

KO-RO-NO-WE-SA

Proceedings of the 15th international colloquium on Mycenaean studies, September 2021

edited by J. Bennet, A. Karnava & T. Meißner

Ariadne Supplement Series 5, Rethymno 2024, p. 483-496

© The Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Crete, Greece, and the individual authors

Mycenaean *qe-te-o* and Greek adjectives in -τέος and *-eyo-

Rupert J. E. Thompson

Since the earliest days of the decipherment the general consensus has been that the forms variously spelt *qe-te-a*₍₂₎, *qe-te-(j)o* are somehow to be understood as semantically the equivalent of a classical verbal adjective in -τέος with a sense 'to be paid' or similar, either from *g^{wh}ed^h- (cf. θέσσασθαι),¹ or *k^wei- (cf. τίω).² Michael Ventris and John Chadwick accepted the sense but saw the missing /w/ as an insurmountable problem.³ They interpreted *qe-te-a*₍₂₎ as an *s*-stem neuter plural in /-e(h)a/, with *qe-te-o* a genitive singular in /-ehos/ or plural in /-ehōn/, comparing τέλθος 'debt, payment due;' the spelling *qe-te-jo*, which is difficult to square with an *s*-stem formation,⁴ was not then known.⁵

After the publication of the *qe-te-jo* forms the prevailing view, following Michel Lejeune, is that they represent an adjective in *-teyo- built to the root *k^wei- in the *e*-grade.⁶ For Lejeune this is a parallel formation to classical -τέος based on the verbal noun in *-ti-, *-tei- rather than that in *-tu-, *-teu-. Leonard Palmer agrees,⁷ but sees classical -τέος too as

¹ FURUMARK 1954, 42.

² MÜHLESTEIN 1955, 131 n. 60, noting the missing /w/ in a form traditionally derived from *-tewo, and seeing the spelling *qe-* (for expected *Ø*-grade *kwi-) as part of a larger phenomenon of *qe* standing for *qi*.

³ *Docs*², 220-221, 410.

⁴ LEJEUNE 1964, 90 and see below, p. 486-487.

⁵ The two examples from Pylos, **Fr 1206** and **Fr 1241**, were published in BENNETT 1958; the three examples from Thebes, **Gp 109** and **Gp 147** (twice) are in *FdC I*.

⁶ LEJEUNE 1964, 89-92 and then e.g. *Docs*², 577; DUHOUX 1976, 139-146; 2008, 266-267; *FdC I*, 278; HEUBECK 1985, 68; KILLEN 1979, 151-179; RUIJGH 1967, 267.

⁷ PALMER 1969, 260-261.

going back to *-teyo- not *-tewo-. Ernst Risch imagines a more complex situation,⁸ in which *qe-te-jo*, *qe-te-a₂* (he sees *a₂* as a spelling of /ya/) and classical -τέος all go back to *-tewyo- (Skt. -tavya), while *qe-te-o* and *qe-te-a* either come from Lejeune's *-teyo-, or from this same *-tewyo- with a special development *-ewyo- > *-eyyo- > -eo- at Knossos.⁹

Christos Piteros, Jean-Pierre Olivier and José Melena observe that the sense 'to be paid' is not compelling for the attestations of *qe-te-a₂* and *qe-te-o* on the sealings from Thebes, reject the interpretation as a verbal adjective altogether and decline to give a specific meaning.¹⁰

We can perhaps pass over the implausible suggestion that *qe-te-o* is /k^weitēon/, an adjective (but not of obligation) meaning 'costly'.¹¹ While not, perhaps, utterly impossible on **KN L 693**, the sense is scarcely appropriate elsewhere.

William Hutton was the first to systematically question the orthodoxy.¹² He rightly observes that nothing in the dossier of *qe-te-jo* requires it to be the equivalent of an adjective in -τέος, with sense 'to be paid' or otherwise, and that the various difficulties with such an interpretation militate against it. Instead, he sees in *qe-te-a₂* the plural of an *s*-stem neuter meaning 'fine.' The spelling *qe-te-jo*, which cannot be from an *s*-stem noun, he sees as a derived adjective, 'resulting from fines.' The forms *qe-te-a* and *qe-te-o* could be respectively an alternative spelling of *qe-te-a₂* and its genitive; but they could also, he claims, be from the adjective; and in support of this latter view he suggests that *qe-te-a₂* is used in contexts where goods are transferred to the palace, while records of outgoing use *qe-te-(j)o*, *qe-te-a*.

There is nothing in the dossier which requires a sense 'to be paid.' There are no occasions where quantities of goods described as *qe-te-o* are clearly shortfalls. Contrast the case of the term *o-pe-ro* and its abbreviation *o*, /op^helos/ 'debt, deficit,' which clearly do record shortfalls. In the Pylos taxation record **Ma 222**, for example, the quantities of the com-

⁸ RISCH 1976, 316.

⁹ This latter possibility is self-evidently special pleading. It is in any case rendered obsolete by the presence of both *qe-te-jo* and *qe-te-o* at Thebes.

¹⁰ PITEROS *et al.* 1990, 152-153, followed by HAJNAL 1992, 292.

¹¹ HAMP 1985.

¹² HUTTON 1990-1991.

modities in the assessment (line 1) equal the sums of the *o* and non-*o* entries in the *a-pu-do-si* /apudosis/ ‘payment’ (line 2): 10 units of *146 + 13 units *o(-pe-ro)* = 23 units in the assessment; 22 M-units of *RI* + one M-unit *o(-pe-ro)* = 23 M-units in the assessment. There is no such equation for *qe-te-o*.

PY Ma 222

(S90–H2)

.1 a-ke-re-wa *146 23 RI M 23 KE M 7 *152 10 O M 5 ME 500
 .2 a-pu-do-si *146 10 o 13 RI M 22 o M 1 KE M 7 *152 8 o 2 O M 5 ME 500 [
 .3 vac.]

The Knossos **L(5)** cloth records are superficially similar to the personnel records of the Pylos **Ac** series which record numbers of men present and missing (*o-pe-ro*) at various locations, and the Knossos **Do** lambing records where the shortfall in breeding targets are recorded as *o ovis^m*.

PY Ac 1275

(S1272–H20)

pe-ti-ni-jo VIR 25 o-pe-ro VIR 1

KN Do 927

(106)

.A] pe ovis^m 19
 .B]sę ovis^f 100 ki za ovis^m 30 o ovis^m 31

On the **Ld(5)** tablets quantities of cloth in the second line are contrasted to quantities of the same type of cloth labelled *qe-te-o* in the first. John Killen plausibly interprets these tablets as records of cloth undergoing finishing, the entries in the lower lines denoting disbursements of cloth already made to the finishers, the *qe-te-o* disbursements which are yet to be made; and he suggests that *qe-te-o* elsewhere also indicates a ‘shortfall in an issue or payment by the palace,’ contrasting with *o(-pe-ro)* which indicates a ‘shortfall in a contribution or payment to the palace.’¹³ Such an interpretation is consistent with but not required by the tablets he discusses. There are no totals recorded on the **Ld(5)** tablets to which the quantities of *qe-te-o* and non-*qe-te-o* cloth add up, nor do the sums on the two tablets where the quantities of both types are known add up to round numbers which could cogently be interpreted

¹³ KILLEN 1979.

as targets. Compare the lambing records, e.g. **KN Do 927** above, where the numbers of lambs present and missing add up to a multiple of ten.

Nor is Killen's suggestion compatible with the Thebes sealings. Three of these, **Wu 51, 65** and **96**, explicitly record animals being sent *te-qa-de* /T^hēg^wans=de/ 'to Thebes,' and each of the sealings records a contribution of a single animal or quantity of produce to the palace for consumption at a state banquet.¹⁴ Since they concern contributions to rather than payments from the palace, 'shortfall in an issue or payment by the palace' is impossible.

Furthermore, any kind of shortfall or deficit is unlikely. First, *qe-te-o* and *o-pe-ro* would indicate the same kind of deficit, viz. in a contribution to the palace. Second, **Wu 51, 65** and **96** would then record the non-contribution of animals which were to be paid later. They would be in modern parlance 'IOU's.' This is perhaps not utterly impossible; but it is hard to reconcile with **PY Un(3) 138** which, as Piteros *et al.* show, records the same commodities in similar quantities and is likely to have been compiled from a similar set of sealings for a similar purpose. For here all of the animals and products—or, at least, all of those in lines 1-4, are described as *qe-te-a₂*. **Un(3) 138** would not then record the ingredients for a state banquet, but the *absence* of those ingredients.

The difficulties besetting a connection of *qe-te-o* etc. and the -τέος verbal adjective are well known, but it is worth rehearsing them here as they are too-often simply side-stepped. In a nutshell, none of the spellings of the *qe-te-o* word shows any trace of a /w/, but the traditional etymology of -τέος is < *-tewo-, connecting it (as discussed below) to Skt. -tave. Conversely, the spelling *qe-te-jo* suggests the presence originally of a /y/—the spellings *qe-te-a₂*, *qe-te-a* and *qe-te-o* are compatible with this, on the likely assumption that intervocalic /y/ passed to /h/—which is not to be found in -τέος.

The -τέος adjective expresses obligation and is used only predicatively.¹⁵ With transitive verbs it is passive in sense and can, like the Latin gerundive, agree with the patient of the action it denotes, but it is more

¹⁴ PITEROS *et al.* 1990, 171-183.

¹⁵ On the attributive use of φατεῖός see below, p. 488.

frequently used impersonally. This is the only possibility with intransitives, either strict intransitives or with verbs taking a non-accusative complement, but it is also the most common construction with transitive verbs. In this construction the verbal adjective stands in the neuter singular (more rarely plural) with any object in the appropriate case.

To account for these peculiarities, Schwyzler argues that *-τέος* is derived from an infinitive in **-tewai* or **-tewei* from the verbal noun in **-tu-* (Latin *cantus* and the supines), seen in the Sanskrit dative infinitive in *-tave*.¹⁶ It generally has a final sense (*ā no nāvā matīnām yātām pārāya gāntave*, ‘come to us with the boat of hymns to go to the further shore,’ *RV* 1.46.11; *īndram codaya dātave maghām*, ‘urge Indra to give bounty,’ *RV* 9.75),¹⁷ while the predicative use expressing obligation is regular after the negative *ná*.¹⁸ In this respect it looks very *unlike* Greek *-τέος* which is predominantly in affirmative contexts.¹⁹

Nor is the pathway from an infinitive in **-tewai* or **-tewei* to an adjective in *-τέος* easy to imagine. If it were in the form **-tewai* used predicatively with a plural feminine noun in the nominative it might, after the remodelling of the *a*-stem nom. pl. as *-ai*, be misanalysed as an adjective (e.g. **πᾶσαι κολακεῖαι φευκτέαι*). But such instances must have been marginal and unlikely to trigger a wholesale reanalysis of both grammatical category and syntax.

A connection between *-τέος* and *-tave* is thus neither straightforward nor necessary. A further consideration is the relatively late date from which *-τέος* adjectives are attested. The earliest literary example would be Theognis 689 (οὐ χρὴ πημαίνειν ὅτε μὴ πημαντέον εἶη), if that were genuinely written by Theognis. Otherwise it is Pindar *Olympian* 2.5–6 (Θήρωνα δὲ τετραορίας ἔνεκα νικαφόρου | γεγωνητέον.) celebrating a victory won in 476 BC. The earliest inscriptional example I have been able to find is in a business letter inscribed on lead found in the Phocaeen colony of Emporion, *SEG* 37:838, which the editors date epigraphically to the first quarter of the 5th century.²⁰ The letter is fragmentary but contains in line 7 the phrase τί τούτων ποητέον.

¹⁶ SCHWYZLER 1959, 1, 810-811.

¹⁷ WHITNEY 2003, 352.

¹⁸ MACDONELL 1916, 335.

¹⁹ BISHOP 1899, 9.

²⁰ SANMARTÍ & SANTIAGO 1987.

Hesiod has οὐ τι φατειόν describing Cerberus at *Theogony* 310, in the nominative describing Φόβος at *Shield* 144 and in the genitive plural qualifying ὀφίων at *Shield* 160. If this were a -τέος adjective (the -ει- would have to be by metrical lengthening) it would push back the date of our earliest example considerably. But the accent (to the extent that it can be trusted) is in the wrong place, and it is used attributively, not predicatively. Tempting as it is to see it as an attributive precursor to the classical forms, it is far from clear that we should. It is worth noting too that one scholiast (ad *Theog.* 310) glosses φατειόν as λεκτόν rather than λεκτέον, another οὐ τι φατειόν as οἶον οὐ ῥητὸν κατὰ ἀξίαν, ἢ οὐ φονεύσιμον. Eustathius (*Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem* 1.70) derives it from φατός by ‘πλεονασμός.’ The ancient commentators saw it, then, as the equivalent of a -τός rather than of a -τέος adjective.

So, if Hesiod’s φατειός is not a -τέος adjective in disguise, the earliest attestation in the inscriptional record will be the early in 5th century, and the earliest literary attestation in the 6th (if Theognis) or early 5th (if Pindar). It is of course possible that these adjectives were circulating in sub-literary registers before the earliest evidence available to us. This is quite likely, I think, given that their syntax is fully developed when we first see them—Aeschylus for example has both the impersonal construction (τοιουῶδε φωτὸς πεῖραν εὖ φυλακτέον, *Seven against Thebes* 499) and the personal (καρπὸς οὐ κομιστέος, *ibid.* 600). But their total absence from epic is suspicious. The earliest literary examples are poetic, and in verse which sits squarely in the Ionic tradition (Theognis) or is influenced by it (Pindar, Aeschylus).²¹ Add to this that the second earliest inscriptional example (indeed the only other inscriptional example I have found before the 3rd century) is in a verse epigram consisting of two hexameters and a pentameter quoted in an inscription from Epidaurus (*IG IV*², 1 121, second half of the 4th century) commemorating the miraculous cure of one Cleo, who having been pregnant for five years, finally gave birth through the intervention of the god:

οὐ μέγε[θο]ς πίνακος θαυμαστέον, ἀλλὰ τὸ θεῖον,
πένθ’ ἔτη ὡς ἐκήησε ἐγ γαστρὶ Κλεῶ βάρος ἔσσε

²¹ *pace* DUHOUX 2000, 314 who sees it as “une forme typique de prose [qui] ne se soit diffusée que lentement en poésie.” It is true that in the 4th century it has found its *floruit* in essentially technical prose (philosophy, the Hippocratic corpus), but if anything it seems to have spread *to* prose, and literary prose at that.

ἐγκατεκοιμάθη καί μιν ἔθηκε ὕγιῃ.

A truly early (i.e. Proto-Indo-European) date is thus far from certain, and one cannot help but wonder, with Duhoux,²² whether the *-τέος* verbal adjective is a development internal to Greek. But if so, it looks like it must have arisen reasonably early in order to have been inherited by, or spread to, Doric, Attic and Ionic by the 5th century. This is suggested, too, by the fact that the feminine is in *-εᾶ* in Attic (πεῖρά τις ζητήεα, Sophocles *Ajax* 571) and *-έη* in Ionic (οὐ σφι περιοπτέη ἐστὶ ἡ Ἑλλάς ἀπολλυμένη, Herodotus 7.168), since this implies that it was present in both dialects at an earlier stage with final vowel [æ:] < *ā. The hiatus in Attic, for expected *-εο-* > *-ου-*, must be due to the presence of some segment between the two vowels which was lost after the contraction ceased to operate and before the split of [æ:] > [ɛ:] ~ [a:] in Attic, and the only candidate is *w. Thus *-τέος* must go back to **-tewos* whether or not it is related to Vedic *-tave*.

One other etymology which has sometimes been pressed into service²³ can be quickly dismissed. Sanskrit has a gerund in *-tavya* which appears to be a **-yo-* derivative of the **-teu-* stem of the *-tave* infinitive. Now **-tewyo-* could underlie Hesiod's φατειός from a phonological perspective;²⁴ but *-tavya* appears to be an internal Sanskrit development which post-dates the *Rig Veda*. In any event, it could not underlie either Attic *-τέος* (we would expect **-τεῖος*), or Mycenaean *qe-te-jo* etc. which would show *w*.

Looking from the other direction *qe-te-jo*, at least, suggests a derivation from **-teyo-* which, *contra* Palmer²⁵, cannot underlie Attic *-τέος* since the change of **y* > **h* > \emptyset predates the contraction of *-εο-* to *-ου-*.

In summary, *qe-te-jo* and its variants cannot be the 2nd millennium precursor to classical *-τέος* verbal adjectives of obligation.

What of Lejeune's suggestion that *qe-te-jo* is an alternative adjective of obligation based on the verbal noun stem **-ti-* (with *e*-grade and thema-

²² DUHOUX 2000, 314.

²³ e.g. RISCH 1976, 316.

²⁴ LEJEUNE 1964, 89-92.

²⁵ PALMER 1969, 260-261.

tisation), as $-\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$ is to $*-tu-$?²⁶ The connection of $-\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$ and $*-tus$ presupposes that $-\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$ is old, as it requires ablauting $*-tu-/-teu-$, which, as we have seen, is far from clear. Lejeune himself admits that the semantics of the $*-tis$ nouns are less suited to the derivation of (passive) adjectives of obligation than those of $*-tus$;²⁷ and that this idea is simply a way of squaring *qe-te-jo* as being such an adjective with the impossibility of deriving it from $*-tewo-$.²⁸

We have seen, then, that *qe-te-jo* etc. cannot be connected with classical Greek $-\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$; that an (unparalleled) adjectival derivation from $*-tis$ nominals is simply a way of rescuing its interpretation as an adjective of obligation; but that nothing in the dossier requires such an interpretation and several things argue against it.

The most obvious feature of the *qe-te-jo* family is the variety of forms $-e-a$, $-e-a_2$, $-e-jo$ and $-e-o$. Of these $-e-a$, $-e-jo$ and $-e-o$ all resemble forms of an adjective in $*-eyo-$. It is standardly assumed that the spelling alternation between $-e-jo$ and $-e-o$ in such adjectives reflects the weakening and subsequently the possible loss of intervocalic $*y$. Whether this weakening is ongoing at the time of the tablets or has already taken place (the $-j-$ being then a historical spelling) is immaterial for the present discussion. If correct then $-e-a_2$, too, could be a spelling of such an adjective.

Hutton²⁹ rejects any connection with the $*-eyo-$ suffix on the following grounds: (i) the spelling $-e-a_2$ would entail a change $*y > /h/$ in intervocalic as well as initial position, for which there is no evidence; and (ii) 'almost all the identifiable words ending in $-a_2$ are plurals of s -stem nouns or adjectives'.³⁰ For this reason he prefers to see *qe-te-a₂* as an s -stem plural /k^{w(h)}et^heha/ 'fines' while *qe-te-jo* (which cannot be a case-form of an s -stem noun), *qe-te-o* and *qe-te-a* are adjectives derived from the same stem. In support of this he argues that *qe-te-a₂* occurs in

²⁶ LEJEUNE 1964, 89-92.

²⁷ LEJEUNE 1964, 105 n. 81.

²⁸ LEJEUNE 1964, 91.

²⁹ HUTTON 1990-1991, 129.

³⁰ He also notes *en passant* that there is no form *qe-te-ja* corresponding to the frequent $-e-ja$ in adjectives of material. If this were used against *qe-te-jo* containing the $*-eyo-$ suffix it would of course be an *argumentum ex silentio* and the numbers of tokens we are dealing with are small.

contexts which ‘definitely or possibly record the transfer of goods to the palace,’ while the other spellings occur in contexts ‘recording the movement of goods from the palace.’ Now while *qe-te-jo* could be a spelling of a derivative **k^wet^hes-yo-*, it is much less plausible that *qe-te-o* and *qe-te-a* could do so since the outcome of intervocalic **sy* is always spelt *-j-*. The semantic distinction between the spellings is also not clear cut, since on **TH Wu 49, 50, 53** and **63** *qe-te-o* is used in the context of animals being sent to the palace, not from it. This objection could be overcome if here *qe-te-o* could somehow be seen as */k^wet^hehos/*, the gen. sg. of *qe-te-a₂*, although the motivation would not be at all clear.

More significantly, however, it is unlikely that **k^wet^hes-* would form a derived adjective in **-yo-*. While this suffix is of good Indo-European origin and is certainly attested in Greek, it is found only in very ancient formations which are mostly morphologically opaque, e.g. μέσ(σ)ος < **med^hyo-*. In productive usage it has in Greek been supplanted by its variant **-iyo-*.³¹ But from an *s*-stem this suffix would derive a form in **-esiyo-* > */-e(h)i(y)o-* which in this case would give **qe-te-i-jo* rather than *qe-te-jo*, and certainly not *qe-te-o*. Taking these as adjectival derivatives of an *s*-stem noun seems implausible.³² It seems equally implausible that *qe-te-a₂* and *qe-te-o* are different formations (an *s*-stem noun and an adjective from a different lexeme) when both are found in the same context on the Thebes sealings.

Are Hutton’s objections to *qe-te-a₂* being from the **-eyo-* suffix cogent? Not really. While it is true that evidence for **y* > */h/* medially is scant, this should hardly come as a surprise.

We know that **y* underwent lenition, both initially and medially. In initial position the outcome in non-psilotic dialects of later Greek is */h/*, as is the outcome of lenition of initial **s*. Although the lenition of **s*, both medially and initially, looks earlier than that of **y*—of which traces remain in Mycenaean spelling, at least—there is no reason to suppose that the pathways were different (viz., **s/y* > */h/* > \emptyset).

Otherwise, the only clear evidence for intervocalic **y* giving */h/* in Mycenaean would come from the use of *a₂* from **ya*, and the only

³¹ CHANTRAINE 1933, 33–34.

³² Examples of **-iyo-* adjectives from *s*-stem nouns in Mycenaean include *e-ke-i-ja* /enke(h)ia/ ‘for spears,’ *e-ra-te-i-jo* /elate(h)ios/ (ethnic adjective of **e-ra-to*, dat.loc. *e-ra-te-i*, acc. seen in *e-ra-to-de* /elatos=de/); *e-te-wo-ke-re-we-i-jo* /etewoklewe(h)ios/ ‘son of Eteocles,’ **56-ko-we-i-jo* (ethnic adjective of **56-ko-we* whose dat.-loc. is **56-ko-we-e*, **56-ko-we-i*).

clear forms in which this might occur (discounting the *qe-te-jo* family) are the feminines and neuters of adjectives of material. Meißner³³ has shown that where it results from *s, intervocalic /h/ has almost certainly been lost already at Knossos—where *a*₂, both medial and initial, is restricted to the Room of the Chariot Tablets and the Northern Entrance Passage, which might well be earlier than the rest of the deposit,³⁴ and to the theonym *ε-ma-a*₂[on **KN X 9669**. Even if /h/ < *y has not been lost at Knossos—and the co-existence of spellings with and without *j* would suggest not—it is clear that the tradition of using *a*₂ to write /h/ has not lasted there. We would not, therefore, expect to find *a*₂ in forms of adjectives of material which lack *j*.

At Pylos, on the other hand, intervocalic /y/ is almost totally consistently written.³⁵ Other than the *qe-te-jo* family, the relevant forms are the participle *to-ro-qe-jo-me-no* /trok^weyomenos/ (Hand 1) and the adjectives of material. Of the latter, 44—the vast majority—are by Hand 2, all with *j* written. Hand 26 has written one form, with *j*. Hand 32 has written four with *j*. I have argued elsewhere³⁶ that Hands 1 and 2 are linguistically conservative, and it comes as no surprise, then, that they write the *j* in these words, nor that Hand 2 writes *qe-te-jo* twice.

Hand 6, however, in **PY Un(2) 853** has written]-we-e-*a*₂[which has plausibly been identified as *we*]-we-e-*a*₂, an alternative spelling of *we-we-e-a* = /werwehe(h)a/ < **werwes-eyo-* ‘woollen’.³⁷

It is interesting then that Hand 42 at Pylos writes *qe-te-a*₂ (once—this is the only example of the *qe-te-jo* family other than the two in Hand 2).

What emerges from the preceding discussion is that it is overly bold to claim that *-e-a*₂ cannot be the spelling of an outcome of **-eyā*. We would not expect to see such a spelling at Knossos, where for various reasons *a*₂ is marginal. At Pylos the majority of the adjectives of material (88%) are written by a scribe who always writes the *j*, and so here, too, our chances of seeing an adjective of material in *-e-a*₂ are low. There are simply no grounds for asserting that *qe-te-a*₂ would not be a licit spelling for a form in /-eha/ < **-eyā*. Indeed, if Hand 6’s]-we-e-*a*₂[is /werwehe-

³³ MEISSNER 2007.

³⁴ DRIESSEN 1990; 1999; 2008.

³⁵ DUHOUX 1987, 107-108.

³⁶ THOMPSON 1996-1997.

³⁷ *Docs*², 411, s.v. *we-we-e-a*. It remains the case that *we-we-e-a* is the only other word containing the sequence *we-e* followed by an /a/ vowel.

ha/ then there is an example of such a spelling. In fact, the attested spellings of the *qe-te-jo* family align perfectly with the spellings of adjectives of material at Knossos and Pylos.³⁸

Hutton's objections to *-e-a₂* being a spelling of /-eha/ < **-eyā* are thus not compelling, and while *qe-te-a₂*, *qe-te-a* and *qe-te-o* could be forms of an *s*-stem noun, *qe-te-jo* could not be, nor an adjective derived from it. On the other hand all forms of the *qe-te-jo* family could be analysed as adjectives in **-eyo-* and fit with the attested distribution of spellings of such adjectives by site and by scribe. The most economical route, then, at least from a morphological perspective, is to see them as adjectives in **-eyo-*.

An obvious objection to such an interpretation is on semantic grounds: **-eyo-* forms adjectives of material, a sense which is scarcely appropriate for the dossier of *qe-te-jo*. Yet this need not be insurmountable. **PY Ta 722.2** records a footstool decorated *ka-ra-a-pi*, *re-wo-te-jo* /krā(h)app^{hi} lewonteyois/ 'with lion heads,' while **PY Tn 996.1** has a pair of bathtubs described as *re-wo-te-re-jo* /lewotreyō/ 'for bathing.' Neither of these **-eyo-* adjectives is of material, suggesting that the suffix had undergone some semantic extension.

As to the lexeme to which the adjective is built, there is still little to go on. The idea that the commodities so designated might have been levied by fines which were 'earmarked for religious purposes'³⁹ is certainly attractive. Hutton compares the statues at Olympia which were paid for out of fines imposed upon cheats in the games; and given the obvious connection with feasting of many of our examples, the present author is reminded of the 'fines' levied in bottles of port against those presenting candidates at graduation in Cambridge whose charges commit misdemeanours of dress, and which are then consumed at a dinner by the ceremonial officers. That is, of course, only speculation. But if right, one might wonder whether there was, after all, some connection with the verbal adjective, not in *-τέος*, but in *-τός*, and with the root **k^wei-*. That is to say, might we be dealing with a form **k^wei-ton* 'paid'

³⁸ From Thebes we have *qe-te-a₂*, *qe-te-jo* and *qe-te-o* but no adjectives of material. From Mycenae we have one adjective of material (*wo-ro-ne-ja*) but no forms of *qe-te-jo*.

³⁹ HUTTON 1990-1991, 130-131.

perhaps substantivised as ‘fine,’ from which a secondary **k^weiteyos* ‘comprised of fines’ was derived? The semantics of the root are suitable (compare τίνω, ‘pay a penalty’), and *qe-ja-me-no*, if /k^wei(h)amenos/ ‘receiving compensation’ (KN Og 8532.1, PY Eb 294.1, Ep 704.1), would show the same lexeme with the same sense in Mycenaean. The *e*-grade is not overly problematic. Although the \emptyset -grade appears to be original in the *-tos* adjective there was a tendency to replace it with the *e*-grade.⁴⁰ That this may have started already in Mycenaean is suggested by *re-po-to* /lepton/ ‘fine’ (KN L 693.1, PY Un(4) 1322.5), formally the **-tos* adjective from λέπω ‘strip, peel.’ The *e*-grade has certainly spread at the expense of the \emptyset -grade in this root in other forms such as Ion. (ἐκ)τεισις, Arc. (ἐσ)τεισις,⁴¹ and Arcadian has a present imperative (ἀπυ)τειετω in IG V,2 6.43.

⁴⁰ CHANTRAINE 1991, 283.

⁴¹ LEJEUNE 1964, 91.

Bibliography

- BENNETT, E. L. JR. 1958 *The olive oil tablets of Pylos. Texts of inscriptions found, 1955.*
- BISHOP, C. E. 1899 The Greek verbal in *-teo*: part I, *AJP* 20, 1-21.
- CHANTRAINE, P. 1933 *La formation des noms en grec ancien.*
- CHANTRAINE, P. 1991 *Morphologie historique du grec*, 3rd ed.
- DRIESSEN, J. 1990 *An early destruction in the Mycenaean palace at Knossos: a new interpretation of the excavation field-notes of the South-East area of the West Wing*, *Acta Archaeologica Lovaniensia* 2.
- DRIESSEN, J. 1999 The Northern Entrance Passage at Knossos and its possible role as central archives. In *Florent 1995*, 205-226.
- DRIESSEN, J. 2008 Chronology of the Linear B texts. In *Companion* 1, 69-79.
- DUHOUX, Y. 1976 *Aspects du vocabulaire économique mycénien (cadastre - artisanat - fiscalité).*
- DUHOUX, Y. 1987 Linéaire B crétois et continental: éléments de comparaison. In *Tractata Mycenaea* 1985, 105-128.
- DUHOUX, Y. 2000 *Le verbe grec ancien: éléments de morphologie et de syntaxe historiques*, 2nd ed.
- DUHOUX, Y. 2008 Mycenaean anthology. In *Companion* 1, 243-393.
- FURUMARK, A. 1954 Ägäische Texte in griechischer Sprache, *Eranos* 52, 18-60.
- HAJNAL, I. 1992 Der mykenische Personennamen *a-e-ri-ko-ta*. In *Mykenaiika* 1990, 285-301.
- HAMP, E. P. 1985 KN L693: *qe-te-o* and μάντις, *Minos* 19, 51-53.
- HEUBECK, A. 1985 Zu einigen Problemen der pylischen Tafeln An 607, *Minos* 19, 61-90.
- HUTTON, W. F. 1990-1991 The meaning of *qe-te-o* in Linear B, *Minos* 25, 105-131.
- KILLEN, J. T. 1979 The Knossos Ld(1) tablets. In *Colloquium Mycenaicum* 1975, 151-181.
- LEJEUNE, M. 1964 Sur quelques termes du vocabulaire économique mycénien. In *Mycenaean Studies* 1961, 77-109.
- MACDONELL, A. A. 1916 *A Vedic grammar for students.*
- MEISNER, T. 2007 Notes on Mycenaean spelling, *CCJ* 53, 96-111.
- MÜHLESTEIN, H. 1955 Zur mykenischen Schrift: die Zeichen *za*, *ze*, *zo*, *Museum Helveticum* 12, 119-131.

- PALMER, L. R. 1969 *The interpretation of Mycenaean Greek texts*, 2nd rev. ed.
- PITEROS, C., OLIVIER, J.-P. & MELENA, J. L. 1990 Les inscriptions en Linéaire B des nodules de Thèbes (1982): la fouille, les documents, les possibilités d'interprétation, *BCH* 114, 103-184.
- RISCH, E. 1976 Die Stoffadjektive auf *-ejos* im Mykenischen. In A. MORGURGO DAVIES & W. MEID (eds), *Studies in Greek, Italic and Indo-European Linguistics offered to Leonard R. Palmer on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, June 5, 1976*, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 16, 309-318.
- RUIJGH, C. J. 1967 *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*.
- SANMARTÍ, E. & SANTIAGO, R. A. 1987 Une lettre grecque sur plomb trouvée à Emporion (Fouilles 1985), *ZPE* 68, 119-127.
- SCHWYZER, E. 1959 *Griechische Grammatik*.
- THOMPSON, R. J. E. 1996-1997 Dialects in Mycenaean and Mycenaean among the dialects, *Minos* 31-32, 313-333.
- WHITNEY, W. D. 2003 *Sanskrit grammar*, 3rd ed.