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: ὀρός ‘year’, ὀρός ‘guard’, ὀλο(ϝ)ίός ‘destructive’, ὀρρός ‘rump’. The first of these alternatives is still pronounced possible\(^1\), while the third is modified to «genitive of the noun ὀλος ['loss'] which underlies the Homeric adjective ὀλὸς, Dor. ὀλὸς, ‘destructive’», evidently in order to bring it into line with the other genitival interpretations. Palmer’s suggestions of a partitive genitive ὀλονο from ὀλὸς ‘millet’ and his adduction\(^2\) of Hom ὀὐλαί, Att. ὀλαί (<*ὀλκαί), Arc. ὀλοαί ‘barley-groats’ (cf. ὀλυρά ‘rice-wheat’) are given top billing in the commentary, but remain disregarded in the translation. Georgiev\(^3\) read ὀλονο ‘of the whole’; Meriggi\(^4\) suggested ὀρου ‘of the boundary’; Lurja\(^5\) assumed ὀρου ‘of the province’; Mühlestein\(^6\) posited ὀρου ‘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 discussed\(^8\). Of those quoted above only Mühlestein’s analysis is worth attention, despite its contextual arbitrariness: the Swiss savant invokes Hes. ὀροῦ φύλαξος; ἑρωρός, Dor. τιμά(ϝ)ορος, Att. τιμωρός;
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7. P. 268-269.
Hom. οὐδενόσωφρος (II. 8.178) and adduces interpretations like χάτ-ορος 'surveillant, inspector' for the repeated Knossian ka-to-ro, and Λύκωρος 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 ὅραω, φρουρός, Hes. βάρος ὁ ἀφθαλμοί, ὄρονται, ὤρα, Mühlstein'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 = κόρος; thus *ḑḻwọ- 'barley' or *ḑḻwọ- 'whole' [Hom. ὄδλος, Att. ὄλος] should appear as o-wo-). Ventris-Chadwick's ἄλος is open to doubt: Hom. ὄδλος, Dor. ὄλος may indeed be a secondary adjective resulting from appositional juxtaposition of a noun which formed the basis of the derivative ὄδλως = ὀλος(φ)(μ)ς, but the forms imply either *ḑḻwọ- or *ḑḻwọ- (hardly *ḑḻwο-); 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 ὄρωτον 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. Ruiz-pérez3 suggests a connexion with ἄροω, comparing ἄρωμα on the same tablet (i.e. ἄρωτον, showing a : o ablaut as in ἄγω : ἄγμας). 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 ἄφρων inferrable from i-to-i-ro-ni to-i a-la-πι-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) τόφον τῆ τ Ἀλα(ς)πρώται

1 Strangely enough nobody has yet exhausted the residue of the homonym storehouse: ὄδλος 'woolly' (*ḑḻnɔs?), ὄδλος 'sheaf' (=Ἰωλος), ὀδλον 'gum(s)', ὀὐλή 'scar' (*τολνα or *τολανα, cf. Lat. ulinus).
3 Minos, V, 1957, p. 204.
and 'Εθαλέξι respectively and first connected (in place of a dubious *τρών) by W. Schulze\(^1\) with Hesychius οἱρών ή εκ τῆς καταμετρήσεως τῆς γῆς εὔθυμωρία\(^2\). Thus ο-ρο-جو would stand for one-time *όριον. 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 \(\mathbf{r}\), perhaps rendered elsewhere sporadically by \(ρ_{o_2}\) (\(κυ-\mathbf{pα-ρο}_2\) beside \(κυ-\mathbf{pα-ρο}\), cf. κύπειρος, κύπαιρος; Ion. κύπερος; fem. dual \(ρο-\mu-\mathbf{ρο}_2\), cf. Aeol. τορφύρος) and \(τα_2\) (\(α-κε-τι-\mathbf{ρα}_2\) beside \(α-κε-τι-\mathbf{ρι-}\mathbf{τα}\)). This assumption needs to be reconciled with the evidence of words like \(μο-\mathbf{ρο-\rhoα}_2\) and \(κο-\mathbf{ρε-τε}\.\) If correctly identified, the former is probably \(μορό-\piπας\) (μόρος) rather than \(μορό-\piπας\) (μόρα \(<*μορία), although classical compounds tend to show \(μορα\-.\) Ruipérez’s brilliant interpretation of \(κο-\mathbf{ρε-τε}\) as \(κοιρητήρ\) from *κορίς\(^3\) 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.
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\(^2\) Cf. also οἱρών or οἱρών reputedly used by Eratosthenes Epicus, meaning ή χάραξις τῶν ἄφτερων (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. \(\text{fines}\) and Myc. \(\text{wo-wo}\).

\(^3\) Etudes Mycéniennes, Paris 1956, p. 105-118.