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I. Introduction

The discovery that the Mycenaean kingdom of Pylos consisted of two separate provinces was made soon after the decipherment of Linear B. Already in Documents (1956)¹ Ventris and Chadwick were able to point out that the taxation and distribution records Cn 608, Vn 20 and in part Vn 19 show the same list of nine places in the same order, and that the same list, with the replacement of e-ra-to by ro-u-so, forms the first section of the list of sixteen places on the taxation record Jn 829. They then note that the distribution record On 300, which mentions five of the additional seven names on Jn 829 in its second paragraph under the heading pe-ra-a-ko-ra-i-jo and two of the first nine in its badly damaged first section, appears to confirm that the Nine and Seven correspond to the two districts de-we-ro-a₃-ko-ra-i-ja and pe-ra₃-ko-ra-i-ja referred to on the two Ng totalling records for the Na flax series (Ng 319 and Ng 332 respectively). Finally, they suggest that these districts are regions (or as we now term them ‘provinces’) ‘on this side’ (deuro) and ‘on the far side’ (pera) of the range of hills running roughly north and south down the peninsula and separating the western coastal strip from the Messenian valley. As they point out, this is generally identified with the Aigaleon mentioned by Strabo (VIII, 4, 2), and while the name is not an exact match for -a₃-ko-ra-i-ja, it is close enough to make the interpretation a plausible one. Though we have learnt much more since 1956 about the history and internal organisation of the two provinces (for the likelihood that the Further Province was a late addition to the kingdom, see Bennet 1995, pp. 596–601; for evidence for a division of each province for taxation purposes into four sub-sections, see Wyatt 1962, Shelmerdine 1973), nothing has emerged over the ensuing fifty years that would lead us to question these overall conclusions of Ventris and Chadwick.

I give below the list of chief places in both provinces (HP = Hither Province, FP = Further Province). The list is that on Jn 829; the places on the Ma tablets are the same, except that a-te-re-wi-ja and e-sa-re-wi-ja replace e-re-i.

¹. See pp. 142–144.
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The purpose of the present paper is to ask the question: what rôle did each of these provinces play in the overall economy of the Pylian state? Were they both treated – and exploited – by the central palace in exactly the same way: subject to the same taxes and receiving the same distributions, producing the same crops, running the same types of livestock, supplying or maintaining the same types of worker, etc.; or were there differences between them, either in the types of activity they were involved in or in the relative scale of those activities? This is of course not the first time such a question has been asked: see for example J. Chadwick’s early discussion of the topic in ‘The Two Provinces of Pylos’ (1963). Moreover, a number of previous studies have focused on matters relevant to the topic, such as the distribution of the textile workforce within the kingdom (see Killen 1984). Thus far, however, there has not been a comprehensive account of all the relevant evidence; and I shall attempt in what follows to fill that gap, taking each of the relevant topics (taxation, types of crop, labour, etc.) in turn, and plotting the distribution of each of them within the kingdom.

Before we begin, however, it is necessary to enter a major caveat. While it is clear into which of the two provinces a number of the places mentioned on the tablets, including of course the Nine and Seven chief places, fall, it is debateable or entirely uncertain where many others are located.2 A number of less frequently attested toponyms appear in contexts where there is no evidence to link them to more securely located places; and the evidence for the location of some more frequently attested places appears to point in more than one direction. As an instance of the latter situation, one might mention the group of places which includes a₂-se-we / a-se-e, i-na-ne / i-na-ni-ja, te-re-ne-we / te-re-ne-wi-ja, qe-re-me-ti-wo and te-ko-to-(n)a-pe (see Killen 1998). An 5 mentions three of these places (one erased) together with mu-ta-pi; and both mu-ta-pi and qe-re-me-ti-wo (in what is evidently an erroneous writing or variant form qe-re-me-ti-re) recur on Cn 4, which lists tā(-to-mo) sheep under the heading a-si-ja-ti-ja, one of the seven chief places in the Further Province. Before we conclude, however, that all these places likewise lie in the Further Province, it is necessary to note, as others previously have done, that one of the other places in the Cn 4 list, e-ri-no-wo-te, is clearly in

2. For an excellent summary of the evidence bearing on the location of each of the places mentioned on the Pylos records, see Sainer 1976.

the Hither Province, not the Further. Its presence in the list may well mean that it is a place near the border between the two provinces; but it also means that we cannot exclude the possibility that \textit{mu-ta-pi} and \textit{qe-re-me-ti-re}, and hence \textit{a}$_3$-\textit{se-we} / \textit{a-se-e}, etc., are also places in the Hither Province, albeit probably near the border. In the tables below, I give the location of places in this group as ‘Further Province (?).’

A further uncertainty surrounds the numerous tablets in the archive which lack, or appear to lack, any place-name. If the analogy of Knossos holds good, where tablets which lack a place-name regularly relate to the ‘capital’ itself, many at least of these records will relate to activity at Pylos itself. Although, however, there is in some cases evidence which encourages this belief, we cannot be certain in any instance that the tablet does in fact relate to the ‘capital’. In all such cases, the location of the activity recorded on the tablet is shown in the tables as ‘(?/?) pu-ro’.

It follows therefore that any picture of the distribution of activity between the two provinces which seems to emerge from the tables beneath must be subject to a degree of reserve. Not only are the locations of certain places and activities which are given in the tables subject to uncertainty: a large number of places where certain activities are recorded as taking place cannot be located at all, and it is clearly possible that the absence of these from the tables results in a skewed picture of the distribution of those activities. In addition, many series of records may well be incomplete, which may again head to skewing. Nevertheless, some of the patterns which emerge from the tables are reasonably pronounced, and it is difficult to believe that any additional evidence would have altered them very significantly.

II. The Evidence

\textit{A. Levies and Distributions (Jn 829, Jo 438, On 300)}

In some cases, both provinces clearly play similar rôles. Both contribute certain taxes and receive certain allocations, in similar amounts: see Jn 829 (levy of bronze), Jo 438 (levy of gold), On 300 (distribution of skins (?) to officials in both provinces). On Jn 829, for example, contributions are expected from local officials in all sixteen of the chief places of the kingdom, and the amount required from each province is virtually the same: 99 N from the nine chief places of the Hither Province; 101 N from the seven chief places of the Further Province (de Fidio 1982, pp. 100–101, Killen 1996, p. 148).

---

4. See e.g. pp. 170-171 on the evidence relative to Fn 50 and pp. 171-172 on the evidence relative to Fr 1184.
Text

Jn 829

.01   jo-do-so-si , ko-re-te-re , du-ma-te-qe ,

.a     e-we-qe

.02   po-ro-ko-re-te-re-qe , ka-ra-wi-po-ro-qe , o-pi-su-ko-qe , o-pi-ka-pe-

.03   ka-ko , na-wi-jo , pa-ta-jo-i-qe , e-ke-si-qe , a_{2}-ka-sa-ma

.04   pi-*82 , ko-re-te

.AES M 2 po-ro-ko-re-te

.AES N 3

.05   me-ta-pa , ko-re-te

.AES M 2 po-ro-ko-re-te

.AES N 3

.06   pe-to-no , ko-re-te

.AES M 2 po-ro-ko-re-te

.AES N 3

.07   pa-ki-ja-pi , ko-re-te

.AES M 2 po-ro-ko-re-te

.AES N 3

.08   a-pu_{2}-we , ko-re-te

.AES M 2 po-ro-ko-re-te

.AES N 3

.09   a-ke-re-wa , ko-re-te

.AES M 2 po-ro-ko-re-te

.AES N 3

.10   ro-u-so , ko-re-te

.AES M 2 po-ro-ko-re-te

.AES N 3

.11   ka-ra-do-ro , ko-re-te

.AES M 2 po-ro-ko-re-te

.AES N 3

.12   ri-jio , ko-re-te

.AES M 2 po-ro-ko-re-te

.AES N 3

.13   ti-mi-to-a-ke-e , ko-re-te

.AES M 2 po-ro-ko-re-te

.AES N 3

.14   ra-[w]ra-ja-ri , ko-re-te

.AES M 2 N 3 po-ro-ko-re-te

.AES N 3

.15   sa-ma-ri , ko-re-te

.AES M 3 N 3 po-ro-ko-re-te

.N 3

.16   a-si-ja-ti-ja , k_{o}-re-te

.AES M 2 po-ro-ko-re-te

.N 3

.17   e-ra-te-re-wa-pi , ko-re-te

.AES M 2 po-ro-ko-re-te

.N 3

.18   za-ma-e-wi-ja , k_{o}-re-te

.AES M 3 N 3 po-ro-ko-re-te

.N 3

.19   e-re-i , ko-re-te

.AES M 3 N 3 po-ro-ko-re-te

.N 3

.20-23

vacant

Table A: Levies and Distributions (Jn, Jo, On)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HP</th>
<th>FP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bronze (Jn 829)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold (Jo 438)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*154 (skins?) (On 300)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Crops, Animals, etc. [I]

In other cases, too, while the figures for the two provinces differ, the data covers both sections of the kingdom. See the Ma tablets (taxes in the textile *146, oxhides, etc.), the Na, Ng, Nn records (contributions of flax) and the Cn flock records (flocks mainly of sheep and goats). Thus Ma 124 deals with the Hither Province place a-pu_{2}, and other tablets in the ‘set’ relate to each of the remaining members of the Nine and Seven, except for the replacement of e-re-i by a-te-re-wi-ja and a-sa-re-wi-ja. Again, as we have seen, the Ng totalling records for the Na records give figures for payments made and deficits incurred in both provinces; and the Cn records of flocks of sheep and goats refer both to Hither Province places like pi-*82 (see e.g. Cn 719) and Further Province places like a-si-ja-ti-ja.
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Texts

Ma 124
.01 a-pu₂-we *146 23 RI M 23 KE M 7 *152 10 O M 5 ME 500
.02 o-da-a₂, ka-ke-we, o-u-di-do-si *146 1 RI M 1 *152 1 ME 20

Ng 319
.01 de-we-ro-a₃,ko-ra-i-ja SA 1239
.02 to-sa-de, o-u-di-do-to SA 457

Ng 332
.01 pe-ra₃,ko-ra-i-ja, SA 200[
.02 to-sa-de, o-u-di-do-to SA [ qs

Cn 719
.01 ma-ro-pi, ka-do-wo, a-ke-o-jo ovism 40
.02 ma-ro-pi, to-si-ta, a-ke-o-jo ovism 82
.03 ma-ro-pi, me-ta-no, a-ke-o-jo ovism 60
.04 pi-*82, ma-ra-ni-jo, pa-ra-jo ovism 230
.05 pi-*82, o-ku-ka, a-ke-o-jo ovism 70
.06 pi-*82, ra-mi-ni-jo, a-ke-o-jo ovism 90
.07 pi-*82 ku-pi-ri-jo, a-ke-o-jo ovism 60
.08 pi-*82 ku-[ka-ra-so, a-so-ta-o ovisb [ ]30
.09 wi-[ja-wei-ra₂, ko-ru-no, pa-ra-jo ovism 66
.10 a-pa-[re-u-pi, pa-pa-ro, a-ko-so-ta-o ovism 100
.11 wi-ja-wei-ra₂, a-ka-ma-wo, a-ko[-so]-tà-o ovism 96
.12 wi-ja-wei-ra₂, a-ke-ta, ᵃw[-ne-]we ovism 100

Table B: Distribution of Crops, Animals, etc. [I]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>HP</th>
<th>FP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ma list [incl. *146 (a simple textile, perh. of linen), *152 (oxhide), RI (perh. linseed)]</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA (flax)(Na, Ng)</td>
<td>1239 + (owed)</td>
<td>200-899 + (owed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep + goats (Cn)</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Figures from Chadwick 1963)

C. Measurement of Land

In other respects, however, there are significant differences between the two provinces. The only plots of land for which the palace appears to have kept precise records of their capacity, expressed in terms of WHEAT, are those listed in the Ea-Es records, all of which seemingly relate to places in the Hither Province close to Pylos, principally pa-ki-ja-ne. On tablets in this group, like Eb 294, we regularly find fractional amounts of WHEAT recorded; whereas the amounts on the Na, Nn records, which list the taxable capacity of plots of flax-producing land in places in both provinces,
including on Nn 831 the capacity of individual plots within one of the contributing localities, are always in round figures. Note, too, that on An 830, two of whose entries concern places in the Further Province, a-te-re-wi-ja (l. 6) and e-sa-re-wi-ja (l. 7), land is recorded in terms of round numbers of DA, perhaps ‘households’. For further discussion of this phenomenon, including comparison with Knossos, where we appear to have evidence for a similar tendency for land near the centre to be recorded in greater detail, see Killen 1985, pp. 245–250, 1987, pp. 171–172.

**Texts**

**Eb 294**

.01 o-pe-te-re-u, qa-ja-me-no, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na

.02 to-so-de, pe-mo, **GRA 2 T 5**

**Na 406**

.A o-qa-[ ]si, **SA 20**

.B e-ko-me-no, di-wi-ja-wo, e-ke, a-ki-ti-to

**Nn 831**

.01 ko-ri[ ]no, [[do-so-mo]]

.02 u-re[ ] **SA 4 4**

.03 a-mo-ke-re-[ ] **SA 1 1**

.04 e-re-e-u **SA 2 2**

.05 qo-u-ko-ro [ ] **SA 4 4**

.06 a-ro-je-u [ ] **SA 1 1**

.07 a-ru-ta-wo [ ] **SA 2 2**

.08 e-po-me-ne-u[ ] **SA 4 4**

.09 ko-re-te [ ] **SA 2 4**

.10 po-me-ne[ ] **SA 2 2**

.11 ka-ke-u[ ] **SA 2 1**

.12-15 **vacant**

**An 830 [+] 907 + fr.**

.01 [ ] **vacat [**

.02 ]ke-ke-me[-no]

.03 di-ri-wa-ṣa[ ]

.04 ma-ra-ti-sa [ ]

.05 **vacat**

.06 a-te-re-wi-ja, e-so, ko-re-te-ri-jo, ke-ke-me- **DA 30[**

.07 **vacat**

.08 e-sa-re-wi-ja, ro-ro-ni-ja, te-u-po-ṛo[ ] **vacat [**

.09 ]no **DA 50** [ ]

.10 ]qo-u-ko-ro **VIR 18 [**

.11 ]qo-u-ko-ro **VIR 66**

.12 o-pi-da-mi-jo, pi-*82, qo-u[-ko]-ṛo **VIR 60**

.13 a₂-ki-ja, qo-u-ko-ro **VIR 60[**
Table C: Distribution of Types of Measurement of Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of measurement</th>
<th>HP</th>
<th>FP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detailed</td>
<td>E series</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round numbers</td>
<td>Na, Nn series</td>
<td>Na, Nn series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In terms of DA (=household?) only</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>An 830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Crops, Animals, etc. [II]

(a) In addition, while some classes of animal (sheep and goats) and crop (flax) are attested for both provinces, we only find deer in the Further Province or areas close to it (viz. in the group of places which include a₃-se-we, te-re-ne-wi-ja, etc.). Moreover, whereas flocks of sheep labelled we-re-ke are only attested for the Hither Province (see e.g. Cn 131: pi-*82), sheep qualified as ta (doubtless = ta-to-mo) are only attested on Cn 4 and Cn 595, both of whose headings refer to Further Province places (a-si-jā-ti-ja and e-ra-te-re-wa-pi), though two of the places mentioned in individual entries on these records (e-ri-no-wo-te and me-ta-pa) are located in the Hither Province, presumably near the border.

Texts

Cr 868

01 a₃-se-we
02 ne-se-e-we CERV[ qs
03 te-re-ne-wi-ja CERV[ qs
04 na-pe-re-wa CERV[ qs
05 infra mutila

Cn 131

01 pi-*82 , we-re-ke
02 pa-ro , pi-me-ta , × ovisₙ 200 pa-ro , o-ku-ka , ovisₙ × 1₃₀[ 
03 pa-ro , ku-pi-ri-jo , ovisₙ 50 × pa-ro , a-ka-ma-wo ovisₙ 1₂₀ × 
04 pa-ro , ko-ru-no ovisₙ 1₀₀ × pa-ro , ne-ri-to ovisₙ 3₀ × 

Cn 595

01 e-ra-te-re-wa-pi , ta-to-mo , o-pe-ro ,
02 me-ta-pa , a-we-ke-se-u VIR 1 ovis⁺TA 5
03 ne-de-we-e ovis⁺TA 9
04 u-de-wi-ne VIR 2 ovis⁺TA 8
05 ma-to-ro-pu-ro ovis⁺TA 1
06 ]i-pi[ VIR ]1 ovis⁺TA 5
07 ]-ko-[ oviₙ [+TA].₅[ 

(b) Again, while On 300 records allocations of skins (?) to officials in both provinces, the allocations of wine on Vn 20 and, as far as we can tell, of olive oil on the Fr tablets are only to Hither Province places. (Vn 20 lists the standard nine Hither Province places.) The issues of oil on the Fr tablets are made in
a religious context, some for use at *pa-ki-ja-ne* close to Pylos (see Fr 1217); and this is in keeping with the picture at Knossos, where many at least of the religious offerings recorded on the tablets are made either at Knossos itself or at places which are certainly or possibly close to it (Killen 1987). Finally, while there appears to be evidence for pigs in both provinces on the Cn ‘flock’ records, Cn 608, which records a requirement to fatten pigs, clearly for consumption, is concerned only with Hither Province places. As R. Palmer has suggested (1994, p. 76), the wine distributed on Vn 20 might well be for local festivities; while the pigs on Cn 608 may have been consumed at state-sponsored banquets, in this case more likely at the capital itself.5

---

**Texts**

**Vn 20**

01 o-a₂ , e-pi-de-da-to
02 pa-ra-we-wo , wo-no
03 pi-*82-de 50
04 me-ta-pa-de 50
05 pe-to-no-de 100
06 pa-ki-ja-na-de 35
07 a-pu₁-de 35
08 a-ke-re-wa-de 30
09 e-ra-to-de 50
10 ka-ra-do-ro-de 40
11 ri-jo-de 20
12 vacat

**Cn 608**

01 jo-a-se-so-si , si-a₂-ro
02 o-pi-da-mi-jo
03 pi-*82 sus+SI 3
04 me-ta-pa sus+SI 3
05 pe-to-no sus+SI 6
06 pa-ki-ja-si sus+SI 2
07 a-pu₁-we sus+SI 2
08 a-ke-re-wa sus+SI 2
09 e-ra-te-i sus+SI 3
10 ka-ra-do-ro sus+SI 2
11 ri-jo sus+SI 2

5. All the references to *SI* (*= *si-a₂-ro*, *sihalos* ‘fattened’) pigs elsewhere are in probable banqueting contexts: see e.g. PY Un 2, TH Wu 52. Since Cn 608 lists a requirement imposed by the centre on the nine chief places of the Hither Province, with the requirement for each district proportional to the tax liability of each as shown in the Ma tablets, it is clear that this is a taxation document, thus making it likely that the product of the levy is required for use at the centre itself. It is in keeping with this conclusion that much if not all of the banqueting activity recorded on the tablets appears to have taken place either at Pylos itself or in its immediate vicinity: see further below.
Fr 1217
.01 e-ra₁-wo, pa-ko-we, we-ja-re-pe[
.02 re-ke-e-to-ro-te-ri-jo
.03 pa-ki-ja-na-de OLE+A V 1

The data discussed above is set out in tabular form below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodities</th>
<th>HP</th>
<th>FP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deer (Cr)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>te-re-ne-wi-ja, etc. (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep + ta-to-mo (Cn)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>a-si-ja-ti-ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e-ra-te-re-wa-pi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep + we-re-ke (Cn)</td>
<td>pi-*82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ro-u-so</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine (allocations) (Vn 20)</td>
<td>HP</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs (for fattening) (Cn 608)</td>
<td>HP</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive oil (allocations) (Fr)</td>
<td>pa-ki-ja-na-de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>]ti-no-de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ro-u-si-jo a-ko-ro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Distribution of Workers

There are also differences between the two provinces as far as the distribution of ‘industrial’ and other workers is concerned. I discuss the various types of worker listed on the tablets in turn.

(a) Bronzesmiths

Though the bronzesmiths mentioned on the Ma taxation tablets as receiving exemptions from contributions are located in both provinces, most of the smiths on the Jn bronze allocation records who are located in places whose whereabouts we can establish are to be found in the Hither Province. The only exception is a group at a-si-ja-ti-ja (Jn 750): a departure from the norm which is particularly surprising in that the group concerned is evidently a specialised one (smiths described as pa-ra-ke-te-e-we), in contrast to the picture we shall see later in the case of textile workers, where the workers in the Further Province appear to have been non-specialists, apart from three groups at re-u-ko-to-ro, the ‘capital’ of the Further Province. In addition, most of the smiths mentioned on the Na, Nn flax records, on the former as receiving exemptions from taxation, are likewise in the Hither Province; and Vn 130, which records the receipt (?) of a-ke-a₂, probably angeha, buckets or the like, from what are evidently ‘owners’ of bronze-workers, deals exclusively with the Hither Province.

Texts

Of the sample texts below, Ma 120 deals with pe-to-no in the Hither Province (for the exemption, see l. 2), Jn 605 with a-pi-no-e-wi-jo, also in the Hither Province, Jn 750
with \(a-si-ja-ti-ja\) in the Further Province (see further above) and Na 252 with \(ri-jo\) in the Hither Province. That Vn 130 deals with receipts (?) from ‘owners’ of bronze-workers is confirmed by the recurrence of \(a_{3}-ki-e-u\) of \(a-pi-no-e-wi-jo\) on Jn 605.10.\(^{6}\)

\[\text{Ma 120}\]

\[\text{Jn 605}\]

\[\text{Jn 750}\]

\[\text{Na 252}\]

\[\text{Vn 130}\]

6. See further p. 170 below.
Table E (a): Distribution of Bronzesmiths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>HP</th>
<th>FP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bronzesmiths (Ma)</td>
<td>7/9</td>
<td>3/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronzesmiths (Jn) (a) ‘Ordinary’</td>
<td>a-ke-re-wa</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wi-ja-we-ra₂ (?)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a-pi-no-e-wi-jo</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e-mi-pa-te-we</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>na-i-se-wi-jo (?)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a-pu₂-e-we</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Specialists (a-ke-te-re, pa-ra-ke-te-e-we)</td>
<td>ro-u-so</td>
<td>a-si-ja-ti-ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronzesmiths (Na, Nn)</td>
<td>e-ri-no-wo</td>
<td>ko-ri[-to (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ri-jo</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pu₂-ra₂-a-ki-ri-jo</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e-ko-me-no (?)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronzesmiths (Vn 130)</td>
<td>me-ta-pa, etc.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Textile workers

As shown by Killen (1984), most of the textile workers in the Further Province, apart from three groups at re-u-ko-to-ro and a group of te-pe-ja, makers of te-pa cloth, at ko-ri-to, perhaps in the Further Province, are ri-ne-ja, lineiai, flax or linen workers. Their name suggests that these are more generalist workers than the bulk of the cloth workers in the Hither Province, nearly all of them at Pylos itself, who carry out more specialised duties, many of them involving only part of the production process, like sewing or finishing, and are likely in many cases to have been concerned with the production of high-grade, luxury fabric. (Indeed, the only group certainly in the Hither Province which is not at Pylos, one at the place e-u-de-we-ro, is a group of ri-ne-ja.) In addition, while the group of te-pe-ja at ko-ri-to [FP (?)] is a specialist grouping to the extent that the workers make one specific variety of cloth (te-pa), this is a fabric which at Knossos is made in workshops all over the central region of the island and whose makers themselves probably carried out most of the work involved in producing it, apart from any finishing required.7

7. Though we have evidence for one group of a-ra-ka-te-ja, ālakateiai ‘distaff-women’, ‘spinners’ at Knossos (see Lc(1) 531), the size of its production ‘target’ suggests that it was a relatively small group, and thus not capable of spinning all the wool used in the Cretan textile industry each year.
**Texts**

I give beneath the texts of Ad 295 (*ri-ne-ja, lineiai, at ke-e, in the Further Province*), Ad 666 (*sons of the a-ke-ti-ra₂, askëtriai, women decorators (of cloth), at Pylos*) and Ad 290 (*sons of the askëtriai at re-u-ko-to-ro, Leuktron, ‘capital’ of the Further Province*).

**Ad 295**

ke-e ri-ne-ja-o ko-wo VIR 8 ko-wo 5

**Ad 666**

pu-ro a-ke-ti-ra₂-o ko-wo VIR 20 ko-wo 7

**Ad 290**

re-u-ko-to-ro a-ke-ti-ra₂-o ko-wo VIR 2 ko-wo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>HP</th>
<th>FP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ri-ne-ja</td>
<td>pu-ro</td>
<td>re-u-ko-to-ro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e-u-de-we-ro</td>
<td>ke-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e-pi-jo-ta-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>da-mi-ni-ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e-pi-ko-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>po-to-ro-wa-pi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pu-ro ra-u-ra-ti-jo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te-pe-ja</td>
<td></td>
<td>ko-ri-to (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-ke-ti-ra₂ / -ri-ja</td>
<td>pu-ro</td>
<td>re-u-ko-to-ro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ro-u-so</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-pu-ko-wo-ko</td>
<td>pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-ra-ka-te-ja</td>
<td>pu-ro</td>
<td>re-u-ko-to-ro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-te-ja</td>
<td>pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ne-we-wi-ja</td>
<td>pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no-ri-wo-ko</td>
<td></td>
<td>re-u-ko-to-ro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-nu-ke-ja</td>
<td>pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-ti-ra₂ / -ri-ja</td>
<td>pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pe-ki-ti-ra₂</td>
<td>pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ra-pi-ti-ra₂</td>
<td>pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ra-qi-ti-ra₂</td>
<td>pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) **Domestic workers**

All known domestic workers (*a-pi-qo-ro, amphik²oloi ‘servants’, me-re-ti-ra₂, -ri-ja, meletriai ‘corn-grinders’ and re-wo-to-ro-ko-wo, lewotrokhowoi ‘bath pourers’)

This in turn suggests that the te-pe-ja were responsible for spinning their own wool. On the other hand, the mention of a separate group of decorators (*a-ze-ti-ri-ja*) on Ln 1568, which appears to give a detailed break-down of te-pa production at da-wo, suggests that te-pe-ja did not perform this part of the production process.
are at either Pylos or Leuktron, ‘capital’ of the Further Province, and presumably worked in the main palace buildings at these sites.

**Text**

Ad 676 records sons of the re-wo-to-ro-ko-wo, lewotrokhowoi ‘bath-pourers’ at Leuktron.

**Ad 676**

pu-ro re-wo-to-ro-ko-wo ko-wo vir 22 ko-wo 11

**Table E (c): Distribution of Domestic Workers (Aa, Ab, Ad)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>HP</th>
<th>FP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-pi-qo-ro</td>
<td>pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me-re-ti-ra₂ / -ri-ja</td>
<td>pu-ro</td>
<td>re-u-ko-to-ro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>re-wo-to-ro-ko-wo</td>
<td>pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) Levies on the Ac tablets

The records in the Ac series, found in the Northeastern Building, clearly record levies of men, probably for work at Pylos itself, perhaps in connexion with one or more of the ‘industrial’ activities which are recorded on tablets from the same location (cf. Lang 1958, p. 190). Indeed, it is possible that some of these men are the same as those listed on An 1282 from this location as ‘for’ (i.e. for work on) chariots (a-qi-ja-i, doubtless an error for i-qi-ja-i, (h)ikkwïähi), (chariot) wheels (a-mo-si, harmosi), etc. (The record lacks a place-name, and it is consistent with the view that it concerns activity at Pylos itself that the bulk of the work on chariot wheel (and doubtless also chariot) production at Knossos evidently took place at the central palace.)⁸ All but one of the surviving Ac tablets relate to the Hither Province; the exception is Ac 1278, which concerns te-mi-ti-jo, men of ti-mi-to(-)a-ke-e.

**Text**

Ac 1277 records that of the 16 men expected from a-ke-re-wa in the Hither Province, 10 are present and 6 are ‘owed’ (o-pe-ro, ophelos).

**Ac 1277**

a-ke-re-wa vir 10 o-pe-ro vir 6

**Table E (d): Levies on Ac Tablets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>HP</th>
<th>FP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters?</td>
<td>ka-ra-do-ro</td>
<td>ti-mi-to(-)a-ke-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pe-to-no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pi-*82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a-ke-re-wa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>me-ta-pa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) Censuses of workers on the An tablets (other than coastguards and rowers)
Many of the workers on the An census records are clearly generalists, not concerned with high added value, luxury production, which often involves a high degree of division of labour among the workers engaged on it. They include *pi-ri-(j)e-te-re, prihentēres* (?) ‘sawyers’ (at Pylos, probably sawyers of wood),9 *to-ko-do-mo, toikhodomoi* ‘builders’, *si-to-ko-wo, sītokhowoi* ‘grain pourers’, *ra-ppte-re, rhaptēres* ‘sewers’, most likely of leather,10 and *go-u-ko-ro, go"oukoloi* ‘oxherds’. Though some of these workers are attested only at Pylos (or perhaps there) or elsewhere in the Hither Province, the majority are found in both provinces. In contrast, the only workers on these records for whose provincial affiliations we have any evidence and who we can be certain were engaged in making élite goods, the *ke-re-te ka-si-ko-no*, Cretan sword-makers,11 mentioned on An 128, appear on a tablet which probably lacks a place-name, and which may well therefore relate to Pylos. If these workers are indeed at Pylos, this would be consistent with evidence elsewhere in the archive [see further E(b), E(g)], which points to the conclusion that makers of high-grade, luxury products tend to be located at the ‘capital’, and also with archaeological evidence: as S. Voutsaki has pointed out (2001), most of our evidence for Mycenaean workshops concerned with luxury production, such as ivory working and jewellery-making, comes from the main palace sites.

The remaining workers mentioned on these records whose locations within the two provinces are either known or probable lack descriptions which have a transparent meaning. They include *ta-te-re* (cf. *ta-to-mo sheep?*; note that just as the latter are only attested for the Further Province or close by, *ta-te-re* are found only at *ko-ri-to*, perhaps in the Further Province), *ki-ri-se-we*, probably ‘anointers’, but it is unclear what they anoint, and *te-u-ta-ra-ko-ro*, ‘collectors’ of an unidentified commodity or other entity.

**Texts**

An 852 lists *go-u-ko-ro*, oxherds, in the group of places which includes *te-re-ne-wi-ja*, etc. On An 128, and the entry of *ke-re-te ka-si-ko-no* on l. 3, see above.

9. While the *pi-ri-je-te-re* on the Ra SWORD tablets at Knossos are clearly specialist sword-makers (perhaps sawyers of ivory for hilts), the *pi-ri-e-te-re* on Fn 7 are listed alongside *to-ko-do-mo, toikhodomoi* ‘builders’, and a *pa-te-ko-to*, probably *pantektōn*, a type of carpenter, and may well therefore also have worked in the building trade. (For convenience, I treat Fn [formerly An] 7 here as if were still an An record.) *Pi-ri-je-te-re*, at an unknown location, are also recorded on An 207. Since all the workers on this tablet appear to have been generalists (potters, goldsmiths, etc.) rather than workers involved in a specialist activity within a particular craft (e.g. finishers of cloth or metalwork), these too may have been sawyers of wood rather than specialist sword-makers. On An 207, see further Killen 2006b, pp. 77–85.


11. Though the precise interpretation of the term remains uncertain, their presence in the Ra SWORD tablets at Knossos, in parallel to *pi-ri-je-te-re, prihentēres* (?) ‘sawyers’ (see n. 9), confirms that *ka-si-ko-no* are a type of swordsmith.
As far as we know, also exclusively in the Hither Province, perhaps mostly at Pylos itself, are the men whom J.-P. Olivier (1960) has identified as ‘desservants de sanctuaire’ viz. persons involved in duties in sanctuaries or the like. Though Olivier’s identification is based mainly on the etymologies of the trade-names in question, and has been questioned by some, it appears to be confirmed by the ‘religious’

(f) ‘Desservants de sanctuaire’ (An, etc.)
contexts in which members of the class are found elsewhere in the archives (see further Killen 2001b, pp. 437–439, 2006a, pp. 90–95). They include pu-ka-wo, purkawoi ‘fire-kindlers’, me-ri-du-ma-te / me-ri-da-ma-te, perhaps melidumartes, melidamartes ‘superintendents of honey’, mi-ka-ta, probably miktai, ‘mixers’ (of wine?), o-pi-te-u-ke-e-we, opiteukhehēwes ‘overseers of teukheha’ (vessels?, storage chests?), e-to-wo-ko, perhaps entoworgoi ‘workers within’ (the sanctuary?), a-to-po-qo, artopokwoi ‘bakers’, po-ro-du-ma-te, po-ru-da-ma-te (obscure), da-ko-ro, perhaps dakoroi ‘temple-servants’ (cf. Class. zdakoros) and dipte-ra-po-ro, probably diphtheraphoroi ‘wears of skins’ (cf. the figures wearing hide skirts depicted on the Haghia Triadha sarcophagus). Many of these are listed on tablets which lack a place-name, and evidence to support the view that these are workers at Pylos itself or close by is provided by Fn 50, where among the other recipients of barley recorded is the qa-si-re-wi-ja of a-ta-no, Antānōr. Since there is a close connexion between gwa-silēwiai and bronzeworking, there must be a good chance that a-ta-no here is the same name as appears in parallel with a3-ki-e-u of a-pi-no-e-wi-jo on Vn 130, which as we have seen earlier is likely to record the receipt (?) of buckets or the like from ‘owners’ of bronzeworkers, and where a-ta-no (l. 7) is noted as being at pa-ki-ja-ne, the religious centre close to Pylos. (For the identification of the two Antānōrs, see further, Interpretation, pp. 369-370, Killen 2006b, pp. 81-82). Moreover, if these are indeed persons involved in ‘religious’ activity, it would come as no surprise if they were located at or near the ‘capital’, given the other evidence, both at Pylos and on records from other sites, for the concentration of the palaces’ interests in religious or possibly religious activity (offerings to shrines, state-sponsored ceremonial banquets which may have involved sacrifices of animals) on areas close to the centres themselves. (On offerings, see further Killen 1987; for the evidence for a connexion between the despatch of animals, etc. for consumption, mainly and perhaps exclusively to Thebes and its vicinity, on TH Wu sealings and the ‘menus’ for state-sponsored ceremonial banquets on the Un tablets at Pylos, see Piteros, Olivier and Melena 1990, Killen 1994.) Of the sample texts below, An 39 recto contains two lists of ‘desservants de sanctuaire’ by two different scribes (the second is continued in the first entry on the verso), while Fn 50, discussed above, shows a group of ‘desservants’ among recipients of barley in what seems most plausibly explained as a ‘religious’ context (Killen 2001b): see ll. 5–8. *Me-ri-du-te* in l. 5 is doubtless an error for *me-ri-du-ma-te.*

**An 39**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.01</td>
<td>pu-ka-wo × VIR 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.02</td>
<td>me-ri-du-ma-te VIR 10 ×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.03</td>
<td>mi-ka-ta × VIR 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.04</td>
<td>o-pi-te-u-ke-e-we VIR 4 ×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.05</td>
<td>e-to-wo-ko × VIR 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.06</td>
<td>ka-sa-to × VIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.07</td>
<td>pu-ka-wo × VIR 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. See further Killen 2006a, p. 84, Weilhartner, this volume.
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.08 me-ri-da-ma-te, VIR 6
.09 o-pi-[te]-u-ke-e-we, VIR 5 ×
.10 mi-ka-[ta], VIR 6 ×
.11 e-[to]-wo-ko, VIR 4 a-to-po-qo VIR 3
.12 vacat

F 05
.01 a-ki-to-jo, qa-si-re-wi-ja HORD[ qs
.02 ke-ko-jo, qa-si-re-wi-ja HORD T[ qs
.03 a-ta-no-ro, qa-si-re-wi-ja HORD T[ qs
.04 me-za-ne HORD V 2 a3-ki-a2-ri-jo V 2[
.05 me-ri-du-te HORD V 3 mi-ka-ta HORD V 3
.06 di-pte-ra-po-ro HORD V 2 e-to-wo-ko V 2
.07 a-to-po-qo HORD V 2 po-ro-du-ma-te HORD V 2
.08 o-pi-te-u-ke-e-we HORD V 2 i-za-a-to-mo-i HORD V 3
.09 ze-u-ke-u-si HORD V 4
.10 vacat
.11 au[-ke-i-]ja-te-wo, do-e-ro-i HORD T 1
.12 mi-jo[-qa] do-e-ro-i HORD V 3
.13 a-pi-e-[ra] do-e-ro-i HORD V 3
.14 ![vacant]
.15-19 vacat

Table E (f): Distribution of ‘desservants de sanctuaire’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>HP</th>
<th>FP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pu-ka-wo</td>
<td>(?) pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pi-*82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me-ri-du-ma-te</td>
<td>(?) pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ke-ra-ti-jo-jo wo-wo (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mi-ka-ta</td>
<td>(?) pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-pi-te-u-ke-e-we</td>
<td>(?) pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-to-wo-ko</td>
<td>(?) pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-to-po-qo</td>
<td>(?) pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>po-ro-du-ma-te</td>
<td>(?) pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>po-ru-da-ma-te</td>
<td>(?) pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da-ko-ro</td>
<td>ke-ra-ti-jo-jo wo-wo (?)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-pu₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>di-pte-ra-po-ro</td>
<td>(?) pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(g) Workers on other Records

The pattern of distribution of workers on records other than the An censuses appears to be similar to the pattern there. Workers in highly-specialised, luxury production, like the unguent-boilers on Fr 1184 and in the Un series, appear on records which lack a place-name; and it would clearly come as no surprise if workers in an
industry which not only involved a luxury product but also required the gathering
together, doubtless under palace auspices, of a wide variety of different ingredients,
were located at or near the central palace.\textsuperscript{13} Indeed, confirmation of this conclusion
may be provided by the recurrence of the unguent-boiler \textit{e-u-me-de}, \textit{Eumêdês},
who is mentioned on Fr 1184, as the holder of a major plot of land, probably in
the vicinity of the place, on the E tablets: see Ea 812.\textsuperscript{14} Indeed, the only workers
on these records known for certain not to be in the Hither Province are the makers
of beds on Pa 398, which explicitly mentions the Further Province. It cannot be
argued, however, that this evidence runs counter to the general pattern, since there
is nothing to confirm that the beds in question are not simple, undecorated objects
of the type that were presumably issued to ordinary workers, like the women textile
workers on MY V 659.\textsuperscript{15} It is true that the Hither Province workers on these records
include the foresters at Pylos (?) and \textit{ro-u-si-jo a-ko-ro} who are recorded on Vn 10
as supplying raw materials ‘to the wheelwright’s workshop’. Not only, however,
is this in keeping with the picture elsewhere, where workers in the Hither Province
are not exclusively makers of élite products (as witness the \textit{ri-ne-ja}, linen or flax
workers, and \textit{qo-u-ko-ro}, oxherds, in both provinces on the Aa, Ab and An records
respectively): it is readily comprehensible why the palace should have drawn on
places that were near the centre itself for its supplies of wood, which would not
have been an easy commodity to transport over long distances.

\textit{Texts}

\begin{verbatim}
Fr 1184
.1 ko-ka-ro , a-pe-do-ke , e-ra-w , to-so
.2 e-u-me-de-i  \textit{OLE+WE}  18
.3 pa-ro , i-pe-se-wa , ka-ra-re-we 38
.4 \textit{vacat}

Ea 812
.a ko-to-na
   e-u-me-de , a-re-po-zo-o , e-ke , \textit{GRA 1 T 8}

Pa 398
.a pe-ra-ko-ra-i-ja
   a-pi-ka-ra-do-jo , qa-si-re-wi[-ja  \textsuperscript{*169}
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{13} See further Killen 2001a, p. 171.
\textsuperscript{14} For the suggestion, based in part on the appearance of the sequence of signs \textit{ke-re-te-u-ti-no} on the
fragmentary Na 565, that the Ea records, which contain a number of references to a man \textit{ke-re-te-u},
concern land at \textit{ti-no}, see \textit{Interpretation}, p. 220. Though the location of \textit{ti-no} is uncertain, it and \textit{pa-ki-ja-ne}
appear in successive entries on An 18. Whether or not these records do deal with \textit{ti-no}, the
analogy of other records at Pylos, Knossos and Thebes (see Ft 140) which, like these, give precise
figures for the capacity of land suggests that they relate to holdings close to the central palace.
\textsuperscript{15} That these women are textile workers is made likely by the recurrence of many of them on Fo 101,
which also includes references to the textile occupational terms \textit{e-ro-pa-ke-ja} and \textit{a-ke-ti-ri-ja(-i)}.
For the (convincing) interpretation of \textit{de-mi-ni-ja} on l. 1 of V 659 as \textit{demnia} ‘beds’ or ‘bedding’,
see e.g. \textit{Documents}\textsuperscript{2}, pp. 425-426.

Table E (g): Distribution of Workers on Other Tablets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>HP</th>
<th>FP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unguent boilers (Fr, Un)</td>
<td>(?) pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chariot makers, etc. (An 1282)</td>
<td>(?) pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture makers [Pa (*169), Un 1482]</td>
<td>a-ke-re-wa</td>
<td>pe-ra-ko-ra-i-ja e-re-te-ri-ja (?) (cf. e-re-u-te-ri[An 18.1?])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chariot-wheel makers (Sa)</td>
<td>(?) pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armourers (Sh)</td>
<td>(?) pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather-workers (Ub, An 1281)</td>
<td>(?) pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foresters (Vn 10)</td>
<td>(?) pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ro-u-si-jo a-ko-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ke-ra-e-we (?) (Un 1482)</td>
<td>(?) pu-ro</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Coastguards and Rowers

Finally as regards manpower, we may note – as has often been observed – that all the coastguards recorded on the An o-ka tablets, with the exception of those at ti-mi-to(-a-ke-i) on An 661.10–13, are stationed in the Hither Province. The same applies to all the rowers (e-re-ta, eretai) recorded on An 1, An 610 and An 724 (and on An 615, which may list land-holders liable for service as rowers) whose location we can establish with certainty;16 though Ad 697, which deals with da-

16. I follow here Sainer 1976, who attributes none of the places on the An ‘rower’ records (or on An 615) confidently to the Further Province. It is possible, however, that a few of the groups on An 610 do have links with this part of the kingdom. Thus both e-wi-ri-pi-ja and da-mi[-ni-ja on Aa 60 and Aa 96, both of which deal with the Further Province; ma-ra-ne-ni-jo (l. 11) could be compared with ma-ra-ne-ni-jo, a description of men in receipt of a tax exemption on Ma 393, which deals with za-ma-e-ri-ja in the Further Province; and po-ii-ja-ke-e (also l. 11) recurs on An 298.2 following a reference on l. 1 to ra-wa-ra-ta, u-ka-ra-ke-r-ja in the Further Province. (Note also the mention of we-re-ra-ta-ja, probably a type of worker, on l. 3 of this tablet, with which compare we-re-ra-ke-ra on An 610.15.) In none of these cases, however, can we be certain that we are dealing with rowers in the Further Province. To take the references in the order in which they appear on An 610, the e-wi-ri-pi-ja on Aa 60 could be a group originally from e-wi-ri-pi-pa but now located at Leuktron in the Further Province (cf. the a*-64-ja, perhaps the women of Aswiā, Lydia, listed as at Leuktron on Ad 326); and note that the positioning of e-wi-ri-po on An 610, between wa, probably ro-o-wa, and a-ke-re-wa, does not suggest a Further Province location for the place. Second, ma-ra-ne-ni-jo is not the ethnic from ma-ra-ne-ni-we; and even if the two terms are related we cannot be certain that the ma-ra-ne-ni-jo on Ma 393 are still located in the place from
mi-ni-ja in the Further Province, records sons of linen or flax workers whom it describes as ‘being rowers’ or ‘wishing to row’, probably the former (Chadwick 1987, p. 77 n. 3). We shall be returning to the question of the location of rowers later in the discussion.

Texts

An 661

\[
\begin{align*}
0.01 & \quad e-k\-n\-o\-jo, o-ka, e-o-te-u \\
0.02 & \quad a-ti-ro, i-da-i-jo, e-se-re-a_2, \\
0.03 & \quad e-na-po-ro, i-wa-so \quad \text{vir} 70 \\
0.04 & \quad a-o-ri-jo, ko-ro-ku[-ra-][i]-jo \quad \text{vir} 30 \\
0.05 & \quad ka-ra-do-ro, ko-ro-ru-ra-i-jo \quad \text{vir} 10 \\
0.06 & \quad za-e-to-ro, ko-ro-ru-ra-i-jo \quad \text{vir} 20 \\
0.07 & \quad me-ta-qe, pe-i, e-qe-ta, wo-ro-tu-mi-ni-jo
\end{align*}
\]

which they derive their name. Note that ma-ra-ne-nu-we is a possible restoration of ma-ra-ne[ on Mn 1410.2, where it immediately follows wi-jat-\(i\)-te-

We may thus argue, as Palmer has done (Interpretation, pp. 69-70), that all the references on the tablet after ri-jo (l. 8) are to places in the Further Province, since da-mi-ni-jo is separated from ma-ra-ne-nu-we and po-ti-ja-ke-e by [\(\ldots\)-\(\ldots\)-\(\ldots\)], now read in PoN IV as za-ku-si-jo and quite likely therefore a reference to men of Zakynthos, and za-e-to-ro, a place almost certainly in the Hither Province, though followed on An 661 by ti-mi-to a-ke-i. Note, too, that the da-mi-ni-jo entry is followed in the next line by a reference to ko-ni-ja, evidently ‘men of ko-no’, whose location in the Hither Province is made probable (i) by Eq 213 and (ii) by An 615, where ko-ni-ja, quite likely a variant of the same name, is followed in the next line by no-e-wi[, almost certainly to be restored as the HP toponym a-pi-no-e-wi-jo. However, even if all four of e-wi-ri-po, ma-ra-ne-nu-we, po-ti-ja-ke-e and da-mi-ni-jo refer to rowers in the Further Province, it still remains the case that all the rowers on An 1, An 724 and An 615, and a substantial majority of those on An 610, are either certainly in the Hither Province or seem more likely than not to have this location. On the other hand, my statement in Killen 2007b, p. 165 that ‘all of the places shown on the tablets as either the location or the provenance of rowers and whose relative whereabouts we can establish are in the Hither Province’ is not correct, given the evidence, mentioned above, of Ad 697, with its description of sons of women at da-mi-ni-ja in the Further Province as either ‘being rowers’ or ‘wishing to row’, more likely the former. It is true that the absence of any numeral after the man ideogram on this record may mean that the ‘sons’ in question are temporarily absent from da-mi-ni-ja, quite likely on rowing service (Chadwick 1987, p. 77 n. 3), perhaps even in the Hither Province. The fact, however, that they are listed on the tablet under the rubric da-mi-ni-ja must mean that even if they are temporarily away from this location, this is their normal place of abode.
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.08 vacat
.09 e-ko-më-na-ta-o, o-ka,
.10 ti-më-to-ë-ake-i, ma-re-u, da-qo-ta,
.11 a-ke[ ]u, a-ke-wa-to,
.12 a₂-ke-a₂-ki-ri-jo, u-ru-pi-ja-jo,
.13 ne-do-wo-ta-de vir 30 me-ta-qe, pe-i, e-qe-ta,

An 1
.01 e-re-ta, pe-re-u-ru-na-de, i-jo-te
.02 ro-o-wa
.03 ri-jo
.04 po-ra-pi
.05 te-ta-ra-ne
.06 a-po-ne-we
.07-08 vacant

Table F: Distribution of Coastguards and Rowers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>HP</th>
<th>FP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastguards (An)</td>
<td>o-wi-to-no, etc.</td>
<td>ti-mi-to(-)a-ke-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowers (Ad)</td>
<td>a-pu-ne-we (?)</td>
<td>da-mi-ni-ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowers (An)</td>
<td>ro-o-wa, etc.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Goods in Store

I conclude this part of the discussion by noting that almost all our evidence for finished goods and other commodities probably or certainly held in store is found on tablets which lack a place-name, and which it is difficult to doubt relate to stores at Pylos. (For the conclusion that records of stores at Knossos which lack a place-name likewise relate to stores at the ‘capital’ itself, see e.g. Killen 1985, pp. 287–288.) The only exceptions are the records of foodstuffs assembled for state-sponsored banquets at pa-ki-ja-ne (Un 2) and ro-u-so (Un 47), both places in the Hither Province which are likely to be near the ‘capital’. In addition, Un 138, another record of food assembled for a feast or feasts, explicitly mentions pu-ro.

Texts

Fr 1201
ku-su-pa, tọ-so ỌLE PO 14 v 2[ vacat

Sa 787
.A pa-ra-ja, we-je-ke-a₂, ROTA ZE 30 MO 1
.B to-sa, e-qe-si-ja pa-ra-ja ROTA ZE 12 za-ku-si-ja ROTA ZE 32

Sh 740
.a ko-ru-to O 4 PA 2
   pa-ra-jo, ARM ZE 5 wi-so-wo-pa-na₉ o-pa-wo-ta, me-zo-a₂ O 20
   me-u-jo-a₂ O 10
III. Conclusions

We may now attempt to draw some conclusions from the evidence set out above.

Despite the limitations of the evidence, a reasonably clear picture seems to emerge: that the Hither Province is very much the centre of gravity in the kingdom. It is of course from Pylos in the Hither Province, where the central archives are compiled and stored, that the kingdom as a whole is governed with the help of local officials throughout the polity; and it is there too that much of the highly specialised production of luxury and other élite goods appears to have taken place, and many of the results of that production (armour, chariot wheels, luxury furniture, etc.) appear to have been kept in store. Pylos and its neighbourhood was also the location of some at least of the major state-sponsored banquets whose ‘menus’ are recorded in the Ua and Un tablets; many at least of the religious offerings mentioned on the tablets clearly took place close to the centre; and it is here that...
most of the ‘desservants de sanctuaire’ appear to have been located (none are found in the Further Province). In addition, it is only for the Hither Province, and perhaps only for areas particularly close to Pylos, that the palace kept records of the precise taxable capacity of plots of land, measuring them down to fractional amounts of WHEAT.

Even outside the ‘capital’ and its immediate environs, the Hither Province appears to have been the location or source of much of the labour and other manpower used by the palace. Most of the smiths recorded on the Jn tablets as receiving working materials from the centre appear to have been located in the Hither Province; and there is a similar picture with the levies of men on the Ac tablets, the coastguards on the An tablets, all but one of the contingents of which are in places in the Hither Province, and the rowers on An 1, etc., the great majority of whom, as far as one can tell, have the same location. We may add, too, that the great majority of the women textile and other workers on the surviving Aa tablets are in the Hither Province, with those in that region outnumbering those in the Further Province in the ratio of 7:2 (Chadwick 1988, p. 76). Moreover, while the distributions of skins (?) on On 300 are made to local officials in both provinces, it is only to places in the Hither Province that the distributions of wine on Vn 20 are made.

It should be stressed, however, that not all the ‘industrial’ production in the Hither Province is highly specialised and concerned with the manufacture of élite products, like much of that at Pylos itself. Though one Hither Province place outside the centre, viz. ro-u-so, is the location both of specialist textile workers (a-ke-ti-ra₂, askētrai, women decorators of cloth) and of specialist bronze-workers (a-ke-te-re, almost certainly askētēres viz. the masculine equivalent of a-ke-ti-ra₂), the remaining bronzesmiths mentioned in the Jn records who we can be certain were located in the Hither Province appear to have been generalist workers; and we have evidence for the relatively unspecialised ri-ne-ja, lineiai, linen or flax workers, at two places in the Hither Province, one of them Pylos itself, though the great majority of ri-ne-ja are in the Further Province. Moreover, further evidence for non-luxury goods production in the Hither Province is probably provided by the Ma taxation records, which deal with contributions of *146 by all nine of the Hither Province chief places, including pa-ki-ja-ne, close to Pylos. Since this is a commodity produced throughout the kingdom, and is not known to have made in palace-controlled workshops either here or at Knossos, it is likely to have been a relatively simple fabric, doubtless produced domestically in the villages. Again, we have evidence for ‘ordinary’ workers like oxherds, leather-sewers, builders, foresters and probably sawyers of wood in the Hither Province, as well as for the running of sheep, goats and pigs and for the production of flax.

In contrast to the Hither Province, however, there is almost no evidence for highly specialised, luxury production in the Further Province. The only exceptions are at the ‘capital’ of the province, re-u-ko-to-ro, where there are three groups of...
specialist textile workers, a-ke-ti-ri-ja, a-ra-ka-te-ja and no-ri-wo-ko, and at a-si-ja-ti-ja, where there is a group of what are presumably specialist bronze-workers (pa-ra-ke-te-e-we), though in the absence of a secure interpretation for the term we cannot be certain of the precise degree of specialisation in this case. There is also a group of me-re-ti-ri-ja, corn-grinders, at Leuktron; like their counterparts at Pylos, these presumably worked in the palatial establishment at the site. These few groups apart, all the workers for which we have secure evidence in the Further Province are of the ‘generalist’ type: builders, leather-sewers, oxherds and the generalist ri-ne-ja, linen or flax workers, who make up the great bulk of the textile workforce in the province. Again, while the districts and villages of the Further Province are subject to the same taxes in oxtails, simple textiles, etc. (Ma), flax (Na) and metals (Jn, Jo) as those in the Hither Province, and while local officials in the province receive the same allocation of skins (?) as their counterparts in the Hither Province, we have no evidence for religious offerings, state-sponsored banquets and ‘desservants de sanctuaire’ in the Further Province, even at the ‘capital’ Leuktron.

In sum, then, the Further Province appears to have been regarded by the central administration at Pylos, first, as an additional source of the tribute also levied on the Hither Province in raw materials (oxtails, flax, metals, etc.) and simple manufactured goods (*146). (The beds mentioned on Pa 398 (+?) may fall into the same category.) It also provides additional pasture for oxen, sheep and other livestock (some categories of which, like deer and ta sheep, are mainly or exclusively found there or near its borders), and is the location of mostly generalist workers, some of whom, like the oxherds on An 852, etc. and the women linen or flax workers on the Aa tablets, doubtless operated in their own areas, but others of whom, like the solitary builder at the place te-re-ne-we on An 18, may have been recruited for work at the palatial centre Leuktron (cf. An 35, which records builders at Leuktron and others going to sa-ma-ra, also in the Further Province, perhaps from Leuktron).18 But while Leuktron may have been involved in some minor (?) re-deployment of labour, and while we do have some limited evidence for specialisation of function in the textile workforce there, there is nothing to suggest that it played a rôle comparable to that of Pylos as a centre of luxury and other élite production or in the storage of the results of that production (armour, chariot wheels, luxury furniture, etc.). Furthermore, we have no evidence at Leuktron or elsewhere in the Further Province for state-sponsored feasting and religious offerings, or for ‘desservants de sanctuaire’.

But a final question remains. To put it in the words of McDonald and Hope Simpson in their discussion of the Mycenaean kingdom in The Minnesota Messenia Expedition (1972), ‘why did the Pylos district [in the Hither Province], in spite of its geometrically eccentric location, become the heartland of the whole region in the Late Bronze Age?’ As they note, ‘the eastern area [viz. the Further Province] is the one most coveted by the Spartans in archaic and classical times, partly no doubt because of its proximity. And it is the most densely populated agricultural area of modern Messenia (and, in fact, of modern Greece’.

The answer, McDonald and Hope Simpson suggest, may be as follows. ‘There are good reasons to believe that in the Bronze Age the southern valley in particular had major liabilities as well. It contained extensive perennial marshes and a much larger area that must have been seasonably inaccessible for cultivation. Communications would have been difficult for much of the year and there probably were serious health hazards as well.’

There may be a reflection in the tablets of one of the shortcomings of the Further Province which McDonald and Hope Simpson draw attention to here. By and large, there appears to be no difference between the two provinces in terms of the local official titles attested for each: both provinces have ko-re-te-re, po-ro-ko-re-te-re, du-ma-te and evidently qa-si-re-we. As I have recently suggested, however, there may be one exception: the term e-re-e-u. Though this is sometimes taken as a personal name or ethnic, it is I believe preferable to take it as a trade-name or title, as Ruipérez (1963) and Palaima (1991) have done. Both these scholars interpret the word as a -eus derivative of the ere- root found in e-re-ta, eretās ‘rower’, Ruipérez as ‘helmsman’, Palaima as a title ‘official in charge of rowers’. As I have pointed out, however, all the attestations of the term where a location is specified that we can certainly or possibly assign to a province are in places which are certainly or perhaps in the Further Province; whereas, as we have seen earlier, there appear to be at most only a few references elsewhere in the archive to rowers in the Further Province, none of them in places which are also recorded as containing e-re-e-we. The attestations of e-re-e-u mentioned above are set out in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tablet ref.</th>
<th>HP</th>
<th>FP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An 723</td>
<td></td>
<td>ra-wa-ra-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn 1197</td>
<td></td>
<td>a-si-ja-ti-ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na 262 + 284</td>
<td></td>
<td>po-to-ro-wa-pi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nn 831</td>
<td></td>
<td>ko-ri[-to] (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is possible therefore, I have asked, that the term is not ereheus, but eleheus ‘official in charge of marshland’ (helos)? For the suggestion that e-re-e-u is a derivative of helos, see previously Ruijgh, Études, p. 165, who compares pe-di-jewe ‘men of the plain’ (pedion) – though he takes it as a personal name. Compare, too, for a title of this type wo-we-u, plausibly – though not certainly – interpreted as worweus < worwos ‘official concerned with borders’. Though there can be no certainty about the explanation, it is at least consistent with the interpretation that, as McDonald and Hope Simpson observe, the Further Province ‘contained extensive perennial marshes’: indeed, one of the seven chief places in the province is e-re-i (dat. loc.), Helehi, lit. ‘the Marsh’. And note too that on Jn 881 e-re-e-we are further qualified as o-pi-ko-wo, most plausibly understood as a variant form of

20. For full discussion of the location of the places mentioned in the table, see Killen 2007b, pp. 165-166.
e-pi-ko-wo ‘watchers’. It would clearly come as no surprise if one of the duties of an official in charge of marshland was to keep watch over these stretches of water (for outlaws or other dangers to the polity?).
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