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Since the submission of the last revised draft of this article, evidence and discussions pertinent to the topics discussed therein have appeared that deserve mention or comment.

1) The ‘canonical’ spelling <wa-na-ko-to> /wanaktos/, identified as a Genitive Singular, appears on one non-sealed facet of an inscribed regular string-nodule (HV Wq 117.β) from the palace site of Ayios Vasileios near Xirokambi in Lakonia. No other signs or marks were incised on this or other facets of the nodule. This spelling had been hitherto unattested and should be added to the evidence presented in Table 1, pp. 68-70 and in the distribution map (Figure 1 on p. 71). The spelling <wa-na-ko-to> is perfectly ‘canonical’ according to the Linear B spelling rules, but belongs to a minority group rendering the orthographic vowel <o> as an Orthographic Copy Vowel or OCV (replicating the value of the following vowel /o/) (parallel to the spelling <wa-na-ke-te> for /wanaktei/ on PY Fr 1215.1 and TH X 105.2) rather than preferring to render it as an Orthographic Arbitrary Vowel or OAV <a>, as in the Genitive Singular <wa-na-ka-to> on PY La 622. Thus, although ‘canonical’ according to the criterion of conforming to widespread spelling rules, such spellings, classified in §6 as belonging to ‘canonical’ Group I, are scarce and rare.

It is interesting that this new example of a ‘canonical’ spelling of this type appears on a nodule of a date earlier than the bulk of Mainland documents so far known.

* I am grateful to Adamantia Vasilogamvrou, Director of the excavations at Ayios Vasileios, for permission to mention HV Wq 117. I wish to thank Tom Palaima, Aren Wilson-Wright and Vassilis Chrysikopoulos for insightful discussions. As always, responsibility for all views expressed herein remain with the author.
apparently within the LH IIIA2/IIIB1 period (the late 14th / early 13th century BCE). It has been argued, on palaeographic and linguistic grounds, that certain inscribed nodules represent “non-centralized features”\(^1\). The new Ayios Vasileios spelling, itself unattested and part of a scarce and sparsely distributed group of spellings that avoid the *orthographic cliché* of treating the orthographic vowel as an OAV (followed in all other sites where the term occurs, see Figure 1, p. 71), fits comfortably well within the pattern of occurrence of such “non-centralized” features attested on other (although not all) inscribed nodules.

Admittedly, the relatively earlier date of the Ayios Vasileios nodule does not support the view that OCV ‘canonical’ Group I spellings occurred when the aforementioned *orthographic cliché* was fading and was treated as ‘archaic’ (§6, pp. 102-103). But the type of document on which it occurs still allows us to treat such spellings as quite ‘peripheral’ to the dominant, but ‘idiosyncratic’ OAV Group II spellings.

2) Recently, Florian Ruppenstein supported the view strongly argued by Claude Brixhe, that the terms *wanaks* and *lāwāgetās* were part of a common Greek-Phrygian heritage (§ 7.1, pp. 104-105).\(^2\) Following Brixhe, Ruppenstein has argued against the possible borrowing of these terms from Greek by Proto-Phrygian or Phrygian communities either in the Late Bronze or the Iron Ages and has *ad absurdum* concluded that “migrating Greek-speaking groups [placed in the EH II-III transition in the second half of the third millennium BCE] brought the terms ‘wanax’ and ‘lāwāgetās’ to their settlement area”.\(^3\) Besides the likelihood that at least \(<\lambdaαϝαγταει>\) is an error for \(*<\lambdaαϝαγεται>*\) with a misplaced <ε> (pp. 104 and 106, n. 218) and therefore a patently Greek formation, the arguments against an adoption of the Greek terms by the Phrygians during the late Geometric or Archaic periods are not very convincing.\(^4\) The sound point that the epic use of ἄναξ suggests “an honorary title”, rather than a formal official title is hardly an obstacle, since a similar “honorary” use is also probably attested on M-01a as well. That these terms did not belong to canonical Phrygian titles is strongly suggested by their *hapax* concurrence in the Phrygian corpus.

In contrast to the prolific use of ἄναξ in the epic and other poetic contexts, the epic absence of lāwāgetās can be assigned to its metrical incompatibility, but Pindaric λᾱγετᾰς suggests that the formation survived the Bronze Age. A more archaic uncontracted form preserving the glide (although absent from the extant alphabetic

\(^1\) Palaima 2000, 228-230, 235-237.
\(^2\) Ruppenstein 2015.
\(^3\) Ruppenstein 2015, 100.
\(^4\) Ruppenstein 2015, 98.
record) might have been the source of the Phrygian adopted title. As has often been noted, its concurrence with ἱάκτει on M-01a shows considerable distance from the Mycenaean use of the terms (where their assignment to the same individual cannot be supported), which is also compatible with a late, post-Bronze Age Phrygian adoption.

Contrary to Ruppenstein, there is a very plausible context for the adoption and adaptation or appropriation of these Greek titles (even as “honorary”) by the Phrygian rulers, whose connections with the Greek world are noteworthy. Besides the testimony of Herodotus (1.14) that Midas dedicated his ἀξιοθέητον throne at Delphi and the tradition of his marriage to a Greek princess from Aeolian Kyme (Hermodikē in Aristotle, fr.611.37 or Demodikē in Pollux Onomastikon X.37), the very fact of the adoption of the Greek alphabet by the Phrygians (probably in the late 8th century BCE), and archaeological evidence for wide-ranging contacts between Phrygia and the Greek world during the 8th-7th centuries documents the considerable acquaintance between Phrygians and Greeks during this period, and provides a more than plausible background for the adoption of Greek titles.\(^5\)

3) A last comment should be inserted regarding the form of the place-name spelled in the Knossos documents as <ru-ki-to>. There may be some dim Egyptian sideline into the possible nature of <i>- in this spelling as representing a true phonological vowel, rather than being orthographic: in the Kom El-Hetan list, dated to the reign of Amenhotep III (early 14th century BCE), a place-name rkt (ry-ki-ti) is identified. The Aegean associations of the place-names mentioned in this inscription are generally accepted without many reservations. The Egyptian spelling might indicate the perception of a phonological vowel between the velar and the dental stop in the original Aegean toponym; admittedly, there are alternative possibilities, such as vocalic epenthesis in the orthographic representation of a stop cluster, as well as a purely orthographic vowel. If the former hypothesis of a phonological representation applies, although the suggested Egyptian value seems to be closer to /a/, we should be reminded that this may well represent the Egyptian perception of a Minoan vowel, in which case the original value of the vowel may well have been different. It might therefore be tempting to associate this Egyptian type with the one spelled as <ru-ki-to> at Knossos, rather than directly with <Λύκτος>.\(^6\) This evidence is compatible with the view supported here (§5, p. 95, with n. 149) that <i>- in this name was phonological rather than an OAV.

---

\(^5\) For a still usable overview of the pertinent evidence see Muscarella 1989.

\(^6\) Edel and Görg 2005, 188–89; Cline and Stannish 2011, 10.
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