

KO-RO-NO-WE-SA

Proceedings of the 15th international colloquium on Mycenaean studies, September 2021

edited by J. Bennet, A. Karnava & T. Meißner

Ariadne Supplement Series 5, Rethymno 2024, p. 259-270

© The Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Crete, Greece, and the individual authors

## **Landowning and the creation of private estates in Pylian *pa-ki-ja-ne*\***

**Claudia Valeria Alonso Moreno**

### ***Agricultural estates in Mycenaean Pylos***

In Mycenaean Pylos, the land had an outstanding economic role but also social prestige and ideological value. Agricultural production was the basis of subsistence and served to feed the cattle. Moreover, it created surplus and wealth. According to the Pylian tablets, the most important people in the kingdom, including the *wanax* himself, were important landholders. In fact, it has been stated that access to agricultural wealth was the common trait shared by Pylian elites.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, land was used by the palatial administration as payment, with some people receiving agricultural plots in exchange for their services, work, or simply because they held an important position within the Pylian society. Some land was also consecrated to the divinities.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, as an institution, the Palace of Pylos was not a landowner itself. Messenian land was in the hands of private landowners and their families. Rural communities sometimes also shared land ownership of pastures and woods. Since it was the *damos*, and not the palace, who owned those lands, I consider them private, despite being communally owned. In this paper, I will address how Mycenaean Pylos gained access to agricultural wealth and its derivatives thanks to the management of different types of private

---

\* This text was funded by the 'Margarita Salas' postdoctoral contract provided by the Spanish Ministry of Universities. This research is included within the R+D+i project "Vulnerabilidad intrafamiliar y política en el mundo antiguo" (PID2020-116349GB-100 / AEI/10.13039/501100011033), with funding from the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness.

<sup>1</sup> ALONSO MORENO 2020.

<sup>2</sup> DE FIDIO 1977.

estates within the territory of *pa-ki-ja-ne*, which housed the best known agricultural land in all of Mycenaean Messenia.

### *Landowning in pa-ki-ja-ne*

*pa-ki-ja-ne*, \*Σφαγιάνες, “the place of slaughter”, is the fourth Pylian district within the province *de-we-ro-a<sub>3</sub>-ko-ra-i-ja* according to **PY Cn 608.6**, **Jn 829.7**, and **Vn 20.6**. It was probably located in the modern town of Chora, just five kilometres away from Pylos.<sup>3</sup> The place was highly intertwined with official palatial cult. It housed many different sanctuaries and religious festivals, and the initiation of the *wanax* also took place here.<sup>4</sup>

Apart from its leading role within the Pylian religion, *pa-ki-ja-ne* was a rich agricultural territory. However, it was not a palatial agricultural estate. The palace gained access to agricultural production thanks to the imposition of a direct tax on landholders and tenants based on the dimensions of their plots.<sup>5</sup> The land of *pa-ki-ja-ne* was also a good in itself since it was used to compensate the members of the palatial elite. Even prominent members of the rural community benefited from the distribution and sanctioning of land by the palace.

The scribes recorded the size of the taxable field according to the amount of seed that could be grown on each plot.<sup>6</sup> Therefore, in the tablets, we do not find actual plots but theoretical tax units.<sup>7</sup> Hands 41 and 1 registered *pa-ki-ja-ne* fields in the series **Eb**, **En**, **Eo** and **Ep** to calculate the tax amount.<sup>8</sup>

Moreover, the scribes also registered the total amount of *pa-ki-ja-ne* land divided by category in series **Ed**.<sup>9</sup> Hand 41 wrote the preliminary series, **Eo** and **Eb**. Hand 1 used those documents to prepare the series, **En** and **Ep**, the final documents. This scribe also wrote the **Ed** tablets.<sup>10</sup> Information about the land included the names of landowners and tenants, the legal category, and the size of each plot. In *pa-ki-ja-ne* there

<sup>3</sup> CHADWICK 1972, 109; STAVRIANOPOULOU 1989, 140-141.

<sup>4</sup> LUPACK 2008, 45-46; 2011, 208; 2016, *passim*; PALAIMA 1995, 131; 2004, 225.

<sup>5</sup> DE FIDIO 1987, 144; ZURBACH 2017a, 165.

<sup>6</sup> DEL FREO 2005, 7; DUHOUX 2016, 49; PALAIMA 2015, 628.

<sup>7</sup> ZURBACH 2017a, 165.

<sup>8</sup> ZURBACH 2017b, 41-42.

<sup>9</sup> ZURBACH 2017a, 46-47.

<sup>10</sup> However, **Ed 411** was written by both hands (see the comment on this tablet in *PTT*<sup>2</sup>).

were four land categories: *ko-to-na ki-ti-me-na*, *ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na*, *ka-ma*, and *e-to-ni-jo*. *ko-to-na*, κτοῖνα, was the generic name for an agricultural plot.<sup>11</sup> As a noun, it was insufficient to classify the type of land; therefore, it was accompanied by the medio-passive participles *ki-ti-me-na* or *ke-ke-me-na*. On the other hand, *e-to-ni-jo* and *ka-ma* lands were deducted from *ke-ke-me-na* estates. In this paper, I will focus on the relationship among the palatial administration, landowners, and tenants in relation to *ko-to-na ki-ti-me-na* and *ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na*.

### *ki-ti-me-na* land and the *te-re-ta* from *pa-ki-ja-ne* (Eo/En series)

The *ko-to-na ki-ti-me-na* land category appears in the **Eo** (preliminary texts written by Hand 41) and **En** (definitive texts written by Hand 1) series. *ki-ti-me-na* is the passive present middle participle of \*κτιμενα. The root is \*ktei-, which creates the verb κτίζω, “to settle”. Much bibliography has been written about the interpretation of this land category, which is usually defined as opposed to *ke-ke-me-na*.<sup>12</sup> The definitive characteristic of the *ko-to-na ki-ti-me-na* is that it belongs to individuals.

In the Pylian tablets, holders of *ki-ti-me-na* land were named *te-re-ta*. This name belongs to the lexical family of τέλος, “charge”, most likely the plural form \*τελέσται.<sup>13</sup> Therefore, the *te-re-ta* were people with some kind of obligations.<sup>14</sup> According to the text in **En 609.1-2**, the heading of the entire series, there were 14 *te-re-ta* in *pa-ki-ja-ne* (1.*pa-ki-ja-ni-ja*, *to-sa*, *da-ma-te*, DA 40/2. *to-so-de*, *te-re-ta*, *e-ne-e-si* VIR 14). Their names appear in the rest of the series in the genitive case next to the plot and its measurements. The **Eo/En** series contains information about 13 plots. The “lost *te-re-ta*” is probably *su-ko*, who is a *po-ro-du-ma*, a grain overseer, according to **Ep 613.4-5**.<sup>15</sup> *a-ka-ta-jo* (**Eo 269.B/En 659.18**), *pi-ri-ta-wo* (**Eo 224.7/En 467.5**), *qe-re-qo-ta* (**Eo 444.1/En 659.1**), *ru-\**83 (**Eo 276.1/En 74.1**), and *ti-qa-jo* (**Eo 278/En 467.1**) also appear in the texts along with their professions and official titles. On the other hand, there is no additional information about *a-da-ma-o* (**Eo 351/En 659.8**), *a-i-qe-u* (**Eo 471/En 659.12**), *a<sub>3</sub>-ti-jo-qo* (**Eo 247/En 74.11**),

<sup>11</sup> DEL FREO 2001, 31; PALAIMA 2015, 626; ZURBACH 2017a, 40.

<sup>12</sup> For a summary of the different proposals, see ALONSO MORENO 2020, 238-240.

<sup>13</sup> CARLIER 1987, *passim*; ZURBACH 2017a, 41.

<sup>14</sup> CARLIER 1987, 66.

<sup>15</sup> ZURBACH 2017a, 104.

<sup>16</sup> Here he is called *pe-re-qo-ta*.

*pi-ke-re-u* (Eo 160/En 74.20), *ra-ku-ro* (Eo 281/En 659.15), and *wa-na-ta-jo* (Eo 211/En 609.3). However, these people also appear in the Eb/Ep series as *ko-to-no-o-ko*. De Fidio thought that all of the *ko-to-no-o-ko* hold this position as owners of *ki-ti-me-na* land. Thus, all the *te-re-ta*, as owners of *ko-to-na ki-ti-me-na*, would also be *ko-to-no-o-ko* and, if this was not explicitly stated, it is because it would have been redundant.<sup>17</sup> Nevertheless, the existence of two different expressions is remarkable and must be explained. The rest of the *te-re-ta* are *po-te-u* (En 467.3) and *a-ma-ru-ta* (Eo 224/En 609.10). There is no additional information about their situation and they are not *ko-to-no-o-ko*.

We should not think about *te-re-ta* as isolated individuals. As land-owners and people close to the palace, they should have held a high-rank position. Moreover, their plots could conceal a familiar patrimony, the *oikos* of each *te-re-ta*.<sup>18</sup> According to Carlier, the *te-re-ta* received this designation because of the “charge” imposed on their lands. According to the author, they were bound to cultivate their plots.<sup>19</sup> Since the Linear B tablets only reflect information about the last days of activity of the Pylian administration, we cannot ascertain the origin of their properties. However, it has been stated that they received these lands as a reward for rendered services to the Pylian Kingdom.<sup>20</sup>

Some other people also had access to these plots: the *o-na-te-re*. Their names appear after the mention of the *ko-to-na ki-ti-me-na* of each *te-re-ta*.<sup>21</sup> They were tenants of the *te-re-ta*. The *o-na-te-re* were the recipients of *ko-to-na ki-ti-me-na* land thanks to the legal category of land tenure designated as *o-na-to*. *o-na-to*, \*ὄνατόν, is a noun or nominalised neuter adjective that designates a usufruct or an amphictyonic tenure.<sup>22</sup> It is the most common type of agricultural tenure in the written record, even more so than the property.<sup>23</sup> The *te-re-ta* could also be *o-na-te-re* of other *te-re-ta*. This is the case of *wa-na-ta-jo*, who held part of the *ki-ti-me-na* land that belonged to *a-ma-ru-ta* as *o-na-te-re* (Eo 224.5/En 609.15). We also find the royal armourer and *ko-to-no-o-ko a-tu-ko*

<sup>17</sup> DE FIDIO 1977, 147.

<sup>18</sup> ALONSO MORENO 2020, 245.

<sup>19</sup> CARLIER 1987.

<sup>20</sup> ADRADOS 1994-1995.

<sup>21</sup> Only *po-te-u* does not have *o-na-te-re* within his *ko-to-na ki-ti-me-na* (Eo 268/En 476.3).

<sup>22</sup> PALAIMA 2015, 624; ZURBACH 2016, 354; 2017a, 41.

<sup>23</sup> ZURBACH 2005, 316.

(**Eo 211.2/En 609.5b**) and the royal fuller, *pe-ki-ta* (**Eo 160.3/En 74.23; Eo 276.2/En 74.3**). However, the vast majority of *o-na-te-re* were *te-o-jo do-e-ro/a*, “slaves of a divinity”.<sup>24</sup> Of 34 *o-na-to* plots, 29 were awarded to *te-o-jo do-e-ro*. The priestess of *pa-ki-ja-ne* also occupied one of these plots, property of the *te-re-ta wa-na-ta-jo* (**Eo 224.8/En 609.18**). The high number of religious personnel is not surprising as the district of *pa-ki-ja-ne*, as we have already seen, housed many sanctuaries and was strongly connected with the official Pylian cult and the supernatural power of the *wanax*. However, the role of *wa-na-ta-jo*, *a-tu-ko*, and *pe-ki-ta* as *o-na-te-re* means that *o-na-to* plots were not exclusively for religious personnel. We can think in a general context of the palatial elites. Even the *i-je-re-ja* could have had access to her *o-na-to*; not because she performed rituals but because of her high social position. The palatial elites gained secondary access to the agricultural wealth of *pa-ki-ja-ne* by leasing *ki-ti-me-na* land from the *te-re-ta*.

### *ke-ke-me-na, ka-ma land, and the damos from pa-ki-ja-ne* (*Eb/Ep series*)

The *ke-ke-me-na* land category appears in the **Eb** (preliminary texts written by Hand 41) and **Ep** (definitive texts written by Hand 1) series. The term *ke-ke-me-na* is a perfect middle passive participle and it is written before *ko-to-na*. Again, different proposals have been made for the interpretation of this category.<sup>25</sup> It is linked to the *da-mo*, the rural community of *pa-ki-ja-ne*. **Ep 301** is the first document of the series:

#### **Ep 301**

.1 *ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, a-no-no, to-so-de, pe-mo* [ GRA 1 T 1

.2a ko-to-no- -o-ko

.2b a<sub>3</sub>-ti-jo-qo, o-na-to, e-ke, pa-ro, da-mo, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, to-so, [pe-mo GRA 1 T 4 V 3

.3 wa-na-ta-jo, o-na-to, e-ke, pa-ro, da-mo, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, to-so-del |pe-mo GRA T 5

.4 a-da-ma-o, o-na-to, e-ke, pa-ro, da-mo, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, to-sol |pe-mo GRA T 4

.5 a-tu-ko, e-te-do-mo, o-na-to, e-ke, pa-ro, da-mo, ke-ke-me-na, ko[-to-na to-so pe-mo GRA

.6 ta-ta-ro, o-na-to, e-ke, pa-ro, da-mo, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, to-so pe-mo[ GRA V 3

.7 *vac.*

.8 p i-ke-re-u, e-ke-qe, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, ko-to-no-o-ko, to-so, pe-mo[ GRA

<sup>24</sup> *Docs*<sup>2</sup>, 445.

<sup>25</sup> ALONSO MORENO 2020, 247.

.9 ra-ku-ro, e-ke-qe, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, ko-to-no-o-ko, to-so, pemo	GRA[
.10 ku-so, e-ke-qe, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, ko-to-no-o-ko, to-so pe-mo	GRA V [ 3
.11 ke-ra-u-jo, e-ke-qe, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, ko-to-no-o-ko, to pe-mo	GRA T 4
.12 pa-ra-ko, e-ke-qe, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, ko-to-no-o-ko, to-so pemo	GRA T 7
.13 ko-tu[-ro <sub>2</sub> ], e-ke-qe, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, ko-to-no-o-ko, to-so, pe-mo	GRA T 1
.14 a-i-qe-u, e-ke-qe, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, ko-to-no-o-ko, to-so, pemo	GRA T 6

Line 1 states the amount of undivided (*a-no-no*) land, *ke-ke-me-na* (.1 *ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, a-no-no, to-so-de, pe-mo* [ GRA 1 T 1). Then, we find the new division of the land among 12 individuals. Hand 1 divided the tablet into two parts. First, we find information about five of these characters (*a<sub>3</sub>-ti-jo-qo, wa-na-ta-jo, a-da-ma-o, a-tu-ko, and ta-ta-ro*), who appear in the text collectively named *ko-to-no-o-ko* (ll. 2-6). They hold *pa-ro da-mo* land, which means that the rural community was the landowner of these plots. Actual land tenure is outlined by Hand 1 thanks to the use of the verb form *e-ke*, which is also used in the **Eo/En** series with the same purpose. The second part of the tablet collects information about the rest of the *ko-to-no-o-ko* (*pi-ke-re-u, ra-ku-ro, ku-so, ke-ra-u-jo, pa-ra-ko, and ko-tu-ro<sub>2</sub>*). These people are not collectively named. Each name is followed by the designation *ko-to-no-o-ko*. Also, we find the verb form *e-ke-qe* instead of *e-ke*; nor does *o-na-to* appear. De Fidio stated that this meant that the attribution of these plots had not yet been confirmed,<sup>26</sup> whereas Zurbach explained that these lands were free from the obligations that normally fell on lands leased as *o-na-to*.<sup>27</sup> Therefore, in this text, both groups of individuals shared one common feature: they were *ko-to-no-o-ko*, which means “holders of *ktoina*”.<sup>28</sup> However, we do not know which properties were actually theirs, as **Ep 301** only shows that their lands were *ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na* as *o-na-to* leased from the *damos*. They act as tenants here, although we know that they were actually the landholders. In the rest of the series, we find *ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na pa-ro da-mo* plots granted, fundamentally, to religious personnel, as in the case of the **Eo/En** series, seeing that the position of *ko-to-no-o-ko* did not allow access to this type of land tenure. All were tenants of *ke-ke-me-na* plots whose property was collectively held by the *damos* of *pa-ki-ja-ne*.

<sup>26</sup> DE FIDIO 1977, 156.

<sup>27</sup> ZURBACH 2017b, 49.

<sup>28</sup> See the entry in *DMic*.

The distinction of the *ko-to-no-o-ko* from the rest of the individuals is highly significant. In fact, they are featured performing another role in the series. Preliminary record **Eb 297** and definite record **Ep 704** (ll. 5-6) show the well-known dispute between the priestess *Eritha* and the *damos* of *pa-ki-ja-ne* over the juridical status of the *ke-ke-me-na* land that she leased. In summary, she claimed that she held an *e-to-ni-jo* on behalf of the goddess, a type of agricultural tenure that was exempt from fees. The *damos*, for its part, stated that she held a normal *o-na-to*. This means that she was trying to avoid paying taxes for her land tenure while the landowner stated the contrary.<sup>29</sup> Hand 1 considered the *da-mo* and *ko-to-no-o-ko* as equivalent entities, as Hand 41 used the last noun in **Eb 297.1** to name the collective landowner of the land leased by *Eritha*.<sup>30</sup> The *ko-to-no-o-ko* acted on behalf of their common economic interest representing the *damos* in the conflict with *Eritha*. In this context, they acted as a collective landholder, not as individual tenants, as outlined by Hand 1. The scribe no longer uses the term *ko-to-no-o-ko* in **Ep 704**, but refers to the collective *damos*.<sup>31</sup>

The lands of the *damos* may have originally been pastures and forests for communal use, forbidden for individual enrichment.<sup>32</sup> Ploughing, division, and cultivation of the land was permitted for private use, although the rural community kept ownership of the land. The first to take advantage of the division of the *ke-ke-me-na* lands into lots would have been the *ko-to-no-o-ko*, the landowners that also belonged to the rural community of *pa-ki-ja-ne*. Their position was ambiguous: they belonged to the community, they represented and defended it but, at the same time, they used land that was collectively owned by the *damos* for themselves, taking advantage of the division of the *ke-ke-me-na* land.

The **Eb/Ep** series also register the existence of *ka-ma* lands, granted also as *o-na-to* and related to *ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na*. It is not surprising to find *ka-ma* land in the **Eb/Ep** series, as the *damos* was its owner.

<sup>29</sup> ALONSO MORENO 2014, 247-249; DE FIDIO 1987, 144; ZURBACH 2017a, 45.

<sup>30</sup> DE FIDIO 1987, 144.

<sup>31</sup> Hand 1 tends to group parcels of similar legal status that belong to the same person (ZURBACH 2006, 271), focusing on the true interests of the administration. In this case, it would be the landowner.

<sup>32</sup> ALONSO MORENO 2020, 251.

In fact, it seems that *ka-ma* plots were created from *ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na*.<sup>33</sup> The creation of *ka-ma* parcels is framed within the formation of individual properties within the communal lands of the *damos*. Apart from being large parcels, *ka-ma* plots had another outstanding feature: they had to be cultivated. This is indicated with the verbs *te-re-ja-e* (**Eb 495/Ep 613.1-2**; **Eb 149/Ep 613.4-5**), *wo-zo-e* (**Eb 338/Ep 704.7.8**), *wo-ze*, with the suffix *-qe* (**Ep 613.3,6-7**; **Eb 156/Ep 613.9**; **Eb 839/Ep 613.13**), and *te-ra-pi-ke* (**Eb 842/Ep 613.8**). They all share the general meaning “agricultural working”. General tax estimation implies that all tenants had to ensure a minimum of agricultural production, so this obligation had to imply something beyond regular cultivation. By alternating between *ka-ma* and *e-re-mo*, “wasteland”, in **Un 718.11** and **Er 312.7**, Del Freo suggests that these obligations refer to the set of tasks necessary to condition wild land for cultivation and its maintenance as arable land in the style of emphyteutic-type regimes.<sup>34</sup> We have, in that case, the transformation of marginal lands of the *damos* into large plots prepared for agriculture.<sup>35</sup> The large size of the plots is linked to the necessity to obtain a productive volume that surpassed the subsistence level. Moreover, the obligations implied some kind of work outsourcing: part of the agricultural production redounded to the palace, which did not have to use additional resources to work these lands, handing the labour to do this over to the individual tenants. Again, we would be facing evidence of a direct taxation on land ownership, probably due to those specific productive needs of the administration, and the creation of more individual estates from common land. *o-na-te-re* of *ka-ma* included the *te-re-ta pe-re-qo-ta* (**Ep 613.5**), the priest *a-ke-re-u* (**Ep 613.7**), the *te-o-jo do-e-ra po-so-re-ja* (**Ep 613.12**), or the *ko-to-no-o-ko ko-tu-ro<sub>2</sub>* (**Ep 613.13**) and *pa-ra-ko* (**Ep 613.11**). Although we find the obligation to cultivate mainly associated with *ka-ma*, it was not exclusive to this category: in **Eb 338/Ep 704.7-8** we find that the Keybearer of *pa-ki-ja-ne*, *ka-pa-ti-ja*, failed in her obligation, *o-pe-ro-sa wo-zo-e*, to cultivate her *ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na*. Some people held *ka-ma* but with exemptions from land working, such as the *te-re-ta su-ko* (**Ep 613.4-5**). This could mean that he did not have to prepare and cultivate his *ka-ma* plot for the palace, perhaps allowing him to keep the harvest for himself

<sup>33</sup> See **PY Ed 236**.

<sup>34</sup> DEL FREO 2009, 47.

<sup>35</sup> ALONSO MORENO 2020, 264.



or use the land for something else (e.g., subleasing).

Land division for the creation of *ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na* and *ko-to-na* allowed the extension of the tax system to include agrarian property. More disposable plots also created more opportunities to gain access to agricultural wealth. However, these lands were only available to a few already privileged people, such as the *ko-to-no-o-ko*.

**The estates of the *te-re-ta*, the *ko-to-no-o-ko*, and the *da-mo*:  
taxation and palatial use of *pa-ki-ja-ne* land**

The kingdom of Pylos needed land for two main and intertwined purposes. Firstly, it was required to ensure the supply of agricultural surplus to feed palatial workers.<sup>36</sup> On the other hand, the land created desirable social allegiances and networks. Taxation over land production enabled the arrival of agricultural goods. The creation of plots and their allocation to individuals could have acted as an economic control tool. Some of these individuals were not landowners. By guaranteeing access to the social and economic benefits derived from land ownership, the palace rewarded the inner elite of the kingdom, mainly religious personnel associated with the official cult.

The palatial administration did not own land in *pa-ki-ja-ne*. However, it had the capacity to parcel it out, impose certain obligations on land tenure, control land allocation and, above all, benefit from the land thanks to taxation. *o-na-to* plots came from two types of owners: the *te-re-ta*, each with their individual plots called *ko-to-na ki-ti-me-na*, and the *damos* of *pa-ki-ja-ne*, who held the property of *ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na*. Both land categories were subject to taxation and allocated to individuals, benefiting private estates. Land division points to the collaboration between the central administration and the local powers, which would have been represented in this case by the *ko-to-no-o-ko*. In this context, their individual privileges and assets benefit from their relationship with the palace, which may have strengthened their position within the *damos*. Land division must also have required control over inheritance and ways of acquiring plots.

Due to the nature of the documentation, we are merely presented with a snapshot of the situation. Therefore, it is difficult to assess the evolution of the forms of property and trace the origins of the properties

<sup>36</sup> On this issue, see ALONSO MORENO 2020, 361-363.

of the landowners of *pa-ki-ja-ne*: the *te-re-ta*, the *damos*, and the *ko-to-no-o-ko*. The *te-re-ta* and *ko-to-no-o-ko* were individual landowners. However, the origins of their properties are not clear. We only know the *ko-to-no-o-ko* as tenants of the *damos*. They could also be *te-re-ta*, but not because of their role as *ko-to-no-o-ko*, as there are other characters that also held *ko-to-na ki-ti-me-na*, as we have already seen. Therefore, we do not know their original properties, probably because the palace did not tax them. The *damos*, represented by the *ko-to-no-o-ko*, acted as a collective landowner. The palace intervened in their communal properties, promoting the creation of individual plots for greater economic control and to stimulate agricultural production. These individual plots were leased as *o-na-to* to the *ko-to-no-o-ko* and many other characters, mainly the *te-o-jo do-e-ro/a*.

The economic and social relations created around land tenure were complex and not exempt from conflict, as we can discern from the dispute between *Eritha* and the *damos*. The *damos* owned the land held by *Eritha*. Although land division created more fiscal units, benefited private wealth, and stimulated taxation, it also generated economic and social struggle. Further research must be done to determine if these problems could have created a structural weakness in the Pylian economic system and irreconcilable differences within the landowning elites.

## Bibliography

- ADRADOS, F. R. 1994-1995 Notas de entrega, no catastro en *pa-ki-ja-na*, *Minos* 29-30, 117-134.
- ALONSO MORENO, C. V. 2014 Historia de un desequilibrio: exención y fraude fiscal en el reino de Pilo. In C. DEL CERRO LINARES, C. V. ALONSO MORENO, O. GONZÁLEZ HERRERO, L. PER HIMENO, S. MILÁN QUIÑONES DE LEÓN, J. ELICES OCÓN, A. MYSLOWSKA & A. VIAÑA GUTIÉRREZ (eds), *Economías, comercio y relaciones internacionales en el mundo antiguo*, 231-255.
- ALONSO MORENO, C. V. 2020 *El colapso de los Estados palaciales micénicos. Pilo como estudio de caso. Análisis interno, contexto suprarregional e implicaciones históricas*, Unpublished PhD thesis, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- CARLIER, P. 1987 À propos des *te-re-ta*. In *Tractata Mycenaea* 1985, 65-73.
- CHADWICK, J. 1972 The Mycenaean documents. In W. A. MACDONALD & G. E. RAPP (eds), *The Minnesota Messenia Expedition: reconstructing a Bronze Age regional environment*, 100-116.
- DE FIDIO, P. 1977 *I dosmoi pilii a Poseidon: una terra sacra di età micenea*, *Incunabula Graeca* 65.
- DE FIDIO, P. 1987 Palais et communautés de village. In *Tractata Mycenaea* 1985, 129-149.
- DEL FREO, M. 2005 *I censimenti di terreni nei testi in lineare B*.
- DEL FREO, M. 2009 Les obligations dans les listes de terrains de Pylos, *Ktèma* 34, 33-50.
- DUHOUX, Y. 2016 Récapitulatifs mycéniens: la série Ed de Pylos, *Kadmos* 55, 49-65.
- LUPACK, S. 2008 *The role of the religious sector in the economy of Late Bronze Age Mycenaean Greece*, BAR International Series 1858.
- LUPACK, S. 2011 A view from outside the palace: the sanctuary and the *damos* in Mycenaean economy and society, *AJA* 115, 207-217.
- LUPACK, S. 2016 *pu-ro, pa-ki-ja-ne*, and the worship of an ancestral *wanax*. In E. ALRAM-STERN, F. BLAKOLMER, S. DEGER-JALKOTZKY, R. LAFFINEUR & J. WEILHARTNER (eds), *Metaphysis. Ritual, myth and symbolism in the Aegean Bronze Age*, *Aegaeum* 39, 537-541.
- PALAIMA, T. G. 1995 The nature of Mycenaean *wanax*: non-Indoeuropean origins and priestly functions. In P. REHAK (ed.), *The role of the*

- ruler in the prehistoric Aegean*, *Aegaeum* 11, 119-143.
- PALAIMA, T. G. 2015 The Mycenaean mobilization of labor in agriculture and building projects. In P. STEINKELLER & M. HUDSON (eds), *Labor in the Ancient World. A Colloquium held at Hirschbach (Saxony), April 2005*, Institute for the Study of Long-term Economic Trends and the International Scholars Conference on Ancient Near Eastern Economies 5, 617-648.
- STAVRIANOPOULOU, E. 1989 *Untersuchungen zur Struktur des Reiches von Pylos. Die Stellung der Ortschaften im Lichte der Linear B-Texte*.
- ZURBACH, J. 2005 Les grandes institutions et la terre dans la société mycénienne. In J. C. MORENO GARCÍA (ed.), *L'agriculture institutionnelle en Egypte ancienne (Colloque de Lille, 2002)*, *Cahiers de recherches de l'institut de papyrologie et d'égyptologie de Lille* 25, 313-328.
- ZURBACH, J. 2006 L'impôt pesant sur la terre dans la société mycénienne: quelques réflexions. In M. PERNA (ed.), *Fiscality in Mycenaean and Near Eastern archives. Proceedings of the conference held at Soprintendenza Archivistica per la Campania, Naples, 21-23 October 2004*, *Studi egei e vicino-orientali* 3, 267-280.
- ZURBACH, J. 2016 Registros di terreni e testi fondiari. In *Manuale*, 349-372.
- ZURBACH, J. 2017a *Les hommes, la terre et la dette en Grèce c. 1400-500 a.C.*, *Scripta Antiqua* 95.
- ZURBACH, J. 2017b Les communautés rurales et le palais dans la Grèce mycénienne. In M. OLLER, J. PÀMIAS & C. VARIAS GARCÍA (eds), *Tierra, territorio y población en la Grecia antigua: aspectos institucionales y míticos*, 39-69.