

24 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-94/0464**),² a program of reconstruction work lasting two weeks³ was undertaken, whose aim was to reduce the number of unpublished fragments by joining them to the published tablets, in view of the forthcoming edition of the Pylos Tablets.

The 24 joins affect 33 published tablets. For the arrangement, cf. «167 Joins of Fragments in the Linear B Tablets from Pylos», *Minos* 27-28, 1992-1993 (1994), pp. 71-82.

En 74 + *frr.*

(S74 H 1)

Two bits found among the fragments **001-099** were placed on the *verso*. Text therefore unchanged.

Ea 102 + Ea 107

(**Ea**; S28 H 43)

di-wo-nu-so-jo , e-ka-ra GRA 2 T 6 [
Traces of erasure at top end

Ea 102 (find-spot: 8.1229B) was salvaged by Emmett L Bennett, jr. from the **Xa** unclassified group on the basis of its appearance, context and adaptability to class formula and hand, and was supplemented after **Ea 71, 756, 801**, as containing the ubiquitous in the series *ko-to-na*. The entire presentation by E. L. Bennett, jr. is worth to be included here:

«There was no new text to observe, but the shape, size, material, and format of what was preserved certainly belonged to the Ea class. The supplement may seem rashly speculative; it does follow from my interpretation of the first word as the genitive of a man's name. I am sure *ko-to-na* was there, though it may have been accompanied by another word or two.»⁴

¹ We thank also other members of the Staff of the Prehistoric Collection: Metaxia Tsipopoulou, Dimitra Kokkevi, 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 30th January until 12th February 1999, but it was only possible to work in the Museum premises for 10 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 support, as well as the checking of readings for the future *Corpus* of Pylos.

⁴ «A Selection of Pylos Tablets Texts», *Mykenaiika*, ed. J.-P. Olivier, Athènes 1992, p. 107.

It is therefore to the credit of Professor Bennett to have classified the **102** piece as Ea. Nevertheless, his interpretation surely prevented him joining it to another Ea piece in the same drawer, 3 centimetres far away from the former, and also found near each other on the bench of the Archives Room 8 (102 coming from 1229B; 107.1 coming from 1228B). **Ea 107** is composed of two components (107.1, and 291.2, find-spot. 8.1360) as a result of the work of Bennett in 1950. The spilling chart for the tablet is slightly complicated, since, after its fall and splitting into three fragments, the right end was projected eastwards from the bench.

A fact which possibly prevented an earlier join is that **Ea 102** suffered a heavier firing and, as a result, is slightly swollen. That means the physical join of the two pieces is made difficult by the slight difference of sizes at the break, but there are not only continuities of the *e*- strokes on **102**, but also profiles at the edges, palm-prints on *verso* and continuities both in the sloping of the back and in the clay failures, which all guarantee that the join is valid.

The join rules out the interpretation of *di-wo-nu-so-jo* as a genitive of a man's name, and the supplements once intended for]*e-ka-ra* as *e-ne-ka*]*e-ka-ra*⁵ or as *pa-ro*]*e-ka-ra*.⁶ Now it is clear that a) *e-ka-ra* is a noun, the same as attested twice in **Ta 709.2**, although used in a metonymic way, and b) *di-wo-nu-so-jo* is undoubtedly the genitive of the theonym, implying a sure attestation of the presence of the god Dionysos among the gods of the Pylian pantheon. Nevertheless, the implications prompted by the join need to be duly discussed.

Firstly, the semantic history of Greek ἑσχάρα, so magnificently traced by the late John Chadwick,⁷ receives now further evidence: Chadwick already stated that '[i]t is by no means impossible that ἑσχάρα had already developed several senses by the thirteenth century; and the nature of the Linear B archives would make it unlikely that any other meaning would be attested.'⁸ He was referring to the fact that only the sense of 'brazier' seemed to be attested in Mycenaean (**Ta 709**), and that the priority would lie with the Homeric examples of ἑσχάρα as 'hearth, fire-place'. We have now in Mycenaean a clear example of the sense II: 'Sacrificial hearth... altar of burnt offering', which is a clear and logical transference of the first sense in the religious sphere: the hearth of a shrine, where offerings were burnt for a god, with a more developed use of the word with the name of a god, as is well attested in later Greek.⁹

⁵ C. Gallavotti, *Inscriptiones Pyliae*, Roma 1961, p. 44 n.

⁶ M. Lejeune, «Analyse du dossier pylien Ea», *Minos* 15, 1974 (1976), p. 91, n. 8 (= *Mémoires IV*, Roma 1997, p. 127, n. 8).

⁷ «The Semantic History of Greek ἑσχάρα», *o-o-pe-ro-si*, *Festschrift E. Risch*, Berlin - New York, 1986, pp. 515-523, and *Lexicographica Graeca. Contributions to the Lexicography of Ancient Greek*, Oxford 1996, pp. 111-115.

⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 517.

⁹ To the instances gathered by J. Chadwick, p. 521, of ἑσχάρα with the name of a god, an ἑσχάρα Διονύσου is mentioned by Alciphron IV.18.16 Denner, Loeb, [= II.3.15]; cf. Deubner, *Attische Feste*, Berlin 1932, p. 139.

So, the two basic meanings of ἑσχάρα posited by Chadwick (p. 521), fireplace and brazier, both are now attested in Mycenaean.

Secondly, it is now clear that the frequent use of ἑσχάρα with the name of a god is deeply rooted in the Greek language: its presence in inscriptions (*IG* 2.1658, IVth cent. BC) already pointed towards a common syntagm and not a poetic usage (Aesch., *Pers.* 205; Eur., *Andr.* 1240), which now receives further conclusive support in the earliest recurrence in **Ea 200**.

Thirdly, the metonymic use of ἑσχάρα for meaning 'shrine, sanctuary' of the Mycenaean Dionysos at Pylos may be imply that the shrine concerned was characterized by the existence of a conspicuous altar of burnt offerings,¹⁰ an ἑσχάρα, seldom employed in the rituals for chthonic gods.¹¹ It is also most probable that the Altar of the Pylian Dionysos was placed out of doors and hollowed out, filled with the ashes of offerings. Since the only altar reported at Pylos is that constituted by a squared block of *poros* standing in front of the shrine in the Court 92 and certainly not used for burnt offerings, as the excavator himself states,¹² the shrine of Dionysos is to have been placed outside the Palace.

The sanctuary of Dionysos near Pylos is still to be located. A suggestion of its appearance could be obtained by considering another Bronze Age temple, suggested to have been dedicated to Dionysos,¹³ the building at Ayia Irini, Kea, excavated by J. L. Caskey. It has been stated that burnt sacrifices were clearly of importance in the cult, in continuity from LH IIIA up to LHIIIC, when an altar was set. «Patches of burning were observed on this floor and around the sides of the altar. The top of the altar was destroyed, but ash and carbonized matter were heaped against the side in one place; it looked as if they had spilled over from the top.»¹⁴ From the numbers of drinking vessels and containers, J. L. Caskey suggested that wine may have been of importance in the cult, and epigraphical evidence shows that Dionysos was worshipped here at least as early as ca. 500 BC.¹⁵ The cult was probably of the god as chthonic deity and was represented as the *anodos* of Dionysos¹⁶ as the manifestation of the chthonic power of growth, so an ἑσχάρα was perfectly consistent. In her contribution to the 1st International

¹⁰ W. Burkert, *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche*, (I am quoting from the Greek version, Athens 1993), § 1.3, p. 146 and n. 52, on the prodigies reported on flames in the altar of Dionysos, Arist. *Mir.* 842a 15-24; Eur. *Bacc.* 758, and T. Liv. 39.13.12.

¹¹ W. Burkert, *op. cit.*, § 1.3, p. 149.

¹² C. W. Blegen, *The Palace of Nestor at Pylos in Western Messenia I*, Princeton 1966, p. 302; this shrine near the NE Building was probably the seat of the 'Mistress of Horses' mentioned in **An 1281**.

¹³ M. E. Caskey, «Ayia Irini, Kea: The Terracotta Statues and the Cult in the Temple». *Sanctuaries and Cults in the Aegean Bronze Age*, edd. R. Hägg - N. Marinatos, Stockholm 1981, pp. 127-135.

¹⁴ M. E. Caskey, *op. cit.*, p. 127.

¹⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 129.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 130.

Symposium, M. E. Caskey suggests «that Dionysos might be the Bronze Age god to whom the various dedications were given and for whom burnt sacrifices were made»,¹⁷ and the Mycenaean evidence for an ἐσχάρα of Dionysos at Pylos now reinforces her arguments against the scepticism with which her suggestions were received.

Fourthly, we have in **Ea 102**, for the first time, an allocation of a piece of land to a sanctuary itself. Up to now allocations of land to priests and other cultic people were well known, but no land is recorded being allotted to the shrine of the Potnia at *pa-ki-ja-na*, for instance. On the other hand, it has been stressed that the owners of the Ea series land are characterized by their laicity («Non totale, il est vrai, puisqu'on a en Ea un ἱερεὺς (*sakereu*)»):¹⁸ such a trait may give some force to a relationship of the priest *sa-ke-re-u* (with a lot of GRA 6 of *ki-ti-me-na* land in **Ea 756**, a lent plot of GRA T 2 from the Swineherd in **Ea 776**, and two plots lent to the cobbler *ze-pu₂-ro*, of GRA T 1, in **Ea 56**, and to the most important landowner in the Ea series, *ke-re-te-u*, of T 6, in **Ea 304**) with the shrine of Dionysos, thus suggesting that *sa-ke-re-u* was actually the priest of Dionysos.¹⁹

There are no hints for locating the Ea allotments in the real geography of the realm of Pylos, but we agree with locations near the Palace itself,²⁰ and perhaps not far from *pa-ki-ja-na*.

The new tablet provides us with the indirect, textual evidence for burnt animal sacrifices in the religious activities of the Mycenaean Palace at Pylos, which can now be linked to a similar interpretation for the burnt faunal remains from the Palace of Nestor.²¹

Xa 200 + Cn 201

(Cn; Ci)

- .1 wa-wo-u-[] , pa-ra-ku OYIS^X 160 ×
 .2 i-sa-ma[-]ta CAP^m 63
 .1 Possibly *wa-wo-u-de*[; × after drying

The back of **200** had some material adhering which was first removed by cleaning, disclosing a complex impression, not compatible with the attachment of the piece to any solid surface, but rather the effects of a strike which smashed the back of the left end of a tablet, moving some clay over the edges towards the obverse, and to the right break as well. It is difficult to ascertain what struck the piece. The dark colour implies that it was covered, thus restricting the supply of

¹⁷ M. E. Caskey, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

¹⁸ M. Lejeune, *op. cit.*, p. 101 (= p. 137).

¹⁹ However, M. Lindgren, *The People of Pylos II*, Uppsala 1973, p. 54, links the priest with a homonymous smith of the Potnia in Jn 431, cf. also P. de Fidio, «Palais et communautés de village dans le royaume mycénien de Pylos», *Tractata Mycenaea*, edd. P. Hr. Ilievski - L. Crepajac, Skopje 1987, p. 146, n. 55.

²⁰ Cf. L. R. Palmer, *Interpretation*, p. 92, 220; S. Deger-Jalkotzy, «Noch einmal zur Ea-Serie von Pylos», *Studies Bennett*, edd. T. G. Palaima - J.-P. Olivier, pp. 117ff., and P. de Fidio, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

²¹ Cf. V. Isaakidou, P. Halstead, J. Davis & Sh. Stocker, «Burnt Animal Sacrifice at the Mycenaean 'Palace of Nestor', Pylos», *Antiquity* 76, 2002, pp. 86-92.

oxygen; it was not a fired beam of the roof, since the clay is not crystalized nor is the piece broken into widespread fragments. A piece of (twigs and clay/plaster) roofing falling and covering the piece is perhaps the most likely explanation for the results that we can discern on **Xa 200**.

On a close examination it was clear nevertheless that **Xa 200** is (the left part of) a canonical tablet, with distinctive rounded edges, just the same edges as shown by the subsequent tablet in the drawer, one of whose components was already found along with **Xa 200**. Moreover, **Cn 201** is also a similar sized (right part of a) tablet, which is similarly ruled. The fact that **Xa 200** is ascribed to Class iii, whereas **Cn 201** is ascribed to S 155 Ci, does not seem to be a major objection, due to the variability within the Classes. A physical contact was prevented because of the manner of breaking of **200**. The detachment of a clay projection in the break permitted a closer junction and to ensure the viability of the join.

The spilling chart is rather clear since component '**39/200** comes from 8.3209, whereas component '**39/201** does from 8.3219, a few centimetres south, and '**39/203** was recovered from 8.3209, and was at once joined by Macdonald/Mavragiannis in 1939.

The structure of the record is now clearer. It deals with two entries of livestock ascribed to two people: *pa-ra-ku* on line 1, and *i-sa-ma[-]ta* on line 2. Both men are to be probably located at *wa-wo-u-de*.

a) *pa-ra-ku* on line 1: an adjective qualifying the sheep is excluded by the lack of agreement, and therefore only an interpretation, as a man's name, imposes itself. It could be interpreted as a name built on the adjective βραχύς, i. e. Βράχυσ,²² but the existence of Aeolic βρόχυσ seems to favour a Mycenaean spelling of such name as ***po-ro-ku* or ***po-ku*. It is likelier to relate such a man's name *pa-ra-ku* with the inlaid *pa-ra-ku* of the **Ta** furniture and the *pa/*56-ra-ku-ja* garments.²³ A nick-name could be easily envisaged either as the usage of a valuable gem as a personal name (as French *Émeraude*), or rather as an appellative 'The Green (animal)', i. e. 'Frog', later on continued after thematization of the ending in the Hesychian gloss βάρακος· βάτραχος.

b) *i-sa-ma[-]ta* on line 2: a hapax which is likely to be a man's name built on an *ex-ethnicon* in *-ātās*; the spelling *-sa-ma-* could hide a cluster *-sm-*, but an interpretation of the name as */Ismātās/*, as a variant of */Isthmātās/* seems to be far-fetched.²⁴

c) *wa-wo-u-de*. The place-name recurs in **An 654.15**, where a detachment of *ke-ki-de* people, under the command of **ta-ti-ḡo-we-u*, is posted. In the *o-ka* tablets, locations of the detachments are usually recorded by means of the

²² Cf. F. Aura, *Diccionario Micénico*, Madrid 1993, II, p. 82 n. 2 s.u.

²³ J. L. Melena, «On Untransliterated Syllabograms *56 and *22», *Tractata Mycenaea*, pp. 212ff.

²⁴ A word ἴσμα is preserved in Lycophron 731; if such a word **si-sd-ma* for 'settlement' is old, it might favour an interpretation of *i-sa-ma[-]ta* as *ex-ethnicon* */Hismātās/* built on a place-name 'The Settlement'.

Dative-Locative case of a place-name; therefore an interpretation of *wa-wo-u-de* in the Dative-Locative case is to be considered first. In **Cn 200**, a heading of the place-name in the Dative-Locative would fit also well in the record: At W., P. with 160 sheep and I. with 63 goats. We encounter, nevertheless, the insurmountable morphological objection that no name in *-ous*, *-oudos* (with a real diphthong *-ou-*) is attested in Greek up-to-date, and a rendering as Dat.-Loc. *-oudei* should be therefore rejected.

Since *o-ka* detachments are often accompanied by ethnics (e.g. *me-ta-pi-jo*, *ke-ki-de* in **An 654.2**, or *u-pi-ja-ki-ri-jo*, *ku-re-we* on line 6 of the same tablet), it has been put forward that *wa-wo-u-de* on line 15 could represent a plural Nominative in *-des* qualifying *ke-ki-de*. Such an interpretation would not easily fit in **Cn 200**. Nevertheless, the insurmountable morphological objection that no name in *-ous*, *-oudos* exists in Greek, still remains, and another solution should be considered, unless we want to posit the desperate solution that a pre-Greek name, ill-adapted to a Greek declension, is involved.

An interpretation of the word as a Lative *wa-wo-u—de*, remains to be discussed.²⁵ It would fit in **Cn 200** as well: two flocks are being sent to W., and the names of the people responsible are also recorded. A pending question is the rendering of the Mycenaean spelling, since an Accusative *-oun—de*, for which we still face the same objection on morphological grounds, could be explained by the use of *wa-wo-u-de* as a variant of an Accusative ***wa-wo-wa-de*, of a name in *-ous*, *-ow-os* (i.e. *owm—de* > a) */-owa—de/*, or b) */-oum—de/*), but, although some nouns with a diphthong stem are well attested in Greek, only βούς is attested for an *o*-vowel.²⁶ Another possibility is an inverse spelling of *-u-* for *-we-*,²⁷ i.e. *wa-wo-u-de* instead of ***wa-wo-we-de*, cf. **MY Wt 712.β** *a-pe-we-de*,²⁸ and the word could therefore hide an Accusative *-owen—de*. To avoid a name in *-eus* with Lative along the line of the Pylian forms *e-re-de* and *ma-se-de*, ***wa-wo-we-u*, it is likely to posit that a neuter place-name in *-wen(t)* is involved: */wa-wo—wen(t)—de/*. There is no need to assume the loss of final stops for the Mycenaean spelling, since a voicing of *-t-* could be easily explained on analogical grounds. A place-name built on an adjective in *-went* would not be surprising at all, and the isolate gloss by Hesychius ἄρους· τὰ λιβάδια would now find an appropriate explanation. Since ἄρους seems to be a generic designation for a ‘wet place’, i.e. an spot ‘rich in small springs or streams’, a masculine back form **ἄρο-wen(t)-s* is suitable. Unfortunately no cognates of such **ἄρο-* are attested,²⁹ and an etymon **warwo-* would have only the support of Mycenaean *wa-wo-u-de*, implying thus a circular reasoning.

²⁵ *Documents*, p. 150, and *Diccionario Micénico*, s.u.

²⁶ P. Chantraine, *La formation des noms en grec ancien*, Paris 1979, p. 1.

²⁷ {we} for u: *we-a₂-re-jo*, *we-a-re-pe*, *we-e-wi-ja*, *we-je-ke-a₂*, *we-je-we*.

²⁸ W. Müller, J.-P. Olivier, I. Pini, «Die Tonplomben aus Mykene», *AA* 1998, p. 43 and fig. 11.

²⁹ Cf. P. Chantraine, *Dict.*, s.u.

‘Rich in orchards’ would be also an interesting way of interpreting *wa-wo-u-de* i.e. *Walwō-wen(t)-de*, but Cyprian ἀλφω, with no initial digamma would ruin the parallel.³⁰

Cn 200 remains unparalleled among the livestock records from Pylos. Since no ascription to hand seems possible, the only similar record in appearance (similar height: 3.6 cm.) is **Cn 286**, with a middle rule and room for two entries. It is also headed by a place-name in the plural Locative (*a-pa-re-u-pi*). Another similar tablet is **Cn 314** (3.9 cm. height), although it was crossed with two rules. On the third line, an entry of 162 male sheep is written, an amount quite close to that recorded on **Cn 200.1**. Since the animals are described by means of the word *au-to-a₂-ta*, probably */auto²aitha/* ‘entirely brown’ and there is a mention of a feast on line 1, it is likely that **Cn 314** deals with animals destined to sacrificial banqueting. We wonder if the flock recorded on **Cn 200** also had a similar destination. There is some evidence of cattle sent to people in the coast-guard detachments (**Cn 3**), and similar stocks of livestock with identical purposes could easily be envisaged. However, the lack of a concrete set for **Cn 200** prevents further speculation.

Ma 222 + fr.

(S90 H 2)

The fragment belongs to the group numbered **200-299** and found its place at the end of **222** continuing the last rule and bearing a slight uprising marking the right end of the tablet, which has not been preserved.

Eb 338 + fr.

(H 41)

- .A ka-pa-ti-ja , ka-ra-wi-po[-ro pa-]ki-ja-pi , e-ke-qe , to-so-de pe-mo
 .B ke-ke-me-no , ko-to-no₁ _dwo , o-pe-ro-sa-de , wo-zo-e , o-wo-ze GRA [qs
 .A pa-]ki-ja-pi: absent from Ep 704.7, cf. En 609.1 (*pa-ki-ja-ni-ja*), Jn 829.7 (*pa-ki-ja-pi*); *to-so-* over erasure
 .B wo-<ze>*e*; o-wo- over erasure; number to be restored ends in 4 or more, cf. Ep 704.8.

The fragment is undoubtedly a bit numbered **338.f** and went into the line .B bearing the uprights of *-no*, crossed by an accidental scratch. No trace of the following divider can be seen, but there is a gap where it could have once been written.

Na 345 + Xa 1015

(Na; S106 H 1)

- .a]re-u-te-ra[
]-ko-si-ja [SA

In the preparatory work of the future *Corpus* of the Pylos Tablets, **1015** was tentatively reclassified from **Xn** (*PTT*) into the **Xa** series on account of the appreciation of the extant bottom edge, and it was even related to the **Na** records.

³⁰ Schwyzer, *GG* 1, 479, posited **walōw-* for ἀλωή. If right, the word must be dissociated from Cyprian ἀλφω.

The present join with **Na 345** now confirms the tentative ascription, in spite of the separation of their findspots '39/345.7: FS 8.2298; (1015 =) '39/224.f: FS 8.1384.

The structure of the record could be the following:

.a e-]re-u-te-ra[
PLACE-NAME SA *qs* to-sa-de X]-ko-si-ja [SA *qs*

X]-ko-si-ja possibly in the singular Dative as recipient of tax-exemption.

Eo 371 + fr.

(H 41)

The new fragment was positioned on the left, at the bottom edge. It bridges the left piece **1160** to the main one, but some clay is still missing preventing complete contact. The relative position of the newly attached fragment **386.2** was determined by the existence of the remains of a great cylindrical straw, which coincides with the traces and direction of the bottom straw on the main piece and the quasi-joined piece on the left. Text unchanged.

The spilling chart is clear: all the components come from main square 23; the tablet fell against the floor in the area formed by contiguous sub-squares 34 and 45, projecting at least two pieces southwards (to 65), and a bit northwards (to 09). It is worth noting that two adjacent similar-sized pieces from the bottom edge are separated by more than 50 cm. (09 to 34), implying moreover that the tablet fell with the *verso* against the floor, i.e., face-up, and with its left end pointing northwards.

Jn 410 + Jn 413 + Jn 1065 + Jn 1067

(Jn; S310 H 2)

- .1]ta-ra-si[-ja e-ko-te
.2 *deest*
.3 we-]
.4 u-de-wi-ni-jo[AES]M 6[
.5 *vacat* [
.6 to-so-de , ka-ko , AES [L]! M[*qs*
.7 *vacat* [] *vacat*
.8 to-so-de , a-ta-ra-si-jo[ka-ke-we] []
.9 ke-ro 1 de-ko-to-jo , do[-e-ro] *vacat*
.3 Traces of two signs after we-]; possibly we-ke-[] or we-de-[]
.4 Trace at right of 6[, unlikely to be another unit
.8 Erasure at end
.9 do[-e-ro]: cf. Jn 341.11

It was quite clear that **Jn 410**, **1065** and **1067** were detached bits from a main piece reconstructed as **Jn 413**, which had recently been further supplemented with new uninscribed pieces. J. Smith recently identified them as possibly parts of **413**.³¹

Thanks to the preceding joins of uninscribed pieces on the *latus superius*, in the interior of the tablet, and on the *vacat* line .7, it was now possible to fix **Jn**

³¹ J. Smith, «The Pylos Jn Series», *Minos* 27-28, 1992-1993, p. 224.

410, 1065 and **1067** on **413**, from now onwards to be known as **Jn 410**. It was possible to join closely **Jn 1067** to the piece of *vacat* of line 7, and once joined the bronze quantity found its place in the totalling entry on line 6.

Jn 410 was undoubtedly struck by a beam falling on it. The direct impact pulverized the tablet in a great number of pieces which suffered a heavy firing without oxygen. There are still many internal pieces belonging to this tablet to be found, but the pace of its reconstruction is very slow. The upper part of the record is defaced, perhaps some minuscule bits are preserved, if the proposal of J. Smith for relating **Xn 1072, 1171** and **1172** to this tablet is ultimately correct,³² but it is better to regard them as parts of **Jn 601**.

The spilling chart of the parts of **Jn 410** is concentrated on square 22: from 25 (which could be wrong) it spreads southwards to the contiguous squares 56-67, jumping then to the cluster 84, 95-96, 98.

Ab 564 [+] **Ab 1105**

(**Ab**; S186 H 21)

pu-ro a-ke-ti-ra₂ MUL[*qs ko-*]wa 34[
a-ke-ti-ra₂: Aa 815, a-ke-ti-ra₂

Identical size and profiles on both upper and lower edges guarantee the quasi-join. Both pieces were in addition found together (find-spot 8.3368), as reflected in their component numbers, **564.1** and **564.2**. There is still a gap of ca. 1-1.5 cm. between physical contact. In *PTT* I, p. 29, a supplementary reading, e.g. MUL[38 *ko-wa* 33 *ko-wo* 16 GRA 13 T 2 TA DA / NI 13 T 2, is proposed, corresponding to **Aa 815**.

Un 612 + fr.

(S2 H 1)

The fragment **613.f** bears a little portion of *verso* which favoured the determination of its place; since it is defaced, no change of text occurs therefore. It is likely that **Xn 1129** also belongs to this tablet, but its position is still uncertain.

An 615 + Xn 1139

(**An**; S615 H 1)

Recto

.1]ta	
.2	a-wa-ši[-ja]no VIR 1
.3	a-wa-si-ja , [] VIR 1
.4	ko-ni-ja , a ₃ -ki[]VIR 1
.5] , ko[]VIR 1
.6	a-pi-]no-e-wi[-jo] VIR [
.7]vest.[]-o , wi-[] VIR[1
.8	o-pi-ke-ri-jo , []di , [] VIR 1[
.9	e-po-wi-ja , []VIR 1
.10	e-po-wi-ja[] VIR 1

³² *Loc. cit.*, n. 141.

- .11 e-po-]wi-ja[]-ta VIR[1
 .12 vacat[] vacat
 .13 me[]jo-a₃-se-wa[]o-me[]re-u-ko VIR 1
 .14]qe[] VIR 1
 .15]wo-wo , wa-ra-ki-no VIR 1
 .16]-ja , ko-tu-we , ko-sa-ma-ne VIR 1
 .17] VIR[1
 .18]i-jo[] vacat

Latus inferius

]o-no , e-qo-te[

⇒

Verso

- .1 vacat
 .2 vacat
 .2 PUNCT before VIR
 .3 Trace of sign at right after , [, possibly e[; PUNCT below 1
 .7]vest.[:]a₃[or]ke[
 .11 Possibly]wa-ta or]ja-ta
 .13 Possibility of a divider between]jo and -a₃-; PUNCT below VIR
 .15 PUNCT before VIR
 .16]ti-ja not impossible; PUNCT before VIR
Lat. inf.]o-no: possibly]wo-no
Verso Graffito, but not pictorial

Fragments **Xn 1132**, **1169**, also belong to this tablet, but their position is still uncertain. Fragment **Xn 1139** was already a component of the tablet ('39/615.25).

La 623 [+] **La 625**

(La; S626 H 13)

Recto

po-to-ro-wa-pi , []pte-we 34[

⇓

Verso

ko-u-ra TELA+PA[qs] vacat

Recto Trace at right in the break, a[not excluded*Verso* -ra over [TELA]; half erased, possibly accidentally

In *PTT* I, p. 187, it was stated that **La 623** was 'perhaps from the same tablet as La 625'. There is little doubt that both pieces belong to one and the same tablet, whose lower edge was distorted by the scribe's finger tips, to give extra breadth (though finally not inscribed): in the piece at right such a distortion is not present, but leaves a gap whose outline continues similar to that in the left piece; the *recto* text was written before the expansion, whereas the *verso* text was written after the expansion. Only one sign is probably missing in the gap between the two pieces, and, since the trace at the break on **623** points to a[, a word a[-

lpte-we is to be perhaps connected with the man's name *a-pe-te-u* **Jn 692.2, 750.20**. If so, a Dative of the personal name should be preferred to a noun or description (in the plural) of the 34 items recorded, which is unlikely. Nevertheless, another likelier solution is to see *lpte-we* actually as a disgregation of logogram *146, which includes in its frame an acrophonic syllabogram *WE* (probably for *we-a₂-no?*) as endogram.³² In other words, instead of the canonic *146 ('*PTE*' + *WE*), we are possibly dealing with an instance of a 'dismantled' *146 ('*PTE*' *WE*), just as we encounter a 'dismantled' **OLE + *PO* as OLE *PO* in **Fr 1201, 1203, 1208** and **1479**.

Since such a practice of rendering *146 is rather strange and does not appear elsewhere, this suggestion should be supported by further evidence. Tablets coming from the Megaron form a coherent whole in appearance and colour, as well as in their palaeographic traits. A fact that is particularly noteworthy is that no old fragments seem to join the extant pieces: all the items seem to be formed by isolated, well-baked pieces, and, when the tablet consists of more than one component, the breaks appear to be recent (**La 633** was broken in two by labourer³³). Such circumstances do not sustain the theory that a bunch of tablets fell from an upper storey, breaking against the soil.³⁴ Moreover, all of them have suffered a firing with plenty of oxygen which produced their characteristic red-brick appearance. The absence of spilling fragments is rather strange, and the tablets are likelier to be the remnants of a clearing operation of a previous, open fire. Since they were found in a red earth layer, perhaps from crude brick, it would be easy to suggest that the remnants of a previous clearing were later used in making crude bricks, used in reparation works on the upper storey of the Megaron. With the final catastrophe they were found in the red-brick layer.

We are then suggesting that the tablets from the Megaron recovered by G. E. Mylonas are not contemporary with the tablets in the Archives, but survivals of the scribal activity at Pylos from an earlier phase than the final destruction of the Palace. Such a view can be reinforced by the rather primitive character of the tablets themselves both in pinacological and palaeographic aspects.³⁵ There would be no surprise then in the usage of an earlier form of *146, with the *WE* outside the frame of *PTE*, namely, as a subsequent exogram. A strange logogram *160 is only attested among these tablets and not elsewhere.³⁶

³² A. L. H. Robkin, «The Endogram *WE* on Mycenaean textiles *146 and *166+*WE*: A Proposed Identification», *AJA* 85, 1981, p. 213.

³³ *Excavation Notebook* by G. E. Mylonas (copy kept at PASP), p. 68.

³⁴ C. W. Blegen - M. Rawson, *The Palace of Nestor at Pylos ins Western Messenia I*, Princeton 1966, p. 81.

³⁵ For positing an earlier date for some Linear B tablets at Pylos, cf. T. G. Palaima, *The Scribes of Pylos*, Rome 1988, pp. 111-113, 133, 165.

³⁶ On **La 628** and **640**. The squarish appearance immediately suggests a textile (with a lateral fringe). It is not clear that it is supplemented with a syllabogram or whether the inner tracing suggest a kind of folding.

Since *146 most probably represents a piece of linen clothing,³⁷ it should be stressed that at *po-to-ro-wa* not only is flax production well attested (Na 262), but also that flax-workers were also settled there, since Ad 678 records the flax-workers' sons at *po-to-ro-wa*. *po-to-ro-wa-pi* is a plural Locative of a place-name of the Further Province, and the interpretation by J. Chadwick as */Phtholowāphil* is sound:³⁸ Φθωλοφαι < *Phtho:lo-wn-* ?

The amount of *146 at P. is of a similar order to the payments of this commodity recorded in the Ma tablets. If so, it is likely that *a*[actually represents the acrophony for *a-pu-do-si*, which describes the sending from P. of 34 linen garments and an undetermined number of *ko-u-ra* cloaks.

Ad 663 [+] **Ad 674**

(Ad; H 23)

o-ti-ra₂-o ko-wo VIR[]5 ko-wo 7
]7 not excluded; PUNCT at the left end of the tablet

In *PTT* I, p. 36, it was already noted that 663 was 'perhaps from the same tablet as Ad 674'. There is little doubt that both pieces belong to the same tablet, but no physical contact exists, since there is still a gap at the bottom of at least 2 mm. The gap explains why]7 is not excluded.

Cn 719 + fr.

(S719 H1)

The position of the fragment numbered '52S3/III-32.f' was determined by the fact that it bears the start of a rule and found its place at the left edge giving the beginning of .7 and .8. No trace of the first sign of the place-name appear in either line, and the text is to be only altered by adding a square bracket [both in lines 7 and 8.

Ea 773 [+] *fr.*

(S28 H 43)

e-u-me-de , e-ke , o-na-to , pa-ro da-mo[GRA (T)]2
[GRA T]4 not excluded.

The fragment '52S3/375-395.f' undoubtedly belongs to this record and bears the trace of unit in the left break.

Eb 884 + frr. (3)

(H 41)

The newly joined fragments went to the *verso* and bottom edge and implied no textual change. One of them is numbered '52S3/432-437.f', another belongs to the 1952 batch as well, but is unnumbered, and the third one is the result of a join made by Jean-Pierre Olivier in December 1968: it was reported as «f+f (box 613)», and was photographed by É. Seraphis in 1969 (negative no. 517) among the 613 fragments, where it remained up now. Nevertheless, from the clay texture and firing, I doubt whether these bits came from the 1939 excavation, but suggest

³⁷ J. T. Killen, «The Textile Industries at Pylos and Knossos», *Pylos Comes Alive*, edd. C. W. Shelmerdine - T. G. Palaima, New York 1984, p. 62.

³⁸ «The Women of Pylos», *Studies Bennett*, pp. 86f., cf. Φολόη?

that they are actually bits from the 1952 batch. Since the entry of the join is followed by other joins implying bits from the '52S3/163 group, I wonder whether or not these alleged '613' bits actually represent strays from the same source.

Eb 993 + Eb 1047

(Eb; H 41)

- .1]kē-kē-me-na , ko-to-na
 .2 GRA] *vacat*

The fragment *993, from the 1952 ('52/426) batch, was determined by Emmett L. Bennett, jr., as pertaining to the Eb series, on the basis that it shows the typical Eb trace of string.³⁸ He supplemented the remains of text as *do-]ē-ro* on line .B. Nevertheless, the thinness of the fragment went against such a reading: its place on the tablet was near the right end, where the presence of *te-o-jo* , *do-e-ro* was certainly excluded. This assumption lead me to join it to **Eb 1047**, from the 1939 batch (component no. 352.4), which was found at 8.2314. Moreover, the resultant piece, a right end of an Eb tablet, could be quasi-joined to **Eb 884**, which is swollen and much fragmented by heavy firing.

Na 1013 [+ Na 1356

(Na; S106 H 1)

- .A] , wa-na-ka[
 .B] , e-re-u-ṭē[] SA [

The quasi-join was made on 15th November 1996, but it was not included in the published batch of that campaign,³⁹ until further consideration of its viability was done. After rechecking the relationship of both pieces, I consider that they are actually parts of the same tablet: ca. 1 cm. is still missing for physical contact. A supplementation

- .A [, e-ke]
 .B [-ra]

could be envisaged following the pattern of **Na 334**.

Xn 1169 + fr.

(—)

- .1]e[

The fragment now attached belongs to a large group of internal bits pertaining to **An 615**, a fact that strengthens the relationship of **Xn 1169** (in fact, itself the component 615.32) to this record.

JOSÉ L. MELENA

³⁸ E. L. Bennett jr., «A Selection of Pylos Tablet Texts», *Mykenaiika*, Athènes 1992, p. 124.

³⁹ J. L. Melena, «133 Joins and Quasi-Joins of Fragments in the Linear B Tablets from Pylos», *Minos* 29-30, 1994-1995, pp. 271-288.