doubt, he has the potential to carry out in-depth investigations and to present his work also in synopsis with broad horizon.

In his master’s thesis the candidate has not only summarized the research history, but also reached independent conclusions reflecting the actual state of the art; therefore he has treated a demanding topic with success.

After a thorough examination of the work presented, I propose the following assessment:

1,0 (excellent = výborně)
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