

CHRISTIANE SOURVINOU

*A-TE-MI-TO AND A-TI-MI-TE*

The origin and etymology of the name of Artemis still remain problematic. Many suggestions have been advanced<sup>1</sup>, but none of them seems to be absolutely convincing. A stage in the history of these studies was of course the discovery, in the Linear B tablets of Pylos, of two words which have been interpreted<sup>2</sup> as two forms of the theonym Artemis, *a-te-mi-to* and *a-ti-mi-te*. The purpose of this paper is to investigate, from both the linguistic and the contextual point of view, whether this tempting suggestion is probable.

The impression that one seems to get, after the study of what has been written on the subject, is that the linguistic approach to the problem has not been very systematic, and that the identification has been made primarily under the influence of the suggestive fact that *a-ti-mi-te* has been found in a tablet in which some divinities are mentioned. Our approach will be completely different. We shall first try to find out whether *a-te-mi-to* and *a-ti-mi-te* can be forms of the theonym Artemis in accordance with the rules of the Mycenaean language; if, however, the answer is negative, we shall examine the contextual evidence to see if it requires that the two words should be theonyms. If this is not the case, it will be obvious that their interpretation as forms of the name of Artemis should be rejected.

---

<sup>1</sup> Plato, *Cratyl.* 406b; *Etym. Magn.* s. v. Artemis; Preller, *Griech. Myth.* 1<sup>2</sup>, 228; Welcker, *Griech. Götter* 1, 603; Voss, *Myth. Br.* 3, 54; O. Müller, *Dorier* 1<sup>2</sup>, 374; Eust. 377, 43. 1732, 27; Macrob. *Sat.* 7, 16; Pott, *Etym. Forsch.* 1, 101; Goebel, *Lexilogus zu Homer und die Homeriden* 1, 594; A. Claus, *De Dianae antiquissima apud Graecos natura* (Diss. Breslau 1881), 10; M. S. Ruipérez, *El nombre de Artemis, dorio-ilirio: Etimología y expansión*, *Emerita* 15, 1947, 1—60. Ruipérez's suggestions about the etymology of the name show possibilities of being right.

<sup>2</sup> *a-te-mi-to*: Docs. 127; VI. Georgiev, *Second Supplément au lexique des inscriptions créto-mycéniennes*, *Annuaire de l'Université de Sofia, Faculté des Lettres* 51, 1956, 40—82; O. Landau, *Mykenisch-Griechische Personennamen*, s. v.; *Studies in Myc. Inscr.* I 13, XI 36. *a-ti-mi-te*: Docs. loc. cit.; O. Landau, op. cit. s. v.; *Studies in Myc. Inscr.* II 14, V 25, VII 27; XI 36

The form *a-te-mi-to* for Artemidos could be either the result of an interchange of *do* and *to* in the Mycenaean, or a particular form of the theonym with declension in *t*. As *do* and *to* never interchange in Mycenaean, we have to investigate whether the second possibility is probable.

Ventris and Chadwick, referring to the presence of Artemis in the Mycenaean tablets, write<sup>3</sup>:

"Her name has the East Greek form *a-te-mi-to* Artemitos, with declension in *t* not *d*. PY Un 11 (= 219) lists along with other divine names *a-ti-mi-te* which may be the dative Artimitei with *i* for *e*".

This would accord with the fact that Mycenaean belongs — more or less — to the East Greek dialects, if the form Artemitos were in fact East Greek. But it is not. It is Doric, that is West Greek, and has no connections whatever with Mycenaean. We have three examples of a declension in *t* of the theonym, all three in Doric:

1. In Alcman (Eustath. Comm. in Hom. 1618, 29): Artemitos.
2. In Choeroboscus (Bekk. 1188): Artemitos.
3. In an inscription from Zakynthos: Artemiti (I. G. 600; H. Collitz, Griech. Dialektinschrift. II, 172 n. 1679; T. S. Hughes, Travels in Greece and Albania <sup>2</sup>1830 I 154, where he reads Artemidi).

It will, perhaps, be objected that the last example is not unquestionably Doric, as we are not sure whether the older dialects of Cephallonia, Ithaca and Zakynthos belonged to the Doric area. But this is not very important for us, because if they did not belong to the Doric area, then they belonged to the Northwest Greek group<sup>4</sup>, likewise remote from the Mycenaean.

From this short investigation it can be deduced that a Mycenaean form Artemitos for Artemidos is most improbable. It is difficult to understand why the majority of scholars rejected the interpretation of Georgiev<sup>5</sup> *si-ja-ru-ro* = Θεάφιλος which presumed the presence of the Laconian σιός = θεός in Mycenaean, while they happily accepted the equivalence *a-te-mi-to* = Artemitos/Artemidos, based on the same principle. Presumably the presence of *a-ti-mi-te* among the divine names was too tempting, and the contextual probability prevailed over the linguistic impossibility. But, then, are *a-te-mi-to*

<sup>3</sup> Docs. 127

<sup>4</sup> A. Thumb, Handbuch der Griechischen Dialekte, Heidelberg 1909, 167

<sup>5</sup> VI. Georgiev, Supplément au lexique des inscriptions créto-mycéniennes, Annuaire de l'Université de Sofia, Faculté des Lettres 1955, 3—33

and *a-ti-mi-te* forms of the same word after all? We have seen that Ventris and Chadwick, who identify definitely *a-te-mi-to* as Artemis, are not so categorical about this point. They say it "may be". It may be, but it is far from being sure, and it would be rather risky to base on it the whole interpretation of the two words. Moreover, examples of the interchange of *e* and *i* are few in Mycenaean. If we exclude the doubtful equations with later Greek words, only three instances of this interchange are left: *pa<sub>2</sub>-me-si-jo/pa<sub>2</sub>-mi-si-jo* (proper names); *e-pa-sa-na-ti/i-pa-sa-na-ti*; *te-mi-ti-ja/ti-mi-ti-ja*. It is obvious that three examples cannot constitute conclusive evidence for a consistent interchange of *e* and *i* in Mycenaean.

It is true that *a-ti-mi-te* is indeed listed along with some divine names, but even so it is not inevitably a divine name. It has been conjectured to be one because of its similarity to *a-te-mi-to*, which is interpreted as a divine name under the influence of the occurrence of *a-ti-mi-te* in a list where some divine names figure. This is a genuine vicious circle. But let us examine the evidence.

The tablet UN 219 runs as follows:

- e-ke-ra-ne, tu-wo* 2 O 4[  
*pa-de-we, O 1 pa-de-we, O 1* ..  
*ka-ru-ke* PE 2 KA 1 O 6  
*te-qi-<ri>-jo-ne, O 1 a-ke-ti-ri-ja-i, KA 1*  
 5. *a-ti-mi-te, O 1 da-ko-ro-i, O 1*  
*di-pte-ra-po-ro, RA 1 O 3 ko-ro[ ]1[*  
*wa-na-ka-te, TE 1 po-ti-ni-ja[*  
*e[-ra] U 1 e-ma-a<sub>2</sub>, U 1 PE[*  
*a-ka-wo-ne, MA 1 pa-ra[ ] 2*  
 10. *ra-wa-ke-ta, MA 1 KO 1[ ] ME 1 O 1 WI 1*  
 KE 1  
 Vacant 6

It is clear from an inspection of this tablet that only similar beings are associated in one and the same line: divinities with divinities (*pa-de-we* / *pa-de-we*; *wa-na-ka-te* / *po-ti-ni-ja*[; *e[-ra]* / *e-ma-a<sub>2</sub>*), and humans with humans (*te-qi-<ri>-jo-ne/a-ke-ti-ri-ja-i* (names of professions)). In other words, there is not even one example of a divinity and a human being listed in the same line. Consequently, we should expect the mysterious *a-ti-mi-te* to have a meaning similar to *da-ko-ro-i* and to denote a being similar to the *da-ko-ro-i*. That is, we should expect the word to be the name of a profession — possibly connected with the cult as is *da-ko-ro-i*<sup>6</sup> — and not of a

divinity. Thus the study of the contextual evidence confirms, so far, the conclusions of the linguistic examination of the problem.

We will finish our investigation with a study of the context in which *a-te-mi-to* occurs, to make sure that the interpretation of the word as a theonym is not inescapable, and perhaps not even probable.

*a-te-mi-to* is mentioned as the owner of a slave in Es 650 recto:

- |  |   |             |
|--|---|-------------|
| <i>ki-ri-ti-jo-jo</i>                      | <i>ko-pe-re-u e-ke, to-so-de, pe-mo</i> | WHEAT 6     |
| <i>a-re-ku-tu-ru-wo,</i>                   | <i>e-ke, to-so-de, pe-mo</i>            | WHEAT 7     |
| <i>se-no</i>                               | <i>e-ke, to-so-de, pe-mo</i>            | WHEAT 1     |
| <i>o-po-ro-me-no</i>                       | <i>e-ke, to-so-de, pe-mo</i>            | WHEAT 4     |
| 5. <i>ai-ki-wa-ro, a-te-mi-to, do-e-ro</i> | <i>e-ke, to-so-de, pe-mo</i>            | WHEAT 1     |
| <i>we-da-ne-wo, do-e-ro</i>                | <i>e-ke, to-so-de, pe-mo</i>            | WHEAT T 4   |
| <i>wo-ro-ti-ja-o</i>                       | <i>e-ke, to-so-de, pe-mo</i>            | WHEAT 2     |
| a. <i>e-ke, to-so-de, pe-mo</i>            |   | WHEAT T 3   |
| b. <i>ka-ra-i/a-ne-o</i>                   | <i>e-ke, to-so-de, pe-mo</i>            | WHEAT 1 T 5 |

The tablet is a list of the holdings in wheat of thirteen men, two of whom are said to be slaves of somebody, of *a-te-mi-to* in the first case, of *we-da-ne-u* in the second. The same thirteen men are listed in the other Es tablets. In Es 644 their annual deliveries in wheat are listed; here *ai-ki-wa-ro* is mentioned only by his name, and the apposition "slave of *a-te-mi-to*" is absent. The slave of *we-da-ne-u* is mentioned as such. In the rest of the Es tablets we have the *do-so-mo* of each of these thirteen men to four beings: 1. to Poseidon 2. to \*34-*ke-te-si* 3. to *we-da-ne-u* and 4. to *di-wi-je-u*. Of these four recipients, only Poseidon is divine. *di-wi-je-u* is *e-qe-ta* in An 656. 9 and connected with cattle in Cn 3. *we-da-ne-u* is connected with cattle in Cn 40. 4. 6. 9, Cn 45. 2. 3. 4, Cn 254. 4. 5. 7, Cn 600. 8, and with rowers in An 610. 14. In Un 1193 he is credited with three DA of land at *a-ke-re-we*, and in Na 856 he figures with 10 SA at *a<sub>2</sub>-ki-ra*, while the same thing happens in Na 1041 with reference to *ko-ro-jo-wo-wo*. Consequently we can gather that both *di-wi-je-u* and *we-da-ne-u* were influential persons. But why do they receive offerings in the same context as Poseidon? Palmer<sup>7</sup> suggests that they are cult personnel associated with this divinity: and this seems quite possible.

<sup>6</sup> Docs. Vocabulary

<sup>7</sup> Interpretation 222

It will be clear that we are interested in elucidating the social position of *we-da-ne-u* because in principle he should be of similar status to *a-te-mi-to*, since their slaves are listed together. Normally we should not expect to see a slave to a divinity in the same category as a slave to a human being. Even if we do not know what exactly were the *te-o-jo do-e-ro-i*, we know at least that, being cult persons, they were not in the same category as ordinary slaves. We have, however, quite exceptionally, a very few isolated instances where, among the slaves of the gods, a slave of a human being is listed. In Eo 211 (and perhaps also in En 609. 16) *e-ra-ta-ra i-je-re-ja do-e-ra* figures in the same tablet as some *te-o-jo do-e-ro-i*. We still remain, of course, in the religious sphere, as she is the slave of a high religious official, a priestess. As we have seen that *we-da-ne-u* may have been a cult person, it could be argued that in Es 650 we have the same circumstance as in Eo 211, that is the slave of a cult person listed together with the slave of a god.

But there are objections to this assumption, not only because this would then be an exception conjecturally based on the existence of another exception, but also because *we-da-ne-u* is not, in the religious realm, of as high a rank as the priestess who is the representative of the goddess and whose slaves may in consequence have been just another class of the *te-o-jo do-e-ro-i*. There are in addition more serious difficulties. The slaves of the gods usually occur grouped together, in connection with land-tenure. This *ai-ki-wa-ro*, if he was a slave of the goddess — in which case we can wonder why he was not listed elsewhere as such — is not only isolated, but also in bad company: in the company of ordinary men and, what is more, of an ordinary slave. It is very difficult to understand why the holdings and the deliveries of a *te-o-jo do-e-ro* should not be listed together with the holdings and deliveries of the individuals who belonged to the same class as he, that is of other *te-o-jo do-e-ro-i*, but rather together with those of persons who do not seem to have any apparent connection with the cult. Furthermore, it remains to be explained why a slave of the goddess, a religious official, apparently of a high rank, should be obliged to give *do-so-mo* to three rather obscure persons who may just possibly be cult persons but are not recorded elsewhere as such, as *ai-ki-wa-ro* does in Es 653. It is very awkward to accept all these assumptions and interpret *a-te-mi-to* as a theonym. What seems possible is that this personage was a cult person as well as *we-da-ne-u* and probably *a-ti-mi-te* who, as Ventris and Chadwick say, "may be" the same person.

The contextual study of the problem has shown that the equation *a-te-mi-to/a-ti-mi-te* with Artemis is highly improbable, while the linguistic study has proved it almost impossible. On the basis of all this we may, I think, affirm that the name of Artemis does not occur in the Linear B tablets. The words interpreted as forms of this theonym may designate a cult person<sup>8</sup>.

---

<sup>8</sup> Mme. Gérard-Rousseau too (in *Les mentions religieuses dans les tablettes mycéniennes*, Rome 1968, 46f.) rejects the identification of *a-te-mi-to/a-ti-mi-te* with Artemis. But her conclusions about the nature of the word are different, as she proposes that the word should be transliterated ἄθεμις, a word which would designate, she thinks, "soit un individu anticonformiste de caractère, soit le titulaire d'une fonction officielle qui, professionnellement, échappait aux règlements normaux de la société contemporaine". Perhaps these suggestions are a little risky, based as they are on a doubtful transliteration. It is worth noting that the interchange *o-u-te-mi/ti-mi-to* which she quotes is no longer tenable, since *e-mi-to* has been proved to be, in this particular context, the right reading of the supposed *ti-mi-to* (Cf. my A propos de la tablette KN As 821 in *Minos* 9, 1968, 184); though *ti-mi-to* is attested in other contexts (v, Myc. Graec. Lex.). On the other hand, the internal evidence points, as we have seen, to the interpretation of *a-te-mi-to* and *a-ti-mi-te* as names of a cult person.