63 JOINS AND QUASI-JOINS OF FRAGMENTS
IN THE LINEAR B TABLETS FROM PYLOS

Thanks to the facilities kindly given by Dr L. Papazoglou,1 with financial support provided by the Ministry of Education and Culture (DGES Research Program PB-97/0627),2 a program of reconstruction work lasting two weeks3 was undertaken. The aim was to reduce the number of unpublished fragments by joining them to the published tablets, in view of the forthcoming edition of the Corpus of Pylos Tablets.


Aa 95 + fr. (S60 H 4)
The minuscule fragment (‘39/100-199.f) with a bit of the latus superius was fitted into its place. Text unchanged therefore.

Ea 136 [+ ] Ea 936 (Ea; S28 H 43)
.a [pa-]ro, da-mo
    wa-tu-o-ko , a-ke-ro , e-ke , o-na-to[ GRA ] T 5 V 4

Metrograms and units over erasure.

The quasi-join is guaranteed by size and profile. ca. 1.3 cm. is still missing for physical contact.

Eb 159 [+ ] Eb 1351 (Eb; H 41)
.A pe-re-qo-ta. pa-da-je-u, i-je-ro[-wo-ko e-]ke-qi
.B ka-ma , si-ri-jot jo-ra-ke , [ to-so-de , pe-mo GRA 2

The join was actually suggested by E. L. Bennett, jr.4 and is undoubtedly correct in spite of the difference in the land surface recorded (Ep 613.17 records GRA 1, whereas 1351 shows GRA 2), which still needs an explanation.

1 We thank also other members of the Staff of the Prehistoric Collection: Metaxia Tsipopoulou, Dimitra Kokkevi, Alexandra Hristopoulou and Kostas Pantazis. I am much indebted to Richard J. Firth for improving the English text.
2 Dirección General de Enseñanza Superior (DGES).
3 From 19th until 29th April 1999, although it was only possible to work in the Museum premises for 9 days with a total of 50 working hours, of which some were also devoted to photographing the joins and the tablets with the aim of making a corpus on digital media, as well as checking readings for the future Corpus of Pylos tablets.
Although the right part of Ea 208 became somehow swollen, both size and profile guarantee the quasi-join with Ea 1017.

The new fragment 37.4 gives the right end of the tablet, bearing one ‘leg’ of the logogram and trace of the unit in the break.

An unscribed fragment numbered 300-399.f fitted into line 9 at the left, widening the vacat.

The fragment numbered 463.5, bearing the remains of the upper curved stroke of *152, is part of the same tablet as Ma 333, without any physical contact. The quasi-join is granted by the type of clay, and the profile of the edge.

The new fragment on the left was the result of an unpublished join of two 244.ff fragments made by Jean-Pierre Olivier on May 25th, 1969, while noting the possibility that the record is an Na tablet. It was clear that it went to the right of the reconstructed Na 345 (see Minos 35-36, p. 000). The peculiar squared profiles of the tablet reinforce the identification of Xa 432 as a Na tablet.

The record is headed by a fragmentary place-name in -wa, a type frequent in the Na tablets.

There are perhaps traces in .a for an e- in the beginning of the adjective re-u-te-ra[, but it is also possible that we encounter another instance of an unprotheticised adjective just as in Na 425.a (thus implying that such a form was not prompted by the preceding ka-ke-we), and it could represent a call for caution in reconstructing fragmentary instances with a prothetic vowel (as in PTT I Na 66.A.B, 284.a, 345.a, 542.A, 848.A, 1025.A.B).

ke-ko-si-ja is a hapax, unless the word is acrophonically represented by ke in Na 856.a and 1041.a, in both instances determined by the genitive we-da-ne-wo. Nevertheless, ke-ko-si-ja could perhaps be actually read as ke-do-si-ja, a specialized working team well attested at Knossos.
Although 1354 is a bit swollen by heavier firing, size, profile and direction of straw guarantee however this quasi-join. *ca.* 1 cm. is still missing for physical contact.

**An 435 + Xn 1516**

The fragment, **Xn 1516**, obtained as the results of a former join (**Minos** 29-30, p. 100) went to the verso and *latus sinistrum*. Text unchanged therefore.

By the way, a ‘52 fragment previously glued to the bottom of **An 435** («244 joins...», p. 321) has now been unglued after ascertaining the different quality of the clay (more similar to that of **Cn 719**).

**Ab 468 [+]*fr.**

1. **A** ]
   [ ]GRA 1 [T 5] TA
2. **B** ]
   [ ]NI 1 T 5

The uninscribed fragment 468.7 went to the left of the tablet. Now the large blank at left suggests likely that no *ko-wo* entry exists, cf. **Ab 372**, nor even one for *ko-wa*, cf. **Ab 388**.

**Ab 559 [+]* Ab 1100 [+]* Ac 1101 [+]*fr.**

1. **A** pu-ro
   [ ]GRA 1
2. **B** e-ke-ro-qo-no[ ] VIR [ko-]wɔ̃ 4 NI 3
   1: probably 3.
   2: *ko-]*wɔ 4: possibly as many as 8.

There is no doubt that the fragment 559.f includes the legs of the logogram in **Ac 1101** (which is also a 559.4 fragment); in spite of the surprising logogram for this series (since *mul* is expected), there is no doubt that they belong to **Ab 1100** (= 559.2 + 559.3) as well. Note that twelve *e-ke-ro-ko-no* VIR and one *ko-wo* are recorded on **An 199.1**. We will keep the record in the **Ab** series in spite of the logogram, since it was undoubtedly written by Hand 21.

**Ab 563 [+]* Ab 581 + Ab 1112 + Ab 1113 + Xa 1506 + fr.**

1. **A** pu-ro, e-ke-ro-qo-no *mul*[ ] [ko-]*wɔ̃ 5 [ ]ko-wɔ 5
   1 could be preceded by tens and other units.
   2: *ko-]*wɔ 5
2. **B** 56 T 1

1506 was obtained by joining two **581.7.f** (**Minos** 27-28, p. 323), and the fragments now joined are **581.2, 581.6** and **581.f**, making the entire document as it appears now.

**Un 612 + fr.**

1. [ ]KO [qs
2. ]-wɔ̃[ ] VIN 5
3. ] CAP 1
   1: Perhaps [KO 1], but [ko-] not impossible.
   2: Possibly []-wa-to[.]}
Two fragments from the 613 group: one on the verso, and the other bearing the remains of signs on line 2 to the left.

Es 650 + fr.
The fragment from the 1952 batch went on the verso and upper edge, completing the gap in the latus superius after the logogram. It bears the horizontal upper stroke of GRA and ensures that the quantity recorded is only one unit (now undotted), and delete therefore the note concerning the first entry on verso in PTT I, p. 142. This implies that the amount of land of ru-ko-wo-ro agrees proportionally with his do-so-mo in Es 729 and was therefore predictable.5

Cn 719 + frr. (S719 H 1)
Two further '52/154 gr. 4 went to the verso. Text unchanged therefore.

Jn 725 + frr. (6) (S310 H 2)
This tablet had been profusely joined (see Minos 27-28, pp. 318f.) on the occasion of being taken from the display case for an initial examination; in the new revision, four fragments (one of them already f+f) went on the verso, another in the big gap at the bottom right of the recto, and another, uninscribed, on line 25 on the right. All the new fragments come from the box where former joined fragments were taken. Text unchanged therefore.

Ea 809 [+ Ab 1483 (Ea; S28 H 43)
.a ra-wa-ke-si-jo-jo , a-mo-te-wo
   ke-[re-te-u , e-ke, o-na-to, ke-ke-me-na , ko-to-na [JGRA T 2
Ab 1483 was recently published in Minos 31-32, p. 170; nevertheless a closer examination of the clay now shows the pebbly quality of the clay as used for the Ea records, thus prompting the link with 809. The size of the lease is usual, cf. Ea 208, 259, 480, 757, and 776.

Vn 851 [+ Xn 914 (Vn; H 12)
.1 ] , de-mi-ni-ja
.2 ]e-ke-ri-jo-na 1 ×
.3 [ 1 × ]ta-ra-ma-ta 1 ×
.4 ka[ 1 × ]da-je-we 1 ×
.5 e-[ 1 × ]ru-ke-ja 1 ×
.6 tu[ 1 × ] e-po-me-ne-we 1 ×
.7 ]-na 1 × wa-na-si-ja-ke 1 ×
&c.

verso .1 ]ko-jo[ ]5 o 3
.2 ]4 o [ ]vacat
&c.

Xn 914 was incorrectly ascribed to Class ii and was found in the same area as the main piece. There is no physical contact, but signs, profile and size of ruled spaces guarantee the quasi-join.

Eb 861 + frr.  
(H 41)
Two fragments from the ‘52 batch join to the verso. Text unchanged therefore.

Eb 872 + fr.  
(H 41)
The fragment from the ‘52 batch went on top giving the latus superius. Text unchanged therefore.

Vn 879 + fr.  
(Cii)
The fragment from the ‘52 batch (409.f) went on verso. Text unchanged therefore.

Eb 915 + fr.  
(H 41)
The fragment from the ‘52 batch went on verso. Text unchanged therefore.

Wa 931 [+] Wa 949  
(Wa; Ciii)
a-ri[ ]ko
a-ri[ ]Ze or a-ri[ ]ZE not excluded.

The quasi-join is prompted by size and profile, and the identical appearance of the clay. ca. 1.3 cm. is missing for physical contact. Both of them come from the same spot where a number of labels were found in Room 7, such a concentration being explained by K. Pluta6 by positing a pile of wickerwork stacks discarded once the transported tablets were entered in the Archives. Nevertheless, the clay of both pieces is different from that used in the remaining labels recorded under the number ‘52S3/175. The original label was broken by the weak line(s) formed by a vertical stake in the wickerwork and their relative position is to be ascertained from the verso.

A place-name is expected on such a label and a-ri[-qo would fit well in Wa 931, cf. An 723.2.

Ab 978 + fr.  
(S186 H 21)
The fragment 468.2 went to the left of 978, but its damaged surface only shows vestigia of MUL quantities. [Ab 946 undoubtedly belongs to the same record, although no physical contact seems possible.]

There is no doubt that Xn 1071 (formerly classified as Cn in PT II) belongs to Cn 1059, although a physical contact has not been found yet and the actual position of the fragment at the bottom of 1059 is therefore tentative. Xn 1071 was left unassigned to hand, but the signs agree with Hand 1. A sequence of two locations by means of X’s wo-wo would link the last line of 1059 with the first one of 1071.

A bit from the 400-499.ff batch joined onto the 1066 piece of 1059.

The characteristic honey-coloured clay prompted the quasi-join, which was confirmed by size as well. Both fragments came from the ‘39 excavations, but their find-spot is unknown.

The new fragment (1995-3) was found by Jonathan Lane on 12th July 1995, under the auspices of MARWP and the join was achieved from photographs by Emmett L. Bennett, jr. The fragment finally reached the National Archaeological Museum of Athens on 27th April 1999, the join was confirmed and the pieces glued. No further joining seems now possible.

Although we keep the ascription of Un 1177 to Class ii, it is worth noting that it could be actually ascribed to Hand 6, responsible for Un 6, 443, and 853, whose physical characteristics Un 1177 does share.

The fragment went on verso. Text unchanged therefore.

---

7 The Minnesota Archaeological Researches in the Western Peloponnese; I thank Professor Fred A. Cooper for kind permission to publish the piece now joined, and Professor Emmett L. Bennett, jr., for allowing me to include his join among the others.
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Fr 1237 [+\+] Fr 1239
[+ to-no \[ \] OLE+A v 1
(Cii)

The quasi-join is guaranteed by size, profile and clay.

Fr 1251 [+\+] fr.
(S1202 H 2)

A fragment bearing the upper traces of logogram OLE joined onto the right of the tablet, the quasi-join being guaranteed by size and profile.

Qa 1259 + Xa 1335
(Qa; H 15)

de-ka-ta , ri-ma *189 1
du-ma seems excluded.

Although 1259 comes from Court 47, it is undoubtedly a stray from the hoard of the Qa series from Room 99, where Xa 1335 was also found. Signs on Xa 1335 are compatible with the handwriting of Hand 15.

Although we do not have any example of sign du in Hand 15 for comparison, there is clearly no trace for a third ‘leg’ of the first sign of the second word, and the bottom remains and shape of the upper break fit quite well with the extant ri signs on Qa 1290 and 1292.

As usual in the set in Hand 15, de-ka-ta must be a man’s name, followed by a title of the religious sphere. So, an interpretation as /deiktäs/ ‘tithe’ is to be rejected in favour of /Deiktäs/ vel sim. However, the ‘title’ ri-ma is a hapax which is difficult to interpret. It ought to be a nominative, but a neuter formation in -ma, -matos on a verbal base is unlikely for a title. So, we are dealing perhaps with another instance of a noun in -mar, -martos, like du-ma or da-ma, for which only δμαρ is attested in the Greek lexicon. Therefore, it cannot be excluded that it is a faulty reading of {du}-ma.

Sa 1266 [+\+] fr.
(H 26 ?)
.a te-mi-de-we-te
e-pi-wo-qa-ta-o , wo-ka , we-je-ke-e [ZE] 1

The fragment was found on 1st August 1957 (another fragment found on this day was joined by J.-P. Olivier to Sa 769 in 1966-1967) and bears the typical hole for a string. This fact along with the type of clay suggested at once that it belonged to a Sa tablet. Since it also bears an apparent rule on the verso, the choice of Sa 1266 was justified and the quasi-join was confirmed by the profile of the bottom edge, and continuity of an accidental scratching on the verso. ca. 0.5 cm are still missing for physical contact. There is not enough space for a canonical ROTA+TE logogram followed by ZE in the gap between both pieces, and perhaps only ZE is gone with the intermediate missing piece, cf. Sa 761. Moreover, this lack of parallelism with the bulk of Sa tablets could reinforce the extant doubts on Hand ascription.

9 In the Notebook by C. W. Blegen for 1957, p. 142, the finding of only two fragments of tablets in the Chasm near the Propylon is recorded.
The quasi-join was already noted in *PTT* I, p. 32, as a possibility, but it is now confirmed. A small bit with a part of verso also was joined onto 1272.

A small bit with a part of verso was finally fitted onto its place on the back. Text therefore unchanged.

Both size and profile guarantee the quasi-join. ca. 2.5 cm. are missing for physical contact. *Qa* 1303 was attributed to Hand 15, whereas *Qa* 1307 was attributed to Hand 33\(^\text{10}\) with the meagre support of a fragmentary logogram, whose upper right part only survived.

Size, profiles, clay quality, and the direction of the straw all guarantee the quasi-join.

There is space for completing the -no and a divider between both pieces with identical profile and matching breaks. We encounter therefore an instance of Mycenaean *i-jo* for ‘son’ at Pylos, which is attested at Mycenae as well.

Such a presence prompts the question of how to explain *i-jo* vs. *i-*\(^*\)65: does it represent a dialectal difference or a different date for *Mb*? However, *i-*\(^*\)65 is conservative (dissimilation of first syllable from an earlier **u-*\(^*\)65) in relation to *i-jo* (thematization of the word for fitting into the -os declension), which must be modern.

On the other hand, the quasi-join prompts an interpretation of *ke-do-jo* in *Ua* 158.1 as nominative, and not as a genitive.

\(^{10}\) A similar case is *Qa* 1305 [+] *Qa* 1308, with the resultant text:

\[
\text{wo-ro-qo-ta[ e-ro-]pa-ke-u } \text{189} 1
\]

Both size and profile would guarantee the quasi-join, and ca. 2 cm. are missing for physical contact. Nevertheless *Qa* 1305 is attributed to Hand 33, whereas *Qa* 1308 is attributed to Hand 15. I still have some doubts on the join therefore.
Mb 1376 [+] Mb 1395  
\[a_3\text{-me-wa[ }]*146 \text{ 5}\]  
Size, profiles, and clay quality all guarantee the quasi-join.

Ea 1424 [+] Xa 1438  
\[.a \text{ pa-ro[ ]ru-ko-ro , ra-wa-ke-[si-[jo}\]de-u \text{ ra-wa-[ke-][si-[jo e-ke o-[na-[to GRA}\]}

What is most surprising is that both pieces were found in 1961 along with another six (1425-1428, 1439, Un 6.fr.) on the same spot (Trench sw 33: 1438; Trench sw 31: 1424, cf. M. Lang, AJA 66, 1962, p. 149) and no attempt to relate them was done then: not only are both pieces of identical size and show the same slanting profile, but among the other accompanying six fragments there were also matching pieces (two belonging to Un 6, and the other two forming Un 1426), a fact which should have prompted an earlier attempt to join 1424 and 1438.

A reconstruction pa-[]de-u for the landholder is likely, since a dative pa-de-we is twice recorded on Un 219.2.

Fr 1479 [+] fr. [+] fr.  
\[\text{OLE po 2 }\text{qs}\]y\[qs\]  
The fragments come from the 1955 excavation and show the clay features of Fr 1479. It was without any doubt that they belonged to this tablet, but their place was not determined until now. Fr 1479 was probably the unphotographed fragment numbered 1249 in The Olive Oil Tablets from Pylos, p. 68, and it will be edited under its former number in the forthcoming Corpus, once this presumption has been confirmed.

Xa 1525 + fr.  
The number was given to a join of two 500-599.ff extant, but unrecorded11 (photographed by E. Seraphis, negative 517). Now it has been further joined by an apparent 563т (or 500-599.f). Since it is a verso, the reading remains unchanged.

Xa 1562 + fr.  
\[\text{to-ra-}\]  
The fragment went on the verso of the piece salvaged from the scraps which are still extant in the drawers with undetermined pieces from the 1952 excavations. Its number comes from the new arrangement of unpublished pieces (which should now be published).

José L. Meleña

---

11 It is probably one of the 17 joins f+f made by Jean-Pierre Olivier during December 1966-February 1967.
APPENDIX: On the new fragment found in 1995

Un 1482

.1 deest
.2 ke-ra-e-we *189[
.3 ka-tu-re-ija 4 [ ] ra-{[.
.4 de-mi-ni-ja, a-ke-re-wi-ja[

infra mutila
.1 vestigia crossing the rule between -ra- and -e-.
.2 ke-ra-e-we over erasure.
.3 [ta-][ traces at right break compatible with nu: ta-ra-nu[
.4 a-ke-re-wi-ja over [ke-re-wi-ja]; trace at right (logogram? *169) possible).

Dimensions: (4.4), (7.3), 1.9 cm.
Rough, porous clay; orange colour; pebbly: unsimilar to extant tablets from Pylos.

Peculiar armature of the record: a straw in the upper break going horizontally, and another one with similar direction, appearing on the back of the left edge. This kind of armature has no parallel in the Pylos tablets. The armature reveals that the original record was probably an elongated tablet of reconstructed dimensions: {ca. 9.0}, {ca. 20.0}, {ca. 2.0 cm.}.

No joining seems possible therefore.

The logogram on line 2 is, although dotted, is quite sure and drawn in the way of Hand 15, although the record still remains unascribed to hand.

It bears on back the number 4083 of accession to the Chora Museum, although it is now kept in the National Museum of Athens.

Proposal of interpretation:

a) It is likely that ke-ra-e-we is actually the Mycenaean name of the items recorded in the Qa class by means of the logogram *189 (which has as endogram the acrophonic KE). Since the word is most probably a plural nominative, we are dealing with a noun in -eus built on a neuter in -as, and the choice is between /kēras/ or /geras/, both attested at Pylos. Qa religious associations would point to /geras/ as the best candidate, and its presence among leathern artifacts is perfectly at home, since word-formation would prompt the interpretation of these Mycenaean /gerahēwes/ as ‘honouring’ implements of some form. We shall discuss the term again below.

b) de-mi-ni-ja, a-ke-re-wi-ja [: there is no doubt that a sign (syllabogram or logogram) is in the break, and the remains could be compatible with *169, which

---

12 The fragment (1995-2) was found by Joanne Murphy on 11 July 1995, under the auspices of MARWP, in the course of clearing backfill and re-excavating Blegen’s dump near the south corner of the site. I thank Professor Fred A. Cooper for kindly granting permission to publish here the piece after studying it at the National Museum of Athens. My thanks are also due to Professors Cynthia W. Shelmerdine, John Bennet and Emmett L. Bennett, jr., formerly entitled to publish it (cf. C. W. Shelmerdine, op. cit., p. 565 n. 172), for their generous cession.
is preceded by DE(-mi-ni-jo) in Pa 49, 53. de-mi-ni-ja is attested on Vn 851, and de-mi-ni-jo in Wr 1326.γ from Room 98. It is possible that we are facing alternant plural/singular neuter forms, but it could be perfectly possible that δεμινα is a pluralia tantu in Mycenaean as is in later Greek. So, the nodule Wr 1326 would refer to two beds in the dual. The question would be how to interpret then a-ke-re-wi-ja with the beds. At first sight it is likely that the word represents an adjective of the place-name a-ke-re-u, and a mention of a payment from A. might be possible (‘beds, the payment of A.’ i.e. a-ke-re-wi-ja [sci. a-pu-do-si]), whereas a mention of the location of the bed-maker’s workshop ought not to be excluded (‘beds of the workshop at A. i.e. a-ke-re-wi-ja [sci. qa-si-re-wi-ja]). A close parallel for such an usage can be found in the Mycenae Ge tablets, where ake-re-wi-jo stands probably for ‘the man from A-ke-re-u’13, a place-name which recurs on Ge 606.2 in the ablative a-ke-re-u-te.14

It is almost sure that traces at the break correspond to the left ‘leg’ of logogram 169, an artifact which was certainly named with a word beginning with DE. The new evidence confirms therefore that these artifacts were actually δεμινα ‘beds’. Beds are recorded at Pylos in two kind of records: a) an isolated Pn 30, where the reception of a good number of beds (and the still due deficits) from the bed-makers si-ma-ko, ke-ka-to and ru-ko is entered by the Palace Majordomo Alksoitâs; and b) a series of four documents in a different hand, where numbers of beds were located (probably expected to be eventually delivered to the Palace) in the Pylos realm by means of either a formula of pa-ro plus a man’s name —the steward or person responsible for the workshop— (Pa 49, 53) or the mention of the workshop (qa-si-re-wi-ja) plus a man’s name in the genitive who was responsible for it (Pa 398, 889). In the latter cases, an adjective in agreement with qa-si-re-wi-ja locates the workshop in the geography of Pylos, and it is likely that the absence of a geographical fix for the former formula implies either that the workshops were situated near the Palace or that the whereabouts of the responsible persons were at once known to the possible readers of the records. The ‘ethnic’ adjective follows immediately qa-si-re-wi-ja. Thus, the workshop of Amphiklados was loosely situated in the Further Province (Pa 398 pe-ra-ko-ra-i-ja), but the establishment ruled by a Ata-x-won was located by means of the adjective e-re-te-ri-ja (Pa 889). Unfortunately the word does not recur elsewhere, nor the place-name on which the adjective (if it is an adjective) is built. The Classical toponym Ἐρέτης is perhaps not misleading, since the existence of an adjective ko-re-te-ri-jo (PY An 830.6) guarantees that e-re-te-ri-ja may presuppose also an earlier *e-re-te /ere tér/, substituted by the current e-re-ta /ere tás/ ‘rower’. Although possible, a plain description for the workshop (‘The Oar-workshop of A.’), where wooden bed-frames could have also been made, should be discarded in favour of a more precise geographical location.

Therefore, it is not certain that a personnage named A-ke-re-u was involved in the production of the beds recorded on Un 1482.4, as the Mycenae parallel suggests, and that a-ke-re-wi-ja can stand for a toponymic reference, must be also considered. A-ke-re-wa is a well known place-name in the Pylos tablets and refers to an important site with harbour facilities, located south of Pylos. The place-name belongs to a productive class of toponyms in —e-wa, well-attested in the Pylos tablets, most of them built on men’s names in -eus (possibly by means of a collective suffix -a): ‘The Houses of A-ke-re-u, Hunter’s Huts?’. As a harbour, carpenters and carpentry workshops were undoubtedly located in or near A-ke-re-wa (‘Fisherman’s Huts’ therefore?), and beds could have also been produced at them and delivered to the Palace. The nodule Wr 1326 was once attached to a pair of beds stored in the NE Building perhaps for being completed with the necessary leathern lattice.

Another piece of upholstery is the possible ta-ra-nu] of the line 3, which is perhaps to be supplemented as ta-ra-nu]-we /thrânuwes/ ‘footstools’. We do not know whether these wooden artifacts, ‘beds & footstools’, were already finished products or they were recorded before being completed with their leathern parts and perhaps decorative attachments.

c) Leathern fabrics seem also to have been recorded alongside in view of the interpretation of ka-ru-te-wi-ja as ‘saddle-bags’, and, in addition, the newly attested ke-ra-e-we are likely to be also leathern items, as advanced above, but the question needs further discussion.

It is clear that ke-ra-e-we is a plural of a noun in -eus, built on a s-stem ke-ra. As already said, the possibilities of interpretation are apparently reduced to two plausible renderings of ke-ra either as /keras/ ‘horn’ or /geras/ ‘gift of honour’. At first sight, the concrete meaning of ‘horn’ seems more at home among a series of artifacts, since horn applications to swords (ke-ra de-de-me-na KN Ra 984.2) as cheaper substitutes for ivory, or horn decorations attached to the reins (ke-ra-(i-)ja-pi o-pi-i-ja-pi KN Sd series) are already recorded in the tablets. The word is once attested amongst the Pylos tablets: a pair of wheels with /termides/ is recorded on Sa 840 and the extant text runs ke-ra-e te]. The remaining tablets in the series without the current formula of man’s name in the genitive plus wo-ka split easily into records with descriptions of quality (no-pe-re-, we-je-ke-), of time (ne-wa, pa-ra-ja), of ascription (e-gi-e-si-ja) &c. The closest parallel for the fragmentary Sa 840 is clearly Sa 793, which is headed as e-re-pa-to, te-mi-dwe-ta... It is likely then that ke-ra-e te]-mi-dwe-ta... is a correct reconstruction, although different cases are to be assumed (singular genitive in e-re-pa-to /elephantos/ versus singular instrumental in ke-ra-e /kerahel). The agentive suffix -eus would stand for an active artifact made of horn as ‘drink-horns’, ‘horns for blowing’ or the like, and the question would be to find out a suitable candidate.

---

A parallel could be the βοὸς κέπας of a fishing line in *Iliad* 24.81, an artificial horn bait or whatever, and an ‘active’ horn /termis/ may be ultimately conceivable.

Nevertheless, we are convinced that the lectio difficilior is also better in this case and tablet 1482 can contribute to light on an entire series of the Pylos tablets. The clue is the presence of a quite clear logogram *189* after ke-ra-e-we, which immediately refers the question to the interpretation of the Pylos Qa series, where low numbers of *189* are ascribed to people belonging to the cult sphere (priests, priestesses and a member of the House of Potnia) or the like.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Personal Name</th>
<th>Description16</th>
<th>Place-Name</th>
<th>*189</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1259</td>
<td>de-ka-ta</td>
<td>ri-ma</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1289</td>
<td>ka-wa-ra</td>
<td>i-je-re-ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1290</td>
<td>i-je-re-u</td>
<td>se-ri-no-wo-te</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1291</td>
<td>← e-ka-sa-te-u</td>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1292</td>
<td>← e]-ke-ri-ja-wo</td>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1293</td>
<td>[me-nu-a2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1294</td>
<td>pu-ti-ja</td>
<td>a-pu2-we</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1295</td>
<td>qe-re-ma-o</td>
<td>po-qa-te-u</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1296</td>
<td>a-o-ri-me-ne</td>
<td>i-je-re-u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1297</td>
<td>a-pi-a2-ro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1298</td>
<td>ne-qa-u</td>
<td>e-da-e-u</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1299</td>
<td>ka-e-se-u</td>
<td>po-ti-ni-ja-we-jo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>i-je-re-ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301</td>
<td>ki-nu-ra</td>
<td>me-nu-a2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1303</td>
<td>ke-i-ja</td>
<td>i]-je-re-ja</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1304</td>
<td>← a-te-ra-wo →</td>
<td>ka-ra-do-ro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1305</td>
<td>wo-ro-qo-ta[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1306</td>
<td>a-e[-ri-qo-ta /-se-wa ??</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1308</td>
<td>← [pa-ke-u →</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1441</td>
<td>Jo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 The formula Description plus Place-Name would strengthen the interpretation of pu-ti-ja in Qa 1249 as a descriptive ποθία rather than the currently accepted personal name, and the same could be true of a-te-ra-wo in Qa 1304. Cult descriptions have been proposed for me-nu-a2, e-qa-e-u and po-qa-te-u (see *Dic. Mic. s. uu.*), for the latter ἱδαθεύς/‘man of the abode (of a deity)’ and ἱφθαίτευς/‘augur, prophet’, cf. φοιβίτευς χρησιμοδεῖν Hsch., are likely renderings.
The Table shows the arrangement of the Qa series: numbers are restricted to one or two *189 as a rule, except for a-pi-a₂-ro, probably the ko-re-te on a distribution of hides, On 300.2, who is credited with five pieces.

It is therefore plausible that *189 represents items related to the cult sphere, termed as they were ‘active’ honouring presents (that is, they confer ‘honour’ to the recipients, cf. Latin honōrārius, honōrārium). The question is now to identify such /gerahēwes/ ‘gifts of honour’ allotted in low quantities to the personnel of sanctuaries, and the evidence from tablet 1482 suggests that they were most possibly skins from sacrificial victims, cf. SIG 1037 (Milet iv/iii BC) τὰ δέρματα καὶ τὰ ἄλλα γέρεςα; 1025.22 (Cos iv/iii BC) γέρη λαμβάνει τὸ δέρμα καὶ τὸ σκέλος. Some thoughts on the disposal of the skins after the sacrifice have been recently provided by J. T. Killen for explaining the tanner (wi-ri-ne-u) on TH Av 100.5.17

In conclusion, the new tablet 1482 is likely to be therefore a ‘store’ list of leathern and wooden objects:

| /gerahēwes/ *189 | ‘skins as γέρας’ X |
| /kanthulēwiai/ | saddle-bags 4 |
| /thrānu[(wes?)| footstools X |
| /demnia Agrēwia/ | beds from A. X |

It is a pity that figures are mostly absent, but, if the making of /kanthulēwiai/ required in fact one skin for each item, it is worthwhile recalling that 4 skins are given to Augeiatēus for making /kanthulēwiai/ in Un 1318.1. So, a mention similar to ‘Thus gave Augeiatēus’ could have been written in the missing first line of the record. Since Augeiatēus was an artisan working in the ‘Seat of the Lady of Horses’, it would not be surprising that he was also responsible for tanning and preparing gifts received as honorarium by priests and other religious officials at sacrifices (/gerahēwes/), strengthening thus the suggested interpretation for the whole Qa series, which is then perfectly at home in its find-spot, the NE Leather Workshop. The Qa series is then likely to record tanned skins from sacrificial victims allotted to personnages of the cult sphere.18

Tablet 1482 should be therefore classified as Un,19 and its original find-spot was possibly the NE Building.

18 It is worth noting the nearness of the interpretation for this series by L. R. Palmer, The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts, Oxford 1963, p. 373: «The indications are that the new Qa texts record the issue of some sacrificial substance ke to prominent religious personnel.»
19 It was mentioned as Un 1482 by C. W. Shelmerdine, op. cit., p. 565.