

THE ABBREVIATION *TU* ON KNOSSOS WOMAN TABLETS

The recent join by the present writer of KN Ap 5748 to L 5901 yields the following text:

sup. mut.

1.]si 1 tu 1 ki-zo 1 MUL 3 [TELA + TE 1
2.] 1 o-ri-mo MUL 3 [TELA¹ + TE 1 pu-zo, ti-no, pi-ja-mu-nu
MUL[3 TELA + TE 1
3.]ni-ta, o-sa-po-to MUL 3 TELA + TE 1 [
4.] *vacat* [

Although the purpose of this record is uncertain, there is a clear pattern in the entries which it contains. The tablet concerns groups of three women, each associated with a single TELA + TE. Each set of entries begins with the names of the three women who make up the group, which are sometimes followed by the numeral one, sometimes merely separated by a divider. Next comes the ideogram MUL(IER), followed in turn by the numeral three; and the set of entries ends with the ideogram TELA + TE, which is followed by the numeral one. Only once does any variation in this pattern occur. On the set of entries which appears on l. 1, the second of the three woman's names is replaced by the syllabic sign *tu*, which, like the name which precedes it, is followed by the numeral one. It is with the meaning of this sign, which is presumably an abbreviation, that the present note is concerned.

The sign *tu* appears as an abbreviation on at least one and probably two other tablets written by the scribe of 5748, who is one of the most prolific scribes known to us at Knossos, and was responsible for many of the large number of texts we have which deal with cloth and personnel. On Ap 629 there are three examples of *tu*:

1. tu-ni-ja `tu' MUL 4 ne di 3 `ko 1' ri-jo-no `tu' MUL 3
ko-wo 3 [
2. do-ti-ja `tu' MUL 4 ne di 6 [
3. *vacat* [

Another example of the abbreviation is probably to be found on Ap 637. The text of the tablet is given in *KT*³ as follows:

1. [.]ke-si-ja, ka[
2. ko-so-jo MUL 1 tu[
3. *inf. mut.* [

But on the broken right-hand edge of line 2, following *tu*, there are clear traces of a vertical stroke, the same length as the one stroke which follows MUL, and almost certainly therefore another numeral one. The text of this line should therefore be amended to read:

.2 ko-so-jo MUL 1 tu 1[

Although we cannot be entirely certain, it seems very likely that *tu* represents the same word on all of these three tablets, given that all have to do with women, and that all are the work of the same scribe. We need not be alarmed by the fact that whereas on 629 the abbreviation stands before the ideogram MUL, it stands alone on 5748 and 637. On the Ak tablets, the scribe of these three texts usually omits the MUL ideogram when he is recording categories of women other than the unqualified MULIERES at the beginning of the tablet: hence on Ak 627 + 7025, for example: [MUL] 9 *pe di* 2 (cf. MUL 6 *pe di* MUL 2 on Ak 616, by a different scribe). Sometimes, however, he writes MUL a second time: see for instance Ak 610.1: MUL 10 *de* MUL 1.

Proceeding, then, on the assumption that *tu* has the same value on all three of these texts, we may summarize as follows what evidence we have for the use of the abbreviation:

1) On 637.2, *tu* appears immediately after an entry relating to one (unnamed) woman. The sign is apparently followed by the numeral one.

2) On 629.1, 2, *tu* is used as a description of women from three different localities, some of whom may have produced children.

3) The second of a group of three women listed on 5748.1 is not designated by name, but instead by *tu*. Like the names which precede and follow it, the sign is followed by the numeral one.

There is a parallel, though not at Knossos, for the situation on 5748: the occasional replacement of a personal name, in a list of women, by what 629 suggests is a descriptive term. MY V 659 is a record of some 24 women, almost all listed in pairs.¹ Most entries on the tablet follow the pattern of 1.2: *ma-no a-re-ka-sa-da-ra-qe* 2: two women's names, in this instance *Manō* and *Alexandrā*, are linked by the copulative *que*, and followed by the numeral two. But a variation in this pattern occurs on ll. 5, 6, where in place of the second woman's name there is substituted the term 'daughter': *o-to-wo-wi-je tu-ka-te-qe* (1.5), 'O. and daughter'; *a-ne-a₂ tu-ka-te-qe*, 'A. and daugh-

¹ See John Chadwick (ed.), *The Mycenae Tablets III: TAPS N. S. vol. 52, Part 7* (1962), 64f.

ter'. The question at once suggests itself: does the *tu* which is substituted for the expected woman's name on 5748 perhaps represent this same word, *tu-ka-te*, *ihugatēr*?

On both 5748 and 637, the attractions of the restoration of *tu* as *tu-ka-te* need little emphasis. Given the parallel of MY V 659, it seems entirely credible that the second of a group of three women should be described as a daughter, presumably the daughter of the first (5748), and that after an entry dealing with one (unnamed) woman (MUL 1) one should find a reference to a daughter (*tu* 1), again presumably the daughter of the woman in question. There remains, however, Ap 629. Is it conceivable that we should have a record of women from three different localities, all described as 'daughters', and with no mention on it of the 'mothers' concerned?

There are two further tablets in the hand of 629, etc. whose arrangement is very similar to that of 629: Ap 618 + 623 + 633 + 5553 + 5922 and Ak 5876 + 5928 + 5971 + 6069. The function of all three records also appears to be similar: all three seem to be some kind of supplement to the individual Ak tablets which relate to the places listed upon them. 629 deals with women and children from *tu-ni-ja*, *ri-jo-no* and *do-ti-ja*, who, as far as one can tell, are classified in exactly the same way as the women and children recorded on the individual Ak tablets we have relating to *tu-ni-ja* (630) and *ri-jo-no* (624): compare, for example, the classification *ne di* on 629.1, . 2, with *ne di* on 630.2, 624.2. 618 lists 'missing' women (*a-pe-a-sa*), some at least of whom again belong to groups of workers already mentioned on separate Ak texts: with *a-no-go-ta* (618) compare *a-no-go-ta* (615); with *we-ra-te-ja* (618) compare *we-ra-ti-ja* (784: a different scribe). 5876, finally, deals with *di* children at *qa-mo* and *ri-jo-no* (the place-names which preceded the other entries on the tablet have not survived); and once again we have individual Ak tablets dealing with the women and children of *qa-mo* (613) and of *ri-jo-no* (624). The heading of 5876 (if there ever was one) has not survived, so we cannot tell whether or not this is also a list of 'missing' personnel: if, for example, of the three *di ko-wo* recorded on Ak 624, two are now missing; or if, instead, the entry on 5876 is a correction of that on 624 — that there are now two, not three, *di* boys at *ri-jo-no*, or, alternatively, that besides the three *di* boys mentioned on 624, there are now an extra two to be recorded.

Since *a-pe-a-sa* does not appear at the beginning of 629, it is unlikely that this is a record of 'missing' women and children. Nor, if 5876 is anything to go by, will this text be merely a recapitulation of information already noted on a number of individual Ak tablets: 5876 does not repeat the information about the number of *di* boys at *ri-jo-no* provided by 624; it gives a different figure. If 629 is a 'supplementary' record, as 5876 and 618 fairly clearly are, its function is perhaps therefore to correct information given on individual Ak tablets about *tu* women, to indicate that the figures given on individual tablets must be altered to those given here, or that the figures given here

must be added to those on individual tablets. But to establish beyond doubt what the precise function of 629 is we should need more evidence than is at present available. What is more relevant to our present purpose is the fact that 629, like 5876 and 618, does seem fairly certain to be a supplement of *some* kind to the Ak tablets. If then we have references to 'daughters' on individual Ak tablets like 637, we should not be surprised, given the analogy of 5876 and 618, to find a separate list of 'daughters' in various localities already mentioned on individual Ak texts. Even the absence of 'mothers' on 629 would be paralleled by the absence of 'mothers' on 5876. There is thus at least nothing to prevent us from taking *tu* as *tu-ka-te* on all of the three texts so far discussed.

One further possible example of *tu* remains to be mentioned. In a recent article,² M. J.-P. Olivier has discussed the reading of the fourth line of KN Ap 639. This tablet, now in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, is a long catalogue of women, and is again the work of the scribe of 5748. The text of 639.4 given in *KT*³ is as follows:

pa-i-ti-ja MUL 1 pi-ra-ka-ra MUL 1 *18-to-no]MUL 1 wi-po[] 1

But M. Olivier has pointed out that the numeral which follows *18-to-no is not one, but two, and that the scribe has inserted a small sign between the divider which follows *18-to-no and the ideogram MUL. This sign M. Olivier reads as *do*, which he interprets as an abbreviation of *do-e-ra*, 'slave', and therefore an indication of the status of the two women recorded; and he takes *18-to-no, not as a woman's name, as it had previously been supposed to be, but as the name of the male 'owner' of the two women with whom the entry is concerned. He goes on to suggest that some of the other names in -o on the tablet may similarly be names of 'owners' rather than of women.

Now there is no question that the numeral after *18-to-no MUL is two and not one, and that a small sign has been inserted by the scribe between *18-to-no and MUL, very likely as an afterthought, to judge both by the spacing of the entry and by the size of the sign. Like *18-to-no, this small sign is followed by a divider. But, as Professor E. L. Bennett has suggested to me, it is not altogether certain that the sign is in fact *do*: there seem to be traces of a vertical stroke bisecting the circle formed by the curving strokes to the left and right of the sign, which suggests that *tu* is also a possible reading. It is also a possibility, not only that the scribe inserted this small sign after he had written the preceding *18-to-no and the following MUL, but that the second of the two unit signs was also added as an afterthought. The upper of the two strokes is the same size as the single unit strokes which occur earlier in the same line after *pa-i-ti-ja* and *pi-ra-ka-ra*; the lower stroke is very much smaller. There is one other example on the tablet of the numeral two written as it is here (1.13); and in this instance both unit strokes are approximately the same size, and

² J.-P. Olivier, *Nouvelle mention d'esclaves dans les tablettes mycéniennes*, AC 32 (1964), 5—9.

are very much smaller than the upper stroke here. Three other numerals on the tablet involve two rows of units: 7 (1.6), 45 (1.6) and 5 (also 1.6); and although two of the three units on the upper row of the 5 on 1.6 are certainly larger than the two on the lower row, this group of units is very much more carelessly written than either the crucial 2 on 1.4 or the 7 and 45 on ll. 5, 6, where the units on both rows are approximately the same size.

If it is the case that both the second numeral and the small sign were added on 1.4 of 639 after the scribe had written the rest of the entry (i. e. *18-to-no MUL 1), it would seem certain that there is a connexion between the two: that the insertion of an extra numeral was a necessary consequence of the insertion of the small sign. It may be, then, that *do* or *tu*, whichever is the correct reading, is not, as M. Olivier suggests, an indication of the status of both the women with whom this entry is concerned, but instead the designation of the second of the two, who for some reason was a late addition to the list. In this event *18-to-no will probably be the name of the first of the two women, rather than the name of the 'owner' of both;³ but the evidence of 637.2 (*ko-so-jo* MUL 1 *tu* 1!), where *ko-so-jo* is likely to be the name of an 'owner', and not the name of the woman concerned, does encourage caution.

If both the small sign and the second numeral were late insertions on 639.4, and the small sign is to be read as *tu*, the abbreviation is likely to have the same meaning here as it does elsewhere at Knossos. If *18-to-no is a woman's name and not the name of an owner, the whole entry (*18-to-no, *tu*, MUL 2) will be very similar to that on 5748.1, where, as we saw, the second of three women is designated by *tu*, except that, like at least two of the second group of names on 1.2 of the same tablet, both *18-to-no and *tu* are followed by a divider and not by the numeral one. And here again restoration of the abbreviation as *tu-ka-te* will yield good sense: the entry will be concerned with two women, *18-to-no and her (unnamed) daughter, who for some reason was included in the record as an afterthought.

If *tu* does represent *tu-ka-te*, the question remains: why is it that at Knossos (and Mycenae) certain women are described as daughters of their mothers, rather than by their own names?

It is most unlikely that the handful of daughters described as such are in fact the only women on the tablets entitled to the description. There are large numbers of female children recorded on Knossos personnel texts, who were presumably put into service as soon as they were old enough; and we can hardly suppose that the working life of a female slave in the Mycenaean period was so short that only a very few mothers survived long enough for their daughters to join them in service. Other daughters, then, must surely be recorded on the tablets, but under their own names.

³ Feminine names in *-o* are frequent on Linear B records (see, for example 5748) and appear to constitute a much more important class than the classical names in *-ó*.

Part of the reason why there are not more references to daughters may be that few daughters worked closely enough with their mothers to be described as their mothers' daughters. It may be, for instance, that some of the women recorded under their own names on 5748, are the daughters of other women recorded there, but only the second woman in the first group of three is actually described as 'daughter' because she alone works with her mother. But *tu-ka-te* may do more than simply indicate a relationship. Just as *ko-wo* can mean both 'son', as on PY Ad 676: *re-wo-to-ro-ko-wo ko-wo*, 'the sons of the bathpourers', and also 'child', as it certainly does on the KN Ak tablets, so *tu-ka-te* may denote not only 'daughter', but 'daughter' of a particular age. We may be fairly certain that *tu* is only used at Knossos of women old enough to be considered as adult workers, and is not simply a variant of *ko-wa*; and it might be that its meaning is still more limited, and that the point of describing women from three areas as *tu* (see 639) is not simply to record that these are daughters of women already listed on individual Ak tablets, but to note that they are daughters of a certain age — perhaps young adults old enough to do a woman's work, but still lacking the mark of full adult status, a name of their own. Those given to speculation may even feel inclined to wonder whether the late inclusion of a daughter on 639, and the preparation of what appears to be a supplement (629) to the records of women and children at *tu-mi-ja*, *ri-jo-no* and *do-ti-ja*, may not have had a similar cause: that daughters who had previously been classified as 'older children' (*ko-wa me-zo-e*) had recently become adults, and had to be reclassified as such.⁴

Cambridge.

J. T. Killen.

⁴ Dr. J. Chadwick and Dr. J. -P. Olivier have very kindly read a draft of this article, and I have been able to profit from their advice on a number of points.