

STUDI MICENEI ED EGEO-ANATOLICI NUOVA SERIE

4, 2018

STUDI MICENEI
ED EGEO-ANATOLICI
NUOVA SERIE

è una rivista dell'Istituto di Studi sul Mediterraneo Antico
del Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Roma

ISSN 1126-6651
e-ISBN 978-88-7140-959-7

Direttore / Editor

Anna D'Agata (ISMA, CNR, Roma)

Comitato Editoriale / Editorial Board

Silvia Alaura (ISMA, CNR, Roma); Marco Bettelli (ISMA, CNR, Roma);
Marco Bonechi (ISMA, CNR, Roma); Maurizio Del Freo (ISMA, CNR, Roma); Francesco Di Filippo (ISMA, CNR, Roma);
Andrea Di Renzoni (ISMA, CNR, Roma); Yannis Galanakis (University of Cambridge);
Luca Girella (Università Telematica Internazionale Uninettuno, Roma); Anna Judson (University of Cambridge);
Françoise Rougemont (CNRS, Paris); Agnese Vacca (Università degli Studi di Milano)

Comitato Scientifico / Advisory Editorial Board

Mary Bachvarova (Willamette University, Salem, Oregon); Fritz Blakolmer (University of Vienna);
Harriet Blitzler (Buffalo State College, New York); John Bintliff (Leiden University);
Eva von Dassow (University of Minnesota); Birgitta Eder (Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna);
Fikri Kulakoğlu (University of Ankara); Maurizio Giangulio (Università di Trento);
Carl Knappett (University of Toronto); Peter Pavúk (Charles University, Prague);
Jeremy B. Rutter (Dartmouth College); Recai Tekoğlu (Dokuz Eylül University, Izmir);
Andreas Vlachopoulos (University of Ioannina); Helène Whittaker (University of Gothenburg)

Stampa e distribuzione / Printing and distribution

Edizioni Quasar di Severino Tognon s.r.l.
Via Ajaccio 41-43 – 00198 Roma
tel. +39 0685358444, fax +39 0685833591
email: info@edizioniquasar.it
www.edizioniquasar.it

© CNR - Istituto di Studi sul Mediterraneo Antico (ISMA)
Area della Ricerca di Roma 1, Via Salaria Km 29,300, 00015 Monterotondo scalo (Roma)
Autorizzazione Tribunale di Roma nr. 288/2014 del 31.12.2014

SOMMARIO

Ilaria Caloi

Inaugurating the Court-Centred Building? A MM IIIB
Feasting Deposit at Neopalatial Sissi, North-Central Crete 7

Francesco Di Filippo, Lucia Mori

How Difficult? Mountain Roads and Pathways Reaching
Ancient Melid (Malatya) in South-Eastern Anatolia:
A Reconsideration 41

Eric R. Force, Jeremy B. Rutter

Holocene Fault Scarps at Mycenae (Greece)
and Possible Cultural Ties 63

José Miguel Jiménez Delgado

Nominative Case and Brachylogic Syntax in Mycenaean Texts 75

Massimiliano Marazzi

The 'Administered' System of Trans-Mediterranean
Maritime Relations at the End of the 2nd Millennium BC:
Apogee and Collapse 95

Rachele Pierini

Syllabogram *65 or Logogram *129 (= FAR)?
The Sign 𐀓 on Thebes Tablets, AB 65 in Linear A,
and Some Remarks on the *o*-Stem Genitive Singular in -Xo 111

Juan Piquero Rodríguez

The Dossier *sa-ra-pe-da* of Pylos Revisited 131

Miguel Valério

Linguistic Awareness in the Development
of the Anatolian Hieroglyphic Sign Values 143

*Massimo Vidale, Sara T. Levi, Marco Bettelli, Andrea Di Renzoni,
Matteo Bettuzzi, Valentina Cannavò, Franco Casali, Francesca Ferranti,
Leandro Lopes, Maria Pia Morigi, Carmelo Triolo, Mario Triolo*
Eating Molluscs at Stromboli (Aeolian Islands, Italy), 1700 BC 161

FORUM ARTICLE

Trevor Bryce

The Kingdom of Ahhiyawa: A Hittite Perspective

191

Responses

Eric Cline, Reaction to Trevor Bryce's Article

197

Jorrit M. Kelder, The Kingdom of Ahhiyawa: Facts, Factoids and Probabilities

200

Jeremy B. Rutter, An Aegean Archaeologist's Response

208

Robert Schon, Response to Trevor Bryce's Article

214

Mark Weeden, Hittite-Ahhiyawan Politics as Seen from the Tablets: A Reaction to Trevor Bryce's Article from a Hittitological Perspective

217

Anna Lucia D'Agata, Postscript

228

SYLLABOGRAM *65 OR LOGOGRAM *129 (= FAR)? THE SIGN ON THEBES TABLETS, AB 65 IN LINEAR A, AND SOME REMARKS ON THE O-STEM GENITIVE SINGULAR IN -XO

Rachele Pierini

Summary

The possible double reading of the sign  both as a syllabogram (*65) and as a logogram (*129 = FAR) has sparked a wide-ranging debate around its meaning on the Thebes tablets from the Fq and Gp series. Initially, this sign was always read as FAR in both series. In the following interpretations, its meaning mostly appears to be *65 on the Fq tablets, but is difficult to determine on the documents termed Gp. For this reason, some interpretative details regarding entries from both series still diverge. This paper will make additional arguments to support the reading as *65 throughout the Fq series, whereas the other occurrences will be analysed individually and a choice will be made where there is sufficient information. To this end, data from Linear A on AB 65 will also be taken into account. Moreover, considerations will be proposed on epigraphic conventions and the possible reassignment of some tablets. Finally, given the ongoing debate on the morphological interpretation of Theban words ending with the sign , as genitive singulars or otherwise, some details on the *o*-stem genitive singular in -Xo will be discussed, and an interpretation of these terms provided.

1. AIM

The sign  recurs throughout the corpus of documents in Mycenaean Greek, with attestations from Knossos, Mycenae, Pylos, and Thebes. It is drawn with a vertical stroke and a curved diagonal attached to its right, and with additional (usually two or three) shorter vertical strokes under the diagonal. From an interpretative point of view, it can be read as both the syllabogram *65 (still undeciphered) and the logogram *129 (= FAR). In most of its occurrences, a distinction between its syllabic and ideographic value seems easy to make. On KN Fs 3.B it is plainly recorded in the same line first as *65 and then, just a few signs later, as FAR. However, its interpretation has proved controversial on the Thebes tablets from *Odos Pelopidou*. As a result, despite the numerous proposals advanced, the long debate surrounding it has not yet reached a shared conclusion. The aim of this paper is to provide additional arguments to support the idea that the sign  should be read as *65 on tablets from the Fq series, as well as to analyse findings from the texts of the Gp documents. Since the debate over the interpretation of  has been long and complex, a complete overview will be provided of the various readings of  hitherto advanced. Finally, some considerations on the *o*-stem genitive singular in -Xo will be provided.

2. INTRODUCTORY NOTE

Though references such as Fq 130.1 and Fq 236.1 seem identical, they indicate different parts of the respective texts. This is because the former refers to an unbroken document and, thus, to the very first line of the text. The latter, by contrast, refers to the first readable line of the text since Fq 236 is a broken tablet, being *supra mutila*. In addition to being ambiguous, references like Fq 236.1 also fail to provide any information on the breakage in the upper part of the tablet. A solution might be to indicate the first readable line with, *e.g.*, underlined numbers. Thus, an entry such as]wā[on the first readable line of Fq 342 would be indicated as Fq 342.1 (instead of Fq 342.1). The next entry on the same tablet, *i.e.* the second readable line, would be referred to as Fq 342.2, and that after it, *i.e.* the third readable line, as Fq 342.3, and so on. References like these are unambiguous and straightforward, and

also provide information on the breakage in the upper part of the tablet. Finally, they clearly indicate which is the first readable line, which is the second, and so forth, though each entry lacks enough evidence to precisely specify its original position within the tablet.

In this paper references to entries on tablets that are *supra mutila* or broken in the upper part will be made in line with this suggestion.

3. LINEAR B DATA: AN OVERVIEW

According to *TFC IV*, the sign 𐀀 is currently recorded in the Fq and Gp series, namely on Fq 123.1, 130.3, 132.1, 214.7.13, 229.4, 236.5, 254.6.7.13, 258.3.5, 275.3,¹ 284.3, 342.2, Gp 110.2, 124.1.2, 144.1, 153.2, 215.1.2, 303.1, for a total of twenty-three attestations on seventeen different tablets.² Hand 305 wrote all the Fq tablets except 236 (by Hand 304), and he has also been assigned Gp 144, though tentatively. Gp 110 and 124 are by Hand 306, whereas Gp 153, 215, 303 are by an unidentified scribal hand.

From *TFC I* onwards, the *editores principes* have always read 𐀀 as FAR. However, this interpretation was soon called into question. Palaima (2000-2001, 483-484) first brought the issue to our attention, arguing that on the Thebes tablets 𐀀 mainly corresponds to *65. Other scholars have since expanded this hypothesis, although with arguments that differ (sometimes considerably) in their details.

4. THE SIGN 𐀀 ON THE FQ SERIES

In his in-depth and thorough analysis, Palaima (2000-2001, 483-484; 2003a, 155; 2003b, 36-37; and especially 2006, 145-148) has argued that 𐀀 corresponds to *65 and not to FAR throughout the Fq series. His main arguments can be summarized as follows: first, in the Fq tablets the main commodity identified in the heading is HORD. When the last line shows a total amount, the totals are of HORD and there is no indication of FAR, not even on Fq 214, 229, 254, where FAR could hypothetically be read. Therefore, the Fq texts exclusively deal with HORD and the presumed instances of FAR should be interpreted as *65. Second, the spatial orientation of the signs speaks in favour of reading *65 for 𐀀 , as can be observed on Fq 123, 132, and 236. Contrary to what the transcription of these tablets in *TFC I* seems to show, there is no space between -jo and 𐀀 on Fq 123, nor between -qo and 𐀀 on Fq 132, where 𐀀 is placed against the preceding [•]-po-qo. Likewise, on Fq 236 𐀀 is run up against the preceding syllabograms and not separated from them, even where there is space to do so. All the metrical z entries are lined up on the far right on Fq 236. On this tablet, 𐀀 is also separated from the z entries and the space between it and the previous no is as wide as the gap between -ko-ro in l. 4 and -ro-ko in l. 6. Thus, the spacing of all three tablets (Fq 123, 132, 236) supports the meaning of 𐀀 as *65. Third, 𐀀 follows words that Palaima interprets as patronymic adjectives or personal names in the genitive or dative. The entry ra-]ke-da-mo-ni-jo-u-jo on Gp 227.2 is composed of the anthroponym ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo and the second member -u-jo 'son'. In light of this word, a phonetic value close to ju (or similia) has been assumed for the still undeciphered *65 (Melena 2014, 16, 116, and especially 131 n. 186). A further five occurrences of the same individual ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo are recorded on the Thebes tablets, namely on Fq 229.4, 258.3, 275.3, 284.3, and also on Fq 254.3, where ra-ke-mi-ni-jo is a writing error for ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo (*TFC I*, 396). In all these entries, the anthroponym ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo is followed directly, without spacing, by 𐀀 ; this makes the interpretation of 𐀀 as *65 far more likely on all these Fq tablets, and provides the variant spelling

1 Although the drawing seems to show a tablet broken in the upper part, the document is not referred to as *supra mutila* (*TFC I*, 112; *TFC IV*, 33-34).

2 In *TFC I* two more entries of the sign 𐀀 were indicated, namely on Gp 303.2 and 313.1. The total was thus of twenty-five attestations, the number also mentioned by Palaima in his papers based on this edition. In light of new information, the editors of the Thebes tablets later reconsidered the reading of both these documents in *TFC IV*. Thus, in line .2 of the very damaged Gp 303 there are just a few, and basically unintelligible, traces of an unidentifiable sign, and in *TFC IV* its text accordingly reads]vestigia[. In the same edition, Gp 313.1 reads as follows: wō-[•] i-jē-tō , tē-o v 3[.

ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo-*65. Since within the Fq group 𐎢𐎠 occurs on Fq 123.1, 130.3, 254.6, 258.5, 342.2 directly after *ka-wi-jo* (another adjectival or patronymic form in Palaima's view), 𐎢𐎠 should also be read as *65 on these tablets.³

However, Killen (2006, 103-106) pointed out that 𐎢𐎠 is *65 in the Fq texts except on Fq 236, where it should be read as FAR. Similarities between the recipients listed on Fq 229 and Fq 236 led him to conclude that *ku-ne* on Fq 229.9 (nom. pl., 'the dogs') parallels *ku-no* on 236.5. In turn, *ku-no* is considered the genitive plural of an animal name, especially thanks to the comparison with *ka-no* on Ft 217.2, a term tentatively linked to the dative plural *ka-si* on Ft 141.2 and thus interpreted as /khanon/ '(on behalf?) of the geese'. In this light, the reading *ku-no* FAR is preferred to *ku-no*-*65, and the presence of FAR is not unexpected in a context like the Fq documents, when compared to tablets such as MY Fu 711.

Recently, Judson (2016, 151-152) has also questioned the reading of 𐎢𐎠 as *65 throughout the Fq series. Besides 236.5, she also finds the interpretation of 𐎢𐎠 on Fq 132 uncertain, and this leads her to cast doubt on the classification of both tablets as Fq. This latter conclusion is based on contextual elements, such as the lack of HORD on both documents, as well as the different spacing between recipients and metrograms. However, the damaged condition of both tablets makes it impossible to better clarify other details, *e.g.* whether the vertical stroke on the right edge of 132.1 is part of 𐎢𐎠 (more likely according to her) or rather of v (as read in *TFC I* and *IV*).

On the basis of these observations, it can be concluded that 𐎢𐎠 is unanimously to be interpreted as *65 throughout the Fq series, except on Fq 132.1 and Fq 236.5. We will first provide an analysis of each of these two tablets (4.1. and 4.2.), and then draw some conclusions (4.3.).

4.1. *TH Fq 132.1*

Fq 132 is by the very productive Hand 305, to whom the vast majority of the Thebes tablets labelled Fq have been attributed. Another three tablets not belonging to the Fq series (*i.e.* Gf 134, Gp 129, Gp 144) have also been attributed to him, although tentatively in all three cases. Thus, the vast corpus ascribed to him provides a significant amount of data on the Fq series to consider. Thanks to all this information, we can briefly summarise the principal characteristics of his scribal habits as follows. His Fq texts show extreme accuracy and regularity in terms of the distribution of signs and words (James, 2002-2003, 399-400), to the extent that what might have represented a discrepancy in the uniformity of his usual pattern has been convincingly justified as part of a different pattern (Del Freo, 2014).⁴

If we analyse the Fq tablets by Hand 305 from another perspective, namely their contents and text structures, we can offer the following observations. The Fq tablets without 𐎢𐎠 hitherto attributed to Hand 305 with certainty⁵ include texts from both broken and unbroken tablets, in both cases characterised by either the presence or absence of logograms and metrograms. We thus have tablets (a) with both logograms and metrograms, (b) with logograms and without metrograms, (c) without logograms and with metrograms, (d) without logograms and without metrograms, (e) with just numbers, (f) with just *vestigia*. The largest groups are (c), made up of sixty tablets,⁶

3 Further studies on the subject have then provided additional observations on specific points. They particularly refer to the phonetic value of *65 in the context of the Fq series (Duhoux 2002-2003, 241-244) as well as to the morphological interpretation of terms such as *ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo* and *ka-wi-jo*, basically focused on clarifying whether they are *o*-stem genitive singulars in *-Xo* (Pierini 2011, 67-79; Duhoux 2017) or not (Jiménez Delgado 2016, 87-88; Thompson 2017).

4 After noticing that, on tablets recording *ma-ka*, Hand 305 had squeezed some signs into a place where there could have been no obstacles to writing (*i.e.* on the upper right edge), Del Freo (2014) argued that Hand 305 first wrote *ma-ka* and only later added the amounts of HORD. Moreover, he shows that in each tablet a correlation can be established between the amounts of *ma-ka* HORD and the number of the entries in the following lines, leading him to conclude that Hand 305 needed to previously know the exact number of entries on each tablet to calculate them as a total.

5 Tablets that in *TCF IV* were only tentatively ascribed to Hand 305 are the following: Fq 133, 173, 245, 250, 261, 289, 329, 344, 346, 351, 393, 406, 407, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420. Though we will not dwell on their detailed analysis, we can note that most of these tablets provide only traces, quite often uncertain, of metrograms and numbers, whereas the remainder have *vestigia*. Only Fq 261 records a readable text, which has no logograms.

6 According to *TCF IV*, the Fq tablets with metrograms and without logograms are the following: 115, 117, 120, 125, 128, 136, 137, 169, 171, 198, 221, 239, 240, 241, 247, 252, 253, 257, 272, 277, 278, 281, 292, 294, 301, 305, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 314, 325, 339, 343, 347, 349, 353, 356, 358, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 374, 379, 380, 382, 383, 384, 385, 387, 389, 390, 329, 395, 396, 398.

and (d), composed of twenty documents.⁷ Groups (e) and (f), by contrast, include only a few tablets (respectively Fq 376, 391, 397, 398 and Fq 405), many of which are severely damaged and rather unremarkable. Lastly, tablets of groups (a) and (b), though few in number, provide interesting data. Group (b) consists of just Fq 131, a damaged fragment whose text is limited to *ma-]ka* HORD[. This Fq tablet by Hand 305 records a logogram which (i) appears in line .1, (ii) is HORD, and (iii) is preceded by *ma-ka*. Likewise, most of the eight documents belonging to group (a), namely Fq 126, 213, 263, 285, 304, 357, read *ma-ka* HORD in line .1; in other words, in all these tablets Hand 305 has written a logogram that (i) appears in line .1, (ii) is HORD, and (iii) is preceded by *ma-ka*. The other two tablets of group (a) are Fq 269 and 276, in which the logogram HORD appears in the last line after *ku-su-to-ro-qa*. The upper part of both tablets is missing and consequently the first line cannot be read. Nevertheless, there are several reasons to argue that *ma-ka* was the commodity referred to in the total in the last line (Pierini 2017, with further details and references). On both Fq 269 and 276 Hand 305 wrote a logogram which (i) appears in the last line, (ii) is HORD, and (iii) is preceded by *ku-su-to-ro-qa*, likely referring to the total of *ma-ka*. This paints the following picture of the Fq tablets without 𒀭 written by Hand 305 and recording a logogram: they list a logogram that (i) appears in the very first or very last line, (ii) is HORD, and (iii) is preceded by *ma-ka* or by a total (likely referring to *ma-ka*). Finally, none of the numerous tablets of groups (c) and (d) present logograms in any line of the text.

Bearing this in mind, we can detect the following pattern in the Fq tablets by Hand 305. His documents often appear without logograms, these being the most common type of text, with a total of eighty examples among the documents of groups (c) and (d). All his texts that do contain a logogram share very specific features, since this logogram (i) is in the very first or very last line, (ii) is HORD, and (iii) is preceded by *ma-ka* or by a total (likely referring to *ma-ka*).

If we move onto the Fq tablets by Hand 305 with 𒀭 , we can make the following observations. Five of these ten tablets, *i.e.* Fq 130, 214, 229, 254, 258, record the logogram HORD, which appears either in line .1 (130, 258), or in the last line (229), or in both the first and the last lines (214, 254).⁸ On the remaining five tablets, *i.e.* Fq 123.1, 132.1, 275.3, 284.3, 342.2, if we leave aside 𒀭 , the signs recorded are syllabograms and metrograms. In other words, if we remove 𒀭 , these texts are perfectly consistent with the other sixty examples of group (c). It is also worth emphasising that all but Fq 275 (*cf.* n. 1) are tablets *supra mutula* and thus all lack the upper part. Consequently, on Fq 275 𒀭 is recorded in line .3 and in the other four documents it is written somewhere in the central part of the tablet. This points to the reading of 𒀭 as syllabogram *65, given that in the Fq texts by Hand 305 a logogram has the aforementioned characteristics (*i.e.* it is in the very first or very last line, it is HORD, and it is preceded by *ma-ka*).

Finally, according to Palaima, on Fq 132.1 there is no space between *-jo* and 𒀭 , though a space is indicated in the transcription of the tablet (*TFC I*, 46; *TFC IV*, 14). This consideration also speaks in favour of reading 𒀭 as a syllabogram.

We have seen that on the tablets of the Fq series, Hand 305 constantly repeats a clear pattern. The Fq documents written by him may or may not have a logogram. The latter is more common; in all the former cases, the logogram (i) is invariably at the very beginning or end of the tablet, (ii) is just HORD, and (iii) is constantly related to *ma-ka*. None of the Fq tablets by Hand 305 present any logogram other than HORD, nor does any logogram appear in the central part of the text. Reading 𒀭 as a logogram FAR on Fq 132.1, *i.e.* in a line that is certainly not the beginning of the tablet, would fall totally outside the pattern and would also be a very isolated example, with no parallels anywhere in the corpus of Hand 305's Fq texts. By contrast, the interpretation of 𒀭 as syllabogram *65 on Fq 132.1 is entirely consistent with all the other Fq tablets by Hand 305. This interpretation is also consistent with another characteristic of the entry on Fq 132.1, namely the lack of spacing between *-qo* and 𒀭 , supporting

⁷ The Fq tablets with neither logograms nor metrograms are the following: 118, 177, 194, 249, 265, 306, 322, 331, 341, 352, 359, 360, 361, 362, 378, 394, 399, 401, 402, 403.

⁸ On Fq 254, HORD also appears in line .2, due to the presence of *ma-ka* in this line, and not in the first as usual. See Pierini 2017 with further details and references.

the interpretation of 𐀢 as a syllabogram joined to the previous signs. In conclusion, the preferable reading for the entry on Fq 132.1 seems to be [•]-*po-qo*-*65. Unfortunately, the initial *lacuna* makes it hard to further clarify the interpretation of this word.

4.2. TH FQ 236.5

Tablet Fq 236 is by Hand 304, to whom *TFC IV* attributes a further four documents of the Fq series (224, 228, 238, 244), and five of the eight texts making up the Av series (100, 101, 106, 185, 318).⁹ Though the corpus of Fq tablets by Hand 304 is smaller than that by Hand 305, some remarks are nevertheless in order. With the exception of Fq 236, the Fq tablets by him share the same characteristics as the vast majority of documents by Hand 305. Likewise, in the corpus by H 304 we see texts without logograms and with metrograms (Fq 228) as well as texts with neither logograms nor metrograms (Fq 224, 238, 244), comparable to the other eighty texts of the aforementioned groups (c) and (d). This is especially evident on Fq 228, where on the right we read metrograms (z, v) and numbers. In other words, Fq 228 paints a picture that is entirely consistent with the Fq tablets by Hand 305. This constitutes a first piece of evidence to argue that Hand 304's corpus suggests the same conclusions as that of Hand 305.

Fq 236 records 𐀢 in the fifth readable line of text (Fq 236.5). In light of the aforementioned considerations on the position of logograms in the Fq texts (at the very beginning or at the end), the presence of 𐀢 in the middle of the tablet might seem to speak against its interpretation as a logogram. Rather, it might constitute another piece of evidence to argue that the preferable reading of 𐀢 is *65 on Fq 236 as well.

Another observation can be added on the spatial orientation of the signs. As Palaima observed and Killen also recognized, on Fq 236.5 all the z entries are lined up to the far right, and the space between 𐀢 and the previous syllabogram spans as much as in the preceding and next line. This also makes the syllabogram *65 the preferable reading of 𐀢 on Fq 236.5. This interpretation yields the term *ku-no*-*65[. I therefore agree with Lejeune (*Mém. IV*, 290) that the word *ku-no* is a personal name with no relation to the word 'dog'. As a possible alphabetic parallel for *ku-no* we can propose Κυνώ, a female name attested by Herodotus (1.110), though a term made of just two syllables could also allow for other interpretations. Further examples of female names in the Fq series are, e.g., *do-ra-a₂-ja* or *do-re-ja*. However, it should be remembered that Fq 236 is broken at the right in the line recording *ku-no*-*65[, exactly where 𐀢 appears, making it hard to know whether *ku-no*-*65[is the complete word.

Our analysis of Fq 236 allows us to make some remarks. The Fq tablets by Hand 304 perfectly fit the pattern identifiable for the Fq texts by Hand 305 in terms of both the distribution and typology of logograms, metrograms, and numbers in the document. Moreover, the position of all the metrograms z (lined up to the far right) supports the reading of 𐀢 as the last syllabogram of the first entry in the line, namely *ku-no*, and this to be read *ku-no*-*65[.

4.3. Internal criteria: *usus scribendi* and *lectio difficilior*

In examining the use of internal criteria for the selection of variants in the *constitutio textus*, Timpanaro (2003, 57-58) draws attention to the criteria of *usus scribendi* and *lectio difficilior*, as well as to the subtle contradiction within these two concepts. The former refers to the habits, to what is well known, to what in modern terms would be defined as a 'comfort zone'. By contrast, the latter refers to what is unusual, unexpected, new, 'out of the box', to use a contemporary expression. Although Mycenaean philology does not deal *stricto sensu* with *variae lectiones* and thus with neither *lectio difficilior* nor *usus scribendi*, the characteristics of the Fq series as a whole offer a picture that can be compared to literary texts as regards the use of internal criteria. Since a pattern can be detected throughout the Fq series, we can compare what falls within this pattern to scribal habits, i.e. to the *usus scribendi*, and what lies outside this pattern and therefore unusual to the *lectio difficilior*. The question to answer in dealing with texts like Fq 132 and 236 is which criterion, *usus scribendi* or *lectio difficilior*, should be applied.

⁹ In *TFC I*, Fq 224, 228, 236, 238, 244 had been attributed to another scribal hand, namely 310, whereas the aforementioned tablets of the Av series had been already indicated as by Hand 304.

If we look at the Fq series as a whole, we can make the following observations. Although it is composed of one hundred and thirty nine tablets, the logogram HORD appears on just a few of them, namely on fourteen texts (Fq 126, 130, 131, 213, 214, 229, 254, 258, 263, 269, 276, 285, 304, 357). This fact allows us to make two further considerations. First, it corresponds almost entirely to the dossier of *ma-ka*, given that HORD is recorded on all twelve Fq documents recording *ma-ka* plus Fq 269 and 276, where the absence of the upper part explains the lack of *ma-ka* (since *ma-ka* is written at the beginning of the tablet, see Pierini 2017). Second, the other one hundred and twenty-five tablets without the logogram HORD share the apparently unremarkable feature of being broken. A closer look shows that these documents are broken in the upper part, and often also in the lower part and at the right, and this is closely connected to the absence of HORD. The unbroken Fq tablets clearly show that HORD constantly appears in the very first (cf. n. 8) or in the last line of the text; as such, the fact that the tablets are broken in these specific parts reinforces the hypothesis that HORD is the only logogram recorded in the Fq texts. We can thus extend the characteristics of homogeneity and regularity detected in the texts by Hand 305 to the whole Fq series. This, in turn, reinforces the hypothesis that the whole Fq series followed a fixed pattern, and not just the Fq texts by Hand 305 (who wrote the vast majority of Fq documents). Only that which fits this pattern should be considered a characteristic of the series and an element potentially belonging to the text. If we agree that, in line with this proposal, the criterion of *usus scribendi* is preferable, we can further develop the hypothesis as follows. We can imagine an Fq tablet as ideally divided into three sections, namely a beginning part, a central segment, and the ending note. Commodities are always written using a logogram, appearing at the beginning and at the end, whereas the central section records the recipients to whom the commodity is allocated. As previously noted, this logogram is HORD and is preceded by *ma-ka* or by a total referring to *ma-ka*. Therefore, *ma-ka* HORD can be taken as a unit (Pierini 2017); we cannot expect to find any other commodity, much less in the central part recording the recipients. This is perfectly in line with Palaima's insightful remark that where we can hypothetically read FAR and there is a total amount, the totals are of HORD and there is no indication of a FAR total.

In addition, though FAR is attested elsewhere with other commodities expressed through logograms (e.g. MY Fu 711), the Thebes tablets from the Fq series paint a different picture. All the Fq documents clearly show not only that HORD is the only logogram certainly recorded in the Fq series, but also that it is closely related to *ma-ka*, or at least to *de-qo-no* (Pierini 2017). Therefore, it would make little sense to have in Thebes an unparalleled logogram in the middle of a tablet perfectly repeating the pattern in all other aspects. This does not even have any relation with any other scribal pattern (as e.g. in the case highlighted by Del Frio 2104), otherwise broadly detectable throughout the whole Fq series. These observations suggest that the criterion of *usus scribendi* should be preferred when interpreting the Fq tablets.

Against this backdrop provided by the tablets of the Fq series, we must ask which interpretation of 𐎶𐎵 on Fq 132.1 and 236.5 is most appropriate. This brings us back to the question on criteria, to the question about what we are dealing with, with habits or with a sudden change. Examining the matter from this point of view, the choice of the syllabogram *65 seems perfectly coherent with the pattern of the Fq series, whereas giving preference to the logogram FAR means departing from the pattern. In the latter case, we would be forced to accept that, out of a total of one hundred and thirty-nine Fq tablets clearly presenting the same pattern, one hundred and thirty-seven documents fit it, whereas two examples do not. It implies that we should admit further conditions as well. First, these two examples might have a logogram in the middle of the text, although all the other Fq tablets show only recipients in this section and record the logogram at the beginning or at the end. Second, the (already suspicious) central part of the text might contain the logogram FAR, notwithstanding the commodity HORD in all the other Fq documents. Third, we should accept both these points though the spacing on both Fq 132.1 and 236.5 speaks against the interpretation of 𐎶𐎵 as logogram. On the other hand, reading 𐎶𐎵 on both Fq 132.1 and 236.5 as a syllabogram would give us two tablets entirely consistent both with the other one hundred and thirty-seven documents of the Fq series and the spacing in their respective texts. In addition, both documents would provide terms that have parallels within the Fq series (see 4.4.).

In light of these observations, reading 𐎶 on Fq 132.1 and 236.5 as a logogram would be unparalleled and inconsistent with the spacing on both tablets. Interpreting it as a syllabogram, though, would align both documents perfectly with the textual characteristics of all the other numerous examples of Fq texts. Furthermore, since from an editorial point of view the Fq series as a whole shows great uniformity and homogeneity, this seems to be a particularly remarkable shared feature. Therefore, the internal criterion of *usus scribendi* seems preferable. These considerations lead us to conclude that the preferable interpretation of 𐎶 on both Fq 132.1 and 236.5 is as syllabogram *65. Thus, the sign 𐎶 can be consistently read as the syllabogram *65 throughout the Fq series.

5. THE SIGN 𐎶 IN THE GP SERIES

The sign 𐎶 appears eight times on six Thebes tablets of the Gp series. Among them, the interpretation of 𐎶 on Gp 110.2 and 124.1 as *65 is widely accepted. Its reading in the other six cases, however, is still debated, including on Gp 124.2, whose palaeographic reading is uncertain according to Duhoux (2002-2003, 242), whereas it lacks explicit references elsewhere.

5.1. TH Gp 110.2, 124.1

In Killen's (2006, 103) *ipsissima verba*, Palaima's argument (2000-2001, 483-484; 2006, 145-148) on the divider after 𐎶 on Gp 110.2 and 124.1 is powerful. The resulting interpretation of 𐎶 as *65 in these two occurrences has been generally accepted. Therefore, these two entries should be read, respectively, as]*65, v 2 and]ko-*65, VIN v 2[.

5.2. TH Gp 124.2

Palaima (2000-2001, 483-484) was the first to highlight that most of the sufficiently preserved and legible Gp texts deal with the commodity VIN. We can further note that the Gp series consists of a total of fifty-four tablets, according to *TFC IV*. Twenty-five of these have been attributed to Hand 306, also tentatively linked to another fourteen Gp documents and to one Fq text.¹⁰ Not counting the two texts recording 𐎶 (*i.e.* Gp 110 and 124), twelve of the tablets by Hand 306 have logograms (Gp 109, 111.b, 112, 127, 147, 164, 167, 183, 184, 210, 231, 233), and this logogram is always VIN. It is VIN both in the most common case, where it appears in line .1 (Gp 111, 112, 164, 167, 184, 210, 231, 233) and also when it appears in line .2 (Gp 109, 147, 183), and even in the only example recording the same logogram in both lines (Gp 127). The other eleven documents (Gp 107, 114, 122, 145, 158, 178, 181, 196, 199, 201, 345) are fragments mostly from the left or central part of the tablet, where no logogram is usually expected. However, it should be stressed that on Gp 199 there are traces of signs to the left and that in line .b these traces are perhaps readable as VIN. Traces to the left can be also seen on both Gp 145 and 201, that are, respectively, of an unknown sign and consistent with *to* (Killen 2006, 101 n. 64; Pierini 2017). The last observation regarding this sub-group of tablets concerns Gp 345, whose text reads:]v 1 *56-ru-we z 2. Both the metrogram v and the numerical indication 1 seem larger than the following syllabograms and signs, according to both the photo and the drawing in *TFC I*. Although without a first-hand analysis it is impossible to go further, it can be remarked that on Gp 158.1 there are some signs larger than others and that the smaller signs are distributed in both line .1a and line .1b. Although this example seems different from Gp 345, it nevertheless provides a parallel for larger signs within the same tablet by Hand 306.

This overview of Hand 306's scribal habits suggests that his texts are very uniform and homogeneous, just like those of Hand 305, though without the same degree of fixed standardization. On this basis, it can be argued that the dotted sign on Gp 124.2, if further research confirms its current tentative reading as 𐎶, should be interpreted as *65. Therefore, Gp 124.2 can be read as follows:]*65 v 1. Finally, these observations provide additional support for the reading *65 for 𐎶 on Gp 110.2, given that VIN is recorded in the previous line of the same tablet.

10 The Gp tablets assigned to Hand 306 with certainty are the following: Gp 107, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 122, 124, 127, 145, 147, 158, 164, 167, 178, 181, 183, 184, 196, 199, 201, 210, 231, 233, 345. Texts doubtfully assigned to him are: Fq 200, Gp 146, 149, 154, 161, 165, 168, 176, 186, 188, 195, 197, 227, 230, 237.

5.3. *TH Gp (?) 153.2, 303.1*

Palaima (2006, 145-148) noted that on both Gp 153 and 303 the metrogram for dry commodities appears (*i.e.* τ), implying that both tablets need to be reassigned. Judson (2016, 146-147) added that Gp 149 should also be reassigned, out of the dossier of the sign 𐎢𐎣 , given the presence of τ in this text. We can therefore agree on reassigning all three tablets. In addition, Duhoux (2002-2003) and Killen (2006) highlighted that the metrogram τ makes FAR the preferable reading of 𐎢𐎣 on both Gp 153 and 303. Despite the presence of τ , we lack sufficient evidence to definitively adopt one or other interpretation. Gp 153 is fragmented and damaged, especially in line .2, where 𐎢𐎣 appears, thus making the choice even harder. The conditions of Gp 303 are not so different in terms of damage. In addition, the unknown scribal hand of both documents offers no help in further clarifying this issue. We can only stress that several other Gp texts present no logogram. Although the fact that these tablets are often broken hinders us in making reliable comparisons, it would nevertheless make the potential lack of logogram on both Gp 153 and 303 not unparalleled. Bearing in mind these restrictions, we can compare Gp 303 to, for example, Gp 313. In the first line of both tablets, we can observe metrograms and numbers on the right, before the break. On Gp 313 no logogram is recorded and, despite the cut on the right and the very damaged conditions of the tablet, the surviving part of the text makes it likely that there was no logogram. If we look at Gp 303, we observe an analogous scenario in the right part of the tablet. As on Gp 313, there are metrograms and numbers before the break. This calls into question the assumption that a logogram is required before a metrogram, though we are dealing with wine in the former case and with a dry commodity in the latter.

We must thus acknowledge that at present we do not have enough information to make a clear-cut decision on the interpretation of 𐎢𐎣 neither on Gp 153 nor on 303, and the reading of the sign still remains uncertain on both these documents.

5.4. *TH Gp (?) 215.1.2*

Palaeographic considerations regarding the spacing between signs on Gp 215.1.2 lead Palaima (2006, 145-148) and Killen (2006, 103-106) to reach opposite conclusions. Palaima inclines towards *65, precisely because of the sign spacing and the preceding entries *qe-da-do-ro* and *a-ko-ro-da-mo*, each occurring on one other Gp text as well (Gp 150.1 and 164.2, respectively). On the other hand, the spacing between 𐎢𐎣 and what precedes it in both lines makes Killen favour the opposite interpretation (*i.e.* FAR), also on the basis of what he judges to be the slightly greater height of 𐎢𐎣 compared to preceding signs in line .1.

The damaged conditions of the tablet and the lack of an identified scribal hand do not help to clarify the question. However, some further considerations can be made. As previously noted, throughout the Gp series there is only one example of a logogram, namely VIN , recorded both in the first and the second line, *i.e.* on Gp 127 by Hand 306. Thus, it would be quite peculiar to have the commodity FAR recorded twice on Gp 215 in two consecutive lines. In addition, Gp 215 is broken on the left side and, consequently, we only have the right part. A comparison with other Gp documents broken on the left side shows that texts such as Gp 114, 149, 154, 170, 175, 181, 188, 195, and 201 record only metrograms and numerals in their right part. Gp 227 as well, albeit broken on both sides, presents only metrograms and numerals in its preserved right part. Gp texts that are broken in different parts and contain the logogram VIN , record it in the left or central part of line .1, as in Gp 110, 184, 197, 210, 230, 231, 233 and possibly also 199 (see 5.2.). Only Gp 124 and 184 provide examples of VIN recorded in the final part of line .1. On Gp 183 and 186, however, VIN is written in line .2, in the right and central part respectively. Though these observations cannot be relied on as scribal habits, they do suggest that within this series it would be peculiar to have a document recording the same logogram FAR twice, in two consecutive lines, and, moreover, on its right part. However, it might not be unusual, were this tablet part of a different series. Finally, regarding the other recipients on Gp 215, *a-me-ro* is well attested in the Fq series and both *qe-da-do-ro* and *a-ko-ro-da-mo* appear in turn in other entries with other recipients, *ku-no* and *e-pe-to-i* plus *56-*ru-we* respectively, occurring on other Gp tablets. We have explained why the preferable reading of *ku-no* seems to be as an anthroponym, and therefore singular, rather than a genitive plural. Therefore, though

the interpretation of 𐀀 on Gp 215.1.2 is far from certain, there seems to be some incompatibility between the reading of 𐀀 as FAR and the belonging of this tablet to the Gp series. At present, *65 appears to be the preferable reading on Gp 215.1.2, unless this document is reassigned, as previously seen for Gp 153 and 303, in which case the reading as FAR would be more probable.

5.5. TH Gp (?) 144.1

Similar considerations can be formulated for Gp 144.1, about which Duhoux (2002-2003) was also uncertain. We are dealing with a tablet whose scribal hand is uncertain (it is only tentatively attributed to 305) and that is broken (on both left and right this time). It can be argued that its preserved part corresponds to the central part of the original document, where logograms can be recorded, as we have already remarked. However, the logogram appearing at the beginning or in the central part of a Gp text is VIN, meaning that we currently lack enough evidence to exhaustively propose that it also works in the same way for the commodity FAR.

Therefore, *65 also seems to be the preferable reading on Gp 144.1, at least assuming that the tablet belongs to the Gp series. If it is reassigned, FAR would also be a possibility.

5.6. The Gp series and the sign 𐀀 : an overview

As previously underlined, 𐀀 is recorded eight times on six different tablets currently labelled Gp. As Palaima first noted, some of these Gp documents offer reasons for considering a reassignment. In addition, there may be reasons for redefining the criteria of Gp tablets. Both VIN and FAR were considered two different components of the same product and thus were interpreted as referring to the same commodity. As such, it made sense that the two logograms were recorded together. In addition, tablets with VIN and FAR, or with just one of them, have been labelled within the same series. However, VIN and FAR seem not to be two ingredients of the same commodity, but rather two different goods with, perhaps, slight differences also in recipients or aims as well.

In light of all these considerations, we have enough information only on Gp 110 and 124 to make a choice and, therefore, add weight to the reading of 𐀀 as *65 on both. On the remaining four tablets, the information available to us is currently controversial, making the interpretation of 𐀀 not unproblematic. The reading of the sign is particularly unclear on both Gp 153 and 303 (that should be both reassigned), whereas on Gp 144 and 215 a slight preference might be given to *65, unless both documents are reassigned.

6. THE SIGN 𐀀 IN LINEAR A (AB 65)

By moving beyond Linear B and briefly touching on Linear A, we can observe that, in Linear A, AB 65 is relatively well-attested, with more than thirty occurrences (*GORILA* 5, 243-244). Both in *GORILA*, in the glossary by Consani-Negri (1999, 249-326), and in Younger's (*LAL*) interpretation, AB 65 has mostly been read as a syllabogram (and only a couple of times as a logogram). On this basis it can be argued that this sign mainly performed a syllabic function in Linear A. Moreover, most of the sequences with AB 65 as the last sign have been read as names in a list, especially according to Younger (*LAL*). Though this conclusion has to be taken with caution and it should be stressed that most of the lexical items appearing on Linear A tablets are considered to be names, Linear A tablets seem to record personal names with AB 65 as the last sign. This piece of information can be interpreted in two different ways. On the one hand, it could support this sign being some kind of morphological marker or ending, thus making AB 65 belong to the word as its final part. On the other, it might be parallel in function to 𐀀 on the Linear B tablets from Thebes, that is to say with the semantic value of 'son'. In both cases, the use of AB 65 thus far indicated by Linear A tablets speaks in favour of the interpretation of the Linear B sign 𐀀 as *65 on the Theban documents from the Fq and Gp series. Moreover, in the former case, some further remarks are needed. It has already been highlighted that signs in -o are scarcely attested on Linear A tablets. This led to the conclusion that, unlike Linear B which had both /o/ and /u/, Linear A had just one velar vowel, namely /u/. This hypothesis seems

to be confirmed by pairs of anthroponyms attested in both writing systems, like QA-QA-RU and *qa-qa-ro*.¹¹ On this basis, some phonetic considerations could be provided. Though AB 65 has been assigned the value *ju* in light of the Linear B attestations, it is nonetheless worth stressing that such a meaning perfectly fits with the contexts where it appears. As shown by the example of QA-QA-RU, *-u* is understood to be a masculine ending in Linear A. Therefore, this analysis of the distributional pattern of AB 65 seems to speak in favour of its possible interpretation as *ju*, or at least as a sign ending with *-u*. In other words, Linear A data on the position of AB 65 within a word (or sign group) lend support to the phonetic interpretation of 𐀓 as belonging to the *-u* vocalic series.

Regardless of any further possible interpretation of AB 65, in Linear A this sign is primarily (if not exclusively) used as a syllabogram, to the best of our knowledge. Since this speaks in favour of its interpretation as *65 on the Linear B tablets from Thebes as well, it could be used to add weight to the possible reading of 𐀓 as a syllabogram on documents from the Fq and Gp series. This hypothesis would be reinforced by any further connection between Linear A and the Thebes tablets, though it is unlikely at first glance given the considerable time gap.

7. DUCTUS VARIATIONS: A PALAEOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Although it has been stressed that the reading of 𐀓 on the Thebes tablets cannot be further clarified by means of palaeography (Judson 2016, 135 n. 399), it is nonetheless worth considering some characteristics of its shape. Given that this sign is attested throughout the corpus of Mycenaean documents as well as in Linear A tablets, a large sample of data is available. By looking at the palaeographical variations of its principal elements (see 1.), Judson (2016, 135-138) has grouped the occurrences of 𐀓 into two categories.¹² In her view, one group is characterised by simple and linear forms, whereas the other type seems more elaborate. She attributes to the latter all the Knossian attestations (except one from the *Room of the Chariot Tablets*, henceforth: *RCT*) and around half of the examples from Pylos; to the former all the Theban occurrences, the Knossian example from the *RCT*, the other half of the Pylian examples, two attestations from Mycenae, and the occurrences of AB 65 on Linear A tablets. Finally, Judson argues that the simple shape might have been the original form, and the more elaborate drawing a subsequent development.

In this light, we can add some further remarks. Though the stratigraphic context of the Linear B tablets from *Odos Pelopidou* is understood to date to the LH IIIB2 (*TOP I*, 14), and is thus more recent than documents from the *RCT* (see 8.), the palaeographical evidence of 𐀓 seems to provide a different picture. Given the graphic similarity of the sign 𐀓 as drawn on *RCT*, Theban, and Linear A documents, palaeography suggests a closer relationship between the writing practices attested in the *RCT* and Thebes, and links them back to Linear A. Thus, if we speak in terms of possible palaeographical traditions (instead of chronological stages), the picture could potentially change slightly. Although we still lack a proper understanding of how palaeographical traditions operated, and much work has still to be done to shed light on the process, it is nonetheless worth tentatively following this path. Given the aforementioned distribution of variants, different palaeographical traditions appear to have followed different routes. One tradition seems to be characterised by a more linear form, perhaps stemming directly from Linear A and therefore older. The other tradition suggests development of the sign shape and seems to have begun already at Knossos (outside the *RCT*). These two different (and perhaps to an extent competing) traditions might have been in concomitant use, with neither fading away over time. This could be attested by the fact that Thebes, perhaps a more recent context (at least as far as archaeology suggests), still preserves the more linear variant of the sign, which we suggest linking back to its Linear A counterpart.

Against this backdrop provided by the palaeographical analysis of 𐀓, the following observations can be made. The *RCT* is understood to record the earliest reconstructable stages of the Linear B script as we know it, and

11 For a recent summary of the previous studies on Linear A as well as an examination of the main issues, see Perna 2016 with further references and details.

12 For a different classification see Raison 1964, who considered the occurrences of 𐀓 from Knossos, Mycenae, and Pylos.

the shapes of the signs drawn on tablets from this deposit have proven to be older. The palaeographical connections of the sign 𐀓 outlined above suggest that Theban palaeography possessed a degree of conservatism, despite the chronological gap between these two deposits. In other words, the scribal tradition of Thebes (or at least one of its possible traditions) may have been more conservative than the traditions attested elsewhere on the mainland. This picture of conservatism in writing practices (at least in terms of palaeography), if confirmed, may also enable us to interpret other features attested on Theban tablets as archaisms. Finally, the palaeographical similarity of 𐀓 as drawn in Linear A and on the Thebes tablets could be used in support of reading 𐀓 as a syllabogram (at least in most cases) on the Theban documents.

8. TERMS ENDING IN -XO AS O-STEM GENITIVE SINGULAR: SOME MORPHOLOGICAL REMARKS

A question strictly related to the reading of 𐀓 on the Thebes tablets is the morphological interpretation of the terms preceding it in the Fq series. This matter concerns the wider debate on the *o*-stem genitive singular in -Xo, a *vexata quaestio* because of two main issues: (i) the very existence of the so-called abnormal genitives in -Xo, and (ii) the morphological interpretation of this ending -Xo. Given that the debate on both issues is wide-ranging and that the latter largely focuses on Proto Indo-European (henceforth: PIE) matters (thus outside the scope of the present paper), we will briefly offer some considerations (for further references and details see Pierini 2011).

As regards the former question, the hypothesis of haplographies and other scribal errors has been often preferred from Chadwick (1958) onwards, mainly on the basis that the ending -Xo is particularly attested among stems in -io- (see Pierini 2011, 130-131; Thompson 2017, 585-586). However, further considerations can be put forward. If we look at all the so-called abnormal genitives in -Xo and focus on the ‘not uncertain’ examples (Pierini 2011, 114-117), we observe that words such as the month names *wo-de-wi-jo* and *ka-ra-e-ri-jo*, which Chadwick also considered convincing examples,¹³ have a larger number of attestations than *wo-de-wi-jo-jo* and *ka-ra-e-ri-jo-jo*. The term *wo-de-wi-jo* is recorded three times on Knossos tablets, twice on documents from the *RCT* and once on a tablet from the *Clay Chest*, whereas *ka-ra-e-ri-jo* is attested four times on four different Knossian documents, all from the *Clay Chest*.¹⁴ On the other hand, *wo-de-wi-jo-jo* occurs just once on KN Ga(4) 953, and *ka-ra-e-ri-jo-jo* twice, on KN Gg 7369 and M(1) 1645. Thus, the so-called abnormal genitives have seven (perhaps eight) attestations, against the three examples of the -Xo-jo form. If we move onto the Thebes tablets, the following remarks may be made with regard to the possible attestation of further genitives in -Xo. As previously highlighted (see n. 3), it is a subject for debate whether or not *ka-wi-jo*-*65 and *ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo*-*65 can be considered abnormal genitives. Both have five occurrences (six for the latter, if we include the variant spelling *ra-ke-da-mo-ni-jo-u-jo*), whereas no evidence of the same terms ending in -Xo-jo has hitherto been provided. As such, the sheer number of -Xo compared to -Xo-jo forms should cast doubt on the interpretation of the so-called abnormal genitives as always being haplographies. Moreover, calling into question scribal errors is even more peculiar in light of the data from the Thebes tablets, not only because of the five attestations of each word, but especially because of the extreme accuracy of the texts by Hand 305. Widening the sample to the other words in -Xo that can be considered abnormal genitives with varying degrees of plausibility (Pierini 2011, 131-135) provides similar results. In short, besides words that can be explained by scribal errors, other terms may be possible examples of abnormal genitives for different reasons.¹⁵

13 For a different explanation of the month names see Jiménez Delgado 2016, 67.

14 On KN V(2) 280.1, from *RCT*, *wo-de-wi-jo* is written by Hand “124”, whereas Hand 138 wrote it on both KN Fp(1) 16.1 and Fp(1) 48.1. Hand 138 also wrote *ka-ra-e-ri-jo* on KN Fp(1) 6.1, 7.1, 15.1, 18.1. Moreover, it has been supposed that *ka-ra-e-i-jo* on KN Fp(2) 354.1 might be a further attestation of the month name (see further references and details in *DMic s.v.*).

15 An analysis of each term potentially considered an example of an abnormal genitive and an overview of their characteristics and the reasons for their interpretation can be found in Pierini 2011, 105-115. A study of the *o*-stem genitive singular in -Xo is also in Thompson 2017, 586-587.

Morphologically, the words in *-Xo* have generally been read either as ablative singulars in **-ōd* (Morpurgo Davies 1960) or as singular genitives in **-os* (see Pierini 2011, 14-35 and 129-131 with further references and details). Though this debate has mostly been approached from a strictly morphological perspective, it should be highlighted that the interpretation of *-Xo* is, in turn, closely related to two further questions. First, we should ask which relationship exists between *-Xo* and *-Xo-jo*. Since *-Xo-jo* is regarded as the regular form, the abnormal *-Xo* could be either an innovation or an archaism with respect to the standard ending (Pierini 2011, 117-120). Second, the possibility of reading *-Xo* as **-os* is closely linked to the debate over the formation of **-osyo*. The origin of this ending could be either monomorphemic, thus split as **-o-syo*, or heteromorphemic, thus split as **-os-yo* (see Pierini 2011, 14-35 and 129-131 with further references and details). To answer these questions, the following data should also be considered.

From a chronological point of view, Driessen's (1990) work has clearly highlighted that the Palace of Knossos suffered several destructions over the centuries. Therefore, its archives belong to different chronological periods. The tablet deposit of the *RCT* is understood to be the earliest archive containing Mycenaean Linear B documents at Knossos. As a result, the data provided by Linear B tablets cannot be read as if they were synchronic; instead, we should take into account the diachronic difference between tablet deposits. A clear example of this is also offered by the analysis of sign 25, namely *a₂*, which has been argued to be an archaism on the basis of the chronology of the deposits from which it comes (Pierini 2014; Nosch forthcoming). Turning to the genitives in *-Xo*, we can recall that at least two of the 'not uncertain' examples, namely *wo-de-wi-jo* and *ka-ra-e-ri-jo*, come from the archaic deposit of the *RCT*. This fact constitutes a first piece of evidence to argue that the abnormal ending *-Xo* can be interpreted as earlier than the standard *-Xo-jo*.

We can thus propose that the abnormal genitives in *-Xo* belong to the very early stages of the Mycenaean Greek language. Thus, the issue is which morphological interpretation of *-Xo*, as ablative singulars in **-ōd* or genitive singulars in **-os*, would better fit this link with archaisms. Here we should also consider the previously mentioned hypotheses on the origin of the ending **-osyo*. The huge debate on its formation can be briefly outlined as follows. First, the PIE endings of the athematic stem genitive singular were **-s* and **-os*, as shown by alphabetic Greek as well in words like *χώρα-ς* 'region' and *φύλακ-ος* 'sentinel'. Thus, splitting **-osyo* into the two morphemes **-os* and **-yo* would make the first element **-os* perfectly parallel to the other PIE endings **-s* and **-os*. Second, though at first glance the *o*-stem genitive singular ending of other Indo-European language families such as Sanskrit *-asya* seems to favour the split **-o-syo*, it may in fact support the heteromorphemic interpretation **-os-yo*. This hypothesis goes as follows. According to the reading **-os-yo*, the first part **-os* could be compared with the Hittite genitive singular ending *-aš*. This, in turn, leads to the further question about when the split in Hittite took place. One possible answer is that, when the *o*-stem genitive singular ending arose, PIE languages were still grouped together, including Hittite. Subsequently, the split in Hittite took place, whereas in the branch of Indo-European languages still all together (Greek, Sanskrit, and Latin, to name a few), the old *o*-stem genitive singular **-os* became **-osyo*. Therefore, **-osyo* is not an independent innovation of several Indo-European language families, but rather an innovation which took place inside the PIE and was then inherited by each language. In the *o*-stem, however, it happens that the nominative also ends in *-os*, making the *o*-stem genitive singular in *-os* entirely homophone and homograph to the nominative. A possible solution could have been to re-characterize the genitive singular ending, for example using the morpheme **-yo*, already used to express the relative pronoun and thus appropriate to expressing the main feature of genitive, possession.

Turning to the Mycenaean data, we must choose the morphological interpretation of *-Xo*, either as ablative singulars in **-ōd* or as genitive singulars in **-os*. According to Hajnal (1995, 247-275), terms such as *ka-ra-e-ri-jo* and *wo-de-wi-jo* fall perfectly within the functions of the ablative, as indicators of time. However, this explanation would not fit *ka-wi-jo*-*65 and *ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo*-*65, if they mean 'son of K., son of L.' (see Appendix A), and thus express possession, *i.e.* one of the proper genitive functions. Moreover, it does not tell us why the ending *-Xo* is to be found especially among stems in *-io-*, nor why an ending **-ōd* should have suddenly disappeared and completely changed into (or been replaced by) **-osyo*. Two further factors should also be taken into account. First, in this case Mycenaean would present an ending apparently unparalleled among the Indo-European endings used to express

the genitive singular. Second, since the provenance of genitives in *-Xo* from the *RCT* seems to link them to the earlier stages of the language, we cannot really know if syncretism between genitive and ablative had already happened. Yet, if we interpret terms in *-Xo* as genitive singulars in **-os*, we would face a different scenario.

If we agree on considering Mycenaean words in *-Xo* as genitive singulars in **-os*, we can assume that **-osyo* was built in two different stages. In the first, the ending was expressed through **-os*. At this stage, Hittite, whose genitive singular ending reads *-as*, had not yet separated from the group of other Indo-European languages. Moreover, at this time, the Mycenaean genitive singular was expressed through the ending *-Xo*, as we can perhaps see from words belonging to conservative semantic areas, such as toponyms and theonyms (Pierini 2011, 132-135). In the second stage, when the split in Hittite had already occurred but the other Indo-European language families were still together, the genitive singular ending **-os* become **-osyo*, possibly to differentiate it from the nominative. This second stage explains perfectly why we find genitives in *-Xo* instead of *-Xo-jo* in a significant number of Mycenaean words ending *-jo*. Since haplography consists in writing only once a group of letters that should be written twice, Mycenaean genitives in *-Xo* in terms ending *-jo* have been explained as scribal errors, namely haplographies. However, they are not haplographies. They are, rather, haplogologies, meaning that it is the word itself that resists the addition of a further *-jo* to a term already ending *-jo*.¹⁶ The absence of this additional *-jo* is not a textual error but a phonological process. This also explains why we see the lack of the extra *-jo*, that is to say the ending *-Xo* instead of the expected *-Xo-jo*. In the former case, the process that led **-os* to become **-osyo* was taking place right at that moment and, thus, haplogology was *in fieri* as well. In the latter, **-osyo* had already become a well established ending, making the language stop resisting and, as a consequence, haplogology unnecessary. By looking at the genitive singular ending in Indo-European languages, the reconstruction of **-osyo* as heteromorphemic **-os-yo* offers a highly reasonable explanation of its development, based on the data provided by Mycenaean Greek.

On the basis of all these considerations, it can be argued that several *-Xo* forms can be read as *o*-stem genitive singular. Furthermore, the morphological interpretation of these forms as genitive singulars in **-os* is consistent with the chronological framework provided by the Mycenaean tablets and with linguistic data, both by means of phenomena such as haplogology and hypotheses on the PIE origin and formation of **-osyo*.

9. CONCLUSION

The analyses previously carried out on the Fq and Gp series highlight significant elements. The supplementary epigraphic criteria suggested here offer a more direct and clear overview of all the tablets and more accurate information on their texts. In this light, the very high degree of uniformity and homogeneity characterising texts from the Fq series is even more evident. Among the Fq tablets we can not only detect a fixed pattern, but also argue that we are not dealing with such a pattern if one of the characteristics identified as a defining feature is missing. The pattern detected for logograms in the Fq series shows that, in this series, the logogram (i) is in the very first or last line, (ii) is *HORD*, (iii) is strictly related to *ma-ka*. Since a sign without these characteristics cannot be considered a logogram but is rather a syllabogram, 𐀓 should be read as **65* throughout the Fq series. On the other hand, documents of the Gp series present an ambiguity upstream. Although *FAR* appears with other commodities in other archives such as Mycenae and Pylos, the examination of the Thebes tablets from *Odos Pelopidou* paints a different picture. Like the Fq texts, the documents currently labelled Gp seem to record just one commodity at a time. Thus, it could be suspicious to read the sign 𐀓 as a logogram if *VIN* occurs as well. However, the reading of 𐀓 as *FAR* cannot be certain even in the case of the concomitant presence of any other logogram, given that thus far there are not enough elements to exhaustively support this hypothesis with at least one clear example. Moreover, when dry measures appear, the option of reassessing the tablet should be taken into consideration.

16 Further examples of haplogology are words such as Latin *nutrix* < **nutritrix*, *venenum* < **venenenum*, and *stipendium* < **stipendium*, which clearly show that, when two homophone or semi-homophone syllables happen to be in contact, a linguistic system tends to remove one of them. See Pierini 2011, 130-132, with further references and details.

The interpretation of 𐀓𐀓 as *65 in the majority of the Theban texts is reinforced by data on AB 65 from Linear A tablets. The comparison between Linear A and Linear B as regards the sign 𐀓𐀓 gives us new, partially unexpected, insights. First, there is a palaeographical connection between Linear A, the *RCT*, and the Thebes tablets from the *Odos Pelopidou*. Moreover, AB 65 mainly performed a syllabic function in Linear A, and this adds weight to the hypothesis that the reading of 𐀓𐀓 as a syllabogram also prevailed on the Thebes tablets. Furthermore, the Linear B tablets from Thebes seem to provide additional examples of the *o*-stem genitive singular in *-Xo* (see also Appendix A), which are also considered archaisms. This allows us to further argue that the Thebes tablets, despite the chronological difference, can be connected to the earliest archives of the *RCT* and to Linear A. Finally, the morphological interpretation of the abnormal genitives as **-os* is supported by chronological, palaeographical and linguistic considerations.

APPENDICES

Two appendices are given below. Appendix A consists of Table 1 showing for each of the Fq and Gp tablets, entry by entry, the different interpretations advanced of the sign 𐀓𐀓 . Some further details will be briefly discussed as well. Appendix B provides the text of each of the eighteen tablets recording 𐀓𐀓 according to the new epigraphic criteria proposed here, to the interpretation of the sign supported, and to Palaima's observations on sign spacing.

Appendix A (Table 1)

The undeciphered syllabogram *65 has been supposed to have a phonetic value near to *ju* (or *similia*), mainly because of *ra-]ke-da-mo-ni-jo-u-jo* on TH Gp 227.2 (cf. 4.). On the basis of this comparison, the *ordo verborum* of the Theban Fq texts, and, ultimately, the evidence provided by the Theban Fq series itself, *65 has been given the semantic value of 'son' on the Thebes Fq tablets, though its phonetic interpretation is still uncertain in some details. This hypothesis has two further implications. One regards the morphological interpretation of the terms recorded on the Thebes Fq tablets that have *65 as the last syllable (cf. 8. and n. 3), the second point concerns the reading of *65 outside the Fq series.

As shown by Table 1, the words ending with *65 from the Fq tablets are as follows: *a-ra-o-*65*, *ka-wi-jo-*65*, *ku-no-*65*], *o-to-ro-no-*65*, *ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo-*65*, *[•]-po-qo-*65*. All these terms are written in the central part of the tablets, where the recipients are recorded. Accordingly, the word hidden behind *65 'son', whatever it may look like, is assumed to be in the dative case. Thus, the further issue to examine is which morphological interpretation should be given to the terms preceding the second element 'son', either as words in apposition or as genitives. In light of the earlier observations (cf. 8.), *ka-wi-jo-* and *ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo-* can both be considered genitive singulars in *-Xo* of the *o*-stem. Both are examples of terms in *-io-* from a deposit palaeographically related to Linear A archives. These characteristics make *ka-wi-jo-* and *ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo-* interesting examples of further abnormal genitives, showing how haplology affected words in *-io-*. Similarly, *a-ra-o-* and *o-to-ro-no-* could also be considered genitives, though the two words present some differences.¹⁷ Analogous observations suggest that *[•]-po-qo-*65* and *ku-no-*65* can be considered genitives, although the damaged conditions of Fq 132 and 236 and the small number of readable syllables in both terms make it hard to offer a clearer explanation of these two words.

On the other hand, reading these terms as words in apposition would be problematic. From Palaima's aforementioned papers onwards, entries such as *ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo-*65* have been interpreted as corresponding to 'Lakedaimnios junior' or 'Lakedaimnios, son'. Though such names and designations are common today, this was not the usual practice in the Greek language, to my knowledge. A son with the same name as one of his ancestors was referred to using the adjective νέος 'young', see e.g. Cyrus the Younger (cf., e.g., Plut. *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* 173E 6: Κῦρος ὁ νεώτερος). In addition, family relations between father and son were expressed through features such as patronymics or the father's name in the genitive. Examples are Achilles' patronymic

17 Given that *o-to-ro-no-* is recorded just once on TH Fq 214.7, we lack enough evidence to determine the stem it belongs to. On the other hand, the further occurrences of *a-ra-o-* make it possible to read it as a so-called abnormal genitive. See further references and details in Pierini 2011, 78-79.

Tablet	TFC IV	Palaima	Killen	Duhoux	Judson	Pierini
Fq 123.1	ka-wi-jo FAR V[	ka-wi-jo- ^{*65} V[	ka-wi-jo- ^{*65} V[	ka-wi-jo-ju [?] V[	ka-wi-jo- ^{*65} V[	ka-wi-jo- ^{*65} V[
Fq 130.3	ka-wi-jo FAR V 1	ka-wi-jo- ^{*65} V 1	ka-wi-jo- ^{*65} V 1	ka-wi-jo-ju [?] V 1	ka-wi-jo- ^{*65} V 1	ka-wi-jo- ^{*65} V 1
Fq 132.1	[*]-po-qa FAR V[	[*]-po-qa- ^{*65} V[	[*]-po-qa- ^{*65} V[	[*]-po-qa-ju [?] V[	[*]-po-qa FAR V[	[*]-po-qa- ^{*65} V[
Fq 214.7	o-to-ro-no FAR V 2	o-to-ro-no- ^{*65} V 2	o-to-ro-no- ^{*65} V 2	o-to-ro-no-ju [?] V 2	o-to-ro-no- ^{*65} V 2	o-to-ro-no- ^{*65} V 2
.13	a-ra-o FAR V[	a-ra-o- ^{*65} V[	a-ra-o- ^{*65} V[	a-ra-o-ju [?] V[	a-ra-o- ^{*65} V[	a-ra-o- ^{*65} V[
Fq 229.4	ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo FAR [	ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo- ^{*65} [	ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo- ^{*65} [	ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo-ju [?] [	ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo- ^{*65} [	ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo- ^{*65} [
Fq 236.5	ku-no FAR[	ku-no- ^{*65} [	ku-no FAR[	ku-no-ju [?] [	ku-no FAR[	ku-no- ^{*65} [
Fq 254.6	ka-wi-jo FAR V 1	ka-wi-jo- ^{*65} V 1	ka-wi-jo- ^{*65} V 1	ka-wi-jo-ju [?] V 1	ka-wi-jo- ^{*65} V 1	ka-wi-jo- ^{*65} V 1
.7	a-ra-o FAR V 1[	a-ra-o- ^{*65} V 1[	a-ra-o- ^{*65} V 1[	a-ra-o-ju [?] V 1[	a-ra-o- ^{*65} V 1[	a-ra-o- ^{*65} V 1[
.13	ra-ke-mi-ni-jo FAR V 2	ra-ke-mi-ni-jo- ^{*65} V 2	ra-ke-mi-ni-jo- ^{*65} V 2	ra-ke-mi-ni-jo-ju [?] V 2	ra-ke-mi-ni-jo- ^{*65} V 2	ra-ke-mi-ni-jo- ^{*65} V 2
Fq 258.3	ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo FAR[	ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo- ^{*65} [	ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo- ^{*65} [	ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo-ju [?] [	ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo- ^{*65} [	ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo- ^{*65} [
.5	ka-wi-jo FAR V 1	ka-wi-jo- ^{*65} V 1	ka-wi-jo- ^{*65} V 1	ka-wi-jo-ju [?] V 1	ka-wi-jo- ^{*65} V 1	ka-wi-jo- ^{*65} V 1
Fq 275.3	ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo FAR V 2	ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo- ^{*65} V 2	ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo- ^{*65} V 2	ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo-ju [?] V 2	ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo- ^{*65} V 2	ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo- ^{*65} V 2
Fq 284.3	ra-ke-[da-mi-ni-jo FAR V 2	ra-ke-[da-mi-ni-jo- ^{*65} V 2	ra-ke-[da-mi-ni-jo- ^{*65} V 2	ra-ke-[da-mi-ni-jo-ju [?] V 2	ra-ke-[da-mi-ni-jo- ^{*65} V 2	ra-ke-[da-mi-ni-jo- ^{*65} V 2
Fq 342.2	ka-wi-jo FAR V[	ka-wi-jo- ^{*65} V[	ka-wi-jo- ^{*65} V[	ka-wi-jo-ju [?] V[	ka-wi-jo- ^{*65} V[	ka-wi-jo- ^{*65} V[
Gp 110.2	[FAR , V 2	] *65 , V 2	] *65 , V 2	ju [?] , V 2	] *65 , V 2	] *65 , V 2
Gp 124.1	[ko FAR, VIN V 2[	] ko- ^{*65} , VIN V 2[	] ko- ^{*65} , VIN V 2[	] ko-ju [?] , VIN V 2[	] ko- ^{*65} , VIN V 2[	] ko- ^{*65} , VIN V 2[
.2	[FAR V 1	] *65 V 1	] *65 V 1	uncertain reading	] *65 V 1	] *65 V 1
Gp(?)144.1	] -we FAR V 1[	(not explicitly mentioned)	(not explicitly mentioned)	uncertain reading	uncertain reading	either *65 or reassignment
Gp 153.2	[FAR 1 T 8 V 4	reassignment	] FAR 1 T 8 V 4	] FAR 1 T 8 V 4	] FAR 1 T 8 V 4	uncertain reading
Gp(?)215.1	qe-da-do-ro FAR V 3	qe-da-do-ro- ^{*65} V 3	qe-da-do-ro FAR V 3	qe-da-do-ro-ju [?] V 3	[+ reassignment]	[+ reassignment]
.2	a-[ko-ro-da-mo FAR V 1	a-[ko-ro-da-mo- ^{*65} V 1	a-[ko-ro-da-mo FAR V 1	a-[ko-ro-da-mo-ju [?] V 1	uncertain reading	either *65 or reassignment
Gp 303.1	i-je-re-wi-jo FAR T 1	reassignment	i-je-re-wi-jo FAR T 1	i-je-re-wi-jo-ju [?] T 1	i-je-re-wi-jo FAR T 1	uncertain reading
					[+ reassignment]	[+ reassignment]

Table 1. Overview of the various readings of 𒀭 hitherto advanced.

Pelides (*Il* 1,146 Πηλεΐδη, *Il.* 1,1 Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος), and others found in passages from Greek literature, such as ‘Timotheus son of Conon’ (Plut. *Sull.* 6.3 Τιμοθέῳ τῷ τοῦ Κόνωνος), ‘Theramenes son of Hagnon’ (Thuc. 8,68.4 Θηραμένης ὁ τοῦ Ἀγνωνος), ‘Hagnon son of Nikias’ (Thuc. 2,58.1 Ἀγνων ὁ Νικίου).

If we move onto the Gp texts, we can provide comparable considerations. Although the reading of 𐀀 is not certain neither on Gp 215 nor 303, its interpretation as **65* cannot be ruled out. If future research confirms this, we will have words such as *qe-da-do-ro-**65, *a-ko-ro-da-mo-**65, and *i-je-re-wi-jo-**65. The potential *i-je-re-wi-jo-**65 on Gp 303.1 perfectly parallels both *ka-wi-jo-**65 and *ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo-**65. Thus, for similar reasons, *i-je-re-wi-jo-**65 could be read as a further example of a term in *-io-* with *-Xo* as the ending of the *o*-stem genitive singular. Regarding *qe-da-do-ro* and *a-ko-ro-da-mo* we could add some further remarks. Both terms have another attestation on a Thebes tablet as well as another two occurrences on two different Knossos tablets,¹⁸ telling us that both terms are *o*-stem. The potential *qe-da-do-ro-**65 and *a-ko-ro-da-mo-**65 could thus be considered further examples of abnormal genitives in *-Xo*. Since neither is an *-io-* stem, haplology could still be involved, albeit differently. Although the exact morphological *facies* of the word ‘son’ during the Mycenaean period is still unknown, it can be assumed that sounds such as *ju* or *jo*, that is to say values given to **65*, were involved. Thus, the genitive in *-Xo* in both the potential *qe-da-do-ro-**65 and *a-ko-ro-da-mo-**65 could be explained either as archaisms or haplogies.

The damaged conditions of Gp 110, 124, 144 and 153 paint a different picture. As regards Gp 144, we do not yet have enough information to decide how to read 𐀀 on this tablet. Thus, we will face a different picture depending on the interpretation of its first line either as *]-we FAR v 1[* or as *]-we-**65 v 1[. In the former case no further observations can be added. Otherwise, some remarks can be made. Given that Gp 144.2 reads *a-ko-]da-mo v 4 a-we[* and that the potential reading of the previous line as *]-we-**65 should be consistent both with it and the terms preceding **65* on tablets of the Fq series, some objections might be raised. Apparently, *]-we-**65 speaks against interpreting those terms as abnormal genitives in *-Xo* and favours their reading as datives. Although **65* as a final syllable is assigned the semantic value of ‘son’ on the basis of several examples, this does not mean that **65* automatically and constantly means ‘son’ every time it appears in this position. If we look at *-qe* as a final syllable, it does not have its usual value of an enclitic conjunction ‘and’ in words such as *a-pi-e-qe*.¹⁹ Therefore, there is no guarantee that **65* on Gp 144 had exactly the same value as elsewhere, especially given the lack of context. In this light, a reading as *]-we-**65 could be acceptable, although we miss its poignancy, and it would make it entirely acceptable that on Fq tablets terms preceding **65* were *o*-stem genitive singulars in *-Xo*. Finally, the damaged condition of Gp 110, 124, and 153 prevents us from offering an explanation of the words recorded on those tablets and ending with 𐀀 . Therefore, on both Gp 110.2 and 124.2 we can just read *]*65*, with no further elements to note, whereas on Gp 124.1 the preserved text is slightly longer and reads as follows: *]ko-**65, VIN v 2[. However, it does not provide additional data to better clarify *]ko-**65. We can only observe that the record of a commodity suggests a syntactical and morphological structure comparable to the Fq texts. In this case, our observations on *]ko-**65 would be similar to the remarks on *o-to-ro-no-**65. On Gp 153.2 we can suggest nothing more than the mere presence of 𐀀 and currently can go no further with its interpretation.

Given all this (cf. 8.), we can propose that the names recorded on the Fq tablets with **65* as their last syllable can be read as genitive singulars. Moreover, some of them can be considered examples of genitive singulars in *-Xo*. On the Gp texts as well, further potential examples of abnormal genitives can be found.

Appendix B

A double text for those Gp tablets the lack of information on which prevents us from reaching a decision on the reading of the sign 𐀀 will be provided below.

18 Further attestations of *qe-da-do-ro* can be found on KN De 1294, Uf(1) 121, TH Gp 150, whereas *a-ko-ro-da-mo* also appears on KN B(1) 1025 (here as *a-ko-ro-da-mo-jo*, that is to say with the standard genitive ending), KN Df 1223, TH Gp 164.

19 For the debate over *a-pi-e-qe* and its various interpretations, see Bernabé-Pierini 2017, 529-531, with further references and details. For an exhaustive study of uses and meanings of the particle *-qe*, see Salgarella 2014-2015.

Fq 123 (305)*sup. mut.*

- .1 ka-wi-jo-*65 V[
 .2 o-ni-si V[
 .3 we-re-]nə-ko V 2[

*inf. mut.***Fq 132 (305)***sup. mut.*

- .1 [•]-pə-qo-*65 V[
 .2 a-nu-to Z 1[
 .3]ka-ti-jo Z 1 [
 .4 do-re-ja[
 .5]me-to-re[-i
 .6]vest.[

*inf. mut.***Fq 214 (305)**

- .1 ma-kaɫ HORD T 1 Z[
 .2 o-po-re-i V 1[]ma-di-jɛ[
 .3 ko-ru-we Z 1[] tə-jə[
 .4 a-ke-ne-u-ʃi[
 .5 a-me-ro V 1[
 .6 i-qo-po-qo-i V 1 [
 .7 o-to-ro-no-*65 V 2 me[
 .8 o-ko-we-i Z 2 do-ro-jo [
 .9 wa-do-ta Z[]ja-so-ro[
 .10 to-tu-no Z 1 e-pi-qə[-i
 .11 pi-ra-ko-ro Z 1 de-u-ke-we[]Z[][•]-mə[
 .12 ko-du-*22-je Z 1 sa-[•]-jo V 3 mɪ-ɾa[-ti-jo
 .13 o-u-wa-ja-wo-ni Z 2 a-ra-o-*65 V[
 .14 ku-su-to-ro-qa HORD T 6 V 5[

Fq 254 (305)

- .1 de-qo-no HORD T 1 V 2 Z 3 o-te, a-pi-e-qeɫ ɫke-ro-ɾa
 .2 pa-ta, ma-ka HORD T 1 V 2 Z 2 a-ko-da-mo V 2
 .3 o-po-re-i[]mə-di-je V 1[] ɫa-ne-jo V 3
 .4 ɫə-wa Z 2 a-pu-wa Z 2 ko-ru Z 2
 .5 qe-re-ma-o V 1 Z 2 zə-wa V 1 a-me-ro V 1
 .6 ka-wi-jo-*65 V 1 *63[]kə [] i-qo-po-qo-i V 1 Z 1
 .7 a-ɾa-ə-*65 V 1[]V 1 me-to-rɛ-i 'Z 2'
 .8 *deest*
 .9]vest.[
 .10]a-nu-to Z 1[]tə-jə[]Z 1 mi-ra-ti-jo[
 .11 e-pi-do-ro-mo Z 1 pi-ra-ko-ro Z 1 de-u-ke-u-we Z 1
 .12 ko-ɬu-*22-je Z 1 do-ra-a₂-ja Z 1
 .13 ra-ke-mi-ni-jo-*65 V 2 a-ke-ne-u-si V 2
 .14 ə-u-wa-ja-wo-ni Z 2 mo-ne-wɛ V 3
 .15 ku-su-to-ro-qa HORD[T]3 V 3 Z 2

Fq 258 (305)

- .1 ma-ka HORD T 1 V 3 'Z 1' a-ko[-da-mo
 .2 ma-di-je V 3 Z 2 ko-wa Z[
 .3 to-jo V 3 ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo-*65[
 .4 qɛ-rɛ-ma-o V 1 Z 2 we-re-nə [-ko
 .5 zo-wa V 1 ka-wi-jo-*65 V 1[
 .6 o-]u-ɫə-we-i V 1 ɬə-rə-jo Z[
 .7]-ɬɛ Z 2 ɫ-kə-de[

*inf. mut.***Fq 130 (305)**

- .1 o-te, o-je-ke-te-to ma-ka HORD T 2[
 .2 o-po-re-i V 2 ko-wa Z 2[
 .3 ka-wi-jo-*65 V 1 re-wa-ko a-me[-ro
 .4]a-ke-ne-u-si V 2 ku-si V 2[
 .5]vest.[

*inf. mut.***Fq 236 (304)***sup. mut.*

- .1 wə-do-ta [
 .2 ɹ-nu-to Z[
 .3 to-tu-no Z 1[
 .4 pi-ra-ko-ro Z 1[
 .5 ku-no-*65[
 .6 a-mə-ta-ro-ko [
 .7 qe-re-ma-o [
 .8 to-so-ɫu[

Fq 229 (305)

- .1 ma-ka[
 .2 o-po-re-i [
 .3 a-pu-wa Z 2 ko-wa[
 .4 ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo-*65[
 .5 qe-re-mə-o V 1 Z 2 mə[
 .6 a-me-rə V 1 ka-wi-jo V 1[
 .7 o-ti-ri-ja-i V 1 me-to-re[-i
 .8 o-u-ko-we-i Z 2 ɬə-ro-jo Z 1[
 .9 ku-ne Z 2 wa-ɬə-ta Z 1 po-[-
 .10 to-tu-no V 1 e-pi-qə-i Z[
 .11 pi-ɾa-ko-ro Z 1 de-u-ke-we Z 1[
 .12 do-ra-a₂-ja Z 1 e-pi-ni-ja Z[
 .13 *vacat* [
 .14 ku-su[-to-]ro-qa HORD[

Fq 275 (305)

- .1 a-]kə-da-mə Z 2
 .2]V 4 Z 2 ko-wa Z 2 a-pu-wa Z 2
 .3]V 1 ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo-*65 V 2
 .4]qe-re-ma-o V 1 Z 1 zo-wa V 1
 .5 ko-du-]*22-je V 1 ə-ti-ri-ja-i V 1
 .6]kə-ʃi-[]i V 2 Z 2 [we]]Z[
 .7]Z[

inf. mut.

Fq 284 (305)*sup. mut.*

.1]vest.[
 .2]Z 2 ko-ru-we V 1 to-jo Z[
 .3 ra-ke-]da-mi-ni-jo-*65 V 2 a-ke-ne-u-si[
 .4 qe-re-]ma-o V 1 Z 2 o-ko[-we-i
 .5]vest. [
inf. mut.

Gp 110 (306)

.1]qe, VIN S 1 na-ne-mo V 2 [
 .2]*65, V 2 mo-ne-we S 1 *56-ru[-we

Gp 153 (–) [reassignment; possibility 1]

.1]ja-de, ke-wa-to, [
 .2]FAR 1 T 8 V 4 di[
 .3 *inf. mut.*

Gp 303 (–) [reassignment; possibility 1]

.1]te, i-je-re-wi-jo FAR T 1 V 2 [
 .2]vestigia[

Gp 144 (305?) [possibility 1, in case: reassignment]

.1]-we FAR V 1[
 .2 a-ko-]da-mo V 4 a-we[

Gp 215 (–) [possibility 1, in case: reassignment]

.1]a-me-ro, qe-da-do-ro FAR V 3
 .2 a-]ko-ro-da-mo FAR V 1

Fq 342 (305)*sup. mut.*

.1]wa[
 .2]ka-wi-jo-*65 V[
 .3]o-ni-si[
 .4 *inf. mut.*

Gp 124 (306)

.1]ko-*65, VIN V 2[
 .2]*65 V 1 Z 1 [

Gp 153 (–) [reassignment; possibility 2]

.1]ja-de, ke-wa-to, [
 .2]*65 1 T 8 V 4 di[
 .3 *inf. mut.*

Gp 303 (–) [reassignment; possibility 2]

.1]te, i-je-re-wi-jo-*65 T 1 V 2 [
 .2]vestigia[

Gp 144 (305?) [possibility 2]

.1]-we-*65 V 1[
 .2 a-ko-]da-mo V 4 a-we[

Gp 215 (–) [possibility 2]

.1]a-me-ro, qe-da-do-ro-*65 V 3
 .2 a-]ko-ro-da-mo-*65 V 1

Acknowledgements

I thank Marie Louise Nosch for kindly making her still unpublished paper (Nosch forthcoming) available to me. I also thank Maurizio Del Frego and Ester Salgarella for providing insightful comments on a draft version of this paper.

Abbreviations

DMic Aura Jorro F., *Diccionario micénico*, I-II, Madrid, 1985-1993.

GORILA Godart L., Olivier J.-P., *Recueil des inscriptions en Linéaire A*, 1-5, Paris 1976-1985.

Lejeune Mém. IV Lejeune M., *Mémoires de philologie mycénienne*, IV (1969-1996), Roma 1997.

TFC I Aravantinos V., Godart L., Sacconi A., *Thèbes, Fouilles de la Cadmée*, I. Les tablettes en linéaire B de la Odos Pelopidou, *Édition et commentaire*, Pisa-Roma 2001.

TFC IV Aravantinos V., Del Frego M., Godart L., Sacconi A., *Thèbes, Fouilles de la Cadmée*, IV. Les textes de Thèbes (1-433). *Translittération et tableaux des scribes*, Pisa-Roma 2005.

References

- Bernabé A., Pierini R. 2017, What, When, Why. Tablet Functions and *o-te* Expressions in Context, in Nosch M.L., Landenius Enegren H. (eds), *Aegean Scripts. Proceedings of the 14th Mycenaean Colloquium held in Copenhagen, 2-5 September 2015*, Roma, 523-536.
- Chadwick J. 1958, Error and abnormality in the Mycenaean noun-declension, *PP* 13, 285-295.
- Consani C., Negri M. 1999, *Testi minoici trascritti*, Roma.
- Del Frego M. 2014, The Allocations of HORD to *ma-ka* and *de-go-no* in the Fq Tablets from Thebes, *Kadmos* 53, 71-78.
- Driessen J. 1990, *An Early Destruction in the Mycenaean Palace at Knossos: A New Interpretation of the Excavation Field-Notes of the South-East Area of the West Wing*, Leuven.

- Duhoux Y. 2002-2003 [2006], Dieux ou humains? Qui sont *ma-ka*, *o-po-re-i* et *ko-wa* dans les tablettes linéaire B de Thèbes?, *Minos* 37-38, 173-253.
- Duhoux Y. 2017, Les patronymes en ...o et ...a des formules onomastiques mycénienes: quel est leur cas?, in Hajnal I., Kölligan D., Zipser K. (eds), *Miscellanea Indogermanica. Festschrift für José Luis García Ramón zum 65. Geburtstag*, Innsbruck, 151-172.
- Hajnal I. 1995, *Studien zum mykenischen Kasussystem*, Berlin-New York.
- James S. 2002-2003 [2006], The Thebes Tablets and the Fq Series: a Contextual Analysis, *Minos* 37-38, 397-417.
- Jiménez Delgado J.M. 2016, *Sintaxis del griego micénico*, Sevilla.
- Judson A. 2016, *The Undeciphered Signs of Linear B*, Ph.D. diss., Cambridge.
- Killen J.T. 2006, Thoughts on the Functions of the new Thebes Tablets, in Deger-Jalkotzy S., Panagl O. (eds), *Die neuen Linear B-Texte aus Theben: ihr Aufschlusswert für die mykenische Sprache und Kultur, Akten des internationalen Forschungskolloquiums an der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 5.-6. Dezember 2002*, Vienna, 79-110.
- Melena J.L. 2014, Micenaean Writing, in Duhoux Y., Morpurgo-Davies A. (eds), *A Companion to Linear B. Mycenaean Greek texts and their world III*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1-186.
- Morpurgo Davies A. 1960, Il genitivo miceneo e il sincretismo dei casi, *RendLinc* s.VIII/15, 33-61.
- Nosch M.L. forthcoming, Observations on sign *a*₂ in Linear B in the various chronological phases of the Knossos Linear B archives and the mainland Linear B archives, *Minos*.
- Palaima T.G. 2000-2001, review of *TFC I*, *Minos* 35-36, 475-486.
- Palaima T.G. 2003a, Reviewing the new Linear B Tablets from Thebes, *AJA* 107, 113-115.
- Palaima T.G. 2003b, Reviewing the new Linear B Tablets from Thebes, *Kadmos* 42, 31-38.
- Palaima T.G. 2006, *65 = FAR? or *ju*? and Other Interpretative Conundra in the New Thebes Tablets, in Deger-Jalkotzy S., Panagl O. (eds), *Die neuen Linear B-Texte aus Theben: ihr Aufschlusswert für die mykenische Sprache und Kultur, Akten des internationalen Forschungskolloquiums an der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 5.-6. Dezember 2002*, Vienna, 139-148.
- Perna M. 2016, La scrittura Lineare A, in Del Frio M., Perna M. (eds), *Manuale di epigrafia micenea: introduzione allo studio dei testi in lineare B*, Padova, 87-114.
- Pierini R. 2011, *Ricerche sulla desinenza del genitivo singolare tematico in Lineare B*, Ph.D. diss., Università di Bologna.
- Pierini R. 2014, Ricerche sul segno 25 del sillabario miceneo, in Bernabé A., Luján E. (eds), *Donum micenologicum. Mycenaean studies in honour of Francisco Aura Jorro*, Leuven, 105-137.
- Pierini R. 2017, An Alphabetic Parallel for Mycenaean *ma-ka*, *Kadmos* 56, 89-106.
- Raison J. 1964, Note sur le signe mycénien 65, *Kadmos* 3, 58-63.
- Salgarella E. 2014-2015, The use of the particle *-qe* in Mycenaean Greek, MPhil Thesis, Cambridge.
- Thompson R. 2017, The Mycenaean *o*-stem Genitive Singular in *-o*: a Re-evaluation, in Nosch M.L., Landenius Enegren H. (eds), *Aegean Scripts. Proceedings of the 14th Mycenological Colloquium held in Copenhagen, 2-5 September 2015*, Roma, 575-589.
- Timpanaro S. 2003, *La genesi del metodo del Lachmann*, Torino.
- Younger J.G. *LAL*, 'Linear A Lexicon', <http://www.people.ku.edu/~jyounger/LinearA/lexicon.html> (last update: 9 January 2017).

Rachele Pierini
 Dipartimento di Filologia Classica e Italianistica
 Università di Bologna
 Via Zamboni 32
 40126 Bologna
 Italia
 rachele.pierini@unibo.it

