

# ΚΥΔΑΛΙΜΟΣ

Τιμητικός Τόμος

για τον Καθηγητή Γεώργιο Στυλ. Κορρέ

ΤΟΜΟΣ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΟΣ



ΚΥΔΑΛΙΜΟΣ  
ΤΙΜΗΤΙΚΟΣ ΤΟΜΟΣ ΓΙΑ ΤΟΝ ΚΑΘΗΓΗΤΗ  
ΓΕΩΡΓΙΟ ΣΤΥΛ. ΚΟΡΡΕ

## Κυδάλιμος

Το επίθετο στον Όμηρο σημαίνει ένδοξος, φημισμένος, ευγενής. Συχνότερα αναφέρεται η έκφραση *κυδάλιμον κῆρ*, ευγενής καρδιά, για να χαρακτηρίσει τους σημαντικότερους ήρωες του έπους: τον Νέστορα (Ιλ. Τ 235) και τους γιούς του Θρασυμήδη και Αντίλοχο (Ιλ. Ρ 378), τον Αγαμέμνονα (Ιλ. Κ 16), τον Αχιλλέα (Ιλ. Σ 33), αλλά και τον Έκτορα (Ιλ. Μ 45).

Φωτογραφίες εξωφύλλου: Θολωτός τάφος Ρούτση 2 (Μυρσινοχωρίου): Χάλκινο στέμμα με ασημένα διακόσμηση και χρυσή σταυρόσχημη επίστεψη (προσωρινή λήψη: Ελευθέριος Γαλανόπουλος, Εθνικό Αρχαιολογικό Μουσείο/Εφορεία Αρχαιοτήτων Μεσσηνίας. © Υπουργείο Πολιτισμού & Αθλητισμού / Ταμείο Αρχαιολογικών Πόρων). Μικρός επιφανειακός τετράπλευρος ΜΕ-ΥΕ Ι τάφος Περιστεριάς Μεσσηνίας: Χρυσοί ρόδακες με σωληνίσκο ανάρτησης και χρυσός κάρθαρος (φωτ. Ηλίας Ηλιάδης).

ΣΕΙΡΑ ΜΟΝΟΓΡΑΦΙΩΝ AURA 4  
AURA SUPPLEMENT 4

ATHENS  
UNIVERSITY  
REVIEW OF  
ARCHAEOLOGY

ISBN:

978-960-466-230-2

978-960-466-233-3 (SET)

# ΚΥΔΑΛΙΜΟΣ

Τιμητικός Τόμος

για τον Καθηγητή Γεώργιο Στυλ. Κορρέ

ΤΟΜΟΣ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΟΣ



ΑΘΗΝΑ 2020

## ΣΕΙΡΑ ΜΟΝΟΓΡΑΦΙΩΝ AURA 4 • AURA SUPPLEMENT 4

### ΕΚΔΟΤΙΚΗ ΕΠΙΤΡΟΠΗ • EDITORS

Κωνσταντίνος Κοπανιάς • Γιάννης Παπαδάτος

### ΣΥΜΒΟΥΛΕΥΤΙΚΗ ΕΚΔΟΤΙΚΗ ΕΠΙΤΡΟΠΗ • EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Γεώργιος Βαβουρανάκης || Γιάννης Γαλανάκης || Γεωργία Κουρτέση-Φιλιππάκη

Ελένη Μαντζουράνη || Χρήστος Ντούμας || Διαμαντής Παναγιωτόπουλος

Ελευθέριος Πλάτων || Νάγια Πολυχρονάκου-Σγουρίτσα || Arnulf Hausleiter

Παναγιώτης Κουσουλής || James Osborne || Πάνος Βαλαβάνης

Χρυσάνθος Κανελλόπουλος || Παυλίνα Καραναστάση || Στυλιανός Κατάκης

Ευρυδίκη Κεφαλίδου || Γεωργία Κοκκορού-Αλευρά || Αντώνης Κοτσώνας

Νότα Κούρου || Βασίλειος Λαμπρινουδάκης || Δημήτρης Μποσνάκης || Όλγα Παλαγγιά

Λυδία Παλαιοκρασσά || Ελευθερία Παπουτσάκη-Σερμπέτη || Δημήτρης Πλάντζος

Εύα Σημαντώνη-Μπουρνιά || Katja Sporn || Θεοδοσία Στεφανίδου-Τιβερίου

Μιχαήλ Τιβέριος || Σοφία Καλοπίση-Βέρτη || Μαρία Κωνσταντουδάκη-Κιτρομηλίδου

Γεώργιος Πάλλης || Μαρία Παναγιωτίδου || Πλάτων Πετρίδης || Andreas Rhoby

Peter Dent || Παναγιώτης Ιωάννου || Θεοδώρα Μαρκάτου || Ευγένιος Μαθιόπουλος

Ευθυμία Μαυρομιχάλη || Δημήτρης Παυλόπουλος || Σουλτάνα-Μαρία Βαλαμώτη

Λίλιαν Καραλή-Γιαννακοπούλου || Βασίλειος Κυλίκογλου || Αλεξάνδρα Λιβάρδα

Ιωάννης Μπασιάκος || Σέβη Τριανταφύλλου || Μάρλεν Μούλιου || Αλεξάνδρα Μπούνια

Μαρία Οικονόμου || Ελευθερία Παλιού || Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδόπουλος || Απόστολος Σαρρής

### ΣΧΕΔΙΑΣΜΟΣ • LAYOUT

Βασιλική Σχίζα

## Εκδοτικό Σημείωμα • Editorial

---

Το Περιοδικό του Τομέα Αρχαιολογίας και Ιστορίας της Τέχνης (AURA) είναι ένα διεθνές περιοδικό με σύστημα διπλής ανώνυμης αξιολόγησης, το οποίο εκδίδεται από το Τμήμα Ιστορίας και Αρχαιολογίας του Εθνικού και Καποδιστριακού Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών. Στόχος του είναι η δημοσίευση πρωτότυπων εργασιών που εστιάζουν στην αρχαιολογία, την τέχνη και τον υλικό πολιτισμό του ευρύτερου ελληνικού κόσμου, από την απώτερη προϊστορία έως και τη σύγχρονη εποχή.

Μέρος της έκδοσης του περιοδικού AURA αποτελεί η σειρά μονογραφιών με τίτλο «AURA Supplements». Περιλαμβάνει μελέτες στα ελληνικά ή στα αγγλικά, που λόγω της μεγάλης τους έκτασης δεν μπορούν να δημοσιευθούν με τη μορφή άρθρου στο περιοδικό. Η θεματολογία των μονογραφιών είναι ίδια με εκείνη του περιοδικού.

Το περιοδικό και η σειρά μονογραφιών είναι ελεύθερης και ανοικτής πρόσβασης. Τα τεύχη του περιοδικού και οι μονογραφίες δημοσιεύονται ηλεκτρονικά ως αρχεία PDF. Όλα τα άρθρα είναι δωρεάν διαθέσιμα για όλους στο διαδίκτυο αμέσως μετά τη δημοσίευσή τους και σύμφωνα με την άδεια Creative Commons (BY-NC-ND 4.0). Τα τεύχη του περιοδικού AURA και οι τόμοι της σειράς «AURA Supplements» μπορούν επίσης να εκτυπωθούν κατόπιν παραγγελίας και να αποσταλούν ταχυδρομικά ή να παραληφθούν από το βιβλιοπωλείο του Εκδοτικού Οίκου Καρδαμίτσα, Ιπποκράτους 8, Αθήνα.

The Athens University Review of Archaeology (AURA) is an international, peer-reviewed archaeological journal published by the Faculty of History and Archaeology of the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens. It is dedicated to the publication of original research articles and reports focusing on, or related to the archaeology, art and material culture in the broader Greek world, from the earliest Prehistory to the Modern Era.

Part of the AURA journal is the AURA Supplement series, comprising studies in Greek or English, which, due to their extent, cannot be published in the journal as articles. The series share the same areas of interest with the journal.

AURA is a fully open access journal. Each issue of the journal and each monograph is published electronically as a PDF file. All papers are available on the internet to all users immediately upon publication and free of charge, according to the Creative Commons (BY-NC-ND 4.0). AURA issues and monographs can also be distributed on a print-on-demand basis and posted or collected from the bookstore of the Kardamitsa Publications, 8 Ippokratous str, Athens.

---

## ΕΠΙΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ • CONTACT

Εθνικό και Καποδιστριακό Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών  
Φιλοσοφική Σχολή / Τμήμα Ιστορίας και Αρχαιολογίας  
Πανεπιστημιόπολη Ζωγράφου / Αθήνα 157 84

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Faculty of History and Archaeology  
University Campus, GR-15784 Athens, Greece

Ιστοσελίδα • Website <http://aura.arch.uoa.gr/>  
email: [aura@arch.uoa.gr](mailto:aura@arch.uoa.gr)

Σχεδιασμός • Layout: Βασιλική Σχίζα ([vass.schiza@gmail.com](mailto:vass.schiza@gmail.com))

© Τμήμα Ιστορίας και Αρχαιολογίας, ΕΚΠΑ © Faculty of History and Archaeology, NKUoA  
Το περιεχόμενο αυτού του τόμου υπόκειται στην άδεια χρήσης Creative Commons CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/deed.el>).  
The content of this volume is subjected to the Creative Commons CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-ncnd/4.0/>).

---

# Iklaina, Traganes, $a\text{-}ru_2$ , and Αἰπύ<sup>1</sup>

Thomas G. Palaima

## ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ: ΙΚΛΑΙΝΑ, ΤΡΑΓΑΝΕΣ, $a\text{-}ru_2$ ΚΑΙ Αἰπύ

Στην παρούσα μελέτη εξετάζεται το παλαιό πρόβλημα της ταύτισης του τοπωνυμίου  $a\text{-}ru_2$ , όπως αυτό αναφέρεται στις πινακίδες της Γραμμικής Β, με μία συγκεκριμένη αρχαιολογική θέση στη Μεσσηνία της Ύστερης Εποχής του Χαλκού. Επίσης, διερευνάται το εάν το τοπωνύμιο αυτό θα πρέπει να ερμηνευθεί όπως είχε ερμηνευθεί από εξέχοντες μυκηναϊολόγους (Chadwick, Lejeune, Morpurgo, Palmer, Ruijgh) στις δεκαετίες του 1950 και 1960, δηλαδή ως Αἰπύ ή Αἶπυ (πρβλ. *Ομ. Ιλ.* Β.592).

Οι περισσότεροι μελετητές συμφωνούν ότι το  $a\text{-}ru_2$  ταυτίζεται με την θέση Τραγάνες κοντά στην Ίκλαινα, ταύτιση για την οποία συμφωνούμε ότι τα επιχειρήματα είναι ισχυρά και στην παρούσα χρονική περίοδο πειστικά. Εκείνο που έχει αμφισβητηθεί είναι η ταύτιση του  $a\text{-}ru_2$  με το Αἰπύ. Στην παρούσα εργασία επανεξετάζουμε και τα αρχικά και τα μεταγενέστερα γλωσσολογικά επιχειρήματα και παρατηρούμε ότι με την πάροδο του χρόνου επιφυλάξεις που αρχικά αφορούσαν στη σωστή φωνητική απόδοση του  $a\text{-}ru_2$  εξελίχθηκαν σε κατηγορηματικό ισχυρισμό ότι η ταύτιση του  $a\text{-}ru_2$  ως Αἰπύ είναι αδύνατη. Εδώ προτείνω ότι η ταύτιση αυτή δεν είναι αδύνατη, εάν λάβουμε υπ' όψιν μας τα ακόλουθα:

1) ότι στη συγκεκριμένη περίπτωση έχουμε γραπτή απόδοση ενός μη ελληνικού τοπωνυμίου σε ένα σύστημα γραφής που προσαρμόστηκε από μία προϋπάρχουσα γραφή χρησιμοποιούμενη για μία μη ελληνική γλώσσα (ή γλώσσες)

2) τον τρόπο με τον οποίο οι γραφείς της Γραμμικής Β θα είχαν αντιληφθεί τους ήχους στην προσπάθειά τους να αποδώσουν γραπτώς ένα προελληνικό τοπωνύμιο κυρίως ως  $a\text{-}ru_2$  και μια φορά ως  $a_3\text{-}ru$ .

Ένα από τα βασικά μας επιχειρήματα είναι ότι κατά την περίοδο στην οποία ενεγράφησαν οι πινακίδες της Πύλου, η προφορά αυτού του τοπωνυμίου διατηρούσε χαρακτηριστικά του προελληνικού χαρακτήρα του. Επίσης συζητούμε τα επιχειρήματα που πρόβαλε ο Lejeune, ότι το αρχικό  $a$ - (χαρακτήρας \*08) μπορεί να αντιπροσωπεύει το /ai/ ή ένα μη ελληνικό ήχο που θα ακουγόταν ως /ai/. Επιπροσθέτως το  $a_3\text{-}ru$ - μπορεί να γραφτεί επίσης στη γραμμική Β και ως /air<sup>h</sup>u/. Γι' αυτό δεν υπάρχει λόγος να απορρίψουμε τη σύνδεση ανάμεσα στο  $a\text{-}ru_2$  και το ομηρικό Αἰπύ, εάν δεχτούμε ότι το προελληνικό τοπωνύμιο είχε ένα συμφωνικό ήχο που γινόταν αντιληπτός από τους γραφείς ως δασυνόμενος. Το ιστορικό ελληνικό λεξικό παρουσιάζει διακυμάνσεις ανάμεσα στο δασυνόμενο /r<sup>h</sup>/ και στο μη δασυνόμενο /r/ σε συγγενείς λέξεις που θεωρούνται ότι προήλθαν από την προελληνική ρίζα: *αἰπύς*, *αἶψα*, *ἐξαίφνης*, *ἄφνω* και *ἄφαρ*. Αυτό περαιτέρω ενισχύει την ταύτιση του  $a\text{-}ru_2$  ως της θέσης που στα ομηρικά κείμενα αναφέρεται ως Αἰπύ.

Συμπερασματικά, υπάρχουν ισχυρά επιχειρήματα στα κείμενα της Γραμμικής Β υπέρ της αρχικής ταύτισης του  $a\text{-}ru_2$  με το ομηρικό Αἰπύ, κάτι που ταιριάζει με την τοπογραφία και τη σημασία της αρχαιολογικής θέσης στην Ίκλαινα.

Γενικά, διαγράφονται δύο πιθανές εξηγήσεις:

1) ότι το  $a\text{-}ru_2$  αντιπροσωπεύει ένα προελληνικό τοπωνύμιο γραμμένο με τον παραδοσιακό τρόπο γραφής για τοπωνύμια των οποίων ο επιθετικός τύπος (που κρύβεται πίσω από τη γραφή  $a_3\text{-}ru$ -) ήδη προφερόταν /airu/ την εποχή των πινακίδων της Πύλου, ή

2) ότι το προελληνικό τοπωνύμιο που εξελίχθηκε στο ομηρικό Αἰπύ ακόμα διατηρούσε ορισμένα χαρακτηριστικά της προελληνικής προφοράς του και αποδόθηκε με όση ακρίβεια ήταν δυνατόν ως  $a\text{-}ru_2$  με το  $ru_2$  να αποδίδει φωνητική ή φωνημική δάσυνση και το  $a$ - να αντιπροσωπεύει έναν ήχο φωνηέντος που στην εποχή της Γραμμικής Β ίσως ακουγόταν ως το διφθογγικό /ai/. Η γραφή  $a_3\text{-}ru$ - στο σύνθετο ανθρωπωνύμιο μπορεί επίσης να αντιπροσωπεύει διφθογγικό /ai/ και δασυμένο /r/.

Πιστεύουμε ότι τα δεδομένα ενισχύουν τη δεύτερη πιθανότητα.

---

1 I thank my colleague in linguistics at the University of Texas at Austin Scott P. Myers for discussing and guiding me through literature on the sound features of languages, how they are represented in systems of writing, and how they are heard and processed by non-native or bilingual speakers. Cassandra Donnelly also read this paper in its penultimate stage and offered several helpful comments. I am solely responsible for the ideas in this final version.

George Korres is an important figure in the Mycenaean archaeology of Messenia in the generation of and just after the primary Palace of Nestor excavations and the University of Minnesota Messenia Expedition (UMME)<sup>2</sup> and preceding the results of the Pylos Regional Archaeological Project (PRAP) and the Iklaina Archaeological Project (IKAP). His work has helped us see the strong nature of Minoan influence on cultural and state formation in late Bronze Age Messenia and has also furnished some of the evidence that allows for firm site identifications. He has always shared openly with others what Michael Cosmopoulos rightly calls “his profound knowledge of Messenian archaeology”<sup>3</sup>. He has generously helped me and my late mentor Emmett L. Bennett, Jr., whose *proxenos* he was when Bennett received an honorary doctorate from the University of Athens in 2004. I partially repay Bennett’s and my debt to George Korres by taking up here the problems connected with how to identify the Bronze Age Messenian toponym *a-pu<sub>2</sub>* in the Linear B texts.

The study of deciphered Mycenaean texts is now solidly in its third generation. In Hesiod’s scheme of successive ages, ironically, this would be the Bronze Age. It is more important than ever to follow the standard practice in the field of classical philology during the first generation of Mycenological scholars (1952-1972), whether we think of this period as Hesiod’s Golden Age or as the generation whose virtues are extolled by Nestor in the Homeric epics.

The practice I refer to is the systematic investigation (a kind of *Quellenforschung*) of how current scholarly *opinioniones communes* have come into being. This entails reexamining what ideas and interpretations have been proposed by scholars even in long years past and what supporting evidence and reasoning were used in their initial proposals and then later for and against these proposals by other scholars through time, until we reach our current state of thinking. This practice used to be *de rigueur*.

In the *Festschrift* for Cynthia Shelmerdine<sup>4</sup>, I demonstrated how an early proposed textual interpretation of the heading line of a Linear B tablet (Vn 130) by Leonard Palmer not only influenced later interpretations, but virtually controlled how the overall text would be interpreted in the context of later archaeological research and data. This happened despite the fact that Palmer’s interpretation had been invalidated –quite literally made impossible– by our developing knowledge of the precise values of Linear B phonograms used in key words in Vn 130 that indicated both to the Mycenaean tablet-writer who wrote the text and to his tablet-writing contemporaries what the text was about. It tells us what the text is about, too, if we read it correctly.

My argument, in the literal sense of casting light on how particular scholarly views came to be, required reading carefully what was an eventually rejected interpretation by a prominent early scholar and tracking what its afterlife was in influencing how later scholars even approached interpreting the text. Simply put, scholars persisted in presuming that key terms in the text of Vn 130 must have meanings close to what Palmer had proposed, even though there was no longer any basis for Palmer’s specific interpretations<sup>5</sup>. Something similar has happened in regard to scholarship concerning the Linear B toponym *a-pu<sub>2</sub>*.

---

2 McDonald and Rapp 1972.

3 Cosmopoulos 2006a, 205.

4 Palaima 2014.

5 The key term in the heading of Vn 130 *ze-to* was interpreted by Palmer as γέντο = 3rd person plural: things ‘have come to be’, i.e., things ‘were delivered’. Even when it was realized that z- signs in the Linear B syllabary could not represent γ-, the tablet was still taken as relating to a central delivery, despite many of the toponyms being clearly in the locative and representing ‘places where’ and not the nominative agents or genitive sources of deliveries. Palmer’s idea about the text made scholars ignore the connection between the verbal form *ze-to* on Vn 130 and *ze-so-me-no* on Un 267 and the link of the text to the much-studied oil manufacture industry at Pylos.

The geographical references in the repertory of Linear B tablets from Pylos have been studied systematically. In 1995 John Bennet<sup>6</sup> went back to Carothers<sup>7</sup> and Bintliff<sup>8</sup> in analyzing the sequence of toponyms for the nine and seven main sites respectively in the two major districts of Mycenaean palatial Messenia in the Pylos tablets (principally Jn 829, Cn 608, Vn 10, Vn 19, and the tablets of the Ma series) and correlating them with sites identified through survey and excavation, especially the latest data then from PRAP. The site of *a-pu*<sub>2</sub> can now be 'tentatively' identified with the area of the village of Iklaina and the associated toponym (with a tholos tomb) Traganes<sup>9</sup>. This identification is so little in dispute that we would be tempted to remove the adverb 'tentatively', were it not a reasonably cautious reminder of the hypothetical nature of all such identifications.

*a-pu*<sub>2</sub> is identified with Iklaina by Hope Simpson in 1981 and in 2014<sup>10</sup>. Earlier in 1976 Chadwick<sup>11</sup> put *a-pu*<sub>2</sub> south of *pa-ki-ja-ne* (the sanctuary district associated with the Palace of Nestor site of *pu-ro* = Pylos in the Linear B tablets) and east of the Bay of Navarino and away from the coast. This is the general vicinity of Iklaina, but earlier still in 1972 Chadwick hypothesized that *a-pu*<sub>2</sub> might be the site of Koukounara<sup>12</sup>:

"It used to be thought that *a-pu*<sub>2</sub> (the nominative is not recorded, but can be certainly reconstructed from the cases which occur) might be identified with *Aipu*, "the Steep," which is mentioned by Homer as an important place in Nestor's kingdom. But now that we understand the Mycenaean script better, it is clear that this would demand a spelling *a*<sub>3</sub>-*pu*<sup>13</sup>, and the equation must be rejected. *a-pu*<sub>2</sub> corresponds more likely to a form such as *Aphu*, *Alphu*, *Arphu*, *Asphu*<sup>14</sup>. The town probably lies away from the coast and a short distance south of the palace. It might be tempting to think of Koukounara (#65) for this name".

Categorical phrases like "*it is clear that*" and "*this would demand a spelling*" and "*the equation must be rejected*" (italics mine) should make us think twice. At the other extreme (of ambiguity) "[it] *might be tempting to think of*" should also call for caution<sup>15</sup>.

6 Bennet 1995. See also Bennet 1998.

7 Carothers 1992.

8 Bintliff 1977.

9 Hope Simpson 2014, xvi, and MAP 6: Iklaina: Traganes = Site no. 52.

10 Hope Simpson 1981, 117; 2014, 30.

11 Chadwick 1976, 46, and map on p. 44.

12 Chadwick 1972, 109. The identification of *a-pu*<sub>2</sub> is surprisingly not discussed in Chadwick 1963, which only cites *a-pu*<sub>2</sub> once, where it appears in the dative locative *a-pu*<sub>2</sub>-*we*, in a catalogue of toponyms associated with ideogram \*146.

13 This is not true, since there are instances (see my further discussion) where word-initial *a*<sub>3</sub>- is written over or likely written over [[*a*-]], where *a*<sub>3</sub>- alternates with *a*- in spelling the same word, and where an *a*-initial second element of a chronologically late forming compound is spelled both with phonograms with an explicit *a*<sub>3</sub>-vowel value and phonograms with the ambiguous *a*-vowel value. Moreover, the spelling *a*<sub>3</sub>-*pu*- is not well attested. It is written but a single time in a compound personal name by a single scribe. To that scribe is assigned only a small set of tablets. They do not give any evidence for the use of alternative bilabial signs \*22, \*29 (the sign that has the value *pu*<sub>2</sub>) and \*56 nor for the representation of pre-Greek toponyms. A single occurrence by a minimally represented tablet-writer of a spelling of what is thought to be a word taken over from a pre-Greek language is not sufficient to rule out alternative spellings by other scribes trying to represent the non-Greek sounds of the word, especially as they are preserved in a pre-Greek toponymic form.

14 As I will discuss later in this paper, there is a range of other possibilities here, including –given that sign \*08 (*a*) can represent *a* and that *aipu* has no convincing Indo-European etymology– spellings of this pre-Greek toponym like *A(i)<sup>m</sup>p<sup>h</sup>u*. Keep in mind the variation between /*ai*/ and /*a*/ in historically attested Greek words later thought to be 'related' to *aipu*: αἶψα, ἐξαίφνης, ἄφνω and ἄφαρ. This may indicate ambiguity in the minds of Greek speakers about the precise value of the first syllable and the consonant.

15 It is impossible to write completely free of rhetoric, but we should try to avoid categorical claims and not over-value the logical force of conjectures.

Our starting point here is the current consensus of scholarly opinion that associates the excavated and surveyed remains at Iklaina-Traganes with the Linear B toponym  $a-pu_2$ . What is subject to debate is whether  $a-pu_2$  in turn is to be identified with Homeric Αἰπύ, as was claimed in the years immediately after the decipherment of Linear B. Homerists and historical linguists were then mining the Linear B tablets for data relevant to their interests. Mycenaean linguists were in the first stages of figuring out the details of how the Linear B script represented the language or languages spoken at the sites and during the time periods where and when the tablets were found.

In 1963 Leonard Palmer asserted that  $a-pu_2$  is “identified with Aipy,” i.e., the toponym of Αἰπύ mentioned in the *Iliad* of Homer<sup>16</sup>. This is, however, based partly on his idea that the sign  $pu_2$  expressed a palatalized consonant  $pi + u$ . This idea seems to have persisted even in the most recent etymological dictionary of ancient Greek<sup>17</sup>, which otherwise views the word as pre-Greek. Other standard etymological dictionaries agree that there is no convincing Indo-European etymology for the word associated in later historical common Greek vocabulary with the site of Αἰπύ. For example, Chantraine<sup>18</sup> sees αἰπύς as having “pas d’étymologie établie” and then refers to the few hypotheses made as being “en l’air,” i.e., ‘wild guesses’. But in his reasoning, Palmer in 1963 was working systematically with what could then be figured out about special or extra consonant signs like  $pa_2$  (= \*56),  $pi_2$  (= \*22) and  $pu_2$  (= \*29), which seemed to alternate with the regular or standard Linear B signs that represented as their initial consonant unvoiced bilabial unaspirated  $p$ - or aspirated  $p^h$ -. Given what we have learned about Minoan phonology from our study of the structure of the Linear B syllabary, Palmer’s hypothesis that  $pu_2$  was among other palatalized phonograms was not unreasonable and it did fit as an explanation for how αἰπύς might be related to words like αἶψα, ἐξαίφνης, ἄφνω and ἄφαρ, which vary between /ai/ (twice) and /a/ (twice) in their initial consonant and show aspiration of the bilabial (three times)<sup>19</sup>.

The identification of  $a-pu_2$  with Αἰπύ in fact was widely proposed and held in the 1950’s and well into the 60’s<sup>20</sup>. Notably in 1963 the influential article by John Chadwick and Lydia Baumbach on words in historical Greek that were attested in the Linear B texts made this identification<sup>21</sup>. They cited in support the first edition of *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*<sup>22</sup> and Michel Lejeune’s work in the 1950’s<sup>23</sup>. But Chadwick and Baumbach issued a reservation that spelling the word with “a-, not ai-, and  $pu_2$  (usually =  $\varphi u$ ) rouse[s] suspicion.” In 1963 also, Morpurgo’s equally influential *Mycenaeae Graecitatis Lexicon* made the same identification with question marks<sup>24</sup>: “Cf. gr. Αἰπύ (Hom. B 592) et intell. *Aipu-de*, *Aipuwei* (??)”<sup>25</sup>. The entry on Pylos tablet Jo 438.11 was also brought to bear by Morpurgo on the identification  $a-pu_2-ja$  explained as “Eandem regionem quam  $a-pu_2(-de)$ , q.v. significare videtur. Intell. *Aipuia* (cf. hom. Αἰπεια)??”<sup>26</sup>.

16 Palmer 1963, 71.

17 Beekes 2010, 1: 45 s. αἰπύς.

18 Chantraine 2009, 36, s. αἰπύς.

19 Potentially all four forms show aspiration, since  $\varphi\varsigma > \psi$ .

20 Aura Jorro and Adrados 1985, 90 s.  $a-pu_2-de$  §2.

21 Chadwick and Baumbach 1963, 168-169 s. αἰπύς.

22 Ventris and Chadwick 1956, 147.

23 Conveniently assembled in Lejeune 1958, 54, 270. See also Lejeune 1956, 31.

24 Morpurgo 1963, 31 s.  $a-pu_2-de$  /  $a-pu_2-we$ .

25 Translate: “Compare Greek Αἰπύ (Hom. B 592) and think of *Aipu-de*, *Aipuwei* (??).”

26 Translate:  $a-pu_2-ja$  “seems to signify the same locality as  $a-pu_2(-de)$ , q.v. Understand it as *Aipuia* (cf. hom. Αἰπεια)??”

Why was this identification supported so strongly in the 50's and 60's and why has it fallen out of favor?

In the Catalogue of Ships in Homer's *Iliad* (2.591-594) we get an enumeration of nine communities where the men in the forces led to Troy by King Nestor lived in Messenia. The number, if we include the site of Pylos itself, matches up with the number of regional centers in the Hither Province in the Linear B texts from Pylos.

οἱ δὲ Πύλον τ' ἐνέμοντο καὶ Ἀρήνην ἐρατεινήν  
καὶ Θρύον Ἀλφειοῦ πόρον καὶ εὐκτιτον Αἶπυ  
καὶ Κυπαρισσήεντα καὶ Ἀμφιγένειαν ἔναιον  
καὶ Πτελεὸν καὶ Ἔλος καὶ Δώριον

Palmer and others<sup>27</sup> noted the almost irresistible connection between *a-pu<sub>2</sub>* and *Aipu*. This was reinforced by the straightforward reading of the Linear B toponym *e-re-e / e-re-i* in the canonical lists Jo 438 and Jn 829 as the locative form of the site of Ἔλος (*Helos*) that appears in *Iliad* 2.594. Pylos itself makes up one of the nine communities in Homer's list, although it does not appear *per se* among the Linear B canonical nine toponyms. But if we assume that the associated territory of *pa-ki-ja-ne* takes the place of Pylos in the Linear B list, we have two matchups besides *Aipu*. Another toponym in the Pylos Linear B texts *\*Kuparissos = \*ku-pa-ri-so* is not among the canonical nine. But it does document that Linear B can use the same pre-Greek-derived phytonym that lies behind Homeric *\*Κυπαρισσῆεις* as the basis for a place name<sup>28</sup>. By such reasoning, *Aipu* became somewhat reasonably a fourth 'matchup' with Homer.

Furthermore, Stephanus of Byzantium's entry Αἶπυ, πόλις Μεσσηνίας "καὶ Θρύον Ἀλφειοῦ πόρον καὶ εὐκτιτον Αἶπυ" ἀπὸ τῆς ἐρμυμότητος Αἶπυ καλουμένη gives both a geographic fix and a topographic explanation for the Homeric reference. The site was in Messenia and it was so-called because of its formidable defensive posture: ἐρμυμότης specifying the 'strength or security' of the place, a quality certainly enhanced, as at the Mycenaean type site of Mycenae, by having one or more approaches to it that were steep to the point of being inaccessible<sup>29</sup>.

Hesychius under the lemma αἶπυ (note that he does not give us the nominative masculine adjectival form αἶπύς as we might expect, but the neuter form used as the toponym in Homer and Stephanus) glosses the term (and the place) similarly as τὸ ὑψηλὸν καὶ χαλεπὸν καὶ σκληρόν· ἢ πόλις τῆς Πύλου = 'the lofty and difficult and hard; or a city site of Pylos'. The related lemma αἶπος (an *-es-* stem neuter noun form clearly related to αἶπυ as taken into Greek as a three-ending adjective) is attested in Aeschylus in the literal meaning of 'a height' or 'a steep' and in Euripides metaphorically as 'a difficult task'. It is glossed as κάματος ἢ ὑψηλὸς τόπος. ἢ

27 E.g., Morpurgo 1963, 196, 94.

28 *\*Kuparissos = \*ku-pa-ri-so* is reconstructed from *ku-]pa-ri-so* on Pylos Na 514 and the ethnic adjective *ku-pa-ri-si-jo* on Pylos An 657.8. There is also a community called Kyparissia in modern Messenia. See Hope Simpson 1981, 134, 148, 151.

29 Note that Kirk (1985, 1: 214-216 s. 2.591-594) thinks that the epithet εὐκτιτον "like εὐκτίμενον and εὐκτίμενον πολίεθρον seems to be applied where convenient for metrical and stylistic reasons." I.e., he thinks it is a convention of poetic verse and not a description of an actual site. Kirk considers the position of AIPU to be unknown. On the steep and formidable topographical presentation of the Iklaina site, 170 m. above sea level with its commanding view and deep protective ravines to the south and west and its impressive Cyclopean remains, see Cosmopoulos 2006a, 219, fig. 5, 2006b, 202-203, figs. 2-3, 2019, online fig. 10. My own opinion is that in the early stages of composing and perfecting oral song poems, the singers would have had to use epithets for places that did match what their audiences knew about the topography of the places. We also note, with regard to the longevity of Homeric phrases, that the standard word in the Linear B land-tenure documents for a land parcel that has been 'settled' or 'built upon' is *ki-ti-me-na = \*κτιμένῃ*. It comes from the same root as εὐκτιτον. See Aura Jorro and Adrados 1985, 1: 366-367, s. *ki-ti-me-na*. The excavated remains at Iklaina certainly can justify it being called εὐκτιτον.

ὕλῳδης = ‘hard labor or a lofty place. Or wooded’. The three meanings here again speak to a topographical placement that is high and difficult to access, both of which suit a position that is covered with trees. Strabo (8.3.24) in discussing the Homeric passage *Iliad* 2.592 says: εὐκτιτον δὲ Αἴπυ τὸ Ἐπιτάλιον: ἔστι γὰρ ἐρυμνὸν φύσει: καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἄλλοις αἰπεῖαν κολώνην λέγει “ἔστι δέ τις Θρυόεσσα πόλις, αἰπεῖα κολώνη” = “Well-built *Aipu* (is) *Epitalion*: for it is naturally securely defensible, for even in other instances he (we understand here Homer) calls a hill ‘steep’: ‘there is a certain city *Thryoessa*, a steep hill.’” Reading Strabo’s entry as I have translated it here, Strabo seems to identify *Aipu* as the historical site of Epitalion (550 BCE – 300 CE) near the coast south southwest of Olympia and close to where, according to Strabo (8.3.12), the Eurotas river empties into the Sicilian Sea.

The Homeric passage in the Catalogue of Ships may or may not then have any probative value in determining what the topographical features of the toponym *Aipu* were. No matter. It is clear from Hesychius, Stephanus, and Strabo that the name that came into later Greek itself as *Aipu* was applied, much like the pre-Greek noun/name for ‘mountain’ = Ὀλυμπ-ος / Οὐλυμπ-ος (posited as the root of the Mycenaean ethnic adjective *u-ru-pi-ja-jo* = *Ulump-iaios*), to a specific kind of topographical area, in this case a steep and defensible (from one or more directions of approach) hill, plateau or ridge upon which a formidably imposing settlement could be well-founded (εὐκτιτον).

This then brings us to the key point. If *a-pu<sub>2</sub>* in the Linear B texts from Pylos is the toponym for the second-order center now identified with the impressive and imposing remains at Iklaina, as seems to be accepted by those who specialize in the geography and settlement patterns of Mycenaean Messenia and the distribution and functions of place-names in the Linear B tablets from Pylos<sup>30</sup>, should it be called *Aipu* and be ‘identified’ with the locality in Homer’s *Iliad* 2.592?

I am not claiming here that the Greek audiences in the historical period would know that the Homeric passage refers to the specific site now known as Iklaina. Yet when geographical catalogues, along with other kinds of catalogues, were being developed in the Bronze Age within the tradition of oral song poems about wars, kings and warriors, a prominent site in Messenia like *a-pu<sub>2</sub>* would have been a good candidate to be included. After all, catalogues were used as ‘crowd-pleasers’. Members of the audience would be made to feel good when they heard the name of a locality within their home region being sung by an oral songster at a communal event, a process –whether in original composition or in later ‘tampering’– that lies behind the historical tradition of a pro-Athenian text of Homer produced by Solon or the Peisistratids<sup>31</sup>.

Iklaina was an important site in LH IIIA and B Messenia, even once a rival with Pylos to become the paramount center of the Hither Province. An identification with a prominent site in Pylos Linear B (*a-pu<sub>2</sub>*) and in Homer (Αἴπυ) texts makes sense. What if we borrow from literary textual editing and view the reading of *a-pu<sub>2</sub>* as Αἴπυ not as a rejected reading, but as a *lectio difficilior*? What arguments can be used in its favor?

The earlier identification of *a-pu<sub>2</sub>* with *Aipu* has been strongly questioned to the point of being rejected by some of the very scholars (e.g., Lejeune, Chadwick, Ruijgh) who originally made the identification. What is at work here?

In the absence of a convincing Indo-European etymology, the word has been taken as pre-Greek. This is sensible and can be supported by an added detail. If the later adjective αἰπύς, αἰπεῖα, αἰπύ was viewed by historical Greek speakers as a perfectly regular and explicable Greek word, there would be no need to gloss any of its forms in a collection of hard-to-understand forms like Hesychius’s.

30 Hope Simpson 2014, 57. Bennet 1999, 147.

31 West 1988, 36-37.

Moreover, the use of the peculiar sign  $pu_2$  in the spelling of  $a-pu_2$  and the use in  $a-pu_2$  of  $a$  and  $u$ , vowels posited as two of the four basic vowels for the non-Greek language(s) represented by Linear A<sup>32</sup>, also support the suggestion that the toponym behind the spelling is of non-Greek / non-Indo-European origin. We compare here  $da-pu_2-ri-to-jo$   $*d/la^{(m)}b^{(h)}urinthojo$  = historical Greek *laburinthoio* (here with ‘Minoan’  $a-i-u$  vowels except in its Greek  $o$ -stem ending, a pre-Greek  $d/l$  alternation, the pre-Greek  $-nth-$  formative suffix, and the use of  $pu_2$  to capture a particular pre-Greek consonantal value later represented by  $/b/$ ) and the cluster of other pre-Greek names with similar features on early Knossos tablet Xd 140 from the Room of the Chariot Tablets:  $da-pu-ri-tō$ ,  $pa-ze$ ,  $*47-ta-qo$ ,  $*47-$ .

Although Ruijgh eventually rejected the identification of  $a-pu_2$  with *aipu*, he originally supported the possibility that a pre-Greek toponym of some such form as  $*\text{Αφϋ}$  had passed by popular etymology [italics mine] into the Greek lexicon as  $\text{Αιπύ}$ <sup>33</sup>. This would require minimally a confusion or substitution of aspirated and unaspirated bilabials  $*A(i)p^hu > *Aipu$  and the same fluctuation between  $/ai/$  and  $/a/$  seen in the cluster of seemingly related historical lexemes:  $\text{αἰπύ(ς)}$ ,  $\text{αἰψα}$ ,  $\text{ἐξαίφνης}$ ,  $\text{ἄφνω}$  and  $\text{ἄφαρ}$ :  $*Ap^hu > *Aipu$ .

Ruijgh’s proposal would be easier to accept if later historical Greek  $\text{αἰπύς}$ ,  $\text{αἰπεῖα}$ ,  $\text{αἰπύ}$  were of Indo-European origin. Since it is not, we are asked to consider here that a non-Greek word used as a toponym  $a-pu_2$  was commonly confused with whatever was the original form of another borrowed term from which the later Greek adjective  $\text{αἰπύς}$ ,  $\text{αἰπεῖα}$ ,  $\text{αἰπύ}$ , developed. Economy of hypothesis would suggest that the Mycenaean toponym and the Mycenaean word for ‘steep’ were from one and the same root. If its sound could be popularly etymologized as *Aipu* as found in the Homeric texts, why could this not have been happening already in the period of genesis of the Homeric poems, the late Bronze Age?

We ask again, why cannot the Mycenaean forms  $a-pu_2-de$  (allative),  $a-pu_2-we$  (locative), and the feminine form for a particular region  $a-pu_2-ja$  ( $*\text{Αιπυῖα}$  or ‘the district of  $a-pu_2$ ’<sup>34</sup>) be interpreted as first proposed?

Ventris and Chadwick (1973) are straightforward, but measured in their rejection<sup>35</sup>: “Not *Aipu* [ $\text{Αἰπύ}$  *Il.* II, 592], since  $pu_2$  appears to stand for *phu* (and *bu*?) but not *pu*, and we would expect  $a_3$ , at least as a variant spelling.” Ruijgh is more assertive:<sup>36</sup>

“Il s’agirait d’un toponyme préhellénique apparenté à  $\text{Ἄφϋτις}$  (v. Pape-B.); cf. aussi  $\text{ἀφύη}$  ‘anchois’, mot d’origine sans doute préhellénique. L’identification de  $a-pu_2$ - avec  $a_3-pu$ -  $\text{Αἰπυ-}$  (v. §219 n. 108) est impossible. Voir M. Lejeune, *Hom. εὐκτιτων Αἰπύ* et les tablettes de Pylos, REG 75 (1962), 327-343”.

Ruijgh’s internal reference is to his footnote discussing the personal name  $a_3-pu-ke-ne-ja$  (PY tablet Fn 79.1), clearly realized as the Mycenaean form of what in later Greek would be  $\text{Αἰπυγένεια}$  ‘she who was born at the site of  $\text{Ἄιπύ}$ ’, for which there are clear parallels in historical Greek  $\text{Θηβηγένης}$  and  $\text{Ἀστυγένεια}$ <sup>37</sup>.

I believe that one factor here is a modern reluctance to admit that the Homeric poems would

32 See Melena 2014, 86 and n. 113: “From the perspective of the signary, this could indicate that the language written in Linear A had an asymmetrical system of four vocalic positions, a central one ( $/\tilde{a}/$  and  $/\tilde{a}/$ ), two front ones ( $/i/$  and  $/i/$  and  $/\tilde{e}/$  and  $/\tilde{e}/$ ), and a back one ( $/\tilde{u}/$  and  $/\tilde{u}/$ ).”

33 Ruijgh 1963, 257 n. 34.

34 Lejeune 1958, 54.

35 Ventris and Chadwick 1973, 533. This is in contrast to Chadwick 1972, 109, as discussed above n. 12. See also Baumbach 1971, 156.

36 Ruijgh 1967, 273 and n. 11.

37 Ruijgh 1967, 256 n. 108.

preserve a Mycenaean toponymic reference of a true site at this level, despite the preservation of a few other site names in the canonical Linear B lists of nine and seven second-order communities. Otherwise, however, reservations about the spelling have been taken as ruling out the identification, without fully considering the implications of the toponym represented by *a-pu<sub>2</sub>* being non-Indo-European and the difficulties presented by trying to represent non-Indo-European words in a script originally devised for a non-Greek language in a period before culturally and institutionally imposed rules of spelling existed.

Is it really true, as we have seen asserted above, that the place name preserved in Homer, Hesychius, Stephanus, and Strabo as Αἰπύ or Αἶπυ would not be represented in the Pylos tablets written in the late 13th-century BCE as *a-pu<sub>2</sub>*? The objections are that:

- (1) *pu<sub>2</sub>* appears to stand for *phu* (and *bu*?) but not (taken to mean ‘never’) *pu*<sup>38</sup>;
- (2) Αἰπύ or Αἶπυ could or would only be written *a<sub>3</sub>-pu*;
- (3) since the tablet-writer who wrote Pylos tablet Fn 79 (H 45) wrote the personal name *Aipugeneia a<sub>3</sub>-pu-ke-ne-ja*, all tablet-writers at Pylos should write the pre-Greek toponym as *a<sub>3</sub>-pu*<sup>39</sup>.

Let us begin with what we now know *pu<sub>2</sub>* (\*29) stands for. This sign is part of a group of three alternative signs (\*56 or *pa<sub>2</sub>*, \*22 or *pi<sub>2</sub>*, \*29 or *pu<sub>2</sub>*) in the Linear B script that represent for three primary Minoan vowels (*a, i, u*) what was a peculiar Minoan consonantal phoneme (a pre-nasalized voiced bilabial)<sup>40</sup> coming from \*/<sup>m</sup>b<sup>h</sup>V/, where the V in \*56, \*22, \*29 is *a, i, u* respectively. When the Mycenaean scribes were confronted with representing certain kinds of labial consonants in non-Indo-European and occasionally even Indo-European terms as pronounced by their informants, they resorted to using these special ‘holdover’ signs. The evidence for the *a*-vowel \*56 has been most extensively discussed, especially with the variants \*56-*ra-ku-ja* vs. *pa-ra-ku-ja* (notice the two spellings, coming from a loan word with initial /b/) by Melena<sup>41</sup>:

“It seems obvious that the occurrence of signs *pi<sub>2</sub>*, *pa<sub>2</sub>*, and *pu<sub>2</sub>*, and *pi*, *pa*, *pu* in rendering one and the same sound is of recent date; it belongs to the *tablettique* phase of the Linear B script, once the unvoicing of Indo-European aspirated stops was developed in Greek and permitted that signs standing for the rendering of voiceless stop /p/ were used in writing the new unvoiced aspirated while keeping also in use their traditional rendering by using the series *pi<sub>2</sub>*, *pa<sub>2</sub>*, *pu<sub>2</sub>* (a conservative spelling now). The indistinct use of e.g. both *pa<sub>2</sub>* and *pa* standing for /pha/ prompted by analogical extension a concurrence of both series also in the rendering of e.g. /ba/, by establishing a new spelling correlation”.

Let us then imagine a situation where tablet-writers who use these alternative signs in their repertory and therefore are attuned to *hearing* variations in pronunciation of this class of consonant sounds confront two phenomena. First, the pronunciation of a disyllabic place name somewhat ossified (i.e., slower to be transformed into a regularized Greek pronunciation pattern) by a local population group that continues to make the sound of the second syllable in a

38 Likewise, we are told that there are “no sure examples” of Linear B signs *pV* representing /bV/, Melena 2014, 24. But see in the Knossos tablets *da-pu-ri-ṭa* alongside *da-pu<sub>2</sub>-ri-to-jo*, and *pa-ra-ku-we*, *pa-ra-ku-ja* and \*56-*ra-ku-ja* clearly being connected with Hesychius βαρακίς, Akkadian barrāqtu, and Hebrew *bāreqet*.

39 Yet unfortunately this tablet-writer H 45 nowhere has to record the site/community represented by other scribes as *a-pu<sub>2</sub>*. In his relatively small extant corpus, he nowhere uses \*56, \*22 or \*29. Consistent with H 45’s particularly innovative or developed way of perceiving what he hears, he dissimilates the first labiovelar in the compound for ‘horse feeders’: writing it as *i-po-po-ḡo-i* and not as original \**i-ḡo-po-ḡo-i*.

40 Melena 2014, 71-73 and 1987.

41 Melena 1987, 224-227, quotation from p. 227.

way that is different than, let us say, the sound in the standard preverb/preposition /*apu*/ as in Mycenaean Greek *apudosis*, which is spelled *a-pu* in Linear B. The place name that lies behind the spelling *a-pu*<sub>2</sub> may have had the same kind of cluster that yielded in later Greek Ὀλυμπος / Οὐλυμπος (cf. Mycenaean Greek *Ulumpiaios*, as noted above) and it may have the fluctuation between /ai/ and /a/ and /p<sup>h</sup>/ and /p/ that we see in the cluster of five related historical lexemes (note 14 above). It is possible that scribes would choose to use sign \*29 not just to render the outcome of \*/mb<sup>h</sup>V/ as /b<sup>(h)</sup>V/ > /p<sup>(h)</sup>V/ or /bV/ or /m<sup>b</sup>V/ > /mV/, but to render /mp<sup>(h)</sup>V/ > /mpV/ just as, *mutatis mutandis*, μπ is used in modern Greek to render /b/, and since the sequence /mpV/ is represented in Linear B as *pV* with the /m/ un-spelled, \*29 may be taken at times as rendering /p/<sup>42</sup>.

When the pre-Greek word that was used for a 'steep' or 'formidably defensible' locale was assimilated into the Greek vocabulary as an adjective for 'steep', 'lofty', 'tiring' or 'difficult', it was made to conform to the adjective class -ύς -εῖα -ύ and the consonantal sound was made into the Greek unvoiced bilabial stop that it now is. That the now purely Greek generated personal name *Aipugeneia* (*a<sub>3</sub>pu-*) therefore should be spelled, by a tablet-writer who is not attested as using \*56, \*22 or \*29, differently from the fossilized pre-Greek place name (*a-pu*<sub>2</sub>) is not surprising. The personal name came after the 'adjective' was assimilated to Greek patterns of pronunciation<sup>43</sup>.

Second, let us consider the claim that we would 'expect' a 'diphthongal' spelling of the first syllable with *a<sub>3</sub>* if *a-pu*<sub>2</sub> represented *Aipu*. For *a* to represent /ai/ was taken to the point of being declared an 'impossibility', as if sign *a* (\*08) nowhere can render /ai/. Since there are clear examples where \*08 represents /ai/, it was then claimed that *a* (\*08) nowhere renders /ai/ at the beginning of a word. But that is mistaking the care taken by some scribes in representing initial /*(h)ai*/ by *a<sub>3</sub>* (\*43) for a universal rule that initial /*(h)ai*/ cannot be rendered by *a* (\*08). I.e., Ventris and Chadwick's "we would expect *a<sub>3</sub>*, at least as a variant spelling" was transformed into a hard and fast rule as Chadwick's *Aipu* "would demand (italics mine) a spelling *a<sub>3</sub>-pu*."

Variant spellings occur in other cases in word initial position within ethnics, personal names and place names. In writing *a<sub>3</sub>-ki-a<sub>2</sub>-ri-jo* (= *Aigi-halios*) on Pylos tablet Fn 50.4, the scribe wrote *a<sub>3</sub>* over [[*a*]] indicating an initial impulse to spell with *a-* what he heard as the first syllable of the ethnic adjective here eventually spelled as *a<sub>3</sub>*. There are three more instances of *a<sub>3</sub>* (\*43) over an erasure likely to be *a* (\*08).<sup>44</sup> See also in the Pylos (and Knossos) corpus personal name spelling variations: *a<sub>3</sub>-ta-ro-we* (KN Da 1221, PY Cn 285, Cn 328) vs. *a-ta-ro-we* (PY An 129.2) and the place name variation *a-ki-a<sub>2</sub>-ri-ja-de* (TH Of 35) vs. *a<sub>3</sub>-ki-a<sub>2</sub>-ri-ja* (TH Of 25). These examples are sufficient to prove that Lejeune<sup>45</sup> is correct: "Ainsi 43 (*a<sub>3</sub>*) ne s'emploie que pour α, dont il constitue la notation la plus fréquente (à Cnossos comme à Pylos), mais non seule (puisque δ [i.e., \*08] est également utilisable)." There is then no rule that initial *a-* (\*08) cannot represent /ai/.

42 A wild card here, as Cassandra Donnelly pointed out to me, is that spelling conventions need not reflect pronunciation at all. A scholarly example is British Magdalen College, pronounced as if Maudlin College. And Worcester pronounced as if Wooster. In the present case, tablet-writers could be differentiating the non-Greek place name *a-pu*<sub>2</sub> from the Greek preverb *a-pu*, with *pu*<sub>2</sub> being an imprecise marker of foreignness.

43 We may also note that Hesychius gives as a lemma ἄμβωνες: αἱ προσαναβάσεις τῶν ὄρων. Put into the singular this would read: "*ambōn* the upward approach path of a mountain," perhaps coming from the pre-Greek \**amb-* or \**amp-* that is behind *a-pu*<sub>2</sub>. Cf. Beekes 2010, 1: 85 s. ἄμβων, which he considers "probably a loanword" with an uncertain connection with Latin *umbō*.

44 Melena 2014, 58. The overriding of the first instinct of the tablet-writers here should not be used as proof that the scribes would never write /ai/ with sign \*08 *a*, but rather that they replaced a 'sufficient spelling' by a 'more exact spelling'.

45 Lejeune 1971, 347. See further examples of alternations between *a<sub>3</sub>-* and *a* in Lejeune 1971, 348 n. 37.

There are two modes of perception in language, a focus on what is being said and a focus on how it is being said. In trying to write down words in a foreign language a non-native speaker may hear a word differently than a native speaker does, in fact may hear and try to represent sounds that are not phonemic, i.e., not used in the key differentiations of words of different meanings known as ‘significant pairs’. A good and pertinent example is provided in Edward Sapir’s classic essay on the psychological reality of phonemes. Sapir, who was noted for his fine ear for spoken sounds, worked at devising a system for writing the Native American Southern Paiute language phonetically and came up with an alphabet that he later discovered stressed phonetic accuracy over phonemic adequacy. The word meaning ‘at the water’, which Sapir wrote as *πά·βά*, his native student Tony wrote as *πά*, pause, *πά*<sup>46</sup>:

“Tony was not ‘hearing’ in terms of the actual sounds (the voiced bilabial β was objectively very different from the initial stop [a voiceless labial]) but in terms of an etymological reconstruction: *pa*: ‘water’ plus postposition \*- *pá* ‘at’”.

Later a word so rendered by a non-native speaker may even be analogized (as Ruijgh proposed for *a-pu*<sub>2</sub>). If the later Greek common adjective *aipus* started out as the word used as a pre-Greek toponym for a ‘steep and hard-to-access site’, the bilabial may in origin have been aspirated, as in four of the later cluster of five semantically related lexemes we have discussed. It became de-aspirated in its most common adjectival use, which, however, preserved the sound of an /ai/ diphthong.

Otherwise, the toponym may have conformed to the pattern we see in *Ulumpiaios* < pre-Greek *\*Ulumpus*, with ‘Minoan’ substrate final *-u* taken over into Greek as *-o(s)*. Greek-speakers trying to spell *\*Ulump-us* and our hypothetical *\*A(i)mp-us* might be inclined to hear an aspirate in the syllable *<sup>m</sup>pu* that is not there phonemically or may not be as noticeably strong in syllables *<sup>m</sup>pi* or *<sup>m</sup>pa*. Pre-nasalization is a way to make vocalization of bilabial consonants noticeable and contrastive with unvoiced bilabials. So *<sup>m</sup>pu* might not only be perceived by a Greek-speaker to have an aspiration (given that *pu*<sub>2</sub> is used to represent the bilabial aspirated unvoiced stop /p<sup>h</sup>/ in true Greek words like *pu*<sub>2</sub>-*te-re*), but also what in later Greek spelling is an unvoiced /p/ would be heard to be close to a /b/ sound. A spelling of an original place name *\*A(i)mp-us*, especially if pronounced by a local accustomed to the traditional pronunciation or language, then might be captured by what *pu*<sub>2</sub> represents during its development /<sup>m</sup>b<sup>h</sup>u/ > /<sup>m</sup>p<sup>h</sup>u/ > /p<sup>h</sup>u/. Notice that the following /i/ vowel seems to condition the development of the original consonant (> /m/) differently than does a following /a/ vowel (> /b/). Here we are suggesting that sign \*29 might be used for a consonantal sound in the range of /b/ - /mp/ - /p/ and, of course, /p<sup>h</sup>/. The personal name attested at Knossos *\*Φύθος* > Πύθος might retain its spelling *pu*<sub>2</sub>-*to* even as the first aspirate was being dissimilated and when it eventually became unaspirated.

Scott P. Myers measured my Voice Onset Time (VOT) for bilabial unvoiced plosive /p/ in English words that would have equivalent CV sounds to Greek. The intervals from the release of the closure (the beginning of the noise interval) to the onset of vowel voicing were for the unaspirated plosives in ‘spa’, ‘spit’ and ‘spook’: 7 milliseconds before the sound of *a*, 4 milliseconds before the sound of *ι* and 10 milliseconds before the sound of *u*. For aspirated plosives ‘pa’, ‘pit’ and ‘put’ the figures were 56 milliseconds, 49 milliseconds and 114 milliseconds respectively. This suggests that what sounds like aspiration might be more noticeable before the vowel sound *u*<sup>47</sup>.

46 Mandelbaum 1958, 48-49. The essay has the title in English translation of “The Psychological Reality of Phonemes.”

47 Myers cautions that Docherty 1992 does not report any effect of the backness of the vowel on the VOT of a

A major place name might have a fossilized pronunciation and what we call, in our age of grammars and dictionaries, a traditional spelling that would persist in usage among tablet-writers at a given site. It still takes a conscious, almost defiant, effort on my part to write the name Mao Zedong as opposed to the name I learned and used and read about from the time of my birth through the Vietnam War period: Mao Tse Tung. Transforming Peking into Beijing has been easier. But I would never dream of spelling –and have not seen on any menu in a Chinese restaurant so far in my lifetime– the culinary delight Peking duck written out as Beijing duck. In fact, Wikipedia (U.S.) begins its article on Peking duck<sup>48</sup>: “Peking duck is a dish from Beijing,” thus illustrating the persistence of traditional spellings in particular social contexts. There are other long noted examples of peculiar proper name spellings standing in contrast to common nouns, e.g., plurals like Toronto Maple Leafs (not leaves) and Mother Gooses (not geese)<sup>49</sup>.

Here we would contrast the consistency of the spelling *a-pu<sub>2</sub>* with the variety seen in the rendering of the artificial name imposed on the two provinces of Pylos after the relatively late state formation in Mycenaean palatial Messenia: *pe-ra-a-ko-ra-i-jo* (PY On 300) vs. *pe-ra<sub>3</sub>-ko-ra-i-ja* (PY Ng 332) vs. *pe-ra-ko-ra-i-ja* (PY Pa 398) vs. *de-we-ro-a<sub>3</sub>-ko-ra-i-ja*. It is not justifiable to wave away this variation in the treatment of the beginning of the post-prefix element of the name as an instance of meaningful variation *a-* vs. *a<sub>3</sub>* in word-initial spelling.

Two final points are worth making about the distinctive way of handling *a-pu<sub>2</sub>* as a place name and *ai-p<sup>(h)</sup>u-* ‘adjectivalized’ and ‘regularized’ when used in a compound Greek proper name.

The first is not trivial. *Testis unus testis nullus*. The spelling *a<sub>3</sub>-pu-* appears once in a single Mycenaean Greek personal name. The root of the word it represents is known to be pre-Greek and to show in its later likely historical Greek outcomes a fluctuation between aspirated /p<sup>h</sup>/ and unaspirated /p/. The normal signs in Linear B *pa*, *pe*, *pi*, *po* and *pu* all can represent /p/ and /p<sup>h</sup>/. (Recall *pu-te* = *phutēr* and *pu<sub>2</sub>-te-re* = *phutēres*.) There is no reason why *a<sub>3</sub>-pu-ke-ne-ja* here cannot be read as *Aip<sup>h</sup>ugeneia* = *Αἰφυγένεια*, which would be consistent with the spelling *a-pu<sub>2</sub>*. The outcome in /p/ would be a post-tablettique phenomenon.

Secondly, Lejeune accepts that the place name designation *a-pu<sub>2</sub>-ja* is a derivative in *-(i)jā* = “region de A”<sup>50</sup>. Yet he also reasons that another adjectival toponym in the Pylos corpus *ta-ra-ke-wi-ja* comes from an adjective of the *-ύς -εῖα -ύ* class used in the neuter as a noun, the Indo-European-derived *τραχύς* (posited place name *Τραχύ*). The fact then that *a-pu<sub>2</sub>* becomes adjectival in a different way may again reflect that the place name is perceived by at least some of the tablet-writers in a traditional pre-Greek pronunciation and so the derivative from it specifying its territory is not generated from the adjectivalized form *ai-p<sup>(h)</sup>u* that had already been completely assimilated into Greek. I.e., the tablet-writer of Jo 438 writes *a-pu<sub>2</sub>-ja* (analogous to \*56-*ra-ku-ja* and *pa-ra-ku-ja* with non-Indo-European root). He does not write \**a-pe-wi-ja* (an unattested, i.e., unused form, that would be analogical with the adjective class *ta-ra-ke-wi-ja*).

In conclusion then, I think there is enough evidence in the Linear B texts to argue for the original ‘identification’ of *a-pu<sub>2</sub>* with ‘Homeric’ *Αἰπύ*, as befits the topography and prominence of the archeological site of Iklaina. There are two options:

- (1) *a-pu<sub>2</sub>* represents a pre-Greek place name as a ‘traditional spelling’ for a toponym whose adjectival form (that lies behind the spelling *a<sub>3</sub>-pu-*) already was pronounced /aipu/ at the time of the Pylos tablets; or

---

preceding plosive.

48 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peking\\_duck](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peking_duck) (last visited June 21, 2020).

49 Kiparsky 1974.

50 Lejeune 1971, 354 and n. 69.

- (2) the pre-Greek place name that became ‘Homeric’ Αἰπύ still retained some aspects of its pre-Greek pronunciation and was rendered as precisely as it could be by  $a-pu_2$ , with  $pu_2$  denoting phonetic or phonemic aspiration and  $a-$  standing for a vowel sound that in Linear B times might or might not be heard as diphthongal /ai/. The spelling  $a_3-pu-$  in the compound anthroponym may represent diphthongal /ai/ and an aspirated /p/.

We think the evidence supports the second option somewhat better.

## ADDENDUM

The recent article by Anna Judson arguing for a specific and exclusive value of /p<sup>h</sup>u/ for Linear B sign \*29 =  $pu_2$  appeared too late to be worked into the argument of this paper. It is well worth reading for an alternative view of doublet and complex signs in Linear B<sup>51</sup>.

Judson’s argument is as complex and detailed as my argument here. It would require a separate paper to address the individual points that lead me to prefer the explanation of the values and historical development and use of signs \*22, \*29 and \*56 put forward by José Melena in 1987 and 2014<sup>52</sup>. Essentially, however, I think that Judson errs in explaining the function of doublet and complex signs too systematically, as if the inventors and users of the new Linear B script had the linguistic sophistication and intention to devise an ancient equivalent of the International Phonetic Alphabet.

$pu_2$  and related signs, in my opinion, were not introduced into and preserved in the Linear B script either because, as Judson proposes, they were “a great improvement in terms of eliminating ambiguity” or in order “to offer a means of decreasing the potential ambiguity by specifying one particular feature<sup>53</sup>.” They are unsystematically retained in Linear B and not just to represent more precisely Greek phonemes originating in Indo-European.

There is, in my mind, compelling evidence that signs \*22, \*29 and \*56 (all found in Linear A) were part of a system derived from Minoan phonology and retained in Linear B, not because these signs were part of an overall design to represent Greek words systematically and precisely, but because, like other doublet and complex signs, they had some utility in representing Greek and non-Greek sounds and Greek morphological patterns at the time the Linear B script was used. Their values could also develop through time, e.g., sign \*62 /pje/ > /pte/ in tolerably unsystematic ways.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aura Jorro, F., and F.R. Adrados, eds. 1985. *Diccionario Griego-Español. Diccionario Micénico*. Volume 1. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- \_\_\_\_\_, eds. 1993. *Diccionario Griego-Español. Diccionario Micénico*. Volume 2. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Baumbach, L. 1971. “The Mycenaean Greek Vocabulary II.” *Glotta* 49:151-190.
- Beekes, R. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. 2 vols. Leiden – Boston: Brill.
- Bennet, J. 1995. “Space Through Time: Diachronic Perspectives on the Spatial Organization of the Pylian State.” In *Politeia: Society and State in the Aegean Bronze Age*, edited by R. Laffineur and W.-D. Niemeier, 2, 587-602. *Aegaeum* 12. Liège: Université de Liège, Histoire de l’art et archéologie de la Grèce antique – Austin: University of Texas at Austin, Program in Aegean Scripts and Prehistory.

51 Judson 2017.

52 See above notes 40 and 41 and the related discussion.

53 Judson 2017, 59.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1998. "The Linear B Archives and the Kingdom of Nestor." In *Sandy Pylos*, edited by J.L. Davis, 110-133. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1999. "The Mycenaean Conceptualization of Space or Pylian Geography (...Yet Again!)." In *Floreat Studia Mycenaea*, edited by S. Deger-Jalkotzy, S. Hiller, and O. Panagl, 131-157. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Bintliff, J., ed. 1977. *Mycenaean Geography. Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium, September 1976*. Cambridge: The University Library Press.
- Carothers, J. 1992. "The Pylian Kingdom: A Case Study of an Early State". Ph.D. diss., UCLA.
- Chadwick, J. 1963 "The Two Provinces of Pylos." *Minos* 7:125-141.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1972. "The Mycenaean Documents." In McDonald and Rapp 1972, 100-116.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1976. *The Mycenaean World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chadwick, J., and L. Baumbach. 1963. "The Mycenaean Greek Vocabulary." *Glotta* 41:157-271.
- Chantraine, P. 2009. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. 2nd ed. Edited by J. Taillardat, O. Masson, and J.L. Perpillou with supplement by A. Blanc, C. de Lamberterie and J.L. Perpillou. Série linguistique 20. Paris: Librairie Klincksieck.
- Cosmopoulos, M. 2006a. "The Political Landscape of Mycenaean States: *A-pu<sub>2</sub>* and the Hither Province of Pylos." *AJA* 110:205-228.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2006b. "Das mykenische Siedlungsmuster Messeniens und die Struktur des pyliischen Reichs." *PZ* 81 (2):200-212.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2019. "State formation in Greece: Iklaina and the unification of Mycenaean Pylos." *AJA* 123 (3):349-380.
- Docherty, G.J. 1992. *The Timing of Voicing in British English Obstruents*. Berlin - New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Hope Simpson, R. 1981. *Mycenaean Greece*. Park Ridge, NJ: Noyes Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2014. *Mycenaean Messenia and the Kingdom of Pylos*. Prehistory Monographs 45. Philadelphia: INSTAP Academic Press.
- Judson, A.P. 2017. "The Mystery of the Mycenaean 'Labyrinth': The Value of Linear B *PU<sub>2</sub>* and Related Signs." *SMEA NS* 3:53-72.
- Kiparsky, P. 1974. "Remarks on Analogical Change." In *Historical Linguistics II*, edited by J.M. Anderson and C. Jones, 257-275. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Kirk, G.S. 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary vol. 1: books 1-4*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lejeune, M. 1956. "Remarques sur l'identification des caractères mycéniens." *Minos* 4:22-32.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1958. *Mémoires de philologie mycénienne. Première série (1955-1957)*. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1971. *Mémoires de philologie mycénienne. Deuxième série*. Incunabula Graeca 42. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
- Mandelbaum, D.G. 1958. *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language, Culture and Personality*. Berkeley - Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- McDonald, W.A., and G.R. Rapp, Jr., eds. 1972. *The Minnesota Messenia Expedition. Reconstructing a Bronze Age Regional Environment*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Melena, J.L. 1987. "On Untransliterated Syllabograms \*56 and \*22." In *Tractata Mycenaea*, edited by P.H. Ilievski and L. Crepajac, 203-232. Skopje: Macedonian Academy of Arts and Sciences.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2014. "Mycenaean Writing." In *A Companion to Linear B: Mycenaean Greek Texts and Their World*, edited by Y. Duhoux and A. Morpurgo Davies, 1-186. Bibliothèque des Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain 133. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.
- Morpurgo, A. 1963. *Mycenaeae Graecitatis Lexicon*. Incunabula Graeca 3. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
- Palaima, T. 2014. "Pylos Tablet Vn 130 and the Pylos Perfume Industry." In *KE-RA-ME-JA. Studies Presented to Cynthia W. Shelmerdine*, edited by D. Nakassis, J. Gulizio, and S.A. James, 83-90. Philadelphia: INSTAP Academic Press.
- Palmer, L.R. 1963. *The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts*. 1st ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ruijgh, C.J. 1963. "Vrouwen en kinderen in Pylos." *Forum der Letteren* 4:228-262.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1967. *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Ventris, M., and J. Chadwick. 1956. *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*. 1st ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1973. *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- West, S. 1988. "The Transmission of the Text." In *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey Volume 1: Introduction and Books I-VIII*, edited by A. Heubeck, S. West, and J.B. Hainsworth, 33-48. Oxford: Oxford University Press.