

COLLOQUIUM ROMANUM

ATTI DEL XII COLLOQUIO
INTERNAZIONALE DI MICENOLOGIA

ROMA · 20-25 FEBBRAIO 2006

SOTTO L'ALTO PATRONATO DEL PRESIDENTE DELLA REPUBBLICA

A CURA DI

A. SACCONI, M. DEL FREO, L. GODART, M. NEGRI

II.



«PASIPHAË» · II.

PISA · ROMA

FABRIZIO SERRA · EDITORE

MMVIII

PASIPHAE

RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA
E ANTICITÀ EGEE

DIRETTORI:

LOUIS GODART · ANNA SACCONI

SEGRETARIO DI REDAZIONE:

MAURIZIO DEL FREO

II.

(2008)



PISA · ROMA

FABRIZIO SERRA · EDITORE

MMVIII

PREMESSA

Nel 2001 decidemmo di creare una rivista internazionale di filologia e antichità egee dal nome "Pasiphae" e di affiancare alla rivista stessa una collana intitolata Biblioteca di "Pasiphae" destinata ad accogliere monografie relative alle civiltà egee.

La collana Biblioteca di "Pasiphae" si è arricchita rapidamente di vari volumi: ne sono già apparsi sette e vari altri sono in preparazione.

Iniziamo ora la pubblicazione della rivista "Pasiphae", che uscirà con cadenza annuale: i numeri I (2007) e II (2008) escono contemporaneamente e contengono gli "Atti del XII Colloquio Internazionale di Micenologia", svoltosi a Roma dal 20 al 25 febbraio 2006.

Roma, dicembre 2007.

Louis GODART

Anna SACCONI

SOMMARIO

VOLUME I

SOMMARIO	pag. IX
INTRODUZIONE	» XIII
ELENCO DELLE ABBREVIAZIONI	» XVII
PROGRAMMA	» XXIX
ELENCO DEI PARTECIPANTI	» XXXVII
ELENCO DEGLI UDITORI	» XLII
F. R. ADRADOS, La cultura micenea nella storia della Grecia	» 1
V. L. ARAVANTINOS, Le iscrizioni in lineare B rinvenute a Tebe in Beozia. Osservazioni storico-topografiche sulle scoperte	» 9
V. L. ARAVANTINOS, L. GODART, A. SACCONI, La tavoletta TH Uq 434	» 23
F. AURA JORRO, About some <i>Instrumenta</i> in Mycenology	» 35
A. BARTONĚK, The Lexical Elements in the Mycenaean Compounds	» 53
L. M. BENDALL, How Much Makes a Feast ? Amounts of Banqueting Food- stuffs in the Linear B Records of Pylos	» 77
J. BENNET, E. GRAMMATIKAKI, A. VASILAKIS, T. WHITELAW, The Knossos Urban Landscape Project 2005. Preliminary Results	» 103
A. BERNABÉ, Some Thoughts on the Knossos Ra Series	» 111
P. CARLIER, Réflexions sur les relations internationales dans le monde My- cénien : y -a-t-il eu des hégémonies?	» 121
M. CIVITILLO, Il sillabogramma *19: <i>status quaestionis</i> e proposte di lettura	» 131
C. CONSANI, Aspects and Problems in Mycenaean and Cypriot Syllabification	» 151
P. DE FIDIO, Miceneo <i>ki-ti-ta</i> e <i>me-ta-ki-ti-ta</i>	» 159
S. DEGER-JALKOTZY, <i>A-mu-ta-wo</i> , <i>Ku-ru-me-no</i> und <i>Pu₂-ke-qi-ri</i> : drei “my- kenische Karrieren”	» 179
M. DEL FREO, Rapport 2001-2005 sur les textes en écriture hiéroglyphique crétoise, en linéaire A et en linéaire B	» 199
R. DUEV, Zeus and Dionysus in the Light of Linear B Records	» 223
Y. DUHOUX, Animaux ou humains ? Réflexions sur les tablettes Aravantinos de Thèbes	» 231
M. EGETMEYER, <i>Epilukos</i> / <i>opilukos</i> : un titolo greco di origine indoeuropea	» 251
G. FACCHETTI, La questione della scrittura “geroglifica cretese” dopo la re- cente edizione del <i>corpus</i> dei testi	» 269
R. J. FIRTH, J. L. MELENA, The Knossos Linear B Tablets: Genesis of the Listing of the Later Fragments	» 281
A. FRANCESCHETTI, Musicisti e strumenti musicali alle corti micenee	» 309

J. L. GARCÍA RAMÓN, Mykenische Personennamen und griechische Dichtung und Phraseologie: <i>i-su-ku-wo-do-to</i> und <i>a-re-me-ne</i> , <i>a-re-i-me-ne</i>	» 323
N. GUILLEUX, Archaïsmes et innovations en grec mycénien : une évaluation critique	» 337
J. GULIZIO, Mycenaean Religion at Knossos	» 351
E. HALLAGER, Some Unpublished Linear A Inscriptions	» 359
M. IODICE, Miceneo <i>a-pu-wa</i>	» 361
M. JANDA, Il nome miceneo * <i>Aiguptos</i> : linguistica e ricostruzione culturale	» 369
A. M. JASINK, The “Scroll” and Its variants: from a Decorative Symbol to a Writing Sign	» 377
A. KARNAVA, La minoicizzazione	» 395
N. N. KAZANSKY, Greek Poetry in the Mycenaean Time	» 407

VOLUME II

SOMMARIO	» IX
J. T. KILLEN, The Commodities on the Pylos Ma Tablets	» 431
E. KYRIAKIDIS, Who’s Who: The Shepherds in the Cn Series at Pylos	» 449
M. LINDGREN, Use of the Cypriot Syllabary in a Multicultural Surrounding	» 461
S. LUPACK, The Northeast Building of Pylos and An 1281	» 467
M. MARAZZI, Il “sistema” Argolide: l’organizzazione territoriale del golfo argolideo	» 485
M. MEIER-BRÜGGER, Une lecture en langue mycénienne des textes de la série Ta de Pylos	» 503
T. MEISSNER, Notes on Mycenaean Spelling	» 507
A. MICHAILIDOU, Late Bronze Age Economy: Copper / Bronze in Linear B Script and Material Evidence	» 521
C. MILANI, Al di là delle varianti grafiche: la lingua di scribe tebani	» 541
D. NAKASSIS, Named Individuals and the Mycenaean State at Pylos	» 549
M. NEGRI, I criteri di distribuzione delle razioni nella Creta del II millennio	» 563
G. NIGHTINGALE, <i>A-ko-so-ta</i> and the Economy of Pylos	» 569
S. NIKOLOUDIS, The Role of the <i>ra-wa-ke-ta</i> . Insights from PY Un 718	» 587
M.-L. B. NOSCH, Administrative Practices in Mycenaean Palace Administration and Economy	» 595
J.-P. OLIVIER, Les syllabaires chypriotes des deuxième et premier millénaires avant notre ère. État des questions	» 605
R. PALMER, Wheat and Barley in Mycenaean Society 15 Years Later	» 621
O. PANAGL, Die etymologische Erforschung des mykenischen Wortschatzes. Ein kritischer Rückblick	» 641
A. PANAYOTOU-TRIANAPHYLLOPOULOU, Les écritures chypriotes et la présence mycénienne a Chypre	» 651

SOMMARIO	XI
M. PERNA, A proposito di alcuni documenti “fiscali” in lineare B	» 659
F. ROUGEMONT, Les enregistrements d’huile de la série Fh de Cnossos. Essai d’interprétation et de comparaison avec les données du bureau de l’huile à Mari	» 669
A. SACCONI, Riflessioni sul significato del termine <i>o-pa</i> nei testi micenei	» 691
E. SCAFA, Palace Politics and Social Results	» 707
S. SHARYPKIN, Irrelevant Phonetic Features and the Rules of the Linear B Script	» 735
R. J. E. THOMPSON, Mycenaean Non-Assibilation and its Significance for the Prehistory of the Greek Dialects	» 753
H. TOMAS, Comparing Linear A and Linear B Administrative Systems: The Case of the Roundel and the Elongated Tablet	» 767
C. VARIAS GARCÍA, Observations on the Mycenaean Vocabulary of Furniture and Vessels	» 775
F. WAANDERS, The Syntax and Co-occurrence of Case Functions in Mycenaean Texts	» 795
J. WEILHARTNER, Zu den Opfertieren innerhalb der Linear B-Texte: Mögliche Hinweise für Brand- und Schlachtopfer	» 807
J. ZURBACH, Pylos, Tirynthe, Cnossos: problèmes fonciers et diversité administrative	» 825
RELAZIONI	» 839
Comité International Permanent des Études Mycéniennes (C.I.P.E.M.)	» 839
Comité sur les signes du linéaire B et des autres écritures égéennes	» 839
Committee on Information Technology Applied to Mycenaeanology	» 840
Comité pour les éditions et les instruments de travail	» 840
INDICI	» 843
Indice dei testi	» 845
Indice delle parole	» 867

STAVROULA NIKOLOUDIS

THE ROLE OF THE *RA-WA-KE-TA*.
INSIGHTS FROM PY Un 718*

The traditional interpretation of the *ra-wa-ke-ta* as the military commander of the State was based in part on early readings of the Homeric *lāos* as a military group. This influenced the understanding of the etymology of the Mycenaean official's title (whose verbal element could be ἄγω 'lead'). The *ra-wa-ke-ta* was therefore conveniently interpreted as the 'military leader'.¹ The nature of the Mycenaean **ra-wo*, however, has always been problematic. This paper concentrates on the textual insights provided by tablet **PY Un 718** regarding the role of the *ra-wa-ke-ta* and the composition of the Mycenaean **ra-wo* (**lāwos*). The relevant linguistic and Homeric evidence is also briefly reassessed.

PY Un 718

(S312 H24)

- .1 sa-ra-pe-da , po-se-da-o-ni , do-so-mo
.2 o-wi-de-ta-i , do-so-mo , to-so , e-ke-ra₂-wo
.3 do-se , GRA 4 VIN 3 BOS^m 1
.4 tu-ro₂ , *TURO*₂ 10 ko-wo , *153 1
.5 me-ri-to , v 3
.6 *vacat*
.7 o-da-a₂ , da-mo , GRA 2 VIN 2
.8 OVIS^m 2 *TURO*₂ 5 a-re-ro , *AREPA* v 2 *153 1
.9 to-so-de , ra-wa-ke-ta , do-se ,
.10 OVIS^m 2 me-re-u-ro , FAR T 6
.11{a
 { VIN S 2 o-da-a₂ , wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo , ka-
.12 GRA T 6 VIN S 1 *TURO*₂ 5 me-ri[
.13 *vacat* [me-]ri-to v 1

PY Un 718 lists the anticipated offerings of food and drink in honour of the god Poseidon.² Four contributors are mentioned: e-ke-ra₂-wo (1.2) – possibly the king of Pylos, the da-mo (1.7) – the established group of owners and administrators of land, the ra-wa-ke-ta (1.9), and the wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo ka-ma (1.11).³ The last entry is rather

* My sincere thanks to the organizers for the opportunity to present this research in Rome and for their hospitality, and to the specialist scholars in attendance for their valuable feedback. I thank especially Dr. José Luís García Ramón and Dr. John Killen for their generous advice on linguistic and textual issues, respectively, as well as Dr. Tom Palaima and Dr. Cynthia Shelmerdine for reading an early draft. Any errors in my argumentation are entirely my own. Some of the information contained here was presented at the AIA Annual Meeting, San Francisco, 2004.

1. For example, 'leader of the war-host' in *Docs*², p. 120, *Interpretation*, p. 214.

2. See T. G. PALAIMA, "Sacrificial Feasting in the Linear B Documents", in *Mycenaean Feast*, p. 97-126. For an excellent discussion in support of the interpretation of *sa-ra-pe-da* as a place-name as opposed to a land tenure term, see R. PALMER, *Wine in the Mycenaean Palace Economy*, Liège – Austin 1994 (Aegaeum, 10), p. 66-72.

3. Palaima suggests that *e-ke-ra₂-wo* was the name of the *wanaks* at Pylos. See T. G. PALAIMA, "Special vs. Normal Mycenaean: Hand 24 and Writing in the Service of the King?", *Minos* 33-34

enigmatic: *ka-ma* landholdings may have been fields ploughed by teams of communal workers.⁴ It seems that the word *ka-ma* could refer to both the land and the group of people working it. Here, its animate nature is indicated by the verb *do-se* ‘will give,’ found on ll. 3 and 9, and implied for each of the four contributors. The accompanying term, *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo*, is either a possessive adjective derived from a man’s name (that is, the *ka-ma* belonging to *Φροικίων) according to Killen⁵ or a toponymic adjective built to the word for ‘break’ *Φρώξ, such as a natural or artificial break in the earth’s surface, with *Φρωγιών being the ‘Place of the breaks’ as outlined by Heubeck (cf. Hom. ῥώγες).⁶

The specific offerings seem to reflect each party’s social standing. In particular, note that *e-ke-ra₂-wo* alone will contribute a bull (the prime example of wealth display), while at the other end of the spectrum, the *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo* group will offer wine and cheese in extremely small quantities and, unlike the other three parties, it will contribute no livestock whatsoever. This detail may indicate a less wealthy group of people, perhaps even a lower degree of mobility of its members (which would naturally hinder sheep-grazing), possibly due to purposefully restricted access to land.⁷

Palaima has argued that the four contributors on **PY Un 718** represent the fundamental functional divisions of society: religious (represented by the *wanaks*), military (by the *ra-wa-ke-ta*), food producers (*da-mo*) and “outsiders” (*wor-gioneion*).⁸ Adding to this interpretation, from a slightly different angle, I suggest

(1998-1999 [2002]), p. 205-221. In this case, the recording of the *wanaks* by name or by title could denote the “personal” and “official” capacities of a single individual, respectively (e.g., T. G. PALAIMA, “Sacrificial Feasting”, cit., p. 111). This could apply to interrelated texts **PY Un 718**, **Er 312** and **Er 880**. **PY Er 312** could then be considered a “parallel text” to **PY Un 718**, listing varied landholdings of the same array of people: the *wanaks*, the *ra-wa-ke-ta*, the *telestai* (officials who were perhaps the administrators of the *da-mo*) and the *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo* group. E.g., *People*, II, p. 158-159. Scholars who doubt the identification of *e-ke-ra₂-wo* as the Pylian *wa-na-ka* include P. CARLIER (*Royauté*, p. 55-62), P. DE FIDIO (*Dosmoi*, p. 133) and J. T. KILLEN (“New Readings and Interpretations in the Pylos tablets”, in *Florent*, p. 352-353). For the purposes of the argument presented here, it is enough to view *e-ke-ra₂-wo* as an influential individual, with strong ties to the palace, a point agreed upon by all, based on the textual evidence.

4. M. S. RUIPÉREZ, “Notes on Mycenaean Land-division and Livestock-grazing”, *Minos* 5 (1957), p. 206 n. 25; Cretan καμάν is glossed by Hesychius as ἀγρός ‘field’, while the Mycenaean term *ka-ma-e-u* designates a holder of a *ka-ma* plot: see *Docs*, p. 121.

5. J. T. KILLEN, “Mycenaean Possessive Adjectives in -E-JO”, *TPhS* (1983), p. 66-99.

6. A. HEUBECK, “Myk. *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo ka-ma*”, *ZAnt* 15 (1966), p. 267-270.

7. According to Killen (pers.comm.), the last entry refers to the contribution expected from a “collector” named *Wroikiōn: the *ra-wa-ke-ta* and *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo ka-ma* entries could simply be parallel entries, with the order perhaps influenced by the size of the contributions (biggest first, smallest last) or by the typical tendency to record “collector” interests last, after non-“collector” interests (e.g., J. T. KILLEN, “Mycenaean Possessive Adjectives”, cit., p. 72). I would still argue that it is the *ka-ma* (work-)group as a distinct entity, separate from its “collector”, that is responsible for the contribution anticipated on **PY Un 718** (hence the limited offerings, especially the absence of livestock). One would expect (perhaps) that a “collector” would be contributing much more; this would be beside the point, however, if the contributions were calculated strictly in respect of the size of the landholdings of each party listed on **PY Er 312** and **880** in the manner argued by P. DE FIDIO (*Dosmoi*) and summarized by J. T. KILLEN, “New Readings”, cit., p. 352.

8. T. G. PALAIMA, “The Nature of the Mycenaean *Wanax*: Non-Indo-European Origins and Priestly Functions”, in *The Role of the Ruler*, p. 119-139 (see p. 132).

that the order in **PY Un 718**, resulting in two pairs of “individual and group” may itself be significant: it seems that *e-ke-ra₂-wo*, quite possibly the *wanaks*, is presented as the symbolic head of the *da-mo*, and the *ra-wa-ke-ta* as the head or representative of the *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo ka-ma*, which I view as a group of agricultural labourers and a component of the overall **ra-wo*. The syntax strengthens these associations: in lines 7 and 11, the adverbial *o-da-a₂* ‘and thus’ links each of the groups to the individual mentioned before them (i.e., it links the *da-mo* to *e-ke-ra₂-wo* and the *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo* to the *ra-wa-ke-ta*).⁹ Furthermore, the *-δε* of *to-so-de* in line 9 effectively separates the two sets of information.¹⁰ In my opinion, the internal ordering of **PY Un 718** reflects an underlying societal division, applicable to Mycenaean society in general, between the rulers (comprising the palace and the various *dāmos* groups) and the ruled (i.e., the “others”, or **ra-wo*).¹¹

While the linguistic link once posited by Ventris and Chadwick between Mycenaean *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo* and the classical Greek ὀργεῶνες is difficult to defend morphologically,¹² there is nevertheless something to be gained from the analogy in sociopolitical terms: there appears to be a degree of correspondence between the later Greek organizations of ὀργεῶνες with their non-citizen, lower class roots, and the Mycenaean *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo* group of **PY Un 718**, comprised of non-*dāmos* members and potentially less privileged, lower class people recorded last, with the smallest expected contributions. Also relevant is the association of the later Greek *polemarch* with foreign settlers: in addition to being the commander-in-chief of the army, he judged all the cases involving non-citizens (*metics*). As Bury and Meiggs remark, « what the *archon* was for citizens, the *polemarch* was for the ... *metics* ». ¹³

Davis and Bennet have highlighted the cultural diversity of Mycenaean society and the ability of the palatial systems to absorb distinct populations.¹⁴ Textually, this is reflected by a range of toponymic designations which often point to the varied geographical origins of groups and individuals.¹⁵ In addition, the Hittite Tawagalawas

9. On **PY En 609** *o-da-a₂* works in a similar way: each *te-re-ta* is recorded first, followed by his tenants / subleasers who are introduced by *o-da-a₂* (e.g., **PY En 609**.3-8).

10. My thanks to Tom Palaima for this particular point. See also M. LEJEUNE, “Le Dossier *sa-ra-pe-da* du Scribe 24 de Pylos”, *Minos* 14 (1975), p. 60-76 (p. 71-72 in particular).

11. While it is dangerous to generalize on the basis of a single text, the currently available evidence would seem to sustain such a hypothesis. Of course, many questions remain. For instance, was the *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo ka-ma* (as interpreted here) a component of the **ra-wo* or *the* (whole) **ra-wo* at *sa-ra-pe-da*?

12. *Docs²*, p. 265, 454; see PALMER’s valid reservations in *Interpretation*, p. 214.

13. J. B. BURY, R. MEIGGS, *A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great*, 4th ed., London 1975, p. 118.

14. J. L. DAVIS, J. BENNET, “Making Mycenaean: Warfare, Territorial Expansion and Representations of the Other in the Pylian Kingdom” in *Polemos*, p. 105-120.

15. For example: J. CHADWICK, “The Women of Pylos”, in *Studies Bennett*, p. 43-95; T. G. PALAIMA, “Maritime Matters in the Linear B Tablets”, in *Thalassa*, p. 273-310; C. W. SHELMERDINE, “Where do we go from here? And how can the Linear B tablets help us get there?”, in *The Aegean and the Orient in the Second Millennium*, E. H. Cline, D. Harris-Cline (ed.), Liège – Austin 1998 (Aegaeum, 18), p. 291-299.

letter, dating from the 13th century BCE, records the transplantation of 7000 Hittite subjects from the Lukka Lands in Anatolia to Ahhiyawa, the latter referring to the Mycenaean world or some part of it (KUB XIV 3iii 7-17).¹⁶ The Mycenaean worship of seemingly foreign / non-Greek divinities such as the Minoan *pi-pi-tu-na* (KN Fp 13) and Anatolian *po-ti-ni-ja a-si-wi-ja* ‘Asian Potnia’ (PY Fr 1206) hints at a celebration of this cultural diversity.

Viewing the *ra-wa-ke-ta* as an overseer or representative of the less privileged “other” cultural groups actually fits in well with the military interpretation of his role since, throughout history, it is usually such marginalized groups (i.e., ethnic and / or cultural minorities) that are called upon to demonstrate loyalty to their new state by fighting its wars. In fact, warfare is one of the most common ways that emerging states successfully integrate their subject populations: involving such populations in a common struggle for defence and even territorial expansion promotes and reinforces overall group unity and identity.¹⁷ So, while the *ra-wa-ke-ta* may have been the military leader, there was probably much more to his role than simply leading the army.

The Linear B textual references to the *ra-wa-ke-ta* (Fig. 1) reveal his high ranking status (at least at Pylos):¹⁸ on PY Er 312, he is the only person besides the *wanaks* to hold a special *temenos* landholding. He is therefore reasonably presumed to have had some connection with warfare and the defence of the State. Yet he does not appear in what may be considered the most militaristic of texts from Pylos, namely the *o-ka* tablets, listing contingents of men patrolling the coast.¹⁹ His absence from this group of tablets could be explained by the fact that such patrol exercises may not have required his physical presence. At the same time, he is often mentioned with individuals and groups of moderate to low status, in outlying districts, removed from the palace’s immediate sphere of activity and control. This is true of the PY Ea series (which I tentatively interpret as a record related to a tanning operation, with craftsmen as well as herdsman involved in different stages of leather-processing, supervised by the *ra-wa-ke-si-jo* men),²⁰ and of the rower series

16. See T. R. BRYCE, “Chapter 3: History”, in *The Luwians*, H. C. Melchert (ed.), Leiden 2003, p. 27-127 (see p. 76-78, 85); T. R. BRYCE, “The Nature of Mycenaean Involvement in Western Anatolia”, *Historia* 38 (1989), p. 1-21.

17. E. M. BRUMFIEL, “Ethnic groups and political development in ancient Mexico”, in *Factional Competition and Political Development in the New World*, E. M. Brumfiel, J. W. Fox (ed.), Cambridge 1994, p. 89-102; also J. L. DAVIS, J. BENNET, “Making Mycenaean”, *cit.*, p. 106-107.

18. Based on the correspondence of entries between PY An 610.13.14 and An 724.5.7, LINDGREN equates the individual named *we-da-ne-u* with the Pylian *ra-wa-ke-ta* (*People*, II, p. 135, 187). The identification is not universally accepted (e.g. *Royauté*, p. 103 n. 585). According to the textual evidence, *we-da-ne-u* was a “collector”, a landholder, and a contributor of rowers (Fig. 1). If the *ra-wa-ke-ta* was not this man, he was someone *like* him, highly positioned in the Pylian social hierarchy.

19. M. LEJEUNE, “La civilisation mycénienne et la guerre”, in *Mémoires* III, p. 55-77; M. LANG, “The *o-ka* Tablets Again”, *Kadmos* 29 (1990), p. 113-125.

20. Precisely how the *ra-wa-ke-si-jo* individuals were connected to the *ra-wa-ke-ta* is unclear, but they are generally viewed as “men in his service”. For the PY Ea series, see M. LEJEUNE, “Analyse du dossier pylien Ea”, *Minos* 15 (1976), p. 82-115; S. DEGER-JALKOTZY, “Zum Charakter und zur

(the *ra-wa-ke-ta* appears by title on **PY An 724**) where settlers, *ki-ti-ta*, are said to owe service as rowers, probably in return for the use of land.²¹ In the case of **PY Un 718**, where the *ra-wa-ke-ta* is associated with the *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo ka-ma* at a site whose location is uncertain, a further insight is offered by Palaima's observation that the Special (= unusual) Mycenaean form of dative *po-se-da-o-ni* (instead of *po-se-da-o-ne*) and the use of *pe-ma* (instead of the regular *pe-mo*) in related texts **PY Er 312** and **Er 880**, all written by the same Hand, may reflect a different dialect – perhaps that of the scribe or of the people from whom he was collecting his information at *sa-ra-pe-da*.²² This could again connect the *ra-wa-ke-ta* with non-palatial contexts. Overall, the textual evidence supports the view that the *ra-wa-ke-ta* could have served as a liaison between the privileged (i.e., palatial élite and local landowners) and the less privileged “others”, viewed as the **ra-wo*.

The etymology of his title provides another clue. The first element, *lāwos*, has often been associated with Hittite *lahha-* ‘military campaign or expedition’. Interestingly, it could be argued that both Greek **lāwos* and Hittite *lahha-* are built to an Indo-European base-root **leh₂-*, preserved in the Hittite verb *lah(h)uwai-*, *lah(h)u-* meaning both ‘to pour’ and ‘to flow’.²³ The numerous cross-cultural images, or metaphors, in which the notion of ‘pouring’ and ‘flowing’ is used to describe outsiders or newcomers to a region (e.g., English “flood” of immigrants, “tide”, a “pouring-in” of newcomers)²⁴ suggest that a similar meaning of ‘influx’, and not the specifically militaristic one, may lie at the heart of the Mycenaean **ra-wo*. The militaristic associations of the root as found in Hitt. *lahha-* ‘military campaign,’ CLuvian *lawarriya-* ‘despoil, strip’, and even Mycenaean *ra-wi-ja-ja* ‘captive women’, etc., could be considered a secondary development, reflecting a specialized and evolved notion of ‘plundering’.²⁵ The fact that ‘pouring in’ is equally applicable to a people and to an army highlights the potential for overlap. As for the second element of the title *ra-wa-ke-ta*, most linguists favour either ἄρω

Herausbildung der mykenischen Socialstruktur”, in *Res Mycenaee*, p. 89-111; M. DEL FREO, “Proposta di riclassificazione delle tavolette PY Mb 1406 e PY Xa 1438”, *RAL* ser. IX, vol. 13 (2002), p. 171-176.

21. J. T. KILLEN, “PY An 1”, *Minos* 18 (1983), p. 71-79; J. CHADWICK, “The Muster of the Pylian Fleet”, in *Tractata Mycenaee*, p. 75-84 (Chadwick’s high status of the rowers is debatable).

22. T. G. PALAIMA, “Special vs. Normal Mycenaean”, cit., p. 220.

23. H. HOFFNER, H. G. GÜTERBOCK (ed.), *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, Chicago 1980, vol. 3.

24. For a modern example, see O. SANTA ANA, *Brown Tide Rising. Metaphors of Latinos in Contemporary American Public Discourse*, Austin 2002.

25. A useful parallel for such a development is that of Latin *populus* ‘populace’ / *populārī* ‘ravage, destroy’. I am indebted to H. Craig Melchert and to the late Mark Southern for helping me to refine this argument, as expounded in Chapter 5 of my dissertation “The *ra-wa-ke-ta*, Ministerial Authority and Mycenaean Cultural Identity”, UT-Austin 2006. It has also been encouraging to learn of José Luís García Ramón’s own proposal of “pour” as the underlying root: J. L. GARCÍA RAMÓN, “Homerisch ὄρος ‘Fahrtwind’, θοῖρος ‘ungestüm’, οἰλος ‘verderblich’: Zur Funktion der -ο- stufigen *-υο-Bildungen im Griechischen”, in *Anusantatyai: Festschrift für Johanna Narten zum 70. Geburtstag*, A. Hintze, E. Tichy (ed.), Dettelbach 2000, p. 63-77 (see p. 66 n. 9). Focusing on the military connotations, Katz prefers an original root meaning something like ‘plunder’: J. T. KATZ, “The ‘Swimming Duck’ in Greek and Hittite”, in *Indo-European Perspectives. Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo-Davies*, J. H. W. Penney (ed.), Oxford 2004, p. 195-216 (see p. 203-206).

‘I lead’ or ἡγέομαι ‘I go before, lead the way’.²⁶ The absence of **ra-wo* as a singleton from the Linear B corpus²⁷ may also point to the heterogeneous nature of its membership: the term was meaningful enough to warrant the creation of an office related to the group it denoted, but it lacked the specificity required to render it useful for recording purposes.

The revised interpretations of the Homeric *lāos* shed more light on the situation. Originally, Jeanmaire’s theory of ‘male adult warriors’ was elaborated by Heubeck who suggested a class opposition between epic *lāos* (military élite) and *dēmos*, originating in Mycenaean times.²⁸ This notion was rightly rejected by van Effenterre, who emphasized the flexibility of the Homeric *lāos*: « The only constant meaning one can ascribe to the term is that of an undifferentiated ... subordinate mass of people, viewed as being in an inferior or precarious situation ». ²⁹ Indeed, this image is similar to the one advocated here for the Mycenaean **ra-wo*. Carlier argues that Homeric *lāos* and *dēmos* were occasionally almost synonymous terms, depending on the context of use.³⁰ Both seem to have gradually acquired a more inclusive meaning of ‘people.’

I propose that the **ra-wo* of the Mycenaean period comprised all “other” members of society from the point of view of the dominant group (i.e., palatial élite and *da-mo*).³¹ Such a categorization of the majority of the population into a hotchpotch of “others” / “outsiders” would have been a convenient means by which the ruling partners could distance themselves from it and jointly legitimize their privileged positions of control. The **ra-wo* would have included both independent,

26. For example, C. J. RUIGH favours the traditional identification of ἄγω (*Études*, p. 69 n. 103, 119 n. 98), but T. MEISSNER and O. TRIBULATO explain that ἡγέομαι cannot be ruled out (“Nominal Composition in Mycenaean Greek”, *TPhS* [2002], p. 319); see also *DMic.*, vol. I, p. 402, and vol. II, p. 230. W. F. WYATT’s proposal of ἀγείρω ‘I gather, assemble’ should also be kept in play as a plausible candidate, given its frequent use with *lāos* in the *Iliad* and the intimate use of both ἄγω and ἀγείρω alongside *lāos* in *Il.*9.338 (“Homeric and Mycenaean ΛΑΟΣ”, *Minos* 29-30 [1994-1995], p. 159-170). Of course, no corresponding compound (with *lāos* and ἀγείρω) is attested in later Greek. Yet, if the palatially-imposed office of *ra-wa-ke-ta* disappeared following the breakdown of palatial administration, it could be argued that Pindaric *lāgetās* (with the verb *agō*) was a later, independent development.

27. It appears in the title *ra-wa-ke-ta*, in the adjectival forms *ra-wa-ke-si-jo/-ja* designating individuals or groups somehow related to the office of *ra-wa-ke-ta*, and in compound personal names. For the latter, see T. G. PALAIMA, “Mycenaean Militarism from a Textual Perspective. Onomastics in Context: *lāos, dāmos, klewos*”, in *Polemos*, p. 367-379.

28. H. JEANMAIRE, *Couroi et Courètes: essai sur l’éducation spartiate et sur les rites d’adolescence dans l’antiquité hellénique*, Lille 1939, p. 57; A. HEUBECK, “Gedanken zu griechisch *lāos*”, in *Studi linguistici in onore di Vittore Pisani*, vol. II, G. Bolognesi, E. Evangelisti, A. Grilli et al. (ed.), Brescia 1969, p. 535-544.

29. H. VAN EFFENTERRE, “Laos, Laoi et Lawagetas”, *Kadmos* 16 (1977), p. 36-55 (quote from p. 51-2, as translated by Haubold); J. HAUBOLD, *Homer’s People. Epic Poetry and Social Formation*, Cambridge 2000, p. 2. See also W. F. WYATT, “ΛΑΟΣ”, cit., *passim*.

30. *Royauté*, p. 107.

31. For the construction of identity in the past and the formation of dominant and minority groups, see S. JONES, *The Archaeology of Identities. Constructing identities in the past and present*, London 1997; J. HALL, *Hellenicity. Between Ethnicity and Culture*, Chicago 2002; C. DOUGHERTY, L. KURKE (ed.), *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture. Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*, Cambridge 2003.

free *and* dependent (including enslaved) individuals, both locals and foreigners. It is difficult to pinpoint the degree of differentiation in each case, but the common denominator for all **ra-wo* members was a lack of land ownership and an exclusion from positions of power and authority. The **ra-wo* originated as the ‘influx’ of individuals and groups ‘pouring’ / ‘flowing’ into the palatial territories or towards their centres. Some flowed in by force, perhaps having been bought elsewhere or captured in raids; others did so voluntarily, possibly at times in order to escape persecution. Seeking refuge with another leader was a common phenomenon in neighbouring Anatolia, where alliances regularly shifted between individuals and between states.³² These incoming “others” were granted access to land in return for their services to the State. These services included military and naval duty, textile and other industrial production, building projects, agricultural labour and so on.³³ The Mycenaean **ra-wo* was not specifically the ‘military’, even if its members probably made up the bulk of the army.

Whether or not the *ra-wa-ke-ta* physically led the army on the battlefield, the textual and linguistic evidence suggests that his office could have been the principal means by which incoming groups were monitored and coordinated. This is highlighted by the internal ordering, syntax, linguistic features and contextual associations of **PY Un 718**. The underlying cultural diversity of the Mycenaean world was created in part by importing to it the labour forces, from nearby and further afield, required to sustain the palatial systems. Military and naval service and agricultural labour were mechanisms through which the *ra-wa-ke-ta* would have mediated the integration of “outsiders” into Mycenaean society. In this respect, his role was critical for the internal peace and stability of the State.

32. T. R. BRYCE, “History”, cit., p. 51-59.

33. For example, S. NIKOLOUDIS “Multiculturalism in the Mycenaean World”, in *Anatolian Interfaces. Proceedings of an International Conference on ‘Hittites, Greeks and their Neighbors in Ancient Anatolia’*, Atlanta, USA, September 2004, B. J. Collins, I. Rutherford, M. R. Bachvarova (ed.) (in press) [with references].

PYLOS

<i>ra-wa-ke-ta</i>	An 724	rower exemption	
	Un 219	recipient of offerings	
	Un 718	contributor of offerings	
	Ea 1406	?] <i>ke-ta, e-ke</i> [<i>perhaps</i> landholder	
<i>ra-wa-ke-si-jo</i>	Er 312	landholding (<i>te-me-no</i>)	
	Na 245	<i>ma-ra-te-we, ra-wa-ke-si-jo</i>	
	Ea 421	* <i>a-mo-te-u</i>	landholder
	Ea 809		landholder
	Ea 814	<i>ku-ro</i> ₂	landholder
	Ea 822	<i>e-u-me-ne</i>	tenant
	Ea 59	<i>e-[u-me-ne ?]</i>	landholder
	Ea 823	<i>ru-ko-ro</i>	landholder
	Ea 882		landholder
	Ea 1424		landholder
	Ea 132		tenant
	Ea 782		tenant
	Ea 1424	?] <i>de-u ra-wa</i> [tenant ? ([+] Xa 1438)	
	[<i>we-da-ne-u</i>]	[An 610	contributes rowers]
[Cn series		a “collector” (sheep and goats)]	
[Es series		his “slave” (Es 650, 644), Poseidon cult (e.g. Es 647)]	
[Na 856		landholder]	
[Na 1041		landholder]	
[Un 1193		<i>a-ke-re-we, we-da-ne-wo DA 3</i> (probably landholder)]	

KNOSSOS

<i>ra-wa-ke-ta</i>	–	
<i>ra-wa-ke-si-ja</i>	As 1516	list of men (<i>ko-no-si-ja, ra-wa-ke-<si->ja</i>)
	X <1027>	(<i>fragm.</i>) <i>ko-no-si-ja, / ra-wa-ke</i> [
	Xd 154	(from RCT) <i>ra-wa-ke-si</i> [
<i>ra-wa-ke-si-jo</i>	E(1) 288	<i>ra-wa-<ke->si-jo</i> (GRA) (from RCT)
	E 846	<i>ra-wa-<k>e-si-jo</i> (GRA)
	E 1569	<i>ra-wa-ke-si-jo</i> (GRA)

Fig. 1. *ra-wa-ke-ta* and its derivatives in the Linear B corpus