

ÖSTERREICHISCHE AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN
PHILOSOPHISCH-HISTORISCHE KLASSE
DENKSCHRIFTEN, 338. BAND

DIE NEUEN LINEAR B-TEXTE AUS THEBEN

IHR AUFSCHLUSSWERT FÜR DIE MYKENISCHE SPRACHE
UND KULTUR

Akten des internationalen Forschungskolloquiums an der
Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 5.–6. Dezember 2002

Herausgegeben von Sigrid Deger-Jalkotzy und Oswald Panagl

Redaktion: Thomas Lindner



VERLAG DER
ÖSTERREICHISCHEN AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN
WIEN 2006

INHALTSVERZEICHNIS

Vorwort	VII
Vassilis L. Aravantinos (Thèbes), Louis Godart, Anna Sacconi (Rome): <i>Commentaires aux nouveaux textes insérés dans le corpus de Thèbes</i>	1
Antonín Bartoněk (Brno): <i>Aspekte des Lexikons der neuesten Theben-Texte</i>	11
Sigrid Deger-Jalkotzy (Salzburg): <i>Theben und Pylos: Terminologische und onomastische Korrespondenzen?</i>	19
José Luis García Ramón (Köln): <i>Zu den Personennamen der neuen Texte aus Theben</i>	37
Ivo Hajnal (Innsbruck): <i>Die Tafeln aus Theben und ihre Bedeutung für die griechische Dialektologie</i>	53
Stefan Hiller (Salzburg): <i>Some Minor Observations Concerning the New Thebes Texts</i>	71
John T. Killen (Cambridge): <i>Thoughts on the functions of the new Thebes tablets</i>	79
Michael Meier-Brügger (Berlin): <i>Sprachliche Beobachtungen</i>	111
Anna Morpurgo Davies (Oxford): <i>Linguistic Evidence from the Thebes Texts in Linear B (Handout)</i>	119
Günter Neumann † (Würzburg): <i>„...Gans und Hund und ihresgleichen...“</i>	125
Thomas G. Palaima (Austin, Texas): <i>*65 = FAR? or ju? and other interpretative conundra in the new Thebes tablets</i>	139
Oswald Panagl (Salzburg): <i>Notizen zur Syntax der neuen thebanischen Linear B-Tafeln</i>	149
Cornelis J. Ruijgh † (Amsterdam): <i>The Three Temporal Clauses (TH Fq 126; 130; 254)</i>	159
Message de Louis Godart en guise de conclusion	171

Linguistic Evidence from the Thebes Texts in Linear B (Handout)*

1. How does the language of Thebes differ from that of the other Mycenaean sites? What can we learn from the new texts about linguistic variation in Mycenaean Greece?

2. John Chadwick, *Minos* 10 (1970), 125f.

“The immediate impression conveyed by the Theban tablets is that they might have been found in any of the other sites which have yielded Linear B tablets ... The proper names on the tablets can be matched from either Pylos or Knossos, in some cases from both...”

3. John Chadwick, *The Thebes Tablets II*, Supl. *Minos* 1975, 97f.

“There is still far too little evidence upon which to assess the Theban variety of the Mycenaean dialect. It is, however, now possible to state that the evidence so far strongly suggests that there is no obvious difference from the dialects of Mycenae, Pylos and Knossos. ... It may be useful to tabulate the evidence for noun-inflection ...

A-stems:	Dat. plur. <i>-a-i</i> Of 25.1, Of 35.2 Gen. sing. masc. <i>-a-o</i> Ug 1, Ug 5, Of 36.2 ?, Of 33.1, Ug 41, Ug 42.
O-stems:	Gen. sing. <i>-o-jo</i> Ug 1, Ug 3
Consonant stems:	Gen. sing. <i>-o</i> (<i>qa-ra₂-to</i>) Of 37.1, (<i>]ta-wo-no</i>) Ug 10 Dat. sing. <i>-e</i> (<i>no-ri-wo-ki-de</i>) Of 36.1, (<i>qa-ra₂-te</i>) Of 38.1; <i>-i</i> ? (<i>pa-pa-ra-ki</i>) Of 25.2. Dat. plur. <i>-si</i> (<i>po-re-si</i>) Of 26.3”.

4. Do the texts which appeared after JC's publications support this view?

5. Theban personal names (excluding the certain or possible divine names and all names on vases) are now ca. 120 (contrast ca. 820 PNs at Pylos and ca. 1100 at Knossos). Of these more than half (ca. 66) are so far unique to Thebes:

5.1. Names with clear Greek etymologies occur both among the names which Thebes shares with PY and/or KN (*ku-ru-me-no*, *ne-ti-ja-no*, *o-pe-re-ta*, *pi-ra-me-no*, etc.) and among the names which are unique to Thebes (*e-pi-do-ro-mo*, *pe-pi-te-me-no*, *pi-ra-ko-ro*).

5.2. The dative *ma-di-je* (TH Av 101, Fq- passim) matches the name of a man /shepherd at KN and looks pre-Greek, but in general the least recognizable names belong to the Thebes-only class.

5.3. We can probably conclude that Thebes has an onomastics of its own, though it substantially overlaps with the onomastics of the other sites.

6. Have we gone beyond Chadwick's tabulation of Theban nominal inflection?

The new data enrich it considerably but do not produce striking surprises. A list which does not aim at completeness:

6.1. *a*-inflection:

Gen. sing. fem. *po-ti-ni-ja* (Of 36: *po-ti-ni-ja wo-ko-de*)

Gen. sing. masc. *a-ka-to-wa-o*, *]de-wa-o*, *e-pe-i-ja-o*, *o-*34-ta-o*

* I much regret that a series of circumstances prevented me from preparing in time the full version of this paper. This handout appears at the request of the editors (see Vorwort); misprints have been corrected but otherwise nothing has been changed from the original version.

Dat. sing. fem. *a-ra-ka-te-ja*, *e-ra*, *ke-o-te-ja*, *ko-wa*, etc.

Dat. sing. masc. *pu₂-re-wa*, ?*pi-ro-pe-se-wa*, *zo-wa* (Av 100)

Dat./loc. plur. *ke-re-na-i*,]*ma-ri-ne-we-ja-i*, *o-ti-ri-ja-i*, *te-qa-i*

Acc.+ de: Sing. (?) *a-ki-a₂-ri-ja-de* (Of 35); cf. form with *-de* missing in Of 25: *a₃-ki-a₂-ri-ja*

Plur. *te-qa-de*

Nom. masc. dual: *ru-ra-ta-e* (before VIR 2 in Av 106)

If *lyra* is acceptable in the second Millennium (not in Homer) presumably read *luratae*. First example of *-a-e* masc. dual outside Knossos. It may be important, if it indicates that the form is more archaic than we tend to think (cf. Hajnal 1997, 89ff.).

6.1.1. A problem caused by the genitive

Ug 3 + fr. *pe-pi-te-me-no-jo*, o-*34-ta O 3 (301/302)

Ug 4 *a-ka-to-wa-o* / *a-u-to-te-qa-jo* O[(301)

The pattern is PN gen. PN nom. O nn, but if so, how do we explain the following tablet also written by hand 301.

Ug 9]jā / *a-mu-ta-wo* O[6

A fem. genitive seems unlikely: are we dealing with a masculine genitive in *-a*? (cf. *ko-ki-da-o-pa* in KN Sd 4403, So 4430).

6.2. Thematic inflection

Nom. sing. *o-pi-ja-ro* (Av 106), *te-u-ke-i-jo* (Av 106), etc.

Acc. sing: *a-ma-ru-to-de* (Of 25)

Gen. sing. *pe-pi-te-me-no-jo* (Ug 1, 3), *qe-ri-jo-jo* (Wu 58)

Dat. sing. *su-me-ra-we-jo* (Of 26), *i-da-i-jo* (Of 28), *ku-ru-me-no* (Of 33), *a-pi-qo-ro* (Of 34), *te-qa-jo* (after *pa-ro* Wu 47), *ka-wi-jo* (Fq 130 etc.), *a-nu-to* (Fq 132 etc.), *pi-ṛa-ko-ro* (Fq 229), etc.

Dat. plur. *e-mi-jo-no-i*[(Gp 129), *e-pe-to-i* (Gp 164, 181, 184), *e-pi-qo-i* (Fq 229, 252), *i-qo-po-qo-i* (Fq 252, 254, 276), *i-si-wi-jo-i* (Gp 127), *te-qa-jo-i*[(Gp 178), *to-pa-po-ro-i* (Gp 184)

Neuter Nom.-Acc. sing. *qe-te-o* (Wu 49, 50, 53, 63), ? *qe-te-jo* (Gp 109; cf. Gp 147), ? *i-je-ro* (Wu 66, 86, 87), *to-ṣo(-pa)* (Ft 140)

Neuter Nom.-Acc. plur. *qe-te-a₂* (Wu 51, 65, 96), ? *i-je-ra* (Wu 44)

6.2.1. The genitive singular and the problem of *di-u-ja-wo* / *di-wi-ja-wo*

Evidence for the name: *di-u-ja-wo* TH Of 26, 33, *di-wi-ja-wo* Nom. KN Vc 293; PY Na 406, TH Ug 11.

Of 26.2. *su-me-ra-we-jo*, *ku* LANA PA 1 *ko-ḏe-wa-o*, *do-de ku* LANA PA 1 H. 303
3. **di-u-ja-wo**, **do-de ku** LANA PA 1 *po-re-si ku* LANA 1

Of 33.1. *ku-ru-me-no ku* LANA PA 1 o-*34-ta-o, *do-de ku* LANA PA 1 H. 303
2. *qi-wo*, **di-u-ja-wo ku**[LANA] PA 2

Ug 11]*vest.* / *di-wi-ja-wo* O 3 H. 301

Ug 9]jā / *a-mu-ta-wo* O 6 H. 301

We expect a genitive in Of 26 (cf. *ko-de-wa-o do-de*); a nominative in Ug 11 (cf. *a-mu-ta-wo: Amuthāōn*) and presumably a dative in Of 33.

If the name was *Diwiāwōn*, we would expect a genitive in *-wo-no*, a dative in *-wo-ne*. A hypocoristic in *-ās* (*Diwyās*?) could have a gen. in *-wos* as in Cypriot (see Hajnal 1997, 53) but that would not explain a dative in *-o*.

A thematic name in *-wos* (for *-arwos* see Ruijgh, *Études*, 130, id., *Minos* 1968, 260) would account for the nom. and dative, but what about the genitive? Why would it not end in *-o-jo*?

6.2.2. Other problematic forms

Wu 58	Wu 88	Wu 46	Wu 76
.α SUS	.α CAP ^x	.α CAP ^f	.α BOS ^f
.βa o-pa			.β1 a-e-ri-qo
.βb qe-ri-jo-jo	.β ra-mi-jo, o-pa	.β pa-ra-wo, o-pa	.β2 vacat
.γ a-ma-ru-to	.γ <i>deest</i>	.γ *I71 30	.γ o-pa *I71 30

The *o-pa* formula requires a genitive and *qe-ri-jo-jo* is a genitive; *pa-ra-wo* could be an athematic genitive. Can we treat *ra-mi-jo* as a nominative? And *a-e-ri-qo*? Or are they genitives?

Gp 227

- .1]V 5 a-ra-o V I[
 .2 ra-]ke-da-mo-ni-jo -u-jo V 2[

We would expect *ra-]ke-da-mo-ni-jo-jo(-)u-jo*. But cf. also **PY Ae 344** *wi-do-wo-i-jo i-*65*. An *o*-genitive or a real patronymic adjective – which could explain the contrast *ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo / ra-ke-da-mo-ni-jo*?

6.3. Consonantal stems

Nom. sing. (masc.): various types attested (examples follow):

n-stems: *a-mu-ta-wo*, *r*-stems: *ne-ti-ja-no*, *eu*-stems: *si-mi-te-u*

Nom.-acc. sing. neuter (*to-so-]pa*)

Acc. *do-de*, *]ro-na-de* (**Av 104**)

Gen. sing. or plur. *te-de-ne-o* (NP gen. sing.? **Ft 220** etc.), *ku-no* (**Fq 205** etc.), *ka-no* (**Ft 217?**)

Dat. sing. *n*-stems: *ku-ne* (if not nom. pl., **Fq 229**), *pu₂-ke-qi-ri-ne* (**Gp 119**), *po-me-ne* (**Av 101** or Nom. plur. ?), *to-po-ne* (**Lf 139**), *o-u-wa-ja-wo-ni* (**Fq 214, 254**), *e-re-o-ni* (**Ft 140, X 155**).

s-stems: *a-ka-de-i* (**Fq 240, 276**), *a-re-i-ze-we-i* (**Of 37**), *me-to-re-i* (**Fq 252, 254, 276, 292**), *o-ko-we-i* (**Fq 214**) / *o-u-ko-we-i* (**Fq 229, 247, 258, 276**), *o-po-re-i* (**Fq 126, 130** and passim)

eu-stems: *de-u-ke-we* (**Fq 229** and passim; cf. *de-u-ke-nu-we?*), *mo-ne-we* (**Fq 254, Gp 110** etc.), *pe-re-ke-we* (if not nom. plur., **Oh 208**), *po-te-we* (**Av 100**), *sa-me-we* (**Wu 59, 60**), *u-re-we* (**Gp 179**) and *o-nu-ke-wi* (**Oh 206**)

u-stems: *ko-ru-we* (**Av 101, Fq 117** and passim), **56-ru-we* (**Fq 205, Gp 112** and passim), *de-u-ke-nu-we* (**Fq 254**) ?? and *ko-ru* (**Fq 126** over [[*ko-ru-we*]], **Fq 254**)

i-stems: ? *]r-q-wi* **Fq 200**, *ko-du-*22-je* (**Fq 214** and passim), *ma-di-je* (**Av 101** and passim), ?? *pa-pa-ra-ki* (**Of 25**)

miscellaneous stems: *no-ri-wo-ki-de* (**Of 36**), *qa-ra₂-te* (**Of 38**), *wa-na-ke-te* (**X 105**) and *e-re-u-te-ri* (**Av 100**)

Nom. plur. *a-po-re-we* (**Ka 113**), *ka-na-pe-we* (**Av 106**), ?? *e-qi-ti-wo-e* (**Wu 75**), ?? *ku-ne* (but cf. dative)

Dat. plur. *a-ke-ne-u-si* (**Fq 130, 240** and passim), *ka-si* (**Ft 141** and passim), *ku-na-ki-si* (**Av 100, Fq 200**), *ku-si* (**Fq 130**), *o-ni-si* (**Fq 123, 169, 342**), *po-re-si* (**Of 26**), *te-ka-ta-si* **Fq 247** and passim)

6.3.1. A welcome archaism: *te-ka-ta-si* (cf. KN *te-ko-to-ne*) < **tekt_n-si*. So far unique to Thebes, but not contradicted by data found elsewhere.

6.3.2. Inflection: in general it matches that known from KN and PY to a surprising degree.

6.3.3. Specific points:

i) *i*-stems. We MAY have evidence in Thebes for two different terminations of dative singular:

- a) *-i* in *pa-pa-ra-ki*, IF this is an *i*-stem.
- b) *-i-je* in *ma-di-je* (cf. KN Nom. *ma-di*) and probably in *ko-du-^{*}22-je*

a) If *pa-pa-ra-ki* is an *i*-stem we cannot be certain whether the ending is [i] or [ī]. The first hypothesis is possible if the name is simply not inflected; a long vowel could be due to the contraction of *-i-i*, but why should we have an *-i* rather than *-ei* ending?

b) *-i-je* certainly stands for [ijei].

a) is probably matched by some KN forms: **56-i-ti*, **56-ti* and perhaps *te-ra-po-ti* (Killen 1992, Hajnal 1997, 35f.)

b) may be matched by KN **56-i-ti-je* (Fh 5487) if this is not, as often supposed, an adjective. Cf. also MY V 659 *o-to-wo-wi-je* (Risch 1987, 290 f.).

Thebes does not seem to have a parallel for KN Xe 524 *ta-qa-ra-tef* with its apparent ablauting ending (Killen 1992, Hajnal loc. cit.)

ii) *u*-stems. Here too we cannot exclude two different terminations of dative sing.

- a) **56-ru-we*, *ko-ru-we*, ? *de-u-ke-nu-we*
- b) *ko-ru* (over [[ko-ru-we]]) Fq 126; Fq 254

Fq 126.2 o-po-re-i V1 Z 2 ko-wa Z[
ko-ru Z 2 ke-re-ṛa-i V[

In Fq 254 *ko-ru* after *o-po-re-i*, *ma-di-je* etc. on a tablet which ends with *i-ḡo-po-ḡo-i*.

If both *-i* and *-ije* datives are acceptable, we might expect both *-u* and *-uwe* datives with *-u* to be read as [u] or [ū] with lack of inflection, or as [ui]; *-u-we* = [uwei].

The *-u-we* termination is well attested in KN and PY (Hajnal 1997, 35); *-u*, if acceptable, would match *e-ri-nu* of KN Fp 1 (in a list of recipients of offerings, all in the dative or allative) vs. *e-ri-nu-we* of KN V 52.

iii) Locative or Nominative?

Ft 140

.1	te-qa-i	GRA + PE 38	OLIV 44
.2	e-u-te-re-u	GRA 14	OLIV 87
.3	ku-te-we-so	GRA 20	OLIV 43
.4	o-ke-u-ri-jo	GRA 3 T 5	
.5	e-re-o-ni	GRA 12 T 7	OLIV 20 ...

Should we take *e-u-te-re-u* as nominative? But a locative is required by the context. PY Nn 228 has *pu₂-ra₂-a-ke-re-u* before SA in a context where *po-ra-pi* and *te-tu-ru-we* appear.

PY Jn 320 *o-re-mo-a-ke-re-u ka-ke-we ta-ra-si-ja e-ko-te*.

A nominative is not expected in all these instances. What are we dealing with? Could we have yet another form of locative?

iv) Dative-locative singular in *-ei* or *-i*

- a) Thebes has *-e* = [ei] in the majority of instances for both locative and dative
- b) Thebes has only *-e-i* ([-ehi]) for the *s*-stems (only exception *a-dwe-e* in Wu 99)

- c) Thebes has isolated instances of *-i* endings in consonantal stems: *o-u-wa-ja-wo-ni*,
e-re-o-ni, *o-nu-ke-wi*, *e-re-u-te-ri*.

If we compare the data collected by Hajnal 1997 for the other Myc. sites the parallelism is striking. Regular *-i* in *s*-stems; occasional *-i* in other consonantal stems with preference for specific stem types: *eu*-stems, *n*-stems, etc., but Thebes has the same types, but different words with *-i*.

7. So far, Thebes offers interesting new material (*te-ka-ta-si*, *ma-di-je*, etc.) but seems to have similar developments to those of the other sites. Does this provide further evidence for a complete identity of written language through the Mycenaean world?

8. Duhoux 1987 pointed out that there are significant statistical preferences in **KN** vs. **PY** and vice-versa; they concern both writing and language.

- i. **PY** preserves in writing intervocalic *-y-* better than **KN**.
- ii. **KN** writes second element of *-i-* diphthongs but **PY** does not.
- iii. **KN** does not have the *-wont-* suffix.
- iv. **KN** has extensive use of *-i-jo* for material adjectives, **PY** does not.
- v. **KN** does not really use *to-so-de* but **PY** does.
- vi. **PY** makes little use of *o-pi* as preposition.

8.1. Thebes does not have sufficient data for valid statistics but preferences can be observed:

- i. **TH** *qe-te-o*, *qe-te-a*, 7 *qe-te-jo* 3 vs. **KN** 7/0; **PY** 1/2
- ii. **TH** *wo-ko-de*, *po-te-u* etc. vs. **KN** *wo-i-ko-de*, *po-i-te-u*
- iii. **TH** *to-so-pa*, *to-so-ku-su-pa*, no *to-so-de*

9. Graphic and linguistic alternations occur in all sites and internally to each site. Thebes is no exception. The alternations reflect innovations in the writing system or in the language or in both and the very fact that they exist demonstrates that the language is not fossilized. Strict schooling does not teach alternative forms.

10. Lessons to be learned.

i. Do not exclude the possibility of variation.

As soon as it becomes clear that a site or a set of texts shows some alternations, it becomes essential to assume that there may be more unexpected variation. Since we have genitives in *-o-jo* and genitives in *-a-o*, should we exclude a priori the possibility of alternative forms such as *-o* and *-a*?

ii. Comparison between sites gives credibility to aberrant forms.

TH *e-u-te-re-u* should lead to comparison with **PY** *-a-ke-re-u*.

*wi-do-wo-i-jo i-*65* is now matched by *ra-ke-da-mo-ni-jo u-jo*. That gives credibility to the apparent genitive without *-o-jo*.

But could we take seriously also *ra-ke-da-mo-ni-jo* vs. *ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo* and read the latter as *Lakedaimnios*, a name, and the former as *Lakedaimonios*, a patronymic adjective: 'son of Lakedaimon'? *wi-do-wo-i-jo* could be equally interpreted.

iii. It is more important to establish the existence of variation than to explain it.

We shall all disagree on the origin of *-i*, *-e*, *-ije* in the dat./loc. sing. of the *i*-stems but after Killen's analysis plus the Theban data we must accept that these forms exist.

It is possible that the *u*-stems had similar variation.

iv. Alternations which are based on a mixture of archaisms and innovations point to a language which is not fossilized.

The alternations between [ci] and [i] endings in the dative sing. are similar in all sites but not identical.

The complete consistency in the use of [i] in the *s*-stems now found in Thebes supports Risch's view that it is an archaism, The preferences rather than rules which dictate the use of [i] in other stems point to a mixture of innovation and archaism – similar but different in different places. This may speak for an evolving language which is acquiring local characteristics. Here Thebes offers the indispensable *tertium comparationis*.

References

- Duhoux, Y. 1987. Linéaire B crétois et continental: Éléments de comparaison, *Tractata Mycenaea*, 105–128.
- Hajnal, I. 1997. Sprachschichten des mykenischen Griechisch. Zur Frage der Differenzierung zwischen "Mycénien spécial" und "Mycénien normal". *Salamanca 1997, Supl. Minos* 14.
- Killen, J. T. 1992. Names in -i on the Knossos Tablets, *Mykenaiika*, 351–363.