

JOHN T. KILLEN  
 Jesus College  
 Cambridge  
 UK

UDC:003.341(091)

## A NOTE ON KNOSSOS TABLET V <1631>

*Abstract:* The paper suggests that the heading of the missing tablet KN V <1631> should be read as ]še-to-i-jē-we[, thus providing a second ‘true’ ethnic in -εῦς at Knossos (in this case derived from the place-name *se-to-i-ja*) to go alongside *ra-je-u*, *ra-je-we*. The paper then considers some of the implications of this finding.

The Knossos tablet V 1631 is now missing, but a photograph of it survives, printed in *Scripta Minoa II*, plate 62.

The text of the record, based on the photograph, is given in *KT*<sup>5</sup> as follows.

### V <1631>

- |    |            |     |
|----|------------|-----|
| .1 | ]-to-i-jē[ |     |
| .2 | ]ru-ko     | 1[  |
| .3 | ]no-du     | 1[  |
| .4 | ]ḏa-na-jō  | 1 [ |
| .5 | ] vac.     | [   |

(–)

Missing; text from *Scripta Minoa II*, pl. 62.

.1 ]še-to-i-jē[ possible.

The body of the text, on ll. 2-4, consists of what are fairly clearly men’s names, each followed by the numeral one. ]ḏa-na-jō, a reasonably secure reading in l. 4, may well be the same name, *da-na-jo*, perhaps *Danaios*, as occurs on KN Db 1324 as that of a shepherd; while ]ru-ko and ]no-du can also readily be taken as masculine personal names: for their forms, compare e.g. the men’s names *qa-ru-ko* MY Au 657.9, 660.2 and *o-du* KN V(3) 479 v.3. Although the tablet is damaged at the left, the curving shape of what survives suggests that not much is missing at the beginning, so that ]no-du may be complete, while the trace at the left may be the first sign of ]ru-ko.

It is the term on the first line of the tablet that I wish to concentrate on here. In *KT*<sup>5</sup>, we read this as ]-to-i-jē[, but note in the critical apparatus that ]še-to-i-jē[ is a possible reading. Though

there can be no certainty about readings that are entirely dependent on a photograph, the *je* seems to me reasonably secure; while there are certainly traces to the left that are consistent with *se*. The possibility immediately comes to mind therefore that what we have here is an ethnic in *-eus* derived from the place-name *se-to-i-ja* which serves to describe the men in the entries below. And there is I believe some further encouragement for the view that this is the correct explanation of the term.



Fig. 1. KN V 1631 (after *SM II*)

First, as we have seen above, there is a good possibility that not much of the tablet is missing at the left, so that ]*se-to-i-je*[ might well be complete at the beginning. And second, as I noticed on a recent re-examination of the *SM II* photograph (of which there is a good reproduction in the *Corpus of Mycenaean Inscriptions from Knossos*), there appears to be a curved stroke at the bottom of the register following the *je* of ]*se-to-i-je*[ which, if it is not illusory, can hardly be other than the bottom of a *we*.

If so, this will give us a reading ]*se-to-i-je-we*[ viz. the expected plural ending, in *-ēwes*, of a masculine ethnic in *-eus* from *se-to-i-ja* qualifying the men beneath. For a tablet of a similar pattern to what we would then have here, see KN V(4) 653:

**V(4) 653**

- .1 do-ti-jo , ‘a-['
- .2 \*49-sa-ro l / po-ti[
- .3 ra-ku l ku-ka-ro[
- .4 ra-te-me l \*56-[

Cut at left.

- .1 *-jo* possibly over [[     ]].

If, then, the indications of the photograph are not misleading, we appear to have a further instance at Knossos of an ethnic in *-eus* to add to our sole previous example of this formation in Linear B viz. the plural *ra-je-we* on KN *L*(9) 7400 and almost certainly also – though the *u* is dotted – the singular *ra-je-u* on KN *Ga*(5) 1530.3b, which there can be no serious doubt (see further below) is an ethnic in *-eus* from the place-name *ra-ja* which is attested on KN *C*(3) 979, *Dn* 1096 and perhaps also on *As*(1) 607.5b.

(103)

As I noted in my discussion of *ra-je-we*, *ra-je-u* in *Studies in Mycenaean and Classical Greek presented to John Chadwick* (1987, pp. 328-331), the discovery of these forms, the first as the result of a join, the second because of an improved reading, is of considerable linguistic interest. Before their discovery, the generally held view of ethnics in Mycenaean had been that whereas ethnics in *-eus* were common in later Greek, and while Mycenaean shows (i) personal names in *-eus* which are clearly derived from place-names, like *o-ko-me-ne-u*, evidently *Orkhomenus* < Orkhomenos, and (ii) descriptive adjectives in *-eus* which are based on the physical characteristics of the places from which those described by the terms come, like *pe-di-je-we*, almost certainly *pediēwes* and derived from *pedion*, ‘plain’, all the ‘true’ ethnics in Mycenaean are in *-ios*, and those in *-eus* are later developments, which perhaps have their origin in the descriptions like *pediēwes* that we have just mentioned<sup>1</sup>. Since, however, *ra-ja-we*, *ra-je-u* and now *]še-to-i-je-we[* are found in their respective contexts either in parallel with ‘true’ ethnics (*ra-je-we* on the L(9) tablets in parallel with *ra-su-ti-jo*, etc.; *ra-je-u* on Ga(5) 1530 in parallel with *da-wi-jo* and *pu-na-si-jo*) or in a position on the tablet occupied by ‘true’ ethnics on similar records (*]še-to-i-je-we[* on V <1631> in the same position as *do-ti-jo* on V(4) 653), it can scarcely be doubted that these also are ‘true’ ethnics, and hence that this traditional view of the matter has to be modified.

Once we know that some ‘true’ ethnics in *-eus* are in fact attested in Mycenaean, a number of questions immediately arise. For instance, should we now explain the personal names in *-eus* on the tablets which are derived from place-names, like *Orkhomenus* < Orkhomenos, as based on ‘true’ ethnics, like the many names in *-ios* on the records that are clearly based on *-ios* ethnics (*pa-i-ti-ja* at Knossos < E *pa-i-ti-jo*, *-ja*; *te-qa-jo* at Thebes < E *te-qa-jo*, *-ja*; etc.); or is there still merit in C. J. Ruijgh’s suggestion (1967, p. 165) that both these and the names in *-ātās* like *Erkhomenātās* < PN *e-ko-me-no* (see below) are based on ethnics of an expressive or popular character? And what of the massive expansion in the use of *-eus* as an ethnic termination in later Greek: should we still see the origin of this, not in ‘true’ ethnics like *ra-je-u*, *ra-je-we* at Knossos, but perhaps in descriptions of the *pediēwes* type?

There is not space here to begin to attempt to answer these questions. I end, however, with a few observations which may be of relevance to any future discussions of these issues.

<sup>1</sup> For the views outlined here, see Risch 1957, Ruijgh 1967, pp. 164-165. For further discussion of the ethnic formants in Mycenaean and later Greek, see Chantraine 1966, pp. 166-167, Risch 1972, pp. 196-197, id. 1976, p. 24, Gschnitzer 1983, Heubeck 1985, pp. 71-75, Leukart 1994, pp. 197-202, 249-254.

1. It is noticeable, and may be significant, that all our known examples of ‘true’ ethnics in *-eus* on the tablets are at Knossos. It is also noticeable that whereas *ra-je-u*, *ra-je-we* is the only known form of the ethnic from *ra-ja*, ]*ṣe-to-i-je-wē*[, if it is indeed a *-eus* ethnic from *se-to-i-ja*, is not the only known ethnic from this toponym: the *-ios* derivative *se-to-i-ja* (fem.) is attested on Ak(1) 634, Lc(1) 525 and Le 654, all in hand 103, while ]*ṣe-to-i-jo*[ on the fragmentary X 9327 in an unidentified hand may be its masculine or neuter equivalent.

2. Despite the presence of ‘true’ ethnics in *-eus* at Knossos, all the personal names at that site which are based on ethnics derived from known Knossian place-names end in *-ios*: none is in *-eus*. The examples include *a-mi-ni-si-jo* Sc 252 v.+<sup>2</sup>, Vc(1) 289, *da-\*83-jo* Vc(2) 7517, *ko-no-si-jo* As(1) 608.3, V(6) 831.8, *ku-ta-si-jo* Da 1394, Dv 1237, *pa-i-ti-ja* Ap 639.4, *pa-i-ti-jo* Da 1314, ]*qa-ra-jo* V(3) 429.1.

3. Indeed, on the tablets as a whole personal names in *-eus* derived from place-names that are themselves attested on the tablets, or are even located in a Mycenaean kingdom from which we have Linear B records, are difficult to point to. *O-ko-me-ne-u* PY Ea 780 is clearly *Orkhomeneus* < Orkhomenos, which although it is in Boeotia is not attested on the Linear B records from Thebes; *ki-e-u* PY An 724.9, Aq 64.16 / *ki-je-u* KN Xd 94 may be *Khiheus* < Khios; *sa-me-u* KN L(3) 455, TH Wu 59, 60 may be *Sameus* < Samos; *a3-ki-e-u* PY Jn 605.10, Vn 130.4 is possibly *Aigieus* < Aigion (Akhaia); and *e-ta-je-u* PY An 5.1 is possibly *Etaieus* (cf. *Etaieis*, identified by Stephanus of Byzantium as a town in Lakonia). Note, however, *a-pa-re-*[ . ] KN B(5) 804.4, which if it is to be read as *a-pa-re-u*<sup>3</sup> could clearly be compared with the Pylian

<sup>2</sup> Though the *a-mi-ni-si-jo* entries on the reverses of several of the Sc tablets are often taken as the ethnic itself, rather than the personal name derived from the ethnic, as it clearly is on Vc(1) 289, I believe that the latter is the likelier explanation. The other terms on the reverses of the Sc tablets include *a-re-ka-tu[-]ru-wo* Sc 256, *a-\*47*[ Sc 242, ]*a-\*47-wi*[ Sc 7469, *ku-ne*[ Sc 258 and *po-\*34*[ Sc 255. None of these appears to be an ethnic; *a-re-ka-tu[-]ru-wo* seems to be a variant or faulty spelling of the MN *a-re-ku-tu-ru-wo*, Alektruōn PY An 654.8, etc.; and all the remainder could also be parts of men’s names. In particular, it seems difficult to dissociate *po-\*34*[ from the MN *po-\*34-wi-do* on the recto of Sc 235: which if it is the same name in both contexts will provide a parallel for the appearance of *a-mi-ni-si-jo* not only on the verso of Sc 252, etc. but also on the recto of Vc(1) 289, viz. on a tablet likely to have very close links with the Sc tablets from the same deposit. [For the attractive suggestion that while the Sc records deal with issues to charioteers of pieces of equipment they lack, the Vc(1) tablets list those who already have a complete set, see Chadwick 1976, pp. 168–169, Driessen 1992, pp. 200–205.]

<sup>3</sup> For this possibility, see the critical apparatus in *KT*<sup>5</sup> ad loc.

place-name *a-pa-re-u-pi* (which is itself evidently an ethnic in -eus) Cn 286.1, 643.1, 719.10<sup>4</sup>.

4. In contrast, many of the personal names in *-ātās* on the records are certainly or possibly derived from place-names that are known from the Pylos tablets or which there is evidence to suggest lay within or close to the Pylian kingdom. Thus *e-ko-me-na-ta* PY An 661.9, Aq 218.11 is < PN *e-ko-me-no* PY Cn 40.5, 6, 599.8, Na 406, 941; *sa-ma-ri-wa-ta* KN As(l) 645.2, Dv 1188 is < PN *sa-ma-ri-wa* PY Na 527; *ne-da-wa-ta* PY Jo 438.7 is < \**Nedwā* (Gr. Neda, the river which may have formed the northern boundary of the Pylian kingdom)<sup>5</sup>; *pi-sa-wa-ta* KN B 1055.2 may be < \**Piswā*, and involve a variant spelling of the Pylian place-name *pi-\**82 Ac 1276, An 830.12, etc. (cf. Gr. *Pīsa*); and *ta-ra-ma-ta* may be < *Thalamai*, a place mentioned by Xenophon (*Hellenica* 7.4.26) which may have been in southern Elis (Chantraine 1966, p. 166)<sup>6</sup>. For the frequency of ethnics in *-ātās* in the Peloponnese in the historical period, see Risch 1957, p. 67.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

##### *Editions of Knossos tablets*

Evans, A.J., ed. Myres, J.L. (*SM II*). *Scripta Minoa*, vol. II, 1952.

Killen, J.T. and Olivier, J.-P. (*KT<sup>5</sup>*). *The Knossos Tablets: a Transliteration*. Fifth edition, 1989.

Chadwick, J., Godart, L., Killen, J.T., Olivier, J.-P., Sacconi, A. and Sakellarakis, J.A. (*CoMIK*). *Corpus of Mycenaean Inscriptions from Knossos*, 4 vols., 1986-1998.

##### *Other works cited*

Chadwick, J. 1976. *The Mycenaean World*.

Chantraine, P. 1966. “Finales mycéniennes en *-iko*”, in L.R. Palmer and J. Chadwick (eds.), *Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies*, pp. 161-179.

Driessen, J. 1992. “«Collector’s items». Observations sur l’élite mycénienne de Cnossos”, in J.-P. Olivier (ed.), *Mykenaiika. Actes du IX<sup>e</sup> Colloque international sur les textes mycéniens et égeens*, pp. 197-214.

<sup>4</sup> As I shall argue in a forthcoming paper [Killen 2007], I think it unlikely that the term *e-re-e-u* PY Nn 831.4, etc. is an ethnic derived from the Pylian place-name *e-re(-e, -i)* Jn 829.19, etc.

<sup>5</sup> Chadwick 1976, p. 39.

<sup>6</sup> Chantraine (ibid.) also mentions the possibility that there was a second town of this name south of Leuktron near the eastern coast of the gulf of Messenia, where there is inscriptional evidence for an ethnic *Thalamātai* (*IG*, V, 1.1312 and 1318).

- Gschnitzer, F. 1983. “Zur geschichtlichen Entwicklung des Systems der griechischen Ethnica”, in A. Heubeck and G. Neumann (eds.), *Res Mycenaeanae. Akten des VII. Internationalen Mykenologischen Colloquiums*, pp. 140-154.
- Heubeck, A. 1985. “Zur einigen Problemen der pylyischen Tafel An 607”, *Minos* 19, pp. 61-90.
- Killen, J. T. 1987. “Notes on the Knossos tablets”, in J. T. Killen, J. L. Melena and J.-P. Olivier (eds.), *Studies in Mycenaean and Classical Greek presented to John Chadwick*, pp. 319-331.
- Killen, J. T. 2007. “Mycenaean *e-re-e-u*”, in F. Lang, Cl. Reinholdt and J. Weilhartner (eds.), *Στέφανος Ἀριστεῖος. Archäologische Forschungen zwischen Nil und Istros: Festschrift für Stefan Hiller zum 65. Geburtstag*, pp. 159-168.
- Leukart, A. 1994. *Die frühgriechischen Nomina auf -tās und -ās*.
- Risch, E. 1957. “Zur Geschichte der griechischen Ethnica”, *Museum Helveticum* 14, pp. 63-74.
- Risch, E. 1972. “Les traits non homériques chez Homère”, in *Mélanges de linguistique et de philologie grecques offerts à Pierre Chantraine*, pp. 191-198.
- Risch, E. 1976. “Il miceneo nella storia della lingua greca”, *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 23, pp. 7-28.
- Ruijgh, C.J. 1967. *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*.