

"i-je-ro and related terms," *Journal of Prehistoric Religion* 15 (2001) 39-50.

- Auro Jorro, F., 1985. *Diccionario Micénico*. Madrid.
- Burkert, W., 1985. *Greek Religion*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Catling, H. W., Cherry, J. F., Jones, R. E. and Killen, J. T., 1980. "The Linear B Inscribed Stirrup Jars and West Crete," *BSA* 75:49-113.
- Cauer, P. and Schwyzer, E. (eds.), 1923. *Dialectorum Graecarum: Exempla Epigraphica Potiora*. Germany.
- Deger-Jalkotzy, S., Hiller, S. and Panagl, O. (eds.), 1999. *Floerant Studia Mycenaea. Akten des X Internationalen Mycénologischen Colloquiums in Salzburg vom 1.-5. Mai 1995*. Vienna.
- Driessen, J., 1999. *The Scribes of the Room of the Chariot Tablets at Knossos: An Interdisciplinary Approach to the Study of a Linear B Deposit. Supplementos a Minos 17*. Salamanca.
- Farnell, L. R., 1896. *Cults of the Greek States*. Oxford.
- Gérard-Rousseau, M., 1968a. *Les mentions religieuses dans les tablettes mycéniques*. Rome.
- Gérard-Rousseau, M., 1968b. "E-ma-a₂ désigne-t-il le dieu Hermès dans les tablettes mycéniques?", in *Atti e Memorie del 1° Congresso Internazionale di Micénologia. Incunabula Graeca* 25: 1-3. Rome, 594-597.
- Hallager, E., 1987. "The Inscribed Stirrup Jars: Implications for Late Minoan III B Crete," *AJA* 91:178-179.
- Heubeck, A., 1970. Review of Gérard-Rousseau, M., *Les mentions religieuses dans les tablettes mycéniques*, *Gnomon* 42:810-814.
- Ilievski, P., 1999. "Interpretation of Some Mycenaean Personal Names: *Nomina Theophora*," in Deger-Jalkotzy, S., Hiller, S. and Panagl, O. (eds). 1999. Vienna.
- Killen, J. T., (forthcoming). "The Language of Religious Texts: Some Fresh Thoughts on Old Problems," in *Proceedings of the 11th International Mycénological Colloquium*.
- Killen, J. T. and Olivier, J.-P., 1989. *The Knossos Tablets, 5th Edition*. Salamanca.
- Laffineur, R. (ed.), 1999. *Polemos. Le Contexte Guerrier en Égée à l'Âge du Bronze, Actes de la 7^e Rencontre égéenne internationale Université de Liège, 14-17 avril 1998. Aegaeum* 19. Liege.
- Melena, J. L., 1972. "On the Knossos Mc Tablets," *Minos* 13:29-54.
- Olivier, J.-P., 1967. "91 Raccords de fragments dans les tablettes de Cnossos," *BSA* 62:325-336.
- Palaima, T. G., 1999. "Mycenaean Militarism from a Textual Perspective," in R. Laffineur 1999, 367-379.
- Pauly, A. F., 1996. *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike* I. Stuttgart.
- Railsback, J. B. 1997. *Mycenaean Theophoric Names*. Austin. (M. A. Thesis: University of Texas at Austin).
- Sacconi, A., 1974. *Corpus delle iscrizioni vascolari in Lineare B*. Rome.
- Schachter, A., 1981. *Cults of Boeotia I*. (University of London, Institute of Classical Studies Bulletin Supplement No. 38). London.
- Ventris, M. and Chadwick, J., 1973. *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*. Cambridge.
- Willets, R. F., 1962. *Cretan Cults and Festivals*. London.

i-je-ro and Related Terms

Amanda Krauss

I. Introduction

The reconstruction of ritual practices and religious notions in Aegean prehistory has been a topic of major concern to prehistorians. From the time of Nilsson's *A History of Greek Religion* (Nilsson 1952), the main sources have been iconographical and artifactual. Most scholars of Bronze Age religion have chosen to focus on the relationship between art and religion. Two of the most recent books, both by Marinatos, have attempted to reconstruct ritual practices by examining the iconography of Aegean sites (Marinatos 1984 and 1993). In addition, Linear B has provided a textual source which helps to flesh out our picture of early Greek religion. Gérard-Rousseau was the first to collect the references in her 1968 book (Gérard-Rousseau 1968), and Ventris and Chadwick provided their own interpretation in a chapter of *Documents in Mycenaean Greek* (Ventris and Chadwick 1973: 125-129). The recent discovery of sealings containing religious references at Thebes has provided an opportunity to re-evaluate the evidence found in Linear B. Here we shall investigate the meanings of sacred terms in Mycenaean prehistory and early Greek history, paying special attention to fundamental notions connected with what is deemed 'holy' or 'sacred'.

First, I shall briefly review the etymological and Indo-European background to

ἱερός, the main word used to convey the notion of 'holiness' in historical Greek. It will be most expedient to use García-Ramón's discussion from his most current article, since it provides a succinct overview of the word's history. For a more in-depth discussion of ἱερός see his 1987 article (García-Ramón 1987). The Indo-European root of Greek ἱερός is generally agreed upon as *H₁ish₂-. García-Ramón further refines it to *h₁ish₂-, a root which, from comparative Vedic evidence, has the oldest meaning of 'to put in motion.' The relationship between motion and the realm of the religious will be discussed later in this paper. To form the adjective, *hieros*, the adjectival *-ro-* suffix is added, and the final laryngeal drops out due to the rule *H>0/s_R*, producing **isros* as the underlying predialectal form. The various dialects produced different outcomes from this underlying form. Ionic/epic ἱρός and Lesbian ἱρος show the underlying form most clearly, probably having developed through the transitional *ἱροος. However, ἱερός implies a development from **is-ros* to **is-eros*. García-Ramón notes the *-ro/-ero-* development is well attested according to the Caland system. Finally, Doric dialects show ἱαρός, which García-Ramón explains by syllabification analo-

gous to the present verbal form of the root (García-Ramón 1996: 263-265).

For García-Ramón, the development of this root is inseparable from its most obvious verbal form, ἰάομαι. This is the athematic reduplicated verbal form of the root (from *h₁i-h₁ish₂-toi), which comes to mean 'to heal', but must have had an original meaning of 'to set in motion, give impulse' (García-Ramón 1996: 265). While all of these morphological 'machinations' may seem far removed from the actual meaning of the word, they do lay an important foundation: the word ἱερός, while conveying a sense of holiness in later Greek, has quite secular beginnings. Moreover, the use of Vedic *iṣṛos* is not religious—it is glossed as 'vigorous, active, quick' (Monier-Williams 1995) while the same root becomes *īra* ('rage') in Latin (Watkins 2000: 22-23). These relatives bring the nature of the holiness described by ἱερός into doubt, and the etymological background is further strengthened by Homeric usages, which we shall examine later in this paper.

I. Mycenaean Uses

The most commonly found derivatives of *i-je-ro* in Mycenaean Greek are *i-je-re-u* and *i-je-re-ja*, translated as 'priest' and 'priestess'. The construction of this word is unproblematic, and utilizes a very common formula of root and the agent-suffix *-eus*. For example, a κεραμεύς (potter) is literally 'one who deals with clay' (κέραμος) or a βασιλεύς ('king')

is one who rules (βασιλεύει). Therefore, a priest (ἱερεύς) is literally 'one who does the holy thing'. Most instances of 'priest' and 'priestess' occur in the land tenure tablets at Pylos in series Eb, En, Eo, and Ep. What is most interesting about these occurrences is what they can tell us about the priests and priestesses at Pylos, rather than what they can tell us about the etymological meaning of the word. From the association of priestesses and other religious personnel by toponymic designation (e.g., *i-je-re-ja pa-ki-ja-na* in En 609.18) we find that *pa-ki-ja-ne* seems to be a religious district, which is supported by other references (e.g. Tn 316). Further, the religious personnel are specified by name, and given special status regarding their land. For instance, Eritha, a priestess named in the Ep tablets, seems to be claiming tax-exempt status for her land (i.e. the land she holds on behalf of the 'god') in one tablet. The *i-je-* root also appears in a few other words for religious personnel, including *i-je-ro-wo-ko* (later Greek ἱερουργός, 'officiating priest') in PY Ep 613.7 and *i-je-re-wi-jo* (either a personal name or a variant for ἱερεῖος, 'sacred'—the context is unclear) in KN K 875.6.

More problematic, though still not particularly troubling, are the adjectival uses of the word. Until recently, we only had the masculine/neuter form *i-je-ro*, which is found on several tablets, though few with very much context to give etymological information. The term *i-je-ro* appears in KN Fp 363 along with offerings of oil, and the religious office of *ki-ri-te-wi-ja* ('barley-women'). The

religious context of the tablet has raised some question about the function of *i-je-ro*. It seems most likely that it represents the neuter ἱερόν but it could be either a nominative singular adjective, modifying the oil, or substantive in dative form, meaning 'to the temple'. In the latter case the temple would appear as a recipient of the oil. Both Auro Jorro and Ventris and Chadwick admit the possibility of both interpretations (Auro Jorro 1985: 275; Ventris and Chadwick 1973: 548).

A clearer case is PY Ae 303, in which *i-je-ro* appears in the genitive case, *i-je-ro-jo*. On the second line of the tablet is the phrase *e-ne-ka ku-ru-so-jo*, and it is clear that *i-je-ro-jo* can modify *ku-ru-so-jo*. This is the reading preferred by Ventris and Chadwick. However, Auro Jorro, Palmer and several others admit the possibility that *i-je-ro-jo* could again be the adjective acting as substantive, either marking the gold as some temple's property, or (for Palmer) describing the oil as 'in the service of the golden shrine' (Palmer 1963: 283 and 1966: 278; Doria 1999: 29 n. 2). This requires taking *e-ne-ka* in a rather unusual sense, at least compared to later uses of ἔνεκα. Regarding the likelihood of ἱερόν having a substantive use in Mycenaean as in later Greek, it is difficult to make decisions on such a limited body of evidence. Luckily, the discovery of the Thebes sealings in 1982 provided more examples of the adjectival use.

As the sealings appear to designate animals for a banquet of some type, they are possibly religious in context, though this is by no means certain. The animals

are described by a variety of adjectives and place names, including three occurrences of *i-je-ro* and one of *i-je-ra* (Wu 66, 86, 87 and 44, respectively). Piteros, Olivier, and Melena (hereafter POM) note that Wu 44 is the first attestation of the form in *-a*, which is either feminine singular or neuter plural. They conclude that the alternation of *i-je-ro/i-je-ra* follows the same pattern as the alternation of the adjective *qe-te-olqe-te-a₂*, and, after noting that the adjective *i-je-ra* accompanies the symbol for a male goat, rule out the possibility of *i-je-ra* being feminine (Piteros, Olivier, and Melena 1990: 157).

Another argument adduced by POM is the possible presence of a toponym on Wu 66. This nodule is badly damaged, but was made by the same hand as Wu 55, which contains the toponym *ka-ru-to*. POM admit the possibility of reconstructing the inscription on Wu 66.b as a toponym on this basis. Thus, they conclude that the possible presence of a toponym in addition to *i-je-ro* along with the pattern of alternation between *i-je-ro/i-je-ra* argues for an adjectival usage describing the sacrificial animals rather than a geographical one specifying the word 'sanctuary', and that the scribe of Wu 44 was using *i-je-ra* as a collective neuter. Thus the *i-je-ra* animals on the sealings are designated as sacred in some way, or as POM suggest, as excluded from the human domain (Piteros, Olivier, and Melena 1990: 157).

II. *i-je-to* and semantic questions in Mycenaean Greek

The verb *i-je-to* as a possible cognate of *i-je-ro* in Mycenaean has caused much debate among Mycenologists and linguists alike. In this word, it is possible to find a wide range of semantic and etymological information about the roots of $\iota\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, but only if one accepts that *i-je-to* is indeed from the same root as *i-je-ro*. Originally, the word was thought to be a middle form of $\iota\eta\mu\iota$. Etymologically this is fine, but there has been some debate about the semantic and syntactic validity of this interpretation.

The word *i-je-to* appears four times in PY Tn 316, a tablet with an obviously religious context. In every instance, it is followed by what was first interpreted as a recipient:

'i-je-to-qe pa-ki-ja-si' (r.2), ('at Sphagi-anes')

'i-je-to-qe po-si-da-i-jo' (v.1) ('at the sanctuary of Poseidon')

'i-je-to-qe pe-re-*82-jo' (v.4) ('at the sanctuary of the deity pe-re-*82')

'i-je-to-qe di-u-jo' (v.8). ('at the sanctuary of Zeus')

If we interpret *i-je-to* as a middle form of $\iota\eta\mu\iota$ meaning 'to send', there is a problem with the recipients of the action. As Palmer first pointed out, *pa-ki-ja-si* is the only word in an unambiguous case - it is clearly dative-locative, which he deemed enough to rule out any interpretation as $\iota\eta\mu\iota$ (Palmer 1963: 264). The allative ending *-de*, rather than the dative-locative, would be expected with a verb of sending. However, other scholars have not been willing to rule out $\iota\eta\mu\iota$ based solely on this evidence. Ventris and Chadwick were willing to admit that the

action, whatever it was, could be happening in the district of *pa-ki-ja-ne* (Ventris and Chadwick 1973: 462-463), and García-Ramón has recently reaffirmed that the absence of the *-de* suffix does not rule out a verb of movement (García-Ramón 1996: 262-263). For the fullest recent discussion on the interpretation of Tn 361, see Palaima's article (Palaima 1999: 437-461).

A second problem arises with the meaning of *i-je-to* as a form of $\iota\eta\mu\iota$. Ruijgh first proposed that it was a present middle (giving it the same force as $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$), with the implication that the subject of the verb took part in the procession, rather than just sending it. His final translation for the phrase was 'il met en mouvement dans...' He gives the verb the same force as $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$ in this form (Ruijgh 1967: 322). This would result in a meaning of "(a procession) is sent/Pylos sends in the district of *pa-ki-ja-ne*." There is no problem with this interpretation in terms of form, though García-Ramón has reservations about the semantic process it implies. He notes that if we accept Ruijgh's explanation, then $\iota\eta\mu\iota$ must function as the causative of $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\mu\iota$, and in addition to acquiring the very specialized sense of making a procession, it can be a substitution for $\pi\omicron\mu\pi\eta\eta\nu$ $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$ / $\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$. To García-Ramón, this semantic specialization seems unlikely. For this reason, he prefers an explanation of *i-je-to* based on the same root as $\iota\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ rather than one based on $\iota\eta\mu\iota$ (García-Ramón 1996: 266).

García-Ramón gives three possible formations for *i-je-to* from the $*h_1ish_2$ -root. The first is a thematized variant of the originally non-thematic present: $*is-e-toi$ from *is-toi* (García-Ramón 1996: 266). The second is a genuinely thematic verb from $*is-e-toi$. In this case, Greek would have two reduplicated present verbs from the original Indo-European root $*h_1ish_2$ -, and they would have non-parallel developments: one athematic, producing $\iota\acute{o}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ and one thematic, producing *i-je-to*. The third possibility is that of a present form in *-iole-*, producing $*is-e-toi$ from original $*is-ie-toi$. García-Ramón finds that the comparative evidence best supports the last possibility (García-Ramón 1996: 267).

After discussing the etymological possibilities, García-Ramón turns to the semantic realm. In his opinion, there are two ways to look at this verb. The first interpretation depends upon the underlying meaning of the root $*h_1ish_2$ -, regardless of Mycenaean parallels. In this case the meaning of *i-je-to* would have the sense closer to that of the root: 'to put in motion or procession', roughly parallel to $\pi\omicron\mu\pi\eta\eta\nu$ $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$. The second follows the meaning of $\iota\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ in Mycenaean, and concentrates on the religious connotations of the word. In this case, the meaning would be the equivalent of the later Greek $\iota\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}$ $\rho\acute{\epsilon}\zeta\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$, 'to make a sacrifice' (García-Ramón 1996: 268). This interpretation was first proposed by Palmer, though he did not make the etymological case very strongly and his

interpretation was not well received (Palmer 1963: 264-266).

The second of Garcia-Ramon's readings is appealing, if not certain. Accepting this interpretation allows us to see some continuity between the Indo-European root of the word, and its Mycenaean Greek and Homeric usages. I shall lay out the evidence for this in the next section of this paper first by exploring some later uses of the word, and then by looking at some other terms for the realm of the holy.

III. Later uses of $\iota\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$

Our primary source for early Greek is of course Homer, and in his poetry we find a variety of uses of $\iota\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, covering a wide semantic range. Most interestingly, $\iota\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ has many uses which can only be described as secular. For instance, the Vedic *iṣṛena manasa* which is so important for comparative evidence has in Homer the exact parallel of $\iota\epsilon\rho\delta\nu$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, literally 'holy strength'. But this formula is used in situations wholly devoid of religious associations, and applied exclusively to mortals.

In other occurrences, $\iota\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ seems to have the sense of 'lively' or 'quick-moving'. In several instances, the word is used to describe the city of Troy (e.g. $\iota\epsilon\rho\delta\nu$ $\pi\tau\omicron\lambda\acute{\iota}\epsilon\theta\rho\nu$ in *Odyssey* 1.2). Adducing Locher's study of the toponymic uses of the adjective (Locher 1963), Hajnal suggests for this use of $\iota\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ the idea of an animated or pulsing

city, in contrast with a sparsely populated landscape (Hajnal 1999: 277). Further evidence for this interpretation comes from *Iliad* 18.504, in which a debate is taking place, and the elders are described as sitting ἱερῶ ἐνὶ κύκλῳ. It can be argued that a circle does have religious significance, but the context of the excited debate and the later description of the elders leaping up to give judgment seems to favor an interpretation of 'quick-moving, lively' or something like it. So too is ἱερός used to describe rivers, fields, and other moving objects.

Perhaps the most famous example of ἱερός being used in a secular sense is the equally famous fish metaphor in *Iliad* 16.401-408. In it, Patroclus spears Thestor through the mouth, and Thestor is likened to a 'holy fish'—ἱερόν ἰχθύον—being caught by a fisherman. Despite rather desperate attempts to explain the fish as a large or impressive species, such as a tuna, or a fish with religious significance, such as a dolphin, the usage here seems very clear. The metaphor describes the fish being dragged onto land, and Thestor being dragged from a chariot. The notion expressed is clearly one of motion.

However, many scholars still do not accept that ἱερός can mean anything but 'holy'. Part of the reason for this is the Mycenaean evidence, which does not clearly demonstrate anything but the religious usage. A scholar who attempts to bring both sides into agreement is Carlo Gallavotti. In his 1963 article, Gallavotti attempted not only to examine the evidence for both meanings, but also attempted to get to the core of the 'holy'

meaning and find out exactly what religious quality it describes. For an initial link between the strong and the sacred, Gallavotti brings up the idea of making a sacrifice, ἱερά ρέζειν, which he translates as 'compiere un' azione vitalmente efficace.' The objects sacrificed, i.e. cows, are not particularly sacred until they are sacrificed. For Gallavotti, the link between 'strong' and 'sacred' is the idea of effective *action*; what is sacred is what is most effective at getting the gods' goodwill (Gallavotti 1963: 418).

Gallavotti's idea of the sacred is also dependent upon the idea of separation. It is a quality that is separate from both gods and men, but by its presence can give something of the divine to those near it. Gallavotti's first example is the sacred cave of the naiads described in *Odyssey* 13.104. In his opinion, the genitive is not merely one of possession, but has a truly ablative usage, and demonstrates that the nymphs are the source of the cave's sacredness (Gallavotti 1963: 419). He goes on to define something which is ἱερός as something to which humans attribute values above the realm of human possibility. This is why humans can only be δῖος or θεῖος when they are considered godlike, never ἱερός. This quality is something wholly removed from the human realm. As evidence, he points out that not even the gods can bestow this kind of divinity upon mortals. For instance, when Apollo is assisting Hector in *Iliad* 15.262 (= *Iliad* 20.110), the strength he receives is μέγα, not ἱερόν. Similarly, Athena breathes μένος μέγα

into Odysseus in *Odyssey* 24.520 (Gallavotti 1963: 419-420).

This line of reasoning should satisfy even those who do not accept ἱερός as anything but sacred. Gallavotti does admit that the Mycenaean evidence shows nothing other than the 'sacred' meaning. He also admits that Homer is the only place where we find these other meanings for the adjective, and notes that Homer is a closed literary environment. Thus, he concludes, we cannot see Homer's use as preserving ancient formulae, but rather as a stylistic choice (Gallavotti 1963: 412). This seems like a reasonable policy, though the recent reconstructions of *i-je-to* (along with comparative linguistic evidence) make it tempting to see continuity between Mycenaean and later Greek in both senses of the word.

Finally, I would like to take a brief look at some other words for 'holy' in Homer, Hesiod, and later authors. Aside from ἱερός, there are several other words for holy, and each does seem to serve a semantic function which is distinct from that of ἱερός. For instance θεῖος, and δῖος are the most basic terms for 'divine'. θεῖος the adjective formed from θεός ('god'), which goes back to the Indo-European root **dhês-* (probably related to **dheh-*, the root of τίθημι). Therefore, the sense of θεός at its root meaning has something to do with giving—either giving something to a god, or the god giving something back (Watkins 2000: 189-19; Chantraine 1970: 429-430; and Burkert 1997). δῖος too is unproblematic, being an adjective **deiwos* from from the

root **dyeu-*. This is the same root from which we have Zeus (gen. Διός) and has a basic meaning of 'bright' or 'shining'. Therefore, both θεῖος, and δῖος mean 'holy' in the sense of 'godlike'—quite literally, as these adjectives are both related to words for a god.

The words θάμβος and σέβας have quite specific functions. σέβας has an interesting etymology, as it comes from **tyeg**, the same root as Sanskrit *tyajati* 'to abandon' (Pokorny 1959: 1086; Chantraine 1977: 992). In this sense, it almost seems to mean something so awesome that one should run away from it. In Greek it also seems to have a sense of 'awe'. In the *Odyssey*, σέβας always appears in the same formula: σέβας μ' ἔχει εἰσορόωντα or εἰσορόωσαν, ('wonder holds me seeing...') which expresses wonder on the part of the viewer. Obviously, σέβας is intimately connected with sight. It appears first when Nestor notes Telemachus' similarity to his father (3.123), once when Helen notices the same thing (4.142), once when Telemachus beholds the riches of Menelaus' palace (4.75), once when Odysseus sees Nausicaa (6.161), and once when Odysseus remarks upon Alcinous' dancers (3.384). In these instances, which are the only appearances in the *Odyssey*, there is nothing overtly religious in the usage. The usage in the *Iliad*, however, does show religious connotations.

In the *Iliad*, σέβας appears only once, when Iris is chiding Achilles: σέβας δέ σε θυμόν with ἰκέσθω/ Πάτροκλον Τρωῆσι κυσίν μέληπθηρα γενέσθαι,

'Let awe come on your heart, because Patroklos is sport for Trojan dogs' (18.178-179). This usage seems closer to the sense of 'awe' or even 'terror' which is expressed in the root. In verbal uses (from σέβομαι), it seems to express a sense which prevents people from doing something: it prevents Proteus from killing Bellerophon (6.167) and Andromache's father from despoiling Eetion's corpse (6.417). Also, Agamemnon uses the word to chide the Argives who are holding back from battle (2.242). So in Greek σέβας has two uses, one to express wonder at the sight of something, and one to express the wondrous awe which causes people to hesitate and prevents them from doing wrong.

θάμβος has a similar use to σέβας, though its etymology is more complicated. It may come from the root *dhâbh, which would make it cognate with Greek τέθηπα 'to be amazed'. In this case, the root would have to be nasalized to form the noun (Pokorny 1959: 233). There is also the possibility of a root *dhembh, cognate with Gothic *dumbs* ('mute') (Chantraine 1977: 992). In either case, it expresses religious awe. It is not always used with a word of seeing, but that sense is always implied. It, like σέβας, always holds its recipient. It holds the Trojans and Achaeans when they see each other on the battlefield (3.342) and when they behold Ajax fighting Diomedes (23.815). It also occurs twice when Athena makes an appearance, one when she leaps to earth in the *Iliad* (4.79), once when she flies away from the

council as a bird, in the *Odyssey* (3.372). Finally, it occurs in an elaborate simile in the *Odyssey*, which likens Priam to a man who has killed in his own country then fled to the house of another; θάμβος holds those who view such a man (24.482).

The most illuminating comparison with ἱερός may be to ἀγνός, since its epic use seems to complement that of ἱερός. ἀγνός generally serves as a direct modifier for gods, unlike ἱερός, but occasionally describes holy places, like ἱερός (e.g. when it describes Olympus in Hesiod's *Aspis* 203). It appears as a modifier for Artemis (*Odyssey* 5.123, 18.202, 20.71), Persephone (*Odyssey* 11.386) and Demeter (*Works and Days* 465) and is found in one case as an alternate reading for ἔσθλός ('good', 'fine', or 'noble'): according to Hesiod the gods are either ἔσθλός or ἀγνός because of the counsels of Zeus (*Works and Days* 121-122). It appears once in adverbial form -- interestingly enough, in the same phrase as ἱερά:

Κάδ δὲ δύναμιν δ' ἔρδειν ἱερ'
ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν

ἀγνώσ καὶ καθαρῶς, ἐπὶ δ'
ἀγλά μῆρία καίειν

ἄλλοτε δὲ σπονδῆσι θύεσσι τε
ἰλάσκεσθαι.

Make sacrifices to the immortal gods according to your ability

Purely and cleanly, but in addition burn fat meats;

and at other times propitiate them with libations and incense.

(*Works and Days*, line 336-338)

Fortunately, the etymology of ἀγνός is very clear: it comes from the root *yag-, 'worship, reverence' (Watkins 2000: 102), and is related to Greek ἅγιος ('holy' in the sense of 'sacred'). To Chantraine, ἀγνός is closest to καθαρός and designates chastity and ritual purity (Chantraine 1968: 25-26). This would account for it describing the female figures mentioned above. More interestingly, Chantraine points out the contrast between the two words in Thucydides 1.126.6, where the Athenians πανδημεὶ θύουσι πολλὰ οὐχ ἱερεῖα, ἀλλ' <ἀγνά> θύματα ἐπιχώρια ('as a town they sacrifice many offerings, not blood offerings, but pure, local ones'). The ἀγνά appears only in a citation by Pollux, the second century A.D. writer. In his *Onomasticon*, Pollux combined a rhetorical manual, thesaurus, and encyclopedia. While the citation is troublesome because it does not appear in Thucydidean manuscripts, Pollux is very careful to distinguish between blood and non-blood sacrifices:

Θουκυδίδης δ' αὐτὰ εἶρηκεν ἀγνά θύματα, πρὸς τὰ αἰμάσσοντα καὶ σφαπτόμενα ἀντιτιθεῖς σμύρναν, λιβαντὸν. ἱερεῖα προσάγειν τοῖς βωμοῖς [αἰμάσσειν τοὺς βωμούς]. δεκάτην ἀποθῦειν, εὐχεσθαι κατὰ βoος ἢ ἄλλου του.

(*Onomasticon* 1.26).

And Thucydides has spoken of pure sacrifices, opposing myrrh and incense to sacrifices involving blood and killing. [It is necessary] to lead blood sacrifices to the altars, in order to spill blood on the the altars, and to make a votive offering of the tenth part, and to swear by a cow or some other [animal].

Pollux' manuscript may be doubtful, but his claim does have some classical evidence to back it up. We have already seen that pure and impure sacrifices are distinguished in the passage cited above. In Classical times Plato kept this distinction: θύματα δὲ οὐκ ἦν τοῖς θεοῖς ζῶα, πέλανοι δὲ καὶ μέλιτι καρποὶ δεδευμένοι καὶ τοιαῦτα ἄλλα ἀγνά θύματα. 'but living sacrifices are not for the gods, but liquid and grain mixed with honey and other such pure sacrifices' (*Laws* 4.782c). So it seems that there was a distinction between blood sacrifices and non-blood sacrifices, which were designated as ἀγνά. Chantraine takes Pollux's word for it, and sees this as a contrast between blood sacrifice, ἱερεῖα, and sacrifice which is not polluted by blood, <ἀγνά> θύματα (Chantraine 1968: 25). Pollux's illustration illuminates a trend which continues into late antiquity. If one consults Hesychius' third-century lexicon, one finds that ἀγνή is still glossed with καθαρὴ and παρθένος, while ἱερός is glossed with σεμνός and ἀγαθός, with a special, separate entry for the Homeric fish: ἱερόν γάρ τὸ μέγα.

ἱερός, then, expresses holiness in connection with a sense of liveliness or being full of life and cannot be applied directly to gods or men. ἄγνός, on the other hand, is able to be applied directly to gods and places, and has a more certain sense of purity. If we take these later uses of the words into account, then, what may we conclude about the Mycenaean use of ἱερός and the related question of Mycenaean textually documented notions of what is 'holy'?

IV. Conclusion

First we should note that there is no clear evidence within Linear B texts for other terms for 'holy' or 'sacred' other than ἱερός and related words. So while there is no evidence for ἱερός as anything but 'holy' in Mycenaean, the word *i-je-to* gives us a possible connection between its original Indo-European meaning of 'quick-moving' which is also apparent in some Homeric uses. But ἱερός does have a meaning which is semantically distinct from other words for 'holy', at least in

Homeric usage. I am inclined to believe Gallavotti's association of ἱερός with action. It is especially fitting that the root on which ἱερεύς and ἱερόν are built has the sense of religious action which effects some result from the divine: for what is a better example of this sense than the agent of this action or the place of worship where it happens? Therefore, the presence of *i-je-ro* and *i-je-re-u* in Mycenaean documents makes perfect sense considering their administrative nature—here we would expect to find the nuts and bolts of religious practice, not abstract notions of holiness. Further, if we accept the scribe's suggestion, the Thucydidean contrast between ἄγνός and ἱερεῖα sacrifices strengthens the argument. For it is equally fitting that blood sacrifices should be designated as ἱερός, since they too are a part of this reciprocal exchange between men and gods. It seems likely, then, that the animals designated as ἱερός on the sealings are holy because they are going to be sacrificed, and not because they are sacred cows (so to speak).

REFERENCES

- Burkert, W. "From Epiphany to Cult Statue: Early Greek *theos*" in Lloyd 1997.
- Chantraine, P., 1968. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque I*. Paris.
- Chantraine, P., 1970. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque II*. Paris.
- Chantraine, P., 1977. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque IV-1*. Paris.
- Deger-Jalkotzy, S. et al. (eds.), 1999. *Florent Studia Mycenaea. Akten des X. Internationalen Mykenologischen Colloquiums in Salzburg vom 1.-5. Mai 1995*. Vienna.
- De Miro, Godart and Sacconi (eds), 1996. *Atti e memorie del Secondo Congresso Internazionale di Micenologia*. Rome.
- Doria, M., 1980. "Testimonianze di ἱερός (=ἱερός) in miceneo", *Kadmos* 19: 29-37.
- Hajnal, I., 1996. "Mykenisch *I-JE-TO*, *I-JE-RO* und Verwandtes", in De Miro, Godart and Sacconi 1996.
- Gallavotti, C. 1963. "Il valore di <hieros> in omero e in miceneo". *L'Antiquité Classique* 32: 409-428.
- García-Ramón, J. L., 1992. "Griechische ἱερός und seine Varianten, vedisch *isirá-*", in *Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie (Akten der VII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Leiden 1987)*, 183-205. Innsbruck.
- García-Ramón, J. L., 1996. "Sobre La Tablilla PY Tn 316 y el Pretendido Present Radical *I-JE-TO*", in De Miro, Godart, and Sacconi 1996.
- Gérard-Rousseau, M., 1968. *Les mentions religieuses dans les tablettes mycéniennes*. Rome.
- Lloyd, A. (ed.), 1997. *What is a God? Studies in the Nature of Greek Divinity*. London.
- Locher, J.P., 1963. *Untersuchungen zu ἱερός hauptsächlich bei Homer* (diss.). Bern.
- Marinatos, N., 1984. *Art and Religion in Thera: Reconstructing a Bronze Age Society*. Athens.
- Marinatos, N., 1993. *Minoan Religion: Ritual, Image, and Symbol*. Columbia, SC.
- Monier-Williams, M., 1995. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages*. Oxford.
- Nilsson, M., 1952. *A History of Greek Religion: Translated from the Swedish by F.J. Fielden*. Oxford.
- Palaima, T. G. 1999, "Kn02 - Tn 316," in Deger-Jalkotzy et.al. 1999.
- Palmer, L. R., 1963. *The Interpretation of Mycenaean Documents*. Oxford.
- Palmer, L. R., 1966. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies*. Cambridge.
- Piteros, Olivier, and Melena, 1990. "Les inscriptions en linéaire B de nodules de Thèbes (1982): la fouille, les documents, les possibilités d'interprétation", *BCH* 114: 103-184.
- Pokorny, J., 1959. *Indogermansches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern.

Ruijgh, C. J. 1967. *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*. Amsterdam.
Ventris and Chadwick, 1973. *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*. Cambridge.

Watkins, C., 2000. *The American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots*. Boston.

Hans-Günter BUCHHOLZ, *Ugarit, Zypern und Ägäis. Kulturbeziehungen im zweiten Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament. Veröffentlichungen zur Kultur und Geschichte des Alten Orients und des Alten Testaments. Band 261). Münster (Ugarit-Verlag) 1999. 812 pp., 111 figs. ISBN 3-927120-38-3.

A Festschrift, *Periplus* (SIMA 127), was presented to the eminent archaeologist and polyhistor Professor Emeritus Dr Dr h.c. Hans-Günter Buchholz on his 80th birthday. An appreciation of his achievements and an impressive analytical list of his publications (some of which were published in this journal) may be found in the Festschrift.

He has earlier enriched the archaeological literature with major syntheses such as *Altägäis und Altkypros* (with V. Karageorghis) and *Ägäische Bronzezeit*. A new sign of his vitality is shown by this massive, synthetic volume on Ugarit, Cyprus and the Aegean. The book is based on a congress paper which proved to be too long and merited to be published as an extensively expanded, special monograph.

The author knows the subject extremely well from travels and participation in excavations at Ugarit, Bogazköy and Enkomi and directing his own excavations at Tamassos. He knows the literature as few others and hardly a single relevant bibliographical reference has escaped him. The book is a mine of

REVIEW

information (the bibliography comprises nearly 50 pages and there are 2797 footnotes!).

A perusal of the contents shows that he treats the subject systematically according to "Sachgruppen": the coastal region of Syria, seafare, sea routes to the West, the middle and western Mediterranean, the sea route to the Black Sea, Ras Shamra, architecture, metal production and trade, luxury goods, pottery as export and import ware, metal forms, seals and inscribed documents, pictorial motifs, religious connections, final considerations and bibliography.

The book contains a wealth of information which cannot be discussed in detail here. Interpretations are made based on factual evidence. It is chapter 14 – "Einige religionsgeschichtliche Verknüpfungen zwischen dem östlichen Mittelmeer und Hellas in archäologischer Sicht" which is of special interest for the readers of *JPR*. After an introduction he deals with the sacrifice, various cult objects, followed by a long chapter on the double axe and its sacred and profane use – a subject which the author has dealt with in his dissertation and in many publications.

The occurrences of so called wall attachments ("Wandappliken") in the Bronze Age and post-Bronze Age are given exhaustively. Buchholz prefers a neutral term and avoids names such as *lampes murales*, hanging lamps, bracket-lamps, wall-lamps, wall-brackets, hanging-brackets, torch holders or incense burners. The author regards them as cult