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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?

"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...”

“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-inflexion ..."

A-stems: Dat. plur. -a-i Of 25.1, Of 35.2
Gen. sing. masc. -a-o Ug 1, Ug 5, Of 36.2 ?, Of 33.1, Ug 41, Ug 42.

O-stems: Gen. sing. -o-jo Ug 1, Ug 3

Consonant stems: Gen. sing. -o (qa-ra-to) Of 37.1, (|wo-wo-no) Ug 10
Dat. sing. -e (no-ri-wo-ki-de) Of 36.1, (qa-ra-te) Of 38.1;
Dat. plur. -si (po-re-si) 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-li-ja-no, o-pe-re-ta, pi-ra-me-no, etc.) and among the names which are unique to Thebes (e-pi-do-ko-no, 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. pu-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-i-i-ri-ja-i, te-qa-i
Acc. + de: Sing. (?) a-ki-a-ri-ja-de (Of 35); cf. form with -de missing in Of 25: a-ki-a-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 Of (301)
The pattern is PN gen. PN nom. O nm, but if so, how do we explain the following tablet also
written by hand 301.
Ug 9 lja / a-mu-ta-wo Of (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), re-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-go-ro (Of 34), te-qa-jo (after pa-ro Wu 47), ka-wi-jio (Fq 130 etc.),
a-mu-to (Fq 132 etc.), pi-qa-ko-ro (Fq 229), etc.
Dat. plur. e-mi-jo-no-i (Gp 129), e-pe-to-i (Gp 164, 181, 184), e-pi-go-i (Fq 229,
252), i-go-po-go-i (Fq 252, 254, 276), i-si-wi-jo-i (Gp 127), te-jaa-i-
(Gp 178), to-pa-po-ro-i (Gp 184)
147), ? i-je-ro (Wu 66, 86, 87), to-qa(-pa) (Pt 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.
3. su-me-ra-we-jo, ku LANA PA 1 ko-de-wa-o, do-de ku LANA PA 1 H. 303
di-u-ja-wo, do-de ku LANA PA 1 po-re-si ku LANA 1
Of 33.1.
2. ku-ru-me-no ku LANA PA 1 o-*34-ta-o, do-de ku LANA PA 1 H. 303
qi-wo, di-u-ja-wo ku[ LANA ] PA 2
Ug 11 ljest / di-wi-ja-wo O 3 , H. 301
Ug 9 lja / 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:
Amathāān) and presumably a dative in Of 33.

If the name was Diwižwōn, 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wu 58</th>
<th>Wu 88</th>
<th>Wu 46</th>
<th>Wu 76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\text{a} \ SUS)</td>
<td>(\text{a} \ CAP)</td>
<td>(\text{a} \ CAP)</td>
<td>(\text{a} \ BOS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\beta \ a \ o-pa)</td>
<td>(\beta \ a \ o-pa)</td>
<td>(\beta \ pa-ra-wo, o-pa)</td>
<td>(\beta \ a-e-ri-qo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\gamma \ a-ma-ru-to)</td>
<td>(\gamma \ deest)</td>
<td>(\gamma \ *17/30)</td>
<td>(\gamma \ o-pa *17/30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The o-pa formula requires a genitive and qa-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 ![
2  ra-[ke-da-mo-ni-jo ]u-jo V ![]

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-li-ja-no, eu-stems: si-mi-te-u
Nom.-acc. neuter (to-so-jo)
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), pu-[ke-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-ne-i (OF 37), me-to-re-i (Fq 252, 254, 276, 292), o-ko-wo-ne-i (Fq 121) / o-u-ko-wo-ne-i (Fq 229, 247, 278, 276), o-po-re-i (Fq 126, 130 and passim)
- eu-stems: de-ke-we (Fq 229 and passim; cf. de-ke-ne-wo-?), mo-ne-wo (Fq 254, Gp 110 etc.), pe-re-ke-we (if not nom.plur., Oh 208), po-te-wo (Av 100), sa-me-wo (Wu 59, 60), u-re-we (Gp 179) and o-ru-lo-wo- (Oh 206)
- u-stems: ko-ru-we (Av 101, Fq 117 and passim), *56-ru-wo (Fq 205, Gp 112 and passim), de-ke-mu-wo- (Fq 254) ?? and ko-ru (Fq 126 over [[ko-ru-wo]], Fq 254)
- i-stems: ?-ra-wo-i (Fq 200, ko-dru-je (Fq 214 and passim), ma-di-je (Av 101 and passim), pu-pa-ra-ki (Of 25)
miscellaneous stems: no-ri-ko-ki-de (Of 36), qa-ra-te (Of 38), wa-na-te-te (X 105) and e-re-u-te-re (Av 100)
Nom. plur. a-po-re-ne (Ka 113), ka-na-ne-wo (Av 106), ?? e-gi-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-kii-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 archaisms: te-ka-ta-si (cf. KN te-ko-to-ne) < *tektu-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 [ɪ]. 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 [jei].

a) is probably matched by some KN forms: *56-i-ti, *56-ti and perhaps te-ra-po-li (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-te/ 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-qa-i V[

In Fq 254 ko-ru after o-po-re-i, ma-di-je etc. on a tablet which ends with i-go-po-go-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 [ʊ] with lack of inflection, or as [ui]; -u- we = [uwe].

The -u-we termination is well attested in KN and PY (Hajnal 1997, 35); -u, if acceptable, would match e-ri-mu 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 pu-rq-a-ke-re-u before SA in a context where po-ra-pi and te-tu-ru-we appear.

PY Jn 320 o-ro-mo-a-ke-re-u ka-ke-velop 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 -el 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 (tu-ka-ta-sti, 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-a2 7 qe-te-jo 3 vs. KN 7/0; PY 1/2
ii. TH wo-ko-de, po-te-u etc. vs. KN wo-l-ko-de, po-l-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-*63 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 Lakedaimious, 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, -i(e) 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.
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