

PY Ad 684

The series of Aa, Ab and Ad tablets from Pylos form a consistent set of records dealing with one and the same class of people.¹ The Ad lists however were not written in the same manner as the Aa and Ab lists. Not only are there among the Ad tablets eight that bear an additional note by the same scribe, written as an addendum or afterthought.² But the Ad lists themselves were completed in two stages: first the texts were written and then the numbers added wherever appropriate. That numbers were not written together with the texts but inserted afterwards, just as one fills in forms, is proved by six Ad tablets: 678 shows the space after VIR left blank and one stroke inserted after KO-WO; 685 and 689 the space after KO-WO blank and a few strokes after VIR; 663 although broken has so much blank space after VIR that a number could only have been inserted after the missing KO-WO; 380 shows VIR and KO-WO with blank spaces, both afterwards erased and three strokes marked boldly over the erased VIR; finally, 697 has a blank space after VIR right to the end, and no numbers are inserted at all.³

As all the Ad tablets (except 142) were written by the same hand,⁴ we must conclude that the scribe first completed a series with

¹ E. L. Bennett, *Colloque* 1956, p. 7 ff., *Études Mycéniennes*, 1957, p. 121 ff. The class of people described in these lists was examined in a paper read to the Linear B Seminar in London and will be the subject of an article in the *Sundwall Festschrift* 1957.

² None of the Aa or Ab tablets contains additional notes. All the corrections of numbers (like Aa 313: 8 for 9; Aa 506: 28 for 30; Aa 775: 10 for 8; Aa 798: 54 for 55; Ab 186: 7 for 8) always occur within the texts, never as addenda. Such corrections within the texts also occur on the Ad tablets (e. g. Ad 671 and Ad 690).

³ On the Aa and Ab tablets there is never a blank space after an ideogram. Whenever there are no numbers, the ideogram itself is omitted (Aa 96, 772, 779, 785, 1182; Ab 372, 388, 575, 745, 746). This shows that the Aa and Ab lists were registers compiled on the spot: the scribe of Ad, on the other hand, merely filled in forms and amended them.

⁴ E. L. Bennett (*supra*) has distinguished the hands of 5 scribes: two for the Aa lists, one for the whole of the Ab lists, one for Ad 142, and one for all the other Ad tablets including the addenda.

a given formula, basing his list on the catalogue of groups in the Aa and Ab lists, and inserted the numbers afterwards before the clay had dried. It can be shown that the Ad roll was composed slightly later than the Aa and Ab lists.¹ Whether our scribe actually used the Ab list is not certain, but that the Aa catalogue was the primary source of his Ad roll cannot be doubted.² This is indeed the main reason why the «KOUROI» of Ad (including both *vir* and *KO-WO*) were listed in relation to their groups of women. Not because they were «matriarchal» or «slaves» or «children» were they thus described,³ but because, as they were together with the womenfolk, it was quicker and more practical to make out their list on the basis of the Aa catalogue which was ready to hand.⁴

¹ *Inter alia*, by the addition of quite a number of occupational names to the groups of women concerned (Ad 295, 664, 670, 675, 678, 684, 687, 697). Yet precisely these additional trade-names, since they concern the women and not the men, would have been far more appropriate to the Aa and Ab lists than to the Ad roll. In fact, in two cases the Ab list already shows them where the Aa catalogue is still without (Ab 194 and 745/746). Another factor indicating that the Ad roll was later is the lumping together in a few instances of two or more groups of women listed separately in the Aa catalogue; their separate group-names as shown in Aa are preserved in the Ad roll (Ad 671, 679, 691). Yet another factor is the splitting up of the Miratija group of Pylos into two subdivisions (Ad 380, 689).

² This was shown by Bennett, *Colloque* 1956, p. 7 ff., *Études Mycéniennes*, 1957, p. 121 ff.: the scribe of Ad 290 who wrote all Ad tablets except 142 had to deal with all the Aa list. It does not mean of course that the Ad scribe transposed all the 50 odd Aa tablets into Ad in one session before inserting the numbers. He obviously did it in batches. We have one batch of 10 odd Ad texts where the scribe seems to have got tired of writing out the full formula *vir KO-WO* in view of the many blanks he had to leave, and simply put *vir* only (although the corresponding Aa tablets show *KO-WO*). Nor must we assume that he copied the Aa texts slavishly. We do find a few differences in spelling (e. g. Ad 684 *Ti-nwa-ti-ja* for Aa 699 *Ti-nwa-si-ja*).

³ If «slaves», at least one of the Pylos tablets mentioning slaves should give a parallel. But there is no parallel whatsoever. If «children», the *vir* would be out of place. Since the *vir* and the *KO-WO* are grouped together as *-ko-wo*, I would suggest calling the latter KOUROI and seeing in the divisions two age groupings.

⁴ It probably also means that they were not independent citizens, land-owners, ship-owners, craftsmen, merchants, in their own rights, but simply the KOUROI of the womenfolk.

Now the eight additional notes could not have been added when the tablets were completely dry. Of these notes, 671, 679, 689, and 691 add to the qualifying ethnics and occupational names of the women another name or two in the same case ending (2nd fem. pl.), names that were listed separately on the Aa tablets but were here combined because the VIR numbers were small; 680 adds the place-name Pylos which had originally been left out at the beginning of the tablet;¹ and only 684, 686, and 697 give additional information relating to the men themselves. Since the text of the tablets was first written and numbers inserted afterwards, and as notes must have been added before the tablets had dried, it is reasonable to suppose that the additional remarks were entered at the same time as the numbers.

The note on Ad 697 says *e-re-[] qe-ro-me-no*. This has been tentatively rendered as «willing to row».² But Ad 697 is precisely the tablet that has a complete blank after VIR and no numbers whatever. Thus *qe-ro-me-no* cannot mean «willing». For if no one is listed no one is willing. On the other hand, since no number was inserted but a remark added, perhaps the remark stands in lieu of the number. It has already been pointed out that additional notes were probably inserted at the same time as numbers. The fact that this tablet was kept in the archives despite the lack of any number, strongly suggests that the additional remark takes the place of the number. Thus while one of the two meanings suggested by Ventris and Chadwick must be ruled out, the other one («becoming rowers» or «being rowers», cf. Aeol. and Homer. *πέλεσθαι* «to become, to be»)³ may very well be correct and afford the right explanation. Since the menfolk of the Aa groups of women were listed ostensibly for the defence of the city or for a similar purpose, anyone of them who had become or was becoming a «rower» or «sailor» could not be included in the

¹ Compare Ad 680 with Ab 789 and Ab 1100 to see the difference between a note added later and an original disposition (E. L. Bennett, *Pylos Tablets* 1955, p. 75, 93, 110).

² Ventris and Chadwick, *Documents*, 1956, p. 161.

³ *Documents*, 1956, p. 161 and 407; Hofmann, *Etymolog. Wörterbuch*, p. 261; Herwerden p. 1140; Hom. *Il.* 6, 434; 11, 737; *Od.* 4, 45. This meaning also agrees with the restoration *e-re-[ta]* which is in any case most probably correct since the bottom stroke of *-ta* seems visible on the tablet (E. L. Bennett, *Pylos Tablets* 1955, p. 78).

numbers. Since no number is given, however, it cannot be decided whether *qe-ro-me-no* is sing. or plural¹.

The note on Ad 686 tells us that somebody «did not present himself» (the name and title are uncertain as the text is damaged).² That the first word of the note reads *o-u-pa-ro-ke-ne-[to]* and that this is a verb cannot possibly be doubted. It is definitely in the singular.

Ad 684 has an additional note on the very edge of the tablet. It says: *a-pu-ne-we-e-re-ta-o-[ko]-wo*. There are no word dividers and the penultimate syllable is missing.³ Assuming the restoration of the last two syllables to *ko-wo* is correct, *ko-wo* can be either sing. or plural. We have to look for analogies in order to decide. Of the other two additional notes concerning men, 697 could, as we have seen, be either, and 686 is definitely in the singular. On this analogy therefore 684.e would mean that a certain *KO-WO* was either absent or on other duties or to be added to the list. *A-pu-ne-we* would either be a personal name (like *A-ta-ma-ne-we* Cn 131.10; *We-u-da-ne-we* Cn 418.1; etc.) or an adverb or a noun that governs *e-re-ta-o*. On the analogy of 686 and 697 we should however also postulate a verb in this additional note. This could only be *a-pu-ne-we*, for *e-re-ta-o-[ko]-wo* cannot contain a verb. The verb would thus stand at the beginning of the note like *o-u-pa-ro-ke-ne-[to]*, and like it be in the singular. Since the note on Ad 697 says that the *KO-WO* became *e-re-ta*, and

¹ *e-re-ta* can be sing. or plural; *qe-ro-me-no* can be *q^welomenos* or *q^welomenoi*. An interesting dilemma results from the place-name on this tablet. *Da-mi-ni-ja* not being in the 2nd fem. pl. is taken to be the place-name entry (*Documents* p. 161: «at Damnia»). But An 610.13 clearly has *Da-mi-ni-jo* (*Documents* p. 186: «a place-name») and other entries in the same column are partly place-names, partly ethnics without adjectival suffixes. If *Da-mi-ni-ja* is the place-name, the entry on An 610.13 and all the fifteen Knossos occurrences must be ethnics, which is hard to believe. It may be that the place-name really was *Da-mi-ni-jo* (cf. KN Df 1119-1121, Dk 1064-1077, 1320, 1399), but in that case *Da-mi-ni-ja* on Ad 697 must be the women themselves. This in turn would lead to a reconsideration of *Ke-re-za* (Ad 318 and 686).

² *Documents*, 1956, p. 161-2; Bennett, *Pylos Tablets*, 1955, p. 77 (686).

³ Bennett, *Pylos Tablets*, 1955, p. 77 (684). The damaged area in the place of the penultimate sign is more extensive than would appear from the drawing of 684.e: compare the drawing of 684 where the damage extends well into vir. Although there are no word dividers, it is practically certain that *a-pu-ne-we* is to be divided from *e-re-ta*.

since the same word occurs in the note on Ad 684 it is a priori likely that a similar meaning is conveyed. Indeed, however we translate it, the sense of 684.e seems to be that someone was absent on *e-re-ta* duties.¹

It is important to remember that the Greek prefix ἀπο- is invariably rendered in Lin. B texts as *a-pu-* and might clearly be part of *a-pu-ne-we*. This consideration adds weight to the notion that all three notes concerning men and added to the Ad tablets belong to one and the same category. Since there is no word divider in 684.e there is no reason to believe that *e-re-ta-o-[]-wo* is to be read *e-re-ta-o [ko]-wo*, especially as this makes grammatical nonsense of the note as we shall see. Another reading is *e-re-ta o-[]-wo*, and on the analogy of *O-to-wo* (personal name on An 616.4) we could read the note *a-pu-ne-we e-re-ta O-[]-wo*. The note on 686 also gives the

¹ This meaning appears to be unassailable. The entry on the tablet is Pylos. The word *e-re-ta* in the note cannot be challenged. A person stated to be on *e-re-ta* duties must be absent from Pylos, whoever this person may be. But if *a-pu-ne-we* is a verb, it can hardly be connected with ἀπονέομαι, since this (Curtius p. 432, Boisacq⁴ p. 663, Hofmann p. 215) has the root *nes- Skr. *nas-*, *nase*, and is possibly represented in Myc. Greek by the name *Ne-e-ra-wo* (Fn 79.5). On the other hand, the IE root *snew-, Skr. *snavas*, *snaumi*, is most certainly represented in Greek as *snew-, *snew- (into *new-, *naw-), cf. Walde-Pokorny II, p. 692 f.; Schwyzer, *Gr. Gr.* I, 702. This is contained in the Greek verbs νέω, νάω, νήχω (Curtius p. 443, Boisacq⁴ p. 659, 667, Hofmann p. 212, 216, 218). The etymological distinction between *neh-* (*nes-*) and *naw-* (*snew-*) is clearly exemplified by the future tense νέσομαι νίσσομαι : νεύσομαι, and by the nouns νόστος, Νέστωρ = «the return(er)» : νεύσις, νευστήρ = «the swim(mer)». Similarly, there is a clear distinction in the meaning, the one (*neh-*, *nes-*) being connected with «coming home, protecting, nourishing», the other (*naw-*, *snew-*) with «water, rain, rivers, and the sea». According to LS (s.v.) ἀπονέω is an old Attic form of ἀπονήχομαι («to escape by swimming»). According to Hesych. (s.v.) νευστήρ means «a swimmer, a sailor». We do not know when the primary meaning («to swim») acquired the additional one («to go by sea»). Perhaps this was originally confined to a combination with ἀπο-, and mainly used for «rowing away» as distinct from «sailing away», for it is curious to note that neither does there exist any other Greek word for «rowing away», nor does ἀπο- ever occur in combination with ἔρε(τ)- (Hofmann p. 91). But πλέω (Hofmann p. 275) seems to show exactly the same range of early meanings («to swim» and «to go by boat») as νέω, though later it was mainly used for sailing away (cf. ἀπο-πλώω). In any case, if *a-pu-ne-we* on our tablet is a verb, its connexion with ἀπο-νέω and its meaning are sufficiently clear.

name of the person who was absent,¹ and justifies this reading. This, however, is as far as we can get by using analogies.

If we reject all analogies, we are left without any indications whatever and have to decide quite arbitrarily. An attempt has been made to identify *a-pu-ne-we* with the place-name *A-po-ne-we*. This place is mentioned on An 1.6 which has the heading «rowers (*e-re-ta*) going to Pleuron», and on An 610.10 which lists 37 *e-re-ta* supplied by *A-po-ne-we*. The double connexion of *e-re-ta* with *A-po-ne-we* is of course tempting, and one must see whether it fits our tablet Ad 684.e. If *a-pu-ne-we* were a misspelling for *A-po-ne-we*, this additional note could mean boys or a boy of «Aponewe rowers». If we choose the plural, the temptation arises to identify these boys with the menfolk of the Tinwasijan women on the same tablet. If we do that, we might say: is it not probable that the sons of these women were boys who had fathers at Aponewe? It is of course far more probable that they were not. But probability apart, such a story makes haywire of the language and of the context. A misspelling of *u* for *o* is very unusual, and *KO-WO* never implies fathers, in fact, it may not mean son or sons. In any case, *a-pu-ne-we e-re-ta* can never be *e-re-ta* of *A-po-ne-we*, for that would certainly have been *A-po-ne-we-jo e-re-ta*. The only entry on this tablet is *Pu-ro* and nothing else, consequently *a-pu-ne-we e-re-ta* can mean neither «of A.» (*-jo*), nor «at A.» (*-pi*), nor «to A.» (*-de*). It is singularly unfortunate that such ill-considered interpretations could be used to put forward arguments and theories concerning the Women Tablets.²

¹ According to *Documents* p. 162: [*A*]-*ka-wo* (cf. Jo 438.18, Un 219.9), but this is not necessarily the precise form of the name on this tablet. In exactly the same way *O-to-wo* is quoted here merely as a parallel form of a man's name. On An 616.4 *O-to-wo* is a βασιλεύς. Even if the name were the same, it need not be the same man (cf. Vn 851.9, Ea 814). On our tablet the name *O-[]-wo* might conceivably be *O-ke-wo* (cf. *O-ke-u* on Ea 814 and Ea 259), or *O-ka-wo* (cf. the short name *O-ko* on Cn 436.4 like *O-to* on Ea 814), or *O-pa₂-wo* (cf. the dative *O-pa₂-wo-ni* on Fn 324.16).

² *Documents* on p. 156 dealing with the Women Tablets: «The casual references (*sic!*) to the fathers of the children... indicate that they are not the product of any regular union». These «references» simply refer to Ad 684.e and to nothing else. «They» are adduced as an argument in favour of a theory that calls people slaves whom the Pylos scribes do not call slaves at all. *Documents*, p. 161 translates Ad 684.e «sons of rowers at Aponewe», and a few lines below on the same page *a-pu-ne-we* is explained as a place-name, probably in the

The purpose of Ad 684 is to list at Pylos the five men and two boys of the Tinwasijan women. Aa 699 and Ab 190 tell us that the women and the children were at Pylos too, and Ad 684 adds that they were *i-te-ja*, possibly used as weavers, but this is by no means certain.¹ As for the situation of the Tinwasijan township we have some useful information. Ea 810 gives the ethnic *Ti-nwa-si-jo* instead of a man's name, and Fn 324.12 adds this ethnic to a man's name. As that addition is quite exceptional on Fn 324, and since the place-name itself is never mentioned on the Pylos tablets, these ethnics on Aa 699, Ab 190, Ad 684, Ea 810, and Fn 324 are indications that the township was situated either outside the Pylian kingdom or on its borders.² The gold tablet Jo 438.21 proves that it was within the kingdom, for we find a certain *Te-po-se-u, Ti-nwa-si-jo ko-re-te*,

dative case and identical with Aponewe. Reference is made to An 1.6 and An 610.10, but when we look these up in *Documents*, p. 185 f., we find they are translated «from Aponewe». Are we then supposed to believe that *a-pu-ne-we* means «at A.» and *a-po-ne-we* «from A.»? Equally deceptive is the explanation of Aponewe as «a place-name in the dative», since some of the other entries on An 610 are certainly not in the dat. or loc. case. Nor can *a-pu-ne-we* be in the dative since Ad 684 has only one entry, the edge bearing merely an additional remark. In fact, *A-po-ne-we* on An 610.10 is probably an ethnic in the nom. pl. (-ῆρες) since it is followed on 610.11-13 by four other ethnics in the nom. pl. Thus the preceding *Te-ta-ra-ne* may also be an ethnic in the nom. pl. (An 1.5-6 = An 610.9-10), while *E-re-e-we* (An 723.1) is another parallel (nom. pl. in -ῆρες from Ἐλεεός, the ethnic of Ἔλος, cf. *E-re-e* on Jn 829.19 as dat. loc. Ἐλέει). As for *a-pu-ne-we*, it is probably a verb, as we have seen. Professor Heubeck writes (letter of 18.3.1957): «Ich bin überzeugt, dass das Wort *a-pu-ne-we* mit *A-po-ne-we* überhaupt nichts zu tun hat: es gibt kein myk. *a-po* = ἄπο. Am wahrscheinlichsten ist m. E. ein Verbum, das nicht viel anders als ἀπονέφει aussehen könnte». Emmett L. Bennett writes (letter of 24.4.1957) in reply to my enquiry about the reasons for his changed treatment of *a-pu-ne-we* in *Etudes Mycéniennes*, 1957, p. 132, as compared with his MS in *Paris Colloque, Brochure Préliminaire*, p. 18: «I changed to APUNEWE and cross-referenced it, not so much from conviction that it was a place and certainly not from conviction that it = *Aponewe*, but from a thought that it *might* prove to be a place and that if so it were better cross-referenced. It is, I agree, certainly easier to interpret the ideographic part of the text if *a-pu-ne-we* is not a place, and the edge *-ko-wo* is not in that way parallel to the face *ko-wo*». I should add that Bennett believes his photograph to show definite traces of *ko* in the damaged part.

1. *Documents* p. 161, 395: from *histeiaon*, women of the loom?

2. E. Turner, *BICS* 1, 1955, p. 20.

and also that it was not just a «coastal region» but a town or village, though the name (*Thinousio-*) does suggest that it was on the coast.¹ This connexion with the coast is also implied by the *e-re-ta* of Ad 684.e. On Jo 438.19-25 this *Ti-nwa-si-jo ko-re-te* is listed between the *po-ro-ko-re-te* of *E-re-e*, the *pa₂-si-re-u A-ke-ro* (who is mentioned on Vn 493.1 in connexion with *Ti-mi-ti-ja*), and *Po-ki-ro-go* (who occurs again on Sn 64.8 together with both the *Ti-mi-ti-ja ko-re-te* and the *I-te-re-wa ko-re-te*)² followed here by the *ko-re-te* of *Ti-mi-ti-ja* and *I-te-re-wa*. Now tablet On 300.8-12 lists the *ko-re-te* of the *pe-ra-a-ko-ra-i-jo*, and the list of the place-names is very similar to Jn 829.13-19. Among these «*pe-ra-a-ko-ra-i-jo ko-re-te*» and along with the *Te-mi-ti-ja ko-re-te* we find again *Te-po-se-u* (the *Ti-nwa-si-jo ko-re-te*) mentioned on On 300.12, which confirms that this township or village or port belonged to Pylos. That it was a town of some size, importance and wealth is shown by the gold tablet, for the gold tribute of its *ko-re-te* is about twice as large as that of the *ko-re-te* of Pakijana, Rouso, Akerewa, Karadoro, Timitija, Iterewa, Eree, etc.³

The following conclusions seem to impose themselves:

1) The Tinwasijan men of Ad 684 had come from within the Pylian kingdom. Tinwasijan women are called *Ti-nwa-si-ja* (Aa 699, Ab 190), Tinwasijan men are called *Ti-nwa-si-jo* (Ea 810, Fn 324.12, Jo 438.21) but on Ad 684 they appear as *Ti-nwa-ti-ja-o ko-wo*;⁴ this

¹ *Studies in Myc. Inscr.* I, 1956, p. 46: «The Coastal Region»; S. Lurja, *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 1955.3, p. 17: «Thinusio». For the *-ti/-si* alternation cf. Chadwick in *Et. Myc.* 1957, p. 83 f. Also *Ti-ni-ja-ta* on Fn 79.3 is probably related (*Thinia-*) but is not a place-name (compare Fn 79.3 with An 192.3,5,13). *Documents* waver a good deal: on p. 149 they suggest a connexion with $\tau\rho\iota\nu\alpha\sigma\acute{o}\varsigma$ (but this is senseless, since $\tau\rho\iota-$ is always written *Ti-ri-*); on p. 161 they suggest the place-name was «Tinwato (- $\alpha\nu\theta\omicron\varsigma$?)»; and on p. 182 and 409 they equate *ti-no* (An 18.9,11; Xa 565) with $\theta\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$ = «of the shore, coast». For *o-pi-ti-ni-ja-ta* «of the Sea Coast» cf. Bennett in *AJA* LX, 1956, p. 130; S. Lurja in *Vestnik* 1955.3, p. 17; and already Ventris-Chadwick in *JHS* LXXIII, 1953, p. 96. Bennett suggests that *we-te-re-u O-pi-ti-ni-ja-ta* might be a parallel to *i-je-re-ja Pa-ki-ja-na* (Eb 472 and 477; Eb 409 and 1176; cf. Ep 539.13), i. e. while the priestess takes her title from the Sanctuary Pakijana the priest takes his from the Coastal Region.

² M. S. Ruipérez, «Une Charte Royale», *Minos* IV, 1956, p. 149, 155-6, 162.

³ Jo 438. Cf. *Documents*, p. 358-9; Ruipérez, *ibidem*, p. 157.

⁴ For this alternative spelling cf. *Documents*, p. 161, 374; and most recently Chadwick in *Et. Myc.* 1957, p. 83 f.

is consistent with the formula used on all the Ad tablets, since these are based on the Aa catalogue and list the women's KOUROI (in two age groups).

2) The situation of their home town or port (a) on the coast, (b) in the *pe-ra-a-ko-ra-i-jo* (cf. Ng 332 and Ng 319), (c) on the borders of the kingdom, and (d) near *Ti-mi-ti-ja* (Themistia), makes it clear that we have to do with a Messenian township near the Laconian border. It confirms Palmer's placing of the *pe-ra-a-ko-ra-i-jo* on the Messenian gulf,¹ for if the *pe-ra-a-ko-ra-i-jo* on On 300.8-12 includes a coastal town on the kingdom's border, this can only be on the Messenian gulf.

The proximity of this town to *Ti-mi-ti-ja* (another coastal township) sheds new light on the military situation during the days before the attack on Pylos. If the Tinwasijan town is on the Messenian gulf and *Ti-mi-ti-ja* is nearby, the stationing of a strong detachment there under *E-ko-me-na-ta* (An 661.9-10) on coastal defence duties acquires some significance. Those Tinwasijans listed in Pylos can hardly represent a population cleared out of their town by the king of Pylos himself (cf. *Od.* 4,174-7), for they comprise only nine women and five men. They cannot be captives.² What the situation really implies is that this border to Laconia was in serious danger from an enemy. The attack was expected by sea. An enemy in the north-west could not endanger the Messenian gulf without being intercepted along the west coast. Only in the south-east could he threaten the Messenian gulf as well as bypass the gulf and attack the west coast of Pylos. Perhaps the enemy was already in Laconia? In any case the attack on Pylos seems to have been coming from the Aegean, from the south-east, not from the north-west. And it was from that area that we find fugitives arriving in Pylos, while all the Pylian allies seem to come from the north-west. This situation clearly requires a new explanation.

University of Birmingham

F. J. TRITSCH

¹ L. Palmer, «Military Arrangements», *Minos* IV, p. 139, 143; *Documents* p. 193 on An 661.9-10; M. S. Ruipérez, *Et. Myc.* 1957, p. 110.

² This may already be obvious from what has been stated above. The status of these people is the subject of a separate article to appear in *Minoica, Sundwall Festschrift*, 1957.