

Did the terms ,wanax' and ,lāwāgetās' already exist before the emergence of the Mycenaean palatial polities?*

von FLORIAN RUPPENSTEIN, Freiburg i. Br.

Abstract: The terms ,wanax' (*wa-na-ka*) and ,lāwāgetās' (*ra-wa-ke-ta*) are not only documented in Linear B records but also in very similar form in a Phrygian inscription on a façade monument or rock-cut shrine in Midas City. This so-called Midas monument dates to the years around 700 BC or even later. According to recent linguistic research, the Phrygian terms were not adopted from the Greek language, as often assumed in earlier studies, but constitute a common Greek-Phrygian linguistic heritage. The plausibility of this result of linguistic research is evaluated from an archaeological point of view and the possible consequences for our understanding of the development and structure of the Mycenaean society are discussed.

Scholars are forced to take notice of the results of neighbouring disciplines, especially if these results have major consequences for their own field of research. Almost all scientists would probably agree with this statement. However, modern scholarly working practice is time-consuming and does not always allow for researchers being informed about new developments in adjoining research areas. As a consequence, scientific results of related disciplines are sometimes neglected, even if they may have a great impact on one's own investigations. My starting point for this paper is a case in point: if the theory of the linguist Claude Brixhe (for which see below) regarding the origin of the Phrygian words for ,wanax' and ,lāwāgetās' is correct, it would have enormous implications for our understanding of the development and structure of Mycenaean society.¹ Nevertheless, despite its potential importance, Brixhe's hypothesis has not yet been discussed by scholars whose interest is focused on Mycenaean society. The principal aim of my article is therefore to call attention to Brixhe's proposal, in the hope of promoting a discussion about its consequences.² Furthermore, the plausibility of the theory is reviewed from an archaeological point of view and its importance for the reconstruction of Mycenaean society is examined. A linguistic analysis is beyond my competence as an archaeologist.

* I would like to thank Heiner Eichner and Oswald Panagl for hints and comments. They are, of course, not responsible for the opinions expressed in this article.

¹ For ,wanax' and ,lāwāgetās' in Mycenaean society, see Wundsam 1968, 16-65; Carlier 1984, 44-107; Palaima 1995; 2006. For short recent summaries, see Shelmerdine 2008a, 127-131; Shelmerdine/Bennet 2008, 292-294.

² For a first short discussion, see Ruppenstein 2012, 49.

‚Wanax‘ and ‚lāwāgetās‘ in the Phrygian language

Brixhe formulates the quintessence of his hypothesis as follows: „The odds are that Midas’ titlature in M-01a, *Midai lavagtaei vanaktei*, where appear two functions that are also found in the Mycenaean Greek documents (*lawagetās* and *wanax*), does not correspond to Greek borrowings, but rather reflects the existence of a common heritage“.³ The inscription, in which Midas is referred to as ‚lāwāgetās‘ and as ‚wanax‘, is engraved on the so-called Midas Monument⁴ in Midas City, modern Yazılıkaya or Midas Şehir in the province of Eskişehir.⁵ The Midas Monument belongs to the Phrygian façade monuments or rock-cut shrines,⁶ which are characterised by large relief-decorated façades. The monument was discovered by the English traveller W.M. Leake in 1800.⁷ The first scholarly edition of the inscription was published in 1862 by A.D. Mordtmann.⁸ The date of the Midas Monument and its inscription is still controversial. One group of scholars assumes a date around 700 BC, while others prefer a date early in the sixth century BC. The archaicism of the writing is used as argument for an early date,⁹ the geometric relief decoration of the façade as an argument for a late one.¹⁰ It is moreover still disputed whether the inscription refers to the famous king Midas, who was active in the late eighth century and is mentioned in Assyrian sources as Mita of Mushki,¹¹ or to another person with the same name.¹² However, these questions are not of crucial importance in this context.

The Midas inscription is as follows: „Ates arkievais akenanogavas Midai lavagtaei vanaktei edaes“,¹³ and in Brixhe’s translation: „Ates...has dedicated [this monument] to Midas, lavagtas and vanax“.¹⁴ A close connection between the Mycenaean and the Phrygian terms is obvious. Most scholars construe this convergence as Phrygian borrowing from the Greek language. This view was most forcefully substantiated by M. Lejeune who based his opinion particularly on the

³ Brixhe 2004a, 780. M-01a refers to the catalogue entry in Brixhe/Lejeune 1984, 6-9.

⁴ Gabriel 1965, 51-72; Haspels 1971, 73-76; Berndt-Ersöz 2006, 232-234 cat. 30.

⁵ The ancient name of the site is unknown.

⁶ Haspels 1971, 73-93; Berndt-Ersöz 2006.

⁷ Huxley 1959, 87; Gabriel 1965, 51.

⁸ Brixhe/Lejeune 1984, 6 with reference. Mordtmann’s reading of the fifth word of the inscription (‚lavagtaei‘, see below) was still inaccurate: *ibidem* 8. The correct reading of the letters for the consonants G and L was firmly established by Lejeune 1969, 23-30. An incorrect reading of ‚lavagtaei‘ was published for the last time in 1971: Haspels 1971, 289 no. 1.

⁹ Brixhe/Lejeune 1984, 6.

¹⁰ Berndt-Ersöz 2006, 40. 98f.

¹¹ Cassola 1997, 139-141; Brixhe 2004a, 777; Wittke 2004, 106-130.

¹² Berndt-Ersöz 2006, 129-134.

¹³ Brixhe/Lejeune 1984, 5-8 cat. M-01a.

¹⁴ Brixhe 2004a, 786.

word ,lavagtaei' because he assessed agent nouns with -ta as Greek innovation. Yet he believed that the word ,vanaktei' alone could not prove the hypothesis that the terms in the Midas inscription are borrowings from the Greek language.¹⁵ Brixhe argued against this view for the first time in 1990 and in more detail in 2002. He demonstrated that agent nouns with -ta could well be a common innovation in Greek and Phrygian.¹⁶ Furthermore, Brixhe pointed out that the term ,vanakt-' was deeply rooted in the Phrygian language as shown by the existence of the Palaeo-Phrygian compound ,modrovanak'¹⁷ and the probably theophoric Neo-Phrygian names Ουαναξος, Ουαναξων and Ουαναξιων.¹⁸ These facts were interpreted by Brixhe as indicating an autochthonous origin of the word. Additionally, he could not ascertain any historical reasons for a transfer of the Greek terms into the Phrygian language. Brixhe concluded that the view, according to which the Phrygian terms are borrowings from the Greek language, is hellenocentric.¹⁹

Brixhe's explanation of the terms ,lāwāgetās/lavagta-' and ,wanax/vanakt-' as common Greco-Phrygian heritage was accepted by I. Hajnal who inferred that the word ,wanax' must be of Indo-European origin²⁰ and cannot be a borrowing from the Minoan language as often assumed. Based on that assumption he proposed an Indo-European etymology for ,wanax'.²¹

The assessment of the words ,lāwāgetās/lavagta-' and ,wanax/vanakt-' as autochthonous in Greek and in Phrygian accords well with the generally accepted fact that these languages are closely related. Especially significant in this respect is the existence of common linguistic innovations in Phrygian and Greek. Among the exclusive isoglosses are the stem ,kako-' and the pronoun ,auto-'.²² It is noteworthy that the Greeks of the classical period were aware of the similarity of Phrygian and Greek words as is shown by a statement of Socrates in the Platonic dialogue Cratylus (410a).

¹⁵ Lejeune 1972, 342-344.

¹⁶ Brixhe 1990, 73f.; 2002, 68.

¹⁷ Brixhe/Lejeune 1984, 21-23 cat. M-04.

¹⁸ Brixhe 1990, 75; 2002, 68.

¹⁹ Brixhe 1990, 74; 2002, 68.

²⁰ Earlier proposals for an Indo-European ancestry of the word ,wanax/ῶναξ' are Puhvel 1956 and Szemerényi 1979, 215-217.

²¹ Hajnal 1998, 64-69. The Indo-European origin of the term ,wanax' was accepted by Palaima 2006, 53-62, who, however, suggested a different etymology. In his earlier writings Palaima (1995, 127) was a proponent of a Minoan origin of the term ,wanax'. A Minoan ancestry of the word ,wanax' was again postulated by Hiller 2011, 144f.

²² Neumann 1988, 10f.; Brixhe 2004a, 780; Panagl 2005, 485f. 489f.

Borrowing of the terms ,wanax' and ,lāwāgetās' by the Phrygians in the southern Balkans during the Late Bronze Age?

As an intermediate result it can be stated that the linguistic evidence does not demonstrate a transmission of the Greek words ,wanax' and ,lāwāgetās' into the Phrygian language, to say the least. It remains to be examined whether the archaeological evidence could support the hypothesis of borrowing. There are two possible regions and periods for such a transfer: the southern Balkans during the Late Bronze Age and Asia Minor during the Early Iron Age. This is because the Phrygians migrated at some point from the southern Balkans to Asia Minor. The prime evidence for this event is linguistic. The close relationship between Greek and Phrygian demonstrates that the speakers of these languages once lived next to each other. On the other hand, the clear difference between Phrygian and the Hittite-Luwian branch of the Indo-European language family shows that Phrygian-speaking communities cannot have been present in Anatolia until late in the second millennium BC.²³ It follows that the speakers of the Phrygian or Proto-Phrygian language settled somewhere in the southern Balkans during the palatial period of the Mycenaean culture. The linguistic evidence is supported by ancient Greek writers. According to Herodotus (7,73) the Phrygians once settled next to the Macedonians and then migrated from Europe to Asia Minor. In Europe they were called Briges. Strabo (7,3,2) also reports that the Briges and the Phrygians are the same people and that they left Europe. Moreover, the archaeological data from Gordion, the Phrygian capital in central Anatolia, seem to indicate a migration event according to the convincing interpretation of the excavators.²⁴ With the beginning of the Early Iron Age (Gordion phase 7B)²⁵ around 1100 BC, diverse new cultural traits without any predecessors in the local Late Bronze Age (LBA) appear at the same time. These are new building techniques and plans as well as a new exclusively handmade pottery.²⁶ Even though this class of handmade pottery shows only general similarities with southeast European assemblages of handmade pottery, it is completely different from the LBA pottery of Gordion. During the LBA phases 8-9 small vessel types were usually thrown on the potter's wheel.²⁷ Looking at the material culture of Gordion 7B in isolation, an explanation other than migration for the new features could probably be proposed, but in the

²³ Neumann 1988, 4f.

²⁴ Voigt/Henrickson 2000a, 354-356; 2000b, 42-46; Rose 2012a, 2; 2012b, 234.

²⁵ The phases are defined according to the Yassihöyük stratigraphic sequence: Voigt/Henrickson 2000a, 331 tab. 17. 1; 2000b, 41 tab. 1. The chronology of Early Iron Age Gordion is unaffected by the re-dating of the Early Phrygian destruction from ca. 700 to 800 BC. Cf. Rose/Darbyshire 2011; Rose 2012b, 231-234.

²⁶ Voigt/Henrickson 2000a, 332-341; 2000b, 42f.

²⁷ Voigt/Henrickson 2000a, 342.

light of the unequivocal linguistic evidence it seems preferable to connect them to the arrival of the Phrygians.²⁸

It is unfortunately impossible to know exactly where in the southern Balkans the settlement area of the Phrygian-speaking communities was during the LBA. Bulgaria, the southern part of former Yugoslavia, and the north of present-day Greece are the most probable territories.²⁹ A recent study has plausibly shown that contacts between Bulgaria and the Mycenaean world were most intense during the LH IIB and LH IIIA1 phases in the 15th and early 14th centuries.³⁰ The contacts are primarily evidenced by swords and spear heads of the Aegean type from diverse Bulgarian locations.³¹ A few LH IIIA1 sherds from Dragojna on the northern fringe of the Rhodope Mountains are a recent addendum to the Aegean finds from the territory of present-day Bulgaria. According to the results of neutron activation analysis the Mycenaean pottery from Dragojna was produced in the region of Volos in southern Thessaly.³² A quite surprising indication for some contact between the southeast Balkans and the eastern Mediterranean during the Mycenaean palatial period was the discovery of a ceremonial stone axe or sceptre with parallels in Bulgaria and Romania on the Uluburun wreck,³³ which sunk off the southwest coast of Asia Minor in the second half of the 14th century.³⁴

Two Mycenaean stirrup jars were found in a cemetery at Faia Petra in the eastern part of Greek Macedonia near the Bulgarian border. That which has been published can be assigned to the end of LH IIIA2 or the beginning of LH IIIB1, in other words to the years around 1300 BC.³⁵ The burial customs at Faia Petra

²⁸ Genz 2003, 185-188, doubts that migrations to central Anatolia happened during the Early Iron Age, though he does not take the linguistic evidence into account.

²⁹ The names of modern states are used in this survey for convenience. It goes without saying that the territories of modern states do not correspond to those of ancient cultures. Interaction between diverse regions of the southern Balkans is indicated by similarities in the local handmade pottery assemblages; cf. Horejs 2007, 26-41. 328-346. The present overview concentrates on the Mycenaean palatial period (LH IIIA-LH IIIB) because this is the most probable era for a transmission of the terms ,wanax' and ,lāwāgetās' during the LBA.

³⁰ Bozhinova et al. 2013, 77-84.

³¹ Krauß 2005; Doncheva 2011, 89; Bozhinova et al. 2013, 86f. For spear heads, see Höckmann 2007.

³² Bozhinova et al. 2013, 67-77.

³³ Buchholz/Weisgerber 2005; Yalçın et al. 2005, 608 cat. 133; Doncheva 2011, 90 with further references.

³⁴ The date is based on integrated tree-ring and radiocarbon dating: Manning et al. 2009. Some LH IIIA2 vessels were found on board: Yalçın et al. 2005, 609f. cat. 134-136.

³⁵ It is a stemmed stirrup jar with a broad base that can be classified as Furumark Type (FT) 167: Valla 2007, 368f. fig. 18. FT 167 stirrup jars are normally dated to LH IIIB but the piece from Faia Petra is not a characteristic example of FT 167 but typologically quite similar to

seem not to be influenced by Mycenaean habits. The deceased were placed in stone enclosures with rectangular, hut-like outlines. Most of the grave goods are local products. In central Macedonia some Mycenaean pottery of the palatial period has been found in settlements. The best explored of these are Kastanas, Assiros and the Thessaloniki Toumba.³⁶ The earliest imports in central Macedonia to the north of the Chalkidiki can be dated to the phase LH IIIA2. A local manufacture of Mycenaean-type pottery started in this region during phase LH IIIB.³⁷ However, the quantity was still rather low in comparison with the large-scale production of local Mycenaean pottery in the subsequent LH IIIC period.³⁸ A substantial amount of Mycenaean pottery of the palatial period, especially of phase LH IIIB,³⁹ was found in some western Macedonian sites in the prefecture of Kozani. The Mycenaean pottery finds are from grave as well as from settlement contexts. The region's most important LBA cemetery is Kozani-Leivadia with 29 pit graves with single burials. Fourteen of these graves were equipped with at least one Mycenaean vessel.⁴⁰ Despite the relatively large number of Mycenaean imports the burial customs remained unaffected by Mycenaean influences. Cemeteries comparable to Kozani-Leivadia with single inhumations in pit graves, which are arranged in rows, did not exist in the Mycenaean core regions during the palatial period.

The southern part of former Yugoslavia need not to be integrated in this survey of Mycenaean finds in the southern Balkans because there is no clear archaeological evidence for contact between this region and the Mycenaean culture during the palatial period.

To sum up, the archaeological evidence indicates that there was some contact between the southern Balkans and the Mycenaean world during the palatial period. Interestingly enough, according to current knowledge, exchange be-

FT 166 stirrup jars, which were produced during LH IIIA2. The relative dating of the stirrup jar accords well with the results of the radiocarbon measurements on bone material from Faia Petra that produced a date range from 1400 to 1200 BC. A statistical analysis model provided date ranges between 1410-1309 and 1375-1264, both with 95.4% probability: Valla et al. 2013, 233 n. 17.

³⁶ Jung 2002, 230-237; Pavúk/Horejs 2012, 130-134 (Horejs) with references. For an overview of the development of Kastanas, see Hänsel 2002. For Assiros, see Wardle/Wardle 2007. For Thessaloniki Toumba, see Andreou/Psaraki 2007.

³⁷ Jung 2002, 244.

³⁸ For a recent list of Mycenaean pottery finds in Macedonia and adjacent areas, see Pavúk/Horejs 2012, 141 map 6; 178-180 (Horejs).

³⁹ Karamitrou-Mentesidi 2003, 187 fig. 14 (Sparto); 188 figs. 15. 16 (Servia-Kolitsaki); 190 fig. 19 (Trigoniko-Phtelia).

⁴⁰ Karamitrou-Mentesidi 2003, 172f. 180-182 figs. 4-6 tab. 1. Cf. Pavúk/Horejs 2012, 135. 142 (Horejs) with further references.

tween the territory of present-day Bulgaria and Mycenaean Greece reached a peak just before and at the beginning of the palatial period and declined afterwards. The larger number of Mycenaean finds in western and central Macedonia, rather than in the more northern and eastern regions, probably reflects more intense communication. Taking the geographical position of the discussed areas into consideration this result is hardly a surprise. However, the archaeological evidence provides no indication for social change in any of the regions of the southern Balkans that were stimulated by contacts with the Mycenaeans. Archaeologically this is most clearly visible in the unchanged burial customs. Moreover, contrary to the situation in Mycenaean Greece, there is not the slightest evidence for monumental architecture in the southern Balkans during the 14th and 13th centuries. In all likelihood the communities in the southern Balkans were politically and socially far less complexly organised than the Mycenaean palatial polities. It may be assumed that during the LBA the southern Balkans were inhabited by members of pre-state communities of comparatively small scale. It would be hard to explain why the leaders of these communities should have taken over the designations of the two most important political officials in the Mycenaean palatial states. To conclude, the archaeological evidence does not support the assumption that the terms ,wanax' and ,lāwāgetās' could have been borrowed by the Phrygians in the southern Balkans during the LBA.⁴¹

Borrowing of the terms ,wanax' and ,lāwāgetās' by the Phrygians in Asia Minor during the Early Iron Age?

There is no clear archaeological evidence for Greco-Phrygian interrelations in Asia Minor until the eighth century BC. A borrowing of the terms ,wanax' and ,lāwāgetās' by the Phrygians in the early first millennium is therefore unlikely. The earliest Greek pottery imports from Gordion are a few fragments of Corinthian *kotylai* that can be dated to the second half of the eighth century.⁴² This date corresponds to the reign of the famous king Midas for whom contacts with Greece are attested by later written sources.⁴³ According to Herodotos (1, 14)

⁴¹ An adoption of the terms by the Phrygians in Macedonia during the LBA was proposed by Huxley 1959, 97-99. Panagl (2005, 486. 490) seems to hold a similar view.

⁴² The earliest fragment is probably Late Geometric and can therefore be dated roughly to the third quarter of the eighth century: DeVries 2005, 37-39 fig. 4-3. The other fragments are Early Protocorinthian: DeVries 2005, 39 fig. 4-3; 42 fig. 4-6. Cf. Rose 2012b, 245. The Early Protocorinthian phase is conventionally dated between 720 and 690 BC. Cf. Coldstream 1968, 330.

⁴³ For a summary of the evidence, see Wittke 2004, 219-225.

Midas sent his throne as a votive offering to the sanctuary of Apollon at Delphi.⁴⁴ Relations between Phrygians and Greeks during the eighth century are furthermore indicated by the similarity of the Greek and the Phrygian alphabets.⁴⁵

The greatest obstacle for the hypothesis that the terms ‚wanax‘ and ‚lāwāgetās‘ were adopted by Midas or another Phrygian king in the eighth century⁴⁶ is the fact that the terms had in all likelihood lost the precise political meaning which they had in the Mycenaean palatial period.⁴⁷ The most important source for the use of the word ἄναξ in the early first millennium are the Homeric epics. In the epics the word does not any more designate a certain office bearer, but has become an honorary title used for diverse gods and kings. Also some mortals who are not kings are called ἄναξ, for example Aeneas in the Iliad (5,311) and the seer Teiresias in the Odyssey (11,144 and 151).⁴⁸ The word ‚lāwāgetās‘ is an even more problematic case. It does not appear at all in the Homeric epics⁴⁹ and only a few times in other Greek writings in the form of λαγέτας, notably in the Pindaric Odes (O. 1,89; P. 3,85; P. 4,107). Λαγέτας is normally translated as ‚leader of the people‘. Yet this is not a certain office holder but a rather unspecific title. It is hard to see why Midas should have chosen these two Greek words as designations for his royalty. In contrast to ἄναξ and λαγέτας, the terms ‚lavagta-‘ and ‚vanakt-‘ in the inscription on the Midas monument seem to have a precise meaning. They characterise Midas as king as the term ‚wanax‘ did in regard to the Mycenaean rulers of the palatial period.

Furthermore, the Phrygian kingdom under the reign of Midas was much more powerful than the small Greek *poleis* on the west coast of Asia Minor. It seems therefore hardly possible to find convincing reasons why the Phrygians should have been so impressed by the Greeks that they decided to call their king both ἄναξ and λαγέτας.⁵⁰

To sum up, a borrowing of the terms ‚wanax‘ and ‚lāwāgetās‘ by the Phrygians in the eighth century is at least as unlikely as a borrowing during the LBA in the southeast Balkans.

⁴⁴ Cf. DeVries/Rose 2012.

⁴⁵ Brixhe 2004a, 781; 2004b.

⁴⁶ This is the view of Cassola 1997, 145f.

⁴⁷ This is the reason why Lejeune (1972, 341. 344) dated the borrowing of the terms in pre-Homeric times.

⁴⁸ For ἄναξ in the Homeric epics, see Carlier 1984, 215-221.

⁴⁹ According to Hajnal (1998, 38f.) the word could be missing because it is metrically incompatible with the hexameter.

⁵⁰ Cf. Brixhe 2002, 70.

Consequences for the reconstruction of the development and organisation of the Mycenaean society

It can be concluded that Brixhe's explanation of the terms ,wanax/vanakt-' and ,lāwāgetās/lavagta-' as autochthonous in Greek as well as in Phrygian is the most plausible, not only from a linguistic but also from an archaeological and historical point of view. The close relationship between Phrygian and Greek is an almost unnoticed, though nevertheless important reason for accepting the theory that communities speaking Greek or Proto-Greek migrated at some point from the north to the southernmost parts of the Balkan Peninsula, i.e. central and southern Greece. This is because, according to common linguistic reasoning, close affinity between two languages implies geographical proximity at some point in their histories. A migration from the north must be assumed because there is no indication that Proto-Phrygian speaking communities ever lived in central or southern Greece. In other words, central and southern Greece can be excluded as the area where Proto-Phrygian and Proto-Greek speakers were in contact. There are more linguistic reasons that strongly support the hypothesis of a migration of Greek speakers to their subsequent settlement area, which need not to be repeated here.⁵¹ It is perhaps not by chance that some supporters of a contrary view avoid an intense discussion of the linguistic evidence.⁵²

It is probably a natural tendency that scholars are often inclined to believe that their field of expertise has the highest explanatory potential for the subjects the scholars themselves are interested in. That is not, however, always the case. Therefore, if problem-solving is at the centre of scholarly interest, one has to accept that other areas of research than one's own sometimes provide more decisive evidence for certain problems. A case in point is the usually controversially debated issue of migration. It is almost always possible to interpret the archaeological record differently with regard to migration, whereas the linguistic evidence is often much more conclusive. Thus it should be no problem for archaeologists to accept the priority of linguistic research results for this topic.

The most likely period for the arrival of Greek speaking communities in their subsequent home country remains to my mind the transition from EH II to EH III in the second half of the third millennium, as was proposed more than fifty

⁵¹ For a recent statement on this point by an Indo-Europeanist, see Meier-Brügger 2007.

⁵² E.g. Forsén 1992. Forsén (1992, 15) does not seriously discuss the linguistic reasons in favour of the migration hypothesis: „Following Morris, who rejects altogether the idea that ,Indo-Europeans' exist other than as a group of languages [...], I will not pursue this issue any further.“

years ago by J.L. Caskey.⁵³ This is, however, not the place to discuss this controversial subject in detail.⁵⁴

In any event, it can be deduced that the migrating Greek-speaking groups brought the terms ‚wanax‘ and ‚lāwāgetās‘ to their new settlement area. If the date of their arrival in Greece is correctly estimated, it follows that both these terms were in use throughout EH III, the Middle Helladic and the pre-palatial Mycenaean periods. The existence of the words implies the existence of office holders who were referred to as ‚wanax‘ and ‚lāwāgetās‘ during the just-mentioned periods. Unfortunately, there is no possibility of reconstructing their duties and functions. Moreover, their functions and duties may have changed considerably during the centuries the titles were in use. The etymology of the word ‚lāwāgetās‘ suggests the meaning ‚leader of the people‘.⁵⁵ If this meaning originally had a military connotation, which is possible but not certain, it could have lost that connotation at some point of historical development. With the establishment of the Mycenaean palatial polities both the ‚wanax‘ and the ‚lāwāgetās‘ were integrated into the new political system. This continuation of a common pre-palatial form of political organisation may explain the fact why a ‚wanax‘ as well as a ‚lāwāgetās‘ existed in every Mycenaean kingdom.⁵⁶ Furthermore, it becomes understandable why the Mycenaean kingdoms were not organised as pure monarchies but as a form of government between monarchy and diarchy.⁵⁷ This is because there was a single highest office holder, the ‚wanax‘, but there was also a single second highest office bearer, the ‚lāwāgetās‘. K. Wundsam and P. Carlier are among the few scholars who paid attention to this remarkable fact. Wundsam saw the potential problems connected to this kind of political organisation but did not elaborate on that point.⁵⁸ Carlier assumed that the ‚lāwāgetās‘ would not necessarily have restricted the power of

⁵³ Caskey 1960, esp. 302.

⁵⁴ The theory is not generally accepted today. For a recent summary of the problem with references, see Pullen 2008, 38-41. Cf. Forsén 2010, 54. The results of recent genome analyses, according to which Europe was affected by a major migration event in the mid third millennium (Allentoft et al. 2015; Haak et al. 2015), will certainly have an impact on the understanding of the EH II/III transition.

⁵⁵ Shelmerdine 2008a, 129f.

⁵⁶ For the hypothesis of the existence of one single Mycenaean kingdom, see Eder/Jung in press. The existence of a ‚wanax‘ and a ‚lāwāgetās‘ in every Mycenaean palace cannot, in the light of the evidence presented here, be used in favour of this theory.

⁵⁷ Cf. Ruppenstein 2012, 48.

⁵⁸ Wundsam 1968, 58: „Wenn man sich ferner vor Augen hält, daß die Einführung einer Doppelherrschaft, wobei die beiden Leiter des Staates ähnliche Funktionen ausübten, nicht gerade zur Stärkung der Zentralgewalt beigetragen haben kann [...].“ Wundsam’s (1968, 58) interpretation of the ‚lāwāgetās‘ as the representative of the aristocracy vis-à-vis the ruling dynasty is, however, not supported by the available evidence.

the ,wanax' because he may have been the crown prince.⁵⁹ However, history is full of examples for bloody conflicts between kings and crown princes. In any event, it seems likely that a political constellation with a highest official and a single second highest was a potentially instable one. The fact that Midas is called both ,vanakt-' and ,lavagta-' in the inscription on the Midas Monument indicates that the Phrygian kings succeeded in merging the two most powerful functions at some point.⁶⁰ The Mycenaean ,wanakes' may have had the same intention, but they had not yet succeeded when the palaces were destroyed. The potentially instable power structure of the Mycenaean kingdoms may have contributed to their downfall.

Bibliography

Allentoft et al. 2015

M. E. Allentoft/M. Sikora/K.-G. Sjögren/S. Rasmussen/M. Rasmussen/J. Stenderup/P.B. Damgaard/H. Schroeder/T. Ahlström/L. Vinner/A.-S. Malaspinas / A. Margaryan/T. Higham/D. Chivall/N. Lynnerup/L. Harvig/J. Baron/P. Della Casa/P. Dabrowski/P.R. Duffy / A.V. Ebel / A. Epimakhov / K. Frei / M. Furmanek / T. Gralak / A. Gromov / S. Gronkiewicz / G. Grupe / T. Hajdu / R. Jarysz / V. Khartanovich / A. Khokhlov / V. Kiss / J. Kolár / A. Kriiska / I. Lasak / C. Longhi / G. McGlynn / A. Merovicus / L. Pospieszny / T.D. Price / L. Saag / M. Sablin / N. Shishlina / V. Smrčka / V.I. Soenov / V. Szeverényi / G. Tóth / S.V. Trifanova / L. Varul / M. Vicze / L. Yepiskoposyan / V. Zhitenev / L. Orlando / T. Sicheritz-Pontén / S. Brunak / R. Nielsen / K. Kristiansen / E. Willerslev, Population Genomics of Bronze Age Eurasia, *Nature* 522, (11 June) 2015, 167-172 <doi:10.1038/nature14507> .

Andreou/Psaraki 2007

S. Andreou/K. Psaraki, Tradition and Innovation in the Bronze Age Pottery of the Thessaloniki Toumba: Food and Drink Consumption and ,Tableware' Ceramics, in: Todorova et al. 2007, 397-420.

Berndt-Ersöz 2006

S. Berndt-Ersöz, Phrygian Rock-Cut Shrines. Structure, Function, and Cult Practice (Leiden 2006)

Blakolmer et al. 2011

F. Blakolmer/C. Reinholdt/J. Weilhartner/G. Nightingale (eds.), Österreichische Forschungen zur Ägäischen Bronzezeit 2009. Akten der Tagung vom 6. bis 7. März 2009 am Fachbereich Altertumswissenschaften der Universität Salzburg (Vienna 2011).

Bozhinova et al. 2013

E. Bozhinova/R. Jung/H. Mommsen, Dragojna. Eine spätbronzezeitliche Höhensiedlung in den bulgarischen Rhodopen mit importierter mykenischer Keramik, *AM* 125, 2010 (2013), 45-97.

⁵⁹ Carlier 1984, 107.

⁶⁰ Cf. Lejeune 1972, 344; Brixhe 2002, 71.

Brixhe 1990

C. Brixhe, Comparaison et langues faiblement documentées: l'exemple du phrygien et de ses voyelles longues, in: *La reconstruction des laryngales*, Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège 253 (Paris 1990) 59-99.

Brixhe 2002

C. Brixhe, Achéens et Phrygiens en Asie Mineure: approche comparative de quelques données lexicales, in: M. Fritz/S. Zeilfelder (eds.), *Novalis Indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann*, Grazer Vergleichende Arbeiten 17 (Graz 2002) 49-73.

Brixhe 2004a

C. Brixhe, Phrygian, in: R.D. Woodard (ed.), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages* (Cambridge 2004) 777-788 = C. Brixhe, Phrygian, in: R.D. Woodard (ed.), *The Ancient Languages of Asia Minor* (Cambridge 2008) 69-80.

Brixhe 2004b

C. Brixhe, Nouvelle chronologie anatolienne et date d'élaboration des alphabets grec et phrygien, *CRAI* 2004, 271-288.

Brixhe/Lejeune 1984

C. Brixhe/M. Lejeune, *Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes* (Paris 1984).

Buchholz/Weisgerber 2005

H.-G. Buchholz/G. Weisgerber, Prominenz mit Steingerät, in: Yalçın et al. 2005, 149-153.

Carlier 1984

P. Carlier, *La royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre* (Strasbourg 1984).

Caskey 1960

J.L. Caskey, The Early Helladic Period in the Argolid, *Hesperia* 29, 1960, 285-303.

Cassola 1997

F. Cassola, Rapporti tra Greci e Frigi al tempo di Mida, in: R. Gusmani/M. Salvini/P. Vannicelli (eds.), *Frigi e Frigio. Atti del 1° simposio internazionale*, Roma, 16-17 ottobre 1995 (Rome 1997) 131-152.

Coldstream 1968

J.N. Coldstream, *Greek Geometric Pottery. A Survey of Ten Local Styles and Their Chronology* (London 1968).

DeVries 2005

K. DeVries, Greek Pottery and Gordion Chronology, in: L. Kealhofer (ed.), *The Archaeology of Midas and the Phrygians. Recent Work at Gordion* (Philadelphia 2005) 36-55.

DeVries/Rose 2012

K. DeVries/C.B. Rose, The Throne of Midas? Delphi and the Power Politics of Phrygia, Lydia, and Greece, in: Rose 2012c, 189-200.

Doncheva 2011

D. Doncheva, Ein Blick von Norden: Einflüsse der mykenischen Welt auf den thrakischen Raum, in: Blakolmer et al. 2011, 81-95.

Eder/Jung in press

B. Eder/R. Jung, ,Unus pro omnibus, omnes pro uno': The Mycenaean Palace System, in: F. Ruppenstein/J. Weilhartner (eds.), Tradition and Innovation in the Mycenaean Palatial Polities (Vienna in press).

Forsén 1992

J. Forsén, The Twilight of the Early Helladics. A Study of the Disturbances in East-Central and Southern Greece towards the End of the Early Bronze Age, SIMA Pocket-book 116 (Jonsered 1992).

Forsén 2010

J. Forsén, Early Bronze Age: Mainland Greece, in: E.C. Cline (ed.), The Oxford Handbook of the Bronze Age Aegean (Oxford 2010) 53-65.

Gabriel 1965

A. Gabriel, Phrygie. Exploration archéologique 4. La cité de Midas – Architecture (Paris 1965).

Genz 2003

H. Genz, The Early Iron Age in Central Anatolia, in: B. Fischer/H. Genz/É. Jean/K. Köroğlu (eds.), Identifying Changes: The Transition from Bronze to Iron Ages in Anatolia and its Neighbouring Regions. Proceedings of the International Workshop, Istanbul, November 8-9, 2002 (Istanbul 2003) 179-191.

Haak et al. 2015

W. Haak/I. Lazaridis/N. Patterson/N. Rohland/S. Mallick/B. Llamas/G. Brandt/S. Nordenfelt/E. Harney/K. Stewardson/Q. Fu/A. Mittnik/E. Bánffy/C. Economou/M. Francken/S. Friederich/R.G. Pena/F. Hallgren/V. Khatanovich/A. Khokhlov/M. Kunst/P. Kuznetsov/H. Meller/O. Mochalov/V. Moiseyev/N. Nicklisch/S.L. Pichler/R. Risch/M.A.R. Guerra/C. Roth/A. Szécsényi-Nagy/J. Wahl/M. Meyer/J. Krause/D. Brown/D. Anthony/A. Cooper/K.W. Alt/D. Reich, Massive Migration from the Steppe was a Source for Indo-European Languages in Europe, Nature 522, (11 June) 2015, 207-211 <doi:10.1038/nature14317>.

Hajnal 1998

I. Hajnal, Mykenisches und homerisches Lexikon. Übereinstimmungen, Divergenzen und der Versuch einer Typologie, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft: Vorträge und kleinere Schriften 69 (Innsbruck 1998).

Hänsel 2002

B. Hänsel, Zusammenfassende Bemerkungen zum Siedlungsverlauf in Kastanas – Kontinuität und Bevölkerungswandel, in: Jung 2002, 11-27.

Haspels 1971

C.H.E. Haspels, The Highlands of Phrygia. Sites and Monuments (Princeton 1971).

Hiller 2011

S. Hiller, *E-ke-ra₂-wo* ,Der Mann mit der Lanze': Wortetymologie, Herrschertitulatur und Bildtopos, in: Blakolmer et al. 2011, 137-146.

Höckmann 2007

O. Höckmann, Zu Lanzen spitzen ägäischer Art aus Bulgarien, in: M. Stefanovich/C. Angelova (eds.), Prae. In Honorem Henrieta Todorova (Sofia 2007) 215-224.

Horejs 2007

B. Horejs, Das prähistorische Olynth. Ausgrabungen in der Toumba Agios Mamas 1994-1996. Die spätbronzezeitliche handgemachte Keramik der Schichten 13 bis 1, PAS 21 (Rahden 2007).

Huxley 1959

G.L. Huxley, Titles of Midas, *GrRomByzSt* 2, 1959, 85-99.

Jung 2002

R. Jung, Kastanas. Ausgrabungen in einem Siedlungshügel der Bronze- und Eisenzeit Makedoniens 1975-1979. Die Drehscheibenkeramik der Schichten 19 bis 11, PAS 18 (Kiel 2002).

Karamitrou-Mentesidi 2003

G. Karamitrou-Mentesidi, Μυκηναϊκά Αιανής – Ελιμιωτίδας και Άνω Μακεδονίας, in: N. Kyparssi-Apostolika/M. Papakonstantinou (eds.), Β' Διεθνές Διεπιστημονικό Συμπόσιο, Η Περιφέρεια του Μυκηναϊκού Κόσμου, 26-30 Σεπτεμβρίου, Λαμία 1999/2nd International Interdisciplinary Colloquium, The Periphery of the Mycenaean World, 26-30 September, Lamia 1999 (Athens 2003) 167-190.

Krauß 2005

R. Krauß, Der Depotfund von Ovča Mogila, Kreis Svištov (Bulgarien). Zur Datierung der Bronzehorte von der unteren Donau über mykenische Schwerter, in: B. Horejs/R. Jung/E. Kaiser/B. Teržan (eds.), Interpretationsraum Bronzezeit. Bernhard Hänsel von seinen Schülern gewidmet, UPA 121 (Bonn 2005) 199-210.

Lejeune 1969

M. Lejeune, Discussions sur l'alphabet phrygien, *SMEA* 10, 1969, 19-47.

Lejeune 1972

M. Lejeune, À propos de la titulature de Midas, in: M. Lejeune, Mémoires de Philologie Mycénienne. Troisième série (1964-1968), *Incunabula Graeca* 43 (Rome 1972) 331-344 (= *Athenaeum* 47, 1969, 179-192).

Manning et al. 2009

S.W. Manning/C. Pulak/B. Kromer/S. Talamo/C. Bronk Ramsey/M. Dee, Absolute Age of the Uluburun Shipwreck: A Key Late Bronze Age Time-Capsule for the East Mediterranean, in: S.W. Manning/M.J. Bruce (eds.), *Tree-Rings, Kings, and Old World Archaeology and Environment. Studies Presented in Honor of Peter Ian Kuniholm* (Oxford 2009) 163-187.

Meier-Brügger 2007

M. Meier-Brügger, Griechen in Griechenland: Einwanderung oder Autochthonie? Gibt es Anhaltspunkte für eine Entscheidung aus dem altgriechischen Wortschatz?, in: F. Lang/C. Reinholdt/J. Weilhartner (eds.), ΣΤΕΦΑΝΟΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΟΣ. Archäologische Forschungen zwischen Nil und Istros. Festschrift für Stefan Hiller zum 65. Geburtstag (Vienna 2007) 187-189.

Neumann 1988

G. Neumann, Phrygisch und Griechisch, *SBWien* 499 (Vienna 1988).

Palaima 1995

T.G. Palaima, *The Nature of the Mycenaean Wanax: Non-Indo-European Origins and Priestly Functions*, in: P. Rehak (ed.), *The Role of the Ruler in the Prehistoric Aegean. Proceedings of a Panel Discussion Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America, New Orleans, Louisiana, 28 December 1992*, *Aegaeum* 11 (Liège 1995) 119-139.

Palaima 2006

T.G. Palaima, *Wanaks and Related Power Terms in Mycenaean and Later Greek*, in: S. Deger-Jalkotzy/I.S. Lemos (eds.), *Ancient Greece: From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer*, *Edinburgh Leventis Studies* 3 (Edinburgh 2006) 53-71.

Panagl 2005

O. Panagl, *Graeco-phrygische Kontaktzonen*, in: G. Meiser/O. Hackstein (eds.), *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel. Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17.-23. September 2000, Halle an der Saale (Wiesbaden 2005)* 483-494.

Pavúk/Horejs 2012

P. Pavúk/B. Horejs, *Mittel- und spätbronzezeitliche Keramik Griechenlands, Sammlung Fritz Schachermeyr 3 = Veröffentlichungen der Mykenischen Kommission 31* (Vienna 2012).

Puhvel 1956

J. Puhvel, *Greek ANAΞ*, *ZVerglSprF* 73, 1956, 202-222.

Pullen 2008

D. Pullen, *The Early Bronze Age in Greece*, in: *Shelmerdine 2008b*, 19-46.

Rose 2012a

C.B. Rose, *Introduction: The Archaeology of Phrygian Gordion*, in: *Rose 2012c*, 1-19.

Rose 2012b

C.B. Rose, *Fieldwork at Gordion 1950-2012*, *AA* 2012, 231-254.

Rose 2012c

C.B. Rose (ed.), *The Archaeology of Phrygian Gordion, Royal City of Midas, Gordion Special Studies* 7 (Philadelphia 2012).

Rose/Darbyshire 2011

C.B. Rose / G. Darbyshire (eds.), *The New Chronology of Iron Age Gordion, Gordion Special Studies* 6 (Philadelphia 2011).

Ruppenstein 2012

F. Ruppenstein, *Gesellschaftliche Transformationen und politisch-soziale Krisen im frühen Griechenland. Überlegungen zur Entstehung der mykenischen Palaststaaten*, in: S. Deger-Jalkotzy/A. Suppan (eds.), *Krise und Transformation. Beiträge des internationalen Symposiums vom 22. bis 23. November 2010 an der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Vienna 2012) 37-68.

Shelmerdine 2008a

C.W. Shelmerdine, *Mycenaean Society*, in: Y. Duhoux/A. Morpurgo Davies (eds.), *A Companion to Linear B. Mycenaean Greek Texts and Their World* 1, *BCILL* 120 (Louvain-la-Neuve 2008) 115-158

Shelmerdine 2008b

C.W. Shelmerdine (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Aegean Bronze Age* (Cambridge 2008).

Shelmerdine/Bennet 2008

C.W. Shelmerdine/J. Bennet, *Mycenaean States: Economy and Administration*, in: Shelmerdine 2008b, 289-309.

Szemerényi 1979

O. Szemerényi, *Etyma Graeca IV (22-29): Homerica et Mycenaica*, *SMEA* 20, 1979, 207-226.

Todorova et al. 2007

H. Todorova/M. Stefanovich/G. Ivanov (eds.), *The Struma/Strymon River Valley in Prehistory. Proceedings of the International Symposium Strymon Praehistoricus, Kjustendil-Blagoevgrad (Bulgaria), Serres-Amphipolis (Greece), 27.09.-01.10. 2004, In the Steps of James Harvey Gaul 2 (Sofia 2007)*.

Valla 2007

M. Valla, *A Late Bronze Age Cemetery in Faia Petra, East of the Middle Strymon Valley*, in: Todorova et al. 2007, 359-372.

Valla et al. 2013

M. Valla/S. Triantaphyllou/P. Halstead/V. Isaakidou, *Handling of Death at the End of the Late Bronze Age: The Case of Faia Petra, 13th c. BC, Eastern Macedonia, Greece*, in: M. Lochner/F. Ruppenstein (eds.), *Brandbestattungen von der mittleren Donau bis zur Ägäis zwischen 1300 und 750 v. Chr. Akten des internationalen Symposiums an der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, 11.-12. Februar 2010/Cremation Burials in the Region between the Middle Danube and the Aegean, 1300-750 BC. Proceedings of the International Symposium Held at the Austrian Academy of Sciences at Vienna, February 11th-12th, 2010 (Vienna 2013) 231-248*.

Voigt/Henrickson 2000a

M.M. Voigt/R.C. Henrickson, *The Early Iron Age at Gordion: The Evidence from the Yassihöyük Stratigraphic Sequence*, in: E.D. Oren (ed.), *The Sea Peoples and Their World: A Reassessment (Philadelphia 2000) 327-360*.

Voigt/Henrickson 2000b

M.M. Voigt/R.C. Henrickson, *Formation of the Phrygian State: The Early Iron Age at Gordion*, *AnSt* 50, 2000, 37-54.

Wardle/Wardle 2007

K.A. Wardle/D. Wardle, *Assiros Toumba: A Brief History of the Settlement*, in: Todorova et al. 2007, 451-479.

Wittke 2004

A.-M. Wittke, *Mušker und Phryger. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Anatoliens vom 12. bis zum 7. Jh. v. Chr., Beih. zum TAVO Reihe B 99 (Wiesbaden 2004)*.

Wundsam 1968

K. Wundsam, *Die politische und soziale Struktur in den mykenischen Residenzen nach den Linear B Texten, Dissertationen der Universität Wien 7 (Vienna 1968)*.

Yalçın et al. 2005

Ü. Yalçın/C. Pulak/R. Slotta (eds.), Das Schiff von Uluburun. Welthandel vor 3000 Jahren. Exhibition catalogue Bochum (Bochum 2005).

Dr. Florian Ruppenstein

Abteilung für Klassische Archäologie

Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg

Fahnenbergplatz

D-79085 Freiburg i. Br.

E-Mail: florian.ruppenstein@archaeologie.uni-freiburg.de