

ANTONÍN BARTONĚK

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE PROBLEM OF LAND  
TENURE IN ANCIENT PYLOS

Our main source of information about Mycenaean agriculture is the Linear B Script, but recently deciphered,<sup>1</sup> and above all, tablets found in Pylos.<sup>2</sup> Taking into account pieces of information contained therein<sup>3</sup> we may distinguish in Pylos on principle two different types of land: *ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na* (probably „common land“) and *ki-ti-me-na ko-to-na* [perhaps „private land“ (?)]. *Ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na* was leased *pa-ra da-mo* („by the community“) first of all to so called *ko-to-no-o-ko*, who seem to have been predecessors of later nobility, as well as to individuals of different social categories who were in some way related to the religious cult (priests, priestesses, their slaves — or rather „servants“ (?) — and also the so called *te-o-jo do-e-ro*, or *do-e-ra*, i. e. servants of the god(ess), whose social standing is not quite clear yet). In exceptional cases figurate as leaseholders of common land also groups of people who likely were in servitude<sup>4</sup> of some degree, the character of the latter being unknown to us. Besides, common land included most likely also the *temenos* of the governor of Pylos and the *temenos* of the military commander (*wa-na-ka-te-ro te-me-no* and *ra-wa-ke-si-jo te-me-no*).

The extent of *ki-ti-me-na ko-to-na* was evidently much smaller than that of common land. Some of the holders of *ki-ti-me-na ko-to-na* were the *ko-to-no-o-ko*, mentioned already as leaseholders of *ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na*. The land that was leased to them by the community they were probably not permitted to transfer to sub-tenants, but with *ki-ti-me-na ko-to-na* they could evidently do what they liked. Among tenants of this category of land are mentioned first of all again servants of the god(ess), but we come across also different craftsmen and occasionally even people of higher social standing.

As there coexisted the two categories of land the leasehold relations became sometimes very complicated. Thus for instance, *ko-to-no-o-ko Ai-ti-jo-go* is a leaseholder of common land, requiring ca. 174 l of grain for sowing;<sup>4</sup> besides, however, he has 188 l of *ki-ti-me-na ko-to-na*, of which as much as 180 l he leases to one priest and five servants of the god(ess).<sup>5</sup> Most of the lessees of *Ai-ti-jo-go*, for their part, are not content with being only his tenants; they hire land from other holders of *ki-ti-me-na ko-to-na*, too (god's servant *Ta-ra-to* [or *Ta-ra<sub>2</sub>-to*] cultivates land leased to him at least by four different holders of *ki-ti-me-na ko-to-na*),<sup>6</sup> yes some of their real estates are even the property of the community.

The quoted facts present, no doubt, a considerably different picture of land tenure in the Mycenaean era from the picture we find in Homer. The disintegration of clan system, which is just in progress in Mycenaean society, leaves permanent traces both in the social structure of the population and in the relations pertaining to land tenure. The times that will be characterized by what we call the slave system of the antique type are still in distant future. That is also why we must draw with J. A. Lencman<sup>7</sup> a comparison between the slave

system in Mycenae and the social position of slaves in the civilizations of the Near East. But we find in Ancient Orient numerous analogies also with respect to land tenure, specially among the Hittites and in Mesopotamia. It is above all in the Hittite Law Codex that we can find a number of regulations corresponding to some items in the palace archive of Pylos, as L. R. Palmer has shown it.<sup>8</sup>

However, when undertaking such comparative work, it is always necessary to be on one's guard. One can hardly be too careful here, specially when transfer of specific social conditions to quite different and remote stages of social evolution is implied, as some experts nowadays do when they write about feudal features of Ancient Oriental society and when they consider some relations, characteristic of Hittite and of Mycenaean society, to be features of serfdom. To be sure, one can scarcely find any immediate connexions between the Hittite and Mycenaean social structure of the middle of the 2nd millennium B. C. on the one hand, and between social relations among Ancient Celts and Teutons shortly before the beginning of our era and in the early centuries after on the other hand, as Palmer tried to do. And yet, one cannot altogether exclude the possibility that future interpretation of social relations among the Ancients will have to admit of a kind of side-branch current, progressing, so to say, on the periphery of the slave system of the classical type, and transforming itself later into a basis on which the feudal society was organized<sup>9</sup>. The tertium comparationis concerning the Teutonic and Celtic analogies of Hittite and Mycenaean conditions would be, thus, based on pre-slave features, which sprang up from the era that witnessed the gradual disintegration of clan system, and have nothing to do with any presupposed specific features of the original Indo-European ethnical community, as Palmer may likely assume.

*Translated by S. Kostomlatský*

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> See *M. Ventris—J. Chadwick*, Evidence for Greek Dialect in the Mycenaean Archives, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 73 (1953), 84—103 [Czech reader may consult specially my articles Nynější stav v luštění krétského lineárního písma B, SPFFBU A 4 (1956), 108—122, Lineární písmo B a hegemonie Řeků na Krétě v pozdní době minojské, SPFFBU C 3 [1956], 145—149, The Linear B Sings 8-A and 25-A<sup>2</sup>, SPFFBU A 5 [1957], 45—62, a Dvě kapitoly z historie rozluštění lineárního písma B, *Listy filologické* 80 [1957], 1—9].

<sup>2</sup> See *E. L. Bennett, Jr.*, The Pylos Tablets, Texts of the Inscriptions Found, 1939—1954, Princeton 1955.

<sup>3</sup> Works dealing with Mycenaean agriculture are discussed in my bibliographical notes „Nejnovější práce o zemědělských poměrech v starém Pylu“, which appeared in this number of SPFFBU.

<sup>4</sup> Eb846, Ep301,2.

<sup>5</sup> En74, 11—18, Eo247, 1—7.

<sup>6</sup> Eo247,6; Eo351,2; Eo471,2; En74,15; En659,6.10.13.

<sup>7</sup> *J. A. Lencman*, Rabstvo v period vznikovenija polisa (a lecture read at the International Meeting of Ancient Historicians [held in Liblice from 24. to 26. April 1957]).

<sup>8</sup> *L. R. Palmer*, Mycenaean Texts from Pylos, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1954, 18—53b, esp. pp. 37sqq.; *L. R. Palmer*, *Achaeans and Indoeuropeans*, Oxford 1955, esp. pp. 10sqq.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. a similar view held by *E. N. Štajerman*, *Krizis rimskej imperiji*, and by *L. Varcl*, *O vývoji některých forem společenského vědomí v době císařské*, (lectures read in Liblice).

## ПРИСПĚVEK K OTÁZCE POZEMKOVÉ DRŽBY VE STARÉM PYLU

Autor si všimá ve svém článku protikladu mezi výrazy ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na (pravděpodobně „společná půda“) a ki-ti-me-na ko-to-na (snad „soukromá půda“[?]) — na pylských tabulkách, psaných lineárním písmem B, se tyto termíny objevují velmi často — a poukazuje na složitost vzájemných vztahů mezi držiteli obojího druhu půdy i na ekonomickou nevyhraněnost jejich sociálního postavení. Doby, kdy řecká společnost na sebe vezme formy otrokářského řádu klasického typu, jsou zřejmě ještě velmi vzdáleny, a tak lze vhodné paralely hledat spíše v starém Orientě (J. A. Lencman). Každé takové srovnávání skrývá ovšem v sobě jisté riziko, a to zvláště tehdy, je-li zároveň spojeno s přenášením specifických společenských vztahů do zcela odlišných vývojových období, jako to činí někteří badatelé, kteří rádi hovoří o feudálních rysech v společnostech starého Orientu a označují i některé zvláštní vztahy, typické pro mykénskou, a také pro hetitskou společnost, nevolnictvím. Hetitskou a mykénskou společenskou strukturu z poloviny 2. tisíciletí př. n. l. lze vskutku asi stěží bezprostředně srovnávat se společenskými vztahy u starých Keltů a Germánů z dob okolo začátku naší éry, jak se o to pokouší L. R. Palmer; naproti tomu nelze však docela vylučovat možnost, naznačenou v jiné souvislosti E. N. Štajermanovou a L. Varclem, že napříště bude třeba připouštět při výkladu starověkých společenských vztahů i existenci jakéhosi vedlejšího proudu, který probíhal jen jakoby na okraji vyspělé soustavy otrokářských vztahů klasického typu a jenž se stal později základem, na němž byl vybudován řád feudální.

### ЗАМЕТКА К ВОПРОСУ О ЗЕМЕЛЬНОЙ СОБСТВЕННОСТИ В ДРЕВНЕМ ПИЛЕ

В своей статье автор противопоставляет выражения ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na („общая земля“)(?) и ki-ti-me-na ko-to-na („частная земельная собственность“)(?) — эти термины часто встречаются на пильских таблицах, написанных линейным письмом В — и указывает на сложность взаимоотношений между землевладельцами обеих категорий, а также на экономическую неопределенность их социального положения. Эпоха, в которую греческое общество примет форму рабовладельческого строя классического типа, является еще очень отдаленной, и таким образом искать соответствующие параллели приходится скорее на древнем Востоке (И. А. Ленцман). Любое такое сравнение является, однако, довольно рискованным, особенно тогда, когда оно соединено с перенесением специфических общественных отношений в совершенно различные периоды развития, как это делают некоторые исследователи, охотно говорящие о феодальных чертах в обществе древнего Востока и обозначающие некоторые особые отношения, типичные для микенского, а также для хеттского общества, крепностным правом.

Трудно действительно сравнивать хеттскую и микенскую общественную структуру середины второго тысячелетия до н. э. с общественными отношениями древних кельтов и германцев (в начале нашей эры) — как это думается делать Л. Р. Пальмер. Не исключена, однако, возможность, указанная при иных обстоятельствах Е. Н. Штайерман и Л. Варцлем, что в дальнейшем необходимо будет допустить при объяснении общественных отношений в древние времена и существование какого-то побочного течения, происшедшего как бы вне рамок главной системы рабовладельческих отношений классического типа, ставшего позднее основанием феодального строя.

*Перевела: Е. Пуцлякова*