

MYCENAEAN *o-ro-jo*

More than almost any other grapheme sequence in Linear B, the quintuple hapax *o-ro-jo* in PY Eq 213.2-6 has been manhandled with frivolous exegetic abandon. The plethora of random interpretations was initiated by Ventris himself, who in his privately circulated preliminary glossary (s.v.) listed at least four possible connexions: ὄρος 'year', οὐρος 'guard', ὄλο(φ)ιός 'destructive', ὄρρος 'rump'. The first of these alternatives is still pronounced possible¹, while the third is modified to «genitive of the noun *ὄλος ['loss'] which underlies the Homeric adjective οὐλος, Dor. ὄλος, 'destructive'», evidently in order to bring it into line with the other genitival interpretations. Palmer's suggestions of a partitive genitive ὄλοιο from *ὄλος 'millet' and his adduction² of Hom οὐλαί, Att. ὄλαι (<*ὄλφαι), Arc. ὄλοαί 'barley-groats' (cf. ὄλυρα 'rice-wheat') are given top billing in the commentary, but remain disregarded in the translation. Georgiev³ read ὄλοιο 'of the whole'; Meriggi⁴ suggested ὄροιο 'of the boundary'; Lurja⁵ assumed ὄροιο 'of the province'; Mühlestein⁶ posited ὄροιο 'of the guard'. The divergences were largely due to the difficulties of the tablet as a whole; indeed its treatment in *Documents*⁷ is one of the least successful in the entire work. On the other hand guesswork was in this instance more dangerous than ever, for it landed *o-ro-jo* on a veritable hotbed of homonymy. Those assuming *r*-value in the *ro* sign had their pick of the synonyms I have previously listed and discussed⁸. Of those quoted above only Mühlestein's analysis is worth attention, despite its contextual arbitrariness: the Swiss savant invokes Hes. ὄρου· φύλακος; θυρωρός, Dor. τιμᾶ(φ)ορος, Att. τιμωρός;

¹ *Documents*, p. 269.

² *Trans. Phil. Soc.* 1954, p. 29.

³ *Lexique*, s. v.

⁴ *Glotta*, XXXIV, 1954, p. 24.

⁵ *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 1955, 3, p. 26.

⁶ *Mus. Helv.*, XII, 1955, p. 130.

⁷ P. 268-269.

⁸ *Eranos*, LIV, 1956, p. 16-18.

Hom. οὐδενόσωρος (*Il.* 8.178) and adduces interpretations like κάτ-ορος 'surveillant, inspector' for the repeated Knossian *ka-to-ro*, and Λόκωρος for *ru-ko-ro* in the Pylian Ea series. If one keeps in mind the absence of expected *w-* in *o-ro-me-no*, and the ambiguities of ὄραω, φρουρός, Hes. βῶροι · ὀφθαλμοί, ὄρονται, ὄρα, Mühlestein's suggestions are at least fraught with possibilities. Of the approaches postulating an *l-*sound those of Palmer and Georgiev may be counted out at once, for the *-lw-* cluster was presumably intact in Mycenaean Greek (cf. *ko-wo* = κόρφος; thus *ὄλφο- 'barley' or *ὄλφο- 'whole' [Hom. οὖλος, Att. ὄλος] should appear as *o-wo-*). Ventris-Chadwick's *ὄλος is open to doubt: Hom. οὖλος, Dor. ὠλος may indeed be a secondary adjective resulting from appositional juxtaposition of a noun which formed the basis of the derivative οὖλιος = ὄλο(F)(ι)ός, but the forms imply either *ὄλφο- or *ὄλνο- (hardly *ὄλσο-); the former should be written *o-wo-*, while the Mycenaean status of the latter is uncertain. Even granted this last possibility, there remain grave combinatory improbabilities¹. My own earlier analysis of the tablet² broke with several of the prevalent preconceptions. Briefly, *o-ro-jo* was interpreted as a noun of indeterminate case (nominative much rather than genitive), governing the preceding toponymic genitives. At the same time this approach was not wholly untainted by etymological reasoning, and the suggested reconstruction *ὄροφιόν disregarded the standard representation of *-wy-* in e.g. *di-u-ja* and *me-u-jo* beside *di-wi-ja*, *me-wi-jo*. However, by assuming a metonymic meaning 'area, territory' the groundwork was laid for further advances. Rui-pérez³ suggests a connexion with ἄρω, comparing ἄρουρα on the same tablet (i.e. ὄροϊόν, showing *a : o* ablaut as in ἄγω : ὄγμος). Palmer⁴ now applies rigorous combinatory analysis and also reaches the conclusion that *o-ro-jo* designates some kind of locale. The time may be ripe for an identification with the Cypriote οἰρών inferrable from *i-to-i-ro-ni to-i a-la-pi-ri-ja-ta-i* and *i-to-i-ro-ni to-i e-ta-li-e-vi* (*Tabula Edaliensis*, lines 8, 31), interpreted as ἰ(ν) τῶιρονι τῷ Ἀλα(μ)πριγάται

¹ Strangely enough nobody has yet exhausted the residue of the homonym storehouse: οὖλος 'woolly' (*Fόλνος?), οὖλος 'sheaf' (=ἴουλος), οὖλον 'gum(s)', οὖλή 'scar' (*Fολνᾶ or *Fολσᾶ, cf. Lat. *uolnus*).

² *Eranos*, LIV, 1956, p. 14-20.

³ *Minos*, V, 1957, p. 204.

⁴ *Gnomon*, XXIX, 1957, p. 567.

and Ἐδαλιεῖν respectively and first connected (in place of a dubious *ἰρών) by W. Schulze¹ with Hesychius οἰρών ἡ ἐκ τῆς καταμετρήσεως τῆς γῆς εὐθωρία². Thus *o-ro-jo* would stand for one-time *ὀρίων. The exact phonemic implications of the Mycenaean graphy are uncertain; quite possibly we are in the presence of an archaizing orthography for what by that time was some variety of palatalized *r*, perhaps rendered elsewhere sporadically by *ro*₂ (*ku-pa-ro*₂ beside *ku-pa-ro*, cf. κύπειρος, κύπαιρος: Ion. κύπερος; fem. dual *po-pu-ro*₂, cf. Aeol. πορφύριος) and *ra*₂ (*a-ke-ti-ra*₂ beside *a-ke-ti-ri-ja*). This assumption needs to be reconciled with the evidence of words like *mo-ro-pa*₂ and *ko-re-te*. If correctly identified, the former is probably μορό-ππᾶς (μόρος) rather than μοιρό-ππᾶς (μοῖρα < *μορία), although classical compounds tend to show μοιρο-. Ruipérez's brilliant interpretation of *ko-re-te* as κοιρητήρ from *χορίε³ would tend to indicate in this connexion that no specific graphic notation of palatalized *r* was requisite before a front vowel, as indeed there are no duplicate signs in the cases of *re* and *ri*, nor within the *e* and *i* columns generally.

Los Angeles
University of California

JAAN PUHVEL

¹ *Berl. Philol. Wochenschrift* 1890, p. 1439 = *Kl. Schriften*, p. 663.

² Cf. also οἰρών or οιορών reputedly used by Eratosthenes Epicus, meaning ἡ χάραξις τῶν ἀρότρων (see J. U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina*, Oxford 1925, p. 68, and 252, where the relevant passage in Herodian is discussed). The approximate meaning 'district' in Cypriote shows the same metonymic connotation as Lat. *finēs* and Myc. *wo-wo*.

³ *Etudes Mycéniennes*, Paris 1956, p. 105-118.