

A MYCENAEAN TOMB INVENTORY

Ta711

- .1 *o-wi-de pu₂-ke-gi-ri o-te wa-na-ka te-ke 85-ke-wa da-mo-ko-ro.*
- .2 *qe-ra-na wa-na-se-wi-ja qo-u-ka-ra ko-ki-re-ja JUG 1*
qe-ra-na a-mo-te-wi-ja ko-ro-no-we-sa.
- .3 *qe-ra-na wa-na-se-wi-ja ku-na-ja qo-u-ka-ra to-gi-de-we-sa JUG 1*

Ta709 & 712

- .1 *pi-je-ra₃ to-gi-de-ja *200 3 pa-ko-to-[about 10 signs lost]-ke-te-ri-ja PAN 1 ko-te-ri-ja 6.*
- .2 *85-te 1 pu-ra-u-to-ro 2 pa₂-ra-to-ro 1 e-[- - - -]-ra i-to-we-sa pe-de-we-sa so-we-ne-ja 85-de-we-sa-ge 1.*
- .3 *ti-ri-po ke-re-si-jo we-ke 34-ke-u TRIPOD [nn- - - -]-u TRIPOD 1*

Ta641

- .1 *ti-ri-po-de ai-ke-u ke-re-si-jo we-ke TRIPOD 2*
ti-ri-po e-me po-de o-wo-we TRIPOD 1
ke-re-a₂ no-[TRIPOD 1]
ti-ri-po ke-re-si-jo we-ke a-pu ke-ka-u-me-no [
- .2 *qe-to VASES 3 di-pa me-zo-e qe-to-ro-we FOUR-HANDLER 1*
di-pa-e me-zo-e ti-ri-o-we-e THREE-HANDLER 2
di-pa me-wi-jo qe-to-ro-we FOUR-HANDLER 1
- .3 *di-pa me-wi-jo ti-ri-jo-we THREE-HANDLER 1*
di-pa me-wi-jo a-no-we NO-HANDLER 1

Ta642

- .1 *to-pe-za ra-e-ja we-a-re-ja a-ja-me-na a₂-ro-[?]-u-do-pi*
ku-wa-no-ge pa-ra-ke-[ge ku-ru-so-ge ?] e-ne-wo pe-[za]
- .2 *to-pe-za ra-e-ja me-no-e-ja e-re-pa-te a-ja-me-na*
qe-gi-no-to 85-de-pi ko-ru-pi-ge
e-ne-wo pe-za
to-pe-za ra-e-ja a-pi-go-to e-re-pa-te-jo po-pi
e-ka-ma-te-ge qe-gi-no-to-ge to-gi-de

Ta713

- .1 *to-pe-za ra-e-ja ku-te-se-jo e-ka-ma-pi e-re-pa-te-jo-ge*
a-pi-go-to e-ne-wo-pe-za qe-gi-no-me-na to-gi-de
- .2 *to-pe-za e-re-pa-te-ja po-ro-e-ke pi-ti-ro₂-we-sa*
we-pe-za qe-gi-no-me-na to-gi-de
- .3 *to-pe-za ku-te-se-ja e-re-pa-te-jo e-ka-ma-pi*
a-pi-go-to e-ne-wo-pe-za ko-ki-re-ja

Ta715

- .1 *to-pe-za ku-te-se-ja e-re-pa-te-jo e-ka-ma-pi*
a-pi-go-to e-ne-wo-pe-za ko-ki-re-ja
- .2 *to-pe-za a-ka-ra-no e-re-pa-te-ja a-pi-go-to*
to-pe-za a-ka-ra-no e-re-pa-te-ja po-ro-e-ke
- .3 *to-pe-za mi-ra₂ a-pi-go-to pu-ko-so e-ke-e*
e-ne-wo pe-za to-gi-de-jo a-ja-me-no pa-ra-ku-we 2

Ta707

- ku-te-ta-jo*
- .1 *to-no ku-ru-sa-pi o-pi-ke-re-mi-ni-ja-pi o-ni-ti-ja-pi*
ta-ra-nu-ge a-ja-me-no e-re-pa-te-jo 85-de-pi 1
- .2 *to-no ku-te-se-jo e-re-pa-te-ja-pi o-pi-ke-re-mi-ni-ja-pi*
se-re-mo-ka-ra-o-i ge-gi-no-me-na a-di-ri-ja-te-ge po-ti-pi-ge 1
- .3 *ta-ra-nu ku-te-so a-ja-me-no e-re-pa-te-jo 85-de-pi*

Ta708

- .1 *to-no ku-te-se-jo a-ja-me-no o-pi-ke-re-mi-ni-ja e-re-pa-te*
- .2 *to-no ku-te-se-jo e-re-pa-te-ja-pi o-pi-ke-re-mi-ni-ja-pi*
se-re-mo-ka-ra-a-pi ge-gi-no-me-na a-di-ri-ja-pi-ge
ta-ra-nu ku-te-se-jo a-ja-me-no e-re-pa-te-jo a-di-ri-ja-pi re-wo-pi-ge 1

Ta714

- .1 *to-no we-a₂-re-jo a-ja-me-no ku-wa-no*
pa-ra-ku-we-ge ku-ru-so-ge o-pi-ke-re-mi-ni-ja
- .2 *a-ja-me-na ku-ru-so a-di-ri-ja-pi se-re-mo-ka-ra-o-i-ge*
ku-ru-so [[go]-u-ka-ra-o-i]] ku-ru-so-ge po-ni-ki-pi 1
- .3 *ku-wa-ni-jo-ge po-ni-ki-pi*
ta-ra-nu a-ja-me-no ku-wa-no pa-ra-ku-we-ge
ku-ru-so-ge ku-ru-sa-pi-ge ko-no-ni-pi 1

Ta721

- .1 *ta-ra-nu a-ja-me-no e-re-pa-te-jo 85-de-pi*
to-gi-de-ge ka-ru-we-ge FOOTSTOOL 1
- .2 *ta-ra-nu-we a-ja-me-no e-re-pa-te-jo 85-de-pi*
so-we-no-ge to-gi-de-ge FOOTSTOOLS 3
- .3 *ta-ra-nu a-ja-me-no e-re-pa-te-jo*
85-de-pi so-we-no-ge FOOTSTOOL 1
- .4 *ta-ra-nu a-ja-me-no e-re-pa-te-jo*
85-de-pi so-we-no-ge FOOTSTOOL 1
- .5 *ta-ra-nu a-ja-me-no*
e-re-pa-te-jo 85-de-pi FOOTSTOOL 1

Ta722

- .1 *ta-ra-nu a-ja-me-no e-re-pa-te-jo a-to-ro-go*
i-go-ge po-ru-po-de-ge po-ni-ke-ge FOOTSTOOL 1
- .2 *ta-ra-nu a-ja-me-no e-re-pa-te-jo*
ka-ra-a-pi re-wo-te-jo so-we-no-ge FOOTSTOOL 1
- .3 *ta-ra-nu a-ja-me-no e-re-pa-te-ja-pi ka-ru-pi FOOTSTOOL 1*
ta-ra-nu a-ja-me-no e-re-pa-te-ja-pi ka-ru-pi FOOTSTOOL 1

Ta710

.1 *ta-ra-nu a-ja-me-no e-re-pa-te-jo 85-de-pi*
so-we-no-ge FOOTSTOOL I

(vacat)

The above group of tablets is among the most interesting of those discovered by Prof. C. W. Blegen¹ during the excavations at Ano Englianos in 1952-53. They have already been the subject of a paper by M. Ventris². The present essay is the result of an independent study of these texts, and the excuse for its publication is that, while there is broad agreement between Ventris and myself, we differ in a number of details important for our knowledge of Mycenaean culture and above all in our interpretation of the opening formula which refers to the occasion on which these documents were drawn up. It will be well under each topic to list the points of agreement before proceeding to the discussion of our differences. I print the documents in the same order as Ventris. Ta711 is evidently the first tablet of the series since it begins with the now familiar opening gambit *o-* plus a verb. Then follows a list of vessels, and the same subject is continued in Ta709+712. Since this tablet ends with an entry referring to *tripods*, I insert here the famous TRIPOD tablet Ta641³.

As is so often the case, each entry has a stereotyped pattern, a fact which must be fully exploited in the interpretation. First, the object is named and then it is described by a series of adjectives. The objects are:

(1) *qe-ra-na* a JUG, which I was tempted to connect with *πελαγός* «a liquid offering». Ventris compares ON *hverna* «pot», but it is unwise to look so far afield for the name of a Mycenaean vessel. In any case, according to the spelling rules which form our quaking causeway to the lexica of post-Mycenaean Greek, **q^werna* would be represented either as *qe-na* or *qe-re-na*. Now *-ανος* and *-ανα* are well-known instrumental suffixes⁴ which characterise a large number of

¹ *The Pylos Tablets*. Texts of the Inscriptions Found 1939-54. Edited by E. L. Bennett. With a Foreword by C. W. Blegen. Princeton 1955.

² *Eranos* LIII (1956), p. 109-124.

³ 'Εφημερίς 'Αρχαιολογική (Εἰς μνήμην Οἰκονόμου) 1953, p. 59-62; further M. Ventris, *Archaeology* VII 1 (1954), p. 15-21.

⁴ Buck-Petersen, *Reverse Index*, p. 288; E. Schwyzer, *Griech. Gramm.* I, p. 489; P. Chantraine, *Formation des noms en grec ancien*, p. 206.

words denoting utensils. The root need not be Indo-European. In fact, if we may judge from *qe-to* = *πίθος*, then *qe-ra-na*, which begins with the same syllabic group, may well be likewise an Aegean word. Perhaps the same is true of *qe-ro₂* «khiton with bronze plates?»¹.

(2) *pi-je-ra₃* can hardly be anything but *φιάλαι*.

(3) *ti-ri-po* = *τρίπους* is likewise self-evident.

(4) *to-pe-za* for *τόπεζα* exemplifies the Achaean treatment of the sonant liquid, if this word indeed began with *q^wtwr²*.

(5) *to-no* = *θόνος*. That this was the Cypriote form was deduced from *θόρναξ· ὑποπόδιον* by F. de Saussure in 1879³.

(6) *ta-ra-nu* = *δρᾶνυς* «footstool».

In the descriptive formulae two technical verbal participles constantly appear. *a-ja-me-no* is applied to tables, footstools and chairs. The material with which the objects are decorated is primarily ivory, a usage which tallies with that previously attested for this verb on the CHARIOT tablets. Apart from this, we find *ku-wa-no* *κύανος*, *ku-ru-so* *χρυσός* and *pa-ra-ku* used conjointly, while *pa-ra-ku* occurs alone in Ta715.3. It is evident that *a-ja-me-no* must mean either «veneered» or «inlaid». It remains to establish some connection if possible with the Greek lexicon. No extant verb is known but the proper name *Αἴητης* may be connected and the same root, with its evident reference to skilled craftsmanship, may be contained in the adjective (?) *αἴητον* applied to the craftsman god Hephaistos in *Il.* 18.410: ...ἀπ' ἀκμοδέτειο πέλωρ αἴητον ἀνέστη. If the connection with Luvian *aia-*, suggested independently by Georgiev, is correct, then a verb meaning «do, make» will have undergone semantic specialisation along the lines of the English «wrought with gold.»

The other technical verb is *qe-qi-no-me-no*, *qe-qi-no-to*, and this was previously known from PY Va482, which lists ivory. Ventris had already brilliantly read this word as = *δεδινωμένος* and connected it with the Homeric *δινωτός*: *δινωτοῖσι λέγεσσι Il.* 3.391, ...*κλισίην... δινωτήν ἐλέφαντι καὶ ἀργύρῳ Od.* 19.55-56.

¹ *Bull. Inst. Class. Stud.* II, 1955, p. 38.

² Schwyzer, *op. cit.* I, p. 352.

³ *Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles en i.-e.*, p. 77.

In these contexts the word can hardly mean «turned on the lathe», but must apply to some technical process of applying ivory and gold as decoration. In the present tablets it is evidently used also of the working of the ivory itself. Ta642.2 must mean «*a-ja-me-na* with ivory which is decorated with *85-de* and helmets» (unless *qe-qi-no-to* is a two-termination adjective, in which case it might refer back to *to-pe-za*). *Ibid.* 1.3 the table has ivory feet and a support, the ivory being decorated with a spiral pattern. Here the *-qe* of *qe-qi-no-to-qe* links up with *e-re-pa-te-jo* and these two adjectives presumably refer to *po-pi e-ka-ma-te-qe*, although here, too, the possibility cannot be excluded that *qe-qi-no-to* may refer back to *to-pe-za*. In 707.2, however, *qe-qi-no-me-na* cannot refer to *to-no* but must qualify *o-pi-ke-re-mi-ni-ja-pi*. So here, too, the ivory parts of the chair are worked into different designs (cf. Ta708.2). In Ta713.1,2 *qe-qi-no-me-na* may refer to *to-pe-za*. Both tables are decorated with a *to-qi* «spiral pattern». In the first the material is *ra-e-ja* «stone», in the second, ivory. Evidently, the technical process is concerned with hard material. As for the precise meaning, Ventris is inclined to think that the word «may perhaps originally have referred to lapidary work executed with a drill.» *δινέω* is used in the *Odyssey* of twirling the hot stake in the Cyclops' eye (9.384) and the whole scene is compared to an operation with the drill of the boat-builder. If Ventris' equation of the Mycenaean and the Homeric words is correct, as I believe, the representation of the voiced labio-velar before *i* offers difficulties. Attic usually has the voiced labial in such words¹. If this is the case, then the Homeric word must come from a dialect with a different representation of the labio-velar in this position. **g^wznos* should lead in Attic to **βίνος*, which would form the basis for a denominative verb *βινέω*. This word does occur in Attic, but in an obscene sense, of course. Abundant semantic parallels suggest themselves, and I am inclined to accord a distant recognition to this outcast. It would appear that a word denoting originally work done with a drill in Mycenaean had slightly extended its semantic range and come to mean «chased, engraved, carved, etc.». One point of morphology remains puzzling: *qe-qi-no-me-no* is the expected form of the

¹ See Schwyzer, *op. cit.* I, p. 300; M. Lejeune, *Traité de phonétique grecque*, p. 41 ff.

perfect participle. The verbal adjective in -τός should, however, lack the reduplication, as it does in the Homeric δινωτός. Conceivably, *qe-qi-no-to* is a denominative from a noun characterised by reduplication. We might compare the words dealing with «drilling» listed by Hesychius: βέμβιξ· ῥόμβος, στρέβλα, δίνη; βεμβεύει· δινεύει; βεμβρεῖ, βεμβρεύει· δινεύει.

Of the materials mentioned in conjunction with these two technical verbs *e-re-pa* «ivory», *ku-wa-no* «cyanos» and *ku-ru-so* «gold» are self-evident. *pa-ra-ku* has no satisfactory equivalent in the Greek lexicon. We might expect a mention of «silver», but we already have the Mycenaean word for this metal in *a-ku-ro* (Sa287 *a-ku-ro de-de-me-no* WHEEL PAIR I «bound with silver»). A possible solution is suggested by the combination of *ku-wa-no pa-ra-ku-we-ge ku-ru-so-ge* Ta714.I, cf. *ibid.* 1.3, which strongly recalls the passage in the Shield (*Il.* II.24-25):

τοῦ δ' ἦτοι δέκα οἴμοι ἔσαν μέλανος κυάνοιο
δώδεκα δὲ χρυσοῖο καὶ εἴκοσι κασσιτέροιο.

This parallelism (cf. *ibid.* 34-36) suggests that *pa-ra-ku* may be the word for «tin.»

Of the adjectives referring to materials, I find with Ventris that *ra-e-ja* = λαεία «stone» (note Cypriote, Cretan, etc. λαός «stone»; see LSJ *sub. voc.*; there is no evidence for a digamma in the word). *ku-te-se-ja* = κυτισεία «ebony» (κύτισος), *we-a-re-ja* ὑαλεία «crystal». Like Ventris I had originally identified *me-no-e-ja* as «crescent-shaped», but the parallelism of the formulaic structure suggests that a word in this «place» is likely to be an adjective referring to the material. Nor can I think of an adjective in -ειος which refers to shape rather than material. Moreover, the word-formation presents difficulties whether the basic noun-stem is *μηγ-* or *μήγᾱ*. It would appear that the noun which underlies this adjective has the stem-form *me-no-* and differs from the thematic *o*-class, which yield corresponding material adjectives in -ειος. I am tempted to postulate a noun of the third declension such as *mēnōs* or *mēnō(i)*. The resemblance to Μίνως is seductive.

Again, with Ventris I connect *a₂-ro-u-do-pi* with the name Ἄλοσούδνη, the latter being evidently an extension with the suffix *-ā* of the stem *udn-*: we must therefore postulate ἄλοσούδωρ / ἄλοσούδητ-. The form we have in this tablet is the instrumental plural in -φι with the sonant nasal represented as an *-o-* (see again below). Ventris,

however, regards the noun as the name of a material and translates «aquamarine». But if it is coordinated with *ku-wa-no-ge pa-ra-ku-we-ge ku-ru-so-ge*, the absence of the particle *-ge* would be puzzling. Consequently, I propose to take it as a noun which the three coordinated adjectives qualify. It is, I believe, the word for a well-known motif of Mycenaean decoration — the wavy line¹. What better name could we think for this than «undulations»? Our tablet records for us the Mycenaean craftsman's technical word for this motif: ἀλοσόδοτα «sea-water». The stone table listed in Ta642.1 is thus inlaid with «undulations» of cyanos, tin (?) and gold.

This brings us to the subject of the decorative motifs and patterns. Here, too, the field must be cleared by listing substantial points of agreement between Ventris and myself. Self-evident are *o-ni-ti-ja-pi* «birds», *a-di-ri-ja-te* «statuette», *po-ti-pi* (πόρτιφι) «heifers», *re-wo-pi* (λέφοντ-φι) «lions», *a-to-ro-go* (ἀνθρώπωι) «man», *i-go* (ἵκρωι) «horse», *po-ru-po-de* (πολυπόδει) «polypod», *ko-ru-pi* (κόρουδ-φι) «helmets». *to-qi-de* can hardly be anything but *τορῳ*^w *ἰδει* in view of its frequency, its place in the formulaic structure, and the prevalence of the spiral motif in Aegean decoration. It is of great importance, as I have already said, to note the «place» which such subsidiary motifs occupy in the structure of the formulae: *to-qi-de* occupies the final position in Ta642.3, 713.1, 2 and 721.2, while the synonymous *to-qi-de-we-sa* occupies a similar position in Ta711.3. It is a matter of common sense that the taker of the inventory first mentions the major features in the design and then proceeds to the accessorial elements.

Now prominent among the subsidiary motifs of Mycenaean decoration are foliage and branches of various kinds². This consideration carries weight for the interpretation of *ka-ru-we* Ta721.1 and *ka-ru-pi* Ta722.3, 4, which with Ventris I take to be «nut-tree(s)». But the same considerations apply equally to *po-ni-ki-pi* (final position in 714.2) and *po-ni-ke* (final position in 722.1). The palm-tree and its branches offer one of the most frequent plant motifs of Aegean decoration³. There appears to be no evidence to support the

¹ A. Furumark, *Mycenaean Pottery* [abbreviated *MP*], p. 370 ff., motif 53.

² *MP*, «Elements», p. 236 ff.

³ *MP*, p. 276 ff.

suggestion favoured by Ventris «that the name of the fabulous bird φοῖνιξ (Hesiod *frg.* 171.4) was first applied to griffins and sphinxes so prominent in Mycenaean art.» Failing this evidence, in view of the structural «place» occupied by this word, we can hardly do otherwise than identify it as one of the accessorial elements and equate it with φοῖνιξ «palm tree».

Other words which tend to be relegated to the final position in the descriptive formulae are *δ5-de-pi* (in conjunction with *ko-ru-pi* 642.2; in conjunction with *to-qi-de-ge ka-ru-we-ge* 721.1; in conjunction with *so-we-no-ge to-qi-de-ge* in 721.2; alone in 707.1 and 3 and 721.5).

For the sign *δ5* I have already suggested¹ the value *s'a* (palatal *sa*). Words and names beginning with this sign are likely to have been of Aegean origin, so both *δ5-de* and the *so-we-no*, with which it is so often associated, I suspect are Aegean words for two frequent traditional accessorial motifs of Aegean decoration. The probabilities must be left in the last instance to the experts in this field. However, in view of the importance of the vine motif in Aegean decoration one is tempted to bring *so-we-no* into connection with ἐλενοί: κλήματα τὰ τῶν ἀμπέλων, Hesychius. I have previously drawn attention to the interchange between *el-* and *ol-* in Aegean words, and parallels are available for the alternation between initial *s-* and the aspiration. As for *δ5-de*, the «rosette» presents itself in view of its great frequency as a strong candidate. *ko-ki-re-ja* I should identify with Ventris as *κογχιλεία «shell pattern». There remains the mysterious animal whose head figures in *se-re-mo-ka-ra-a-pi* (708.2) and the dual form *se-re-mo-ka-ra-o-i* (707.2, 714.2). We can eliminate lions, heifers, bulls (*qo-u-ka-ra* 711.2 and 3, see below) and horses (*i-qo*). Moreover the scribe has had second thoughts in 714.2 about «bulls' heads», which he has deleted. This leaves «stag» as a strong possibility, in view of its importance in Aegean decoration². The initial *s-* again suggests a pre-Greek word and here again Hesychius

¹ *Bull. Inst. Class. Stud.* II, 1955, p. 37 f.

² See motif 5, *MP.* p. 247 ff.

may help us with his entry σέρφοι· ἐλαφοί. I deal with the interchange of nasalised and non-nasalised labial consonants elsewhere¹.

Further material adjectives are provided by the well-known Indo-European suffix *-went-*: *to-qi-de-we-sa* 711.3 is evidently equivalent to *to-qi-de-ja* 709.1. Its formation is strikingly archaic, the suffix being attached directly to the basic noun without the intervention of the analogical thematic vowel (see below, where this is vital in the interpretation of an important word). The same is evidently true of *85-de-we-sa* 709.2. In this word the evidence of the instrumental plural *85-de-pi* (642.2 etc.) makes it likely that the underlying noun is an *s*-stem *85-dos/85-des-*. This would tend to cast doubt on the proposal of J. Chadwick to derive the adjective in question from σίδη «pomegranate», for *-went-* derivatives from *ā*-nouns in later Greek have the form *-āwent-* (see again below).

We may now turn to a consideration of the structural details of the furniture. *e-ka-ma-pi* 713.1 and *e-ka-ma-te* 642.3 are evidently the instrumental plural and singular respectively of the neuter noun ἔχμα «support» as distinct from the feet *po-pi* (642.3). The feet are concerned in two compounds: *e-ne-wo pe-za* (642.1 and 3) where for later purposes we may note that the two parts of this compound word are separated by a word-divider; it is written as one word in 713.1 and 3 and 715.1; but this last tablet has the dual written *e-ne-wo pe-zo* in the third line (note the sonant nasal in *e-ne-wo* again represented as an *-o-*); and *we-pe-za* (713.2). Chadwick took these as adjectives of measurement «nine feet long», «six feet long». But this inter-

¹ On *wi* × *mi* see E. Sittig, *Minos* III 2 (1955), p. 98; further Schwyzer, *op. cit.* I, p. 436; Gortyn. ῥέδιμνος for μέδιμνος may be a further example; add also Cypr. κυβερῆναι = κυβερῶν.

The only pair of animals heads I have been able to discover in the repertoire of Near Eastern ivory decoration is quoted in L. Woolley, *Alalakh*, p. 290: «AT/47/24, two gazelles heads, chin to chin... details of eyes, etc... picked out in black pigment». Cf. AT/48/72 head of gazelle. There are other passages of interest in connection with the above discussion. «Nearly all the examples of ivory working are decorative elements for appliqué or inlay [= *a-ja-me-no*] Most of the inlay... is 'worked' not at all or in the most mechanical manner» (p. 288). «AT/38/74.6... engraved [= *qe-qi-no-to*] with a compass-drawn rosette» (p. 289). AT/48/7 «pieces of ivory inlay, all blackened by the fire. The largest of them are fronds from a palm design common on ivory-carvings, cf. Carchemish vol. iii. Pl. 71 f.» (*ibid.*). This recalls *po-ni-ke* etc. above.

pretation has little plausibility and takes no account of a curious fact that the feet are in all instances multiples of three. This can hardly be an accident. I suggest, therefore that the tables in question have either two or three supports and that each support has three feet, perhaps in the form of animals' feet or paws and the like.

a-pi-go-to (642.3, 713.1 and 3, 715.1, 2 and 3) I also identify as ἀμφιγῶστος = ἀμφίβατος (again with the sonant nasal represented as -o-). Ventris, however, suggests that «it may refer to a broad edging round the table top.» The proposal of Mühlestein, quoted by Ventris, that this adjective means «what can be walked round», «free standing» seems to me a remarkable way of describing a table. In fact there is no need to depart from the well-established meaning of the underlying verb ἀμφιβαίνω, which means «to stand astride», «with the legs apart». I should be inclined to translate «splay-legged».

I also find difficulty in embracing the suggestion that *po-ro-e-ke* means «jutting», that is, a table set against a wall. The word προεχής is quoted only from Plutarch *fr.* 13.2 as a correction of the manuscript reading προσεχής (see LSJ). Moreover, this interpretation ignores a relevant fact: namely, that in the next line of the same tablet (715.3) we have the descriptive term *pu-ko-so e-ke-e* (dual, again with with a word-divider in a compound word). There can be little doubt that these are two compound adjectives, the first constituent being a noun and the second perhaps the verbal root ἐχ-, though it may also be a neuter *s*-stem denoting a part of the table. If *pu-ko-so* is identified as πύξο- «boxwood», then the parallelism of the two adjectives would force us to conclude that *po-ro* conceals the name of some material: perhaps πῶρος «a kind of marble, like the Parian in colour and solidity, but lighter» (see LSJ *sub voc.*).

Of the structural details we are left with *o-pi-ke-re-mi-ni-ja*. I have nothing to add to Ventris' discussion of this word except to say that its nucleus is evidently an Aegean word with the suffix *-mi-* which is found in a number of technical words suspect of pre-Greek origin¹.

It is in the introductory tablet Ta711 that there is a wide difference of interpretation between Ventris and myself. The objects con-

¹ Schwyzer, *op. cit.* I, p. 524.

cerned are identified by the ideogram as JUGS, their name being *qe-ra-na* (see above). The principle on which we diverge is best exemplified in 1.3. Here Ventris and myself agree in interpreting the last two words of the descriptive formula *go-u-ka-ra to-qi-de-we-sa* as (decorated with) *bull's head* and *spiral*, for the first word must be connected with the later βουκράνιον etc; and there is no need to stress the importance of this motif as an element of Aegean decoration. Thus there is agreement between us that the last two words of the formula are *adjectives designating the decorative motifs*. They are preceded by two other words *wa-na-se-wi-ja* and *ku-na-ja*, which are evidently likewise feminine adjectives parallel with the first two. We both identify the underlying nouns as *ῥάνασσα* and *γυνή*. At this point Ventris departs from our common principle of interpretation and renders «of the queen's service, belonging to a woman», which I find quite unintelligible. I could understand that an inventory might designate a JUG as «belonging to X» but not as «belonging to (some unspecified) woman». I propose, therefore, to assume as a working hypothesis *that the four coordinated adjectives of which the formula consists all have the same function and refer to the decorative motifs on the JUG*; and further to put the same principle to the severe test of applying it to all the other descriptive formulae. Some difficult problems will arise as regards word formation which it will be convenient to leave until the end. So I propose to strip off the adjective-forming morphemes *-e-wi-jo*, *e-ja*, *-ja*, *-we-sa* etc. and to attempt to identify the basic nouns as elements of decoration.

In view of the uncertainties it will be well, by way of preliminary, to state the principles of interpretation explicitly.

(1) The meaning of the basic noun (e. g. *wa-na-sa*) would be ideally established by the analysis of the contexts in which it occurs. This counsel of perfection is unfortunately seldom open to us because of the paucity and nature of the available texts. In one important instance, however, the tablets do offer such an opportunity (see below on *a-mo-ta*).

(2) As the next best course, possibilities are opened up by strict application of the established spelling rules to link up with words known from later Greek sources.

(3) The plausibility of the results reached by the two preceding methods will be tested by comparison with the repertory of decorative motifs known to have been current in the Mycenaean artefacts *of this period* (i. e. LH III B = Myc. III B). Our chief reference will be to A. Furumark, *Mycenaean Pottery* (abbreviated *MP*).

(4) The motifs conjoined in a given formula must be mutually compatible, that is to say, make an intelligible composition (see below on «pictorial composition»).

An interpretation which satisfies all these criteria will possess considerable plausibility. By way of preliminary let us assess the plausibility of an *agreed interpretation* against this scale of values.

(1) *to-qi-de-ja*. The word occurs most frequently at the end of the formula. It will therefore be an important accessorial decorative theme (see above).

(2) No extant word in later Greek occurs which would account for the syllabic group except *τρόπις* and this means «the keel of a ship». Consequently, we are compelled to equate with an Indo-European root **treqw* and to assume that from this a noun is derived by means of the well-known suffix *-id-* which is assigned the meaning «that which twists».

(3) The frequent word *torq^w id-* is equated with the frequent motif «spiral».

(4) This being a subsidiary motif, the test of compatibility does not arise.

Thus the plausibility of the proposed solution rests (1) on the philological construction of a non-attested word by means of a well-known morphological procedure yielding deverbatives of a well-defined semantic class (Schwyzer, *op. cit.* I p. 464 f.; Chantraine, *op. cit.* p. 335-348); (2) the motif which thus emerges is well known in Mycenaean decoration. It will be seen that the plausibility of the solution falls far short of the maximum points attainable by all the criteria enumerated. Yet there is no disagreement between Ventris and myself, who arrived at it independently.

We may now proceed to the ventilation of our disagreements. Both parties identify the basic words as *θάνασσα*, «goddess (or queen)» and *γυνή* «woman». But I prefer to keep to the one principle of interpretation. The jug in question is, I suggest, decorated with a pictorial composition consisting of *goddess* and *women*, with *bull's heads* and *spirals* as the subsidiary. Such a scene is, of course, familiar to students of Mino-Mycenaean art, e. g. from the ring reproduced by G. Glotz¹ on which he comments «La grande Mère, au pied d'un arbre, une fleur sur la tête, des fleurs dans la main, reçoit d'autres fleurs encore et des fruits que lui offrent des femmes et des jeunes filles.» Another scene which might be described in the words of our formula is the ritual dance of the women which provokes the epiphany of the Goddess as depicted on the gold ring from Isopata². The vessel listed in the second line of Ta711 will have been decorated with a picture of the Goddess alone, but this time with sub-

¹ *La civilisation égéenne*, p. 274, fig. 37.

² See *ibid.* p. 285 and fig. 44.

sidiary motifs of *bull's heads* and *sea shells*. The motifs thus elicited satisfy all the above criteria except the first and are to be awarded high marks for plausibility, higher than *τόρρωις*.

A third *qe-ra-na* is listed in the second half of line 2, but the ideogram has been omitted because the text runs to the extreme edge of the tablet. The descriptive formula reads *a-mo-te-wi-ja ko-ro-no-we-sa*. Ventris appears to identify the basic noun as *ἀρμωστής*, and he translates strangely «of the Harmost's service». No evidence is offered for the intrusion of this Spartan official into a Mycenaean document and we are left unenlightened as to the appearance of a *jug* which might plausibly be described as «of the Harmost's service». *ko-ro-no-we-sa* Ventris links with *κορώνη* either in the meaning «sea-bird» or «curved handle». It is unnecessary to examine the plausibility of the motif thus arrived at since the link with the basic noun *κορώνᾱ* cannot be established. All the available evidence shows that adjectives made with the suffix *-went-* from *ā*-nouns have the form *-āwent-* and not *-owent-*. Thus E. Risch¹ writes: «Die Ableitungen zu den *o*-Stämmen lauten regelmässig *-όεις*, z. B. *λωτόεις*, zu *ā*-Stämmen *-ήεις*, z. B. *ποιήεις*, aus metrischen Gründen *σχιόεις* zu *σκήη...*». An example from these tablets is the name *ko-ma-we* An519.10. Jn750.9, dative *ko-ma-we-te* Cn925.1. The evidence from the linear B tablets in fact reveals a picture even more archaic than the Homeric poems since the suffix is attached, as we have seen, to consonant stems without the interposition of the thematic vowel: *pe-de-we-sa* Ta709.2 and *to-qi-de-we-sa* (see above). But to return to the *ā*-stems, Ventris himself has suggested that *wo-ra-we-sa* which describes a CHARIOT in Se880+1017 is derived from *οὐλά* and he translates «scarred». This I doubt, for I believe the chariot has a cover, *φώρα*), but the principle of word formation at least is correct. It is all the stranger that he ignores this vital fact of word formation when attempting to link *ko-ro-no-we-sa* with *κορώνᾱ*. A rigorous application of the four heuristic principles enumerated above will, I believe, yield a description of the vase less strange and open to philological objection than «of the Harmost's service with a curved handle.»

In the first place, we are fortunate in that the meaning of the syllabic group *a-mo-ta* may be established contextually, for the word

¹ *Wortbildung der hom. Sprache*, p. 139.

also occurs in the CHARIOT tablets, from which I quote some typical specimens, So0492+5790+6019.

de-do-me-na

A-MO-TA *pte-re-wa* *te-mi-7I-ta* WHEEL ZE 24

In these contexts Ventris and Chadwick¹ took *a-mo-ta* as an adjective ἄρμωστά, which they interpreted as a technical description of the wheels in question. The difficulties inherent in this interpretation have been pointed out by M. Lejeune² in a lucid examination of these texts, although he still regards the identification ἄρμωστά as probable. I have long doubted this interpretation, and my doubts have been shared with P. B. S. Andrews. In the first place, the position of *A-MO-TA* written large at the beginning of the tablets, like *I-QI-FA*, suggested to me that this word is in fact a noun designating the objects depicted in the ideogram WHEEL. That, however, it did not simply designate the wheel was probable from the fact that we have a persistent Indo-European word for the wheel in κύκλος while Homer also uses τροχός. Moreover, if Ventris' interpretation were correct, then one would expect to find that the objects described as *a-na-mo-ta* were WHEELS lacking this particular specification, that is, not ἄρμωστά. But in fact where *a-na-mo-ta* occurs, we find not WHEELS but the bare unmounted CHARIOT BODY, with the pole attached. If then *a-mo-ta* is a noun, then the obvious way to establish its meaning is to ask what is it which the *a-na-mo-ta* tablets lack which the *a-mo-ta* tablets have. The plain answer is that they lack the *undercarriage*, which of course is seen from the side and represented by a single wheel, as it commonly is in Mycenaean representations of the complete chariot.

The meaning thus tentatively established by the analysis of the contexts, we may apply the second of our heuristic principles and attempt to link up *a-mo-ta* and *a-na-mo-to* with known Greek words. We may now use the fact to which attention was repeatedly drawn above, namely that in the South Achaean dialect with which we are dealing the sonant nasal is represented by a short *-o-*. We are fortunate in that we have an exact morphological parallel for *a-na-mo-to*.

¹ *Evidence*, p. 99.

² *Rev. Phil.* XXIX 2 (1955), p. 159; further P. Chantraine, *Minos* IV 1 (1956), p. 52.

In his *Transliteration Nucleus* (February 1954) Ventris listed «76 spellings which I consider to be the most securely interpreted». No. 6 in his list reads «*a-no-wo-to* K875.1 = $\acute{\alpha}$ - $\nu\omicron$ - $\rho\acute{\alpha}$ - $\tau\omicron\nu$ 'no-handled'», and the short *-o-* is glossed by him «*η*». It remains to be added that the same sound correspondence is used by him in the present tablets for *a-pi-go-to* and *e-ne-wo* (see above). It can hardly be open then to deny that just as *a-no-wo-to* = $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\rho\eta\tau\omicron\nu$ so *a-na-mo-to* = $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\rho\mu\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$. There is complete morphological and phonological parallelism. The basic noun for which we are searching will evidently be the well-known chariot word $\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\alpha$, $\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$. In Homer this means of course «chariot» but the meaning elicited above recalls the fact that in Homer $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\acute{\alpha}$ means both «undercarriage» and «carriage, cart». For the first meaning see *Il* 24. 266-7:

ἐκ μὲν ἄμαξαν ἄειραν ἐύτροχον ἡμιονεῖην
καλὴν πρωτοπαγέα, πείρινθα δὲ δῆσαν ἐπ' αὐτῆς

cf. 262:

οὐκ ἂν δὴ μοι ἄμαξαν ἐφοπλίσσαιτε τάχιστα.

The verb ἐφοπλίζειν patently means «to put the gear on», an operation which in fact consists of tying on the πείρινθα. Thus in its narrower technical sense ἄμαξα means the wagon *less* the πείρινθα just as in our texts the ἄρμα in the narrower sense means the chariot without the body. That we have successfully identified the *a-mo-ta* as a neuter noun is now confirmed by a fact which Ventris communicated to me after the above analysis was complete: a new fragment So7485.3 reads *a-mo* I. Here we have the expected singular, the equivalent of $\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\eta$, again with the final sonant nasal represented as an *-o-*, as in *e-ne-wo* and, we must now suppose, in *pe-mo*. It remains to add that the dual *a-mo-te* was so interpreted by me, a word which Ventris and Chadwick¹ interpreted as $\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\acute{o}\sigma\theta\eta$ and M. Lejeune² as $\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\omicron\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$ or $\acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\nu$ «de provenance indéterminée». There is certainly only one type of Greek noun of the pattern singular *a-mo*, dual *a-mo-te*, plural *a-mo-ta* and they are the neutres in *-μη*, *-μητος*. The present interpretation will remove a number of objections to the previous interpretation which are listed by Lejeune. It re-

¹ *Evidence*, p. 99.

² *Ibid.*, p. 159, 166.

moves an uncompounded adjective in -τός; it explains the position and large writing *A-MO-TA* in the first position; it saves us the embarrassment of having to postulate an entirely different word to account for *a-mo-te*; it obviates the question «what are the wheels which are not *a-mo-ta*?»; it explains why *a-na-mo-ta* are accompanied by ideograms depicting the CHARIOT BODY; and finally, it explains why there is no mention of ἄξονες for on our hypothesis the ἄρμα consists essentially of the two wheels mounted on an axle. We conclude that in Mycenaean times the word ἄρμα in a narrower technical sense meant «undercarriage» and in a looser sense «chariot», as it does in later Greek. Thus the *a-mo-te-wo ra-wa-ke-si-jo-jo* of Ea25 was most likely the «War Leader's Charioteer». In Vno6 the woodcutters send *e-pi-pu-ta a-mo-te-jo-na-de* as well as *a-ko-so-ne*. Ventris and Chadwick¹ have already interpreted the place in question as ἄρματα(ι)ών «the chariot work-shop». Our investigation of the contexts of the syllabic group *a-mo-t-* is now complete, and it is difficult to resist the conclusion that *a-mo-te-wi-ja* means «decorated with a charioteer».

This provides us with an attractive possibility for *ko-ro-no-we-sa*. This group of syllables can stand for κλονόφσσα and κλόνος is an Homeric word for a «dense throng of warriors», or «battle rout», e. g.

Il. 5.167:

βῆ δ' ἕμεν ἄν τε μάχην καὶ ἀνὰ κλόνον ἐγχειάων.

Il. 16.331:

ζῶν ἔλε βλαφθέντα κατὰ κλόνον.

ibid. 713:

δίξε γὰρ ἠὲ μάχοιτο κατὰ κλόνον αὐτίς ἐλάσσας.

ibid. 788-9:

ἦντετο γὰρ τοι Φοῖβος ἐνὶ κρατερῆι ὑσμίνῃ
δεινός. ὁ μὲν τὸν ἰόντα κατὰ κλόνον οὐκ ἐνόησεν.

Il. 11.148-9:

ὁ δ' ὄθι πλείσται κλονέοντο φάλαγγες
τῆι ῥ' ἐνόρουσ'.

Il. 16.284-5:

Πάτροκλος δὲ πρῶτος ἀκόντισε δουρὶ φαεινῶι
ἀντικρὺ κατὰ μέσσον, ὄθι πλείστοι κλονέοντο.

¹ *Ibid.*

The conformation of the semantic field revealed by the above passages makes it likely that κλόνος and κλονέω referred originally to the closely packed battle formation and that the notion «closely packed, huddled together» developed implications of disorder and rout. An obvious parallel is provided by the noun οὐλαμός «throng of warriors» especially in battle, and the notion of disorder in the corresponding verb (*Il* 8.214-5):

πλήθεν ὁμῶς ἵππων τε καὶ ἀνδρῶν ἀπιστάων
εἰλομένων

I suggest, therefore, that the *ge-ra-na* under discussion was decorated with «a charioteer and a band of warriors». That these motifs satisfy the criterion of mutual compatibility goes without saying. We may now make enquiry of the Aegean archaeologist.

In his chapter on «Pictorial Composition» Furumark writes (*MP* p. 430): «... at this stage (*scil.* the beginning of Myc. III) an altogether different class of pictorial decoration appears, viz. one where the separate elements as a rule are not *per se* ornamental and where the composition is of a more narrative character, representing scenes from real life». Particularly important for our problem are his remarks on the Hellado-Mycenaean style (p. 446 ff.): «Another thing should be observed: the representation is of a narrative character, the composition forming one coherent whole». This insistence on the logical coherence of the decorative motifs gives an added importance to our criterion of mutual compatibility (no. 3). Now apropos of the subjects represented in the pictorial compositions of the Hellado-Mycenaean vases² of our period Furumark comments thus on the *chariot scenes*: «We may assume the following subjects to have been represented on these vases: (a) simple chariot scene... (b) battle scene with chariots... (c) spearmen advancing towards the foe... (d) battle scene with spearmen...» And again, (p. 452); «If we assume that these representations had prototypes in the greater arts, we may easily reconstruct a cycle illustrating the successive stages of warfare. First we have the preparation and the departure of the infantry and of charioteers, in the first instance, the leave taking and the marching off of warriors equipped with provisions, in the second, the unharnessed horses, grooms harnessing the horses and chariots on their way to the battle. Then comes the battle itself: advancing spearmen, spearmen throwing their spears and charioteers fighting». Furumark's exposition, it will be seen, corresponds strikingly to the pictorial scene «charioteer with throng of warriors» which our linguistic analysis has elicited from the tablet under discussion. We emphasize once again that such pictorial compositions are peculiar to the Myc. III period to which the Palace of Nestor is assigned. The interpretation offered thus satisfies all the criteria set up as measures of plausibility.

We may be encouraged to search for further enlightenment in Furumark's monumental work. As the comparative philologist turns over the pages which the distinguished Swedish archaeologist devotes to the pictorial compositions

of this same period, he finds that a prominent place is given to *bull compositions* (p. 438ff). In particular (p. 439): «It has also been shown that the postures of some of the specimens correspond to those of the Vaphio Bulls.» Furumark is of course referring to the famous gold cup found in the tholos tomb of Vaphio near the hands of the buried king (see Evans, *Palace of Minos* II, p. 175 fig. 88). We may add that a gold and silver cup with running bulls was found by Persson in the royal tomb at Dendra. If we now return to our working hypothesis that the descriptive formulae consist of strings of adjectives formed with various suffixes from nouns denoting the motif in question, for «decorated with a *bull*» with a feminine noun we should expect to find an adjective something like *go-wi-ja*. At once the mind recurs to a passage which was left unexplained in our previous discussion of Kn02.3 (= Tn316.r.3). It will be recalled that this document appears to be a calendar of offerings made to number of Mycenaean divinities and that the first entry records the offerings made to the divine occupant of the *po-se-da-i-jo*, who, to judge from the human offering (2 WOMEN) was a goddess. The offerings recorded in l. 3 are:

GOLD CUP I WOMEN 2 *go-wi-ja*[...] *ko-ma-we-te-ja*

It should be noted that the syllabic groups diverge from the normal in that such textual items usually occur before the ideograms. We must assume that they were added as an afterthought, and this is consistent with the fact that the last syllable is squeezed in above the line. The added words may thus refer either to the GOLD CUP or to the two WOMEN. Now appopos of the *bull compositions*, Furumark notes the occurrence as an accessorial motif of *leaf plant*: «an ornament absent in non-pictorial decoration is a stemmed plant with one or several lanceolate leaves» (p. 439). Trees are likewise a prominent feature of the decoration of the Vaphio gold cup. This fact gives us an opportunity of using the criterion of compatibility. In Greek an object «having foliage» would be κομᾶ-φεντ- (for κόμη «foliage» see *Odyssey* 23.195: καὶ τότ' ἔπειτ' ἀπέκοφα κόμην τανυφύλλου ἐλαίης). According to our hypothesis the corresponding descriptive adjective would be κομαφεντ-εῖα (cf. *to-qi-de-ja*). In view of the facts assembled by the archaeologists relative to the *bull compositions* on Mycenaean artefacts of our period and the association of *leaf plant* with *bulls*, can it be an accident that *go-wi-ja* (in the first position of the formula representing the principal theme) should be associated with *ko-ma-we-te-ja* (in the final position representing the accessorial motif) on the same line as an ideogram representing a GOLD CUP? Let us examine the probabilities involved in the alternative assumption that these are two women's names which quite accidentally counterfeit the names for the *combination of motifs* presented in the surviving Mycenaean gold cups and also listed in the *bull compositions* of the contemporary pottery. On the hypothesis that the names have nothing to do with the gold cup offered, we must assess the probabilities by making a random choice. To test the hypothesis that these are two women's names, we shall put all the available Mycenaean women's names into two urns, mix thoroughly, blindfold ourselves and make a random selection from each of the two urns with our right hand and our left. The probabilities will be the same if it is thought that the second word is a derivative from a man's name representing either the owner or the woman concerned («[slave of] Komaweis»: (G. Pugliese Carratelli, *St. in onore di*

U. Paoli, p. 11.) if we may assume that there were roughly the same number of men's and women's names to choose from. Thus the chances of a random *combination of names* counterfeiting the *combination of motifs* established by the archaeologists are one in x^2 , where x is the number of women's and/or men's names available. On the modest assumption that there were only one hundred names the chances of accident would be one in ten thousand. We should add a further factor in the calculation: the names would have to be written *in the appropriate order* to account for the distinction between principal and subsidiary motif. It will be conceded that the odds are enormously in favour of the hypothesis that the words in question refer to the GOLD CUP and mean «decorated with a *bull...* and *leaf plant.*» It remains to add that the alternative hypothesis has to establish the right of *go-wi-ja* to be put into the urn at all and that it in any case offers no explanation of the smudged word, which has proved impossible to read (Bennett's revised text gives a blank for this word). If our hypothesis be accepted, the GOLD CUP offered to the goddess of the *po-se-da-i-jo*, who I believe to have been the patroness of Pylos, will have been similar in decoration to the gold cups found at Vaphio and elsewhere.

We may now resume our expectant perusal of the relevant pages of *Mycenaean Pottery*. The chapter on Myc. III pictorial composition lists *goat compositions* among the most frequent. *aik-* = *aiγ-* immediately obtrudes itself and with it the possibility of solving yet another problem.

The famous TRIPOD tablet Sa641 reads:

ti-ri-po ai-ke-u ke-re-si-jo we-ke TRIPOD 2

ti-ri-po ke-re-si-jo we-ke a-pu ke-ka-u-me-no ke-re-a₂ TRIPOD [

To this we may now add Ta709.3.

ti-ri-po ke-re-si-jo we-ke 34-ke-u TRIPOD I [

Ventris¹ in his discussion of the first tablet took *ai-ke-u* as a proper name and *ke-re-si-jo* as Κρήσιος «the Cretan». *we-ke* he identified as the verb φέρω «bring», and he translated the whole phrase «Aigeus the Cretan brings it». In the second formula quoted we should have to assume that the name was omitted and only the ethnic remains. The new example presents a strange word order «tripod, the Cretan brought it, *34-ke-u.*» In fact Ventris² has now abandoned his version. But recently Aigeus the Cretan has been resuscitated by H. Mühlestein, who offers³ an ingenious way out of the difficulties of the changing word order. In the first place, he identifies *we-ke* as the

¹ *Archaeology* VII 1 (1954), p. 18.

² *Eranos* LIII (1956), p. 116.

³ *Les trépieds de Pylos* (privately circulated, December 1955).

root aorist of ῥεργ- «make», 'rival de *wo-zo*'. «Mais d'où notre notaire savait-il qu'un Aigeus avait forgé ces trépieds? Et comment vérifier cette indication postérieurement? Les comptables mycéniens n'ont guère su reconnaître l'ouvrage d'un Aigeus à son style. Et d'autre part, la syntaxe reste bien étrange, cette principale qui ne se rattache à rien, alors qu'on ne manquait pas de participes, par exemple. Les difficultés disparaissent, si le notaire lisait, gravée sur les trépieds, la signature de l'artiste, en trois mots, et qu'il l'a notée littéralement dans son inventaire, comme trait caractéristique et indélébile de ses pièces. Plus que ça: Les trois mots de l'inscription étaient disposés en rond sur le bassin circulaire des trépieds d'Aigeus, puisqu'en Ta709.3, le notaire a manqué son entrée.....»

However, while acknowledging the ingeniousness of the proposed solution, doubts assail one. Particularly daunting is the implication that the trained palace «notaire», who is drawing up the inventory *in Greek*, found the inscriptions on the tripods so unintelligible that he could copy them nonsensically in the wrong order of words. Moreover, in the third description of Ta641 he apparently left out the name and merely copied the patronymic *ke-re-si-jo*. If we eschew hypothesis for the moment and merely look at the facts, we shall notice two things: first, that *ke-re-si-jo we-ke* moves in the formula as a single unit; and secondly that the scribe shows a tendency to separate by a word divider the constituents of compound words (see above and add *a-pu ke-ka-u-me-no* in this very tablet). Thus there are strong reasons for reading this as one word ῥησιοῤεργῆς , which could hardly be bettered as a description of a Mycenaean bronze tripod. Karo¹ writes: «Während so die Keramik des Festlandes eine namhafte Selbstständigkeit bewahrt, sind Schmuck, Gemmen und Ringe, Elfenbein und Bronzearbeiten sowie Gefässe aus Edelmetall und Waffen von minoischen Tast nie unterscheidbar. Hier herrschte Kreta unumschränkt.» Dr. M. Todd has drawn my attention to the frequency of such formations in the description of artefacts: ῤεινιοεργῆς (τράπεζα) Critias 35d; Λυκιοεργῆς (φιάλη) Dem. 49.31; Ναξιοεργῆς (κάνθαρος) Ar. Pax 143; Μιλησιοεργῆς (κλίνη) IG I².330.3; Χιοεργῆς (ποτήριον) IG II (2), 110,1.7 (Delos, in an inventory of ἀργυρώματα; cf. ῤηιοεργῆ l. 22), etc.

¹ *PW* Suppl. VI col. 593.

Against this mass of evidence we must set with Mühlestein the syntactical incongruence in the formula as thus interpreted with singular for dual. But this objection can hardly weigh very heavily with a scribe who can write *di-pa me-zo-e* with dual for singular in the next line. In fact, Ventris, as I have said, has now abandoned his own interpretation in favour of that argued here and rightly concludes «we must then assume an erroneous singular for dual *-wergeš* on Ta64I.1 and it is doubtful if *ai-ke-u* can be a man's name.»¹

My own explanation follows from the general interpretation of the descriptive formulae. Ignoring for the moment the question of word formation, I take *ai-k-* to represent *aiγ-* so that *aiγεύς* is again a word referring to the decorative motif: *goat* (mot. 6, *MP* p. 250 ff.). In 709.3 *34-ke-u* is taken by Ventris as *ai₂-ke-u*. I am doubtful about this value for *34*, *inter alia* on phoneme-distributional grounds: in particular, *po-ai₂-wi-do* KN Sc235 is a strange concatenation of sounds. I have already suggested² that the closely resemblant *35* has the value *pu₃*. I shall argue the case in detail elsewhere along with other as yet unread sounds, but the example of *pa-34-so* KN X328 as compared with *pa-pu-so* Jn08.4, and the possibility that the *-w-* in *po-34-wi-do* may be a glide sound after an *-u-* all make it possible that *34* is after all a variant of *35* with the same value *pu₃*. *34-te* in An29.11 would then be *φωτήρ*, the plural of which *pu₂-te-re*³ occurs in Na57. If *pu₃* like *pa₃* was used primarily to represent the aspirated stops, then *34-ke-u* may stand for *φουεύς*, and the motif which then emerges is well-known from the Cretan repertory: it is *sea weed*⁴.

We may now step back from the canvas and again assess the probabilities. Given the fact that the repertory of Aegean decorative motifs of this period includes *goddess* and *women*, *charioteer* and *warriors*, *bulls* and *leaf plant*, and *goat*, what is the likelihood that in texts admittedly concerned with the description of Mycenaean artefacts the syllabic groups *wa-na-s-* + *ku-na*, *a-mo-t-* + *ko-ro-no-*, *go-w-* + *ko-ma-we-t-*, and *ai-k* would occur *by sheer accident* and counterfeit the Greek words for the motifs in question, espe-

¹ *Eranos* LIII (1956),

² *Bull. Inst. Class. Stud.* II, 1955, p. 44.

³ *Gnomon* XXVI (1954), p. 66 f.

⁴ Motif 30, *MP*, p. 321 ff.

cially when no fewer than three are *groups of words* corresponding to the established *combinations of motifs* where the probabilities must be calculated in terms of x^2 rather than x ? I submit that such an accumulation reduces the possibility of random occurrence to negligible proportions, so that we may now approach the difficult question of Mycenaean word formation with greater confidence.

What we are faced with is a type $\alpha\iota\gamma\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, a denominative which in these formulae means «decorated with *goat* motif», and a corresponding feminine formation in $-\eta\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha$. The latter could have arisen by «false division» from a basic form like $\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ «charioteer», from which a «decorative» adjective $\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\alpha\tau\eta\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha$ could have been formed with the suffix $-i\bar{a}$ as in $\gamma\omicron\nu\alpha-\iota\alpha$. It is to the suffix $-\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ that we must turn our attention. In Homer, Risch¹ writes, «die meisten Appellativa auf $-\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ kennzeichnen einen Mann nach seinem Stande, der Waffengattung oder dem Beruf.» Thus $\chi\alpha\lambda\kappa\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ meant «he who has to do with bronze». But it is relevant to the present problem to note that such formations could be also used to describe *things*. As Risch remarks: «Merkwürdig ist $\beta\omicron\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ 'rindslederner Riemen'». Here we have precisely such a derivative from an animal name used to describe an object, just as according to our submission $\alpha\iota\gamma\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ describes the tripod. It would appear that the semantic content of the denominative suffix is of the vaguest. $\alpha\iota\gamma\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ simply means the person or thing which has to do with goats, just as $\omicron\upsilon\beta\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ is explained by W. Schulze² «*proprie significat sulcatorem.*»

After this digression the most important question claims our attention. What was the occasion on which the inventory was taken? The secret lies concealed in the introductory formula. Ventris³ translates: «Thus $pu_2-ke-qi-ri$ made inspection on the occasion when the king appointed Sigewas to be a *damokoros*.» This was, in fact, my own first version, but further consideration has convinced me that it is untenable.

The formula begins as so often with $o-$ prefixed to a verb: $o-wi-de$ = «thus saw... ». $pu_2-ke-qi-ri$ is presumably the subject and a proper name as in the precisely parallel opening $o-wi-de a-ko-so-ta$

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 144.

² See Risch, *ibidem*.

³ *Eranos* LIII (1956), p. 113.

of Eq213.1 (Eq01), a text which seems to record the inspection of grain stocks by the prominent personage *A-ko-so-ta* when the *ἄρουρα* was being ploughed up. Ventris comments: «It possibly refers to the checking of the transaction by the responsible official» and he adduces by way of explanation parallels from the tablets from Alalakh, e. g. no. 255: «...four (birds) to Taguzi, when the king went to stay in Abena.» Ventris has in fact suggested, and this is the implication of the parallel he has adduced, that the tablets under discussion record presents given to various people on the occasion of the appointment of *Ḫ5-ke-wa* to the office of *da-mo-ko-ro*. This is an interesting suggestion. It would not perhaps be a fatal objection that the expression *o-wi-de* «thus he (she) saw.....» is hardly appropriate as a description of the giving of presents. The verb certainly suggests here as in Eq213 that what is recorded is an inspection by the official responsible of objects *in situ* and the taking of an inventory. But if they form a series of presents, why should the recipients be named only in the case of two items namely the jugs? And why is the donor mentioned only in one entry and even then anonymously (Ta711.3 «gift of a woman»)? Furthermore if this were a record of gifts on a ceremonious occasion, should we not expect some order or precedence? The gift hypothesis also fails to account for another set of facts, namely that the objects listed form a unity. As Ventris remarks they appear to be «the furnishings of a luxurious reception room (furniture, vessels, and arrangements for heating)». Now such a complete set of household equipment might be given away for instance as a dowry (cf. the trousseau of Ahat Milku, which includes besides clothing and elaborate decorated furniture, cooking pots and tongs, as Professor Webster pointed out after a communication by Dr. Tritsch to the London Seminar on 10th October 1956 on the relevance of the Ugarit texts to the study of the Linear B tablets), or otherwise disposed of at the death or disgrace of the owner (as for instance in the Hermocopid inventories). But why should this be done when the *ῥάναξ* appointed *Ḫ5-ke-wa* a *da-mo-ko-ro*? And if the tablets record a series of honorific presents on this auspicious occasion, one may be permitted to wonder who received the «useless» tripod with the legs burned off and who, again, the similar item with one foot. But there are even more trivial objects — the hearth furniture in Ta709, which it will be convenient to identify here.

pi-je-ra₃ to-gi-de-ja 3 is evidently «three φιάλαι decorated with spirals». The next word is mutilated and only the end of the next word is legible. But since it obviously ends with the common instrument suffix -τήρια and the ideogram presents the form of a boiling pan or some such thing, we must conclude that *pa-ko-to* is likewise the beginning of the name of some cooking vessel.¹ With the next word we pass out of the repertory of such ideograms and the objects concerned are spelled out in syllabic groups. Their semantic sphere is fortunately indicated by *pu-ra-u-to-ro 2* which must be the dual of πυραύστρα (πύραστρον is also attested). That these words list the hearth furniture is further corroborated by *pa₂-ra-to-ro*, which, have identified as σπάλαθρον «rake». This enables us to delimit the possibilities for *85-te*. In a previous paper I have argued that the value of 85 is *s'a*. This word provides the opportunity of testing this value: *sa-te* may stand for ἴσαρτήρ which I take to be the agent noun from σαίρω² and the word will mean «brush», a satisfactory companion for the fire-tongs and rake. There remains *ko-te-ri-ja 6*. Here too we have the suffix -τήρια or -τήριον. Consequently we have to find a verbal root which can be rendered by the syllable *ko-* and which combined with the suffix in question will yield a word which will find congenial semantic company among the minor appurtenances of the hearth. I suggest that the verb in question is *χω-* «heap up (earth etc.)» (cf. χῶμα): *χωστηρία* or *χωστήριον* then, will mean «shovel». Whatever view be taken of the last suggestions, «firetongs» and «fire-rake» are tolerably certain, and it is difficult to see what role was assigned to them in the investiture of *85-ke-wa*. The fact is that the syllabic groups are so ambiguous that it is necessary to provide them with a context to give them the necessary precision. *te-ke* is most likely *θηκε* (see below³), but the rendering of this aorist as «appointed» is plausible only if it is proved that *da-mo-ko-ro* is the name of some rank or office to which such appointment can be made. Ventris does not discuss this crucial point nor does he attempt to identify the word,

¹ This would rule out the suggestion quoted by Ventris that this word may mean the bag for holding the utensils in question.

² σαίρω is itself a denominative from σάρον.

³ It could stand for τέκε, τέγγε, θέλγε, etc.

which he simply transliterates as *damokoros*. This is a point which must be settled before any attempt is made to translate the formula as a whole.

The question may be decided by compiling the dossier of the individual who is the central personage of this text. *85-ke-wa* occurs in An192.4 (An16), which consists of a list of names followed by the MAN ideogram and the figure 1. They are presumably all proper names. Now *85-ke-wa* occurs again in Jo438.23 (Kn01), a tablet which records amounts of GOLD entered against (1) place names e. g. l. 26 *pi-jai* = Φεαί, l. 25 *i-te-re-wa*; (2) place names followed by *ko-re-te* or *po-ro-ko-re-te*, words which presumably denote officials of the place in question; and (3) personal names such as *85-ke-wa* l. 23, *po-ki-ro-qo* l. 22, some of these names being followed by descriptive terms (e. g. *do-ri-ka-o mo-ro-pa₂* l. 5, *te-po-se-u ti-nwa-si-jo ko-re-te* l. 21). Now, *te-po-se-u* occurs again in On 300.11 (On01), a document which is drawn up in a similar way to Jo438 in that the entries consist either of persons (with or without further description) or places, the commodity being indicated by the ideogram *I54. Among the entries in the first half of this document, which are in the dative case (note for instance *pa-ki-ja-ni-ja ko-re-te-ri* l. 2), there occurs the personal name *a-pi-a₂-ro*, whom we find in the company of *85-ke-wa* in An192.1. Note further in this latter document *du-ni-jo du-ma* l. 5, which suggests a restoration *du-]ni-jo* [community name] *du-ma-ti* in On300.5. *a-pi-a₂-ro* is also known as a lessor of land from Ea109, 270 and 922. The dossiers of the personages concerned, who all seem to be of some importance, will be examined further in a later article devoted to the personnel of the «*o-ka*» tablets¹. For present purposes it suffices to say that the pursuit of *85-ke-wa* leads us from Jo438 to On300. Of decisive importance is the nature of the entries in these two documents. *In not a single instance does the entry take the form of a noun denoting status or rank*. The first word is either a personal name or a place name, and it is only *after the latter* that we find *ko-re-te* or *po-ro-ke-re-te*. Now the final entry on the first half of On300 is *da-mo-ko-ro*, just as *te-po-se-u* is the final entry of the second half. The structure of the tablet strongly suggests that *da-mo-ko-ro* is a proper name. Now let

¹ See *Minos* IV 2 (1956), p. 121-145; *Eranos* LIV, 1956, p. 1 ff.

us apply the second test and use the spelling rules to link up with later Greek. The result corroborates that of the contextual analysis: the only word in the Greek reference books which I can equate with *da-mo-ko-ro* is the proper name Δάμοκλος. Now the fact that *85-ke-wa* occurs in very similar contexts to *da-mo-ko-ro* and that the two names are conjoined in the introductory formula to Ta711 suggests that this personage has a double name: *85-ke-wa*, the first sign indicates, is an Aegean name while Δάμοκλος is patently Greek. Parallels for such double names might be quoted from other sources, notably the Greek papyri from Egypt. One is also reminded of Paris who was also called Alexander and the boy

τόν ῥ' Ἐκτωρ καλέεσκε Σχαμάνδριον, αὐτὰρ οἱ ἄλλοι Ἀστυάνακτ'.

But the Pylos tablets themselves provide us with an example of double naming. In his discussion of the E tablets Bennett¹ has shown that the En series are all written by the same hand and copied from the Eo series. In particular Eo444 = En659.1-6. What is relevant to the present problem is that in Eo444 the formula has *pa-ro pa-da-je-we* whereas in the later copy the scribe has substituted the name *qe-re-qa-ta* (*pe-re-qa-ta*). This individual has his full style *pe-re-qa-ta pa-da-je-(u)* in An192.12, a document which also lists the very man we are discussing, *85-ke-wa*. This shows clearly that in the Pylos tablets, too, a man may bear a double name and be referred to by either or both together. The text under discussion records a matter of some solemnity as we shall see, and so he receives his full style, *85-ke-wa da-mo-ko-ro*. Finally Professor Webster points out to me «a trump card» which I have not used: if *da-mo-ko-ro* is the name of some office, why is it not included in the list which heads Jn829? But if *da-mo-ko-ro* cannot be shown to be the name of some office, then *te-ke* cannot mean «appointed». This is fatal to Ventris' interpretation, apart from the fact that in any case it failed to provide any plausible context for the taking of the inventory. We must make a fresh start. It will be wisest if make an attempt to build up the context, using all the available data before venturing on a translation of the syllabic groups which hint so tantalisingly at a Greek sentence of the thirteenth century B. C. If we can do this we shall put ourselves in the

¹ *Amer. Journ. of Archaeol.* LX (1956), p. 103 ff.

position of the scribe. For that is the major difficulty in the interpretation of these texts: the scribe was aware of the context of situation and could content himself with the vaguest hints at the form of words used. We can interpret *te-ke* only when we have established the context.

We may start from the items which proved most puzzling on the hypothesis of an honorific presentation — the fire-damaged cooking vessels and the paltry objects of the hearth. It is evident that the objects in question have been in use, and we ask ourselves what evidence we have for such collections of objects from the ancient world. There is, of course, ample evidence from Etruscan tombs. In fact, the possibility that we are in fact in possession of the inventory of a rich Mycenaean tomb first suggested itself to me during a visit at Easter 1955 to the Villa Giulia in Rome where, in the first case on the right in Room 3, the equipment of Tomb 51 (this room «contiene in gran parte corredi ed oggetti da tombe della necropoli vulcente dell' Osteria») includes, besides an Attic black-figure vase, signed by Nicosthenes, with a battle scene (end of sixth century) *a rake* (in the form of an arm with a hand) and *a pair of fire-tongs*. Such hearth equipment along with cooking pots is of course a commonplace in Etruscan tombs. But the mention of a rake and tongs recalls the *πυράστρω* and *σπάλαθρον* of our tablet, and this impels one to seek for similar evidence from the Aegean Bronze Age. We are fortunate in having a comparatively recent survey of Mycenaean burial customs by G. Mylonas (*Amer. Journ. of Archaeol.* LII [1948], p. 56-81) which it will be convenient to summarise.

Two types of grave are distinguished, the tholos of the princes and the rock-hewn chamber tombs of the wealthy middle class and even the poor.

The tombs were family graves.

Both types of tombs were family graves and contained a number of burials. Some were in use for centuries and «occasionally the need must have arisen of using a grave soon after a first burial, when two members of the same family followed one another in a short time». In the tholos at Dendra, Persson found four cists, and «it is apparent that the three bodies found in the cists were buried at different times and that the grave had to be opened at least twice after the first interment» (p. 74).

Personal and household objects were interred.

«The kterismata buried with the body fall into two categories: personal objects such as ornaments, weapons, goblets, etc. and vases containing supplies» (p. 73). Apropos of chamber no. 2 at Dendra, Persson suggested that «the tomb has been fitted up as comfortably as possible with a strongly built hearth to warm oneself at, with the dead person's household goods.»

Traces of fire.

Persson has attributed the burning of the objects (in the Dendra tholos) to the rites which followed the burial of the king and queen (p. 75). In general, the traces of fire and remains of charcoal found in a number of Mycenaean graves «our authorities agree..... are the remains of funeral rites» (p. 68).

The tombs were family treasure houses.

«Both Wace and Blegen further observed that the relatives who brought into a grave new bodies had no difficulty in taking away valuable objects belonging to the remains which they brushed aside.... on these occasions, objects of value, especially of metal, were removed from among the offerings accompanying earlier interments.... this was not regarded as spoliation since the tomb and its contents were considered as a hereditary property of the family».

This summary of archaeological opinion concerning Mycenaean burial customs shows in particular that the tombs, and we may suppose *κατ' ἐξοχήν* the royal tombs, were in effect depositories of valuable property and that the reopening of such a tomb for a fresh burial would provide an appropriate occasion for the taking of an inventory such as is contained in these tablets. The evidence concerning traces of fire in the tombs and the conclusions drawn from them as to the holding of rites in honour of the dead are consistent with the fire-damaged condition of some of the hearth furniture. We may mention at this point a fact recorded by Persson (*The Royal Tombs at Dendra*, 1931, p. 41). It will be recalled that above the ivory inlaid decoration included men (*a-to-ro-go* and *a-di-ri-ja-te*) and lion's heads (*ka-ra-a-pi re-wo-te-jo*). Persson lists fragments of burnt ivory, with the forelegs of a bull, the wing of a sphinx, the upper part of the body of a small man, the head of a negro, part of a lion's head! We may in fact finally declare roundly that most Mycenaean objects in our possession have been retrieved from tombs. So at the very least we cannot exclude the possibility that the household effects listed in these documents were the furnishings of a tomb.

I propose therefore to make the experiment of placing the ambiguous syllabic groups of which the opening formula is composed within this contextual sounding board. At once the all-important verb *te-ke* rings loud and clear. Like Ventris, I identify it with *θηκε*. But we are no longer compelled to choose the rendering «appointed» from the wide semantic field of this verb, a rendering which must in any case depend on the proof that the word *da-mo-ko-ro* denotes an official position. In a tomb context *τιθημι* means «bury». This is well-known to LSJ *sub. voc.* section II. It remains to add the similar specialisation of the noun *θήκη* in the sense «tomb.»

It will be seen that the difficulties inherent in Ventris' interpretation do not arise. *da-mo-ko-ro* as a proper name receives the interpretation which harmonises with its contexts and with the only known post-Mycenaean equivalent of this group of syllables. The dead man receives on this solemn occasion his full name *δ5-ke-wa Δάμοκλος*. The evident unity of the objects listed, difficult to explain on the hypothesis of a series of separate gifts, an hypothesis which

causes particular difficulty in the case of the hearth furniture, is accounted for as a tolerably complete household equipment deposited in the tomb. Such equipment of the dead is of course widespread. As G. Thomson has written¹, «wherever interment is the rule, it has been and still is customary to deposit beside the corpse pots, tools, weapons and utensils of all kinds.» Similarly E. F. Bruck² writes: «Der Tote ist wie ein Lebender zu behandeln, er ist mit allem, was er zu Lebzeiten gebraucht hat auszustatten: mit Waffen, Schmuck und Hausrat, mit Speisen und Trank und zwar hiermit auch noch nach der Bestattung mit Pferden und Hunden, auch mit Frauen und Konkubinen, Tänzerinnen und Flötenspielerinnen. Das ist im wesentlichen noch der Standpunkt der kretisch-mykenischen Epoche, er kommt noch in der älteren Anschauungsschicht der Epen z. B. bei der Bestattung des Patroklos zum Ausdruck.» If our contention be accepted that this is the context of the inventory with its explanatory introductory sentence, then this important new find of tablets enables us to fill a grievous gap in our archaeological knowledge.

Mylonas writes (p. 77): «The details of a royal burial in a tholos tomb are not so well-known since few undisturbed royal sepulchres have been found thus far, but it must have been a more elaborate affair». It will not have escaped attention that not only was **85-ke-wa* a personage of some importance but that the *ῥάναξ* himself officiated at his burial. We do not know the manner in which this Mycenaean lord met his death in the last months of Mycenaean Pylos, but there are grounds for believing that some of the people with whom he is associated and were of like rank were on active service defending the coast, as I have shown in a previous article³. He may indeed have been a member of the royal family. Certainly, the gorgeousness of the tomb furnishings described above implies that the dead man was a member of the ruling class. So we may conclude that though Blegen has not yet found an unrobbed royal tomb of this Mycenaean dynasty, he has unearthed what may serve as an archaeologist's report. It remains to provide an «interpreted» Greek text and a translation.

¹ *Studies in Ancient Greek Society*, p. 503.

² *Totenteil und Seelgerät*, p. 35.

³ See *Minos* IV 2 (1956), p. 121-145.

Ta 711

- .1 ὡς φίδε *pu₂-ke-qi-ri* ὅτε φάναξ θῆκε *85-ke-wa* Δάμοκλον.
 .2 *q^wελάνᾱ* φανασηφία *g^wουκάρα* κογχιλεία JUG I
q^wελάνᾱ ἀρμοτηφία κλονόφεσσα.
 .3 *q^wελάνᾱ* φανασηφία γυναῖα *g^wουκάρα* τορ*q^w* ἰδφεσσα JUG I.

Inspection carried out by *pu₂-ke-qi-ri* when the King buried *Sa-ke-wa* Damoklos.

Jug (decorated with) goddess, bull's head(s), shell pattern JUG I.

Jug (decorated with) charioteer, battle throng.

Jug (decorated with) goddess, woman (or women), bull's head(s), spirals JUG I.

Ta 709 & 712

- .1 φιέλαι τορ*q^w* ἰδείαι *200 3 *pa-ko-to* []-κτηρίᾱ PAN I χω(σ)-τηρια 6.
 .2 σαρτήρ I πυραύστρω 2 σπάλαθρον I *e-*[]-*ta i-to-φεσσα* πέδφεσσα
so-we-νεία sa-de-φεσσα q^we I.
 .3 τρίπως κρησιοφεργής φυκεύς (?) TRIPOD I []-*u* TRIPOD I.

Boiling pans, decorated with spirals. *200 3 ?? [] ?? shovels 6.
 brush I, tongs 2, rake I [] having an *i-to*, a foot, decorated
 with *vines* and *rosettes*.

tripod, of Cretan workmanship *sea-weed* decoration, TRIPOD I...,
 TRIPOD I.

Ta 641

- .1 τρίποδε αἰγεύς κρησιοφεργής TRIPOD 2 τρίπως, ἐμεί πόδει ὄφητφεις TRIPOD I
 τρίπως κρησιοφεργής ἀπυ κεκαυμένος σκέλεα TRIPOD []
 .2 *q^wέθου* *203 3 δίπας μέζοε (*sic*) *202 I δίπας μέζοε τριῶφες *202 2
 δίπας μέφιον *q^wετρῶφες* *202 I
 .3 δίπας μέφιον τριῶφες *202 I δίπας μέφιον ἀνώφες *202 I.

Two tripods, (decoration) goat, of Cretan workmanship TRIPOD 2.
 tripod, with one foot, with handles TRIPOD I. tripod of Cretan
 workmanship, with the legs burnt off TRIPOD []

jars 3, pot, large I. two pots, large, with three handles 2. pot,
 small, with four handles I.

pot, small, with three handles I. pot, small, without handles I.

Ta 642

- .1 τόρπεζα λαεία γεαλεία αἰαμένα ἀλοσύδο(τ)φι κυάνφ *q^we pa-ra-κῆει*
 [*q^we χρυσᾱ q^we*] ἐννερόπεζα.

- .2 τóρπεζα λαεία μενοσία ἐλεφάντει αἰαμένα $g^{we}g^{winot\bar{\omega}}$ σα-δε-φι κόρυ(θ)-φι q^{we} .
- .3 τóρπεζα λαεία ἀμφί g^{wot} ος ἐννερόπεζα ἐλεφαντείους πό(δ)φι ἔχμάτει q^{we} $g^{we}g^{winot\bar{\omega}}$ τoρq^wίδει.

Table, stone, crystal, inlaid with undulations of cyanos, *tin* and gold, with nine feet.

table, stone, (some other material), inlaid with ivory, worked with *rosettes* and helmets.

table, stone, splay-legged, with nine feet, with feet and support of ivory worked with spiral.

Ta 713

- .1 τóρπεζα λαεία κυτσειούς ἔχμα(τ)φι ἐλεφαντείους q^{we} ἀμφί g^{wot} ος, ἐννερόπεζα $g^{we}g^{winom\bar{\omega}}$ να τoρq^wίδει.
- .2 τóρπεζα ἐλεφαντεία, πωροεχής πιλόφεσσα, κέ(χ)πεζα $g^{we}g^{winom\bar{\omega}}$ να τoρq^wίδει.
- .3 τóρπεζα κυτσειά ἐλεφαντείους ἔχμα(τ)φι ἀμφί g^{wot} ος ἐννερόπεζα κογγιλεία.

Table, stone, with supports of ebony and ivory, splay-legged, with nine feet, worked with spiral.

table, of ivory, with marble, feather pattern, with six feet, worked with spiral.

table, ebony, with ivory supports, splay-legged, with nine feet, shell pattern.

Ta 715

- .1 τóρπεζα κυτσειά ἐλεφαντείους ἔχμα(τ)φι, ἀμφί g^{wot} ος, ἐννερόπεζα, κογγιλεία.
- .2 τóρπεζα ἀκάρᾱνος (οr ἄκρᾱνος), ἐλεφαντεία, ἀμφί g^{wot} ος.
- .3 τoρπεζα ἀκάρᾱνος (οr ἄκρᾱνος), ἐλεφαντεία, πωροεχής.
- .4 τoρπέζω *mi-ra*, (?) ἀμφί g^{wot} ω πωροεχέε ἐννεροπέζω, τoρq^wιδείω, αἰαμένω *pa-ra-kúei* 2.

Table, ebony, with ivory supports, splay-legged, with nine feet, shell pattern.

table (of ?? wood), ivory, splay-legged.

table (of ?? wood), ivory, with marble.

two tables, of yew wood, splay-legged, with box-wood, with nine feet, spiral pattern, inlaid with tin (??) 2.

Ta 707

- .1 θόρνος κυτέσειος χρυσάφι ο-ρι-ke-re-mi-ni-a-φι ὀρνιθίαφι, θράνυς q^{wε} αἰαμένος ἐλεφαντεῖοις sa-de-φι.
 .2 θόρνος κυτέσειος ἐλεφαντεῖαφι ο-ρι-ke-re-mi-ni-a-φι σερμοκαραουιν (?).
 g^{wε}g^{wι}νωμέναις ἀνδριάντει q^{wε} πορτιφι q^{wε}
 .3 θράνυς κύτεσος αἰαμένος ἐλεφαντεῖοις sa-de-φι.

Chair, ebony, with golden birds on the *back*, and a foot-stool inlaid with ivory *rosettes*.

chair, ebony with *back* of ivory worked with a pair of *stag's* heads and the figure of a man and heifers.

foot-stool, of ebony, inlaid with ivory *rosettes*.

Ta 708

- .1 θόρνος κυτέσειος αἰαμένος ο-ρι-ke-re-mi-ni-a ἐλεφάντει.
 .2 θόρνος κυτέσειος ἐλεφαντεῖαφι ο-ρι-ke-re-mi-ni-ja-φι σερμοκάραφι
 g^{wε}g^{wι}νωμέναις ἀνδρία(ντ)φι q^{wε}
 .3 θράνυς κυτέσειος αἰαμένος ἐλεφαντεῖοις ἀνδρία(ντ)φι λέφο(ντ)φι.

Chair, ebony, with the *back* inlaid with ivory.

chair, ebony, with the *back* of ivory worked with *stag's* heads and with figures of men.

foot-stool, ebony, inlaid with ivory figures of men and lions.

Ta 714

- .1 θόρνος φεάλειος αἰαμένος κυάνω pa-ra-κύει q^{wε} χρυσῶ q^{wε} ο-ρι-ke-re-mi-ni-ja
 .2 αἰαμέναι χρυσοῖς ἀνδρία(ντ)φι σερμοκαραουιν q^{wε} χρυσοῖς [[g^{wου}καραοι]]
 χρυσοῖς q^{wε} φοίνι(κ)φι
 .3 κυανίους q^{wε} φοίνι(κ)φι θράνυς αἰαμένος κυάνω pa-ra-κύει q^{wε} χρυσῶ
 q^{wε} χρυσάφι κονονί(δ)φι.

Chair, crystal, inlaid with cyanos and *tin* and gold, the *back* inlaid with golden human figures and a pair of *stag's* heads and golden [[bull's heads]] and with golden palm trees,

and with palm trees of cyanos. foot-stool, inlaid with cyanos and *tin* and gold, and with golden *cross-bars*.

Ta 721

- .1 θράνυς αἰαμένος ἐλεφαντεῖοις sa-de-φι τοργ^{wίδει} q^{wε} καρύει q^{wε} I
 .2 θράνυες αἰαμένοι ἐλεφαντεῖοις sa-de-φι so-we-νω q^{wε} τοργ^{wίδει} q^{wε} 3
 .3 θράνυς αἰαμένος ἐλεφαντεῖοις sa-de-φι so-we-νω q^{wε} I

4. θράνυς αἰαμένος ἐλεφαντεῖοις *sa-de-φι so-we-νω q^wε* I
 5. θράνυς αἰαμένος ἐλεφαντεῖοις *sa-de-φι* I

Foot-stool, inlaid with ivory *rosettes* and spiral and *nut tree*, I.

foot-stools, inlaid with ivory *rosettes* and *vine* and spiral, 3.

foot-stool, inlaid with ivory *rosettes* and *vine*.

do.

do.

do.

foot-stool, inlaid with ivory *rosettes*.

Ta 722

1. θράνυς αἰαμένος ἐλεφαντεῖω ἀνθρώq^wφ ἴq^wq^wφ q^wε πολυπόδει q^wε
 φοινίχει q^wε I
 2. θράνυς αἰαμένος ἐλεφαντεῖοις καρααφι λεγοντεῖοις *so-we-νω q^wε* I
 3. θράνυς αἰαμένος ἐλεφαντεῖαφι κάρυφι
 4. θράνυς αἰαμένος ἐλεφαντεῖαφι κάρυφι.

Foot-stool inlaid with ivory man and horse and polypod and palm tree.

foot-stool inlaid with ivory lion's heads and with *vine*.

foot-stool inlaid with ivory *nut trees*.

foot-stool inlaid with ivory *nut trees*.

Ta 710

1. θράνυς αἰαμένος ἐλεφαντεῖοις *sa-de-φι so-we-νω q^wε* I
 vacat

Foot-stool inlaid with ivory *rosettes* and *vines*.

ADDENDA.—The above article embodies the substance of a communication to the Seminar of the Classical Institute of the University of London on November 25, 1955. Its contents were made generally available by indexing in Chadwick, Palmer and Ventris' *Studies in Mycenaean Inscriptions 1953-55* prepared for the International Colloquium in Paris, April 1956. Since it was written we have been saddened by the untimely death of the founder of Mycenaean philology. This article owes much to his open-hearted generosity in communicating the texts concerned for independent study. Though on many points I have differed from his judgement I have not introduced alterations. His main concern was to advance our understanding of the documents which his genius had unlocked for us, and he revelled in vigorous argument. Much of the above has now won acceptance, even what at first stimulated severe criticism, as for instance the interpretation of *ai-ke-u* as an adjective describing the tripod (*Documents* p. 336, where however Professor Webster has inadvertently by implication been saddled with responsibility for what at first was regarded as preposterous).

I now see that the joint authors of *Documents* agree that *a-mo-ta* is a noun and not an adjective, though they differ slightly from me in translating «wheels» rather than «undercarriage». So only the axle divides the two interpretations, and that the workshop making the *a-mo-ta* required axles for its operations is evident from PY Ea25, which records the delivery of *a-ko-so-ne* to the *a-mo-te-jo-na-de* (ἀρματεώναδε «to the chariot workshop»).

If *a-mo-ta* is now generally regarded as the Mycenaean equivalent of the later ἄρματα and combined like ἄμαξα the meanings of «undercarriage» and the whole vehicle, what was the technical name of the upper part or body? Attention is attracted to the word *a-na-ta* also spelt *a-na-i-ta*. In the first place we note that it occurs only on the tablets bearing the ideogram CHARIOT FRAME.

One tablet will suffice as an illustration: Sf 0420

I-QI-ḂA a-na-ta a-na-mo-to CHARIOT FRAME 80

It was tempting to see in *a-na(i)-ta* the negative of *a-ja-me na* (so also P. Chantraine). But the termination should give pause because a privative adjective has no separate feminine form, and the possibility of a mistake is ruled out by the recurrence of *a-na-i-ta* on Sf 0419 and Sf 7151. This is brushed aside in *Documents* (p. 368), but in view of the adjacency of *a-na-mo-to*, which testifies to the normality of Mycenaean morphology in this respect, we cannot do otherwise than reject an interpretation which seems self-evident. The word, I suggest, is a noun which *a-na-mo-to* qualifies and the tablet is to be translated: «CHARIOTS, bodies without undercarriages.» The noun in question may be a compound of the prefix ἀνά with the verbal root *ar*. That the body of the chariot was conceived of as the «upper part» attached (*ar*) to the undercarriage is evident from ξ 70: ἀπήνην ὑψηλήν εὐκυκλον ὑπερτερίη ἀραρυῖαν. Plato (*Tht.* 207a) lists the parts of the chariot as τροχοί, ἄξων, ὑπερτερία, ἄντυγες, ζυγόν. Finally that *a-na-ta* was a noun in Mycenaean is lent further plausibility by the occurrence in our texts of the craftsman's name *a-na-te-u* Jn415.11, which parallels *a-mo-te-u* from *a-mo-ta*.

A new text which has become available strengthens my conviction that *wa-na-se-wi-ja* means «decorated with Goddess» rather than «Queen». The tablet in question was secured by Blegen in the 1955 dig and was published by Blegen in the *Illustrated London News* of 7. iv. 1956 p. 258. It reads:

vacat

wa-no-so-i po-se-da-o-ne OIL+a QT 2

This simple text is of the highest importance to the Religionsforscher. It evidently records an offering to Poseidon. But who is conjoined with him? Blegen writes «(it) seems to record a dedication to the Lord Poseidon.» «Lord» would however be *wa-na-ka-te* and my suspicions that *wa-no-so-i* is an orthographic error for *wa-na-so-i* have been confirmed. Now we know that in this dialect the dual of *a*-stems ends in *-o*: *ko-to-no* «two ktoinai», *to-pe-zo* «two tables», *i-qi-jo* «two chariots»). Thus *wa-na-so* will be «the two Mistresses» and *wa-na-so-i* is the dative of the dual, thus confirming the interpretation of *ka-ra-o-i* as «with two heads». This means that associated with Poseidon in an offering are a pair of goddesses called «The Two Mistresses». The com-

mentary on this is already to be found in the existing handbooks of Greek religion. M. P. Nilsson (*Gesch. gr. Rel.* I p. 448ff.) in the section on «Die arkadischen Grossen Göttinen» stresses their close association in myth and cult with Poseidon. Detailed discussion of the implications of our new text must lie with the students of Greek religion (the most recent treatment known to me is E. Wüst *Pauly Wissowa*, Suppl. viii, c. 95ff.). For our purposes it will suffice to quote Pausanias viii.37.9: ταύτην μάλιστα θεῶν σέβουσιν οἱ Ἀρκάδες τὴν Δέσποιναν, θυγατέρα δὲ αὐτῆν Ποσειδῶνός φασιν εἶναι καὶ Δήμητρος (cf. VIII. 42. 1).

The facts strongly suggest that the *wa-na-so* of our tablet are to be identified with the Arcadian Despoinai. It is worth noting that the cult title *ῥάνασσα* survived in Cyprus: Τιμοχάρειος βασιλεῦς τῆς ῥανάσσης τῷ ἱερέως Cauer-Schwyzler, no. 681.4.

In view of this new evidence I should now give new precision to the descriptive formula *wa-na-se-wi-ja ku-na-ja*. The *ge-ra-na* so described was decorated with a scene depicting «the Wanassa with women».]

It remains to add how appropriate the pictures on the *ge-ra-na* are to the tomb context. The importance of these vessels is indicated by the fact that they are listed first in the inventory. The *charioteer* with *warriors* needs no comment in view of the frequency of this theme at this period of the Mycenaean world. But if *wanassa* is to be identified as «la grande Mère», I may venture to quote by way of commentary a passage from a forthcoming book by Professor E. O. James: «When the Lady of the Mountain made her way from Western Asia through the Eastern Mediterranean to the Aegean area, she retained her position and life-giving functions which as in Mesopotamia extended to the land of the dead... [she was] the guardian and reviver of the dead... The emblems suggest the cult of the Goddess in a funerary setting with her priestesses as the officiants in a sacrificial oblation on behalf of the deceased perhaps with the blood flowing down to the earth through bottomless vessels as an offering to Mother Earth as the source of rebirth.»

The funerary significance of the Cypriot charioteer vases is stressed by Miss H. L. Lorimer (*Homer and the Monuments* p. 34).

Oxford

Worcester College

L. R. PALMER