

### MYCENAEAN *pa-wo-ke*

The word *pa-wo-ke* occurs on PY Aa 795 as a description of female workers, and its genitive *pa-wo-ko* appears on Ad 691 with the suffix *-qe* after *o-pi-ro-qo* and *e-ke-ro-qo-no* in a description of the parentage of nine men. The same spelling *pa-wo-ko* recurs on PY La 632 before the ideogram LANA, but there are insufficient parallels to determine whether or not this is the same word. In Aa-Ad it is clear that we have a noun with a velar stem, ending *-es* in the nominative plural, *-ōn* in the genitive plural.

The word was interpreted by L. R. Palmer<sup>1</sup> as *par-worges* 'cancillary workers.' This is satisfactory for its sense, and an archaic root compound in *-worx*, later replaced by *-worgos*, is quite acceptable on the model of σύζυξ, σύζυγος. But the assumed apocope of the preposition παρά, which at an early stage of the study of Mycenaean seemed plausible, has not been confirmed by any certain example of an abbreviated form of this or any other preposition. The independent form *pa-ro* occurs repeatedly, and it seems to survive in composition in the verbal compound *o-u-pa-ro-ke-ne-[to?]* = *ou paro-gene[to]*. It is therefore legitimate to search for another interpretation of the first element.

There is an alternative which must have occurred to many scholars, only to be rejected for what seem at first sight adequate reasons. Sense would be satisfied if we interpreted the word as *pan-worges* 'maids-of-all-work'. But there are two obvious objections: the 'rule' that in the group *-nw-*, *n* is always spelt out as an extra syllable; and the fact that *\*pan-worx* would be continued into classical Greek by πανοὔργος, which shows a semantic difference. None the less, it may be instructive to test these objections.

The existence of the cluster *-nw-* in Mycenaean is certain only where the sign *nwa* is used (e. g. *qi-nwa-so*) or a spelling alternation

<sup>1</sup> See *Documents* p. 404; cf. Palmer, *Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts*, p. 116.

is attested such as *ke-se-ni-wi-jo/ke-se-nu-wi-ja*. Of these the only certain Greek words are the derivatives of ξένος and the adjective περυσινός (*pe-ru-si-nu-wo*, *pe-ru-si-nwa*). In neither case is there the kind of morpheme boundary which exists between the two parts of a compound such as \**pan-worx*. Since the syllabic division in a compound might well be different, a different spelling might be adopted, for *n* would here be syllable final, whereas *xenwos* might have been divided *xe/nwos*.

This theory can be tested in two ways. First we can look for possible cases of the same word spelt with or without *n*. I know of one example: *ti-wa-ti-ja* KN Ap 633.2 might be the same word as *ti-nwa-ti-ja-o* (genitive plural) PY Ad 684 (cf. *ti-nwa-si-ja* PY Aa 669), but there is no positive evidence in favour of identifying them.

Secondly we can look for examples of other compounds of which the first element ends in *-n*, in particular compounds of ἐν and ξύν. The search is disappointing. The man's name *e-wi-te-u* could perhaps be interpreted *Enwisteus*, but this is mere conjecture. On the other hand *e-nwa-ri-jo* (PY An 724.12) raises a difficulty; it can hardly, as has sometimes been assumed, echo the god's name *Enualios*, but it might be taken as *Enwālios* from ἐν + \**ἦλις* (= ἥλιος). Since both reading and interpretation are so uncertain, this contrary example cannot be allowed to carry much weight.

*ku-su-w-* equally leads to no convincing result. *o-ku-su-wa-si* (MY Ue 652.1) could now be regarded as containing *hō xun-*, but no satisfactory explanation of *-wa-si* suggests itself. Thus we cannot confirm the theory that *n* is omitted before *w* if a morpheme boundary intervenes; but equally there is no convincing evidence against it. It would be helpful if the behaviour of the cluster *-rw-* could be explained in the same way; but the only clear case which contains a morpheme boundary at this point is *a-ra-ru-wo-a* = *arar/wo(h)a*, and here the final *r* is written. But at least we must accept the fact that *r* may be either omitted or written before *w*; a firm rule that *r* is omitted whereas *n* is written<sup>2</sup> is impossible.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. E. Vilborg, *A Tentative Grammar of Mycenaean Greek*, p. 37.

On the semantic side the obstacle is easily surmounted. πανούργος is a new formation modelled on κακοῦργος<sup>3</sup> and the meaning may also have been influenced by it. It has been explained as 'ready to do anything'<sup>4</sup>, i.e. anything no matter how wicked. But it would be possible, and I venture to think preferable, to derive the meaning 'rascal' from an original sense 'he who performs all tasks.' The menial who has no settled trade but is assigned to all unskilled jobs is clearly the lowest in the social scale, and the word might thus easily become a general term of condemnation, a semantic development paralleled by such a word as English *villain* from Latin *villanus*.

Until further evidence is forthcoming it is hardly possible to decide the question, but it seems worth while putting forward this idea in the hope it may lead others to solutions of problems that at present defeat us.

JOHN CHADWICK

*Cambridge (November, 1964)*

*Downing College*

<sup>3</sup> E. Boisacq, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, s.v. πᾶς.

<sup>4</sup> Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, ed. 9., s.v.