

## WANAKS AND RELATED POWER TERMS IN MYCENAEAN AND LATER GREEK

*Thomas G. Palaima*

There have been numerous advances in scholarship<sup>1</sup> (since Carlier, Royauté and Palaima 1995<sup>2</sup>) affecting the interpretation of the two lexical items (*wa-na-ka* = later *wanaks* and *qa-si-re-u* = later *basileus*) and related terms (e.g., *lāwāgetās* and *e-ke-ra<sub>2</sub>-wo*) associated with the concept ‘king’ within Greek language and culture. Here I shall deal with them systematically under various subject headings that I hope are more than arbitrary. My main aim is to demonstrate that the most recently proposed etymologies of the term *wanaks* either confuse the functions of the *wanaks* within the Mycenaean texts for the essential meaning (and ideological basis) of the word itself or are attractive as explanations for the meaning of the term, but ultimately unconvincing in accounting for its history.

I argue that the essential meaning of the *wanaks* has to do, as in Hittite, with ‘birth, begetting and fertility’ and then with ‘lineage’.<sup>3</sup> I then discuss many aspects of the attested functions of the *wanaks* in Mycenaean society.

### THE ETYMOLOGY OF *WA-NA-KA*, *QA-SI-RE-U* AND *E-KE-RA<sub>2</sub>-WO*: LINEAR B, HITTITE AND HOMER

There are no convincing, that is, widely accepted, Indo-European etymologies of the Mycenaean terms *wa-na-ka* (later Greek ἄναξ) and *qa-si-re-u* (later Greek

1 I dedicate this paper to the late Kees Ruijgh whose scholarly erudition, integrity, deep humanity and generosity are sorely missed by all of us who still work at the Mycenaean texts that he understood so deeply and explicated so clearly. I was helped in writing this paper by discussions with graduate students in Austin, particularly Kerri Cox, Amy Dill, Stephie Nikoloudis and Dimitri Nakassis. Mark Southern and Sara Kimball advised me on some Hittite matters. All flaws in what I present here are mine.

2 See also Carlier 1990 and 1995 and Kilian 1988.

3 I rely on the Hittite evidence for four reasons: (1) the contemporaneity and proximity of the Hittite culture to the Mycenaean; (2) the relatively ample written historical documentation pertinent to activities and functions of specific Hittite kings and to the ideology and practice of Hittite kingship; (3) the Hittites had reached a level of state formation more advanced than the Mycenaean and under roughly parallel conditions; (4) the Hittite institution of kingship was heavily influenced by preceding indigenous and surrounding cultures, which I have come to believe is also the case with Mycenaean kingship.

βασιλεύς). The standard etymological dictionary (Chantraine 1968/1990: vol. 1, s.v. ἄναξ and βασιλεύς) assumes both terms are non-Greek loan words. The reconstruction of the role of the *wanaks* in Mycenaean society offered in Palaima 1995 took this as a starting point, positing non-Indo-European origins for both terms. I argued then that *qa-si-re-u* derived from the pre-existing mainland culture with which the arriving Indo-European speakers merged. The term *qa-si-re-u* and the power figures whom it identified understandably survived into the relatively short-lived Mycenaean palatial culture (and after its collapse) at the village level of social, economic and political organisation. I also suggested that *wa-na-ka* might have derived from Minoan high culture which the Mycenaean elite clearly used as a source for prestige borrowing in the spheres of ritual, ideology and material culture.

It should be noted that Ruijgh 1999: 521 (going back to his seminal work Ruijgh 1967: 385 n. 166) flatly declares that the term *Ἡρανακτ-* is ‘sans doute préhellénique’ and gives it a meaning of ‘maître souverain’. This follows a time-honoured tradition of deducing the meaning of this inscrutable term from an understanding of how the word is used in Homer, the Linear B texts and later Greek (particularly in Cyprus where it refers, according to Aristotle Frag. 483 Rose, to the sons and brothers of the king or *basileus*). Ruijgh, for example, argues, from the use of *wanaks* and its feminine counterpart *wanassa* as epithets of deities, that the Homeric use of *basileus* with Zeus is metaphorical. What distinguishes the two terms, in Ruijgh’s view, is that the underlying meaning (‘la valeur fondamentale’) of the term *wanaks* is ‘divine sovereignty’, while the term *basileus* indicates in the historical period ‘mortal sovereignty’ and in the Bronze Age identifies mortal ‘roitelets’ (Ruijgh 1999: 525–7).

Ruijgh then goes further, analysing Homeric periphrases for prominent heroes. In fact, he takes the term ἦρωσ (*heros*) itself as a prehellenic term designating nobility, ‘seigneur’ *vel sim.* From the periphrases containing the terms ἱερός (*hieros*) and ἴς (cf. Latin *vis*) he argues that supernatural ‘force’ is a necessary quality of the Mycenaean king and later traditional heroes. He then posits that the formulae involving the words \*ἱερά *ἴς* and γωῖᾱ (later Greek βίᾱ) plus genitives or adjectival forms of proper names are survivals of Mycenaean noble titles or forms of address (cf. such English expressions as ‘your majesty’, ‘your honour’, or ‘your highness’). Ruijgh also proposes, on the basis of Homeric parallels (for instance, Priam and Hector, Oeneus and Meleager, Laertes and Odysseus), that the *lāwāgetās* was the prince ‘heir apparent’ entrusted with directing military matters when the *wanaks*, who generally had such authority and responsibilities, was incapable of so doing because of age or absence. Ruijgh explains the absence of the term *lāwāgetās* in the Homeric tradition purely on metrical grounds. Its metrical shape (— — —) was unsuited to hexameter.

Ruijgh also mines Homeric personal names (Ruijgh 1999: 529–30) in an interesting way. Noting the occurrence of Ἄστρ-ἄναξ and Ἰφι-ἄνασσα as names respectively of a prince and princess of royal blood, Ruijgh argues that the terms *wanaks* and *wanassa* are reserved for use within royal and divine families. He then

proposes that the prehellenic culture from which *wanaks* was borrowed would have employed particular kinds of endocentric determinative compound name-formations. It follows then that the influence of this practice might be seen in Mycenaean *pe-re-ku-wa-na-ka*, which Ruijgh interprets as a proper name *Πρεσγυ-Φαναξ* (with the meaning ‘roi de rang prééminent’). It should be noted, however, that one other fairly reasonable interpretation of *pe-re-ku-wa-na-ka* has been proposed (Aura Jorro, *DMic II*: s.v.).

There is obviously much that is tantalising in such speculations, and I myself am more inclined to favour certain forms of *argumenta ex Homero* than is currently fashionable. Nonetheless, it seems to be settling for too little to posit that the ‘meaning’ of *wanaks* is ‘sovereign master’, because: (1) *wa-na-ka* is used in Linear B and *wanaks* is used in Homer to designate a single elevated king at a rank above or considerably above the more numerous individuals known each as a *basileus* and (2) in Homer the term is used as an epithet of Zeus and other deities. This is to confuse ‘function’ with ‘essential meaning’, that is, it posits that the word *wanaks* means ‘sovereign master’ because the *wanaks* in Linear B and Homer seems to be a ‘sovereign master’. But I think Ruijgh’s scholarly instincts are correct. I have long thought that Ἄστυ-ἄναξ and Ἴφι-ἄνασσα are key terms for establishing what the meaning of *\*wanak-* might be.

Hajnal 1998: 60–9 has proposed an interesting new Indo-European etymology for *wanaks*. It is a proposal of considerable merit. Hajnal starts by positing that *lāwāgetās* and *wanaks* are a ‘Begriffspaar’ (a conceptual pair). This has much to recommend it considering how the two figures are linked in important texts like Pylos Er 312.

Hajnal therefore looks for parallel structure in their forms. He sees the terms as once having been strictly parallel formations, after which the term *lāwāgetās* was modernised with an *-etās* ending. We should note that such words as *ku-na-ke-ta-i*, *o-wi-de-ta-i*, *ko-to-ne-ta*, *su-qo-ta*, *qo-u-qo-ta*, *ai-ki-pa-ta*, *po-ku-ta*, *mi-ka-ta*, *e-re-ta*, *e-qe-ta* and *do-po-ta* show how productive this suffix was in certain spheres of Mycenaean economic and social terminology. The last two items (*e-qe-ta* = ‘follower’) and (*do-po-ta* = ‘house-master’) function in the sphere of elite social ranking and ritual. Thus analogical innovative pressure is here *a priori* reasonable. Here is Hajnal’s reconstruction:

*lāwāgetās* ultimately from *\*/lah<sub>2</sub>uo- h<sub>2</sub>g-/*

*wanaks* ultimately *\*/un-h<sub>2</sub>ág-/* with the first element traced to IE *\*uen(H)-* meaning ‘gewinnen, Gewinn’

these lead to

*\*/lah<sub>2</sub>uo- h<sub>2</sub>g-t/* ‘Person, die waffenfähige Bevölkerung leitet’

*\*/un-h<sub>2</sub>ág-t/* ‘Person, die Gewinn mit sich führt, erzielt’.

The implications of Hajnal’s proposal are, in my opinion, worth exploring.

The idea of the *wanaks* as ‘he who brings gain/profit’ is historically attractive, given how Wright 1995 explains the transformation from mainland chieftains to Mycenaean kings in terms of acquisition and controlled distribution and manipulation of prestige commodities, artefacts and symbols.<sup>4</sup> We can even imagine that the more prestigious term (*wanaks*) was treated conservatively when the less prestigious term (*lāwāgetās*) was modernised by use of the popular agent-noun suffix *-etās*.

What then are the implications of Hajnal’s proposal? If a term like *\*lāwaks* was used originally for the office of ‘leader of the armed Volk’, then the absence of this term from the epic tradition has to be explained. *\*lāwaks* has a different metrical shape than *wanaks* ( -- vs. - - ), but it would not present the compositional problems caused by *lāwāgetās* ( - - - - ). Unless, then, the poems as we have them left out references to this political office as a kind of thematic fluke, the metrical unsuitability of the new formation *lāwāgetās* would have to provide, if we follow the implications of Hajnal’s argument, a *terminus post quem* for the generation of the story cycles contained in epic. That is, they would have to originate after the innovation *\*lāwaks* > *lāwagetās*.

There is also a strong tradition in Homer, *Od.* 19.109 ff. and Hesiod, *Theog.* 225–47 (and even in Sophocles’ *Oedipus Tyrannus*) for the ideological notion of the *wanaks* (and later *basileus*) as intercessor with the divine sphere and guarantor of the general prosperity of his community. Given the potential length of the traditions that could convey such notions (Ruijgh 1995), it seems reasonable to trace them back to the formative stages of Greek culture where we find already in our written records the essential terminology with which such notions are expressed. Within this ideological framework, Hajnal’s etymology makes appropriate sense of compound names such as Ἄστν-ἀνάξ (that is, ‘he who secures profit for the town’) and Ἴφι-ἀνάσσα (‘she who secures profit by force’).

On the negative side, it is one thing to imagine the innovation through *-etās* obtaining from the analysed form before the change of original /g/ to /k/. It is harder to imagine once the nominative and all other stem-forms had become //lāwāk-/. Besides arguing that the more prestigious term was treated conservatively while the less prestigious term was modernised, one could also make an argument from the transparency of meaning of the component elements. Thus one could argue that *\*lāwaks* > *lāwāgetās* occurred because of the transparent meaning of the component elements within early Greek (*lāwos* and *ag-*), but that *wanaks* > *wanagetās* did not take place because the first element was not used in any easily recognised free-standing noun-form. I hope you see then that I found much that is attractive in this proposal and have even thought of additional reasons for liking it, even if, ultimately, I prefer not to accept it.

4 See also Palaima 1999 on the distinction between Mycenaean goblets and Minoan chalices in the important ritual text PY Tn 316, and Palaima 2003b on Minoan heirloom tripods used in major palatial commensal ceremonies.

Chantraine 1968, vol. 1, s.v. ἄναξ argues, from the use of the epithet ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν nearly uniquely for Agamemnon (and in conjunction with the common metaphorical notion of the ‘king’ as ποιμὲν λαῶν), that the underlying meaning of what he considers a loan word is ‘protecteur’. But this is to let a single metaphorical usage in the Homeric texts dictate opaque etymology.

In etymological (and Mycenaean and Homeric) terms I would start with the analogy to contemporary Hittite society. The etymological connection of the Hittite terms *hassu-* ‘king’ (and *hassussara* ‘queen’) and *hassa-* ‘progeny, issue, offspring, descendant’ is not completely certain.<sup>5</sup> However, if the etymological connection of the terms is not a mirage, then we might build a case that the underlying meaning of the term *wanaks* is connected with ‘birth’ and ‘generation’. This would be consistent with the importance of blood-line connection (1) discussed by Palmer for Germanic kings (Palmer 1955: 18–53, esp. 32–7);<sup>6</sup> (2) seen in the importance of Mycenaean (and later archaic) burial and ancestor cult (as discussed by Wright 1995: 70 and Kilian 1986: 284), and (3) embedded in such Homeric and Hesiodic notions as ‘Zeus-born’ and ‘Zeus-nourished’ kings.

We would then derive the original meaning (and ideological basis) of the term *wanaks* not from the specific roles and functions the *wanaks* is seen performing in the Linear B tablets and the Homeric poems, but from a fundamental and primal Indo-European notion that is at the very basis of his power and authority: linkage through blood-ties to ancestral and divine power and guarantor through his own fertility of the purity and health of his people. Not only does the Hittite term for the royal line stress the importance of kinship and genealogical linkage with the divine sphere,<sup>7</sup> but the Hittite king took his functions as the highest human

5 Puhvel 1991: s.v. explains *hassu* as ‘Born One’ or ‘Begotten One’ with an extended meaning of ‘best-born’. Puhvel and Tischler 1978: s.v., compare the derivation of Germanic words for ‘king’ (\**kuningaz*, *chuning*, *König*, *king*) from the Indo-European root that also means ‘beget’ or ‘be born’, from which also comes Latin *gigno*. Nagy 1974: 71–100, has even proposed a further connection of both *hassu-* and *hassa-* with *hassa-* ‘fire altar, hearth’. For an up-to-date assessment of Hittite royal ideology and functions, see Kimball 2002. For the importance of ancestor cult specifically as a basis for Mycenaean kingship, cf. Kilian 1986: 284, and especially Wright 1995: 70.

6 Palmer relies on Tacitus’ description of Germanic kingship (*Germania* 7): *reges ex nobilitate, duces ex virtute sumunt* and argues that the king in Indo-European societies ‘governed not by his personal qualities (*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.’ Thus Palmer rejected ‘martial prowess’ as the main determinative of Mycenaean kingship.

7 This certainly plays a role in the divine genealogies of ‘Zeus-born’ and ‘Zeus-nourished’ kings in Greek tradition: cf. Homer, *Od.* 6.7 ff. for the lineage of the kings of Scheria stemming from Nausithous. The link to royal ancestors and to the divine (often one and the same) is usually not a later artificial development, but something that serves as a vital ideological basis for kingship from the outset, even in societies wherein direct succession through blood lines is unstable. For Hittite, cf. Gurney 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.’

authority connected with the sacred realm extremely seriously, to the point where the need to perform rituals for the gods could and did outweigh other considerations, that is, his role as military commander.<sup>8</sup>

Further important clues are provided here by Watkins' discussion (Watkins 1986) of Laroche's theories about the name of Priam (*Priamos*) and Paris in the *Iliad*.<sup>9</sup> These are identified as Luwian *Pariya-muwas* and *Pari-LÚ*. The first element seems to come from IE *\*perh<sub>3</sub>* 'birth, produce' and the second element from IE *\*meuh<sub>1</sub>/h<sub>3</sub>* 'abundant, reproductively powerful'. Thus Priam, who in the *Iliad* is the archetype of the king in control of his community, and Paris, who as one of Priam's chief sons causes problems connected fundamentally with his procreative proclivities, have names that emphasise 'birth' and 'generation'.

If we then turn to the names that concern Rujgh (Ἰφι-άνασσα and Ἄστυ-άναξ), we can say first that the very survival of the community of Troy is powerfully bound up with two lives: *Hek-tōr*, who literally is the agent for holding and preserving the community, and Ἄστυ-άναξ, whose death will mean the extirpation of the royal blood line of Troy and who conversely, under better circumstances, would have been the active agent for its perpetuation. More importantly still, it would seem that the Homeric tradition is actively manipulating these *redende Namen* in sophisticated ways and with a clear understanding of their inherent meanings.

If we look then at Ἰφι-άνασσα in *Il.* 9.145, we see that she is one of the three daughters Agamenon offers to Achilles: Chrysothemis, Laodike and Iphianassa.

εἰ δέ κεν Ἄργος ἰκοίμεθ' Ἀχαιικόν, οὔθαρ ἀρούρης,  
 γαμβρός κέν μοι ἔοι· τίσω δέ ἐῖσον Ὀρέστη,  
 ὅς μοι τηλύγετος τρέφεται θαλίῃ ἐνὶ πολλῇ.  
 τρεῖς δέ μοι εἰσι θύγατρες ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ ἐυπήκτω,  
 145 Χρυσόθεμις καὶ Λαοδίκη καὶ Ἰφιάνασσα,

(footnote 7 *continued*)

And the notion is not only Indo-European. For New World Mayan, cf. Schele and Freidel 1990: 97–99, 115–17. For Egyptian, cf. Frankfort 1948: 36–7, 89–104, and Fairman 1958: 76–8 and 97–9, with a concise description on p. 99: 'The evidence that has been discussed suggests that the kingship of the reigning king resided in his predecessor. In other words, his kingly office is derived from and inherent in his ancestors, and it was in the establishment and preservation of the direct link with the ancestors that his claim to rule resided. One method of emphasizing that link was undoubtedly the performance of the funerary ritual for his predecessor, and indeed for all the company of ancestors'.

8 For a thumbnail description of the religious duties and other functions of the Hittite king, see Macqueen 1986: 75–7, 115–16. For a fuller account, cf. Gurney 1958: 105–21. 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, for instance, the sun-goddess Arinna and the storm-god, cf. Pritchard 1950: 397–9. In the 27th year of the *Annals of Mursilis II*, the king returns from a campaign in order to celebrate the Puruli-festival.

9 Watkins 1986: 45–62, esp. 56–7. I thank Amy Dill and Mark Southern for this reference and for discussing this line of reasoning with me.

τάων ἦν κ' ἐθέλησι φίλην ἀνάεδνον ἀγέσθω  
 πρὸς οἶκον Πηλῆος· ἐγὼ δ' ἐπὶ μείλια δώσω  
 πολλὰ μάλ', ὅσ' οὐ πῶ τις ἐῆ ἐπέδωκε θυγατρί.

But later tradition varies. Euripides' *Orestes* gives the three daughters of Agamemnon as Chrysothemis, Elektra and Iphigeneia:

Ηλ. γαμει δ' ὅ μὲν δὴ τὴν θεοῖς στυγουμένην  
 20 Μενέλαος Ἑλένην, ὃ δὲ Κλυταιμῆστρας λέχος  
 ἐπίσημον εἰς Ἑλληνας Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ  
 ᾧ παρθένοι μὲν τρεῖς ἔφυμεν ἐκ μιᾶς,  
 Χρυσόθεμις Ἰφιγένεια τ' Ἥλέκτρα τ' ἐγώ,  
 ἄρσην δ' Ὀρέστης, μητρὸς ἀνοσιωτάτης,  
 25 ἣ πόσιν ἀπείρω περιβαλοῦσ' ὑφάσματι  
 ἔκτεινεν ᾧν δ' ἕκατι, παρθένω λέγειν  
 οὐ καλόν· ἐὼ τοῦτ' ἀσαφές ἐν κοινῷ σκοπεῖν.

But Sophocles' *Electra* knows Electra, Chrysothemis and Iphianassa:

ΧΟ: οὔτοι σοὶ μούνα, τέκνον, ἄχος ἐφάνη βροτῶν,  
 πρὸς ὅ τι σὺ τῶν ἔνδον εἶ περισσά, 155  
 οἷς ὁμόθεν εἶ καὶ γονᾶ ξύναιμος,  
 οἷα Χρυσόθεμις ζῶει καὶ Ἰφιάνασσα,  
 κρυπτᾶ τ' ἀχέων ἐν ἡβᾶ,  
 ὄλβιος, ὃν ἄ κλεινὰ 160  
 γὰ ποτὲ Μυκηναίων  
 δέξεται εὐπατρίδαν, Διὸς εὐφροني  
 βήματι μολόντα τάνδε γὰν Ὀρέσταν.

The questions then become how many daughters did Agamemnon have and how did tradition manipulate and refer to them? Pape 1959: s.v. and many commentators on the *Iliad* maintain that *Iphianassa* = *Iphigeneia*, i.e., for a variety of reasons the names were interchanged one for another, again in ways that would seem to indicate conscious understanding of their synonymity.

Pape: IPHIANASSA

1. = Iphigeneia, *Iliad* 9.145, daughter of Agamemnon
2. Sophocles, *Elektra* 157 von ihr verschieden.

IPHIGENEIA

1. Daughter of Agamemnon and Clytemnaestra, sacrificed to Artemis at Aulis, dann Priesterin derselben in Tauris Herodotus 4.103, Aeschylus *Ag.* 1534, Pindar *P.* 11.26

How are these names treated by Homerists? A sample of recent commentaries and the *Iliad* scholia gives us a clear view.

Among *Iliad* commentaries, Willcock 1976: 9.145 is a good starting point, because he lays out the different lines of interpretation. I have introduced in square brackets the names that Willcock here translates.

The names of the three daughters strike us as surprising in view of the stories of the children of Agamemnon as we meet them in the Attic tragedians. Elektra is not mentioned here; and if 'Iphianassa' is a variation of 'Iphigeneia', then Homer appears to be ignorant of the sacrifice of Iphigeneia before the Greeks sailed for Troy. The *Odyssey* knows of the vengeance of Orestes (named here in 142) for his father, but it, too, is silent about both Elektra and Iphigeneia. Later poets tried to introduce consistency by assuming Laodike to be another name for Elektra and treating Iphigeneia and Iphianassa as separate daughters. The whole is a good lesson for us that the 'facts' of mythology were not fixed.

It has been pointed out that the names of the three daughters in this line reflect aspects of the majesty of the great king (they might be translated 'Divine Right' [Chrysothemis], 'Justice over the People' [Laodice] and 'Dominion' [Iphianassa]), which is not true of the names of Elektra or Iphigeneia. It would be dangerous, however, to draw conclusions about relative antiquity from this observation.

Willcock here goes no further than to interpret the *-anassa* element of Iphianassa generically as 'queen' and to then roll up the *iphi-* element into an abstract 'Dominion'. Likewise Chrysothemis is abstracted and its first element is rolled up into the abstract 'Divine Right', which makes great assumptions about what *themis* signifies in the name Chrysothemis, especially in this context.

Monro 1884: 9.145 simply explains that 'Elektra and Iphigeneia are names unknown to Homer'. He goes on to call attention to 'the echo of this line in Soph. *El.* 157 οἶα Χρυσόθεμις ζώει καὶ Ἰφιάνασσα'. Paley 1866: 9.145 observes:

Laodice and Iphianassa seem to have been called Elektra and Iphigeneia in the Cyclic poets. It has been inferred from hence that the sacrifice of Iphigeneia is a post-Homeric myth. This may be doubted. Other contemporary ballads may have contained it, and yet some may have ignored it.

His underlying assumption is that Iphianassa and Iphigeneia are the same figure. Therefore, he feels the need to explain how one and the same daughter can be present at Troy and offered to Achilles in a compensation package after having been sacrificed at the outset of the Trojan expedition. He doubts the view that the second story is an invention of post-*Iliad* tradition.

Leaf 1900: 9.145 agrees with Paley, but adds a complication, namely that the later epic tradition itself seems to have been confused about the identities of the daughters. Leaf argues:

Iphianassa seems here to be identical with Iphigeneia, whose death at Aulis is ignored by Homer. But according to the *Kypria* Agamemnon had four daughters, Iphigeneia and Iphianassa being distinct. This legend is followed by Sophocles, *El.* 157 (see Jebb 1880). Laodike was identified with Elektra by Stesichoros and his predecessor Xanthos (Jebb 1880: xix).

Leaf then agrees with the Greek scholia to the *Iliad* (Erbse 1969) that the later tradition invented the name Iphigeneia and the story of her sacrifice (or intended sacrifice) at Aulis. The scholia also help us to understand Willcock's translations of these names, since they treat the three names as abstract qualities of kingship.

- 145a. (Χρυσόθεμις καὶ Λαοδίκη καὶ Ἰφιάνασσα:) ὅτι οὐκ οἶδε τὴν παρά τοῖς νεωτέροις σφάγγην Ἰφιγενείας. A<sup>im</sup>  
 b. Χρυσόθεμις καὶ Λαοδίκη καὶ Ἰφιάνασσα: οἰκεία θυγατράσι βασιλέως τὰ ὀνόματα: τρία γὰρ συνέχει τὴν ἀρχὴν, νόμος ὀρθός, ἔπειτα κρίσις καὶ ἰσχὺς. A b(BCE<sup>3</sup>E<sup>4</sup>) T

Turning to other sources, Hesychius specifically asserts that Iphianassa is original, while the later poets substituted Iphigeneia:

*Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon* (Latte 1953: s.v.):

Ἰφιάνασσαν· οἱ νεώτεροι ταύτην Ἰφιγένειαν λέγουσιν (I 145)

Finally Eustathius discusses what many, beginning with the ancient scholiasts, have noticed, that this triad of daughters symbolises three aspects of 'good rule': *themis*, *dikē*, and *iphi-anassa*. To Eustathius and others the last term simply means 'ruling in strength', but it would be even more appropriate in the way we understand it now: 'powerful in generative force' *vel sim.*

Ἔτι ἰστέον καὶ ὅτι τρία συνέχει τὴν ἀρχὴν· νόμος ὀρθός, κρίσις ἢ πρὸς τὸν δῆμον καὶ ἰσχὺς ἀρχοντι πρέπουσα. Ὅθεν καὶ Ἀγαμέμνων προσφυῶς Χρυσόθεμιν καὶ Λαοδίκτην καὶ Ἰφιάνασσαν ἱστορεῖ τὰς ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρας. Καὶ ἔστιν ἡ μὲν Χρυσόθεμις τοῦ ὀρθοῦ νόμου καὶ καθαροῦ παρώνυμος διὰ τὴν θέμιν, ἡ δὲ Λαοδίκη τῆς κρίσεως τοῦ δικαζομένου λαοῦ, ἡ δὲ Ἰφιάνασσα τῆς βασιλικῆς ἰσχύος, ἥτοι τοῦ ἴφι ἀνάσσειν. (Van der Valk 1971: 9.145)

Following, however, upon Hesychius and the *Iliad* commentators, and in keeping with what we have observed about the house of Troy, we have good reasons for maintaining that *Iphigeneia* is in fact a ‘gloss’-substitute for *Iphianassa*, i.e., a later name in which the underlying meaning of the *-anassa* component of the name is translated into Greek. The two are metrically equivalent, which would have been crucial if one wanted to ‘swap’ a completely transparent Greek name for a name whose second element was non-Greek and opaque in meaning. So I think that *-geneia* ‘translates’ *-wanassa*. Thus *Iphi-anassa* and *Astu-anaks* are meaningful names in connection with blood-line fertility, birth and progeny.

Lastly under the heading of etymology, one other key word in Linear B pertaining to *wanaks* has been subject to new interpretation. This is *e-ke-ra<sub>2</sub>-wo*. The issues are well known to Mycenologists and are most recently discussed in my article in the Killen Festschrift on the tablets and dialect/idiolect features of Pylos scribal Hand 24 (Palaima 2002). In tablets Pylos Er 312 and Un 718, written by the same scribe, landholdings (Er 312) and contributions (*do-so-mo*) to a commensal ceremony (Un 718) by the four principal components of the overall society are listed (see now also Palaima 2004). In PY Er 312 these are: *wanaks* (in adjectival form *wa-na-ka-te-ro*), *lāwāgetās* (in adjectival form *ra-wa-ke-si-jo*), three title-holders who are landholders (*te-re-ta* = *telestai*, itself an important socio-political term with *-tās* suffix) and *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo e-re-mo* (the least prominent of the four components again noted in adjectival form).

The importance of the first two figures is made clear by: (1) their being listed first in a separate section, (2) their possession each of a *temenos* – the only individuals in the entire Linear B corpus accorded this distinction, and (3) by the binary-contrastive suffixation of the adjectival form *wa-na-ka-te-ro* which marks out the *wa-na-ka* in contradistinction to all other members of Pylian society. We should note proleptically in passing that it is most likely that the *wa-na-ka* who here possesses a *temenos* is a mortal and not a deity.

PY Un 718 lists as offerings to a commensal ceremony in honour of Poseidon in the district of *sa-ra-pe-da* contributions from four sources: an individual named *e-ke-ra<sub>2</sub>-wo*, the *da-mo* (*dāmos*), the *lāwāgetās*, and the *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo ka-ma*. The parallelism is clear. The tablets are written by the same hand. The ordering of entries and even groupings into sections on the tablets is meaningful with regard to ranking. The size of landholdings on PY Er 312 corresponds roughly proportionally to the quantity and value of contributions on PY Un 718. And those contributions seem to be ‘prospective’, that is, expected contributions calculated on the basis of, or at least proportional with, the landholdings listed in PY Er 312 (or their equivalent).

The variation between the collective *da-mo* (in Un 718) and the individual *telestai* (in Er 312) is explicable from what we know of Mycenaean landholding terminology. Likewise the variation between *ka-ma* (Er 312) and *e-re-mo*, literally ‘deserted’, i.e., ‘unsettled’, land (Un 718), as the designation for the type of land

and/or land organisation for the collective group indicated by the adjectival form *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo* is also explicable. Moreover, Un 718 was discovered isolated within the Archives Complex in association with the famous Ta tablet set. It has associations with the *wanaks* and with commensal ceremonial equipment, furniture and ritual paraphernalia (Palaima 2004 with references). There are therefore many powerful reasons to reject Carlier's continuing skepticism (Carlier 1998: 413) about the identification of the person *e-ke-ra<sub>2</sub>-wo* as the *wa-na-ka*.<sup>10</sup>

The standard (although not without interpretive problems<sup>11</sup>) explanation of the name *e-ke-ra<sub>2</sub>-wo* is \**Εχελᾶων*. Problems pertain to the use of the phonogram *ra<sub>2</sub>* and the alternative spellings] *e-ke-ri-ja-wo* (PY Qa 1292) and *e-ke-ra-<wo->ne* (PY Un 219) to represent what may be the same person. These were partially addressed by Leukart 1992 taking the line of approach that the sign *ra<sub>2</sub>* that originally represented a post-palatalized liquid came to be used for the double consonantal outcome of such a cluster in Greek (Leukart 1992: 293, and compare Linear B sign *pte* which clearly developed from original \**pje*).

However, a new alternative has been proposed by Melena 2001: 73: *e-ke-ra<sub>2</sub>-wo* = */Enkhellawōn/* < */Enkhes-lawōn/*. The logic is as follows: *ra<sub>2</sub>* can represent */rral/* or */llal/*. These clusters may result from *r/ll+y* (etymological) or */rsal/*, */lsral/*, */slal/*, */lsal/* (analogical notation for geminates). There are attested compound formations like Homeric *lenkhespalos/* 'spear-brandishing' (*Il.* 2.131) and Pindaric *lenkhesphoros/* 'spear-carrying' (*Nem.* 3.107) that guarantee a first member *lenkhes-/* for *e-ke-ra<sub>2</sub>-wo*. The second element here is identified as */-law-/* found in compounded form in Greek ἀπολαύω, Chantraine 1968: s.v. 'profiter de, jouir de'. The meaning would be 'he who takes profit from (or delights in) his spear'. The alternative spelling in *je-ke-ri-ja-wo* would be explained as a 'traditional' representation of *ra<sub>2</sub>* in its original value of *rja*, while *e-ke-ra-<wo->ne* is perfectly acceptable *ra = lla*.

This reading of the the 'king's name' is simple and efficient. It links his name with martial interests, which are already established in references to the *wanaks* per se in tablets from the Room of the Chariot tablets at Knossos (KN Vc 73 and Vd 136 and Pylos sealing PY Wr 1480), and in the tablet entries connecting *e-ke-ra<sub>2</sub>-wo* with the provision/absence of sizable numbers of rowers (PY An 724.5-.6 and An 610.13).

10 See, however, the proper caution of *Documents*<sup>2</sup>: 454. This identification, *pace* Carlier, does not rest merely or finally on the assumption that no individual besides the *wanaks* would command resources enough for the scale of contribution expected of *e-ke-ra<sub>2</sub>-wo* on PY Un 718. Rather it is dictated by all the factors listed above and more. For example, the expected offering by *e-ke-ra<sub>2</sub>-wo* of a single bull is in keeping with Pylian palatial iconographical representations of a 'royal' offering ceremony where a supra-scale power-figure contributes a single bull. The name *e-ke-ra<sub>2</sub>-wo* is appropriate for the *wanaks*. Further arguments relating to this identification and to the implications of the contents of these tablets will be advanced by Dimitri Nakassis and Stephie Nikoloudis in their Ph.D. dissertations with which Jim Wright and Pierre Carlier respectively are involved.

11 Aura Jorro, *DMic I*, s.v. *e-ke-ra<sub>2</sub>-wo*: 'Sin interp. gr. satisfactoria'.

### THE WANAKS AND RELIGION AND RITUAL

The direct or indirect associations of the *wanaks* (and at Pylos of the individual *e-ke-ra<sub>2</sub>-wo* whom we identify as the *wanaks* at the time the Linear B tablets from the destruction phase were written) with rituals in the religious sphere are seen in:

1. tablets of the PY Un series (contributions to commensal ceremonies: Un 2, Un 219, Un 718, Un 853 and Un 1426),
2. the PY Ta series (vessels, fire implements, furniture, and sacrificial implements associated with a commensal sacrificial ceremony on the occasion when the *wanaks* appointed an individual named *Augewās* to the office of *da-mo-ko-ro*, either some kind of land overseer or, less likely, a royal commercial agent of the king (Aura Jorro *Dmic I: s. da-mo-ko-ro*); and
3. Knossos tablet KN F 51 (probably from the Room of the Chariot Tablets and recording quantities of grain in reference to *di-we, wa, po-ro-de-go-no* and *ma-ka*).<sup>12</sup>

References to the *wa-na-ka* in the context of oil (PY Fr 1220.2, 1227, 1235.1) and spice (KN Ga 675) have been taken in many ways: (1) as reflections of the semi-divine aspect of the Mycenaean *wanaks*, (2) as the use of the term *wanaks* as a reference to an actual deity, that is, Poseidon, and (3) my preference, as reflections of the prominence and ritual involvement of the *wanaks* without any implications as to his status as a semi-deity. Carlier 1998: 414 reasons that these texts demonstrate that the *wa-na-ka* was himself the object of cult, which is not historically or culturally unreasonable, but is surely not necessary. We should note that PY Un 2 records the fact of the initiation of a human *wanaks* as occasion for collection of foodstuffs for a commensal ceremony.

Ruijgh 1999, as we have mentioned, sees the references to the *wa-na-ka* in the Pylos Fr tablets and on Knossos tablet F 51 as demonstrating either the divinity of the *wanaks* or the applicability of the term *wanaks* to divinities themselves. Poseidon is a recipient in Pylos Fr-series tablets and does not occur in the same tablets with the *wanaks*. Ruijgh 1999: 524 points out that *wanaks* is used as an epithet of Poseidon in the *Iliad*, where it also appears commonly with Zeus. He then concludes that we are here in Linear B dealing with ritual offerings of oil that are made by invoking the deity either as Poseidon or as *wanaks*. His arguments hinge on two assumptions: (1) that all recipients in those Pylos Fr series tablets that are not clearly secular and practical monitorings of oil allocations (for instance, PY Fr 1184) are deities; and (2) accordingly that the terms *wa-na-so-i* and *a-pi-go-ro-i* refer to deities.

It needs to be said that to rule out *a-pi-go-ro-i* (Ruijgh 1999: 532) 'to the attendants' as a clear reference to the distribution of an allocated commodity to per-

<sup>12</sup> See Gulizio, Pluta and Palaima 2001. For the interpretation of Knossos tablet F 51, see Palaima 2003c and below.

sonnel associated with deities or their sanctuaries and instead to view the term as a reference to minor deities is nothing other than asserting what one needs to prove. In fact many ‘offering’ and ‘allocation’ series in the Linear B corpus<sup>13</sup> mix human functionaries and officials with deities. The tablet writers in all instances are clearly focused on the allocations of particular commodities to cult locales or into the cultic sphere, so designations such as ‘to Zeus’ or ‘to Poseidon’ can be taken to stand for ‘to their sanctuaries or officials’.<sup>14</sup> This explains the easy movement in the tablets between theonyms and functionary titles.

Moreover, Ruijgh 1999: 532 rejects the interpretation of *wa-na-so-i* as ‘aux desservants du *wanaks*’ on linguistic grounds that to me do not make sense: namely that the development through rapid pronunciation of terms like *su-za* and *ka-za* from  $\sigma\upsilon\kappa\acute{\iota}\bar{\alpha}$  and  $\chi\alpha\lambda\kappa\acute{\iota}\bar{\alpha}$  is unreasonable as an analogy for deriving *wa-na-so-i* from  $\text{φανάκ(τ)-ιος}$ . He asserts that such changes only affect words of frequent use within a language such as  $\text{ποῆσαι} > \text{ποῆσαι}$ . But the very words that Ruijgh isolates in the Linear B texts (*su-za*, *ka-za*, *i-za*, *a<sub>3</sub>-za*) all satisfy this very condition if we view usage according to how we would expect scribes to represent or simplify words that *they* came across frequently in the course of their economic administrative activities. Fig tree (*su-za*), bronze object (*ka-za*), chariot (*i-za*) and goat skin (*a<sub>3</sub>-za*) certainly would be frequent items of discussion and graphemic representation by tablet-writers. Thus I see no impediments to interpreting *wa-na-ka*, *a-pi-qo-ro*, and \**wa-na-so* in the Fr series as mortal *wanaks*, servants, and servants of the *wanaks*.<sup>15</sup>

Ruijgh’s interpretation of KN F 51 (cf. also Carlier 1998: 412) and even *wa-na-so-i* is haunted by the spectre of *ma-ka* and Demeter as raised in the newly published interpretations of the Linear B tablets from Thebes.<sup>16</sup> Ruijgh in interpreting Pylos tablet Tn 316 and Knossos tablet F 51 has used particular restorations and readings to identify deities who are essentially for him Demeter (or Mother Earth) and Persephone (or Kore). This involves:

1. assuming a scribal error in the reading *ma-na-sa* on PY Tn 316 r.4 and changing it to otherwise unattested *ma-<wa->na-sa*;
2. interpreting the problematical sequence *qo-wi-ja*,  $\eta\alpha$ -[ ] on Tn 316 v.3 as ‘to Demeter and her daughter’; and
3. reading *ma-qe* on Knossos F 51 as *ma-ka* and interpreting it and *wa* as references to deities.

13 For example, the Pylos Fn series, the Knossos Fp series, the Thebes Uf series and even, according to Ruijgh’s I believe mistaken interpretation, Knossos tablet F 51.

14 See also now Bendall 2002 for the ambiguity in determining why particular commodities are allocated to sanctuaries or even targeted deities.

15 Note that Carlier 1998: 414 takes *wa-na-so-i* as ‘desservants du *wa-na-ka*’.

16 For a thorough critique of the problems with interpreting *ma-ka* in the TH Fq series as ‘Mother Earth’ = Demeter, see Palaima 2000–2001, 2003a, 2003c, and forthcoming.

It is remarkable to me how forced these attempts to find Demeter and Persephone in the Linear B tablets have become. There is no way of proving that the scribe of PY Tn 316 made an unforced error in writing a theonym on line .4 of the *recto*. It is then simply asserted, without any proof from later historical cult practice, that *qo-wi-ja* ‘the bovine one’ or, as Ruijgh 1999: 533 n. 92, puts it ‘la déesse des boeufs de labour’ here stands for Demeter. My checking in standard compilations of cult epithets and ritual has not found any strong, clear or natural association of Demeter with cows or plow oxen, and we would have to accept that Demeter would be referred to in two separate ways on this tablet. Finally, the reading of *na-[ ]* as *na-qe* is simply not consistent with the *apparatus criticus* for this vexed section of text.

I have argued elsewhere at greater length than is appropriate here that *ma-ka* both in the new Thebes Fq tablets and in Knossos F 51 (which deal with barley) is simply a *nomen actionis* μαγά ‘kneading’. The existence of this form is implied, according to Chantraine, s.v. μάσσω, by the later Greek μαγεύς, and Mycenaean uses many such ‘action noun’ forms. In a forthcoming paper, M. Meier-Bruegger has argued, as I have done, against interpreting *de-qo-no* and *po-ro-de-qo-no* as functionary titles. Rather they are clearly terms parallel to *ma-ka* and mean ‘meal’ and ‘preliminary (to the) meal’. This very brief excursus underscores why it is unnecessary to take *wa* in Knossos F 51 as anything more than an allocation to the human *wanaks* pure and simple. The ‘parallelism’ with *di-we* here does not dictate that the *wa* abbreviation be taken to refer to a divine *wanaks* or a deity referred to as *wanaks*.

Finally, Ruijgh’s firm belief that *wa-na-so-i* must refer to ‘the two queens’, that is, Demeter and Kore, also has consequences for his interpretation of the phrases *qe-ra-na wa-na-se-wi-ja* (Pylos Ta 711.2.3) and *qe-ra-na a-mo-te-wi-ja* (Ta 711.2). According to Ruijgh the adjective *wa-na-se-wi-ja* is to be ultimately linked to *ἑορτασθήναι* ‘la fête des initiés aux mystères des deux déesses’. But this is clearly unacceptable, as it ignores the parallelism in designation of the ritual vases in the Ta series. As Ruijgh himself admits *wa-na-se-wi-ja* is most easily explained as coming from *\*wanasseus*, the likeliest meaning for which is the official who attends to the *wanassa*, i.e., the queen, and her affairs.<sup>17</sup> The parallelism with *a-mo-te-wi-ja* which derives from *\*a-mo-te-u* (attested in genitive *a-mo-te-wo*) is conspicuous.

Thus I think that it is reasonable to read *wa-na-ka* and *wa-na-sa* and related forms everywhere as references to mortal ‘kings’ and ‘queens’ and to reject alternative interpretations based on hyper-speculative readings and restorations and strained attempts to find Demeter in the Linear B tablets.

17 It is unnecessary to follow Carlier 1998: 414 in associating *wa-na-se-wi-jo* oil with ‘the servants of the *wanassa*’. It is rather designated as oil for the *wanasseus*.

### THE WANAKS AND ECONOMY

The spheres of economic activity in which the adjective *wa-na-ka-te-ro* (or its abbreviation *wa*) occur clearly point to the limited involvement of the *wanaks* in oil and cloth production and the ‘setting aside’ or holding of land for or by the *wanaks*. This land, in turn, can be used for fruit, linen, oil or grain production. In the stirrup jars (Eleusis Z 1, Thebes Z 839, Tiryns Z 29) the jars with ‘royal’ oil stand in contrast to jars with ‘collector’-slotted personal names.<sup>18</sup> Thus it is reasonable to assume that royal lands such as those designated in Pylos Er 312 and Er 880 produced oil that was then shipped to appropriate markets. The *wanaks* also seems to hold land that produces linen, see Pylos Na 334 and 1356 (Ruijgh 1999: 522).

Likewise the crafts or specialist personnel associated with the *wanaks* (*ke-ra-me-u*, *ka-na-pe-u*, *e-te-do-mo* at Pylos, *a-ke-ti-ra*<sub>2</sub> at Thebes, and types of TELA and *po-pu-re-jø* [ at Knossos) would point to individual specialist personnel attendant on the person of the *wanaks* and to the manufacture of cloth that could be used for the purposes (ritualistic or economic) of the *wanaks* (Palaima 1997). The very designation of these things as *wa-na-ka-te-rol-ra* implies that they are set apart from other parts of economic organisation. As Ruijgh 1999: 530 points out, *wa-na-ka-te-ra* textiles are contrasted with *e-qe-si-ja* (associated with the *e-qe-ta*) and *ke-se-nu-wi-ja* (associated with *ksenoi* and the practice of *ksenia*, that is, the formal social process of ‘guest-host’ interaction) textiles.

Conspicuous is the absence of any flocks of sheep designated as belonging to the *wanaks*, in contrast with those under the control of ‘collectors’ or designated as belonging to the deity *po-ti-ni-ja*. Likewise institutions or locations of production designated by *do-de* and *wo-ko-de* are also associated with ‘collectors’ and *po-ti-ni-ja*, but not the *wanaks*.

### THE WANAKS AND THE MILITARY SPHERE

There is no need to belabour the presence of the *wanaks* in the military sphere. The evidence is minimal, but clear. Pylos sealing Wr 1480 makes reference to ‘royal handles of javelins’ (Shelmerdine and Bennet 1995: 123–32). Driessen 2000: 213 interprets tablets Knossos Vc 73 and Vd 136 as somehow being ‘duplicates’ of one another (the Vd text was rewritten as Vc), so that the *wanaks* here would be recorded as in possession of one complete outfitting of chariot, horses and armour.<sup>19</sup> Ruijgh’s notion that the entry *wa-na-ka* was written in larger characters than other personal names in Vd 136 because the *wanaks* was the supreme chief of the entire army is, of course, a speculation that is undercut if Vd 136 is simply,

18 The collectors are high-status regional nobility (see Bennet 1992 and Olivier 2001) who play major roles in economic production. For their involvement in the perfumed-oil/stirrup jar trade, see Van Alfen 1996–1997.

19 Not two sets as proposed by Carlier 1998: 412.

as Driessen thinks, a preliminary version of Vc 73. Otherwise we have noted the presence of *e-ke-ra<sub>2</sub>-wo* in rower texts at Pylos. But our military and potential military texts, pertaining both to personnel and equipment, feature prominently the *ra-wa-ke-ta* and the *e-qe-ta* and the collective groups known as the *ra-wa-ke-si-ja* and the *qa-si-re-wi-ja*. And, of course, the name *e-ke-ra<sub>2</sub>-wo*, as interpreted by Melena, works well with Pylos sealing Wr 1480.

### THE WANAKS AND SOCIO-POLITICAL ORGANISATION

PY Er 312 and PY Un 718 clearly establish the prominence of the *wanaks* within the socio-political hierarchy. He is also the only official in the entire Linear B corpus specifically recorded as having 'appointment-authority' (PY Ta 711). If *da-mo-ko-ro* is correctly understood to be a major figure in the administration of one of the two provinces of the palatial kingdom of Pylos,<sup>20</sup> then the fact that he is appointed by the *wanaks* further heightens the socio-political prominence of the *wanaks*.

### WANAKS AND BASILEUS

It has long been clear (at least since Morpurgo-Davies 1979) that the *qa-si-re-u* is a 'local chieftain' who is drawn into relations with the central palatial authority in specific circumstances (such as the bronze allotment texts of the Pylos Jn series). Otherwise the *qa-si-re-u* is conspicuously absent from palatio-centric records (especially those like PY Er 312 and Un 718 and the Pylos E- documents) and is not in the 'chain of administrative command' that the central palatial authorities set up to monitor and control economic and manpower activities in the palatial territory of Messenia. For these things the *da-mo-ko-ro*, *ko-re-te-re*, *po-ro-ko-re-te-re*, *e-qe-ta*, *te-re-ta* and *ko-to-no-o-ko* interface with the central palace and occur in palatial records, as do religious officials like the *i-je-re-ja*, *du-ma-te*, *ka-ra-wi-po-ro* and so on.

The most compelling point of Morpurgo-Davies' argument was that titles connected with power and work that were intrinsically associated with, not to say invented by, the palatial centres and their interests disappeared from the later Greek lexicon. What survived in the sphere of power were the titles of individuals whose authority was not derived from the rather artificially overlaid palatial system. Thus with the destruction of the palaces, such words as *du-ma*, *ko-re-te*, *po-ro-ko-re-te*, and *da-mo-ko-ro* disappear. The term *wanaks* also disappears except in fossilised Homeric and cultic contexts and in a semantically transformed dialect usage.

That the *qa-si-re-u*, operating at, and deriving his authority from, the local or 'village' level, is called upon selectively for labour and other forms of economic

20 See the still sensible and clear discussion in Lindgren 1973: vol. 2, 32-3 and further references in Aura Jorro, *DMic I*, s. v. *da-mo-ko-ro*.

mobilisation is clear from the way the collective organisations known as *qa-si-re-wi-ja*, *ra-wa-ke-si-ja*, *we-ke-i-ja* and *ke-ro-si-ja* function in the Linear B texts (see Carlier 1995 and Deger-Jalkotzy 2002).

With the destruction of the Mycenaean palatial system, local community chieftains, each a *basileus*, would have continued to exercise their authority, but no longer alongside, or occasionally slotted into, the palatial system of regional hierarchical authority. The essential features of *wanaks* ideology (concerns with ‘birth’ and ‘lineage’ and ‘fertility’), as we have here explained them, were then transferred to the *basileis*, who on the local level might have legitimised their authority, even in the Mycenaean period, with a similar ideology. But the essential meaning of the term *basileus* remains opaque.

### References

- Aravantinos, V. , Godart, L. and Sacconi, A. (2001), *Les tablettes en linéaire B de la Odos Pelopidou, Édition et Commentaire, Thèbes Fouilles de la Cadmée 1*, Pisa and Rome: Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali.
- Bendall, L. (2002), ‘A time for offerings: dedications of perfumed oil at Pylos festivals’, in *A-NA-QO-TA*, pp. 1–9.
- Bennet, J. (1992), ‘Collectors or owners?’, in *Mykenaiika*, pp. 65–101.
- Carlier, P. (1990), ‘La double face du pouvoir royal dans le monde mycénien’, in Nicolet, C. (ed.), *Du Pouvoir dans l'antiquité: mots et réalités, Hautes Études du Monde Gréco-Romain* 16, Geneve: Droz, pp. 37–52.
- Carlier, P. (1995), ‘*qa-si-re-u* et *qa-si-re-wi-ja*’, in *Politeia*, pp. 355–65.
- Carlier, P. (1998), ‘*wa-na-ka* derechef: nouvelles réflexions sur les royautés mycénienes’, *BCH*, 122, pp. 411–15.
- Chantraine, P. (1968/1990), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue Grecque*, 5 vols, Paris: Klincksieck.
- Deger-Jalkotzy, S. (2002), ‘Working for the palace: some observations on PY An 261’, in *A-NA-QO-TA*, pp. 65–81.
- Driessen, J. (2000), *The Scribes of the Room of the Chariot Tablets at Knossos: Interdisciplinary Approach to the Study of a Linear B Deposit*, Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- Erbse, H. (1969), *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (scholia vetera) Recensuit Hartmut Erbse*, Berolini: de Gruyter.
- Fairman, H. W. (1958), ‘The Kingship rituals of Egypt’, in Hooke, S. J. (ed.), *Myth, Ritual, and Kingship*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 74–104.
- Frankfort, H. (1948), *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gulizio, J., Pluta, K., Palaima, T. G. (2001), ‘Religion in the Room of the Chariot Tablets’, in *Potnia*, pp. 453–61.
- Gurney, O. R. (1958), ‘Hittite Kingship’, in Hooke, S. J. (ed.), *Myth, Ritual, and Kingship*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 105–21.
- Hajnal, I. (1998), *Mykenisches und homerisches Lexikon: Übereinstimmungen, Divergenzen und der versuch einer Typologie (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Vorträge und Kleinere Schriften 69)*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

- Jebb, R. C. (1880), *The Electra of Sophocles* (with notes by R. C. Jebb, revised and edited, with additional notes, by R. H. Mather, third edition), Boston: J. Allyn.
- Kilian, K. (1986), 'Il confine settentrionale della civiltà micenea nella tarda età del Bronzo', in Marazzi, M., Tusa, S., Vagnetti L. (eds), *Traffici micenei nel Mediterraneo*, Taranto: Istituto per la storia e l'archeologia della Magna Grecia, pp. 283–301.
- Kilian, K. (1988), 'The Emergence of *wanax* ideology in the Mycenaean palaces', *OJA*, 7, pp. 291–302.
- Kimball, S. (2002), 'Hittite Kings and Queens', in Southern, M. (ed.) (2002), *Indo-European Perspectives (Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph 43)*, Washington: Institute for the Study of Man, Inc., pp. 177–97.
- Latte, K. (1953), *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon recensuit et emendavit Kurt Latte*, Hauniae: E. Munksgaard.
- Leaf, W. (1900), *The Iliad; edited, with apparatus criticus, prolegomena, notes, and appendices, by Walter Leaf*, London: Macmillan.
- Leukart, A. (1992), 'Les signes \*76 and \*77 (*ra<sub>2</sub>-rja*) et \*68 (*ro<sub>2</sub>-rjo*) et le nom du grand prêtre (sinon du roi) à Pylos', in *Mykenaiika*, pp. 387–405.
- Lindgren, M. (1973), *The People of Pylos* vols. 1–2 (*Boreas* 3:1–2), Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell.
- Macqueen, J. A. (1986), *The Hittites*, London: Thames and Hudson.
- Melena, J. L. (2001), *Textos griegos micénicos comentados*, Vitoria-Gasteiz: Eusko Legebiltzarra Parlamento Vasco.
- Monro, D. B. (1884), *Iliad, with an introduction, a brief Homeric grammar, and notes, by D. B. Monro*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Morpurgo-Davies, A. (1979), 'Terminology of power and terminology of work in Greek and Linear B', in *Colloquium Mycenaeanum*, pp. 87–108.
- Nagy, G. (1974), 'Six studies of sacral vocabulary relating to the fireplace', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 78, pp. 71–100.
- Olivier, J.-P. (2001), "'Les collecteurs": leur distribution spatiale et temporelle', in *Economy and Politics*, pp. 139–57.
- Palaima, T. G. (1995), 'The nature of the Mycenaean *Wanax*: non-Indo-European origins and priestly functions', in *Role of the Ruler*, pp. 119–39.
- Palaima, T. G. (1997), 'Potter and fuller: the royal craftsmen', in Laffineur, R. and Betancourt, P. P. (eds) (1997), *TEXNH: Craftsmen, Craftswomen and Craftsmanship in the Aegean Bronze Age*, Liège and Austin: Université de Liège and The University of Texas at Austin, pp. 407–12.
- Palaima, T. G. (1999), 'Kn 02 – Tn 316', in *Floerant Studia Mycenaea*, Vol. 2, pp. 437–61.
- Palaima, T. G. (2000–2001), Rev. Aravantinos, Godart and Sacconi 2001, *Minos*, 35–6, pp. 475–86.
- Palaima, T. G. (2002), 'Special vs. Normal Mycenaean: Hand 24 and writing in the service of the king?' in *A-NA-QO-TA*, pp. 205–21.
- Palaima, T. G. (2003a), Rev. Aravantinos, Godart and Sacconi 2001, *AJA*, 107.1, pp. 113–15.
- Palaima, T. G. (2003b), 'The inscribed bronze "Kessel" from Shaft Grave IV and Cretan heirlooms of the Bronze Age artist named "Aigeus" *vel sim.* in the Mycenaean palatial period', in Duhoux, Y. (ed.), *BRICIAKA: A Tribute to W. C. Brice, Cretan Studies*, 9, pp. 187–201.
- Palaima, T. G. (2003c), 'Reviewing the new Linear B tablets from Thebes', *Kadmos*, 42, pp. 31–8.

- Palaima, T. G. (2004), 'Sacrificial feasting in the Linear B documents', *Hesperia*, 73, pp. 217–46.
- Palaima, T. G. (forthcoming), 'FAR? or ju? and other interpretative conundra in the new Thebes tablets', *Acta of the Internationales Forschungskolloquium der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna December 5–6, 2002*.
- Paley, F. A. (1866), *The Iliad of Homer, with English notes*, London: Whittaker.
- Palmer, L. R. (1955), 'Mycenaean texts from Pylos', *Transactions of the Philological Society*, pp. 18–53.
- Pape, W. (1959), *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt.
- Pritchard, J. B. (ed.) (1950), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Puhvel, J. (1991), *Hittite Etymological Dictionary* vol. 3, New York: Mouton.
- Puhvel, J. and Tischler, J. (1978), *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Rose, V. (1886), *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta collegit Valentinus Rose*, Lipsiae: B. G. Teubner.
- Ruijgh, C. J. (1967), *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*, Amsterdam: E. J. Brill.
- Ruijgh, C. J. (1995), 'D'Homère aux origines proto-mycéniens de la tradition épique', in *Homeric Questions*, pp. 1–96.
- Ruijgh, C. J. (1999), 'wanax et ses dérivés dans les textes mycénien', in *Florent Studia Mycenaea*, pp. 523–35.
- Schele, L. and Freidel, D. (1990), *A Forest of Kings*, New York: William Morrow.
- Shelmerdine, C. W. and Bennet, J. (1995), 'Two new Linear B documents from Bronze Age Pylos', *Kadmos* 34, pp. 123–36.
- Van Alfen, P. (1996–1997), 'The LM III B inscribed stirrup jars as links in an administrative Chain', *Minos* 31–2, pp. 251–74.
- Van der Valk, M. (1971), *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes, ad fidem codicis Laurentiani editi. Curavit Marchinus van der Valk*, Amsterdam: Brill.
- Watkins, C. (1986), 'The language of the Trojans', in Mellink, M. J. (ed.), *Troy and the Trojan War: A Symposium Held at Bryn Mawr College, October 1984* (Bryn Mawr: Dept. of Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology), pp. 45–62.
- Willcock, M. M. (1976), *A Commentary on Homer's Iliad, by M. M. Willcock*, London: Macmillan.
- Wright, J. C. (1995), 'From chief to king in Mycenaean society', in *Role of the Ruler*, pp. 63–80.