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-je-we[, thus providing a second ‘true’ ethnic in -εύς 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 as follows.

V <1631> (-)

1 ]-to-i-jε[  
2 ]-ru-kο 1[  
3 ]no-du 1[  
4 ]da-na-jο 1[  
5 ] vac. [  

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

1 ]še-to-i-jε[ 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. ]da-na-jο, 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-kο 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-kο.

It is the term on the first line of the tablet that I wish to concentrate on here. In KT, we read this as ]-to-i-jε[, but note in the critical apparatus that ]še-to-i-jε[ 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.

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(l) 607.5b.
As I noted in my discussion of ra-ja-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 Orkhomenes < 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. Since, however, ra-ja-we, ra-je-u and now jse-to-i-je-wei 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 qa-wj-jo and pu-na-si-jo) or in a position on the tablet occupied by ‘true’ ethnics on similar records (jse-to-i-je-wei 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 Orkhome-neus < 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 -atās like Erkhomenatās < PN e-kom-e-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.

---

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, ]se-to-i-je-we[, 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(l) 634, Lc(l) 525 and Le 654, all in hand 103, while ]se-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.†2, Vc(1) 289, da-*83-jo Vc(2) 7517, ko-no-si-jo As(l) 608.3, V(6) 831.8, ku-ta-si-jo Da 1394, Dv 1237, 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 Khīheus < Khios; sa-me-u KN L(3) 455, TH Wu 59, 60 may be Sameus < Samos; a-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 Etaiheus (cf. Etaieis, identified by Stephanus of Byzantium as a town in Lako-nia). Note, however, a-pa-re-[ ] KN B(5) 804.4, which if it is to be read as a-pa-re-u² could clearly be compared with the Pylian

2 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(l) 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-[u]-ru-wo seems to be a variant or faulty spelling of the MN a-re-ku-tu-ru-wo, Alektraun 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(l) 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(l) tablets list those who already have a complete set, see Chadwick 1976, pp. 168-169, Driessen 1992, pp. 200-205.]

3 For this possibility, see the critical apparatus in KT² ad loc.
place-name a-pa-re-u-pi (which is itself evidently an ethnic in -eus) Cn 286.1, 643.1, 719.10\textsuperscript{4}.

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-mena-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)\textsuperscript{5}; 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. Pîsa); 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)\textsuperscript{6}. For the frequency of ethnics in -ātās in the Peloponnese in the historical period, see Risch 1957, p. 67.
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\textsuperscript{4} 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.

\textsuperscript{5} Chadwick 1976, p. 39.

\textsuperscript{6} 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 inscrptional evidence for an ethnic Thalamāui (IG, V, 1.1312 and 1318).


