

JOHN T. KILLEN  
Jesus College  
Cambridge

UDC 807.653—55

## SOME PUZZLES IN A MYCENAE PERSONNEL RECORD

The text of the Mycenae tablet Au 102 reads as follows:

Au 102	(Hand 52)
.1 wa-ra-pi-si-ro, i-jo-qe,	VIR 2
.2 na-su-to	VIR 1
.3 te-ra-wo, ka-ri-ṣe-u-qe,	VIR 2
.4 e-ke-ne, e-u-po-ro-qe,	VIR 2
.5 *85-ja-to, ko-no-[.]du-ro-qe	VIR 2
.6 ke-re-no	VIR 2
.7 wa-a <sub>2</sub> -ta, de-u-ki-jo-qe	VIR 2
.8 mo-i-da	VIR 1
.9 o-ri-ko	VIR 3
.10—13 <i>vacant</i>	
.14 a-to-po-qo [ ] <i>vacat</i>	

The pattern of most of the entries on 11. 1—9 of the record is entirely straightforward: either a single man's name followed by VIR 2 or two men's names (or, in the case of the entry on l. 1, a man's name plus the word *i-jo*, probably 'son') linked by the copulative *-qe* and followed by VIR 2. In two cases, however, the entries are of a more puzzling nature: that on l. 6, where the single term *ke-re-no* is followed by VIR 2, not the VIR 1 which we should expect on the analogy of single-term entries elsewhere on the tablet, and that on l. 9, where the single term *o-ri-ko* is followed by VIR 3. It is the problems raised by these two entries which I wish to discuss here.

I begin with *ke-re-no* VIR 2. One possible explanation of an entry of this type is that *ke-re-no* is the (singular) name of an 'owner' or supervisor of workers, and that the VIR 2 refers, not to him personally, but to two workers whom he 'owns' or supervises. This is evidently the explanation of the entries on the Knossos record B 798, where a series

of singular “owners” or “collectors” names are followed by VIR entries involving numerals ranging from 1 to 6:

B 798

(Hand 107)

*sup. mut.*

.1	] -k̄o [	
.2	ke-sa-do-ro	VIR [
.3	a-ke-ta	VIR [
.4	a-na-qo-ta	VIR 6
.5	ko-ma-we-ta	VIR 2
.6	pe-qo-no	VIR 1
.7	ra-wo-qo-no	VIR 1
.8	ko-a-ta	VIR 2
.9	ku-ni-ta	VIR 3
.10	o-pi-te-u-ke-we	VIR 2
.11	i-se-we-ri-jo	VIR 3

This can hardly be the explanation of *ke-re-no* VIR 2 here, however. All the names recorded in other entries on the tablet are clearly those of the men listed, not those of their owners; and it would be highly surprising if there were a radically different pattern of entry in this instance.

What, then, is the correct explanation of the entry? As L. R. Palmer has suggested<sup>1</sup>, a possible clue to the correct answer is provided by another record at Mycenae, Fo 101. The text of this tablet reads as follows:

Fo 101

(Hand 53)

.1	a-ne-a <sub>2</sub>	V 3	pa-ṇa-ki	v 1
.2	ma-no	V 1	a-na-*82	v 1
.3	to-ti-ja	V 1	we-i-we-sa	v 1
.4	ke-ra-so [ ]	V 1		
.5	pi-we-ri-ṣi	S 1	tu-mi-[ ]	v 1
.6	ko-ma-ta	V 1	na-ta-ra-ma	v [1]
.7	pe-ta-[.]	V 1	pu-ka-ro	[v 1]
.8	o-ta-ki	V 1 [ ]	<i>vacat</i>	[ ]
.9	e-ro-pa-ke-ja	OLE + <i>WE</i> 1		
.10	a-ke-ti-ri-ja-i	V 4		
.11	11—14	<i>vacant</i>		
.15	to-so	OLE + <i>WE</i> 2	S 1	v 1

<sup>1</sup> *Gnomon* 31 (1959) 431.

The purpose of this record is to list allocations of oil to women: almost certainly in all cases women workers in the textile industry. (*e-ro-pa-ke-ja* and *a-ke-ti-ri-ja-i* on 11. 9, 10 are both textile trade-names, and are doubtless references to groups of women of these particular categories; and all the tablets other than Fo 101 which were found in the House of the Oil Merchant and whose subjects we know are concerned with wool and with textile production<sup>2</sup>).

All the entries except two on 11. 1—8 of the record, before the *e-ro-pa-ke-ja* and *a-ke-ti-ri-ja-i* entries, follow the same fixed pattern: first a woman's name, then an entry of  $\nu$  1 of OIL (i. e., one eighteenth of a full unit). The two variations occur at the beginning of 1. 1, where the name *a-ne-a<sub>2</sub>* is followed by  $\nu$  3 rather than  $\nu$  1, and on 1. 5, where the term *pi-we-ri-si*, which is evidently a dative plural, is followed by  $\varsigma$  1, i. e., one third of a full unit, or six times the allocation shown in the normal entries on the tablet. How are these variations to be explained?

I begin with *pi-we-ri-si*. A first possible explanation of this term which comes to mind, given the references on 11. 9—10 of the tablet to women designated by trade-names (*e-ro-pa-ke-ja*, *a-ke-ti-ri-ja-i*), is that this is likewise a trade-name in the dative plural; and in early studies Palmer<sup>3</sup> and Meriggi<sup>4</sup> in fact suggested interpreting the term as a textile trade-name derived from  $\pi\acute{\iota}\alpha\rho$ , 'grease'. The difficulty with this line of approach, however, is the position which the word occupies on the record. All the other terms in this section of the record are personal names; and a trade-name would clearly break this sequence. A similar objection applies to a further suggestion, first offered by Doria<sup>5</sup> and by Chadwick in *MT II*<sup>6</sup>, that the term is an ethnic: perhaps even, as Chadwick suggested, the ethnic  $\Pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\varsigma$  and a reference to the Muses. Even an ethnic which was not a reference to the Muses, however, would break the sequence of personal names; and a reference to the Muses would be highly intrusive in what otherwise seems to be a fully secular context. Moreover, as Palmer points out in his review of *MT II*<sup>7</sup>, if *pi-we-ri-si* were the Muses (dat. plur.), it would then be difficult to explain the issue of wool to the singular *pi-we-ri-di* on Oe 103: particularly since all the other recipients of wool who are listed on this record seem certainly to be human:

Oe 103 + 105

(*Hand 52*)

- .1 a-pi-e-ra [
- .2 di-we-se-ja [
- .3 a-qi-ti-ta[

<sup>2</sup> All except Au 102 are classified as Oe.

<sup>3</sup> *BICS* 2 (1955) 37.

<sup>4</sup> *Athenaeum* 33 (1955) 87.

<sup>5</sup> *PdP* fasc. 81 (1961) 407.

<sup>6</sup> p. 106.

<sup>7</sup> loc. cit. (n. 1 above).

- .4 ku-po LANA[  
 .5 pi-we-ri-di LANA [  
 .6—8 vacant

What seems a much more promising approach to the problem, therefore, is that suggested by Palmer in his review of *MT II* just mentioned. As Palmer points out, *pi-we-ri-di* on Oe 103 is most readily taken as a personal name; and this at once suggests an explanation of the plural of the term. Palmer writes as follows: '[What is the explanation of *pi-we-ri-si*?] Oe 106.2 suggests an answer. The text reads *O-te-ra tu-ka-te-re*. This is interpreted by JC as probably dative singular «for the daughter of O». But here Oe 121 is relevant: *pa-se-ri-jo ko-wo*, again in the dative, where JC comments «probably 'for the son of Pa-se-r'». However another interpretation suggests itself: in both cases 'X junior' is meant, in the one case the daughter, and in the other the son. *This might account for pi-we-ri-si as a family group.*' (My italics).

That *pi-we-ri-si* is plural of a personal name, and denotes a group of persons who either share this name or are called the *pi-we-ri-de* (nom. plur.) because the most prominent member of the group is called *pi-we-ri* (nom. sing.) (see further below), seems to me very likely indeed. But before we take Palmer's suggestion a stage further, and ask whether it might not help explain some of the puzzling features of Au 102 (as Palmer himself suggests it might), it is necessary to ask one further question. If *pi-we-ri-si* is a reference to a family group, of how many persons does that group consist?

As Bennett notes in *MT II*<sup>8</sup>, and as Palmer emphasises in his review of the volume, the opening section of Fo 101 falls into two distinct paragraphs. Between the entry at the beginning of 1. 4 and that at the beginning of 1. 5 a space has been left blank: clearly suggesting that the scribe intends to make a distinction between the group of names which begins with *pi-we-ri-si* and the group which stands above that term and before the blank. That this paragraphing is deliberate is further confirmed by the fact that each of the two groups of entries separated by the break has an identical content: an opening entry involving an OIL figure larger than the norm (*a-ne-a<sub>2</sub>* v 3 in 1. 1, *pi-we-ri-si* S 1 (= v 6) in 1. 5), followed in each case by six entries of the standard pattern (personal name + v 1). This regular patterning may be set out in tabular form as follows (see Bennett in *MT II*, p. 97); for the purpose of the table, the quantities are reckoned in the smaller unit, and the personal names are abbreviated:

<i>A.</i> 3		<i>Pa.</i> 1		<i>Ma.</i> 1		<i>A.</i> 1		<i>To.</i> 1		<i>We.</i> 1		<i>Ke.</i> 1
<i>Pi.</i> 6		<i>Tu.</i> 1		<i>Ko.</i> 1		<i>Na.</i> 1		<i>Pe.</i> 1		<i>Pu.</i> 1		<i>O.</i> 1

The position which *pi-we-ri-si* occupies at the head of a paragraph, and the size of the OIL entry which follows the reference, may well be a

<sup>8</sup> p. 97.

significant clue to the number of persons the group contains. There seems no doubt from the evidence of MY V 659, where the name recurs, that *a-ne-a<sub>2</sub>* at the beginning of the first paragraph of names is a woman; and the fact that she receives three times the standard allocation of oil, and is named at the head of the group, immediately suggests that she is the *supervisor* of these workers. There is (probable) evidence at Knossos for the practice of listing supervisors of a work-group at the head of the group<sup>9</sup>; and there is plentiful evidence in Near Eastern societies, and perhaps also on the tablets, for the allocation of enhanced amounts of rations and other allowances to supervisors<sup>10</sup>. And if *a-ne-a<sub>2</sub>* at the head of the first group of workers on the tablet is a supervisor, it is highly tempting to conclude that *pi-we-ri-si*, which appears at the head of the second group of women, and which is followed by an OIL entry of *six* times the norm, or twice the amount given to *a-ne-a<sub>2</sub>*, is a reference to *two* supervisors who are each given the standard supervisor's ration of  $v \ 3^{11}$ .

We may now return to Au 102.

As we saw, the two problem entries on this tablet are those on 1. 6, where *ke-re-no* is followed by VIR 2, and on 1. 9, where *o-ri-ko* is followed by VIR 3. I begin with 1. 6 and *ke-re-no* VIR 2.

It is quite certain that on its only other appearance on the tablets the graph *ke-re-no* denotes a masculine personal name<sup>12</sup>; and given the evidence which we have just seen that a group of two women at Mycenae can be referred to by means of a plural of a personal name, it is attractive to follow L. R. Palmer's suggestion, again in his review of *MT II*, that *ke-re-no* VIR 2 has a similar explanation, and is the plural of a masculine personal name (*Gerēnos* vel sim.) which denotes two workers: either two men (most likely a father and a son: cf. *wa-ra-pi-si-ro i-jo-qe* on 1. 1 of the record) who share the *same* name, or alternatively two men (again probably a father and son) who are called after the more prominent member of the pair, though not actually named alike. The use of the dual, and later the plural, of personal names for this purpose is well attested both in other Indo-European languages and in Greek itself: see such examples as Θεσμοφόρω = Thesmophoros and

<sup>9</sup> See KN As (2) 1516. The first name listed in the group of men recorded on 11. 2ff. of the tablet (as comprising the *ko-no-si-ja ra-wa-ke-ja*) is *a-nu-wi-ko*. That he is a supervisor is suggested not only by his position on the record but also by the fact that on Ws < 8754 > the same name appears governed by the preposition *o-pi*. For evidence that *o-pi* means 'chez', and that the personal names found governed by the preposition are (often at least) those of supervisors, see Killen, *Atti* (1967) 636 ff.

<sup>10</sup> For enhanced rations, etc. given to supervisors in the Near East see e.g. Gelb, *JNES* 24 (1965) 233. For the possibility that the rations given to *TA* and *DA* on the Pylos Ab tablets are additional amounts, over and above the amounts they receive as normal workers, given to supervisors, see Killen, *Atti* (1967) 639 f.

<sup>11</sup> Professor Palmer tells me in personal correspondence that he has independently reached the same conclusion.

<sup>12</sup> See PY Cn 599. 6.

Kore (Aristophanes, *Thesmo.* 282, 1156), *Δαμάτερσιν* = Demeter and Persephone (SIG 1031, Note 3) and *Δεσπόνησιν* = *Δέσποινα* (= Kore) and Demeter (IGA 501)<sup>13</sup>.

But what of *o-ri-ko* VIR 3 on 1. 9 of the record? Given the presence of *ke-re-no* VIR 2 earlier on the record, one's first instinct might be to take this also as a plural of a personal name and a reference to three individuals. But there must be some doubt as to whether this is the correct interpretation. First, whereas there is no difficulty in envisaging a situation in which *two* persons might have the same name, it is much more difficult to envisage a situation in which *three* persons would be called alike. Given the wide variety of personal names that is attested on the tablets, it would seem highly unlikely that three *unrelated* persons in the same relatively small group would have the same name; and whereas it would be perfectly possible for *one* son or daughter to have the same name as his/her father/mother (cf. such Classical instances as *Μέδων Μέδοντος*), one can surely rule out the possibility that *two* sons/daughters of the same father or mother would have the same name as their parent. Again, while there are plentiful examples of the use of the dual or plural of a personal name in Greek to denote a pair of individuals who do not share the same name but who are referred to in terms of the more prominent member of the pairing (see the examples quoted earlier), it is much more difficult to find evidence for the use of a plural of a name to describe a group which is larger than two (though there are examples of this in Indo-Iranian, and it would be difficult to exclude the possibility of such a usage on *a priori* grounds)<sup>14</sup>.

Perhaps, therefore, one should look elsewhere for an explanation of *o-ri-ko* VIR 3; and here again it is possible that the position which the word occupies on the tablet, and the numeral which follows the term, provides an important clue to its correct explanation.

Among explanations of *o-ri-ko* which have been offered in the past is that it is an occupational term. (A more specific proposal is Meriggi's suggestion<sup>15</sup> that it is *|orikoil|*, 'muleteers'; but, as Chadwick points out<sup>16</sup>, this interpretation encounters severe linguistic difficulties). An occupational term would be possible here, provided that the trade-name concerned were one connected with the textile industry: compare the entries relating to *e-ro-pa-ke-ja* and *a-ke-ti-ri-ja-i* on Fo 101, which follow personal name entries earlier on that record. No obvious interpretation of *o-ri-ko* as a textile trade-name suggests itself, however;

<sup>13</sup> For a full discussion, which includes these examples, see Schwyzer-Debrunner, *Gr. Gr.* II 50 f.

<sup>14</sup> Schwyzer, loc. cit., quotes the Vedic *Várunaih*, denoting the trio Varuna, Mitra and Aryaman (O. Richter, *IF* 9, 23, 3), as an example of a plural of a personal name indicating a series of related persons longer than two; but the only comparable instance in Greek which he mentions involves a common rather than a proper noun: *πατέρες*, which, as he points out, like Vedic *pítaras*, can mean 'forefathers' (father, grandfather, great-grandfather, etc.).

<sup>15</sup> *Athenaeum* 33 (1955) 86.

<sup>16</sup> *MT II.* 106.

and for this reason and others I believe that a much more promising approach to the problem is to interpret the term as the nominative plural (of rubric) of the Greek word δλίγος.

The suggestion that *o-ri-ko* might be */oligoi/* is not a new one: it was first offered by Hampe as long ago as 1956<sup>17</sup>. Hitherto, however, the problem has been to see what force */oligoi/* could possibly have in this context. Hampe's own suggestion was that the term meant 'individuals' and hence 'others'; but there is no known parallel for this sense of the word. Nor does it seem possible to reconcile the normal classical sense of the term, viz. 'few', with the context. If one turns to Homer, however, one finds that in its earliest uses in Greek δλίγος has the sense, not of 'few', but of 'small': see LSJ<sup>9</sup> s.v.:

δλίγος . . . . of Size, *little, small*, freq. in Hom.,<sup>h</sup> rarer later, opp. μέγας, σάκος Il. 14.376; κῦμα Od 10.94, etc.; δλίγη ὀπί with *small, low voice*, 14.492; of stature, 9.515; δ. κῶρος Theoc. 1.47; οὐκ δλίγησ αἶμα βοδς κέχεται Call. *Aet. Oxy.* 2080. 85; of Space, δ. χῶρος Il.10.161, etc.; of Time, χρόνος 19.157,23. 418, Pi. *N.* 7.38, etc.; ἐν βραχεῖ κῶλιγῳ χρόνῳ S. *Fr.* 646 . . .

The thought at once occurs therefore: might not δλίγος have the same sense here, and might not *o-ri-ko* VIR 3 be a reference to three *younger* adults who are attached to this group of men: perhaps a sub-group equivalent to the *di ko-wo* (probably apprentices) who are listed in company with a group of 32 men on B 817+7858+7876, and the 8 *ko-wo* who are listed in company with 18 adult males on Am(2) 819?

B 817 (Hand 137)

to-so/ ku-su-to-ro-qa VIR 32[ ] / ko-wo, di[

Am(2) 819 (—)

.A ] we-ke-i-ja VIR 18 'ko-wo' 8

.B ]qa-ra / si-to LUNA 1 HORD 9 T 7 V 3

It seems perfectly conceivable that youths who were old enough to be associated with an adult workforce (perhaps as apprentices), and to be classed as VIR (unlike the *ko-wo* on B 817, Am 819), had still not achieved full adult physical status, and could hence be referred to as 'small'. Moreover, it is in keeping with this interpretation that the group of *o-ri-ko* are listed in the *last* of the series of entries on 11.1—9 of Au 102, immediately before the break that extends from 1.10 to 1.14 of the tablet:

<sup>17</sup> *Gymnasium* 63 (1956) 40.

.6 ke-re-no	VIR 2
.7 wa-a <sub>2</sub> -ta, de-u-ki-jo-qe	VIR 2
.8 mo-i-da	VIR 1
.9 o-ri-ko	VIR 3
.10—13 vacant	
.14 a-to-po-qo [       ] vacant	

On the Knossos Ak and Pylos Aa, Ab personnel records, it is standard practice to list women and children in order of seniority; and, in keeping with this rule, it is normal for children to be listed *last* on the records: see e.g. Ak(1) 611:

.1 to-te-ja, TA 2 'DA 1' MUL 10[ ]	q̄e-di-ku-ja MUL 1[
.2 ko-wa, / me-zo-e 4 [   ]	ko-wo, /me-wi-jo 1[
.3 vacant	[

But what of the number 3 which follows the *o-ri-ko* VIR entry, and which contrasts with the 1 or 2 that is normal in other entries on the tablet? One possibility which comes to mind is that the men are grouped in one's and two's for *work* purposes, and that the group of *o-ri-ko* are young adults (apprentices?) who are not yet mature enough to work singly or as part of a two-man team, and are hence simply listed as a group to themselves, in the 'other members of the group' column, as it were. As we have seen earlier, the find spot of Au 102 suggests that the men it lists may have been textile workers; and As(1) 602 at Knossos, which is probably concerned with the finishing of cloth<sup>18</sup>, provides evidence for textile work-groups which consist of either one or two men. The individual TELA entries on this record (which always relate to a single unit of cloth) are preceded either by a single man's name or by two men's names linked by the copulative *-qe*: the names in question probably being those of the workers who are responsible for finishing the cloth.

As(1) 602 + 650 + 1639 + fr. (Hand 103)

.1	]VIR 1 TELA <sup>1</sup> 1
.2 ]j̄o VIR 1[	]VIR 1 TELA <sup>1</sup> 1 [
.3 ], qe-ro-a-ta-qe VIR 2 TELA <sup>1</sup> 1 ka-nu-se-u, ta-to-qe	VIR 2 TELA <sup>1</sup> 1[
.4 ]d̄a-ro, a-ka-sa-no[-qe ]VIR 2 TELA <sup>1</sup> 1 p̄e-re-*82-ta,	qo-wa-ke-se-u[-qe VIR 2 TELA <sup>1</sup> 1
.5 ]to-so [   ]VIR 12 [   ] TELA <sup>1</sup> 1[	[

<sup>18</sup> Killen, *Colloquium Mycenaeanum* (1979) 168.

The analogy of a further Mycenae record, V 659, however, suggests an alternative possibility. Though the interpretation is not unambiguously accepted, this tablet is probably a record of the provision of beds or bedding (*de-mi-ni-ja*, Gr. δέμνια) for female workers<sup>19</sup>:

V 659		(Hand 61)
.1	wo-di-je-ja, de-mi-ni-ja	1
.2	ma-no, a-re-ka-sa-da-ra-ka	2
.3	ri-su-ra, qo-ta-qe	2
.4	e-ri-tu-pi-na, te-o-do-ra-'qe'	2
.5	o-to-wo-wi-je tu-ka-te-qe	2
.6	a-ne-a <sub>2</sub> , tu-ka-te-qe	2
.7	pi-ro-wo-na ki-ra-qe	2
.8	[ ]ka-ro ke-ti-de-qe	2
.9	]ri-mo-qe	2
.10	]ma-ta-qe	2
.11	]*82	1
.12	]qe	2
.13		] vacat
	<i>inf. mut.</i>	
	<i>lat. dex. i-ri-[.]l ke-ra-so, ki-ra-qe</i>	2

The parallels between this record and Au 102 are extremely striking. Here also, as on Au 102, persons are listed in groups of one (11. 1, 11) or two (1. 2, etc.); and with the form of the entries on 11. 5 and 6 of the record (X. and daughter (*tu-ka-te-qe*, /*thugatērq<sup>u</sup>e*/)) one can compare the form of the entry on Au 102. 1, *wa-ra-pi-si-ro i-jo-qe*: almost certainly, W. and son. Moreover, it seems unlikely that the groupings on this record, which so closely resemble those on Au 102, can be groupings for work purposes. A number of the women who are named here also appear on Fo 101; and, as we have seen earlier, there is strong evidence that the groupings on that tablet (those consisting of six persons headed by a supervisor) are the groupings in which they worked. The thought occurs, therefore, given the fact that V 659 records the allocation of bedding, whether the groups of one and two which are shown both on that record and on Au 102 are the groups in which the workers *lived* and, in particular, slept. Did each group of two, for instance, live in a different small room in the palace buildings? It would obviously fit with this hypothesis that mothers and daughters and a father and son are recorded together as pairs. And is perhaps the reason why the three *o-ri-ko* MEN on Au 102 are recorded as a group together that these, as we have suggested, are young adults of less than full stature, who because of their size (and their status?) could be asked to share the same room?

*Received April 30 1981.*

<sup>19</sup> For an excellent statement of the case for taking *de-mi-ni-ja* as δέμνια, see *Docs*<sup>3</sup> 425 f. For a more sceptical view of the matter, however, see Lejeune, *REG* 89 (1976) 597,