STUDI MICENEI ED EGEO-ANATOLICI
NUOVA SERIE

4, 2018

Edizioni Quasar

STUDI MICENEI
ED EGEO-ANATOLICI
NUOVA SERIE

è una rivista dell'Istituto di Studi sul Mediterraneo Antico
del Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Roma

ISSN 1126-6651
e-ISBN 978-88-7140-959-7

Stampa e distribuzione / Printing and distribution
Edizioni Quasar di Severino Tognon s.r.l.
Via Ajaccio 41-43 – 00198 Roma
tel. +39 0685358444, fax +39 0685833591
email: info@edizioniquasar.it
www.edizioniquasar.it

Autorizzazione Tribunale di Roma nr. 288/2014 del 31.12.2014

SOMMARIO

FORUM ARTICLE

Responses

THE DOSSIER *SA-RA-PE-DA* OF PYLOS REVISITED

Juan Piquero Rodríguez

Summary

The purpose of this article is twofold. First, I intend to review and evaluate some hypotheses regarding the identification and status of the payers who appear in PY Un 718, especially *e-ke-ra$_2$-wo*. Second, I will try to justify the reconstruction [*a-ki-ti-*]*to* for PY Er 880.4 based on a comparison with other attestations of the term in the Na series from Pylos. In my opinion, this is the most accurate reconstruction, even though the lacunae make any proposal subject to an ongoing discussion.

1. INTRODUCTION

The principal aims of this paper are two: first (§3), to reconsider some hypotheses regarding the identification and status of the payers who appear in PY Un 718, especially of *e-ke-ra$_2$-wo*; second (§4), to attempt to demonstrate that the reconstruction [*a-ki-ti-*]*to* for PY Er 880.4 is the most plausible from a fiscal point of view, despite the criticism that this interpretation has triggered on the basis of a comparison with other documents from the Pylos Na series in which the term also appears.

2. DOCUMENTS[1]

As already pointed out by M. Lejeune in his famous work from 1975, "Le dossier *sa-ra-pe-da* du Scribe 24 de Pylos," all the documents written by Hand 24 refer to a specific location in Pylos: *sa-ra-pe-da.*[2] These are tablets Er 312, Er 880 and Un 718, and the label Wa 731.

Er 312 (S312 H 24)

.1 wa-na-ka-te-ro , te-me-no [
.2 to-so-jo [[ ]]pe-ma GRA 30
.3 ra-wa-ke-si-jo , te-me-no GRA 10
.4 *vacat*
.5 te-re-ta-o˪ ˪ṭọ-̣ṣọ p̣ẹ-ṃạ GRA 30
.6 to-so-de , te-re-ta VIR 3
.7 wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo , e-re-mo
.8 to-so-jo , pe-ma GRA 7[
.9 *vacat*

Er 880 (S312 H 24)

.1]ke-ra$_2$[ ]ti-me-no , e-ke
.2 sa-ra-pe-do[ ]pu$_2$-te-me-no
.3 to-so [ ]GRA 30[ ]*vacat*
.4 to-so-de , [ ]to , pe-ma GRA ˪42[
.5 to-sa , we-je[ ]1100[
.6 to-sa-de , su-̣ẓạ [ ]1̣0̣0̣0̣[ ] *vac.*

1 *PofN IV* (draft).

2 See Palaima 1998-1999 on the dialectic peculiarites of this scribe. *Contra* Thompson 2002-2003.

.7 *vacat*
.8 ku-su-to-ro-qa , to-so , pe-ma 94
.9 *vacat*

Un 718 (S312 H24)
.1 sa-ra-pe-da , po-se-da-o-ni , do-so-mo
.2 o-wi-de-ta-i , do-so-mo , to-so , e-ke-ra$_2$-wo
.3 do-se , GRA 4 VIN 3 BOS^m 1
.4 tu-ro$_2$, *TURO$_2$* 10 ko-wo , **153* 1
.5 me-ri-to , V 3
.6 *vacat*
.7 o-da-a$_2$, da-mo , GRA 2 VIN 2
.8 OVIS^m 2 *TURO$_2$* 5 a-re-ro , *AREPA* V 2 **153* 1
.9 to-so-de , ra-wa-ke-ta , do-se ,
.10 OVIS^m 2 me-re-u-ro , FAR T 6
.a -ma
.11 VIN S 2 o-da-a$_2$, wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo , ka-
.12 GRA T 6 VIN S 1 *TURO$_2$* 5 me-ri[
.13 *vacat* [me-]ṛi-ṭọ V 1

Wa 731 (S312 H 24)
.A do-so-mo
.B]o-wi-de-ta[

3. THE RECORDS OF THE DOSSIER

Tablet PY Un 718 is a fiscal document which records that a "tax" (*do-so-mo*) is to be payed by four taxpayers in favour of the sanctuary of Poseidon:

1. An individual by the name of *e-ke-ra$_2$-wo*, probably */*Enkherr'āwōn*/ (García Ramón 2014).
2. The *da-mo*, δᾶμος, the "community."
3. The *ra-we-ke-ta*, λαγέτας, the kingdom's second most important figure, whose precise role is still a matter of debate.[3]
4. An individual by the name of **wo-ro-ki-jo*, */*Wroikiōn*/ (Chadwick *apud* Killen 1983, 83-84; Nakassis 2013, 410), recorded in the document in the genitive case: *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo*.[4]

The Er series, which comprises the documents Er 312 and Er 880, records plots of land, specifically the plots to which the taxes recorded in Un 718 apply, as has previously been suggested (Lejeune 1975; De Fidio 1977, 77-129; 2017, 131), although some scholars have criticised this hypothesis (§3). The products listed as taxes in PY Un 718 were probably intended for consumption at a sacrificial banquet (Weilhartner 2008; Nakassis 2012; De Fidio 2017, 130). However, it is not unlikely that they were consumed by the individuals responsible for the economic organization of the temple and the priests (Burkert 2011, 108). According to Killen (2004, 158, n.v = 2015, 856, n.v), "there is nothing to indicate that the small numbers of animals and amounts of other foodstuffs, etc. listed on this record were consumed at a large, state-sponsored banquet."

3 Literally 'leader of *laos*.' It has been suggested that the word refers to the chief of the army, although this interpretation is debatable. Cf. *DMic s.v.; LGM, s.v.* λαγέτας.

4 Another theory suggests that it is an appellative referring to a group of individuals, although this seems less likely (§3).

Judging from the marks found on its reverse, the label[5] Wa 731 would have been placed on the outside of a wicker basket in which the documents comprising this tax record were probably kept to facilitate their identification.[6]

4. A LONG HISTORY OF DISAGREEMENT

The interpretation of this series of documents was and continues to be a matter of debate among scholars of the Mycenaean world.

4.1. *Analysis of the documents*

a. *e-ke-ra$_2$-wo vs. wa-na-ka*

Already in the first edition of the *Documents in Mycenaean Greek* (1956, 264-268), M. Ventris and J. Chadwick established a possible comparison between two of the documents of the dossier: Er 312 and Un 718. According to their comparative analysis, all the entries in Er 312 corresponded to those in Un 718 in the same order. Thus, *e-ke-ra$_2$-wo* would be the owner of *wa-na-ka-te-ro te-me-no* that appears in Er 312. In other words, he would be the king of Pylos, mentioned here by name or, more likely, "a representative member of his household."[7]

Based on this comparison, when the authors write in relation to Er 880: "if he is indeed the king, E. has evidently built up an estate of 'private plots' in addition to the hereditary *temenos* assigned to his office at the original land-division."

Nonetheless, it was an article by Chadwick (1975) that really opened the debate on whether *e-ke-ra$_2$-wo* was the name of the king of Pylos. In it, Chadwick compares the four taxpayers in Un 718 with the four plots of land in Er 312. Towards the end of the article he asks "why should we hesitate to equate *E-ke-ra$_2$-wo* with the *Wanax*? It must be admitted that a definite proof is impossible." In fact, he suggests that it might refer to the "retired rulers" or even to the "heir."

This hypothesis, albeit feeble, was taken up by Th. G. Palaima (1995) in his now classic work on the nature of the Mycenaean *wanax*. Palaima attempted to place further emphasis on the idea of the Mycenaean *wanax* as a figure whose field of action extended fundamentally to the religious sphere. He based himself on Chadwick's hypothesis[8] to attribute to the king the payment of the taxes in favour of Poseidon which are registered in Un 718 as an offering intended for a sacrificial banquet.[9]

The same idea, though further elaborated, was recently proposed by D. Nakassis (2012). Nakassis supports the theory that *e-ke-ra$_2$-wo* was the *wanax* of Pylos, and justifies an attested reference to the king by name in terms of social strategies: "the alternation between the king's title and name, I suggest, represents a distinction between two specific roles: official and personal (…). I propose that the alternation between the king's title and personal name is the scribe's response to a specific social strategy, the goal of which was to associate the generosity of the king with his own person" (Nakassis 2012, 2).

As has become clear from various analyses [Lejeune 1975; De Fidio 1977, 131-135; Carlier 1984, 60-62; 1998; Killen 1999, 352-353 (= 2015, 744-745)); Petrakis 2008; Tsagrakis 2016, 214-216; De Fidio 2017, 133-134], it seems unlikely that *e-ke-ra$_2$-wo* was the name of the king of Pylos. Alternatively, it may refer to a very pow-

5 On the function of labels, cf. Marazzi 2016, 594-595.

6 It appears that during the collapse of the palace the documents were not all inside the same container, since the Er series appeared in Room 8, while Un 718 and Wa 731 were found in Room 7. In addition, it seems that Wa 731 was not placed on the outside of the wicker basket, since it was grouped with other labels in *Grid* 52 (Palaima 1988, 89).

7 With similar caution Chadwick (1973, 454) writes: "the suggestion that *E-ke-ra$_2$-wo* is the name of the king has not been confirmed or refuted; at least he is a very important official."

8 Palaima 1995, 129: "this now seems compelling linguistically, archivally and textually."

9 All the products registered as payment by *e-ke-ra$_2$-wo* are foodstuffs except for the one represented with the logogram **153*, *ko-wo*, /*kōwos*/, probably 'fleece.' Cf. Melena 2014, 145.

erful figure in the kingdom whose specific role remains unclear. As was acknowledged by Nakassis (2012, 3), "the identification of *e-ke-ra*$_2$*-wo* with the *wanax* was based in large part on his prominence in the feasting text Un 718."

Those who defend that the taxes paid to Poseidon by *e-ke-ra*$_2$*-wo* in Un 718 reflect a tax on the landholdings of the *wa-na-ka-te-ro te-me-no* in Er 312 should be able to answer at least the following two questions: 1) why does the scribe, the same H24, call the king by his personal name in the document that records the tax (Un 718) and by his office in the document in which the size of the landholdings is recorded (Er 312)? 2) How should tablet Er 880 be interpreted, in which landholdings are recorded under the name of *e-ke-ra*$_2$*-wo*?

It was Nakassis in his work of 2012 cited above who attempted to answer these questions, although, in my opinion, unsuccessfully. Regarding the first question, Nakassis (2012, 10-13) based his hypothesis of equating Er 312 with Un 718 (leaving out Er 880) on the interpretation of the term *a-ki-ti-to*, and on the inconsistency of the result obtained from the total sum of Er 312 + Er 880. I deal with this question further below (§6), since I believe it is a manner to reconcile the numbers in a way that, following Lejeune (1975), Un 718 records the taxes imposed on the landholdings of Er 880 + Er 312. To justify the scribe's use of the king's name in Un 718 and not in Er 312, where a *wa-na-ka-te-ro te-me-no* appears, Nakassis (2012, 17-23) defends the concept of social strategies. He explains the scribe's use of different terms for the same individual as follows: "from one perspective, this is unsurprising, as scribes regularly refer to the same individual differently in different texts; the same individual can be identified by name, office, or both, depending on what information the Scribe felt was relevant to supply." However, the example he adduces, that a man named *Klumenos* (*ku-ru-me-no*) is identified in three different ways, is not very satisfactory: the scribes of the documents are different, as he himself acknowledges (2012, 19), as is also their context. Therefore, there is no relation similar to that between Er 312 and Un 718, in which one deals not only with the same scribe (H24), but also with an internal connection between the documents: the same individuals appear in both, except for the *wanax*, whose omission seems to be justified, as I will explain further on (§5). Nakassis argues (2012, 21) that the king appears by name as *e-ke-ra*$_2$*-wo* in Un 718 because this is how the scribe makes a distinction between the office (*wanax*) and the individual (*e-ke-ra*$_2$*-wo*): "Hand 24 therefore seems to specify that the contributions on Un 718 were provided by the *wanax* in his personal capacity and not in his official capacity as king (…) I suggest that this reality was a social strategy of the king: the disproportionately large amount of goods dedicated by *e-ke-ra*$_2$*-wo* on Un 718 functioned as a conspicuous display of royal generosity within an important communal ritual context." In my opinion, this hypothesis is not very likely.[10] First of all, Un 718 records a tax (*do-so-mo*). Regardless of whether or not it was ultimately intended for a ritual such as a sacrificial banquet, this tax does not relate to the religious sphere strictly speaking, but rather to the taxation system. Furthermore, it appears that the king did not pay taxes (§5), and following A. Tsagrakis (2016, 215), "in feast the *wa-na-ka* appears to be a recipient or a participant rather than a sponsor." On the other hand, as Nakassis himself states (2012, 20), the practice of distinguishing the king from his office is largely absent in contemporary Near Eastern kingdoms, which further strengthens the hypothesis that *e-ke-ra-*$_2$*-wo* and *wanax* were two different individuals.

Apart from that, if we were to accept that Un 718 exclusively records the taxes listed in Er 312, we would have to explain why tablet Er 880 should not be taken into account, given that the scribe (H24), the location of the tablet within the site,[11] the possible toponym *sa-ra-pe-da*/*sa-ra-pe-do*[and the individuals mentioned in the documents coincide. Even the hypothesis that Un 718 reflects the tax imposed on the landholdings recorded in Er 880 + Er 312 is confirmed by their total sum (§5), despite Nakassis's opinion to the contrary (2012).

The argument that *e-ke-ra-*$_2$*-wo* is the individual that pays the most in Un 718 and possesses the largest property among those appearing in the Pylos documents has led some researchers to see in this figure that of a "great king." Thus M.R. Cataudella (2002) and G. Mariotta (2003) suggest that *e-ke-ra-*$_2$*-wo* may have been a great king who was above the *wanax* of Pylos himself, whose landholdings (*te-me-no*) figure next to those of the former in the Er series. This hypothesis, however, does not explain why the great king *e-ke-ra-*$_2$*-wo* paid taxes, while the "re

10 Cf. also De Fidio 2017, 134.

11 Archives Room 8, like Er 312. Cf. Palaima 1988, 89.

vassallo," of whom the *wanax* of Pylos was likely a subject, did not (§5). On the other hand, Mariotta's hypothesis for the existence of a lexical testimony to a double form of taxation in the Mycenaean documents – depending on whether taxes were paid to the 'vassal king' or to the 'great king' – is far from proven.[12]

b. *da-mo vs. te-re-ta*

At first, there was no agreement as to the identification of the *da-mo* appearing in Un 718.7 with the *te-re-ta / telestai/*[13] of Er 312.5.6, and the two were therefore considered "collectivités agricoles différentes" (Lejeune 1975, 65). Nevertheless, the identification between the two is now accepted by scholars (De Fidio 1977, 155; Carlier 1987) and currently there seems to be a consensus regarding this issue.

c. *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo*

Ventris and Chadwick (1956, 265) suggested the interpretation of *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo* "as equivalent to ὀργεωνικός, from the term ὀργεῶνες, 'members of a religious association'; it is spelt ὀργίονας (acc. pl.) in the Homeric hymn to Apollo [389], and derived from *(ϝ)ὄργια 'rites'." This interpretation was soon criticised by L.R. Palmer (1963, 214), who argued that "the base of the word is *worgāwōn*; the *h. Apoll.* form is an itacistic spelling of the Ionic ὀργηόνας. Thus the expected Mycenaean form of the derived adjective would be written *wo-ka-wo-ne-jo*. A word ϝοργιών 'place of the ὄργια' might be hazarded, but there remains the uncertainty about the *scriptio plena*."[14] Although a metathesis of the root IE **worg-* > **wrog-* (Thompson 2002-2003, 362-363) may be conceded, Killen's argument (1983, 83-84 [= 2015, 290-291]) that the adjectives in *-e-jo* are possessives derived from anthroponyms undermines the hypothesis that the term refers to a group of individuals.

Even so, Palaima (1995, 132) suggests that *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo* could be an appellative **worgiōneion*, "the class of 'outsiders.' This last group would consist of those who live in the territory of Messenia, but are not fully integrated members of it. One naturally thinks of *metics* in historical Greece or the *perioikoi* and *helotes* in historical Sparta." Based on this, and provided that *e-ke-ra$_2$-wo* was the name of the king of Pylos, Palaima concludes that in Un 718 we witness a record of "the fundamental functional divisions of society into the major practitioner in the religious realm (*Ekhelawon*), the chief figure in the sphere of warfare (*lawagetas*), the class of food producers (*damos*), and the class of 'outsiders' (*worgioneion*)."[15]

S. Nikoloudis (2006, 2008a, 2008b) goes one step further with this interpretation. The author departs from an interpretation of the term *ra-wa-ke-ta *lāwāgertās* as a composite of λαός and ἀγείρω, 'he who gathers the **lāwos*.' This, however, does not seem plausible (Jiménez Delgado 2015), since, moreover, a term λαγέτας attested in alphabetic Greek appears to derive from the Mycenaean word (Piquero 2017).

Nikoloudis proposes the following subdivision for PY Un 718:

e-ke-ra$_2$-wo ⇔ *da-mo*
ra-wa-ke-ta ⇔ *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo ka-ma*

According to it, the king, represented under his own name *e-ke-ra$_2$-wo*, would be the person in charge of the *da-mo*, while the *ra-wa-ke-ta* is the person responsible for the *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo ka-ma*. Following this hypothesis, the term *ka-ma*, which refers to a particular type of land with certain obligations (Del Freo 2009), should be interpreted in this document as referring to an animated being (Nikoloudis 2014, 233), that is, it would denote the workers of the *ka-ma*, which seems highly unlikely if compared with the rest of the contexts in which the term

12 It is true that there are indications according to which there might have existed a single fiscal law for all the kingdoms (Olivier 1974; 2006), but this does not justify Mariotta's position. For the idea of a Mycenaean 'empire,' see Eder, Jung 2015.

13 Literally 'he who has a duty, a task.' Probably a type of magistrate whose specific functions are still a matter of debate. Cf. *DMic s.v.*; *LGM s.v.* τελεστής.

14 Del Freo 2005, 163 uses similar terms.

15 Pontani (1998) is also of the same opinion; she suggests they might be a religious group.

appears. Furthermore, Nikoloudis suggests that *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo* should be interpreted as *worgiōneion*, a group of people made up of "*non-damos* members and potentially less privileged." The group would have been headed by the *ra-wa-ke-ta*. According to her view, the toponym *sa-ra-pe-da* could be a composite whose first part should be reconstructed as related to the Hittite adverb *šarā*, 'up, upwards,' which may indicate that those less-privileged people were immigrants from the coast of Anatolia. As evidence for this proposal, she presents the '*Tawagalawa* Letter'.[16] As I have already argued elsewhere (Piquero 2017), I believe that the hypothesis presented by Nikoloudis, though interesting, is not satisfactory, and requires one to assume as possible morphological interpretations which are rather questionable (**lawagertas*, **wrogiōneion*…).

5. PY Er 880 AND THE TERM *A-KI-TI-TO*

On the basis of what has been said so far, the most likely hypothesis seems to be that Un 718 records the taxes on the landholdings that appear in Er 880 + Er 312.

Er 880 is very fragmentary and the reconstruction of its content is controversial. Except for the reconstruction of line 4, which I discuss further on, I concur with M. Del Freo (2005, 154-161) and refer to his work for a detailed critique of the proposed reconstructions and their plausibility.

In my opinion, it seems that the most likely reconstruction of the document is the following:

.1 e-]ke-ra$_2$[-wo , ki-]ti-me-no , e-ke
.2 sa-ra-pe-do[-i , pe-]pu$_2$-te-me-no
.3 to-so [pe-ma] GRA 30[ ] *vacat*
.4 to-so-de , [a-ki-ti-]to , pe-ma GRA ⌊42[
.5 to-sa , we-je[-we]1100[
.6 to-sa-de , su-ẓạ[ ]1̣0̣0̣0̣[ ] *vacat*
.7 *vacat*
.8 ku-su-to-ro-qa , to-so , pe-ma 94
.9 *vacat*

I accept the reconstruction of *sa-ra-pe-do*[*-i*, a toponym in the locative plural,[17] although a form *sa-ra-pe-do*[*-pi*, instrumental plural with a locative sense (cf. *pa-ki-ja-pi*) cannot be discarded.[18] I also follow the general consensus with regard to the reconstruction of *pe-*]*pu$_2$-te-me-no*, although other alternatives are also possible. The term is a perfect participle of a verb that is not attested in later Greek, perhaps */phuteō/* or */phutēmi/*, meaning 'planting trees.' However, an origin from φυτεύω cannot be excluded, since, as acknowledged by De Fidio (1977, 90), "infatti l'assenza della -υ- nel dittongo in -ευ- non è quello scoglio insuperabile che qualcuno ha voluto riconoscervi; dato che di essa non mancano altri esempi: si confrontino in propósito le alternanze *ke-po-da/ke-u-po-da, o-wo-ze/o-u-wo-ze/qo-qo-ta-o/qo-u-qo-ta, we-da-ne-u/we-u-da-ne-u.*"

In line 5, nonetheless, a term *we-je*[*-wi-ja* may have to be reconstructed in agreement with *to-sa* (Ruijgh 1967, 346, n. 44), whose meaning remains unclear.

According to this reconstruction, lines 1-2 record that *e-ke-ra$_2$-wo* has in *sa-ra-pe-do*[*-i/-pi* a plot of land *ki-ti-me-no,*[19] probably 'in the process of cultivation', and *pe-*]*pu$_2$-te-me-no,* 'planted with trees.' There is also agreement over the reconstruction of the term *pe-ma*, σπέρμα, 'seed,' in the lacuna of line 3 through comparison with line 4

16 Regarding this letter see Beckman, Bryce, Cline 2011, 101-123.

17 It has been suggested that it may be a substantive that designates a specific type of land whose meaning is subject of discussion. See *DMic s.v. sa-ra-pe-da*.

18 But see García Ramón 2011, 237, "with ablative value."

19 This form is better interpreted as a neuter participial noun in the accusative singular rather than as a feminine dual, since, in my view, there is no reason to think of a dual here. Cf. De Fidio 1977, 92; Del Freo 2005, 160.

which reveals the size of the cultivated land (Del Freo 2005, 158). To the restoration of the term *a-ki-ti-*]*to* in line 4 I refer in what follows. In lines 5-6 there are records of *we-je*[*-we*, /*huiēwes*/ or /*weyewes*/, 'vine seedlings' (Perpillou 2012) and *su-za*, /*sūtsai*/, 'fig trees.' In line 8 we are given the total sum of *pe-ma*.[20]

5.1. *The reconstruction of the term a-ki-ti-to*

Ventris and Charwick (1956, 267) had already suggested the reconstruction of the term [*a-ki-ti-*]*to*, /*aktiton*/ in the lacuna of line 4 of PY Er 880, with a possible meaning 'not-inhabited.' This reconstruction was called into question due to the length of the lacuna (Hiller 1984, 67; Palmer 1994, 72), and even Del Freo (2005, 158-161) suggested a reconstruction [*a-pu$_2$-te-*]*to*, ἀφύτευτον or /*aphutēton*/, '(terreno) senza alberi.'

The term *a-ki-ti-to* is a verbal adjective derived from a noun based on the root IE **tḱei*,'to live, to inhabit, to cultivate,' perhaps with a laryngeal lengthening **tkeH(i)-* (Álvarez-Pedrosa Núñez 1993, 17-18), and the addition of a privative prefix ἀ-. As has been demonstrated (Jiménez Delgado 2016, 182-183), this type of adjectives in -τος stand in contrast to the Mycenaean participles in -μενος. Therefore, *a-ki-ti-to* is juxtaposed by *ki-ti-me-na*/*-o*, middle-passive present participle of the verb *ki-ti-me-na*/*-o*, of which there are no attestations from the first millennium. The term ἄκτιτος is attested in later Greek (*h.Ven.* 123), probably with the meaning 'uncultivated' (Casevitz 1985, 24; Faulkner 2008, 198).

Despite the fact that the morphology of the term in Mycenaean is straightforward, there is no agreement regarding its translation (cf. *DMic. s.v.*; *LGM s.v.* ἄκτιτος). The main objection to the interpretation of *a-ki-ti-to* as 'uncultivated' is that in the Pylos Na series (Perna 2004, 209-256; 2006; 2016, 471-478), the lands that were in theory not cultivated pay a certain quantity of linen. Thus Ventris and Chadwick (1973[2], 470) raised concerns over this interpretation stating that *a-ki-ti-to* "can hardly be uncultivated, if at least 6 units of flax are expected from it." Various hypotheses have been proposed in order to solve this apparent contradiction (cf. *DMic. s.v.*; *LGM, s.v.* ἄκτιτος). However, in my opinion, it is M. Perna who offers the most plausible explanation. Examining the typology of the documents of the Na series from Pylos (2004, 218-243), Perna points out that "les textes enregistrant des rentrées présentent les chiffres des ces entrées à gauche (après le toponyme) et ceux enregistrant des sorties ou des attributions de lin (…) présentent les chiffres à droite." Therefore, it may be established that, from the point of view of account keeping, the scribe[21] "a accompli son travail de façon très logique et rationnelle, en mettant à gauche du document tous les chiffres correspondant à des entrées assurées et à droite tous les chiffres des rentrées qu'il a prévu de ne pas recevoir." The term *a-ki-ti-to* is attested in three documents of the Na series (406, 926, and probably 537). The figures indicating the linen appear always on the right side, that is, in the section of the document where the scribe noted down the figures which he already knew would be missing in the final calculation of the tax payments. I think this theory supports the interpretation of the term *a-ki-ti-to* as 'not-cultivated, uncultivated (land),' because the scribe knows that the condition of the land is such that the owner will not pay the corresponding amount of linen: the land is not cultivated and, consequently, there is no production of linen.[22] According to Perna (2004, 237-238), this situation would not have generated a debt but simply a loss, since the scribe would otherwise have used the term *o-pe-ro* to indicate such debt.

If Perna is correct, as it seems he is, and the term *a-ki-ti-to* describes uncultivated land which does not produce debt but rather simply implies loss, I believe the reconstruction of [*a-ki-ti-*]*to* in PY Er 880.4 gains strength.

Nakassis objections (2012, 10-13) with regard to this hypothesis are unfounded. First, he criticises the reconstruction of [*a-ki-ti-*]*to*, since according to him the term *ki-*]*ti-me-no* in line 1 can only be a dual /*ktimenō*/. This dual would refer to the landholdings in lines 3-4, and so it would be contradictory if the scribe recorded 'two cultivated plots of land (*ki-ti-me-no*)' in line 1 and then went on to write in line 4 that one of them was 'uncultivated (*a-ki-ti-to*).' In my opinion, it is more possible to interpret it as a neuter singular /*ktimenon*/ (De Fidio 1977, 94-

20 Regarding the possible reconstruction of the numbers in lines 3-4, see Del Freo 2005, 165-166.

21 H1 with the exception of Na 337, 561, 841 and 1027, which are attributed to Class ii, S337. Cf. Palaima 1988, 119.

22 Possible reasons in De Fidio 1987.

95). Nakassis also criticises the hypothesis set forth by P. De Fidio (1977, 97-98) that this *a-ki-ti-to* land would have been exempt from taxation, because the tablets in the Na series (where the term appears) indicate that "the land *is* subject to taxation." The land was indeed subject to taxation and this is why it is recorded on the tablets, but the quantities of linen that accompany the term *a-ki-ti-to* are always written on the right site of the document, which, according to Perna, suggests that they do not record a payment. In Er 880 the scribe (H24) does not make any differentiation in the spatial distribution of the tablet's content to indicate that no payment results from the 'uncultivated' (*a-ki-ti-to*) plots of land. He knows that this is so due to the unproductiveness of the land, as is also the case with the landholdings of the Na series. This argument confirms the hypothesis proposed by De Fidio (1977, 97-98) that "sembra infatti assai improbabile che il *dosmos* consegnato da *E-ke-ra$_2$-wo* in Un 718 sia prelevato indiscriminatamente sulle aree produttive e sulle aree improduttive." The scribe makes note of all the landholdings to make a full assessment of the land plots of *e-ke-ra$_2$-wo* in *sa-ra-pe-da*, but exempts from tax payment those lands that are "uncultivated" (*a-ki-ti-to*) since they do not produce grain. The same could be said of the *a-ki-ti-to* lands that appear in the Na series. The scribe records all the lands, cultivated and uncultivated, to reflect the profit and losses that these lands had generated over that year.

Although I think that the reconstruction of [*a-ki-ti-*]*to* is the most plausible, this interpretation is not without its problems. If *ki-*]*ti-me-no* is a singular /*ktimenon*/, as I believe, we must assume that three types of land are recorded in Er 880: cultivated land, uncultivated land, and land planted with trees. As M. Del Freo has pointed out to me (personal communication), it is unusual that the scribe recorded the term [*a-ki-ti-*]*to* after *to-so-de* and not the reverse, as is the norm in other land listings. One would expect *a-ki-ti-to to-so-de pe-mo.* Although this is indeed the norm, there are no documented cases in which *pe-mo/-a* appears qualified by an adjective. It is difficult to determine which one was the standard word order in the case of an adjective and the noun it qualified. Nevertheless, it is likely that the order adj. + noun indicated a marked position of the former (Jiménez Delgado 2016, 199) through which the scribe implied that, compared to the landholding in line 3, which would have been cultivated, the one in line 4 remained "uncultivated." In any case, and considering this as the most likely option, the lacunae of the document in lines 3 and 4 mean that any reconstruction remains an open ended discussion.

A large tract of land[23] is considered as *a-ki-ti-to,* 'uncultivated,' in Er 880.4. It has been suggested (De Fidio 1987, 140) that the uncultivated landholdings registered in the Na series might have been in such a state due to a production or demographic crisis, but as Perna points out (2004, 238), "nous ignorons pourquoi cette terre (…) est inculte, si par exemple un incendie ou une autre cause l'a rendue inutilisable pour un certain temps." In the case of the uncultivated landholdings of Er 880.4, provided that the *a-ki-ti-to* interpretation is correct, as it appears to be, they might have remained uncultivated for any of those two reasons. Yet it should be remembered that they also belonged to the ἱερὰ χῶρα of Poseidon. This is relevant because there are testimonies from the first millennium that refer to a series of restrictions regarding the exploitation of sacred lands (Horster 2010, 450-453). Be that as it may, the uncultivated lands were not productive. In some sources from the first millennium BC there are references to the exploitation of these lands, which could be dedicated to grazing or the exploitation of wood, as well as to beekeeping among other things (Forbes 1996; Horster 2010, 452-453).

6. THE TAX NUMBERS

As Nakassis (2012, 10) points out, Un 718 is a taxation document behind which one should be able to detect a rational system. He has criticised (2012, 10-13) the equivalence proposed by Lejeune (1975) and De Fidio (1977, 77-129) that Un 718 records the taxes that must be paid for the plots of land mentioned in Er 880 + Er 312. Nakassis bases fundamentally his argument on two principles:

23 See Del Freo (2005, 165-166) for possible reconstructions of the amount.

1. It is arbitrary to propose that the *a-ki-ti-to* lands are exempt from payment. The term does not mean "uncultivated (land)," but rather refers to a specific type of land or condition of landholding. We have already seen (§4) that the comparison with the Na series calls into question the validity of this objection.
2. De Fidio's calculations depend on the equivalence between grain and wine, but there are reasons to doubt his solution. As he explains, there are some issues regarding the quantities that are not sufficiently clear and are still under debate[24]. As De Fidio points out (1977, 102-103) "si tratta, superfluo sottolinearlo, di un elemento in sé assai poco solido." According to J. Zurbach (2017, 51), "les correspondances entre Er et Un 718 sont trop hypothétiques dans leur détail pour qu'on en tire beaucoup de renseignements." Even so, and despite the reasonable doubts remaining in relation to the quantities suggested by De Fidio, I believe that the observation made by Nakassis that "it seems likely that the apparent correspondence between the landholdings in the Er series and the quantities of grain and wine contributed on Un 718 is illusory," is exaggerated, and serves to demonstrate that *e-ke-ra$_2$-wo* is the king Pylos and that Er 880 should not be taken into account in the *do-so-mo* of Un 718.[25]

Therefore, if we accept that the *wanax* was exempt from paying for his landholdings, as the Na series indicates, (Killen 1992-1993, 114-119 [= 2015, 598-603]; Perna 2016, 472-475), and that the "uncultivated" (*a-ki-ti-to*) land plots did not yield taxes in grain because of the unproductive condition of the land, it is possible to defend the hypothesis put forward by Lejeune (1975) and De Fidio (1977, 77-129) that Un 718 records the taxes on the landholdings of the Er series. This, on the other hand, is also the opinion of the majority of scholars (Killen 1999, 352 = 2015, 744; Del Freo 2005, 152-166; Bendall 2007, 74; Doyen 2011, 158-159; Zurbach 2016, 359-362; Perna 2016, 454; De Fidio 2017).

7. CONCLUSIONS: THE CONTENT OF THE DOSSIER *SA-RA-PE-DA*

As already demonstrated by de Fidio (1977; 2017), the landholdings recorded in the Er series probably formed part of the ἱερὰ χῶρα of Poseidon. One of the problems of the dossier as a set is the geographical location of *sa-ra-pe-da*. Although it has been suggested that the term may be a noun referring to a specific type of land and not a toponymic designation (De Fidio 1977, 97), it seems more likely that it represents a toponym, with -πέδον being the second part of the compound. The toponym hypothesis poses the problem that the term only appears in the dossier among all the Pylos documents, thus undermining the hypothesis. The most likely solution, in my opinion, is to agree with Del Freo (2017, 112) that the term *sa-ra-pe-da* is the name of a land plot, of an estate: "si l'on accepte l'interprétation selon laquelle les terrains des séries Er et Es appartenaient à une *hiera chora* de Poséidon, on peut faire l'hypothèse que celle-ci était divisée en domaines, ultérieurement subdivisés entre possesseurs, un scénario assez peu différent de celui de la *hiera chora* d'Apollon Délien à l'époque classique, où, entre autres, certains des domaines donnés en location portaient des noms inspirés par le paysage agricole, comme Φυταλιά 'La plantation' et Φοίνικες 'Les palmiers'." This obviously does not solve the problem of the exact location of the ἱερὰ χῶρα of Poseidon, which might have been situated near the god's sanctuary (*po-si-da-i-jo*), which in turn was probably in close proximity to the city (De Fidio 1990, 169; Del Freo 2017, 121-123; De Fidio 2017, 136), although no agreement exists as to its exact location (Montecchi 2016).

Regardless of where the ἱερὰ χῶρα of Poseidon was located, there were five different tenants in the estate of *sa-ra-pe-da*. Two individuals are recorded by name, *e-ke-ra$_2$-wo*, whose social position must have been very important according to the data preserved in the documents (Petrakis 2008; Nakassis 2013, 243-244), and **wo-ro-ki-jo* who appears only in this dossier. Other lands were in the possession of the king, the δᾶμος, 'the community,' and the λαγέτας, an important official of the kingdom.

24 See also Palmer 1989; Manzano 2016.

25 On tax proportions see also De Fidio 2017, 134-136.

Therefore, the purpose of the Er series was strictly fiscal. An official (H24) recorded the tenants of the estate *sa-ra-pe-da*, located in the ἱερὰ χῶρα of Poseidon, and established the size of their landholdings. In Un 718 he meticulously recorded the payments that corresponded to each of the tenants based on the amount of land they possesed: the *wanax* was exempt from payment, and so were the *a-ki-ti-to* "uncultivated" land plots of *e-ke-ra$_2$-wo*. The latter do not seem to have produced any debt but only losses (§5). According to Del Freo (2017, 107-108), the fact that the only surviving documents are those that record the *do-so-mo* of the settled lands in the Es and Er series, both related to the ἱερὰ χῶρα of Poseidon, and that they were both found in Room 7 of the archive, seems to suggest that the collection of the land-taxes had only just started when the collapse of the palace occurred.

Acknowledgements

This work is part of the project *Estudios de morfosintaxis nominal: lenguas paleohispánicas e indoeuropeas antiguas (FFI2015-63981-C3-2)*. I would like to express my most sincere gratitude to Alberto Bernabé, Maurizio Del Freo, Massimo Perna and Paloma Guijarro for their valuable contributions during the development of this research and to Petros Tsagkaropoulos for the revision of the English version. Any mistakes remain my own.

Abbreviations

DMic Aura Jorro F., *Diccionario Micénico*, Madrid, 1985-1993.

LGM Piquero Rodríguez J. forthcoming, *El léxico del griego micénico:* Index Graecitatis*, estudio y actualización bibliográfica*, Nancy.

PofN IV (draft) Bennett Jr. E.L., Melena J.L., Olivier J.-P., Firth R., Palaima Th.G. (eds), *The Palace of Nestor at Pylos in Western Messenia, vol. 4. The Inscribed Documents*, Austin.
https://www.academia.edu/5788888/DRAFT_VERSION_NOT_DEFINITIVE_Bennett_Melena_Olivier_Firth_Palaima_The_Palace_of_Nestor_at_Pylos_in_Western_Messenia_Volume_IV_The_Inscribed_Documents.

References

Álvarez-Pedrosa Núñez J.A. 1993, Analysis of the Vocabulary of Roots contaning the so Called Indo-European Þ, *IF* 98, 13-23.

Beckmann G.M., Brice T.R., Cline E.H. 2011, *The Ahhiyawa Texts* (Writings from the Ancient World 28), Atlanta-Leiden.

Bendall L.M. 2007, *Economics of Religion in the Mycenaean World. Resources Dedicated to Religion in the Mycenaean Palace Economy*, Oxford.

Burkert W. 2011, *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche*, 2nd edition, Stuttgart.

Carlier P. 1984, *La royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre*, Strasbourg.

Carlier P. 1987, À propos des *te-re-ta*, in Ilievski P.H., Crepajac L. (eds), *Tractata Mycenaea. Proceedings of the Eight International Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies. Ohrid, 15-20 September 1985*, Skopje, 65-73.

Carlier P. 1998, *wa-na-ka* derechef. Nouvelles réflexions sur les royautés mycéniennes, *BCH* 122, 411-415.

Casevitz M. 1985, *Le vocabulaire de la colonisation en grec ancien: étude lexicologique. Les familles de* κτίζω *et de* οἰκέω-οἰκίζω, Paris.

Cataudella M.R. 2002, Myc. *E-ke-ra$_2$-wo* (chi era costui? Ce n'è traccia nei testi ittiti?), in Pecchioli Daddi F., De Martino S. (eds), *Anatolia Antica. Studi in onore di Fiorella Imparati*, Firenze, 155-170.

Chadwick J. 1975, Who was *E-ke-ra$_2$-wo*?, in Bingen J., Cambier G., Nachtergael G. (eds), *Le monde grec: pensé, litératture, histoire, documents. Hommages à Claire Preaux*, Bruxelles, 450-453.

De Fidio P. 1977, *I Dosmoi Pilii a Poseidon. Una terra sacra di età micenea* (IG 65), Roma.

De Fidio P. 1987, Fattori di crisi nella Messenia della Tarda Età del Bronzo, in *Studies in Mycenaean and Classical Greek presented to J. Chadwick* (*Minos* 20-22), Salamanca-Vitoria, 127-136.

De Fidio P. 1990, Potere politico e funzione del sacro nella società micenee, in Mactoux M.-M., Geny E. (eds), *Mélanges Pierre Lévêque, vol. 4*, Besançon-Paris, 151-171.

De Fidio P. 2017, A Reassessment of Taxation on Sacred Lands in the Linear B Corpus, in Carlier P., Joannès F., Rougemont F., Zurbach J. (eds), *Palatial Economy in the Ancient Near East and in the Aegean. First steps towards a comprehensive study and analysis. Acts of the ESF Exploratory Workshop held in Sèvres, 16-19 September 2010* (*Pasiphae* 11), 121-139.

Del Freo M. 2005, *I censimenti di terreni nei testi in lineare B*, Pisa-Roma.

Del Freo M. 2009, Les obligations dans les listes de terrains de Pylos, in Guilleux N., Petit D. (eds), *A-ti-do-ro. Etrennes en hommage à Jean-Louis Perpillou de la part de quelques-un de ses anciens élèves* (*Ktema* 34), 33-50.

Del Freo M. 2017, Quelques réflexions sur les possessions foncières et les obligations à Pylos, in Carlier P., Joannès Fr., Rougemont Fr., Zurbach J. (eds), *Palatial Economy in the Ancient Near East and in the Aegean. First steps towards a comprehensive study and analysis. Acts of the ESF Exploratory Workshop held in Sèvres, 16-19 September 2010* (*Pasiphae* 11), 105-119.

Doyen Ch. 2011, *Poseidon souverain: contribution à l'histoire religieuse de la Grèce mycénienne et archaïque*, Bruxelles.

Eder B., Jung R. 2015, *Unus pro omnibus, omnes pro uno*: The Mycenaean Palace System, in Weilhartner J., Ruppenstein F. (eds), *Tradition and Innovation in the Mycenaean Palatial Polities. Proceedings of an International Symposium held at the Austrian Academy of Sciences, Institute for Oriental and European Archaeology, Aegean and Anatolia Department, Vienna, 1-2 March, 2013*, Vienna, 113-140.

Faulkner A. 2008, *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite: introduction, text and commentary*, Oxford.

Forbes H. 1996, The Uses of the Uncultivated Landscape in Modern Greece: A Pointer to the Value of the Wilderness in Antiquity?, in Shipley G., Salmon J. (eds), *Human Landscapes in Classical Antiquity. Enviroment and Culture*, London-New York, 68-97.

García Ramón J.L. 2011, Mycenaean Onomastics, in Duhoux Y., Morpurgo Davies A. (eds), *A Companion to Linear B. Mycenaean Greek Texts and Their World*, *vol. 2,* Louvain-la-Neuve, 213-251.

García Ramón J. L. 2014, *Anthroponymica Mycenaea. e-ke-ra$_2$-wo */En-kheriā-wōn/*, *ἐγχειρία y ἐγχειρέω 'emprender' (*'poner mano en') ἐγχείρημα, ἐγχείρησις, in Bernabé A., Luján E.R. (eds), *Donum Mycenologicum. Mycenaean Studies in honour of Francisco Aura Jorro*, Louvain-La-Neuve, 35-50.

Hiller S. 1984, Fruchtbaumkulturen auf Kreta und in Pylos, in *Res Mycenaeae. Akten des VII Internationalen Mykenologischen Colloquiums in Nünberg von 6-10 April 1981*, Göttingen, 171-201.

Horster M. 2010, Religious Landscape and Sacred Ground: Relationships between Space and Cult in the Greek World, *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 4, 435-458.

Jiménez Delgado J.M. 2015, The etymology of Myc. *ku-na-ke-ta-i*, Ion.-Att. κυνηγέτες, and Myc. *ra-wa-ke-ta*, Dor. λᾱγέτᾱς, *Glotta* 91, 116-128.

Jiménez Delgado J.M. 2016, *Sintaxis del griego micénico*, Sevilla.

Killen J.T. 1983, Mycenaean Possesive Adjectives in *-e-jo*, *TPhS* 81, 63-99.

Killen J.T. 1992-1993, *ke-u-po-da e-sa-re-u* and the Exemptions of the Pylos Na Tablets, *Minos* 27-28, 109-123.

Killen J.T. 1999, New Readings and Interpretations in the Pylos Tablets, in Deger-Jalkotzy S., Hiller S., Panagl O. (eds), *Floreant Studia Mycenaea. Akten des X. Internationalen Mykenologischen Colloquiums in Salzburg vom 1.-5. Mai 1995*, Vienna, 343-353.

Killen J.T. 2004, Wheat, Barley, Flour, Olives and Figs on Linear B Tablets, in Halstead P., Barret J.C. (eds), *Food, Cuisine and Society in Prehistoric Greece*, Oxford, 155-173.

Killen J.T. 2015, *Economy and Administration in Mycenaean Greece. Collected Papers on Linear B*, edited by Del Freo M. (IG 104/1-3), Roma.

Lejeune M. 1975, Le dossier *sa-ra-pe-da* du scribe 24 de Pylos, *Minos* 14, 60-76.

Manzano N. 2016, Razioni alimentari a Cnosso, Micene e Pilo, *Pasiphae* 10, 97-116.

Marazzi M. 2016, L'uso delle cretule nel mondo miceneo, in Del Freo M., Perna M. (eds), *Manuale di epigrafia micenea. Introduzione allo studio dei testi in lineare B*, Padova, 589-612.

Mariotta G. 2003, *Struttura politica e fisco nello Stato miceneo: aspetti e problemi della storia greca delle origini*, Padova.

Melena J.L. 2014, Mycenaean Writing, in Duhoux Y., Morpurgo Davies A. (eds), *A Companion to Linear B. Mycenaean Greek Texts and Their World*, *vol. 3,* Louvain-La-Neuve, 1-186.

Montecchi B. 2016, *pu-ro, pa-ki-ja-na/-ne*, and the Sanctuary of Poseidon at Pylos, *SMEA NS* 2, 119-136.

Nakassis D. 2012, Prestige and Interest. Feasting and the King at Mycenaean Pylos, *Hesperia* 81, 1-30.

Nakassis D. 2013, *Individuals and Society in Mycenaean Pylos*, Leiden-Boston.

Nikoloudis S. 2006, *The* ra-wa-ke-ta. *Ministerial Authority and Mycenaean Cultural Identity*, Ph.D. diss., University of Texas at Austin.

Nikoloudis S. 2008a, Multiculturalism in Mycenaean World, in Collins B.J., Bachvarova M.R., Rutherford I. (eds), *Anatolian Interfaces: Hittites, Greeks and their Neighbours*, Havertown, 45-56.

Nikoloudis S. 2008b, The Role of the *ra-wa-ke-ta*. Insights from PY Un 718, in Sacconi A., Del Freo M., Godart L., Negri M. (eds), *Colloquium Romanum. Atti del XII Colloquio Internazionale di Micenologia. Roma 20-25 Febbraio 2006*, Pisa-Roma, 587-594.

Nikoloudis S. 2015, Working the Land: *ka-ma* Plots at Pylos, in Nakassis D., Gulizio J., James S.A. (eds), *Ke-ra-me-ja*: *Studies Presented to Cynthia W. Shelmerdine*, Philadelphia, 223-238.

Olivier J.-P. 1974, Une loi fiscale mycénienne, *BCH* 98, 23-35.

Olivier J.-P. 2006, De 'l'empire mycénien' et de sa nécéssaire fiscalité, in Perna M. (ed.), *Fiscality in Mycenaean and Near Eastern Archives. Proceedings of the Conference held at Sopraintendenza Archivistica per la Campania, Naples, 21-23 October 2004*, Paris, 183-188.

Palaima Th.G. 1988, *The Scribes of Pylos* (IG 87), Roma.

Palaima Th.G. 1995, The Nature of the Mycenaean Wanax: Non-Indoeuropean Origins and Priestly Functions, in Rehak P. (ed.), *The Role of the Ruler in the Prehistoric Aegaean. Proceedings of a Panel Discussion Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America. New Orleans, Louisiana, 22 December 1992. With additions* (*Aegaeum* 11), Liège-Austin, 119-139.

Palaima, Th.G. 1998-1999, Special *vs*. Normal Mycenaean. Hand 24 and Writing in the Service of the King?, in Bennet J., Driessen J. (eds), A-NA-QO-TA. *Studies Presented to J.T. Killen* (*Minos* 33-34), Salamanca, 205-221.

Palmer L.R. 1963, *The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts*, Oxford.

Palmer R. 1989, Subsistence Rations at Pylos and Knossos, *Minos* 24, 89-124.

Palmer, R. 1994, *Wine in the Mycenaean Palace Economy (Aegaeum* 10), Liège-Austin.

Perna M. 2004, *Recherches sur la fiscalité mycénienne*, Nancy.

Perna M. 2006, Les tablettes de la série Na de Pylos, in Perna M. (ed.), *Fiscality in Mycenaean and Near Eastern Archives. Proceedings of the Conference held at Sopraintendenza Archivistica per la Campania, Naples, 21-23 October 2004*, Paris, 189-197.

Perna M. 2016, Testi che trattano di procedure fiscali, in Del Freo M., Perna M. (eds), *Manuale di epigrafia micenea. Introduzione allo studio dei testi in lineare B*, Padova, 453-490.

Perpillou J.-L. 2012, La plante à vin, in Blanc A., Dubois L., De Lamberterie Ch. (eds), *ΠΟΛΥΜΗΤΙΣ: Mélanges en l'honneur de Françoise Bader*, Leuven, 109-114.

Petrakis V.P. 2008, *e-ke-ra$_2$-wo ≠ wa-na-ka*: The Implications of a Probable Non-Identification for Pylian Feasting and Politics, in Hitchcook A., Laffineur R., Crowley J. (eds), *DAIS. The Aegean Feast. Proceedings of the 12th International Aegean Conference. University of Melbourne, Centre for Classics and Archaeology, 28-29 March 2008 (Aegaeum* 29*)*, Liège-Austin, 391-399.

Piquero J. 2017, Estudios sobre el léxico micénico: notas sobre la naturaleza y funciones del *ra-wa-ke-ta*, *Actas XIV Congreso de Estudios Clásicos*, *Barcelona, 13-18 Julio 2015,* Barcelona, 355-363.

Pontani P. 1998, Note all'iscrizione di Pilo Er 312: potere tripartito?, *Aevum* 72, 37-51.

Ruijgh C.J. 1967, Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien, Amsterdam.

Thompson, R. J. E. 2002-2003, Special *vs*. Normal Mycenaean Revisited, *Minos* 37-38, 337-369.

Tsagrakis A. 2016, The wa-na-ka – (F)ÁNAKΣ - ἌΝΑΞ, *Pasiphae* 10, 201-216.

Ventris M., Chadwick J. 1956, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek. Three hundred selected tablets from Knossos, Pylos and Mycenae with commentary and vocabulary*, Cambridge.

Ventris M., Chadwick J. 1973, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, 2nd edition, Cambridge.

Weilhartner J. 2008, Some Observations on the Commodities in the Linear B Tablets Referring to Sacrificial Banquets, in Hitchcook A., Laffineur R., Crowley J. (eds), *DAIS. The Aegean Feast. Proceedings of the 12th International Aegean Conference. University of Melbourne, Centre for Classics and Archaeology, 28-29 March 2008 (Aegaeum* 29*)*, Liège-Austin, 411-426.

Zurbach J. 2016, Registrazioni di terreni e testi fondiari, in Del Freo M., Perna M. (eds), *Manuale di epigrafia micenea. Introduzione allo studio dei testi in lineare B*, Padova, 349-372.

Zurbach J. 2017, *Les hommes, la terre et la dette en Grèce, ca. 1400 – ca. 500 a.C.*, Bordeaux.

Juan Piquero Rodríguez
Facultad de Filología, Edificio A
Departamento de Filología Griega y Lingüística Indoeuropea
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
Plaza Menéndez Pelayo s/n.
28040 Madrid
Spain
juanpiqu@ucm.es