

JOHN T. KILLEN
Jesus College
Cambridge

UDC 811.14'02'28

TWO NOTES ON LINEAR B

Abstract: It is suggested 1. That the phrase (*to-so*) *e-te e-so-to a-mo-ra-ma* on KN Am(1) 600, 601 means ‘(so many) [MEN] will be [present] from there on a day-to-day basis’, and indicates that the male textile workers from Knossos and Amnisos to whom these tablets refer will work at the central textile (finishing?) workshop(s) at Knossos without needing accommodation/bedding. Note that the two other Am(1) records most closely comparable to 600, 601 viz. Am(1) 568, 5882 (a) refer to places less close to the centre than Knossos itself and Amnisos and (b) do not (apparently) contain such an entry. – 2. That the contrasting phrases (i) *o-u-qe e-to *35-ka-te-re*; (ii) *e-ke-qe a-po-te-ro-te *35-ra-ka-te-ra* on the mysterious record PY Va 15 are most plausibly interpreted as (i) ‘and there are no *35. inside (*entos*)’ and (ii) ‘and it has (a) *35. on both sides (*amphoterōthen*)’ viz. both inside and outside.

1. *e-te e-so-to a-mo-ra-ma*

The text of the Knossos MAN record Am(1) 601 reads as follows.

Am(1) 601	(103)
.a	e-te, e-so-to, a-mo-ra-ma
.b to-so, / a-mi-ni-si-jo,	VIR 9

Given its scribe (no. 103, the writer of records of the textile industry *par excellence*), the tablet is likely to concern male cloth workers: perhaps, as I suggested in 1979, male finishing specialists (fullers and perhaps also decorators of fabric), such as are also found in comparable centrally-controlled textile industries in the Ancient Near East⁽¹⁾. The tablet begins with the phrase *to-so a-mi-ni-si-jo, /tos(s)oi Amnisiol*, ‘so many men of Amnisos’, and then continues with the words *e-te e-so-to a-mo-ra-ma*, written smaller and at a higher level than the initial phrase, i.e., in a position often occupied by explanatory glosses. The tablet then concludes with the MAN ideogram and the numeral 9.

What is the meaning of *e-te e-so-to a-mo-ra-ma*? A first suggestion was offered by Ventris and Chadwick in *Documents*¹ (and repeated by Chadwick in *Documents*²): that *a-mo-ra-ma* means ‘food levy’, ‘rations’ (they compared Greek ἀρμαλιά, ἀρμολιά, ‘rations’,

⁽¹⁾ *Chaumont Colloquium* 167f.

and the gloss ἄρωλα-ἀρτύματα. Ἄρκαδες. καὶ ἀρωμάλα in Hesychius), and that the phrase as a whole should be interpreted as */enthen es(s)ontoi harmolāma/*, ‘the rations will be from there’ i.e. will be provided locally at Amnisos, rather than at Knossos.⁽²⁾ In *Docs*¹, VC also entertain another possibility, that *e-so-to* is a full spelling of the imperative */estō/*⁽³⁾; in *Docs*², however, Chadwick notes that */es(s)ontoi/* is preferable ‘because of the absence of orders on the tablets’⁽⁴⁾.

As H. Mühlestein points out in his discussion of *e-te e-so-to a-mo-ra-ma* in the *Proceedings of the Second Cretological Congress* (1968)⁽⁵⁾, however, a severe difficulty for VC’s interpretation of *a-mo-ra-ma* is raised by a closely similar record to Am(1) 601: Am(1) 600, the text of which reads as follows.

Am(1) 600 + 665 + 8307	(103) ⁴
.a	to-so, e-te, e-so-to, a-mo-ra-ma
.b ko-no-si-jo, /	VIR 25

Here, instead of preceding the initial ethnic, *to-so* stands before *e-te e-so-to a-mo-ra-ma* in the upper line; and, as Mühlestein points out, if *e-so-to* is */es(s)ontoi/*, *a-mo-ra-ma* can hardly be its neuter subject, since *to-so* on this tablet presumably has the same interpretation, */tos(s)oi/*, as *to-so* on Am(1) 601, in which case *a-mo-ra-ma* cannot agree with it. And given this fact, Mühlestein suggests another interpretation of *to-so e-te e-so-to a-mo-ra-ma*: that *e-te* is a masculine plural noun *†ἔτεες*, related to *ἔταϊρος*; that *to-so* agrees with this; and that *a-mo-ra-ma* is an adverbial expression */āmōr-āmar/* (cf. Greek *ἡμαρ*, ‘day’, and for the ending of *āmōr* Greek *τέκμωρ* besides *τέκμαρ*) meaning ‘day by day’, just as *we-te-i-we-te-i* on the Pylos Es *do-so-mo* tablets seems clearly to mean ‘year by year’. (Later, A. Heubeck was to suggest that *a-mo-* was better explained as an *o-* spelling of a zero-grade *āmṛ-*.)⁽⁶⁾ In short, Mühlestein explains *to-so e-te e-so-to a-mo-ra-ma* as ‘there will be so many companions (*vel sim.*) day by day (*viz.* on a daily basis)’.

Though there can be no final confirmation of Mühlestein’s interpretation of *a-mo-ra-ma* (the context is not such as to allow this, and it remains puzzling why ‘day’ should have a different form in the first element of the juxtaposition than in the second), there is perhaps some modest contextual evidence to suggest that it may be correct; though I am not persuaded by Mühlestein’s second suggestion, that *e-te* is an otherwise unattested *†ἔτεες*.

(2) *Documents*¹ 170, 387; *Documents*² 420, 530.

(3) *Documents*¹ 170.

(4) *Documents*² 420.

(5) II, 135f.

(6) *Acta Mycenaea* II, 69f.

Besides Am(1) 600 and Am(1) 601, which, as we have seen, record men of Knossos and Amnisos respectively, there are two other Am(1) records in hand 103 which appear to serve the same purpose as those documents (though neither is as closely similar physically to Am(1) 600 and Am(1) 601 as these are to themselves). Their texts read as follows.

Am(1) 568 (103)
 .a to-so [
 .b da-wi-jo / VIR[

Am(1) 5882 + 5902 (103)
]-so / ka-ma-jo, VIR 16[
 Trace at left consistent with]t ρ .

It is immediately noticeable that unlike Am(1) 600 and Am(1) 601, Am(1) 5882 contains no entry on an upper register comparable with *e-te e-so-to a-mo-ra-ma* on Am(1) 601 and *to-so e-te e-so-to a-mo-ra-ma* on Am(1) 600. It is also quite possible (though final confirmation is lacking) that there was no entry of this type on Am(1) 568, other than the *to-so* which immediately follows *da-wi-jo*. Though we cannot exclude the possibility that something of this kind appeared on the part of the tablet now missing at the right, the top of the MAN ideogram extends above the level of *to-so* before it; and if something originally followed *to-so* at the same level it can only have done so after the intervening VIR i.e. with a break between it and *to-so*. On balance, therefore, it seems more likely than not that this tablet, too, lacked an *e-te e-so-to a-mo-ra-ma* entry, and hence that it had precisely the same contents as Am(1) 5882 viz. an ethnic; the adjective *to-so* (here at a higher level than the ethnic, as on 600, rather than preceding it, as on 601); the ideogram VIR; and a numeral.

The question therefore at once comes to mind: is it simply an accident that the two records in this small ‘set’ which relate to Knossos and its port Amnisos (600, 601) contain a (*to-so*) *e-te e-so-to a-mo-ra-ma* entry; whereas both the remaining tablets, which relate to places further afield, *da-wo* in the south of the island (568) and *ka-ma* of uncertain location, but evidently not in the immediate vicinity of the palace⁽⁷⁾ (5882), may well do not? Is it possible, in fact, that *e-te* is not, as Mühlestein has suggested, an unattested

⁽⁷⁾ It is associated with *do-ti-ja* on L 520; and *ka-mo*, which may well be a variant spelling of the same toponym, is associated with *ra-su-to* on As(1) 604, which in turn is paired with *do-ti-ja* on Dn 1200. See further J.K. McArthur, *Place-names in the Knossos tablets: identification and location* (Salamanca 1993) 64–68 (and *op. cit.* 241f. for the suggestion that *do-ti-ja* and *ka-ma/-mo* may be in the south-central part of Crete).

†ξτεϙ, but as Ventris and Chadwick suggested, /*enthen*/ ‘thence’; and is perhaps (*to-so*) *e-te e-so-to a-mo-ra-ma* an annotation by the scribe of these records that the male workers of Knossos and Amnisos who are dealt with on them will be present in the palace (finishing) workshop(s) at Knossos on a daily basis: ‘they (or, with *to-so* before *e-te*, ‘so many’) will be (present) thence (i.e. from the Knossos district - the area immediately surrounding the palace - and Amnisos) day by day’. And is the reason for this situation that because of the short distance they have to travel these men can lodge in their own houses, and will not need to be supplied with bedding (as some personnel at some central Mycenaean sites appear to have been)?⁽⁸⁾ (As I have suggested, it may well be that, in contrast to part at least of the female workforce, many of the male workers for Mycenaean palaces may have been semi-dependent, part-time employees, who worked during the periods of the year that they were not engaged in palace service on their own (or palace-allocated) land-holdings.)⁽⁹⁾ If most of the workforce, permanent or temporary, at Knossos *did* need accommodation (perhaps, in the case of the temporary workers, because they came from some distance away from the palace), the adding of an annotation with the sense that I am proposing for (*to-so*) *e-te e-so-to a-mo-ra-ma* to the two Am(1) records dealing with Knossos and Amnisos would, it is arguable, be readily understandable⁽¹⁰⁾.

2. Pylos Va 15

In his excellent discussion of the mysterious Pylos record Va 15 in the *Acts* of the 9th International Mycenological Colloquium, J. Chadwick interprets the term *e-to* on line 1 of the tablet as the dual of the verb ‘to be’, /*eston*/,⁽¹¹⁾ as he and Ventris had earlier done in *Documents*¹, and as he himself had previously done in

⁽⁸⁾ For the allocation of bedding (*de-mi-ni-ja*) to personnel at Pylos, see Vn 851; for the same phenomenon at Mycenae, see V 659 (where the female recipients appear to have been workers in the textile industry).

⁽⁹⁾ *BICS* 26 (1979) 133f.

⁽¹⁰⁾ If the suggestion offered here about the significance of the presence of *e-te e-so-to a-mo-ra-ma* on Am(1) 600, Am(1) 601 but not on Am(1) 568, Am(1) 5882 is correct, the failure of the annotation to appear on the latter records could be for one or other of two reasons. Either (i) the workers of *da-wo* and *ka-ma* recorded on these tablets are workers from these places who are (temporarily?) located at Knossos, and who have to be given accommodation there because of the distance from which they have had to travel to the centre, or (ii) these are workers still in the locations indicated by their descriptions, and the palace administration at Knossos takes no interest in the domestic arrangements of workers in more remote locations.

⁽¹¹⁾ *Mykenaiika* 167-172.

*Documents*²,⁽¹²⁾ The text of the record which Chadwick was using in his *Mykenaika* discussion reads as follows.

Va 15

.1 pu-ro, a[]a₂, o-[]ke, e-[.]*83, o-u-qe, e-to *35-ka-te-re 2
 .a *35-ra-ka-te-ra
 .2 pe-]re-ku wa-na-ka[]e-te, pu-ro, e-ke-qe, a-po-te-ro-te 1
verso
 .a a-mo-i-je-to
 pe-re-ku / wa-na-ka , pu-ro e-ti-wa-jo , *35-ka-te-re

In his comments on the tablet, Chadwick makes a number of cogent points.

1. The words *pe-re-ku wa-na-ka* on l.2 of the recto and on the reverse appear to represent a compound personal name (*Presguwanaks* or *Pelekuwanaks*).

2. The phrase *o-u-qe e-to *35-ka-te-re* on l.1 of the recto is strongly reminiscent of phrases on the Sd CHARIOT records at Knossos such as *o-u-qe pte-no* (Sd 4402.a, Sd 4405.a: *louk^we pternōl*, ‘and there are no foot-boards’); *o-u-qe a-ni-ja po-si* (Sd 4402.b: *louk^we hāniai posi*, ‘and there are no reins attached’); *o-u-qe a-ni-ja po-si e-e-si* (Sd 4422.b: *louk^we hāniai posi e(h)ensil*, same sense). (Chadwick goes on to suggest that the last phrase, involving not the absolute use of the preposition, with the verb ‘to be’ understood, as on Sd 4402, &c., but the insertion of the verb, provides a parallel for his proposed interpretation of *e-to* following *o-u-qe* on Va 15.1 as *leston*.)

3. **35-ka-te-re* on l.1 of the tablet is apparently a variant spelling of the word which appears in a different case form in l.2, **35-ra-ka-te-ra*.

4. The phrase *o-u-qe e-to *35-ka-te-re* on l.1 of the record is likely to form a contrast with the phrase *e-ke-qe a-po-te-ro-te *35-ra-ka-te-ra* on l.2.

Finally, Chadwick adduces in support of his contention that *e-to* is *leston* the numeral 2 at the end of the line which contains the term.

Since Chadwick wrote, there has been a further revision of the text of Va 15, by J.L. Melena. I am much indebted to José Melena for allowing me to reproduce here his revised text and critical notes. These are as follows.

⁽¹²⁾ *Documents*¹ 348, 391; *Documents*² 546.

Va 15

(Cii)

Recto.1 pu-ro, a[]-a₂, o-[]ke, e-*83 o-u-qe, e-to *35-ka-te-re 2[

.a *35-ra-ka-te-ra

.2 pe-]re-ku_L]wa-na-ka[]-e-te, pu-ro, e-ke-qe, a-po-te-ro-te]!

↓↓

Verso

.a a-mo-i-je-to

pe-re-ku wa-na-ka , pu-ro e-ti-wa-jo *35-ka-te-re [

.1 ø[]-a₂ not excluded; 2[not complete at right, 4 or more

.2 Space for two signs between -ka and]e- (jo-wi not excluded);

! perhaps belonging to the previous text

Verso Change of size between *pe-re-ku* and *wa-na-ka*; *35-ka-te-re over erasure; -ka- certainly over [[ka]] or [[qe]]

Of particular interest is Melena's note on the numeral at the end of line 1: '2[not complete at right, 4 or more'. If this reading is correct, it will of course follow that a major prop for Chadwick's interpretation of *e-to* as the dual /*eston*/ is removed. But if *e-to* were not /*eston*/, could it be interpreted in any other way?

In a discussion of possible examples of the adverbial suffix -θεν in Mycenaean in *Živa Antika* 9 (1959) 105-128, P. Hr. Ilievski suggests that since *e-to* on l.1 occupies the same position as *a-po-te-ro-te*, fairly clearly /*amphoterōthen*/, on l.2, both are likely to be adverbs with ablatival meaning; and he further suggests that *e-to* is Gr. ἐντός, here with the (undocumented) sense of 'from inside', contrasting with ἀμφοτέρωθεν, 'from both sides' in l.2.⁽¹³⁾

It could well, I believe, be that *e-to* here is indeed ἐντός; though I suggest that, if this is what it is, it is perhaps more likely to have its standard sense of 'inside, within', rather than 'from within', as Ilievski suggests. My reasons for favouring this interpretation are as follows.

As Chadwick has argued, it is attractive to take *o-u-qe e-to *35-ka-te-re* on line 1 of the record as contrasting with *e-ke-qe a-po-te-ro-te *35-ra-ka-te-ra* on l.2. Because of the state of the tablet, and our uncertainty about the meaning of *35-(ra-)ka-te, we cannot establish what is being recorded here; but one possibility, given the recurrence of phrases of the *o-u-qe ...* type in the Sd CHARIOT tablets at Knossos, is that the tablet relates to artefacts of some kind. Is perhaps, therefore, the purpose of these contrasting entries on lines 1 and 2 to indicate that the 2[objects (?) referred to in line 1 do not

⁽¹³⁾ ἐντός may also occur in Mycenaean as the first element in the description *e-to-wo-ko* (see KN Fh 462.2, PY An 39.5, Fn 79.13), which may be /*lentoworgos*/, 'worker within (the sanctuary?)', though this interpretation is far from certain. (Cf. the term *e-ko-so-wo-ko*], perhaps /*eksoworgos*/, 'worker outside', on KN Xd <299>).

have *35-(*ra-*)*ka-te-re* (nom. plur. of an agent noun in *-tēr*) on the inside ('and there are no *35. within'), whereas the one (?) object (?) listed on l.2 (see the numeral *!* at the end) has *35-(*ra-*)*ka-te-re* or a *35-(*ra-*)*ka-te* on both sides viz. on both outside and inside ('and it has a *35. (or *35.s) on both sides')? [It is unclear whether *35-*ra-ka-te-ra* here is accusative singular or accusative plural.]

There would seem to be no difficulties for such an interpretation; and I would submit that this suggested explanation of the phrase on l.1 of the record (*o-u-qe e-to *35-ka-te-re*) is more in keeping with the pattern of comparable entries on other records in the archive than the interpretation which Chadwick has suggested. First, though the *-θεν* suffix of *ἀμφοτέρωθεν* must originally have had ablatival force, the term in Homer and later Greek regularly has the sense, not of 'from both sides' but of 'on both sides'⁽¹⁴⁾. See, for instance, in Homer *Il.* 12.54-55 (of the ditch): *κρημνοὶ γὰρ ἐπηρεφέες περὶ πᾶσαν | ἕστασαν ἀμφοτέρωθεν*: 'along its full length, tall overhanging banks rose on both sides'. Clearly, if *a-po-te-ro-te* on Va 15.2 has this (normal) sense of 'on both sides', there will then be no need to assume that *entos* in the contrasting phrase on l.1 has the otherwise undocumented sense of 'from within'.

Second, though the verb 'to be' does accompany the preposition *po-si* in the phrase *o-u-qe a-ni-ja po-si e-e-si* on Sd 4422 (a point adduced by Chadwick in support of his explanation of *e-to* as */eston/*), this is in fact an exceptional addition: it is much more common for the preposition/adverb to be used absolutely in such phrases, thus providing a parallel for the absolute use which I am suggesting for *entos* in the phrase *o-u-qe e-to *35-ka-te-re*. The following are examples of the absolute use of the preposition/adverb in the Sd series.

Sd 4402.b	<i>o-u-qe a-ni-ja po-si</i>
Sd 4412.a	<i>o-u-qe po-si e-re-pa</i>
Sd 4416.a	<i>o-u-qe a-ni-ja po-si</i>
Sd 4422.a	<i>o-u-qe pe-qa-to u-po</i>
Sd <4450>.b	<i>o-u-qe pte-no po-si</i>

Finally, on my interpretation of both phrases, the numerals at the end of each line will refer to the number of objects (?) being recorded on the tablet, not to some aspect of their decoration, added equipment or the like, as Chadwick's interpretation involved assuming. This finds a precise parallel in the Sd series, where the numeral at the end of each record, following the CUR ideogram,

⁽¹⁴⁾ M. Lejeune, *Les adverbess grecs en -θεν* (Bordeaux 1939) 247f.

refers to the number of chariots being listed, not to some aspect of their additional equipment (reins, &c.) or ornamentation (ivory, &c.).

Only one question remains: whether if *o-u-qe e-to* *35-ka-te-re, *e-ke-qe a-po-te-ro-te* *35-ra-qa-te-ra do have the sense that I am suggesting here it then becomes easier to suggest an interpretation of the mysterious term *35-(ra-)ka-te in both phrases? The answer, unfortunately, is ‘no’. As Chadwick points out in his *Mykenaika* discussion, an interpretation of the term as ἀλκτῆρ (Hom.), ‘protector’, would neatly explain the fluctuation in spelling between *35-ra-qa-te-ra and *35-ka-te-re (in the first instance, the *l* would be indicated, in the second, not). While, however, a sense ‘protective element’ would be consistent with the interpretations of *o-u-qe*, &c., *e-ke-qe*, &c. that I have suggested above (‘and there are no protective elements on the inside(s)’; ‘and it has (a) protective element(s) on both sides’), there is nothing on the record to impose this sense for *35(-ra)-ka-te. Moreover, as Chadwick observes, supplying the value *al* for *34/*35 ‘does not produce satisfactory solutions to other words containing this sign’.

DISCUSSION

C. J. Ruijgh: Prof. Killen's convincing interpretation of KN Am(i) 600 and 601 leads me to interpret *a-mo-ra-ma* as ἄμωρ ἄμαρ ‘in the day-time every day’. The adverb ἄμωρ ‘by day, in the day-time’ would be the opposite of νύκτερ ‘by night’, whereas the addition of ἄμαρ would indicate the notion of repetition.