AEGAEUM 11
Annales d'archéologie égéenne de l'Université de Liège et UT-PASP

THE ROLE OF THE RULER IN THE PREHISTORIC AEGEAN

Proceedings of a Panel Discussion
presented at the Annual Meeting
of the Archaeological Institute of America
New Orleans, Louisiana
28 December 1992
With Additions

edited by Paul REHAK

Université de Liège
Histoire de l'art et archéologie de la Grèce antique
University of Texas at Austin
Program in Aegean Scripts and Prehistory

1995

THE NATURE OF THE MYCENAEAN *WANAX*: NON-INDO-EUROPEAN ORIGINS AND PRIESTLY FUNCTIONS*

The *wanax* is the central figure of authority in Mycenaean society. This much is clear from:

a. studies of the references to *wanax* in the Linear B tablets;
b. interpretation of the history of the use of the term *wanax* in Homer and later Greek;
c. reconstruction of the development of the institution of kingship from the end of the Bronze Age through the Archaic to Hellenistic period [1].

---

* Please see the *Addendum* to this article, *infra*, for acknowledgements, dedications, and bibliographical orientation. The following abbreviations have been used in addition to those in the *American Journal of Archaeology* 95 (1991) 1-16:
DMic I and II = F. AURA JORRO, *Diccionario Micénico* vols. I and II (1985; 1993);
Docs^2 = M. VENTRIS and J. CHADWICK, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek* (rev. ed. 1973);
FunctMinPal = R. HÄGG and N. MARINATOS, eds., *The Function of the Minoan Palaces. Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium at the Swedish Institute in Athens, 10-16 June, 1984, Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen* 35 (1987);
L'idéologie tripartie = G. DUMÉZIL, *L'idéologie tripartie des Indo-Européens* (1958);
Interpretation = L.R. PALMER, *The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts* (1963);
La royauté = P. CARLIER, *La royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre* (1984);
Le vocabulaire I and II = E. BENVENISTE, *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes* I and II (1966; 1974);
SIE = J.P. MALLORY, *In Search of the Indo-Europeans* (1989);
Thalassa = R. LAFFINEUR and L. BASCH, eds., *Thalassa. L'Egée préhistorique et la mer. Actes de la troisième Rencontre égéenne internationale de l'Université de Liège, Station de recherches sous-marines et océanographiques (StaReSO), Calvi, Corse (23-25 avril 1990)* (*Aegaeum* 7: 1991);
Thalassocracy = R. HÄGG and N. MARINATOS, eds., *The Minoan Thalassocracy. Myth and Reality. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium at the Swedish Institute in Athens, 31 May-5 June, 1982, Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen* 32 (1984);
Transition = R. LAFFINEUR, ed., *Transition. Le monde égéen du Bronze moyen au Bronze récent. Actes de la deuxième Rencontre égéenne internationale de l'Université de Liège (18-20 avril 1988)* (*Aegaeum* 3: 1989).

1 The most detailed and most balanced study of the Mycenaean textual evidence for kingship is *La royauté* 3-134, which is followed by a treatment of the Homeric evidence, pp. 139-230. Of particular value are appendices I-II, on the occurrences of ἄναξ, ἀνάσσειν, and βασιλεύς in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Carlier offers a detailed analysis of textual references. He is logical and cautious in examining alternative theories of interpretation for each tablet within the context of a sweeping historical survey of the institution of Greek kingship. Some minor updating needs to be done because of: (1) changing theories about the chronology of the evidence, (2) recent reediting of texts, and (3) new interpretations of linguistic technicalities, *e.g.*, regarding the possible king's name *e-ke-ra*$_2$*-wo*. But *La royauté* will long serve as the basic starting point. For further thoughts by CARLIER, cf. "La double face du pouvoir royal dans le monde mycénien", in C. NICOLET ed., *Du Pouvoir dans l'antiquité: mots et realités* (*Hautes Études du Monde Gréco-Romain* 16: 1990) 37-52.
The standard handbook treatments of the textual evidence for Mycenaean kingship are: *Interpretation* 83-95 *et passim*; and *Docs*^{2} 120, 264-267, 280, 300, 408-409, 478-480. One may also consult M. LINDGREN, *The People of Pylos* II (1973) 150-155, for a concise discussion of Linear B references to

We want to know the same things about the Mycenaean *wanax* that we do about power figures -- "big men", chieftains, shamans, kings -- in any society:

a. how and when did the *wanax* originate;
b. how were the institution and authority of the *wanax* legitimized and maintained;
c. what cultural needs did the *wanax* satisfy and what powers and responsibilities did he have in different spheres of daily life: religious, political, economic, military, and social;
d. what led to the disappearance of the institution of the *wanax* in post-palatial Greek culture.

Each of these questions is major and multi-faceted. Here I shall discuss them and problems connected with them in two parts.

Part I. *Indo-European Theory and Mycenaean Terminology for Kingship. The Historical and Cultural Context for* Wanax *Ideology. Archaeological and Textual Evidence for the Origins of the* Wanax *and His Functions During the Most Fully Developed Stage of Mycenaean Palatial Culture. The Iconography of the Megaron at Pylos and Its Relationship to Textual Evidence.*

I shall begin with a fundamental problem that is generally unacknowledged. I would like to stress that it is very dangerous procedure to assume that Mycenaean kingship (*i.e.*, the institution of the *wa-na-ka* as we know it from the fully developed palatial stage of Mycenaean culture), in its origin (which I would place sometime within the later stages of the Shaft Grave period) or in its functions and ideological basis, conforms to any single simplistic or deterministic Indo-European model. Standard discussions of Mycenaean kingship begin with this assumption, relying on differently nuanced Indo-European and/or Homeric interpretive models. Thus one conceives of the *wanax* as an Indo-European/Homeric warrior-king or alternatively as an Indo-European priestly king, by focusing on and adducing parallels from one or another branch of the Indo-Europeans. Carol Thomas offers a good example of the first viewpoint [2] :

> Any attempt to determine the bases of royal power in the Mycenaean period must begin with the recognition that the Mycenaean overlords were Indo-Europeans. Certainly deductions about the nature of early Indo-European social-political structure must be made with caution for, first, our evidence is drawn largely from Indo-European communities existing a millennium or more after the presumed primary movements and, second, the earliest Indo-European communities are found in diverse regions where they received various stimuli. Nevertheless, the same general structure is found for the Hittites of the second millennium, the early Latin communities, the Macedonians, and the Germanic peoples of the first century B.C. and later. Consequently, comparative analysis must be employed cautiously.
>
> On this principle, an examination of Mycenaean kingship should start with its *military basis* for Indo-European kingship appears to have developed out of the requirement of a tribal society for effective leadership on war. Where Indo-European peoples succeeded in establishing control over a relatively

---

wanax based on a complete prosopographical study of the Pylos tablets, and M. GÉRARD-ROUSSEAU, *Les mentions religieuses dans les tablettes mycéniennes* (1968) 232-242, for possible religious associations of the *wanax* references. Finally, a bibliographically full overview of scholarly opinion together with a clear synthetic description of the origins, functions, status and *Fortleben* of Mycenaean kingship is offered by C.G. THOMAS, "The Nature of Mycenaean Kingship", *SMEA* 7 (1976) 93-116. Thomas is very good at framing the important questions and, after weighing rival theories, at formulating reasonable answers.

2 THOMAS (*supra* n. 1) 97-98. Her interpretation is obviously influenced by the "martial/warrior" iconography in the Shaft Graves and its correspondence to the image of military chieftains in the Homeric epics.

large pre-existing population they did so as warrior aristocrats. It would appear that the Mycenaeans were no exception for the military nature of their civilization is apparent in all aspects of life.

Leonard Palmer, on the other hand, cites [3] Germanic and Hittite parallels to demonstrate that the *wanax* was a Priest King, who "governed not by his personal qualities [4] (*virtute*) but by his degree of 'nobility', that is 'affinity' to earlier kings, who for their part in the last resort traced their descent to some distinguished popular hero or claimed a divine ancestor". According to this view, the holding of royal power requires a connection via ancestral blood-line to the gods and control within a specific family of the knowledge and practice of sacred rites that assured divine protection for the whole community [5].

Here we observe a basic disagreement about how to apply the non-uniform Indo-European evidence to the specific case of Mycenaean culture. It is fair to say that we cannot have confidence in any explanation of the nature of Mycenaean kingship that begins with assumptions based either on how Indo-European societies are supposed to behave or even on the image of kingship projected by the Homeric epics, particularly the *Iliad* wherein the very theme of the poem tends to highlight the warrior activities of the regional chieftains or *basilêes*. In any branch of Indo-European culture, the king's role and power can be either religious or religious and military in varying proportions. One cannot postulate *a priori* that the Mycenaean kings serve primarily military functions or primarily religious functions because the Mycenaean form of kingship is Indo-European. In fact, by so doing, one is ignoring Dumézil's explicit warnings about the universal applicability of the trifunctional Indo-European model, particularly in regard to its implications for any particular manifestation of kingship [6]:

> In concluding this very general account, I would like to stress again that our recognition of this fact [*i.e.*, the tripartite/trifunctional structure of Indo-European society in the social mythology of different branches of Indo-Europeans at different periods], as important as it is, does not afford us, in and of itself, the means to describe the actual state of society, the institutions of the "common Indo-Europeans", which were doubtless already different from place to place. We have only the principle, rather one of the principles and the essential outlines. For example, one of the most obscure questions that remains is the relationship between the three functions [i.e., the functional divisions of society] and the "king". The agreement among Vedic *râj-*, Latin *rêg-*, and Gallic *rig-* establishes the existence [of the "king"] very early in what are no doubt the most conservative branches of the Indo-Europeans. There are diverse relationships between the "king" and the three functions, and the relationship of the "king" and each function varies in different periods and in different places [7]. There is some fluctuation in the

---

3 L.R. PALMER, "Mycenaean Texts from Pylos", *TAPS* (1955) 18-53b, esp. 36.

4 One understands here that Palmer means martial prowess. He is relying on Tacitus' description of Germanic kingship (*Germania* 7): *reges ex nobilitate, duces ex virtute sumunt*.

5 Palmer went further than simply using the Indo-European nature of the Mycenaean Greeks as a tool for reconstructing the form of Mycenaean kingship. Working with key landholding records and series (*e.g.*, tablets Er 312 and Er 880; series Ea, Eb, En, Ep) and with the occurrences of important socio-political terms (e.g., *wa-na-ka = wanax*, *ra-wa-ke-ta = lawagetas*, *te-re-ta = telestas*, *da-mo = damos*, and the problematical *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo*), Palmer applied Dumézil's theories about the trifunctionality of Indo-European societies to the overall structure of Mycenaean society. For a synthetic discussion of the evidence for a strict tripartite division of Indo-European culture, in terms of both social mythology and theology, and the absence of such a division in non-Indo-European cultures, cf. G. DUMÉZIL, *L'idéologie tripartie* 7-33, 3-89 *et passim*, but especially p. 32 for the logic behind positing such a division as characteristic of the original Indo-Europeans. See also E. BENVENISTE, *Le vocabulaire* I and II, and PALMER, *Interpretation* 83-95, 186-224. A good capsule analysis can be found in *SIE* 130-135.

6 *L'idéologie tripartie* 32-33 [translation and bracketed explanatory commentary mine].

7 MALLORY, *SIE* 125, discusses recent developments in the study of Proto-Indo-European kingship. One is the reinterpretation by A. SIHLER, "The Etymology of PIE *rêg- 'King' etc.", *JIES* 5 (1977) 221-246, of the root for "king" which Benveniste and others had associated with "stretching out", "laying out lines of demarcation", "establishing right", thus arguing that Indo-European kings had a primary role in

representation and definition of the three functions and especially the first. The "king" is sometimes superior -- or at least exterior -- to the trifunctional structure, where the first [*i.e.*, the priestly or sacred] function is then focused on the pure administration of what is sacred, *i.e.*, on the priest, rather than on power, the ruler and his agents. Sometimes the "king" -- and then he is a "priest-king" as much as or more than a "governing king" -- is on the contrary the most eminent representative of the first function. Sometimes the "king" displays an unsteady mixture of elements derived from all three functions, and notably from the second function, *i.e.*, from the military function and eventually the class from which the "king" most often comes. The name which defines the Indic warrior class, *kṣatriya*, does it not have as a synonym *rajânya*, which is derived from the word *rajân*? This particular difficulty and some others can be better formulated, if not resolved, when we focus this study on what was the most solid support of abstract thought in these early societies: the system of the gods, theology, and their extensions in myth and epic.

We should notice especially the emphasis that Dumézil places on the king's sacral functions. While recognizing that in certain cases the king displays a mixture of all three functions and especially performs the second function, as war leader, Dumézil does not admit a case where the king's power and functions are exclusively military. The primacy of the king's role as performer of sacred rituals, as intermediary between the human and divine spheres, as guarantor of the benevolence and beneficence of the gods towards his community[8] is further reinforced by a study of Indo-European mythologies.

However, there is another problem that should be central to any discussion of Mycenaean kingship: the terminology directly relating to Mycenaean and later Greek kingship and kingly ideology is either non-Indo-European (ἄναξ and βασιλεύς) or Greek-specific (σκῆπτρον). This must be our starting point in understanding how the institutions of the *wanax* and the *basileus* originated and were maintained. There are no good grounds for believing that the Mycenaean institution of kingship is purely or mainly Indo-European and then interpreting it accordingly. Neither term used in the Mycenaean documents (*wanax*), in Homer (*wanax* or *basileus*), in later Greek (*basileus*), and in the historical Cypriote dialect (*wanax* or *basileus*), in connection with "kingship" has a convincing Indo-European

---

establishing and maintaining social order in ways that revealed overtly priestly functions. Sihler now proposes that the root means "be efficacious, have mana"; and H. SCHARFE, "The Vedic Word for 'King'", *JAOS* 105 (1985) 543-548, has attempted to undermine the very existence of the word for "king" in the Vedic texts, by interpreting *raj* as meaning "strength, power" rather than king *per se*. If this were true, the related Latin and Gallic terms could be viewed as referring to late institutional developments without necessarily having any early Asiatic parallel. A further interesting implication of Scharfe's work is that it would make the "master of the clan" the highest socio-political figure in Proto-Indo-European society. This would potentially allow for very heterogeneous, and divergent, outcomes in different branches of Indo-European when kingship evolved. Whatever the precise etymology of the Proto-Indo-European word for "king", it should be pointed out that neither Greek nor Hittite uses the root *rêg- for "king", and that both cultures resort to conspicuous loan words (Greek: *wanax*, *basileus*; Hittite: *Tabarnas*, *Labarnas* -- but also *hassu*) as titles for their "kings".

8 In later Greek tradition, we can cite the well-known passages from Hesiod (*Theog.* 225-247) and Homer (*Od.* 19.109 and ff.) which describe how the proper administration of justice by the king assures the fertility (agricultural and human) and general prosperity of his community under the favor of Zeus. The same notion underlies the pollution which Oedipus brings upon the entire community of Thebes because, as king, he violates -- albeit unwittingly -- the taboos against patricide and incest. The concept of king as guarantor of the fertility and prosperity of his community by means of his proper relationship with the divine is found in Hebraic and Egyptian literature as well as in Irish, Germanic and Mesopotamian cultures. Cf. discussion and references in M.L. WEST, *Hesiod. Works and Days* (1978) 213-219. To this list, we might add the Scythian notion discussed by B. LINCOLN, "On the Scythian Royal Burials", in S.N. SKOMAL and E.C. POLOMÉ eds., *Proto-Indo-European: The Archaeology of a Linguistic Problem. Studies in Honor of Marija Gimbutas* (1987) 276-279, that "well-being and even life itself were felt to flow from the sacred gold [golden objects sent from the heavenly gods to the Scythian kings], through the king to the Scythian people".

etymology. Both the term *wanax* and the term *basileus* are likely borrowings from foreign cultures. We might compare this process, linguistically, historically and institutionally, to that involving *turannos* in archaic Greece. But this analogy cannot be pressed. Individuals who were called tyrants arose from internal Greek historical, socio-political and economic factors. The term was plucked from a non-Greek society and applied to an extraordinary Greek development. I do not think that this is the way in which the terms *wanax* or *basileus* came to be applied to kingship in the Greek Bronze Age and later.

The Homeric poems use two terms to refer to the heroes who lead contingents from the various natural geographic districts of Greece. The main term is βασιλεύς (*basileus*). The second is used more sparingly: ἄναξ (*anax* or *wanax*). Zeus, for example, is given an epithet "ruler of gods and men" which uses *wanax*. The term *wanax* occurs almost always in the singular in Homer (271 of 276 instances) [9]. It therefore seems to denote overarching "monarchical power" as opposed to *basileus* which is applied to all the single heroes and in the plural to a number of such leaders even within one community (*e.g.*, Ithaka, Phaiakia). In later Greek the term *wanax* is used almost exclusively as an epithet of divinities. The common word for king is *basileus*, which is applied to the two kings of Sparta, to the *archon basileus* at Athens, to the Macedonian and Cypriote kings, and to foreign rulers like the king of Persia. An odd survival of the term *wanax* in the secular sphere is found in Cyprus, the Greek dialect of which shows closest affinities with the main dialect of the Linear B tablets both in phonology and in lexicon [10]. We have a quotation from Aristotle's *Cypriote Politeia* in the lexicographer Harpocration that says that the sister or wife of a Cypriote *basileus* was called a(n) *(w)anassa* (feminine form of *wanax*) while his son or brother was called *wanax* [11]. In extant Cypriote inscriptions of the historical period (8th-3rd centuries B.C.), the word *anassa* is used as a divine epithet, usually of Aphrodite. Homer uses the feminine term rarely and exclusively as a divine epithet. Later Greek literature occasionally uses the term as an honorific for a person of high rank or lineage [12]. Both the term *basileus* and the term *wanax* are peculiar to Greek within the Indo-European language family [13].

---

9 *La royauté* 45, n. 237.

10 It is significant that there is appreciable evidence for an influx of Mycenaean Greek settlers into Cyprus in the period following the collapse of the Mycenaean palaces. They might be responsible for the transmission of this usage to Cyprus.

11 The Cypriote usage is especially interesting because of the stress it places on kinship ties.

12 C.M. BOWRA, "Homeric Words in Cyprus", *JHS* 54 (1934) 54-55.

13 The standard current views on the etymology of *basileus* are: (1) H. FRISK, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Band I (1960) *s.v.*: "Die bis in die neueste Zeit...wiederholten Bemühungen, βασιλεύς aus dem Indog. herzuleiten, sind erfolglos geblieben. Auch die Versuche, an kleinasiatische und andere sprachlichen [sic] Elemente anzuknüpfen...kommen über allgemeine Vermutungen nicht hinaus. So muß βασιλεύς immer noch als ein wenigstens in Einzelheiten unklares Fremdwort betrachtet werden". (2) P. CHANTRAINE, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (1968) *s.v.*: "Il est vain de chercher une étymologie à βασιλεύς. Le mot semblerait emprunté comme τύραννος et ἄναξ. Mais κοίρανος peut avoir une étymologie indo-européenne. Et le mycénien atteste une labio-vélaire initiale, qui peut faire penser à une origine i.-e". A. MEILLET, "Les noms des chefs en Grec", in *Mélanges Gustave Glotz* II (1932) 587-589, established that βασιλεύς and ἄναξ are not Indo-European. He pointed out that the only word for "king" reconstructible in Indo-European is that represented by Latin *rex*, a term which is not used in Greek. Different daughter languages (*e.g.*, Armenian, Gothic) have different terms for this function. Meillet also noted that ἄναξ is associated more closely with the religious sphere and βασιλεύς with secular kingship. He also posited that both terms are loan words, perhaps from an Aegean substrate. E. BENVENISTE, *Indo-European Language and Society* (1973) 318 ff., discusses the division of meaning between these two terms: "... [T]hey both defy any etymological analysis... There has been much fruitless discussion over the origin of *basileús*. If the identification of the root is impossible, we may at least suggest a probable analysis of its morphology: *basileús* is derived by means of the suffix *-eús*, which is preceded by the morpheme *-il-*, this being an element characteristic of the personal names of Asia Minor... This is all that can be said... As for the root element *bas-*, none of the numerous hypotheses recorded in the etymological

We can at least examine the terms as they occur in the Linear B documents and come to some understanding of the position and functions of the *basileus* (*qa-si-re-u*) and *wanax* (*wa-na-ka*) in the Mycenaean period, and then try to make sense of the later usage of the terms in the light of historical and social developments [14]. There is universal agreement that the *qa-si-re-u* in the Mycenaean period operates at the local level of the socio-political hierarchy. At the top of the social pyramid stand the *wanax*, the palace, and palace-specific officials and administrative functionaries. Although named individuals with the title *qa-si-re-u* appear mainly in the context of bronze working and have to do with apparent "worker-collectives" or "industrial groups", there is no absolutely compelling evidence or line of argument for associating the *qa-si-re-u* exclusively with such activities [15]. It is thought to be clear that the *qa-si-re-u* in the Mycenaean period lacks the lofty aristocratic associations of the term in the Homeric epics. This is true in relative terms, when one compares Mycenaean usage with Homeric and later usage. Nonetheless the status of *qa-si-re-u* is such that the individuals who hold this title are variously defined by scholars who do not limit the *qa-si-re-u* to a supervisory role in the industrial sphere as "head man of a tributary village" or, in the case of Bronze Age Messenia, "provincial dignitaries of secondary importance, successors of the 'kinglets' who submitted themselves to the Neleid dynasts, in any case vassals of the ruler of Pylos" [16], *i.e.*, they are viewed as members of local, small-scale aristocracy.

Coexisting with these several *qa-si-re-we* are officials known as *ko-re-te-re* and *po-ro-ko-re-te-re* (roughly translated "mayors" and "vice-mayors") whose local duties, especially in connection with the major second-order centers within the palatial regional administration of Bronze Age Messenia, are clearly and systematically registered in the texts (*e.g.*, PY Jn 829). It is attractive to posit that these officials are directly responsible to the central palace -- and appointed, controlled, rewarded and sustained by it [17]. The many individuals who hold the title *qa-si-re-u* then can be interpreted as local chieftains in the purest sense, *i.e.*, figures who derive their authority and privileges from society as it developed on this level, and who had

---

dictionaries can even be discussed today". Among the etymologies rejected by these discussions is that of A. HEUBECK, *IGForsch* 63 (1958) 113, 115, 123, 132, 134, who reconstructs a post-Indo-European form made up of Indo-European elements related to the root *$*g^{w}em$*- "to go, to come" with a secondary semantic development "to be born". Thus *basileus* would mean "he who belongs to a 'family, lineage, caste'". For further discussion, see *DMic.* II, *s. qa-si-re-u.*

Regarding ἄναξ, FRISK *s.v.*, accepts Meillet's opinion that the word is a loan word of uncertain etymology, while pointing out that the commonly adduced Phrygian form *wanaktei* most likely is borrowed from Greek rather than vice versa. This last opinion is shared by M. LEJEUNE, "A propos de la titulature de Midas", *Athenaeum* NS 47 (1969) 192, and I.M. DIAKONOFF and V.P. NEROZNAK, *Phrygian* (1985), 140. Connections with Tocharian, recently revived, are also problematical. CHANTRAINE concludes simply: "Inconnue. On admet que c'est un terme d'emprunt". He explicitly rejects the attempt by J. PUHVEL, "Greek ANAΞ", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 73 (1956) 202-222 to reconstruct a litotic Indo-European root meaning "not subject to doom" or, in positive terms, "wondrously full of vital force". This reconstruction is replete with problems with regard to vowel gradation, justification of the presence of laryngeals in the hypothesized form, and so on. It is motivated, however, by Puhvel's belief that Mycenaean Greek kingship would have been divinely sanctioned. I thank Fred Schwink for compiling most of the information contained in this footnote.

14 The full range of references can be grasped in capsule summary by consulting the entries for *qa-si-re-u*, *qa-si-re-wi-ja*, and *wa-na-ka* in *DMic.* II. The most recent study of the term *qa-si-re-u* and associated forms is B. LAFORSE, *The Meaning of the Mycenaean Words* qa-si-re-u, qa-si-re-wi-ja, *and* ke-ro-si-ja (M.A. Thesis, Univ. of Texas at Austin 1989).

15 M. LINDGREN, *The People of Pylos* II (1973) 126-130. L.R. PALMER, however, in comments on a paper by A. MORPURGO-DAVIES (*infra* n. 20) 108, describes the *qa-si-re-u* as "an industrial functionary, seemingly on the non-Potnia side of the equation".

16 *Docs*^{2} 121, 359, 404; M. LEJEUNE, *Mémoires de philologie mycénienne* II (1971) 183.

17 Cf. *DMic* I, *s. ko-re-te* for the overwhelming agreement among scholars that the *ko-re-te-re* are palatially dependent and subservient regional officials.

local responsibilities that might, in some cases, involve the central palatial administration. Otherwise they would perform purely local duties and derive their status from their local communities, although that status might be enhanced by their intermittent contacts with representatives of the bureaucratic hierarchy of the central palace. If the term *qa-si-re-u* is indeed derived from an Aegean substrate language [18], we could link it to the Helladic peoples with whom the Greek-speakers came into contact upon their arrival in the Balkan peninsula and with whom they integrated in forming the fundamental Middle and early Late Helladic culture upon which the Mycenaean palatial social, political, economic, and administrative systems were overlaid [19]. As Anna Morpurgo-Davies has convincingly argued [20], the term and the local officials so titled came to prominence with the collapse of the Mycenaean palatial system that had overlaid the local -- dare we call it "tribal" or "demotic" -- system of social organization. Once the palace and its *wanax* were removed, the chief local and practical -- that is, both *technically* and *actually* non-palatial -- administrators during the late Mycenaean period, the *qa-si-re-we*, became the chief power figures in the regional socio-political systems that developed in post-palatial Greece [21].

At the pinnacle of the Mycenaean socio-political hierarchy stood the *wanax*, the figure around whom the Mycenaean palatial system was created [22]. It is not difficult to speculate how and why a borrowed, non-Greek term was used for this central figure of authority and power. There was a transition from a society with many locally based chieftains (each a *basileus*) to one in which single figures (each a *wanax*) held power over larger, separate territories and over the local communities in which the *basilêes* continued to function. This transition would have entailed a process whereby the *wanax* could be singled out and placed at a level well above the *basilêes* and competing local aristocracy and the creation of an ideology that would justify and sustain this differentiation. At the same time, the new larger and hierarchically organized "state" would have to be united and stabilized. Thus the creation of the palace centers, the focus upon the central hearth within equally central throne rooms (no doubt a manifestation of the primal and persistent Greek and Indo-European religious notion of *Hestia* [Latin *Vesta*], *i.e.*, the importance of the communally maintained central

---

18 This might be true not only of its basic root, but also of its suffix. The productive *-eus* noun suffix in Mycenaean and Greek is difficult to explain and has been thought to be of a non-Indo-European, pre-Greek origin. Cf. J.L. PERPILLOU, *Les substantifs grecs en* -εύς (1973) 15, 29-33.

19 A particularly thoughtful discussion of this process is to be found in S. JALKOTZY, "On the Negative Aspects of the Mycenaean Palace System", *Acts of the Second International Mycenological Congress* held in Rome and Naples in 1991 (forthcoming). Jalkotzy explains just how unsuited the palatial system was to the natural resources of the Balkan peninsula in the Late Bronze Age.

20 A. MORPURGO-DAVIES, "Terminology of Power and Terminology of Work", in E. RISCH and H. MÜHLESTEIN eds., *Colloquium Mycenaeum* (1979) 98-99.

21 MORPURGO-DAVIES (*supra* n. 20) 98: "It could be easy to see how, after the disintegration of the central power, a minor official could 'pull rank' and strengthen his authority". Morpurgo-Davies, however, would see the *qa-si-re-u* as "a very minor officer who depended on the central authority but did not reside in the capital and could be dispatched to various places". Given the limited range of activities of the *qa-si-re-u* and his parallel status with clearly palatially dependent officials (*ko-re-te* and *po-ro-ko-re-te* = "mayor" and "vice-mayor" whose titles seem to be connected with the term *koiranos*), I think it is more reasonable to interpret the *basileus* as I have: a local authority who has power that is not derived primarily from his connections to the palace and who therefore will still hold that power when the palace is removed.

22 K. KILIAN, *OJA* 7 (1988) 292-293, presents a helpful schematic representation of Mycenaean social hierarchy as documented in the Linear B tablets. (Cf. a more simplified schematic in PALMER [*supra* n. 15]). One should note the position of the *wanax* in relation to the divine sphere and the coordination of *qa-si-re-u* and *ko-re-te*. The structure of the pyramid was probably influenced by the spheres (religious, palatial, local-communal/extra-palatial) in which interaction between any two levels took place, and the relationships between figures were undoubtedly much more complex than the simplifying schema can convey.

fire[23]), textually documented commensual ceremonies that symbolically and practically united the individual communities which the separate palaces controlled, power iconography reflected both in palace frescoes and in more widely circulating minor arts such as seals.

Such a radical transformation, universally undertaken, so far as textual references and archaeological remains indicate, throughout the major territories of the Late Helladic world, would have been more readily effected and perpetuated if the dominant figure, the *wanax*, had a special authority, the source of which lay outside the Greek-Helladic culture in which the *basilêes* were central figures. It is my opinion that we can detect the importation and implementation of such an ideology within the various stages of Shaft Grave burials at Mycenae, as they have now been identified and refined by Kilian-Dirlmeier, Graziadio and Laffineur, and synthesized by Dietz [24]. I do not think it is coincidental that LH I is a period of extremely strong Minoan influence in the two regions where our evidence for the formation of mainland palatial culture is strongest: the Argolid and Messenia, and that in both territories we find then and later Minoan artifacts with strong religious iconographical overtones, including architectural Horns of Consecration, double axe and bull representations, Sacral Knots and shrine imagery [25].

---

23 *Hestia* always remains the most primitive and least anthropomorphized Olympian deity, but the centrality of the "Hearth" is an immutable concept throughout the history of the Greek polis: hearths were located in the *prytaneion* or an important temple, and that in the temple of Apollo at Delphi was viewed as the central hearth for all Hellenes. Cf. W. BURKERT, *Greek Religion* (1985) 170 and 334-335, where Burkert observes that Plato in constructing his theoretical *polis* in the *Laws* describes an acropolis with sanctuaries of Hestia, Zeus and Athena: "To have Hestia, Zeus, and Athena on the acropolis means having the hearth at the centre of the community, and the highest god and the representative of the city in proximity".

24 A full exposition of this argument will form a separate paper. That the crucial transition from a chieftain-dominated to a *wanax*-oriented society took place in LH I during the later phases of the Shaft Graves is argued by K. KILIAN, *OJA* 7 (1988) 292. The reader is invited to refer to the following pertinent works: S. DIETZ, *The Argolid at the Transition to the Mycenaean Age* (1991); R. LAFFINEUR, "Mobilier funéraire et hiérarchie sociale aux cercles des tombes de Mycènes", *Transition* 227-238; G. GRAZIADIO, "The Process of Social Stratification at Mycenae in the Shaft Grave Period: A Comparative Examination of the Evidence", *AJA* 95 (1991) 403-440; and O.T.P.K. DICKINSON, "'The Origins of Mycenaean Civilisation' Revisited", *Transition* 131-136. One can point to the adoption within the Shaft Graves of Minoan religious and status symbols, particularly in the three richest Shaft Graves, wherein one might detect that society had made the transition from domination by local chieftains to the creation of rulers of higher status who adopt the use of ritual gold masks and Minoan paraphernalia (bull's head rhyton, gold cutouts with women in flounced skirts and cult buildings with Horns of Consecration, double axes, Sacral Knots) as a means of authenticating and reinforcing their newly created authority. One should also note the presence in Shaft Grave Γ, which Kilian and Kilian-Dirlmeier (in the *Addendum* to this article, *infra*) think marks the crucial point of transition from chieftaincy to single-ruler society, of a portrait seal identified first as that of a chieftain, but correctly reinterpreted as a Minoan "priest" by J.H. BETTS, "The Seal from Shaft Grave Gamma - A 'Mycenaean Chieftain'?", *TUAS* 6 (1981) 2-8. See DICKINSON (*op. cit.*) 135; E. VERMEULE, *Greece in the Bronze Age* (rev. ed. 1972) 94-105; R. HÄGG, "Degrees and Character of the Minoan Influence on the Mainland", *Thalassocracy* 120-121; IDEM, "On the Nature of the Minoan Influence in Early Mycenaean Messenia", *OpAth* 14 (1982) 27-32, for details of evidence of Minoan influence on mainland culture, not for my line of argument. Cf. also S. HILLER, "On the Origin of the Shaft Graves", *Transition* 142-144, for arguments linking the mainland tholos tombs to Minoan influence.

25 Besides the Shaft Grave material cited in n. 24, see especially the shrine area of Northeast Workshop at Pylos, the double axe mason's marks on the ashlar wall course beneath Archives Room 7 at Pylos, and eventually the offering and bull procession fresco of vestibule 5 of the megaron complex. P. Rehak informs me that fragments of a bull's head rhyton were found at Pylos, but mistakenly identified as a lion's head rhyton. For Minoan influence in Messenia during LH I, see also Y.G. LOLOS, "The Tholos Tomb at Koryphasion", *Transition* 175: "[T]he years immediately preceding the full development of the new Mycenaean (LH I) style of Messenia appear to be particularly characterized by an increase of trade contacts and other exchanges with Crete, Kythera and southern Lakonia, by the arrival of immigrant Minoan potters and other craftsmen in the major centres of the region, and by the general diffusion of

I would go so far as to suggest something that is now unprovable: that the term *wanax* and what Kilian properly calls the *wanax* ideology were introduced from Minoan culture, whether or not they originated with the Minoans [26]. That is, I think it is possible that the Minoans may have themselves adopted or adapted both the term and the institution from further east, especially if Weingarten is correct in seeing a wholesale importation of administrative systems from the Near East sometime during the long history of Minoan palatial civilization [27]. This is not to say that Minoan kings were installed in mainland territories, for example, displacing the conspicuous warrior élites of the Shaft Graves, or that Minoan kingship was adopted wholesale by the Mycenaean élites [28]. I am suggesting, however, that ideological notions, symbols and perhaps the very term for "king" itself were borrowed and used to help establish and authorize the primacy of the heads of the newly developing palatial system [29].

---

multiform Minoan influence in the wider area of the southern Peloponnese". For Mycenae in the Argolid, see DIETZ (*supra* n. 24) 300: "LH IA is the first phase in which imported Minoan pottery constitutes an important category in the Grave Circles at Mycenae". For a synthetic study of Minoan influence, see M. MELAS, "Minoans Overseas: Alternative Models of Interpretation", *Aegaeum* 2 (1988) 47-70.

26 The suggestion, in general terms, is hardly new. Cf. J.L. MELENA, "En torno al ΣΚΗΠΤΡΟΝ Homérico", *Cuadernos de Filologia Clásica* 3 (1972) 346 and n. 162-163, for the idea that the sacred aspect of Greek kingship could derive from Minoan culture. There is a Homeric passage (*Od.* 19.187) that speaks of Minos as *basileus* and *he who is conversant with* great Zeus. M. BLOMBERG, in a recent and as yet unpublished paper, "*Minos Enneoros*. Archaeoastronomical Light on the Priestly Role of the King in Crete", cites this passage in analyzing evidence that Minoan rulers used astronomical knowledge as a basis for religious and, by extension, political power and that "special relationships of the Minoan leaders to the divine world in the form of priestly functions" and other such "qualities of Minoan leaders were taken over and exalted by the Mycenaean king at Knossos as part of a strategy to legitimize the new [Mycenaean] order". Blomberg also argues that this process had a subsequent impact upon mainland kingship lasting into the historical period.

27 J. WEINGARTEN, "Three Upheavals in Minoan Sealing Administration: Evidence for Radical Change", in T.G. PALAIMA ed., *Aegean Seals, Sealings and Administration. Proceedings of the NEH-Dickson Conference of the Program in Aegean Scripts and Prehistory of the Dept. of Classics, University of Texas at Austin, January 11-13, 1989* (*Aegaeum* 5: 1990) 105-120.

28 Essentially I would agree with the conclusions of R.L.N. BARBER, "The Origins of the Mycenaean Palace", in J.M. SANDERS ed., *ΦΙΛΟΛΑΚΩΝ. Lakonian Studies in Honour of Hector Catling* (1992) 11-23, esp. 22-23, that the Mycenaeans are indebted to Crete "in the sphere of palace architecture, ornamentation and decoration, even organisation" but that some features of the palace, such as that of the common hearth presided over by a "ruler/priest" were strongly Mycenaean. Barber views "tholos tombs, ashlar masonry, frescoes, fine artefacts, and the incorporation of these in increasingly splendid palatial culture" as "an elaboration of an established order". I would though stress that the establishment of a ruler according to the foreign-derived *wanax* -model was the key factor in providing an impetus to, and appetite for, these Minoan-style features of high material culture. In sum, I am not claiming that the Minoans *dominated* the Mycenaeans on the mainland or that "'Mycenaean' is only a provincial variant of the same 'Minoan' civilisation", *à la* A. EVANS, "The Minoan and Mycenaean Element in Hellenic Life", *JHS* 32 (1912) 277-297 and esp. 282. Rather, I am allowing for a process whereby the established Helladic/ Aegean and Indo-European features of mainland culture were transformed and made part of the Late Helladic palatial culture through a strong, though selective, adaptation of diverse elements of Minoan material culture and Minoan social, political and religious ideology.

29 I would cite again (cf. n. 7) the case of a contemporary Indo-European palatial civilization, the Hittite of Anatolia, wherein both terminology and aspects of the cult of the ruler were borrowed from and heavily influenced by the non-Indo-European Hattic culture. Cf. O.R. GURNEY, "Hittite Kingship", in S.H. HOOKE ed., *Myth, Ritual, and Kingship* (1958) 121: "The belief that the reigning Hittite king impersonated the spirit of the royal ancestor Labarnas appears to date from the earliest times. Since the name of this ancestor is Hattic, it is unlikely that this belief originated with the Indo-European element in the Hittite nation". I also here should say that I do not agree with the implications of the argument by R. HÄGG, *Thalassocracy* 119-121, that the Minoan religious symbols in the Shaft Graves "were mostly prestige items without religious meaning". This is based primarily on the observation that the graves

I am obviously arguing from the circumstances as we know them. The lower status and local-level responsibilities of the *qa-si-re-u* make it most likely that this figure derives from Helladic mainland culture. It is more reasonable to attribute the borrowed aspects of the most important figure in Mycenaean society to the influence of the predominant culture within the Aegean prior to (MM II-III) and during (LH I-IIA) the formative stages of mainland palatial culture. We should also note that the other "high cultures" with whom the Mycenaeans were in contact at this time do not offer, among their terms for elevated rulers, any that could be the source for the Mycenaean term. For now, this leaves Minoan culture and the undeciphered and poorly documented Minoan language as a last resort. One may wonder about the absence of the term for *wanax* in the meager Linear A material. Even if we can rely on transposed Linear B values for Linear A signs -- and Emmett Bennett and I do not think that this is certain -- we still have only some 330 tablets. The whole Linear A corpus can be printed out in 12-point type and in conventional transcription on seven sheets of A4 paper: there are approximately 1430 texts (many exceedingly brief sealing inscriptions) and a mere 7400 occurrences of signs total [30]. These texts are decidedly what Jean-Pierre Olivier calls "domainal" in character. They deal almost exclusively with basic agricultural commodities and some manufactured items like pottery. They define local economic transactions in brief headings of three or four sign groups. They list what are likely to be local personal or place names or perhaps the names of lower-order officials. The term *wanax* appears in the Linear B tablets mainly on higher level documents, such as the Pylos Ta or Er series, or on texts recording religious offerings made by the palace proper, or in texts -- including those on painted stirrup jars -- dealing with important intensive industries (such as cloth production and perfumed oil manufacture) in which the *wanax* had some sort of stake or vital interest. The Linear A documents seem to be of an entirely different nature than these. Simply put, it would be more surprising to find the word for Minoan ruler in the Linear A texts, such as they are, than it is not to find it.

The implications of my discussion so far should be clear. If we wish to argue for conventional tripartite functions of the Mycenaean king in the religious, military and judicial-administrative spheres, we must do so on the basis of the internal evidence of Linear B texts and Aegean archaeological remains—and *not* according to a preconceived Indo-European

---

themselves, the stelae, the gold masks, and the manner of burial are un-Minoan. In my view this has little relevance to whether or not the objects with religious iconography have a religious value. We are here at the outset of palatial culture and cannot expect to find widely manifested evidence of "mainlanders adopting the Minoan beliefs and religious system". What we have here is a selective élite using these and other symbols, such as the non-Minoan but equally non-pan-Mycenaean funeral masks, to legitimize and enhance their authority. Whether they would have used such symbols in their lives as well is a question which the poor documentation for LH I-LH II aristocratic architecture at Mycenae and Pylos makes it impossible to answer. Eventually when we have sufficient evidence of religious practices in the full palatial period, we see Minoan elements installed and integrated. There is no compelling reason to argue, essentially from a broader silence of archaeological testimony, that the "religious" artifacts of the later Shaft Graves had no "religious" or "charismatic" meaning for the "rulers" with whom they were buried.
To use a simple modern example, I believe that my grandmother was buried with a rosary that was both the only religious artefact in her grave and also the only item that would possibly identify her Ukrainian-Polish origins. Otherwise her burial would appear secular and American in form and in its artefactual assemblage. But the absence of corroborating materials would not invalidate the significance of the rosary as a subtle token of ethnic origin and a clear symbol of religious belief.
With regard to the simple borrowing of terms from another culture to reinforce social status and even expected patterns of behavior, we might think of the different values and behavioral styles connected with a person in a restaurant called a "host" or "hostess" and a person called a *maître d'hôtel*.

30 J.-P. OLIVIER, "The Possible Methods in Deciphering the Pictographic Cretan Script", in Y. DUHOUX *et al.* eds., *Problems in Decipherment* (1989) figs. 1-2. Also in the same volume, Y. DUHOUX, "Le linéaire A: problèmes de déchiffrement", 60-61, 74.

formula. It is my own opinion that the powers and authority of the *wanax* are intimately connected with -- and derived from -- his religious associations. This is certainly what the textual dossier, however limited and accidentally formed it might be, would suggest.

Judicial matters do not enter directly into the Linear B texts, except for the well-known dispute between the priestess *Eritha* and the *demos* about the nature of her landholding. This disagreement is recorded, without any hint at how it might be resolved, in Pylos tablet Ep 704.5-.6. There are, of course, in the Linear B texts many relationships with contractual or obligatory aspects to them that would depend on judicial determination of matters under dispute. But we have no legal documents that would inform us on such subjects.

From the texts, it appears that the dominant military figure is the etymologically transparent *lawagetas* ("leader of the *laos*" where *laos* is generally taken to mean "the collective folk of armed warriors") [31]. References within the Pylos tablets indicate that its well-documented palatial territory had a single *lawagetas* and a single *wanax*. Each is of high status. Each is apparently named in the texts by title and also by personal name, perhaps indicating a differentiation between duties and privileges attached to them as officials and attached to them in their status as "private" persons of high social standing. They are contextually associated with one another in tablets that record: their *temenê* (PY Er 312), their contributions of ceremonial banquet items to Poseidon (PY Un 718), and absent rowers in their charge (PY An 724). The *lawagetas* seems to be second to the *wanax* in rank and status. Both have individual craftsmen who are designated adjectivally (*wa-na-ka-te-ro* and *ra-wa-ke-si-jo*) as theirs, most probably meaning that these craftsmen are in their service. In return for such services, these craftsmen received the reward of landholdings that are recorded, so far as we can tell, in separate series (Ea and Eb/En/Eo/Ep) for the personnel of the *lawagetas* and the personnel of the *wanax* respectively. Thus the *wanax* and the *lawagetas* seem to have clearly distinguished spheres of influence, responsibility and privilege.

If the *lawagetas* is the chief military official, what role might the *wanax* have in warfare, and how does the relationship between these two figures at the very end of the palatial period fit with the theory that we have proposed for the origin of the *wanax* and *wanax* ideology? The *wanax* may have some concern for matters of warfare, but the evidence is minimal. For example, he might have his own armorer: an individual named *a-tu-ko* is identified as an *e-te-do-mo wa-na-ka-te-ro* in tablet PY En 609.5 and holds one of the smallest shares of land of any granted to the mainly religious personnel in the Eb/En/Eo/Ep series. But the etymology of the term as *entes-domos* (comparing ἔντα = "fighting gear, arms, armor" in Homer) is so problematical as to be explicitly rejected by Ventris and Chadwick in their second edition of *Documents in Mycenaean Greek* [32]. The only other possible military association of the *wanax* in the tablets depends on the identification of the individual named *e-ke-ra$_2$-wo* (with other alternative spellings) as the personal name of the Messenian *wanax*. This now seems compelling linguistically, archivally and textually [33]. The name itself means "he who holds (preserves?) the *laos* [or fighting force] (in check?)", and it would be highly appropriate for a Mycenaean ruler and in line with similar Homeric and/or Mycenaean

31 See LINDGREN (*supra* n. 15) 134-136, for a discussion of this etymology and for a capsule analysis of the role of the *lawagetas* in the Linear B tablets. See also J.M. DRIESSEN, "La 'grande tablette' (As 1516) de Cnossos", *Minos* 19 (1985) 169-193, esp. pp. 191-192 for the identity of the *lawagetas* and pp. 192-193 for the hypothesis that the 71 men listed on this tablet, most under the *lawagetas*, formed something like a royal guard, equivalent to "the Friends of the King" at Ugarit.

32 *Docs*^{2} 546.

33 The linguistic difficulties raised by the alternative spellings and the particular value of the sign *ra$_2$* have been substantially removed by A. LEUKART, "Les signes **76* (*ra$_2$*, "*rja*") et **68* (*ro$_2$*, "*rjo*") et le nom du grand prêtre de Poséidon (sinon du roi) à Pylos", in J.P. OLIVIER ed., *Mykenaika* (*BCH Suppl.* XXV: 1992) 387-405, and esp. 404-405. I shall discuss the archival evidence below.

"significant names" such as Menelaus, Neleus (cf. *ne-ti-ja-no*), Hektor (attested in Linear B as *e-ko-to*), *e-ke-da-mo* (*i.e.*, *Ekhedamos*), and perhaps Achilles (attested in Linear B as *a-ki-re-u*). On two long multiple-entry tablets dealing most probably with a regular system for the recruitment of rowers for the palatial fleet, *e-ke-ra₂-wo* (PY An 724 and An 610) is recorded with relatively large numbers [34]. It should be noted, however, that in this case the individual who is the *wanax* is simply one among many individuals and collective groups responsible for rowers, and that on both tablets the responsibility is linked to his personal identity rather than to the office of *wanax per se* [35]. Thus we have no secure evidence that the *wanax* has control of, or even any critical responsibilities for, the management of military affairs [36].

In the Indo-European model as seen in Hittite ruler ideology, the king would be simultaneously commander of the army, chief priest, and guarantor thereby of the prosperity of his community [37]. Yet the Hittite king took his functions as the highest human authority in the sacred realm extremely seriously, to the point where the need to perform rituals for the gods could and did outweigh military considerations, *i.e.*, the king's role as priest took precedence even over his role as military commander [38]. But as we have made clear, the Indo-European model cannot be applied to the Mycenaean *wanax*. Instead one can argue, with some validity, even from palatial architecture and iconography [39], that the *wanax* had primarily religious functions, while military matters were in the hands of the *lawagetas*. This might certainly be the expected outcome of the differentiation that I have suggested took place at the period of the later Shaft Graves at Mycenae. The social value of warfare for the Shaft Grave warrior nobility and the prestige that it conferred upon them would have remained in their domain throughout the palatial period, while the *wanax* concerned himself primarily with the performance of rituals that assured the benevolence of the gods towards his

34 See T.G. PALAIMA, "Maritime Matters in the Linear B Tablets", *Thalassa* 285-286, with further references. It is an assumption, based mainly on the large number of rowers and on presumed parallels with the levying methods in Ugaritic texts, that these rowers are military personnel.

35 In contrast, An 724 refers to the *ra-wa-ke-ta* and An 610 to *we-da-ne-u*, the personal name of the *lawagetas*.

36 I have kindly been permitted to mention the forthcoming publication by C.W. SHELMERDINE and J. BENNET of a sealing recently discovered at the site of Pylos that bears an inscription relating to *pa-ta-ja* (=javelins) and has on the face that would normally bear the seal impression the single phonogram *wa*, most likely standing for the adjectival form of *wanax*. This would designate this military equipment as technically the property of the *wanax*. Again, however, this does not place him actively in military affairs. In the military sphere, the *e-qe-ta* ("Followers" most likely "of the king") seem to serve as liaisons between the palace and field operations. They accompany divisions on the *o-ka* tablets from Pylos, but do not control them. They have a direct connection with chariot wheels in the PY Sa series and with economic production in the Knossos tablets. See LINDGREN (*supra* n. 15) *s.v.* The *ra-wa-ke-ta* otherwise is much less attested than the *wanax* in the Linear B documents, perhaps because the tablets focus primarily upon the -- broadly defined -- economic concerns of the *wanax*-dominated palatial system. See *supra* n. 31.

37 See E. MASSON, *Le combat pour l'immortalité. Héritage indo-européen dans la mythologie anatolienne* (1991) 225-250.

38 For a thumbnail description of the religious duties and other functions of the Hittite king, see J.A. MACQUEEN, *The Hittites* (1986) 75-77, 115-116. For a fuller account, cf. O.R. GURNEY, "Hittite Kingship", in S.H. HOOKE ed., *Myth, Ritual, and Kingship* (1958) 121, 105-121. For a specific example of the king's relationship to the divine, as chief priest of the state ritual and sacrifice, as personal servant of the gods, and as direct beneficiary of the patronage and protection of particular divinities, *e.g.*, the sun-goddess Arinna and the storm-god, cf. "Prayer to Be Spoken in an Emergency", in J.B. PRITCHARD ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (1950) 397-399. In the 27th year of the *Annals of Mursilis II*, the king returns from a campaign in order to celebrate the Puruli-festival.

39 See the suggestion of Kilian and Hiller (in the *Addendum* to this article, *infra*) that the Southwest Building at Pylos might be the "palace" of the *lawagetas*. One could also contrast the religious-ritualistic-charismatic iconography of the megaron complex with the military scenes depicted elsewhere in the Palace of Nestor.

community. The Hittite model shows clearly that society as a whole would have viewed the role of the *wanax* as intermediary with the divine sphere as of overwhelming importance for the well-being of the entire community. Thus one should not be surprised that the *temenos* of the *wanax* on Er 312 is three times as large as that of the *lawagetas*.

The Linear B tablets furnish clear and ample evidence for the religious duties and powers of the *wanax*. Only the force of the Indo-European/Homeric paradigm and the absence of any model of historical development such as I have proposed in this paper have kept scholars from accepting that the tablet evidence in this case is not skewed by the hazards of discovery, that in fact the *wanax* was primarily a religious figure. We have explicit references to the *wanax* that :

1. involve him or personnel associated with him in landholdings connected with a religious district (PY Er 312.1; En 74.3, .23; En 609.5; Eo 371.a);
2. have him making an appointment or burial (PY Ta 711.1);
3. record the distribution of scented oil (PY Fr 1215.1, 1220.2, 1227, 1235.1) and spice (KN Ga 675) from the palace stores to divinities and to the *wanax* himself;
4. undergoing or presiding over an initiation (PY Un 2.1).

In addition, *Ekhelawon* is also recorded on religious offering texts (Un 718, Un 853) making major donations of banquet provisions to the god Poseidon (grain, wine, a bull, cheese, sheepskin, honey / cloth, wool, oil, a ram, a ewe, a she-goat, 2 boars, 4 or more sows, *pharwos* cloth).

As we have seen, the *wanax* holds a *temenos*, as does the *lawagetas*. While this term probably does not carry in the Mycenaean period its later religious significance, tablet Er 312 which records these *temenê* is most reasonably interpreted as a document that would be used later to assess contributions to religious ceremonies. The *wanax* on tablet Un 2 is described as undergoing or presiding over an "initiation" in the religious district *pa-ki-ja-ne* whose name means "the place of slaughter". It is the occasion of a public ceremonial banquet. Although we do not know the precise nature of the "initiation", it is significant that elsewhere the potter, fuller and *e-te-do-mo* of the *wanax* are recorded as holding land grants in this same district where otherwise exclusively religious personnel have holdings: "servants of the god", "servants of the priestess", the religious functionary known as the "key-bearer", "priests" and "sacrificing priests". Moreover, in the Linear B tablets only the *wanax* is recorded as undergoing an initiation. The *wanax*, recorded by his personal name *Ekhelawon*, is the chief contributor of offerings for a sacrificial banquet to Poseidon (Un 718). *Ekhelawon* makes major banquet contributions in regard to Poseidon on the fragmentary tablet Un 853. The other two tablets by this scribe (Hand 6) record:

1. animals for sacrifice and other items such as cloth and wool in relation to Poseidon and the important Pylian deity *pe-re-*82* (Un 6), both of whom have sanctuaries in the district of *pa-ki-ja-ne* (cf. Tn 316); and
2. wool and cloth, in one instance involving *ka-pa-ti-ja* who is the "key-bearer" of *pa-ki-ja-ne*.

This raises the question again of the separation of the *wanax*'s duties as *wanax* and his obligations as an individual of clearly exalted status. But here, unlike what we saw in regard to the military sphere, there is strong evidence of major religious duties and activities both in an official and a personal capacity.

John Killen's recent, as yet not fully published, work [40] with Linear B tablets and sealings from Thebes, Knossos and Pylos that record materials for ritual sacrificial banquets makes it clear that public ceremonies of this sort were a chief means for the Mycenaean *wanax* not only to perform an important religious duty, but also to display his charisma and thereby assert and reinforce his power. Killen's conclusions are further supported by Lucinda McCallum's work on the fresco program of the megaron at Pylos [41]. Together they leave little doubt in my mind that one function of the throne-room complex was as a center for such community-uniting ceremonies, and that a chief function of the king or *wanax* was to preside over ritual sacrifices and feasts, much as Nestor does at the arrival of Telemachus in the *Odyssey*.

On tablet Un 718, *Ekhelawon*, the *lawagetas*, the *demos*, and a lower-level social group known as the *worgioneion* separately contribute edible items like sheep, cheese, wine, honey and grain to a banquet for Poseidon. If we accept the argument so far advanced, these contributors can be interpreted as representing the fundamental functional divisions of society into the major practitioner in the religious realm (*Ekhelawon*), the chief figure in the sphere of warfare (*lawagetas*), the class of food producers (*damos*), and the class of "outsiders" (*worgioneion*) [42]. This last group would consist of those who live in the territory of Messenia, but are not fully integrated members of it. One naturally thinks of *metics* in historical Greece or the *perioikoi* and *helotes* in historical Sparta. The Linear B tablets from Pylos offer ample evidence for the presence of a sizable number of persons who are identified by non-Messenian ethnics. These include Zakynthians, Amnisians, and the many women workers with ethnics from the western coast of Anatolia. Thus tablet Un 718 offers a model of the way that such ceremonies would symbolically unite all the people who lived in the kingdom of Pylos.

On Un 718 *Ekhelawon* alone contributes a single bull. I do not think it is mere coincidence that the processional frieze on the wall of the Vestibule (Room 5) of the Throne Room within the Pylos megaron complex depicts a single bull as the lone animal being brought as offering **(Pl. XLIa)** and that the Throne Room (Room 6) frescoes depict seated banqueters and a lyre player who is seated in the open air on a rock and accompanied by an extraordinary bird. From the same area of the Throne Room also come fresco fragments of a single bull **(Pl. XLIb)** [43]. The procession depicted in the fresco in Room 5 moves in the

---

40 Killen has discussed this material in papers presented in Naples and Austin. He adduces Inca parallels. PY Un 2, Un 138 and the Thebes sealings all seem to be connected with commensual ceremonies. See now C. PITEROS, J.-P. OLIVIER, J.L. MELENA, "Les inscriptions en linéaire B des nodules de Thèbes", *BCH* 114 (1990) 166-184; and J.T. KILLEN, "Observations on the Thebes Sealings", *Mykenaika* (*supra* n. 33) 365-380.

41 L. MCCALLUM, *Decorative Program in the Mycenaean Palace of Pylos: The Megaron Frescoes* (Ph.D. Diss. Univ. of Pennsylvania 1987) esp. 108-133. See also R. HÄGG, "Pictorial Programmes in Minoan Palaces and Villas", in P. DARCQUE and J.-C. POURSAT, eds., *L'iconographie minoenne. Actes de la Table Ronde d'Athènes (21-23 avril 1983)* (*BCH Suppl.* XI: 1985) 214-217 and figs. 2-3.

42 See L.R. PALMER (*supra* nn. 3-5) for this analysis strictly along Indo-European lines. I would stress that these divisions work for most societies, since they are fundamental to the survival and growth of any society.

43 See MCCALLUM (*supra* n. 41) 117-133, for the special cult status of the bull in Aegean iconography and the significance of these scenes at Pylos as a procession that was part of a "state sponsored festival" in honor of a major deity. McCallum agrees with my point about the single bull offering on Un 718. I should also add here that an important tablet from Pylos (Cn 418) that lists specially tended sacrificial bulls records that they are under the control of *we-da-ne-u*, the *lawagetas*. McCallum does not, however, draw attention to the fact that the lyre player is seated outside, which is of relevance to the discussion (below) about the location of the ceremonies represented in the megaron iconographical program. Finally, I should note that McCallum reconstructs the bull from Room 6 as on a table of sacrifice. P. Rehak and N.

direction of the Throne Room and contains one figure, among those bringing offerings, who is of much larger scale than the others bringing offerings. I would note that this figure is positioned to the front of the procession and ahead of the super-scale bull. It has been suggested that this figure is the *wanax* himself [44]. The scene depicts a procession making its way to an open-air shrine, and it would not be improbable that the *wanax* would participate. The tablet evidence might be taken to suggest that the destination would have been *pa-ki-ja-ne* with its many textually attested religious precincts (cf. Tn 316) [45]. The significance of the processional scene for the Throne Room is at least to symbolize that the megaron hearth was "literally and figuratively the focus of the whole establishment" [46]. I would argue further that it is the focus of all inhabitants of the kingdom of Messenia, and that at least some symbolic ritual activities must have taken place in the Throne Room proper [47].

It is worth mentioning here that the *wanax* -- whatever his precise powers and functions -- is the most conspicuous human figure in the Linear B tablets. No other title appears in quite so many diverse and important contexts. The *wanax* is the only person who undergoes or presides over an initiation (Un 2). The *wanax* is the only person who appoints (or buries?) another official, an occasion that gives rise to our lengthiest and most detailed description of specially ornamented vases and costly decorated furniture (Ta series). With the exception of the *lawagetas*, the *wanax* alone possesses a *temenos*, and his is three times bigger than the military leader's. The *wanax* alone at Knossos has a purple-dye workshop or workers or purple dye itself under his control [48]. We should stress that the rarity of this dye and the evidence that the Minoans may have been the first to exploit it commercially make it likely that it had the same rare aristocratic associations in the Bronze Age that it did in the historical period. Perhaps it is not too far-fetched to propose that the link between the dye and the *wanax* went back to Minoan palatial culture [49].

Marinatos have informed me independently that there is no material evidence for the table upon which the bull rests.

44 KILIAN, *OJA* 7 (1988) 300 n. 1.

45 It might not be too romantic to recall the scene that greeted Telemachus on his arrival in Messenia: Nestor presiding over sacrifices of bulls along the shore.

46 MCCALLUM (*supra* n. 41) 119-120 and n. 48, cites G. SÄFLUND, "Sacrificial Banquets in the 'Palace of Nestor'", *OpAth* 13 (1980) 241 on this symbolism, but objects to Säflund's assumption that the palace proper was a *hieron* or "holy place". I think this is more a problem of modern nomenclature. If one calls the palace a shrine or sanctuary or temple, one immediately conjures up modern associations linked to our strict dichotomy between religious and secular. Perhaps it is best to remind ourselves of the intelligent observation by R. HÄGG (*supra* n. 41), 209-210, that "[s]uch programmes are well known from Ancient Near Eastern cultures, as *e.g.* the Assyrian palaces, where the supreme power and dignity of the ruler *as well as his close connection with the gods* are expressed". [Italics mine.]

47 MCCALLUM (*supra* n. 41) 120, speaks of the difficulty of maneuvering a live bull into the Throne Room and the damage this would cause to the painted plaster floor. We should perhaps be cautious about applying our modern sensibilities to such matters. Nevertheless it seems to me that the purpose of the ceremonial scenes in the megaron complex is to remind one of the ritual actions that have taken place *en plein air*: the procession of worshippers with their ample offerings (boxes, grain trays, vases, the single bull); the bard, seated on the rocks and accompanied by the preternatural bird on the wing; the banqueters, who would be among the thousands who could be fed by the menu items listed on the Un tablets or by the aggregate of animals in the Thebes sealings. The scenes serve the same purpose as images of the crucified Christ, stations of the cross, and images of the last supper in Roman Catholic churches. In Roman Catholic ritual, no human being is driven along to be crucified outdoors on a cross nor do a dozen or so apostles sit around a table dining, but a symbolic ritual enactment of these events regularly takes place indoors involving smaller or larger numbers of the overall parish community and presided over by the priest who lives within the church complex.

48 PALAIMA (*supra* n. 34) 289-291.

49 Many of the techniques and products of the Minoan cloth industry and the terms for them were adopted by the Mycenaeans.

The *wanax* is the only official to be allotted offerings of perfumed oil along with the divinities Poseidon and *potnia*: Pylos tablet Fr 1235 lists the *wanax* and then the *potnia* on its two lines. This has caused some to wonder whether *wanax* in the Mycenaean period might not also serve as a divine epithet as in Homer, or whether *potnia* (which means "she who masters") might not sometimes stand for the human queen in her role as stand-in of the divine "Mistress" goddess. I do not think that this is a necessary deduction. It is clear from the textual evidence that *potnia* and Poseidon are the principal male and female deities of Bronze Age Messenia, the patron divinities of the kingdom of Pylos. The *wanax* would be the chief intermediary between them and his people and therefore be closely associated with them both. The oil tablets are intrinsically economic, not religious [50].

The adjectival form of *wanax* is the only modifier of perfumed oil shipped between Mycenaean palatial centers. The form of this adjective *wanakteros* (with its binary-contrastive *-teros* suffix) stands in unique opposition to such forms as *lawagesios*. It stresses linguistically that the *wanax* is special. He is "other" than the rest of society. He is differentiated from all other officials and individuals. No priest, priestess, official, or human being comes close to the *wanax* in prominence. For the greatest ceremonial banquet recorded on the tablets, it is *Ekhelawon*, *wanax* of Pylos, who makes the major contribution, including the sacrificial bull. Piet de Jong's color restoration of the Throne Room at Pylos is inaccurate in many ways, but I think it is most accurate in its most imaginative detail: there is a male *wanax* sitting on the throne.

Part II. *Further Evidence: Archival Evidence for the Identification of* Ekhelawon *as* Wanax. *The Ideology and Origins of the Scepter as a Sacred Symbol. The Word* Skêptron. *Minoan Iconographical Representations of Figures With Scepters. Evidence from Palaeography of Minoan Familiarity With the "Throne and Scepter". The Parallel of the "Double Axe" Sign.*

In this closing section, I shall discuss briefly evidence and arguments that are either technically complicated and specialized or much more speculative than those discussed above. I separate them in order to make clear that the interpretation of the *wanax* so far advanced can stand on its own merits.

1. A major point of scholarly debate has been the identity of the individual named *Ekhelawon* with the *wanax*. Besides the new linguistic interpretations of Leukart (*supra* n. 33), there is now strong archival evidence for this identification. The crucial texts Un 718 and Er 312 are both written by Hand 24 [51]. Un 718, which lists *Ekhelawon* and the *lawagetas*, is found in an unusual find-spot in Room 7 (grid 83), dissociated from the full page-shaped tablets of storage Room 8 and even from the smaller number of tablets found in Room 7. This location is to the left of the doorway into Room 7 and away from the doorway into Room 8, next to which tablets awaiting processing were placed. What no one has noticed before is that Un 718 is found in context with one other important series: the Ta tablets of Hand 2 that comprise the inventory of precious vessels and furniture on the occasion when the *wanax*, so designated, either appointed or buried an official. That these tablets should be grouped together in an isolated place within the archives can best be explained by their relating to the

50 The tablets are concerned with noting the distribution of the oil from the central stores. To continue the analogy of n. 47, a modern equivalent would be a receipt from a wine supplier of a delivery of wine to a parish church. This might combine an entry for table wine for the priest and another entry for wine for the sacred mass.

51 For the work of this scribe, see T.G. PALAIMA , *The Scribes of Pylos* (1988) 89-91. The reader may also want to consult the grids of the Archives Complex on pp. 184-185. Here I would like to thank members of the *Konversatorium* that I taught in Salzburg in fall-winter 1992/93 for patiently checking my argument.

affairs of the *wanax*. Tablets Er 312 and 880 of Hand 24, one of which records the *wanax*'s temenos while the other records *Ekhelawon*'s orchard-vineyard, are stored together in Room 8 with the important religious offering text Tn 316. The label for Un 718 is found in the normal spot for label discards. That find-spot also contains the Es tablets of offerings to Poseidon and three other parties, one of whom, *we-da-ne-u*, may have been the *ra-wa-ke-ta*[52]. The nexus of associations is such as to make it clear that Hand 24 was in charge of compiling texts that made it possible to calculate the contributions due for religious functions from the *wanax* in his capacity as *wanax* and from *Ekhelawon* in his private status.

2. The powers of the Homeric king are closely associated with the symbol of the *skêptron* or scepter which has profound religious significance and transmits divine authority to the human sphere, whether to individual *basileis*, to messengers, to individual speakers in an assembly, or to successive generations of the royal lineage of the house of Atreus. The purple passage here is *Iliad* 2.100-109 [53].

The *skêptron* is "ancestral, forever imperishable"; it is manufactured by Hephaistos and given to Zeus as *wanax*. He entrusts it then to Hermes, also described as *wanax*. Hermes, as messenger between the divine and mortal realms, transmits the scepter and its divine powers of authority to the human rulers of the Argolid, who then pass it down from generation to generation: from Pelops to Atreus to Thyestes to Agamemnon. They are able to *anassein*—they "hold authority as *wanax*"—through the *skêptron*.

Although Homeric kingship is not Mycenaean kingship, what gives me the temerity to think that this practice and symbol go back to the Mycenaean period is the following line of argument. First we find a close association of the *skêptron* in Homer with the terms and concepts: *wanax* and *wanassein*. Second, we note Benveniste's observation that the word *skêptron* itself, and the concepts with which it is associated, are not pan-Indo-European [54]. In fact both are markedly Greek. The word itself is derived from *skêptô* and means "lean or press upon with all one's weight". It is, as Easterling remarks, a walking stick or messenger's staff. Both Benveniste and Melena stress the sacred quality of this object. Holding it defines the traveler as "a sacred personage whose mission is to transmit a message of authority". It makes the one who holds it a sacred individual, and this applies equally to a priest, a king, a *mantis*, or even an epic bard like Hesiod. Thus the Homeric "Zeus-nourished" and "Zeus-born" king serves as "messenger" in transmitting divine will to the community that he rules.

Since the concept and term are singularly Greek, we should ask whence did they come? On the philological side, I would argue that the isolation of the word originally to Greek and its fundamental descriptive meaning make it likely that it is the product of a cultural borrowing. The scepter is essentially a simple staff or walking stick. Thus Pausanias, in a passage (9.40.11) discussed both by Benveniste and Easterling, describes an object that he saw at Chaeronea and that the Chaeroneans claimed was the very staff from the second book of the *Iliad* that Hephaistos had made for Zeus and that Hermes had transmitted to the Pelopids. We are told that the Chaeroneans worship this scepter and call it a *doru*, *i.e.*, a spear. In appearance it must have been very similar to a simple spear-shaft. This is further corroborated by Benveniste's citation of Justin 43.3: "hastas quas Graeci sceptra dicere" :

---

52 LINDGREN (*supra* nn. 1 and 15) I 127; II 134-136.

53 This passage is ably explicated by P. EASTERLING, "Agamemnon's *Skêptron* in the *Iliad*", in M.M. MACKENZIE and C. ROUECHÉ, eds., *Images of Authority. Papers Presented to Joyce Reynolds on the Occasion of her 70th Birthday* (*Cambridge Philological Society Suppl. vol.* 16: 1989) 104-121. I thank John Lenz for alerting me to this article. See also J.L. MELENA (*supra* n. 26) 321-356, for a full discussion of Homeric passages, and especially p. 346 and nn. 162-165.

54 *Le vocabulaire* II 29-42.

"spears which the Greeks call scepters". The point is that we are not dealing with anything elaborate, but rather with a plain spear that has remarkable powers.

If the Minoans used a staff on occasions of communication between the divine and human spheres, what would the Mycenaeans have called the thing if they used it on similar occasions and for similar purposes? They could have adopted the Minoan term, or a term borrowed through Minoan, as they undoubtedly did with the Semitic word for gold. The term for gold probably occurs on Knossos tablet K 740.7 in the compound form of the name of a special vase shape (*207^{VAS}) with Minoan *u*-treatment: *ku-ru*-su-**56*. It elsewhere occurs with its normal Greek *o*-treatment: *ku-ru*-so. Or the Mycenaeans could have done what they did with that special Minoan object, the larnax. On a Knossos sealing (KN Ws 8497), this object is recorded using the pre-Greek form *a-sa-mi-to* equaling *asaminthos* with the conspicuous non-Greek *-nth-* element. On the presumably later mainland tablet Pylos Tn 996, a pair of *larnakes* are listed as *re-wo-te-re-jo*, that is, using a basic, descriptive Greek-derived noun: *loutreion*, which means simply "something to bathe with". This would be precisely analogous to the process I am suggesting for the borrowing of the scepter as what we might consider a cult or ritual object. It would eventually have become part of the *Greek* vocabulary, not as a loan-word, but as a rather ordinary Greek term that stresses the plain inherent function of the object.

This conjecture will only be reasonable if we can demonstrate that the Minoans had such staffs and used them in ways similar to the later Greek practice. Wolf-Dietrich Niemeier and Erik Hallager, in their thorough studies of what was formerly known as the Priest-King fresco and the Khania sealing that is now known as the Master Impression, have gathered together the iconographical comparanda for what Niemeier calls "the gesture of command"[55]. On gold rings and seal impressions that come from Minoan-Mycenaean Knossos and from what we might call "transitional" Minoan-Mycenaean LM IB-LM II Khania, and on one cushion-shaped seal from Naxos, we see:

a. the Knossos Mother on the Mountain sealing **(Pl. XLIIa)**;
b. a ring with an airborne figure hovering between a shrine and a flounce-skirted adorant in a gesture of worship **(Pl. XLIIb)**;
c. a sealing with a figure standing before a lion **(Pl. XLIIc)**;
d. a cushion seal (*CMS* V no. 608) with male figure reaching out over an table and presumably ritual vessels and objects **(Pl. XLIId)**;
e. the Khania Master Impression (*CMS* V Suppl. 1A no. 142) with a super-scale, long-haired male surmounting buildings crowned with Horns of Consecration **(Pl. XLIIe)**.

All these figures hold in their outstretched hands a simple shaft or an obvious spear. In all cases the images have to do either with power or with divine or religious authority. In two cases the symbolism clearly is that of communication between the divine and mortal realms. This is the Minoan staff of which I speak. This is what I think the Mycenaeans later called *skêptron* or even *doru*. This is what the Mycenaeans brought into their remarkably anonymous and non-represented ritual of kingship. This is where I would propose the Greek tradition seen in Homer and Hesiod ultimately derived the idea of the scepter and of its

55 E. HALLAGER, *The Master Impression* (*SIMA* LXIX:1985) figs. 11, 20f, 22h, 28a, 28d, 28g, 28 j-k, 30 b-c, with Near Eastern comparanda in fig. 29 a-g. See HALLAGER, pp. 24-25, for full discussion of the sacred nature of the staff and the gesture on the Khania sealing; and p. 29, n. 145, for a discussion of whether the Mother on the Mountain sealing, which dates to a destruction horizon of the palace of Minos, is an heirloom from Minoan times. Cf. W.-D. NIEMEIER, "Das Stuckrelief des 'Prinzen mit der Federkrone' aus Knossos und minoische Götterdarstellungen", *AM* 102 (1987) plates 9-10 and especially figs. 15-23.

association with the supreme figures in Mycenaean and Minoan society: Minos, the *wanax*, and later the *basileus*. In this context the reported restoration of a scepter from Shaft Grave IV at Mycenae becomes even more significant [56]. It would place the introduction of this symbol and the notions connected with it at the precise stage when, according to my view, other kinds of Minoan symbols and ideas were being used to authorize the *wanax* as the paramount figure in Mycenaean society.

One final point comes from palaeography. It is by no means crucial to my argument, but it is worthwhile mentioning in this context. In the Linear B writing system the signs with *o*-vowel are mainly Linear B inventions. This is one reason that I believe tentatively scholars like Y. Duhoux when they offer other reasons for believing that the Minoan language had primarily three vowels: *a*, *i*, and *u* [57]. Linear A had no signs for *do*, *jo*, *mo*, *no*, *qo*, *so*, and *wo*. The Linear B sign for *o* (sign *61) is taken over from Linear A where it might have served for some non-consonantally modified value of *u*. That sign is what Sir Arthur Evans calls "the throne and scepter" **(Pl. XLIIf)**.

One may counter that Evans believed in Priest Kings and other such naive notions sprung from Windsor castle and *The Golden Bough*. But Linear B sign **61* is definitely a chair with a clear vertical or hooked staff symbolically placed over the seat. The sign is occasionally simplified by Linear B scribes, so that only the throne-element remains. But the obvious ideal and prototype is the throne and scepter in inextricable association, clearly stressing the scepter as the symbol of the authority figure who would be seated on the throne[58]. The Minoans used this symbol at least in Linear A and in forms that also have a conspicuous "scepter". Clear examples are to be seen on the following documents: HT 93a.6, HT 113.3, HT Wa 1231, HT Wa 1279, PH 2.2, KH Wc 2006 and KH Wc 2110. It is particularly encouraging to find the form with the scepter used in LM IB at Khania, the period in which the Master Impression most probably was made or arrived at the same site [59]. When Jean-Pierre Olivier publishes the corpus of Cretan hieroglyphic inscriptions, we shall know whether the Minoans also used a more representational form of this symbol in hieroglyphic. Until then, it is enough for me to know that the Minoans were familiar enough with such symbolism to incorporate it into their Linear A writing system. There is a clear parallel for this process. The Minoans did the same thing with the sign that is the prototype for the later Linear B sign **08* = *a*. This sign is definitely connected with a sacral symbol: the Minoan double axe **(Pl. XLIIg)**. Although it is schematized in Linear B, it is found drawn in forms that are clearly double axes both in Linear A (including versions that reproduce the curving sides of the miniature gold double axes from Cretan sanctuaries) and in Cretan hieroglyphic, and it has a healthy life as a mason's mark, found in many locations including an ashlar wall from an earlier stage of the Palace of Nestor and the ashlar façade of tholos 1 at Peristeria [60].

---

56 KILIAN, *OJA* 7 (1988) 294.

57 DUHOUX (*supra* n. 30) 72.

58 For Minoan-Mycenaean throne iconography, see the papers by P. REHAK and J.G. YOUNGER in this volume. The Knossian Linear B forms are discussed and illustrated in *PM* IV 686-688, where Evans also comments on the Linear A and Linear B signs for double axe and perhaps Horns of Consecration. A very good example of a Linear A version of the sign with crooked scepter is illustrated in *PM* I 625, fig. 462, the stone ladle-shaped vessel from Troullos. For a synoptic view of the Linear A shapes, cf. L. GODART and J.-P. OLIVIER, *Recueil des inscriptions en linéaire A* (1985) vol. 5, xxxviii.

59 HALLAGER (*supra* n. 55) 11-15. The sealing seems to be of the kind that was used fairly commonly in the Minoan neo-palatial period in connection with small documents of folded leather. As such it might have been manufactured elsewhere and brought to Khania. Its archaeological context is in a large LM I-II dump. But lacking evidence that the kind of administration in which such a sealing was used continued past LM IB, Hallager prefers to date the piece to the final stage of neopalatial culture.

60 S. HOOD, "Mason's Marks in the Palaces", *FunctMinPal* 205-212 and fig. 5; VERMEULE (*supra* n. 24) fig. 6. For the double axe in Cretan hieroglyphic, see OLIVIER (*supra* n. 30) 58, fig. 5, sign 03. It is the

This is a final way in which Minoan culture made its mark -- in this case literally, physically, and ideologically -- on Mycenaean palatial culture.

Thomas G. PALAIMA

ADDENDUM

My thinking about Mycenaean kingship has been shaped by the following activities: participating in the Sibley conference on world kingship organized by Linda Schele at the University of Texas at Austin in spring 1991; lecturing at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in January, 1992; offering a Konversatorium as Fulbright Gastprofessor of Mycenaean Studies at the University of Salzburg in fall-winter 1992-93; lecturing at the University of Nancy in December, 1992 and at the University of Heidelberg in January, 1993; and being asked by Paul Rehak and Nanno Marinatos to deliver a paper *in absentia* at the AIA session that formed the basis for this *Aegaeum* volume. J.G. Younger kindly read the paper for me. In particular I would like to thank Mary Blomberg, Pierre Carlier, Kevin Cauley, Stefan Hiller, Sigrid Jalkotzy, Sara Kimball, John Lenz, Wolf-Dietrich Niemeier, Oswald Panagl, Paul Rehak, Kent Reilly and Fred Schwink, for discussions and references.

I would like to dedicate this paper to the memories of two scholars who wrote clearly, critically and provocatively on the textual and archaeological evidence for Mycenaean kingship: James Hooker and Klaus Kilian. All who want to begin to understand the complexities of this subject would do well to begin with their articles: J.T. HOOKER, "The *wanax* in the Linear B Texts", *Kadmos* 18 (1979) 100-111; IDEM, "Titles and Functions in the Pylian State", in J.T. KILLEN, J.L. MELENA, and J.-P. OLIVIER eds., *Studies in Mycenaean and Classical Greek Presented to John Chadwick* (*Minos* 20-22: 1987) 257-267; and K. KILIAN, "The Emergence of *wanax* Ideology in the Mycenaean Palaces", *OJA* 7 (1988) 291-302. Hooker reassesses the assumptions involved in the standard interpretations of Mycenaean kingship. He argues correctly that belief in the divinity of the Mycenaean *wanax* or even in the existence of a deity titled *wanax* is just that: a ***belief*** requiring leaps of faith and logic of the sort used by Sir Arthur Evans in identifying Minoan Priest Kings. Hooker himself puts forward some unwarranted and patently untenable hypotheses from his familiar position of *advocatus diaboli*, for example the theory that the term *wanax* within the dossier of Linear B tablets from any particular Mycenaean palatial site might refer to local leaders within the territories controlled by the major sites. But in general he offers a sobering corrective to some general treatments of Mycenaean kingship. Kilian examines the architectural history of the mainland palaces and their decorative programs in order to trace the evolution of *wanax* ideology in mainland palatial territories from LH IIIA:1 onward. His article is particularly important for interpreting these developments in light of the social and organizational developments that transformed the Middle Helladic ranked society into a stratified Mycenaean society "probably with a royal family at its head" (p. 292). However, he accepts (pp. 292-294) the theory of I. KILIAN-DIRLMEIER, "Beobachtungen zu den Schachtgräbern von Mykenai und zu den Schmuckbeigaben mykenischer Männergräber: Untersuchungen zur Sozialstruktur in späthelladischer Zeit", *JRGZM* 33 (1986) 159-198, esp. 167-174, that this transformation was achieved, at least at Mycenae in the Argolid, at the beginning of LH I (Circle B, Grave Γ: to be precise, with Kilian-Dirlmeier's phase 3 materials in Grave Γ, which also contains materials from a phase 2 burial). The date and causes of this transformation remain critical problems in understanding the nature of Mycenaean kingship. Finally one should note that Kilian does not explicitly incorporate his (and S. Hiller's) earlier conjecture ("Zur Funktion der mykenischen Residenzen", *FunctMinPal* 23-25, 38) on the functional purpose for the Mycenaean "double palace" (the main megaron for the *wanax*, another area -- *e.g.*, the SW Building and Hall 65 at Pylos—for the *lawagetas*) into this reconstruction of the development of *wanax* ideology. For the architectural evidence at various sites, cf. also KILIAN, "L'architecture des résidences mycéniennes : Origine et extension d'une structure du pouvoir politique pendant l'âge de Bronze Récent", in E. LÉVY ed., *Le système palatial en Orient, en Grèce et à Rome. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg, 19-22 juin, 1985* (1987) 203-217.

---

third most frequent sign in the clay documents. For the double axe mason's mark on a wall below Room 7, see *PN* I 2 pl. 16.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Pl. XLIa Pylos vestibule fresco, after MCCALLUM (*supra* n. 41) pl. VIIIa.
Pl. XLIb Pylos megaron fresco: bard and banqueters, after MCCALLUM (*supra* n. 41) pl. X.
Pl. XLIIa Mother on the Mountain sealing, after *PM* II 2 809 fig. 528.
Pl. XLIIb Ashmolean Museum 1938.1127 (after V.E.G. KENNA, *Cretan Seals* [1960] 75 fig. 155).
Pl. XLIIc Temple Repository sealing with figure and lion, after *PM* III fig. 325.
Pl. XLIId Naxos seal, after *CMS* V 2 no. 608.
Pl. XLIIe Master Impression, after HALLAGER (*supra* n. 55)
Pl. XLIIf "Throne and scepter sign", after *PM* IV 2 687 fig. 670.
Pl. XLIIg Double axes, after *PM* IV 2 686 fig. 37.