A Companion to Linear B
Mycenaean Greek Texts and their World

VOLUME 2

edited by

Yves Duhoux
and
Anna Morpurgo Davies

PEETERS
LOUVAIN-LA-NEUVE – WALPOLE, MA
2011
CONTENTS

Table of Contents .......................................................... V

Foreword ........................................................................ VII

Chapter 11. Y. DUHOUX, Interpreting the Linear B records: some guidelines .............................................. 1

Chapter 12. T.G. PALAIMA, Scribes, scribal hands and palaeography ....................................................... 33

Chapter 13. J. BENNET, The geography of the Mycenaean kingdoms ...................................................... 137

Chapter 14. S. HILLER, Mycenaean religion and cult ............................................................................. 169

Chapter 15. J.L. GARCÍA RAMÓN, Mycenaean onomastics ................................................................. 213

Chapter 16. † C.J. RULIGH, Mycenaean and Homeric language ............................................................. 253

Indexes ............................................................................... 299

1. General Index ............................................................... 299

2. Index of Linear B Texts ..................................................... 315

3. Index of Linear B Words .................................................... 319

4. Index of Linear B Undeciphered Syllabograms .......... 329

5. Index of Linear B Abbreviations/Ideograms ............... 329

6. Index of Alphabetic Greek Words ................................ 331
CHAPTER 13

THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE MYCENAEAN KINGDOMS*

J. BENNET
University of Sheffield

SUMMARY

§13.1. Introduction ................................................................................................. 137
§13.2. Place-Names: identification ....................................................................... 139
§13.3. Place-Names: their nature and reference ................................................... 140
§13.4. Geography: linking place-names to particular physical locations .......... 144
§13.5. Geographies ................................................................................................ 148
  §13.5.1. Knossos ........................................................................................ 148
  §13.5.2. Pylos ............................................................................................. 151
  §13.5.3. Other Mycenaean centres ............................................................ 155
§13.6. References to areas outside the ‘Mycenaean world’ ................................. 157
§13.7. Conclusion .................................................................................................. 162
§13.8. Further reading including lists of Linear B place-names .......................... 162
§13.9. References for Chapter 13.......................................................................... 162

§13.1. INTRODUCTION

Geography was implicated in the very origins of the discipline of Mycenaean studies, the decipherment itself. In his famous Work Note 20 (originally circulated in June 1952) Ventris identified Amnisos prior to identifying Knossos and Tylisos, only then going on to propose some lexical items:

One of the most likely Cretan placenames is Amnisos, a few kilometres NE of Knossos .... If Amnisos does occur ... and the phonetic assumptions above are

* The editors received the first version of this chapter in November 2006.
1 I should like to thank the editors for their patience and for valuable comments on earlier drafts. John Baines offered sage advice on matters Egyptological, while Peter Day, Hal Haskell, Richard Jones and John Killen kindly allowed me access to work in progress in relation to inscribed stirrup jars. As ever, none of the above should be held responsible for remaining errors of fact or judgement; for these, I claim sole responsibility.
correct, we should expect it to be written in the form ⚗ - ⚙. and we do in fact find that one common sign-group, and one only, contains these signs: ⚗ ⚙ ⚘, which forms an adjectival form ⚗ ⚙ ⚘ ⚙ ⚘ ⚙ / and a locative (?) ⚗ ⚙ ⚘ ⚙ ⚘. (VENTRIS 1988, 328)

The identification of place-names on Crete and the Greek mainland in the Linear B documents, however, has more extensive implications than its role in the decipherment. Although seemingly obvious, it is of no small significance that we are able to confirm the Bronze Age names of the centres at Knossos (ko-no-so), Pylos (pu-ro), and Thebes (te-qa-), even if those of Mycenae and Tiryns still elude us. It is widely recognised (e.g., KILLEN 2008) that the Linear B documents offer a biased view, recording only those activities of direct interest to the palatial centres in which they were found. Not all of these activities took place at those centres, however, a fact demonstrated partly by the very existence of place-names in the documents. Furthermore, where these locations can be fixed in the modern landscape, even if relatively rather than absolutely, we can reconstruct an outline of the extent of palatial interests or control (depending on one’s view of the nature of the Mycenaean state’s relation to its territory). Perhaps more significantly, when we take into account the nature of activities associated with place-names (agriculture, animal management, manufacture, tax collection, cult activity, for example), we can determine patterning in palatial operations, suggesting, for example, the existence of important places with subordinate administrative roles (e.g., BENNET 1985; 1999a), or that certain activities carried out close to the centres are controlled in more detail (e.g. offerings: KILLEN 1987; land: KILLEN 2008), or even different constructions of the landscape from the perspective of Linear B administrators (e.g. BENNET 1999a, 133-34).

Merely being able to say that x is a place-name or that there are n place-names in the archive is not terribly useful in examining the areas controlled by the Mycenaean palaces. We really need to be able to determine some patterning in the distribution of place-names in order to say anything meaningful regarding the economic and political geography of the Mycenaean polities (e.g., BENNET 1988).

There are difficulties, however. In the first instance, only a relatively small proportion of Linear B place-names can be identified with historically attested and locatable ancient names; an even smaller number of those with sites known to have been in use at the period to which the documents belong. So, identifying a Linear B sign-group as a place-name does not automatically allow us to talk about it in relation to a specific, known geographical location. Equally, there are no surviving (cf. BENNET 1999a, 131-33) Mycenaean maps that might
allow us (at least approximately) to locate unlocatable place-names on the
ground. If we wish to propose relative locations, then we are dependent on the
principle of assuming that *textual* proximity (e.g., within a list, or a series of lists
of place-names) reflects *geographical* proximity in the real world (below §13.4).
Furthermore, we need, where possible, to understand the rationale(s) for such
lists (e.g., BENNET 1985, 240-42; 1999a, 139-41; KILLEN 1977, 42-43).

§13.2. PLACE-NAMES: IDENTIFICATION

With this in mind, then, how do we identify place-names within the docu-
ments that comprise the Linear B corpus (see also this volume, Chapter 15)?
There are three ways in which this can be achieved (e.g., MCARTHUR 1985, 7;
1993, 19-93). The most obvious is the identification of a sign-group — within
the spelling conventions of Linear B and allowing for sound changes between
late second- and first-millennium BC Greek — with a place-name known from
later historical sources, as was the case for Amnisos, Knossos and Tylisos
(above §13.1; this volume, Chapter 15). Such identifications should ideally be
supported, where necessary, by context and/or by patterns of morphological
variation in the sign-group identified in this way. We would expect a place-
name to exist potentially in four distinct forms:

- plain place-name (‘London’): base-form (e.g., *ko-no-so*, Knōs(os); KN
  Ak[1] 626.1)
- ‘ethnic’ form (‘Londoner’): base-form + a suffix of the pattern -(i)-jo/-(i)-ja
  (e.g., *ko-no-si-ja*, Knōs(s)ia; KN As [2] 1516.2; *ko-no-si-jo*, Knōs(s)ios; KN
  As[1] 608.3)
- ‘allative’ form (‘to London’): base-form (acc.) + -de (-ōe) (e.g., *ko-no-so-de,
  Knōs(os)onde; KN C[1] 5753)
- ‘ablative’ form (‘from London’): base-form + -te (-ōeν) (e.g., *ko-no-so-te,
  Knōs(s)othēn [not attested in the surviving documents]; see KILLEN 1983, 219,
  226, for a possible example: *a-ke-re-u-te* ‘from the place *a-ke-re-u-*’; MY
  Ge 606.2)

Many of the identifiable place-names in the Linear B corpus offer attestations
of this morphological variation, another example being Amnisos (*a-mi-ni-so*)
as Ventris observed (above §13.1).

However, of the 400 or so place-names that can be identified in the Linear
B corpus (see below §13.5.1), perhaps fewer than 20 are securely identifiable
with later historically attested names and are locatable on a modern map. Clearly,
if we had to rely solely on this number of place-names to reconstruct
the geography of the Mycenaean world from Crete to Boeotia, we would have very little to go on. We are fortunately not solely dependent on identifiable place-names, but can expand the repertoire of plausible place-names considerably using two other procedures. First, we can identify other sign-groups that follow the morphological pattern outlined above, but cannot be equated with later place-names. Second, we can assume that, where secure place-names are attested, those sign-groups occurring in parallel contexts within the same document or closely related sets or series of texts are also place-names.

To take a simple example, among the Knossos sheep tablets (the 600 or so of the Da-g series: OLIVIER 1988), there are a number of occurrences of the identifiable place-name tu-ri-so (Τυλάσσω). KN Db 1241 (hand 117) is a good example:

.A ovis\textsuperscript{m} 80 ovis\textsuperscript{f} 20
.B wa-du-na-ro //, tu-ri-so ,

There are almost 30 other sign-groups that occur in this same position (for details, see OLIVIER 1988, 266), some of them identifiable (e.g., pa-i-to, Φαιστός), many of them not, but almost certainly fulfilling the same function as place-names. Thus, for example, KN Db 1155 (hand 117) has the sign-group da-wo in this position:

.A we-we-si-jo ovis\textsuperscript{m} 86 ovis\textsuperscript{f} 14
.B wi-jo-ka-de // da-wo

Although we cannot identify this with a known place-name, it also occurs in other contexts in the expected ‘ethnic’ forms da-wi-jo (e.g., KN Am[1] 568.b) and da-wi-ja (e.g., KN Ak[3] 780.1), although an allative form (*da-wo-de) is not attested.

The ability to recognize place-names in the archive depends quite heavily on the quantity of material available. Where large numbers of texts are available, as they are at Knossos and Pylos, those place-names not readily identifiable with a later Greek name can be isolated on the basis of morphological patterns, and thus identified in other texts, as outlined above. Where only a small number of texts are available (e.g., at Mycenae and Tiryns), this is less easy to achieve.

§13.3. Place-Names: Their Nature and Reference

Having identified a place-name, it is important to understand its reference, since place-names can refer to many different types of features on the landscape.
If we think of modern western maps, for example, their reference may range from settlements (of all sizes from conurbations to hamlets, or farmsteads) to other human features of the landscape (churches, power stations, reservoirs, etc.) and a host of natural features (rivers, mountains, hills, valleys, etc.). So it is important to consider the status of the place-names contained in the Linear B archives. In the majority of cases, these seem to be places where humans were resident or active: settlements of varying sizes, diversity of function, or status, plus, in addition, some special-purpose locations, such as sanctuaries (e.g. HILLER 1981; WEILHARTNER 2005), possibly metal-working areas (PY Jn: SMITH 1992-93). The case of the Knossos sheep tablet place-names just mentioned is a good one. We might imagine that these denote the locations in which flocks were pastured, not necessarily in or even near settlements, but many of the place-names identified appear also in contexts within the archive other than shepherding, implying that the settlement is what was referred to by the place-name. We assume, therefore, that the place-name defines the settlement in which the ‘shepherd’ associated with the flocks was resident, wherever the flocks were actually pastured at any one moment.

It follows from this that the actual etymology of the place-name need not be relevant to its usage as the name of a settlement, sanctuary, or other location of human activity. We can propose etymologies for a number of place-names attested at Pylos, for example. So, the Further Province district centre *ti-mi-to-ako may perhaps be τηρμίνθον ἅγκος, ‘glen of the terebinth trees’ (PALAIMA 2000). The Hither Province centre ri-jo is transparently ‘Ῥίον, ‘promontory’, just possibly the promontory on which modern Koroni lies (cf. Fig. 13.2), if Strabo’s attribution of the name Rhion as an alternative to Koroni’s ancient name, Asine, is correct (cf. BENNET 1999a, 148). The Hither Province place-name, probably coastal because it appears on one of the o-ka tablets (An 657.12), e-ra-po ri-me-ne seems to represent ἐλάφων λιμένει, ‘stag harbour’ (VAN EFFENTERRE 1990-1991). Finally, the Hither Province district centre ka-ra-do-ro may represent Χάραδρος, ‘gorge’, or, perhaps, a dual form, as John Chadwick once proposed, arguing that it was appropriate to the site of Foinikous (cf. Fig. 13.2), where two gorges converge (CHADWICK 1972, 110). So, although we may be able to determine the meaning of a place-name, and this may, in some instances reflect the local topographical or environmental situation, the meaning is largely irrelevant to the use of the place-name. This is especially true if the name belongs originally to another language, such as the widely attested -s(s)os or -nthos names in the Aegean.

Another difficulty is the possibility that places might appear in the documents under various names, because different subdivisions of a single (large) site were referred to by different names, or because naming was ‘nested’, one
name referring to a district, another to the chief settlement in that district. Mabel Lang discussed this possibility in relation to the Pylos archive, suggesting that the large numbers of place-names there might imply multiple references, whereby sub-divisions of settlements went by different names and districts and central places may have had different and unrelated names (LANG 1988, 186). As an example, the two place-names at Pylos e-ra-to and ro-u-so seem to be interchangeable because they appear in identical position in list order on PY Jn 829.10 (ro-u-so), as opposed to Cn 608.9 and Vn 20.9 (e-ra-to). John Chadwick explained the alternation by suggesting that ro-u-so is the district term and e-ra-to that for the central place (CHADWICK 1972, 102). My own suggestion, however, is that the names may reflect the existence of twin major settlements in this district of Pylos’s Hither Province, either side of a major topographical feature (BENNET 1999a, 147), unless we assume that an administrative reform was in progress at the time of the documents. Support for the idea that ro-u-so is a settlement, as opposed to merely a district designation, is offered by the presence of 86 female textile workers there (CHADWICK 1988, 85). Equally, as John Killen has pointed out, ro-u-so not only appears as the central collection point on PY Ma 365, but is also listed, with its own contribution, on PY Mn 456, which lists contributions of *146 cloth by individual place-name (KILLEN 1996). The most likely interpretation of this situation is that ro-u-so was used to define the major settlement at which Ma commodities were collected, but was itself a contributor of such commodities, as were a number of other places within the overall district — the appearance of si-re-wa both on Mn 456.4 and Ma 126 lends further support to the suggestion that Mn 456 represents a breakdown of ro-u-so’s territory, as does the similar appearance of a-si-ja-ti-ja, a Further Province place-name, on both Ma 397 and Mn 162.8.

Convincing examples of district denotations do occur, however. The major town of one of the Pylos Further Province districts was pu-ro, normally distinguished in the documents to avoid ambiguity by the additional adjective ra-wa-ra-ti-jo (e.g., PY Cn 45.1), but, on the Ma documents, it is simply noted as ra-wa-rafta2, or ‘the land of *ra-wa-ra-to’ (Ma 216.1). Other examples are: a-te-re-wi-ja, ‘Άτρης, ‘the land of Atreus’ (PY Ma 244.1); e-sa-re-wi-ja, ‘the land of [the?] e-sa-re-u’ (PY Ma 330.1); and, possibly, me-to-re-ja-de, Μεντόρειονδε, ‘to the land of Mentor’ (TH X 433.b: ARAVANTINOS – GODART – SACCONI 2006, 8-9). Indeed, it has been remarked that of the nine place-names we have preserved as major district centres in the Pylos Further Province, five are forms that seem to mean ‘land of …’ (RUIPÉREZ – MELENA 1990, 115; cf. BENNET 1999a, 143).

The only convincing incidence of a sub-division within a settlement appears to be that suggested by John Chadwick for ke-re-za (PY Aa 762, etc.), which
he believed to be a subdivision (perhaps the lower town, as distinct from the citadel?) of the Englianos settlement normally referred to in Linear B as pu-ro (Chadwick 1988, 84-85). The fact that, in some instances, a specific subdivision could be denoted (e.g., by the term wa-tu, Fāστυ, ‘town’ [KN V 114], or do-de, δῦδῦ, ‘to the house’ [TH Of 26, 31, 33], or wo-ko-de, Φοικόνδε, ‘to the house/temple’ [TH Of 36]), implies that Linear B administrators were capable of making a specific distinction of subdivisions, where required. We should note, however, that in these instances we are dealing with lexical items that have exact equivalence in later Greek, but that we cannot be certain of their specific meaning in the Mycenaean period.

Some of the place-names in the documents reference natural features, but these appear in particular contexts. Thus the term *a_ko-ra-i-jo at Pylos represents a major feature around which the polity was articulated into ‘this-side-of-’ (de-we-ro-, cf. alph. Greek δεῦρο, ‘hither’) and ‘beyond-’ (pe-ra-, cf. alph. Greek πέρα, ‘beyond’). The term almost certainly refers to the mountain later known as Αἰγαλέων (Strabo 8.4.1-2; cf. Bennett 1995, 588-89 and below §13.5.2), but it is used administratively to define the two major provinces of the Pylos polity, normally referred to by scholars as the Hither (de-we-ro-a_ko-ra-i-ja) and Further (pe-ra_ko-ra-i-ja) Provinces (cf. Fig. 13.2), not primarily as a reference to a topographic feature. Similarly, at Knossos, the term di-ka-ta appears (e.g., KN Fh 5467.a; Fp[1] 7.2), presumably denoting (a?) mount Dikte, but even so, in the context of the Linear B documents, which record offerings ‘to Dikta’ (di-ka-ta-de), it probably refers to a sanctuary on the mountain, not to the mountain itself (e.g., Killen 1987, 172-73; cf. Crowther 1988). This is consistent with other place-names, often limited in use, that seem to refer to shrines, such as da-da-re-jo-de, Δαίδαλεϊνόδε (KN Fp[1] 1.3), perhaps also ro-u-si-jo a-ko-ro, ‘the ἄγρος (‘plain’, ‘territory’) of ro-u-so’, and pa-ki-ja-jo a-ko-ro, the ἄγρος of pa-ki-ja-ne (in the PY Fr texts) and also some of the less frequently occurring terms in the KN Fs documents (e.g., McArthur 1985, 112-14; Hiller 1981; Weihartner 2005, in general). In some instances (e.g., KN Fp[1] 1) the absence of a place-name implies an offering directly to the deity within the palace area. River names also occur, such as ne-do-wo-ta-de, ‘to the Ned(w)on’ (PY An 661.13), although this perhaps refers to a settlement on the river (as seems possible from PY Cn 4.6).

It is unclear whether the place-names ever refer to non-settlement features, except when ethnics are used. There are two clear reasons why this is likely to be so. First, the documents are not involved in geographical or topographical description. In this respect they are unlike later boundary treaties, in which state boundaries are defined by a string of topographic terminology: river, gorge, ridge, peak, occasionally roads, even more occasionally sanctuaries and
settlements (e.g., Faure 1967; Van Effenterre – Bougrat 1969; Inscriptions Creticae III.i.v.9). The second reason is that the palace is in all cases dealing with people — not always named, sometimes identified only by title (e.g., ko-re-te, etc.), or as groups — who (however much they may range over the landscape) tend to be based in, or deal with people in a settlement. On the whole, then, we should expect the majority of place-name references on the tablets to be to locations of human settlement or activity.

§13.4. GEOGRAPHY: LINKING PLACE-NAMES TO PARTICULAR PHYSICAL LOCATIONS

Our first strategy in linking place-names to particular locations is clearly to make use of those place-names identifiable with later, historically attested names. However, John Chadwick reminds us that even this seemingly secure strategy has its limitations:

It was natural … that in the first flush of enthusiasm we tended to identify many Mycenaean names at Pylos with similar classical ones; for the recognition of familiar Cretan names on the Knossos tablets was both a starting point and a proof of the decipherment. No one will impugn the equation of Pu-ro with Πύλος; but almost all the others have been attacked with more or less success. It has become clear that we must draw a sharp distinction between identifying a name with its classical form, and identifying the geographical site meant with the classical town. (Chadwick 1963, 125)

It is crucial, in other words, to be sure that the location referred to is the same one as that known historically and that this location was inhabited or in use at the time to which the documents belong. Among the Pylos place-names, for example, there are a number that can be equated with later Peloponnesian names (see Talbert 2000, Map 58, for locations): for example, o-ru-ma-to (PY Cn 3.6), recalling the later mountain name Ἔρυμανθος in Akhaia; re-u-ko-to-ro (e.g., PY Ad 290) Λεύκτρον, the name of two settlements in the Mani and Arkadia; e-ko-me-no (e.g., PY Cn 40.5), resembling later Ὀρχωμενός in Arkadia (and Boeotia); and ro-u-so (e.g., PY Jn 829.10) Λουσώι, the name of a city and sanctuary in Arkadia (cf. Figs. 13.2-3). Plausible though these equations are, these locations mostly lie outside the area generally accepted as falling within Pylos’s control (pace Herrero Ingelmo 1989) (see below §13.5.2). Even further afield would be the place-name ko-ri-to, Κόρινθος (e.g., PY Ad 921; possibly Nn 831.1), if it could be equated with classical Corinth. It is possible that this Corinth is to be associated with the vicinity of the modern village of Longa, near the coast north of ancient Asine (modern Koroni),
where a temple of Apollo Korythos (cf. Fig. 13.2) was excavated early in the 20th century (McDonald – Rapp 1972, 312-13, with references; cf. Pausanias 4.34.7, who gives the form ‘Korynthos’; SEG xi.993-5).

Somewhat similar is the case of a-pa-ta-wa among the Knossos place-names (e.g., KN Co 909.1). Although almost certainly an early form of the place-name later known as Ἀπταρα or Ἀπτερα, the Bronze Age place-name probably does not refer to the location of the later city, since there is very little material there of that period. Rather, a-pa-ta-wa may have denoted the site of Stylos, a little further inland, where there was a tholos tomb and other features (cf. Fig. 13.1; Bennett 1985, 236; cf. Kanta 1984). The identification of place-names in this way produces ‘fixed points’ in generating maps of Mycenaean political geography.

A second strategy, however, is required to deal with the much larger number of place-names that cannot be linked to locations known from later historical sources. Here we rely on the possibility that we can convert ‘associations’ in documents into relative geographical links in the real world. If we can generate groups of place-names with strong textual ‘associations’, among which are one or two ‘fixed points’, then we can begin to pin these down to specific regions. The idea of using textual proximity to suggest geographical proximity is not new in Mycenaean studies (e.g., Hart 1965). Examining the question of relative geography for the Knossos archive in the late 1960s and 1970s, Leonard Palmer developed the concept of the ‘scribal route’ already implicit in Hart’s work (Hart 1965, 3, n. 1; Palmer 1972, 33; cf. Meleca 1975, 121-23), by which he did not mean an actual route that an administrator (= ‘scribe’) would have taken on the ground when carrying out an inspection (as suggested, for example, by PY Eq 213: o-wi-de, ‘thus he saw’) or gathering data, but rather a ‘route’ followed in the scribe’s mind — bearing some relation to actual topography — when recording place-names (Palmer 1979, 47). The same principles were used in a larger study of Knossian geography by an Italian team in the 1970s (Cremona – Marrazzi – Scarpa – Sinatra 1978).

The difficulty of processing the relatively large number of associations (the Knossos archive contains approximately 1150 individual place-name occurrences) meant that the problem was ideally suited to broadly statistical applications (i.e., examining co-occurrences without assumptions about actual location as a series of links in a matrix), either by hand or using computers. Drawing on earlier analyses of the relative geography of the place-names mentioned in the famous documents from the 19th century BC Assyrian trading colony (karum) at Kültepe, ancient Kaneš (e.g., Gardin – Garelli 1961; Tobler – Wineburg 1971), John Cherry and Joan Carothers carried out computer analyses of Pylian (Cherry 1977; Carothers 1992) and Jennifer McArthur of
Knossian geography (McArthur 1993). At about the same time, Tony Wilson applied statistical methods to the Knossos corpus (Wilson 1977). Sample sizes need to be sufficiently large to satisfy the criteria for such analyses, thereby limiting their applicability to the major archives at Knossos and Pylos. The picture presented in the different studies of each region is reassuringly consistent.

Essentially what the computer technique, called multi-dimensional scaling (MDSCAL), does is to use a series of associations between pairs of items (in this case, place-names) to devise a way of arranging those items most economically in a space of as few dimensions as possible, ideally two (cf. McArthur 1993, 238-39; Cherry 1977, 77-78). The resulting solution (see, e.g., Cherry 1977, figs. 4, 5, and 7) is not a map, since the application makes no assumption about orientation (north, south, etc.) or about distance, but can be scaled and oriented to the ‘real world’ by using fixed points, such as known place-names or known boundaries, like the Hither/Further province boundary at Pylos (Cherry 1977, 77-78).

However, although studies of the type mentioned do produce unbiased data on relative geography, there can be problems in assuming that geographical proximity is the sole reason for textual proximity, as I indicated some years ago for Knossos: there may be other reasons for place-names to be collected together on the same document (Bennet 1985, 240-42; cf. Killen 1977, 42-43).

We do need to consider the circumstances in which textual associations might be generated, as Tony Wilson remarked in the course of his study of Knossos geography:

In considering the reasons for associations, it may help to envisage how the scribes could have obtained the information that is recorded in the tablets. Two possibilities suggest themselves; either the scribes (or their appointees) left the palace to secure the information or it came into the palace by other means. Whichever, if not both, is true, significant associations between toponyms seem likely to arise for one or more of three reasons: (i) information from individual places was obtained and then deliberately recorded in the same context, (ii) information from a number of places was obtained from one ‘central place’ and recorded as received, (iii) information from a number of places was collated by their lord (or his officer) and then supplied to the scribe who recorded it as received. (Wilson 1977, 95)

We need to be aware of the possibility that ‘scribal routes’ are merely artefacts of data assembly, not necessarily of geographical proximity, as David Kendall warned at the Cambridge Colloquium on Mycenaean geography in 1976:

…let us remember the fate of the genealogist who thought that he could put all the former inhabitants of his village into the houses they lived in in 1851, by following the census-taker’s route from house to house, until a friend reminded…
him that the census lists were very possibly made up over a pot of ale in the local public house (Kendall 1977, 87).

Despite these ‘cautionary tales’, where consistent patterns are built up through careful analyses, we can be reasonably confident that they are genuine and offer some insight into relative geography within the Mycenaean polities.

A good example is the group of place-names that seem to have lain in the vicinity of Knossos itself, sometimes referred to as the ‘Tylissos group’ (e.g., Hart 1965, 5: ‘Lyktos-Tylissos group’). If we compare the two Knossos texts E 749 and Og 833, we can see that they list the same place-names, but in slightly different order, and one place-name (tu-ri-si-jo, Τυλίσιο-) occurs only on Og 833 (cf. Hart 1965, 3-5):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Og 833 (?hand)</th>
<th>E 749 (h. 136)</th>
<th>Pp set (h. 119)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.0 supra mutila</td>
<td>.1 qa-ra-jo , GRA 25</td>
<td>493: ti-ri-to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1 [su-]ri-mi-jo[</td>
<td>.2 ru-ki-ti-jo GRA 23</td>
<td>495: qa-ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2 [u-]ta-mi-jo[</td>
<td>.3 ti-ri-ti-jo GRA [</td>
<td>494: su-ri-mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3 [ti-]ri-ti-jo M ’6</td>
<td>.4 [su-]ri-mi-jo GRA τ2 ν3</td>
<td>496: u-ta-no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4 qa-mi-jo M 6</td>
<td>.5 qa-mi-jo , GRA 12 τ5</td>
<td>497: qa-mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5 pu-si-jo M 5</td>
<td>.6 u-ta-ni-jo , GRA [</td>
<td>498: e-ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6 ru-ki-ti-jo M 9</td>
<td>.7 pu-si-jo , GRA 6[</td>
<td>498:2: pa-i-to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7 tu-ri-si-jo M 4</td>
<td>.8 vacat</td>
<td>499: to-so [total]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.8 qa-ra-jo M 9</td>
<td>.9 vacat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.9 to-so M 47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10 vacat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The different scribes (E 749 is by hand 136; Og 833 by an unidentified hand) clearly did not follow the same ‘route’ (even starting at different points), but they clearly had the same group of place-names in mind, although tu-ri-so only occurs on Og 833. The reality of the group is further supported by the Pp series (by yet another scribe, hand 119) which again lists most of the same place-names — with the addition of e-ra and pa-i-to — but on single-entry, elongated tablets. The only possibility of defining an order in the Pp series is from Evans’s published photograph (SM II, pl. XXXVIII) showing the tablets in situ in the order given above (not their numerical order: cf. Meleena 1975, 120). Of the juxtapositions produced by this order, we have su-ri-mo + u-ta-no, plus two that are repeated in the Dn tablets, by yet another hand (117): ti-ri-to + qa-ra (Pp 493-495; Dn 1095) and u-ta-no + qa-mo (Pp 496-497; Dn 5559).

Finally, we should note that the absence of a place-name almost certainly implies activity located at whatever centre the documents were written (i.e., this is the ‘default’ location). Examples are the Knossos Ld(1) documents that, almost alone of all the Knossos documents dealing with sheep, wool and cloth, contain no place-names and record bales of cloth in storage at Knossos (Kilien...
Similarly, the Knossos Sd texts record chariots, some having no place-name, while others contain *pa-i-to*, Phaistos (KN Sd 4413.b), *ku-do-ni-ja*, Kydonia (KN Sd 4404.b) or *se-to-i-ja* (KN Sd 4407.b) (Lejeune 1968, 23-24).

§13.5. Geographies

§13.5.1. Knossos (Fig. 13.1)

Following the principles outlined above, we can identify approximately 100 place-names in the Knossos archives (Bennet 1985, 233 [103, more likely 98]; McArthur 1985 [81 ‘certain and probable’, plus 18 ‘uncertain or doubtful’]; 1993 [80 ‘certain and plausible’]). The geography of the Knossos polity is largely reconstructed around a series of fixed points and the following place-names are likely to refer to locations known in later sources (Fig. 13.1; cf. also Talbert 2000, Map 60):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a-mi-ni-so} & \quad (\text{Άμνισός}) \\
\text{a-pa-ta-wa} & \quad (\text{Άπτάρα}) \\
\text{ko-no-so} & \quad (\text{Κωνός}) \\
\text{ku-do-ni-ja} & \quad (\text{Κυδωνία}) \\
\text{pa-i-to} & \quad (\text{Φαιστός}) \\
\text{tu-ri-so} & \quad (\text{Τυλισός})
\end{align*}
\]

![Fig. 13.1. Crete, showing place-names mentioned in the text and other key features.](image)
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Some other possible equivalences (e.g., CHADWICK 1973a; MCARTHUR 1993, 23-24) are either unlikely to denote the later site (e.g., u-ta-no = Ῥτανός) or involve phonological problems (e.g., se-to-i-ja, if it were to represent the place-name behind the epigraphically attested form Σηταήται [modern Siteia]: *Inscriptiones Creticae* III.vi.7; cf. also BENNET 1987).

These fixed points suggest a minimum extent of the Knossos polity from Kydonia (modern Hania) in west Crete, through Aptarwa (the region of later Aptera, east of Hania), to Tylisos, Amnisos, and Knossos itself, in north-central, and the Phaistos region in south-central Crete. East Crete does not seem to have been included (BENNET 1987). However, using place-name associations with these fixed locations, we have built up a relative geography for a larger number of place-names that suggests that, at the time of the main archive (LMIIIA2 [early], ca 1350 BC), Knossian interests extended over much of Crete from the west as far east as the Lasithi massif. This contextual control allows the relative location of place-names in regions, in turn suggesting further possible ‘fixes’, such as: wi-na-to = ἔνατος (modern Inatos – Tsoutsouros) and ra-su-to = Λάσυνθος (confirmed by a Hellenistic inscription from the Kato Symi sanctuary with the tribal name Λασύνθοι [KRITZAS 2000]) falling in east-central Crete; e-ko-so = Ἀζωσ (although the variation in initial vowel quality and the absence of digamma attested in historical period inscriptions raise serious difficulties: cf. CHADWICK 1973a, 42) and su-ki-ri-ta = Σόβριτα in west-central Crete (although the later form would be more consistent with a Linear B form *su-qi-ri-ta*: cf. CHADWICK 1973a, 42); ru-ki-to = Λύκτος (unless this indicates a form Lukistos, a possible predecessor for later Λύκαστος; we would strictly expect Linear B *ru-ko-to* for Lyktos); and, possibly, di-ka-ta Δίκτα, in the Knossos region, perhaps Mt Iouchtas (unless it refers to modern Dikte in Lasithi) (Fig. 13.1; cf. also TALBERT 2000, Map 60).

Some independent confirmation for the location of place-names defined as west Cretan by documentary context comes from analysis of the clay composition of stirrup jars, on a small number of which these place-names appear painted before firing (CATLING – CHERRY – JONES – KILLEN 1980; also DAY – HASKELL 1995; KILLEN 2010). The Co series, by hand 107, lists sheep, goats, pigs and cattle against six place-names: a-pa-ta-wa (909), ka-ta-ra-i (906), ku-do-ni-ja (904), o-]du-ru-wo (910), si-ra-ro (907), and wa-to (903). The presence of both Aptarwa and Kydonia in this small set strongly implies a west-Cretan location for them all. It is also worth noting that this hand also wrote a document with the word ko-no-so-de (‘to Knossos’; KN C[1] 5753), implying that his administrative interests, if not his physical location, lay outside Knossos itself, no doubt in the west of the island. Of the Co place-names, wa-to appears on at least six (and probably eight) stirrup jars found at Thebes in
Boeotia (TH Z 846; 849; 851; 852; 853; 854; 878 [?]; and 882 [?]); _o-du-ru-wi-jo_ appears on one (TH Z 839); and _si-ra-ri-jo_ may appear on a vessel at Tiryns (TI Z 29). Where these vessels have been analysed, their clay composition is consistent with production in the Hania region of western Crete (CATLING – CHERRY – JONES – KILLEN 1980; DAY – HASKELL 1995; _Transport Stirrup Jars_). Two other significant place-names appear on stirrup jars found on the mainland: _da-*22-to_, on a vessel found at Eleusis (EL Z 1), and _*56-ko-we_, on a vessel from Tiryns (TI Z 27), as well as an unpublished fragment found at Knossos. Contextual analysis suggests these place-names lay in west-central Crete, but only the Eleusis vessel has been analysed; its composition is not consistent with manufacture in west Crete and appears not to be central Cretan either (_Transport Stirrup Jars_).

Although the Knossos archive preserves the largest number of Linear B texts from any site in the Aegean, it seems that these belong to at least two, possibly more (DRIESSEN 1997), destruction horizons. Specifically, the archive in the Room of the Chariot Tablets (DRIESSEN 2000) belongs almost certainly a generation or so earlier than the main archive, perhaps at the beginning as opposed to near the middle of the 14th century BC. The existence of a time difference between the two major groups of texts raises the possibility of exploring the history of expansion of the Knossos polity. Driessen has argued that east-central Crete and possibly the Amari region are underrepresented in the earlier archive, suggesting expansion into those areas over the life of the Knossos polity (DRIESSEN 2001). I proposed the existence of a number of second-order centres within the Knossos administration, including Kydonia, Phaistos (perhaps to be equated with the site of Ayia Triada at this date: BENNET 1992, 97, n. 96), and _se-to-i-ja_, and that different regions were subject to different types of integration (BENNET 1985). Thus, the north-central region around Knossos itself was more directly managed from the centre, while areas to the south (the Mesara region, in the vicinity of Phaistos – Ayia Triada), east and west of this area were less directly managed, involving a greater degree of control through ‘collectors’ (BENNET 1992; cf. HART 1965, 14-15). Finally, it seems that the west of the island, the region around Kydonia, was perhaps semi-independent at the time of the main Knossos archive, although it is clear that there was an archive at Kydonia in the mid-13th century, post-dating the main Knossos archive (HALLAGER – VLASAKIS – HALLAGER 1992). The location of the second-order centre _se-to-i-ja_, clearly an important place, is undetermined, although suggestions have been made (BENNET 1985, 243 [Malia]; FARNOUX 1996 [Archanes]); it may have functioned as a second-order centre for east-central Crete. Crucially, it is very unlikely to reflect the modern Cretan name Siteia (e.g., BENNET 1987; CHADWICK 1973a, 40).
Driessen has offered some valuable qualifications of this model (Driessen 2001), proposing that there is little evidence that Knossos was in total control of a large, continuous territory at any point in its Linear B administrative history, but was selective both in the specific regions and the activities in which it maintained an interest. This can be supported by the observation that the 100 or so place-names in the Knossos archive are distributed over quite a large proportion of the island, perhaps 25-33%, an area of about 2000-2700 km², but represent a very small proportion of known archaeological sites from this period (e.g., Bennet 1988, 26-31). Equally, the Knossos archive as a whole has relatively few place-names (25, or 26% of the total attested) that occur only once in the archive; these probably fulfilled specialised functions in relation to palatial interests, such as sanctuaries. The strong indication is, therefore, that the administrators at Knossos dealt with its region indirectly through larger settlements, in many cases those places that had already been of significance in the preceding Neo-Palatial period, prior to the introduction of Linear B as an administrative script (e.g., Bennet 1990). So, it appears that Knossian administrators adapted pre-existing palatial centres to their new administrative network.

It is finally worth noting that the Homeric picture of Crete in the Catalogue of Ships in Iliad 2 (Hope Simpson – Lazenby 1970, 112, Map 6) includes only the central part of the island, the core of the Linear B Knossos polity. This is of interest, since we know that in the mid-13th century BC, there was a Linear B administration at Hania in west Crete (Hallager – Vlasakis – Hallager 1992), presumably by now independent of Knossos, but including, even on the four surviving tablets, personal names formed from place-names already known in the Knossos archive: wa-ti-jo (KH Ar 4.1; cf. KN Co 903.1: wa-to); pu-na-si-jo (KH Ar 4.2; cf. KN Da 1588.B: pu-na-so).

§13.5.2. Pylos (Fig. 13.2)

In the Pylos archive, approximately 247 place-names have been identified (Sainer 1976 [254 items, but not all place-names in the Pylos polity]). This archive offers fewer securely identifiable place-names than that at Knossos. Only one place-name, pu-ro (= Πύλος), can be identified with a particular physical location, the so-called Palace of Nestor and its surrounding town at Ano Englianos. This identification provides interesting confirmation of the tradition preserved in Strabo (8.4.1-2) that the original location of the classical Pylos at Koryphasion had been elsewhere, ‘under Aigaleon’. The profound discontinuity in place-names suggests a distinct rupture in settlement in Messenia.
between the Late Bronze Age and the early Iron Age, supported by the precipitous decline in attested site numbers over this period (cf., e.g., McDonald – Rapp 1972, maps 8-14 and 8-15). Place-names that echo those attested in other regions of the Peloponnesian in later historical periods (above §13.4) may have moved in the wake of the polity’s collapse around 1200 BC.

Beyond the location of pu-ro itself, the geography of the polity has largely been reconstructed around the topography of Messenia (e.g., Chadwick 1972; Bennett 1999a; Cosmopoulos 2006 is a useful summary), but Messenia has been the subject of two major archaeological research projects with regional scope — the Minnesota Messenia Expedition (McDonald – Rapp 1972) and the Pylos Regional Archaeological Project (e.g., Davis [ed.] 2007) — that offer an understanding of settlement distribution across its territory unparalleled in Crete. A number of texts (Py Ng 319.1; 332.1 [totalling flax for the two provinces]; Pa 398.a; Wa 114.2; 948; On 300.8) express the conceptual division of the polity into two provinces (de-we-ro-a3-ko-ra-i-ja and pe-ra3-ko-ra-i-ja) on either side of what is almost certainly the Aigaleon chain that runs from just inland of modern Kyperissia in the north to Mt Lykodimos in the south, west of modern Petalidi (ancient Korone). Exactly where the boundary lay has been a subject for debate. Some scholars suggest that the Hither Province settlements extended inland, up the Kyperissia valley (e.g., Chadwick 1972, 104; Hope Simpson 1981, 144-52), while others see the northern boundary as the mouth of the Kyperissia river, with the Further Province extending up that valley, ‘beyond Aigolaion’ from the point of view of the coast (e.g., Bennett 1998-99, 19-20; 1999a, 133-34).

In addition to the province division, fixed-order lists situate nine place-names in the Hither Province and seven (Py Jn 829) or eight (Py Ma series) in the Further. Pylos, as the centre, does not appear on the lists, but is strongly associated with the fifth name in the Hither Province lists, pa-ki-ja-ne (possibly Sfakian). It is very likely that these place-names represent subordinate centres within the Pylian administration, focal points for the collection of taxes (e.g., Bennett – Shelmerdine 2001), for example (Py Ma series), or for the distribution of wine for local festivals (Py Vn 20). The major Hither Province place-names on the list seem to run down the west coast of Messenia from north to south, beginning either at the River Neda (the boundary between Messenia and Triphylia in Strabo’s day: Strabo 8.3.22) or, more likely in my view, the Kyperissia valley. The place-names then extended around the Akritas peninsula to a point somewhere to the north of modern Koroni. Those in the Further Province lay on the Pamisos valley, beginning at the northern shore of the Gulf of Messenia, extending up to the Soulima valley region (Chadwick 1973b; Shelmerdine 1973; Bennett 1999a). The eastern boundary of the polity was
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Fig. 13.2. Messenia and the western Peloponnese, showing place-names mentioned in the text and other key features. 3
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presumably the Taýgetos range, perhaps marked by the River Nedon (cf. *nedo-wo-ta-de*, ‘to [the] Nedon’: PY An 661.13).

The territory is therefore probably somewhat smaller than that of the modern district (Nomóz) of Messenia, perhaps 2000 km² as opposed to 2991 km². The large number of place-names spread over this territory that is of the same order of magnitude as that of Knossos implies a deeper reach to the lower levels of settlement within the Pylos polity (e.g., *Bennet* 1995, 594-96). The fact that there are a large number (116, or 47%) of place-names that occur only once, suggesting their specialised relationship to the palace (e.g., in flax production) also supports this implication. Even though the place-name numbers are large at Pylos, they are nevertheless unlikely to represent the total number of settlements occupied at the time of the archive (e.g., *Bennet* 1995, 594-96; cf. *Whitelaw* 2001, 63-64).

Following the example of Joan Carothers, if not necessarily the detail of her analysis (Carothers 1992, 233-34; cf. *Bennet* 1995, 593-95; 1999a, 146-47), it is possible to correlate the major sites identified archaeologically with the place-names assigned to the two provinces, given the relative locations provided by the fixed-order lists. The most convincing identification that has been proposed is that of the Linear B place-name *ti-mi-to-a-ke-e* (perhaps *tirmínqwn áykóz*, ‘glen of the terebinth trees’: *Palaíma* 2000) with the archaeological site of Nichoria (*Selmérdine* 1981). Nichoria is clearly an important site, with a megaron and tholos tomb, while the Linear B place-name appears first in the Further Province lists and is within sight of the coast, as its presence in the *o-ka* tablets demonstrates (PY An 661.10). Similar arguments, if not as certain, can be made about the place-names *a-ke-re-wa* (possibly the archaeological site of Koryfasio *Beylerbey*: Hopé Simpson – Dickinson 1979, D4; *Bennet* 1999a, 146), *a-pu2-we* (perhaps Iklaina *Traganes*: Hopé Simpson – Dickinson 1979, D46; *Bennet* 1999a, 147; *Cosmopoulos* 2006, 215-24), and others (discussion in Chadwick 1972; Hopé Simpson 1981, 144-52; Stavríanopoulos 1989; *Bennet* 1999a, 139-49; *Cosmopoulos* 2006). For the problems involved, the issue of the place-name *re-u-ko-to-ro*, Λευκτρον, argued by some to be the capital of the Further Province, is a good example (see discussion in *Bennet* 1998-99, with references).

The possibility of linking Linear B place-names to archaeologically recognisable sites has created the possibility of introducing a dynamic into the essentially static, synchronic picture offered by the documents. Linking the Linear B data to the diachronic picture suggested by changes in the archaeological data, we can suggest that Pylos expanded its polity from west to east, first incorporating local rival centres in the early Mycenaean period (LHI-II, ca 1600-1400 BC), then the Hither Province (by LHIIIa1, ca 1400 BC), before
expanding to the Further Province, perhaps beginning with the Nichoria region in LHIIIA2, *ca* 1350 BC (e.g., Bennett 1995; 1999a; 1999b; Bennett – Schlemerdine 2001). It is even possible that the northern margins were still in ‘administrative flux’ at the time of the documents late in the LHIIIB period, *ca* 1200 BC (e.g., Bennett 1998-99).

It is worth observing finally that the picture of a divided polity is consistent once again with the ‘Homeric’ picture (cf. Hope Simpson – Lazenby 1970, 75, Map 4), in which Telemachus stops at Pherai on his way to Laconia in the *Odyssey*, while nine towns, all in western Messenia, are listed in the Catalogue of Ships (*Iliad* 2.591-4), and Telemachus meets Nestor on the shore sacrificing nine bulls, at the opening of *Odyssey* 3. Equally, the seven towns offered to Achilleus as a ‘gift’ by Agamemnon in *Iliad* 9 seem to be in eastern Messenia, recalling the number of districts in the Linear B Further Province, if not the names. It would seem, then, that, despite the extreme loss of population in Messenia at the end of the Bronze Age, elements of the structure (two provinces) and detail (nine units under the western province) remained in the tradition (cf. Bennett 1997). However, the specific place-names listed in the *Iliad* bear little resemblance to either group attested in the Linear B documents, a fact that is consistent with the extreme depopulation of the region in the early Iron Age.

### §13.5.3. Other Mycenaean centres (Fig. 13.3)

#### §13.5.3.1. The Bronze Age name of Thebes (te-qa-, presumably Thēgʰai, or possibly singular Thēgʰa) first appeared on a tablet recovered at Mycenae in 1953 (MY X 508.a), but it was then attested among the sealings recovered in 1982 at Thebes itself (TH Wu 51.β; 65.β; 96.β) (see Schlemerdine 2008, §5.7). Among the place-names on these documents were also ka-ru-to, i.e. Karystos (TH Wu 55.β), and a-ma-ru-to / a-ma-ru-to-de, i.e. Amarynthos (TH Wu 58.γ; also Of 25.2), both places on the island of Euboea. Recent discoveries at Thebes have boosted the number of plausible identifications to as many as 34 (*TOP*, 355-58), although not all within its territory, nor all fully convincing identifications. The attestation of e-re-o-ni (‘Ελεών: TH Ft 140.5), in association with Thebes itself (Ft 140.1) is striking, since it also appears in the *Iliad* (2.500), but it is difficult to know what to do with a₂-pa₂-de (TH Wu 94.β), linked by the editors to the sanctuary of Aphaia on Aegina (cf. Fig. 13.3). Some place-names are only attested as ethnics or personal names derived from ethnics, including the intriguing form ‘Lakedaimnian’ (ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo and ra]-ke-da-mo-mi-jo are attested, i.e. Lakedaimnio- and Lakedaimonio-). The restricted size of the
§13.5.3.2. At present contexts are insufficiently well developed to identify more than two place-names in the Mycenaean archive: *te-qa-de* (X 508.a) and *a-ke-re-u-te* (Ge 606.2), probably an ‘ablative’ form ending in -θευν (Kilien 1983, 219).

---
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The density of major sites in the Argolid makes defining plausible, independent territories for them all extremely difficult (cf. Kilian 1988, 297, fig. 3 for a valiant attempt). Here it is worth speculating whether there is some truth in the ‘Homeric’ picture in the Catalogue, that assigns the southern Argive plain, including Argos and Tiryns, to one polity (under Diomedes), while the other polity (under Agamemnon) controlled the area around Mycenae extending over into the Corinthia and the Gulf of Corinth (Hope Simpson – Lazenby 1970, 57, Map 3), a suggestion that has some support in links proposed between Mycenae and the Nemea valley on the basis of archaeological survey investigations (e.g., Cherry – Davis 2001).

Finally, a recently discovered nodule from the site of Midea (MI Wv 6.β1) displays the sign-group me-ka-ro-de, which may be a place-name in characteristic ‘allative’ form, if it does not refer to the Greek term megaron (μεγαρόν), ‘hall’ (Demakopoulou, K. et al. 2002, 53-54).

It is commonly remarked that references to external trade or exchange are surprisingly absent from the Linear B documents (e.g., Killen 2008). However, there are some references within the corpus that appear to allude to areas outside the Greek mainland or Crete, even outside the Aegean. Two issues arise here: first, our knowledge of the place-name repertoire within the eastern Mediterranean in general and, second, the difficulty of working across cultural and, particularly, linguistic boundaries. We need, therefore, to know the ancient names for key places, like Cyprus, or Egypt, for example, and we need to be alert to the ways in which place-names from the Aegean might appear when they ‘move’ from one linguistic group to another.

Good examples of these issues are the names for Cyprus and Egypt. Cyprus (or at least part of the island) seems to have been called Alašiya in Akkadian texts (Knapp [ed.] 1996; Goreń et al. 2003). Its more familiar name, Cyprus (Kýprov), appears to be attested in Linear B sources (Bennet 1996). Both names appear in personal names, not place-names: ku-pi-ri-jo (Kyprios, etymologically ‘man of Cyprus’; e.g., KN Fh 347.1; PY Cn 131.3, Un 443.1 [and elsewhere]), a-ra-si-jo (Alassios, perhaps also etymologically ‘man of Cyprus [Alašiya]; KN Df 1229.b, etc.). Similarly, Egypt was known by a number of names: Miṣr was common in the Semitic-speaking world, while Aiguptos (Ἀἰγύπτος) was the Greek name. Again, both seem to be attested in
personal names in Linear B: \(a_2\)-ku-pi-ti-jo (Aiguptios, etymologically ‘man of Egypt’ [strictly ‘of Memphis’]; KN Db 1105.B) and mi-sa-ra-jo (Misraios, also etymologically ‘man of Egypt’ [Miṣr], if this is truly the name behind the form; KN F[2] 841.4) (cf. SHELMERDINE 2008, §5.4.2.2). Since it is very unlikely that we are dealing with single anonymous Egyptians here, these are most likely personal names. We need not, therefore, read them literally as giving the immediate geographical origin of the individual concerned. It is not impossible that the Kuprios in PY Un 443, who is receiving a payment (o-no, ōvov) for alum (tu-ru-pte-ri-ja, strupteriās) might actually be a merchant from Cyprus itself, and the adjective, when applied, for example, to wool (e.g., KN Od 667.A) may mean ‘Cypriot’ or ‘of Cypriot type’ (cf. BENNET 1996). The Pylos archive also contains references to female work groups identified by ‘ethnics’ that suggest an origin in western Anatolia (CHADWICK 1988, 78-84, 91-93; also SHELMERDINE 2008, §5.4.2.2).

§13.6.2. More intriguing are the potential references to the Aegean in textual sources elsewhere in the eastern Mediterranean. These fall into two broad categories. First, there are references almost certainly to Crete in Egyptian (Keftiu; mostly New Kingdom) and Akkadian (Kaptaru) and biblical (Kaph-tor) sources (pace STRANGE 1980). Keftiu is often associated with the term ‘Isles in the Middle of the Great Green’ (jw hrj-jb nw w5-d-wr), which seems to refer to the Aegean islands, possibly including the mainland (e.g., PANGIOTOPoulos 2001, 263, with references; but see DUHOUX 2003 for an alternative suggestion). Second, a land called Aḫḫiyawa (or Aḫḫiya, the earlier form) appears in Hittite sources (HAWKINS 1998; NIEMEIER 1998, for valuable summaries of the recent state of affairs on this debate). A crucial point to appreciate in these references is that both terms are geographical terms, not ethnonyms, or social terms. Some evidence for this is available in an 18th dynasty ostrakon that gives the name p5-k-f-ti-w-y, a nisbe formed from Keftiu, meaning ‘person from Keftiu’, and showing that ‘Keftiu’ itself is not an ethnic form (VERCOUTTER 1956, 96, n. 5). The derivational pattern is comparable with that by which the name \(a_2\)-ku-pi-ti-jo [Aiguptios] on KN Db 1105.B was derived. Thus Keftiu means ‘Crete’, not ‘people of Crete’. In Egyptian, the term may be combined with ‘man of’ or ‘chief of’ to refer to people (VERCOUTTER 1956, 106-107). The same is true of Aḫḫiyawa, which always appears in Hittite documents with the addition ‘man/king of’ (lu) or ‘king of’ (LUGAL), and is itself marked with determinatives, either ‘land’ (KUR), or ‘city’ (URU). This is an important point, because it is possible that the phrase used may in theory refer to different actual groups within the same geographical area at different times.
Keftiu has come to be identified with Crete primarily because of a series of representations in eight tombs of high Egyptian officials that cluster in a 50-year span within the first part of the 18th dynasty, the mid- to late-15th century BC (e.g., Vercoutter 1956; Wachsmann 1987; Helck 1995). These form part of a larger group of 27 tombs in which foreign visitors are depicted bringing gifts to Pharaoh (Panagiotopoulos 2001). The objects carried by those identified by the accompanying hieroglyphic texts as coming from Keftiu are recognisably ‘Aegean’, leading to the identification of Keftiu with Crete, reinforced by the term’s association with ‘The Islands in the Middle of the Great Green’.

Much has been made of modifications made to the representations — including that of their dress, from cod-piece to kilt — of those identified with the land of Keftiu in the tomb of Rekhmire (T. 100, falling near the end of Tuthmosis III’s reign [1479-1425 BC]) (e.g., Wachsmann 1987, 44-48). This modification has been assumed to reflect the transition from Cretan to mainland tributaries in the wake of the Mycenaean ‘take over’ at Knossos, but Paul Rehak showed that Aegean representations of kilt and cod-piece are not sufficiently consistent to support this tenuous hypothesis in relation to the Egyptian depictions (Rehak 1996), and other elements of the revised depictions appear to be non-Mycenaean (Duhoux 2003, 21-15). Panagiotopoulos points out that they are part of a much larger group of representations of foreigners bringing offerings that span the period of Egyptian imperial expansion between the reigns of Tuthmosis I (1494-1482 BC) and Tutankhamun (1336-1327 BC). He argues that the representations are ‘historical’, in the sense that events like these happened, but do not depict events at specific times or in particular places. The depictions we have reflect status claims by these officials and their desire to link themselves to Pharaonic power (cf. Panagiotopoulos 2001).

A slightly different claim seems to be behind the lists of places in the known world that appear on a series of statue bases in the mortuary temple of Amenhotep III (1391-1353 BC) at Kom el-Hetan, part of the expansionist rhetoric of 18th-dynasty Egypt about control of the known world. Aegean scholars (notably Hankey 1981, followed and developed by Cline 1987) have dwelt on one of these lists (E_N), the so-called ‘Aegean’ list. As interpreted by Egyptologists (particularly Edel 1966; Helck 1995; Edel – Görg 2005), this contains a list of ‘foreign’ names (indicated by the ‘fortress oval’ within which the names appear). The two on the right, but facing to the left — Keftiu and Tanaya — are accompanied, to the left, with a list of 12 preserved names each facing to the right, plus three more illegible. Above them appears the caption ‘remote lands of the far north of Asia’ (Edel – Görg 2005, 161). It is possible that the two figures with ‘fortress ovals’ on the right are placed there as initial, general figures to be followed by more specific toponyms and indicating the geograph-
ical area (*Keftiu*), plus (tentatively) the name of the inhabitants (*Tanaya = Danaoi [Δαναοί]?*).

If this analysis is accepted, then the preserved names in the list can be identified, with uncertainty in some instances, as the names of key cities or regions within the general area (cf. *EDEL – Görg* 2005). The first three names are palimpsests, inscribed over earlier names: Amnisos (over ‘*a-m-k-l/r*), Phaistos (over another version of the same name) and Kydonia (also over ‘*a-m-k-l/r*).

We then encounter Mycenae, Thebes (possibly to be read as Tegea), Messan(i)a (cf. *me-Za-na*: *PY Cn* 3.1), Nauplia, Kythera, *w3-jw-r-ji-i* (possibly to be equated with later Elis [Waleia?], or *Wilios [= Troy?]*, or possibly a place-name known from the Pylos archive, *wi-Ja-We-ra* [PY Cn 643.2; 719.9,.11,.12; Jn 478.1; Mn 1410.1?]: cf. *Duoux* 2008, 29), Knossos, Amnisos (again), and Lyktos. It may just be significant that only four ‘fortress ovals’ contain the Egyptian sign denoting foreign land: *Keftiu, Messan(i)a, Nauplia and Kythera*. Might these then denote ‘lands’ rather than ‘cities’, and does this imply that we should be looking for another name behind the supposed Nauplia? Given the overwhelming focus on Crete and mainland Greece, the reading of Wilios (= Troy?) seems unlikely.

Hankey and Cline, among others, saw this list as a diplomatic itinerary of Egyptian visitors to the Aegean, with its material reflection in a small number of objects assignable to Amenhotep III found in mainland Greek and Cretan contexts (Hankey 1981; Cline 1987). The idea of a diplomatic itinerary seems less plausible when we consider the context of the much larger number of lists inscribed on bases throughout the complex (cf. O’Connor 1996; *EDEL – Görg* 2005), including two further fragmentary lists recovered in 2004, possibly containing a reference to ‘Ionians’ (Sourouzian – Stadelmann 2005). The overall purpose is less specifically historical than cosmological (defining the Egyptian world-view) or political (claiming Pharaoh’s authority over the known world). Those responsible for the inscription were not necessarily, nor even likely to have been, first-hand observers of Aegean geography; more likely they got their knowledge from archival sources. In this respect, they may have differed from those creating the earlier depictions, who may well have observed foreign visitors to Egypt (cf. *Panagiotopoulos* 2001, 269-70).

These depictions and lists imply that there was Egyptian interaction with Aegean elites and sufficient contact, for example, for lists of names (e.g., *Vercoutter* 1956, 45-50) or incantations (e.g., *Vercoutter* 1956, 82-85) said to be from *Keftiu* to have been generated. Similarly, Syrian documents of the 18th century BC make reference to a ‘man from Kaptara’ and to products of Kaptara (e.g., *Guichard* 1999), while Egyptian texts of the 15th century BC also refer to products of Keftiu. There is a striking parallel to the description
of cauldrons in PY Ta 641.1.1-1 and 709.3.3 as ke-re-si-jo we-ke (‘of Cretan workmanship’) in the Annals of Tuthmosis III (yr. 42), where tribute from the prince of Tinaya (Danaoi?) includes a ‘shubti-vessel’ of ‘Keftiu workmanship’ (Vercoutter 1956, 55-56; though see Duhoux 2003, 232-233). Interestingly the Greek term for Egypt, Aiguptos, seems to be identical to that in Akkadian — hikuptah — a very specific usage (apparently referring to Memphis), once again implying high-level links (Strange 1980, 167, n. 262; cf. Moran [ed.] 1992, 154-156 [EA 84], 225-226 [EA 139]). Vercoutter even suggests that both terms — Kaptara and Keftiu — go back to an original form *kftr (Vercoutter 1956, 110; cf. Edel — Görg 2005, 166-167). If so, it is tempting to see in Greek Krete (Krßtj) a possible Hellenisation of an indigenous word for the island going back at least to the 18th century BC.

Somewhat similar issues surround the terms Ahhiya and Ahhiyawa (the later form), which occur in a small number of Hittite texts apparently spanning the 14th and 13th centuries BC. These texts document various interactions between individuals from Ahhiy(a)wa and Hittite rulers, although, unlike the Egyptian context, these are not combined with visual representations. I leave aside here the historical issues in relation to the nature of the relations implied and any possible links to the Trojan War (cf., for example, Latacz 2004, 121-128, admittedly a very literal reading). The similarity between Ahhiyawa and the Greek ethnonym Akhaioi (ˆAxaioí) encouraged an identification with a land called Akhaiwia (cf. Finkelberg 1988, who proposes, not entirely convincingly, solutions to the phonological problems with the identification; Niemeier 1998, 17-27, offering a concise history of the question). Indeed, this term, or something very similar, is attested in the Knossos documents (a-ka-wi-ja-de: KN C[2] 914.B), the destination for a hecatomb of 50 rams and 50 goats. The word has the ‘allative’ suffix, suggesting it may well be a place, but, if so, it is only certainly attested here in the corpus and it is difficult to see how it could have had the significance implied by its occurrence in Hittite texts and appear so rarely. John Killen has suggested that the term may refer to a festival (the occurrence of the word sa-pa-ka-te-ri-ja, probably σφακτηρία, ‘sacrifice’ on another text in the same series — KN C(2) 941 — supports this contextual interpretation), for which the use of an ‘allative’ is possible, rather than to a particular place, although it is also possible that it was a place reserved exclusively for ritual (see above §13.3) (Kil len 1994, 78). Daphne Gondicas, on the other hand, proposes it as a name for the district of the later city-state of Polyrhenia (Gondicas 1988, 258-260 [I3]).

Even if we can accept that Hittite Ahhiyawa does reflect Greek Akhaiwia, the question of its location is still open. Niemeier and Hawkins, for slightly different reasons, argue that Ahhiyawa did not lie on the Anatolian mainland
(Niemeier 1998, 17-27; Hawkins 1998) and reference to travel overseas in at least one of the texts supports this notion. However, whether it then refers to what we think of as Greece, or to a specific part (e.g., the territory of one particular polity, such as Mycenae [following the Homeric tradition] or perhaps Thebes [with its particularly strong ‘eastern’ associations, both archaeological and in the tradition]) cannot be determined at present. It has also been suggested that it refers to an island, or group of islands in the eastern Aegean (e.g., Mountjoy 1998). If Ahhiyawa does reflect Greek Akhaiwia, with a basic sense ‘land of the Achaeans’, then it may have been used to designate any place where Achaeans settled. What is slightly frustrating from the point of view of reconstructing Aegean geography is that there appears no point of contact between Hittite and Egyptian terminology for the area. We appear to be in a not unfamiliar situation in the study of place-names where regions may have had alternative names, such as Egypt itself, or Cyprus (above §13.6).

§13.7. Conclusion

I hope in this chapter to have given an overview of geographical perspectives on the Mycenaean kingdoms of the Late Bronze Age Aegean. Beginning with the identification of place-names in the Linear B documents, we are able to use topographical data and archaeological data to reconstruct the political geographies of Pylos and Knossos, in some detail, and that of Thebes in outline. Equally references in the Linear B texts to areas outside the Aegean are suggestive, while references in eastern Mediterranean texts to the Aegean offer some insights into how the Aegean states were viewed from the outside.

§13.8. Further reading including lists of Linear B place-names

General: Diccionario, s.yv.
Thebes: TOP; Del Freo 2009.
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