

RECENSIONES

VASSILIS L. ARAVANTINOS, LOUIS GODART, ANNA SACCONI, *Thèbes Fouilles de la Cadmée*
I. Les tablettes en linéaire B de la Odos Pelopidou, Édition et commentaire,
Pisa/Rome, Istituti Editoriali Poligrafici Internazionali 2001, pp. 460. ISBN 88-8147-
228-7. <http://www.iepi.it> and news@librawb.net.

The three collaborators in the official publication (hereafter cited as *TOP* = *Tablettes Odos Pelopidou*) of the 238 new Linear B tablets and inscribed tablet fragments from Mycenaean Thebes are to be congratulated for the care taken with the edition of the texts and for guiding the teams of excavators, field archaeologists, technical conservators, menders of pottery and tablets, site and museum guards, photographers, and layout and copy editors that made their publication of the largest discovery of Linear B tablets since the Pylos excavations (1939-1963) possible. The Greek Ministry of Culture and its Secretary General, G. Thomas, and the Director of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities, I. Tzedakis, deserve thanks for their support, and the Institute for Aegean Prehistory for its funding.

It is fitting here at the outset to thank the collective *da-mo te-qa-jo* (δῆμος τῶν Θηβαίων) for supporting the scientific work that has preserved for Mycenologists around the world evidence about the lives and language of the earliest literate Thebans (ca. 1200 B.C.E.). V. Aravantinos has overseen all aspects of the excavation, preservation, recording and publication of the tablets and the material remains associated with them. He himself thanks the people of Thebes (p. 10) and local collaborators like E. Andrikou and A. Papadaki. The fine tablet drawings were made by the expert eyes and hand of Louis Godart and then checked by all three editors.

Readers should first examine the superb color photograph of the upper half of Fq 254 [+] 255 that graces the front of the dust jacket of the volume, and then imagine the skill required of the entire archaeological and epigraphical team assembled by V. Aravantinos in identifying these many fragments in the soil, extracting them with surgical precision, preserving and joining them together in their fragile state, and then proceeding to read, draw and transcribe them in the publication we now have in our hands after a quick six years. This is good work, and it is fitting that the volume reached most Mycenologists in the year that marks the fiftieth anniversary of the Ventris decipherment.

The edition begins (pp. 9-23) with a succinct discussion, accompanied by related bibliography, of the initial discovery of the tablets in 1993 to 1995. The introduction also has an archaeological commentary concerning findspots: (1) of tablets from the *Odos Pelopidou* excavation (although nothing, as yet —this may appear in volume two of this series— like the Bill McDonald drawings of the find-spots from the Archives Complex at Pylos that have led eventually to K. Pluta's careful study in *Minos* 31-32 [1996-97], pp. 231-250); (2) of tablet fragments found in reexamining ceramic material from the 'Arsenal' excavations of 1964 and that join tablets of the Ug series from that excavation —the new readings will appear in volume three; and (3) of a tablet and three inscribed sealings from cleaning work in the 'Treasury' —these texts should also appear in volume three.

The introduction includes a brief report on context pottery that makes clear that the *Odos Pelopidou* tablets and the 'Arsenal' tablets all date to the end of LH III B:2. It also

has a brief overview of the contents of the tablets and the picture they offer of the ongoing—and, the editors posit, non-emergency—administration of economic resources, particularly the allocation of grain and other agricultural commodities, at the time of the destruction that preserved the tablets. It then gives the authors' hypotheses (pp. 16-19) about what caused this destruction. They believe that earthquake, as traced in the material record by other scholars at Thebes and elsewhere at the close of the III B period (nn. 14-15), is most probable.

The introduction announces the two volumes that will follow in this series. They will be devoted to: (1) a thorough treatment of the archaeological contexts for all the inscribed tablets (here, we look forward to the detailed context analysis that is so helpful in controlling and refining our interpretations of texts); and (2) a complete edition of all the Linear B material from Thebes. Given the good quality of the transcriptions and drawings presented here, this edition will be welcome.

The introduction next informs readers about: (1) the division of the *Odos Pelopidou* material into twelve new tablet classes (Av, Ev, Fq, Ft, Gf, Gp, Ka, Lf, Oh, Uo, V and X); (2) the standard conventions for transcription (signaling the occurrence of three alternative signs *22, *56, and *63, as well as what they consider to be a possible new sign *92 on Fq 207.3—but it is clear from the position on the tablet of the sign sequence in which it is contained that this sign is simply *16 *qa* awkwardly written); (3) who made the excellent photographs of the tablets (thanks to Ph. Colet, L. Godart, K. Xenikakis); and (4) the methods used for making and checking the tablet drawings. The volume is dedicated to the late Nikolaos Platon, who discovered the first traces of Linear B tablets at Thebes, and to the late Michel Lejeune, who, just before his death, assisted with some of the interpretation of the contents of the texts in this volume.

After the introduction, the volume is divided into two main parts. The first is the edition *stricto sensu* (pp. 25-154). Its presentation conforms to the style used in *CoMIK*. The tablets are given in numerical order rather than series order, and for each tablet is given a photograph, facsimile drawing, transcription, museum inventory number, information about scribal hand attribution and tablet dimensions (but not color or other physical characteristics), and an *apparatus criticus*. We owe the editors and their collaborators, including the publisher, a debt of thanks for the high quality of the photographs, the facsimile drawings and the transcriptions.

The second part is the commentary (pp. 157-371) which is broken down into six chapters followed by a section entitled «Conclusions». It is of very mixed quality. Chapter I gives a very brief overview of the tablet series and their scribes (pp. 157-159). Chapter II presents the philological commentary. It begins with a brief discussion of the evidence the editors think one of the new Thebes tablets (Ft 140) gives for different proportions between the two highest increments of dry commodity measures (the whole ideogram unit and the τ unit in a proportion of 1:12).

The proportions assumed heretofore universally for all Mycenaean sites, including Thebes, are that the whole dry unit and τ unit stand in a proportion of 1:10. Nowhere in the entire Linear B corpus, even at Thebes, does τ 10 or τ 11 occur. We might expect at least one entry of τ 10 or τ 11, if the whole dry unit equals τ 12. Instead we get τ 7 as a maximum τ quantity on Mycenae Fu 711.3; and τ 8 on Thebes Fq 276 and Gp 153. At Pylos τ 7 occurs ca. ten times, τ 8 five times and τ 9 four or five times. At Knossos τ 8 and τ 7 occur on F(1) 193 + 7361 + *fr.* and F(1) 51 respectively on early tablets from the Room of the Chariot Tablets, while τ 7 occurs one to three times in Knossos E series tablets. Thus the evidence suggests that τ 10 is the point where τ -unit quantities translate into the next higher increment, i.e., the dry ideograms themselves.

The editors present absolute quantities for the *Odos Pelopidou* Thebes tablets, according to the standard value of $\tau = 9.6$ liters. This standard equation is used both in the commentary on Ft 140 (pp. 263-266) and in their helpful Chapter IV, which catalogues

quantities appearing in the individual entries on the tablets. However, for entries on Ft 140, and Ft 140 only, the equivalence GRA 1 and OLIV 1 = τ 12 = 12 x 9.6 liters = 115.2 liters is used. (Note that on p. 342 the actual amounts of whole OLIV units are omitted from the table, and only the absolute quantities, according to this proposed scribally idiosyncratic ratio, are listed.)

This line of interpretation is predicated upon the entries of GRA 3 τ 5 on Ft 140.4 and GRA 12 τ 7 on Ft 140.5 having to add up to a sum with whole GRA units (i.e., without τ 2 left over) so that the grand total of GRA 88 will work correctly. If one looks at the tablet photograph on p. 51, it is clear that the vertical unit strokes in τ 7 are arranged in such a way that it would have been very easy in doing a rapid total for the tablet-writer to mistake the τ 7 for τ 5. (At one point I even thought two of the 'strokes' were tablet flaws misread as strokes, but I trust the judgment of the editors. The other, certainly less desirable, option is that the large total quantity is simply rounded off.)

Assuming an error, are there parallels? Yes. Expert Pylos Hand 2 makes several errors in adding up repetitive bronze allotment entries in the Jn series (e.g., Jn 389.2-.9). Such arithmetical mistakes are well known, too, in Linear A accounting, especially where fractions of whole agricultural commodity units are involved in totaling —tablets HT 9a and HT 13 provide two good examples of 'errors' in totaling sums from entries with fractional elements. Moreover, the daily and monthly ration quantities of HORD and OLIV for the individuals and professional groups listed on the newly reconstituted Pylos tablet Fn 7 (= An 7 + Fn 1427 and fragments) work out correctly if one assumes τ 10 = the whole dry unit (cf. *Minos* 31-32 [1996-97] pp. 171-178, esp. p. 174 for the calculations). Thus the solution proposed here that new proportions between τ and the whole dry unit of GRA and OLIV and new absolute quantities for the whole dry unit of GRA and OLIV are found on Ft 140 —and Ft 140 only in the entire Mycenaean corpus!— should be viewed with considerable caution. We should also note the risk entailed in applying such new values to OLIV on TH Ft 140, when the OLIV entries and total on Ft 140 have no τ units at all.

The discussion of dry quantity measures is followed (pp. 163-165) by a bibliography of preliminary publications by Godart, Sacconi, Aravantinos and Lejeune pertaining to the evidence of the new Thebes tablets. This list is supplemented by standard abbreviations for the handbooks, reference works and colloquium volumes cited in the commentary. One conspicuous omission from the bibliography is the masterful posthumous article by the late John Chadwick (in *Minos* 31-31 [1996-1997 (1998)], pp. 293-301) which examines the puzzling verbal forms in the three temporal *o-te* clauses on Fq 126.3 (known as Fq 121 in preliminary publications), Fq 130.1, and Fq 254.1-.2. Chadwick offers judiciously considered and meticulous, lexicographically documented alternative explanations of these forms and alternative interpretations of these clauses to those advanced in this volume on pp. 185-188, 195-196, and 225. Readers of *TOP* should have been alerted to the existence of this superb article by the collaborator of Michael Ventris.

Then follows the commentary on the individual tablets. Each tablet is presented, here in series order, with its formal transcription —repeated from part one for convenience— followed by a translation and then line-by-line and, where appropriate, longer synthetic commentary. When a lexical item has already been discussed in one tablet, discussion of subsequent tablets refers back to the earlier and fuller discussion. The same is also true of the glossary (pp. 389-398). As the contents of the next chapter indicate, the authors interpret these series primarily from a religious perspective.

Chapter III is entitled «Les tablettes de la *Odos Pelopidou* et la religion grecque». It is broken down into subsections. The first subsection advances further arguments for the identification of the four divine figures the editors consider identifiable in series Av, Fq, Ft and Gp. These four are (pp. 317-318):

a. the already rather controversial *ma-ka*, which occurs or is likely to occur on twelve Fq tablets and on tablets Gp 201 and X 152. It also might recur on the *verso* of Knossos

tablet F(1) 51. The editors make the equation *ma-ka* = *Mā* Γᾱ = ‘Mère Terre’ (Mother Earth), and view this recipient entry as corresponding to Demeter in the first millennium Greek pantheon. It is only pious to note that in his posthumously published article that I mentioned above, the late John Chadwick stated categorically (p. 293): ‘I make no secret of the fact that I find the interpretation as *Mā* Γᾱ unacceptable’. He had good reason.

A form such as *qo-o* = *g^uōns* in Linear B, where we would expect simply *qo*, has been explained reasonably as *scriptio plena* (cf. *Docs*², p. 207) in order to prevent any ambiguity between phonetic ideograms, e.g., *NI* = figs, and monosyllabic lexical items that might occur imbedded in syntax. The idea is that *qo* might easily be misinterpreted as *QO* (cf. KN U 49). But with *ma-ka*, and *ma-ka* alone, we are asked by the editors of *TOP* to believe that the tablet-writer sought to avoid ambiguity by joining two otherwise ambiguous monosyllabic spellings into a single, if anything more ambiguous, compound spelling.

The editors think the same Bronze Age Demeter is present here in the term *si-to* which they interpret on Av 100, Av 101, Ft 219 and Ft 220 [+] 248 as a theonym in the dative = Σιτω, for which they adduce the parallel of an historical epithet applied to the goddess Demeter in the region of Sicily. They bring into discussion the phrase *si-to-po-ti-ni-ja* on MY Oi 701.3 which they interpret as Σιτω Ποτινια. This is at odds with the more generally accepted rendering σιτωβ Ποτινια, in which *po-ti-ni-ja* is preceded by a genitive as in *da-pu₂-ri-to-jo po-ti-ni-ja*, *u-po-jo po-ti-ni-ja*, and most likely even *a-ta-na-po-ti-ni-ja*. In fact in terms of standard word order, it is virtually invariable in Mycenaean for genitives to precede the nouns with which they are associated (see J. D. Hill, *Observations on Clause Structure in the Linear B Corpus*, M. A. Thesis, University of Texas at Austin 2002, pp. 81-82).

The common noun *si-to* is attested in association with GRA elsewhere in the Linear B corpus and in ‘tablet syntax’ comparable to its appearance here on Av 100 and 101 (see KN Am 819.B and MY Au 658.4). It also appears in the compound occupational designation *si-to-ko-wo* ‘grain-pourers’ (women PY An 292). *si-to-ko-wo* (men) appears on TH Av 104 [+] 191; and here, too, the editors reinterpret the compound as cult officials ‘those who attend to the divinity Σιτω’, citing by way of analogy *e-pi-ko-wo* in PY An 657. The difficulty with this line of interpretation is that it is clear from textual parallels with the Pylos Aa, Ab and Ad series that the three largish groups of *si-to-ko-wo* women (or women assigned to a single male *si-to-ko-wo*) listed with male children on PY An 292.2-.4 are part of the force of specialist dependent laborers, many acquired in a kind of slave trade, who are assigned bare-survival levels of subsistence rations. It is hard to conceive of these women—or the individual *si-to-ko-wo* to whom they are assigned—as cult functionaries. (I do not see the difficulties in numbers that prompted Chadwick in *Studies Bennett* [Supplementos a *Minos* 10, Salamanca 1988], pp. 87-89, to interpret *si-to-ko-wo* on An 292.1 as dative singular masculine ‘for the grain-dispenser’, i.e., the official in charge of grain. But our reasoning with regard to the Thebes occurrence is valid no matter how we interpret the Pylos text.)

Among other factors militating against an interpretation of *si-to* as a theonym or divine epithet in these contexts on the Thebes tablets is that in all four occurrences the term *si-to* does not appear alone in the lexical entry slot, but with other terms some of which are clearly dative recipients, e.g., *po-te-we* and *ku-na-ki-si* (Av 100.2), *to-pa-po-ro-i* (Av 101.6.b). We are asked to believe in rather unparalleled asyndetical recipient listings in these entries, rather than viewing *si-to* more naturally and reasonably as a qualifier/specifier of the ideographic GRA. I know of no parallel for a single entry with three recipients: ‘pour *Potewe*, pour *Sito*, pour les chasseresses BLE 196 l.’ as proposed by the editors of *TOP*. An interpretation such ‘for Portheus (*vel sim.*) food (or ‘grain’ or whatever *sitos* specifies exactly in this period) for (his) women’ makes much more sense in terms of what we know about Mycenaean accounting methods and the supervision of

women work forces by prominent individuals. In Av 100.2 one may even restore *pa-ro* before *po-te-we*, so that *ku-na-ki-si* becomes the only dative recipient. The four *si-to* occurrences on the new Thebes tablets need further study. Right now the interpretation of *si-to* as a grain goddess has little to recommend it.

b. Zeus, so identified from the recipient name *o-po-re-i*. This name occurs, definitely or as likely restoration, on eleven Fq tablets. The name of Zeus itself is not attested in these tablets. The editors make an identification with Zeus Ὀπῶρης, presumably an *es*-variant of the epithet Ὀπῶρεύς attested epigraphically for Zeus at Akraiphia in Boeotia in historical times.

The editors propose that *o-po-re-i* = for (Zeus) 'protecteur des fruits'. But there are clear problems with such an interpretation. First, it is not normal in Mycenaean Greek for a *descriptive* epithet to be used independently without the name of the deity accompanying it. Thus we find *po-ti-ni-ja i-qe-ja* and *e-ma-a₂ a-re-ja*, not just *i-qe-ja* and *a-re-ja*. (Note this does not apply to original independent deities like *e-nu-wa-ri-jo* syncretized with major deities in the historical period and then reduced to epithets.) Second, if the epithet Ὀπῶρης existed in Mycenaean Greek, we would expect for it to be a noun in *-eus* and to be rendered in the dative singular *o-po-a₂-re-wi* (cf. *o-nu-ke-wi* on Oh 206.2). Third, the only reason for interpreting the term as a divine epithet, as opposed to an anthroponym, is the presumed need for parallelism of status in these entries once one has made the identification of *ma-ka* as a theonym. If we do not accept this precarious assumption, and we consider the many anthroponyms with which the alleged theonyms contextually occur, then it is reasonable to interpret *o-po-re-i* as an anthroponymic compound of the Mycenaean preverb/preposition *o-pi* and the later Greek word for 'mountain' (root **ores*).

c. Kore, so identified in the recipient name *ko-wa*. *ko-wa* occurs or is likely to occur on thirteen Fq tablets and depends on the identification of *ma-ka* as Mā Γā for its own status as a deity. The argument again proceeds from *ma-ka* and ignores the obvious anthroponyms with which, and even after which, *ko-wa* occurs on the Thebes tablets. Succinctly put, the editors argue that *ma-ka* is Demeter, so *ko-wa* must be the famous divine 'girl' associated with Demeter, namely Kore, i.e., Persephone. *ko-wa* is elsewhere used with good frequency in the Linear B texts as is its male equivalent *ko-wo*. The terms designate respectively non-adult female and non-adult male human beings. We should note that of the thirteen occurrences of *ko-wa* in the Thebes tablets, in twelve cases *ko-wa* is listed after another entry in a line of text. *ko-wa* is immediately preceded by *o-po-re-i*, *a-pu-wa*, *a-ko-da-mo*, *ma-di-je*, and *ka-ne-jo*. *ko-wa* is never immediately preceded by *ma-ka*, and only in three cases does *ko-wa* occur right after entries of *ma-ka* and *o-po-re-i*. It would seem much safer as a working hypothesis to interpret the term according to its pattern of use in the other ten instances and as parallel to the clear anthroponyms and/or occupational titles. We might adduce *ko-wo* on MY Oe 121 and interpret *ko-wa* as the child, in these cases female, associated with the immediately preceding entries.

d. *Diwia* = the female counterpart of Zeus, which is here detected in and extracted from the lexical unit *di-wi-ja-me-ro* on Gp 109.1, which the editors of *TOP* interpret as a graphic aggregate of two words *di-wi-ja* and *me-ro* (the phrase would mean: 'the portion of or for Diwia'). The same word-unit is likely to be read on Gp 313.2 where the tablet is broken immediately after the *-ja* element. Elsewhere in the Linear B corpus *di-wi-ja* occurs as a deity in a suitably controlled and probative context for a deity on PY An 607.5 and in an alternative spelling *di-u-ja* most famously in proximate association with Zeus on PY Tn 316 v. 6 (cf. also PY Cn 1287.6). Theophorics of this deity are attested at Thebes: *di-u-ja-wo* Of 26.3 and Of 33.2, and *di-wi-ja-wo* TH Ug 11. So it is not unreasonable to try to find the deity herself in the new Thebes tablets. But there is nothing compelling about dividing the word unit on the Thebes tablet as here suggested and a reconstruction *dwiāmeron* 'a two-day allotment' (*Textos griegos*, pp. 50-51) provides a more plausible

alternative (for this common formation with *hāmeros* as the second element, cf. Chantraine, *DicÉt.* p. 412 *sub* ἤμαρ). The word **me-ro*, as here proposed by the editors, is nowhere else attested in Linear B, and is absent from the many parallel texts designating distributions of commodities and materials to recipients, sacred or secular.

I hope I have made clear how speculative the interpretations of deities in the Thebes tablets are. We have a rich repertory of theonyms on Linear B documents from all other sites and from Thebes itself, e.g., *di-w-*, *di-wi-ja*, *po-ti-ni-ja* (alone and with many specific qualifiers), *e-ra*, *di-wo-nu-so*, *e-ma-a₂*, *po-se-da-o*, *po-si-da-e-ja*, *pa-si-te-o-i*, *te-o-jo*, *qe-ra-si-ja*, *e-ri-nu*, *pa-de*, *pi-pi-tu-na*, *a-ti-mi-te* and *a-te-mi-to*, *et al.* There are also well-attested vocabulary terms associated with religious donating and sending (*do-se*, *do-so-si*, *do-so-mo*, *i-je-to*, *i-je-si*) and the names of religious functionaries (*i-je-re-u*, *i-je-re-ja*, *i-je-ro-wo-ko*, *da-ko-ro*, *ka-ra-wi-po-ro*, **o-wi-de-ta?*, **ka-ru-ka*, **po-re?*, *te-o-jo do-e-ro/ra*). The absence of any such lexical items in the 238 new Thebes tablets and fragments is conspicuous and makes it much more difficult to establish the religious context necessary to accept the interpretations of *ma-ka*, *si-to*, *ko-wa*, *o-po-re-i*, and *di-wi-ja-me-ro* proposed by the editors of *TOP*. (See below for discussion of *qe-te-jo*, *i-je-re-wi-jo*, and the three *o-te* clauses.)

After their discussion of hypothetical ‘deities’, the editors present subsections that discuss (1) possible religious festival names; (2) possibly sacred animals (mules, serpents, geese, pigs, dogs and birds) whom the editors view as theriomorphic deities; (3) lists of sanctuary officials and professional names; and (4) general comments on vocabulary for ritual action in the texts.

The two posited religious ‘festival names’ are found on Av 104 [+] 191, *po-to-a₂-ja-de* and *te-re-ja-de*, both interpreted as allative forms with festival names. There are a good number of Mycenaean festival names attested in Linear B, like *re-ke-e-to-ro-te-ri-jo* and *to-no-e-ke-te-ri-jo*. These occur on commodity allocation texts. None occurs with the allative *-de* postposition. In Linear B, the *-de* postposition appears with the accusatives (singular and plural) of concrete physical locations, e.g., *di-wi-jo-de* (‘to the sanctuary of Zeus’), *da-da-re-jo-de* (‘to the sanctuary of Daidalos’), *pa-ki-ja-na-de* (‘to *Sphagiānai*’), *a-mo-te-jo-na-de* (‘to the place of joining/assembly’).

Oddly the editors do not cite the one item in the Linear B corpus that would support their interpretation. On KN C 901 twenty cows and one *ta* BOS (a bull **ta-u-ro* rather than a bovid ‘in its stead’ *ta[-to-mo]*) are designated as *e-wo-ta-de*. Although the interpretation of *e-wo-ta-de* as ἔορτᾶνδε ‘to the (place of the) festival’ is not without formal and etymological problems associated with **e-wo-ta*, it would provide a parallel. It should be noted, however, that the scribe of C 901 (H 107) elsewhere manages large numbers of livestock, including bovids, designated as *a-ko-ra-jo* and designated at specific places: C(1) 989 + 5744 + 7997: *ku-do-ni-ja* BOS^f 14; C(1) 5753 + 7046 + 7630: *ko-no-so-de* BOS^f 5 BOS^m 8; C(1) 5544:] BOS^m 91 [. Thus *e-wo-ta-de* on C 901 is generally interpreted as making reference to a place-name (cf. *DMic s.v.*).

The list of ‘desservants de sanctuaire et les noms de profession’ includes only one name associated with cultic activity in other Linear B tablets: **e-re-u-te* (dative *e-re-u-te-re*) ‘inspector’. This term, as the editors point out, occurs on PY Cn 3 with a list of single BOS that *may* have to do ultimately —and I think that they do— with sacrificial ceremony. But the term **e-re-u-te* also occurs on label PY Wa 917.2 where this official is involved in the regional management of flax production and use. Thus he may be an ‘inspector’ in the general sphere of economics who is drawn into ‘cultic’ matters when goods or materials for which he is responsible fall into the ‘cultic’ sphere. The occurrence of this term in Av 100.4b does not prove that this record had to do with cultic or ritual matters.

Even for skeptics, it is not possible to exclude interpretations linking the contents of some of the new Thebes tablets with ritual or ceremonial activities. However, it is important to emphasize that there are rituals and ceremonies that do not fall into what we

could call the 'religious' sphere. For one thing, the lead temporal phrases in Fq 126.3, Fq 130.1, and Fq 254.1-.2 point at least to 'ceremonial' (as opposed to 'cultic') procedures: ceremonies, according to Chadwick, that have to do with aromatic incensing, some procedure of 'opening', e.g., a *Pithoigia*, and an assembling of a group of elders (or *gerousia*) respectively. In the last instance, desperately striving for some cultic meaning, the editors of *TOP* (pp. 224-226) cast darkness over the pellucid phrase *a-pi-e-qe ke-ro-ta pa-ta* proposing 'lorsque *Kerota*? a dressé la purée d'orge', where the phrase clearly means —translating a well-paralleled impersonal verbal construction into good English, 'when all the elders were brought into attendance'.

The word *i-je-re-wi-jo* on Gp 303.1 may indicate that some of the agricultural goods being dispensed have a connection with the priestly sphere. But here surprisingly again the editors interpret the word-unit as a dative anthroponym, thus removing it as evidence for a direct connection of Gp 303 with 'priests'. If they adopted the alternative explanation of Michel Lejeune [*DMic s.v.*] for the form as it appears on KN K 875.6, i.e., 'destined for the ἱερεὺς', the term would designate the FAR on Gp 303 as a priest's allocation. (The editors read the commodity FAR, but as I explain below, in many cases where they read the ideogram FAR, the phonogram *65 = *ju* should be read. Thus ultimately the reading on Gp 303 should be 'for the son of the priest', and does not provide evidence of any priestly commodity).

The term *qe-te-jo*, as its meaning has been clarified by Hutton (here cited on p. 278 n. 118), would indicate the 'payment of a religious fine *vel sim.*' This is consistent with how the term is used in the TH Wu sealings (Wu 49, 50, 51, 53, 63, 65 and 96) and, Hutton argues, in other tablets like PY Fr 1206, PY Un 138, KN Fh 348. It is surprising that the sealing evidence from Thebes is omitted by the editors from the commentary on the term (p. 278) —the editors later cite the publication of the Thebes sealings in *BCH* 114 (1990), pp. 103-184 in discussing toponymic evidence from Thebes (p. 355 n. 161). Here the commentary discusses only the interpretation of *qe-te-jo* (and related spellings) that prevailed before the discovery and interpretation of the Thebes sealings. This old interpretation stressed payment 'out from' the palace and is accepted here. But the texts of the Thebes sealings, attached to delivery of livestock 'to the palace', clearly cast this aspect of meaning of the term *qe-te-jo* in the Mycenaean period into doubt.

None of the four lexical items identified in the numerous Fq (and Gp) tablets by the editors as deities (*ma-ka*, *o-po-re-i*, *ko-wa*, and *di-wi-ja*) is without a reasonable alternative non-religious interpretation. In the case of *ma-ka* we also have two viable alternatives for a theonym, e.g., (1) an abstract deity that suits its only non-Theban occurrence on KN tablet F 51, namely *Máχā*, i.e., a personified divinity of combat. We might keep in mind the Mycenaean anthroponyms *ma-ka-wo* and *ma-ka-ta* and the close link of Ares with the foundation legend of Thebes (A. Schachter, *The Cults of Boiotia* [*BICS Suppl.* 38.1, London 1981], p. 91); or (2) an abstract deity that would very much suit the Thebes context, namely **Mayā* (cf. Chantraine, *DicÉt.* p. 670 *sub* μάσσω, and cf. later Greek μαγεύς) 'kneading or processing grain'. For anthroponymic alternatives, cf. *Textos griegos*, p. 50. It should be noted that *ma-ka* is always the first 'recipient' entry on the Fq tablets. This is even so on Fq 254.2, where I would not follow the editors in viewing *de-qo-no* as an anthroponym, but would see it as simply a rubric entry designating the ca. 14 liters of HORD specially listed there as an allocation for a 'meal'. *ma-ka* gets the largest allocation (cf. Chapter 4, pp. 328-338) of HORD (9.6 to 19.2+ liters). So the term, whatever its exact identification, is prominent and I am inclined to interpret it as a common noun like *de-qo-no* 'for dinner', *po-qa* 'for eating', *ka-pa* 'with seed or pit still in and not yet processed for consumption', *po-ro-de-qo-no* 'for pre-dinner', as a specifier of the quality or use of the listed allocation of grain, in this instance 'grain ready for kneading, i.e., for further processing as food' (as opposed to its use as fodder, or as first harvested —cf. the KN F(2) series, or as seed grain, or as ready to eat, i.e., *po-qa*).

Identification of *di-wi-ja* as a deity depends on a peculiar word-splitting. Identification of *ko-wa* as a divinity requires interpreting the term contrary to all its other Mycenaean uses, and the only reason for doing this is its *indirect* occurrence —as opposed to direct contextual association— on a number of texts with the hypothetical theonym *ma-ka*. In the only other possible occurrence of *ma-ka* in the Linear B tablets, i.e., KN F 51 *verso*, *ma-ka* appears in parallel position with *po-ro-de-go-no*. There, too, it is more reasonable to see parallel references to how the *HORD* will be used than to posit theonyms or odd anthroponyms. *ma-ka* = Demeter also would require that this lexical item be a composite of two monosyllabic words, unique in Linear B.

The Demeter equation for *ma-ka* is used to identify *si-to* as a divinity, rather than as the basic noun form that would be perfectly appropriate in the context of grains and agricultural products (cf. also *si-to-ko-wo*). Many other recipient entries on the Fq and Gp and Av tablets have no clear connection with religious practice. Some such terms are assigned by the editors of *TOP* to the religious sphere through unique and improbable interpretations, e.g., *a-ke-ne-u-si* = *hagneusi*. This interpretation is particularly problematical. The standard and well-attested terms in Linear B for ‘holy’, ‘sacred’, ‘holy man’ (or priest), ‘holy woman’ (or priestess), ‘holy animals’ —even at Thebes— are related to the word *i-je-ro*. We are asked to believe that only here in the entire Linear B corpus is a ‘holy man’ or ‘priest’ not a *hiereus*, but a *hagneus*. But the scribe who uses this term has in his repertory *a₂* = *ha* and does not use it in spelling *hagneus*. Many of the forms for which the editors of *TOP* propose strained ‘religious’ interpretations have reasonable alternative interpretations well-suited to their contexts. In regard to *a-ke-ne-u-si*, I would propose *akhneusi* = ‘winnowers’ (cf. Chantraine, *DicÉt*, pp. 151-152 *sub* ἄχυρη ‘the chaff that comes off in winnowing’ and ἄχυρα).

It would have been comforting to find in these new texts one recognizable deity, such as *po-ti-ni-ja* attested on TH Of 36.2 or *e-ra* on TH Of 28, that would firmly fix the contextual patterning for our interpretations. But we do not have any such lexical term. Without such a fixed point, what have the editors of *TOP* done? They have erected their entire framework upon *ma-ka*. If we do not start with *ma-ka*, but reverse the entire process and ask what in the rich new Thebes material can be adduced to establish a compelling interpretive context for identifying *ma-ka* as a theonym, whether Demeter or not, it is hard to find much.

The editors themselves (p. 206) admit that the one possible occurrence of the word *i-je-ro* on Fq 200.2 is ‘très incertaine’. As discussed above, *qe-te-jo* and *i-je-re-wi-jo* (particularly given how the editors interpret these terms) on one tablet (Gp 303) are insufficient to establish interpretive context for the rest of the tablets. I know of no other ‘religious’ sets of Linear B texts from any other site so devoid of standard religious terminology. Identifiable theonyms, cult functionaries, cultic transactional words, or names of sanctuary locales are needed to anchor interpretation with reasonable plausibility. The editors have tried out —and even pushed to the limit— a consistent line of adventurous interpretation. But it is not convincing. They should expect considerable discussion *entre mycéologues*.

It would not surprise me if in twenty years the speculative interpretations in *TOP* have been consigned to decent obscurity. Certain hypotheses like T 12 = GRA (see above) within the work of a single scribe at Thebes defy common sense. Others like *56 = *ko₂* (see below) are at odds with a carefully assembled dossier of evidence that the editors do not in any way address. These will be rejected immediately. For now the more serious problem is that the editors have not signposted how speculative their ideas about religion are. The bibliographical references they make, as I have noted, are nearly exclusively to their own recent work and a few articles of the late Michel Lejeune. The way the edition is structured, non-Mycenological and non-linguistic specialists (scholars of religion, iconography, material archaeology, later Greek history) will read mainly the commentary

and be without the tools to understand how weakly supported many of these theories are. They will be likely to accept at face values ideas put forward by such weighty names as Godart, Sacconi, Aravantinos and Lejeune. This is why senior scholars have the responsibility to be scrupulous in laying out as fully as possible their thinking on major and minor points and to consult before publication with learned colleagues about matters such as linguistic reconstruction that might lie outside their own special competence. In other words, *l'esprit de Gif* with regard to full informal sharing of information and group thinking on problems, in the manner of the late Michael Ventris, must be protected and fostered at all costs.

Chapter IV (pp. 327-354) lists in tabular form all the quantities for GRA, HORD, VIN, FAR and OLIV in these series. Although I have not checked all entries against the photographs and transcriptions, the entries seem to be reasonably free of slips. Fq 254.2 on p. 337 provides the exception that proves the rule. It gives $\tau 1 \vee 2 z 2$, but the actual text reads: $\tau 1 \vee 2 z 2$. The table is followed by a helpful narrative that analyzes the categories of recipients according to the different commodities allocated. The discussion assumes the traditional values for ideograms *120 and *121, wheat and barley respectively. Scholars who agree with Ruth Palmer's carefully reasoned hypothesis (in «Wheat and Barley in Mycenaean Society», in J.-P. Olivier ed., *Mykenaiika, BCH Suppl.* 25, Paris 1992, pp. 475-497) that the values of these two grain ideograms should be reversed (and I lean strongly in this direction) will certainly want to see how the Thebes tablet evidence fits in with lines of reasoning *pro* and *con*. P. Halstead, «Late Bronze Age Grain Crops and Linear B Ideograms *65, *120 and *121», *ABSA* 90, 1995, pp. 229-234, provides the main counter-argument.

On the subject of ideograms, I must also here state my firm opinion that the sign transcribed as FAR and translated as 'farine' in the Thebes tablets in many places is phonogram *65 = *ju*. This is not the place for a full exposition of this claim, but its validity can be demonstrated by pointing out the absurdities that a study of the dossier of occurrences reveals about the readings given in *TOP*. For example, on Gp 124, line 1, the editors read]ko FAR , VIN v 2[proposing (p. 283) that these two ideograms here uniquely function as a 'complex ideogram' and refer to a 'mixture of wine with sacred barley flour'. But such an explanation requires that these signs be collocated in an unprecedented way and their separation by a word-divider would be odd if they made up a 'complex ideogram'. On Gp 110 one reads:

- .1]qe , VIN s 1 na-ne-mo v 2 [
- .2]FAR , v 2 mo-ne-we s 1 *56-ru[-we

Jean-Pierre Olivier reminds me of only two other examples (KN Dc 1129.A and Fs 21.1) in Linear B texts where a word-divider is placed between an ideogram and a following numerical sign or measurement unit. The occurrence is so rare that in Dc 1129.A, the editors of *CoMIK* 2, including two of the Thebes editors, note the mark as an apparent intentional mark in the *apparatus criticus* but do not transcribe it as part of the intended textual message. Moreover in the entire Gp series, most of the sufficiently preserved and legible tablets, like Gp 110 by Hand 306, deal otherwise with the commodity VIN. Notice also that in the longer lists of recipients in the Fq series, by Hands 305 and 310, the main commodity identified in the heading and in the final total is HORD. FAR is read in these texts in a small number of their numerous entries, but it occurs five times with the adjectival *ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo* and four times with the adjectival *ka-wi-jo*, and it is never accounted for in the total. Why such a bizarre pattern? Because the sign is not FAR at all, but *ju*.

This is corroborated by Fq 236 where Hand 310 has written *ku-no* FAR but all the metrical z entries are lined up far right and the supposed FAR is separated from them and in place with the spacing for another phonetic sign that would close the lexical entry as on other lines. Likewise on Fq 132 the supposed FAR is shoved up against the preceding [•]-

to-qa. We would seem to have here a syntagm like *ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo*.*65 which renders a dative /Lakedaimnio:i hiyui/ and shows haplography *ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo{-i}-ju*. On Gp 227 (possibly in Hand 306) we have an entry *ra-ke-da-mo-ni-jo-u-jo*, thus proving that the sequence in the Fq tablets must refer to an individual as 'son of Lakedaimon' or Lakedaimnios, son'. Likewise *ka-wi-jo-ju* is 'son of Handsome' or 'Handsome, son'. (Note that the spacing posited between *-jo* and FAR in the transcription of Fq 123 does not exist.)

I cannot help but think that such an elementary mistake in transcription would not have been made if the Thebes material had been made available by the editors for informal collaborative study before the edition took final form. It took me about seventy-five minutes on an airline flight with *TOP* to see that certain of the signs in question could not be FAR, but must be *ju*. So the edition has done what an edition should do: lay open the texts for easy study. Yet it also makes clear its avoidable deficiencies.

Chapter V (pp. 355-358) succinctly surveys the evidence found in all inscriptions from Thebes for the extent of its Mycenaean palatial territory. The editors make a full list, including proposed links through anthroponyms with locales in Thrace and NW Anatolia. The new Thebes material supplements the intriguing list of place names on the Wu sealings (where we found, *inter alia*, Karystos and Amarynthos, both presumably in Euboea). Exciting, and certain, in the new material are the ethnics *mi-ra-ti-jo*, *ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo*, and *u-re-we* (dat. sg.). The editors now add up generously 25 localities that can be extracted from the aggregate texts, and they point us (p. 357 n. 163) in the direction of an article by B. Sergent in *REA* 96 (1994), pp. 365-384 for the historical implications of these place name references.

Chapter VI (pp. 359-361) discusses the occurrences of doublet signs *22, *56 and *63 in the texts and what the editors think might be a single occurrence (Fq 207.3) of a new syllabogram *92 (p. 361): *e*.*92-*do-ma*. As I have already mentioned, *92 does not exist. It is merely the known sign *qa* written awkwardly at the lower right of a tablet. The reading here should be: *e-qa-do MA 1*.

The editors also discuss the evidence these attestations furnish for the values of the signs. *22 is consistent with an /i/ vocalic value (p. 358). Sign *63 (p. 360) occurring in *63-*te-ra-de* and *63-*u-ro* is considered to give too little evidence to propose any value. The editors' line of reasoning with regard to sign *56 was already laid out in M. Lejeune and L. Godart, «Le syllabogram *56 dans le linéaire B thébain», *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 123, 1995, pp. 272-277. They do not make a persuasive case. To be honest, they perversely ignore thirty-plus years of scholarship about the value of this sign and how it relates to the overall structure and design of the Linear A and Linear B syllabaries.

Based on the supposed equivalence of the word units *56-*ru-we* and *ko-ru-we*, for which there is insufficient contextual control and alternative explanations even if they refer to the same individual, the editors ignore or dismiss the carefully constructed arguments from the tablet evidence of other Mycenaean sites that *56 has a value something like 'pre-nasalized labial + a' = *pa*₂, i.e., *mba vel sim*. (For a progress report on work with these signs going all the way back to A. Morpurgo Davies, «The Structure of the Minoan Language», *BICS* 16, 1969, pp. 161ff., see J. L. Melena, «On Untransliterated Syllabograms *56 and *22», in P. H. Ilievski and L. Crepajac eds., *Tractata Mycenaea*, Skopje 1987, pp. 203-232, and M. Janda, «Zur Lesung des Zeichens *22 von Linear B», *Kadmos* 25, 1986, pp. 44-48.) The standard value assignment fits in structurally with the retention in Linear B of three Linear A signs with such consonantal value (*56, *22, *29) for the three prime Minoan vowels (*pa*₂, *pi*₂, *pu*₂ respectively) (cf. Y. Duhoux, «Le linéaire A : Problèmes de déchiffrement», in Y. Duhoux, T. G. Palaima and J. Bennet eds., *Problems in Decipherment*, *BCILL* 49, Louvain-la-Neuve 1989, p. 73).

The new Thebes evidence for sign *22 is consistent with the established view of Melena, Duhoux and Janda insofar as it suggests that *22 has an /i/ vowel. The editors do

not at all address the most patent and contextually controlled spelling alternation: *pa-ra-ku-ja* and *56-*ra-ku-ja* in the KN Ld cloth series. The Ld alternation is the foundation for the generally accepted theory that *56 = *pa*₂. We might also briefly here call attention to the anthroponym *ka-ra-pa-so* / *ka-ra*-*56-*so* reconstructed as Κάλρασος / Κάρπασος, where the Latin borrowed forms *carbasa*, *carbasinus* and *carpasinus* (cf. Chantraine, *DicÉt*, p. 500 *sub* κάρπασος) show precisely the kind of ambiguity about the precise nature of the labial consonantal value that we would expect according to the established line of interpretation.

A brief section (pp. 363-371) entitled «Conclusions» recapitulates by series and by scribal hand the contents of the tablets as interpreted by the editors. The volume closes with indices of lexical terms (pp. 375-384) and ideograms (pp. 385-387), a succinct glossary directed towards interpretive discussions of individual word-units in the commentary (pp. 389-398), and concordances (pp. 402-411) of tablets by inventory number and by series. A table of contents (pp. 459-460) follows tables of all sign forms found on the new tablets (pp. 415-417). In the palaeographical tables the sign forms are listed in signary order with individual sign variants arranged in numerical sequence of their appearance according to tablet numbers and line numbers. This varies from the standard convention for Linear B, namely to list variants according to scribal hand. But pinacologists will be able to sort out for themselves the scribal variants by xeroxing or computer scanning. But this will take weeks of work that could have been done much more easily and competently by the editors of *TOP*. Moreover, the forms of sign *63, arguably the one sign whose exact renderings we would most want illustrated, have been omitted from the palaeographical tables. Sign *67 (*ki*) is also omitted.

It will not have escaped notice that my substantive comments in this review almost all pertain to the interpretive part of this volume. The edition *per se* and its accompanying indices and tables of signs are reasonably well done. Some photographs are not-to-scale, some readings will be debated, and some tablet transcriptions have elements misaligned. But these are not serious impediments to the use of the edition proper by trained Mycenologists, as this very review attests.

The lines of approach in the interpretive commentary will be debated by Mycenologists. Overall the commentary reaches again and again for the sensational, when straightforward interpretations have more to recommend them. I have called attention to some of the areas where further thought certainly is needed and where the editors easily could and should have signposted the hypothetical nature of their interpretations by means of short footnotes to articles, e.g. Chadwick's last article in *Minos*, that provide other perspectives.

I have passed over many, many smaller points about the interpretation of words and phrases that will surely raise eyebrows. For example, *a-ko-da-mo* and *a-ko-ro-da-mo* are interpreted as variants of the same word and impossibly linked to the Greek verb ἀγείρω in order to yield an 'assembler of the *damos* within the context of a sanctuary, i.e., a religious functionary charged with assembling the faithful during religious ceremonies'. A relationship with the later Greek *agurmos* within the Eleusinian Mysteries is proposed. But this fantasy is impossible. A compound name of the type /*Phere-l*, /*Ekhe-l* *vel sim.* would require in the case of /*ageir-o/e-l* an *e*-grade of the root, and an *-e-* bridge vowel to the second part of the compound, i.e., it would be represented in Linear B as **a-ke-re-da-mo*. A simple explanation of the term as a proper name, e.g., *Akrodamos* (cf. historical Greek *Aristodamos*) is readily at hand. There are other possibilities. C. J. Ruijgh proposes *Argodamos/Argodamos*.

o-je-ke-te-to is interpreted as two words in a way that, even if it were tenable, would actually require **o-je-ke-a₂-te-to* in Mycenaean. *ka-pa* is interpreted as σκάφη, although the cited Pylos contrast with *po-qa* suggests at least one reasonable alternative (*καρπά) that lies in the same semantic field as *po-qa*, whereas σκάφη does not. *ku-na-ki-si* is uneconomically interpreted as the rare term κυνηγίσι when the more familiar γυναιξί

is satisfactory. *to-pa-po-ro-i* is interpreted as 'mystical torch-bearers' but the occurrence of *to-pa* on PY Ub 1318 (cf. *Docs*², p. 491) and the contexts in which *to-pa-po-ro-i* appears on tablets Av 101 and Gp 184 make clear that we are dealing here with 'pack animals' or perhaps human 'bearers of *to-pa*'. Likewise later usage in early historical authors and parallelism on the tablets make it more plausible that *e-pe-to-i* are quadrupeds and not sacred snakes.

Students of Greek culture, especially students of ancient cult and ritual, outside of the specialized field of Mycenology will have to approach the commentary with great care.

About the commentary then, I have given fair warning to those whose competence in Mycenaean script, language and grammar is insufficient to understand how hypothetical the main line of reconstruction in *TOP* is. Most of the religious interpretations are gravely suspect. Likely 'winnowers' are transformed into 'holy men', 'pack animals' or 'basket-bearers' into 'ritual torch bearers', 'quadrupeds' into 'sacred snakes', the simple word for 'grain' into the goddess 'Grain', 'grain-pourers' into 'religious attendants', the word for 'girl' into the goddess Kore, a simple personal name meaning 'He who is prominent (or shines) in the *damos*' is made into an assembler of ritual initiates. The word for 'two-day allocation' is ripped apart to find a divine female counterpart to Zeus, 'women' become 'huntresses', and so on. I see no way of reasonably supporting the equation GRA 1 = T 12 even on Ft 140; and, to paraphrase the late John Chadwick, it is no secret that the interpretation *56 = *ko* is unacceptable.

Still all Mycenologists should offer sincere great thanks to the editors for an edition of the tablets that makes it easy to understand and detect such errors.

Austin, TX 78712-0308 USA

University of Texas at Austin

Program in Aegean Scripts and Prehistory, Department of Classics

1 University Station C3400

tpalaima@mail.utexas.edu

THOMAS G. PALAIMA

NICOLLE HIRSCHFELD: *The PASP Data Base for the Use of Scripts on Cyprus* (= *Minos* Supplement 13). Salamanca, Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca 1996 (1997), pp. 367.

Dies ist kein aufregendes Buch. Es ist auch nicht tiefschürfend. Aber es ist nützlich. Und nur das will es sein. Eigentlich ist es nur der Ausdruck einer Datenbank, der moderneren Version des Zettelkastens. Ein solcher Zettelkasten kann natürlich von ganz unterschiedlicher Qualität sein. Dieser hier ist recht ordentlich, wenn man auch manchmal den Eindruck hat, dass ein Windstoss einige der Zettelchen durcheinandergewirbelt hat und mancher Zettel nicht mehr beschriftet wurde oder zumindest den Weg vom Schreibtisch in den Kasten nicht mehr geschafft hat. Aber das Buch will eine erste Zwischenbilanz sein. Deren Fundament ist solide und die Hoffnung, dass das begonnene Projekt weitergeführt und verbessert wird, wohl berechtigt.

Aber, worum geht es genau? 'PASP' ist das Program in Aegean Scripts and Prehistory der Universität Austin/Texas und dessen Direktor Thomas G. Palaima hatte dieses Vorhaben schon vor einer Weile angekündigt («Program in Aegean Scripts and Prehistory. 5-Year Report on the Activities of the PASP at the University of Texas at Austin (1986-1991)», *Mykenaiika*, Hrsg. J. P. Olivier (= *BCH* Suppl. 25), 1992, S. 643-648, bes. 645-646), damals noch unter dem Namen von Leah Himmelhoch (vgl. S. 9 *). Die Herausgeberin N. Hirschfeld schreibt selbst, die Arbeit gehe hervor aus einer 'study of Cypro-Minoan pot marks' (vgl. ihre Aufsätze «Cypriot Marks on Mycenaean Pottery», *Mykenaiika* 1992, S. 315-319, «Cypriots in the Mycenaean Aegean», *Atti e Memorie del secondo congresso internazionale di Micenologia*, Roma-Napoli 1991, Hrsg. E. de Miro,