A NOTE ON PYLOS TABLET Un 1482

With his customary kindness, José Melena has sent me an advance copy of his discussion, in this volume of *Minos*, of Pylos tablet Un 1482, found in 1995 by my fellow Dubliner Joanne Murphy. I should like to offer one or two reflections on the document.¹

I have nothing to add to José Melena's reading of the text of the record, which seems to me admirable in all respects. What, however, I should like to suggest is that there may perhaps be merit in Melena's (rejected) alternative explanation of the first word on the tablet, *ke-ra-e-we*, as a derivative in $-\epsilon \dot{\upsilon}_S$, not of $\gamma \dot{\epsilon} \rho \alpha_S$, 'portion of honour', but of $\kappa \dot{\epsilon} \rho \alpha_S$, 'horn'.

At first sight at least, Melena's preferred explanation of ke-ra-e-we as a derivative of $\gamma \epsilon \rho \alpha \varsigma$, and the name of the object denoted by ideogram *189, which here almost certainly follows the term, does have points in its favour. Ideogram *189 has a KE surcharged on it, which might clearly abbreviate ke-rae-we; and if we take the term as the name of an object, all four entries on the record would appear to have a similar pattern: first the name of the object being recorded, then either a numeral or an ideogram followed by a numeral. Moreover, it would not be surprising if the persons mentioned on the Qa records at Pylos as giving or receiving small quantities of *189 were in fact receiving these objects as a mark of honour; as Melena rightly points out, many of them at least are clearly persons of significance, some if not all in the religious sphere. Again, it is in keeping with Melena's suggestion that *189 is a hide given as a mark of honour (for which he adduces parallels in the Classical world) (i) that line 3 of the tablet begins with a reference to saddle-bags (ka-tu-re-wi-ja), which we know from elsewhere at Pylos to have been made of leather, and (ii) that *a-pi* a_2 -ro, mentioned on Qa 1297 as the donor or recipient of five units of *189, is almost certainly to be identified with *a-pi-a₂-ro* the *ko-re-te*, who is recorded on On 300 as the recipient of six units of *154, almost certainly a skin.

On the other hand, while a $-\epsilon \dot{\upsilon}_{S}$ derivative of $\gamma \dot{\epsilon} \rho \alpha_{S}$ with the sense 'object which gives honour' is perhaps not entirely inconceivable, this explanation of the term does raise some doubts in the mind. First, the great majority of $-\epsilon \dot{\upsilon}_{S}$ derivatives in Mycenaean and later Greek are agent nouns like *ka-ke-u*, $\chi \alpha \lambda \kappa \epsilon \dot{\upsilon}_{S}$, *ke-ra-me-u*, $\kappa \epsilon \rho \alpha \mu \epsilon \dot{\upsilon}_{S}$; and *ke-ra-e-we* could of course be readily analysed as a trade-name of this type derived from $\kappa \dot{\epsilon} \rho \alpha_{S}$ 'horn' and meaning 'worker in horn (and ivory?)'. And, second, while we do find the same extension in the case of

¹ I am grateful to Kees Ruijgh for discussion of the problems raised by the record, and to Lisa Bendall and Torsten Meissner for acute comments on a draft of this note. Any errors or misjudgements that remain are of course mine alone.

nouns in $-\epsilon \upsilon_S$ as we do in the case of agent nouns in $-\tau \eta \rho$, and have nouns with this suffix denoting implements (e.g. $\delta \chi \epsilon \upsilon_S$, 'fastening (of a helmet)', 'bolt (of a door)') and vessels (e.g. a - p(i-p)o - re - u, $d\mu \phi(\iota \phi) \circ \rho \epsilon \upsilon_S$, 'amphora'),² a noun * $\gamma \epsilon \rho \alpha(h) \epsilon \upsilon_S$, with the sense 'object which gives honour', would involve a rather more abstract concept than those that are normally involved in $-\epsilon \upsilon_S$ terms for implements and vessels, which seem in general to be used of objects of a decidedly practical and down-to-earth character, and where they are based on nouns are derived from terms of a highly concrete nature.³

Moreover, it does not seem impossible to interpret *ke-ra-e-we* in the context of Un 1482 as an agent noun */keraheus/*, 'worker in horn', in one of its case forms. Indeed, a reference to a worker or workers in horn at this point in the record is arguably well in keeping with the following entries on the tablet, and would not be in conflict with the patterning of those entries.

To begin with the first point, the entries which follow ke-ra-e-we relate to *189, to ka-tu-re-wi-ja, 'saddle-bags', to ta-ra-nu[, 'a footstool' or 'footstools', and to de-mi-ni-ja a-ke-re-wi-ja, almost certainly 'beds from *a-ke-re-u' (which in turn is probably a variant spelling of the place-name a-ke-re-wa).⁴ As Melena

² For these examples and others, see P. Chantraine, *Formation*, p. 128.

- ³ P. Chantraine, *loc. cit.*, mentions, besides ὀχεύς (Homer, poets) and ἀμφιφορεύς (Homer), ἀμφορεύς (Attic), ἐγκοπεύς, 'chisel' (Lucian), βοεύς, 'yoke-strap' (Homer), ἱστοβοεύς, 'plough-tree' (Hesiod), κατοχεύς, 'bolt' (Callimachus), σφαγεύς, 'sacrificial knife' (tragedy), τομεύς, 'carver' (Attic Ionic) and the vessel-name ἀμολγεύς, 'milking-pail' (Theocritus). Of these, only σφαγεύς has elevated overtones; and this is only found in tragedy. [In addition to these terms denoting implements and vessels, there are some (generally old) terms in -εύς in Classical Greek where the sense of the suffix is vaguer than it is in their case e.g. δονακεύς, 'area planted with rushes' (Homer, poets), κωπεύς, 'wood for making oars' (Attic-Ionic): see P. Chantraine, *op. cit.*, p. 126. Not only, however, do we appear not to have examples of these in Mycenaean (though we do find -εύς there as a suffix of ethnics and other terms denoting origin): these terms share the characteristic of the -εύς terms for implements and vessels that where they are formed from nouns the base terms in question are always concrete (e.g. δόναξ, 'rush', κώπη, 'oar').]
- 4 There are at least three cases at Pylos where we have both an -e-u and a -wa form of what is evidently the same place-name. For the -e-u form of a-ke-re-wa see, in addition to a-ke-re-wi-ja here (and a-ke-re-u-te, a-ke-re-wi-jo at Mycenae, on which see Killen 1983, p. 226), the locative a-ke-re-we on Un 1193.3. For similar formations, see (i) wo-no-ge-we (loc.) Un 1193.2, besides wo-no-ge-wa Na 396 (and note also wo-ge-we An 610.7, An 724.13, which on An 610 immediately follows a reference to a-ke-re-wa, just as wo-no-qe-we on 1193 precedes the reference to a-kere-we on the following line); (ii) e-ra-te-re-we Ma 333.1, besides e-ra-te-re-wa-o Jo 438.27 (and *e*[]-re-wa-o On 300.10) and e-ra-te-re-wa-pi Cn 595.1, Jn 829.17, Vn 493.4; and possibly, but much more doubtfully, (iii) a-no-ke-we An 192.13, besides ano-ke-wa An 192.5. L. R. Palmer (Interpretation, p. 76, 162) suggests that the -e-u forms may be district names and the -wa forms village names; note, however, that era-te-re-we is found on the Ma tablets and e-ra-te-re-wa-pi on Jn 829, in both of which contexts the names of the Pylian Nine and Seven (major districts) are being quoted. [Note that while the place-name]a-ke-re-u[on Cn 441.2,3 is sometimes quoted as the nominative of *a-ke-re-we*, this is certainly not complete at the beginning,

points out in his own discussion of ke-ra-e-we, not only did the Mycenaeans regularly use horn as a cheaper equivalent of ivory (see for instance the description of swords on the Ra(2) tablets at Knossos as ke-ra de-de-me-na and e-re-pa-te de-de-me-na, 'bound with horn', 'bound with ivory'): horn is recorded elsewhere on the tablets as being attached to leather items, as the ka-tu-re-wi-ja on the present record almost certainly are.⁵ (See the regular description of *a-ni*ja, 'reins', on the Sd CHARIOT tablets at Knossos as wi-ri-ne-(j)o/wi-ri-ni-jo o-poqo ke-ra-ja-pi o-pi-i-ja-pi, 'with leather blinkers (and) horn attachments'. As Ventris and Chadwick note in Documents (p. 365), «o-pi-i-ja-pi ... [is] presumably another part of the *a-ni-ja* (or, if the lack of $-q^{u}e$ is significant, a part of the *o-po-qo* itself)».) But it is not only to leather that horn or ivory was attached: line 3 of the present tablet records *ta-ra-nu*[, a footstool or footstools; and all but one of the ta-ra-nu-we recorded on the Pylos Ta furniture tablets are described as inlaid or overlaid with ivory. (See e.g. Ta 722.3, where a ta-ra-nu is described as a-ja-me-no e-re-pa-te-ja-pi ka-ru-pi, 'inlaid (vel sim.) with ivory bosses (?)'.) Moreover, given that the *de-mi-ni-ja*, 'beds', recorded on 1. 4 of the tablet are again items of furniture, it seems perfectly possible that these also were sometimes decorated with ivory or horn attachments.

The possibility comes to mind therefore that what the tablet is recording is the supply of various objects, one at least of leather and two at least of wood, to a worker (or workers) in horn (and ivory?), with the intention that he (or they) should add decoration to them. (As we have noted, *ke-ra-e-we* could either be dative singular or nominative plural; if it is the latter, it would on this interpretation of the record have to be a nominative plural of rubric, again indicating the destination of the objects.) But what of *189 with its *KE* surcharge; and what of the patterning of the entries if we adopt this approach to the interpretation of *ke-ra-e-we*?

Taking the second matter first, there in fact seems no difficulty for the proposal from this point of view. Whereas the entries on the tablet from 1. 3 onwards do follow the pattern (a) name of object (b) numeral or ideogram plus numeral, this is actually not an objection to taking ke-ra-e-we as dative singular or nominative plural of a trade-name. Since ka-tu-re-wi-ja on 1. 3 is not followed by an ideogram,⁶ the name of the object is obligatory here; and since the wording before the likely *169 is not simply de-mi-ni-ja but de-mi-ni-ja a-ke-re-wi-ja, 'beds from *a-ke-re-u', the use of the name of the object here is readily understandable (even though the adjective a-ke-re-wi-ja plus the ideogram would

and must therefore be a compound of the type exemplified by o-re-mo-a-ke-re-u and da-i-ja-ke-re-u (the former certainly, the latter possibly, a place-name). (Given that the scribe of Cn 441 (H 1) sometimes omits a -j- glide after (C+)*i*, da-i-ja-ke-re-u might well have been spelt on this record as da-i-a-ke-re-u.)]

⁵ PY Ub 1318.1 lists four skins (*di-pte-ra*) as *ka-tu-re-wi-ja-i* viz. for (making into) saddle-bags.

⁶ Note the same phenomenon in the *ka-tu-re-wi-ja* entry on PY Ub 1318.1 (see the previous note).

have been a sufficient indication of what was being recorded). Again, since we do not know whether an ideogram followed *ta-ra-nu* on 1. 3, or simply a numeral (both forms of entry occur in references to *ta-ra-nu-we* on the Ta tablets, though the ideogram is usually written), we cannot say anything about the pattern of this entry. Against this background, the appearance of *189 on 1. 2 without a reference to the name of the object would seem perfectly conceivable. Moreover, there also seems no difficulty from the point of view of the patterning of the tablet in having the dative or nominative of a trade-name at the beginning of line 2. Even if line 1 is not simply a blank exergue of the type sometimes found on Pylos tablets (and it is noticeable that the tablet has already begun to curve quite sharply inwards at the top left of 1. 2, suggesting that this is possible), there are good parallels elsewhere in the archive for a heading in line 1 continuing into line 2. See, for instance, Vn 10, where the phrase o-di-do-si duru-to-mo, 'thus the wood-cutters give', on 1. 1 is continued on 1. 2 with the word *a-mo-te-jo-na-de*, 'to the wheel-wright's workshop', indicating the destination of the contribution.

Vn 10.1	o-di-do-si , du-ru-to-mo ,
.2	a-mo-te-jo-na-de , e-pi-[•]-ta 50
.3	a-ko-so-ne-qe 50
.4	to-sa-de, ro-u-si-jo, a-ko-ro, a-ko-so-ne
.5	100, to-sa-de, e-pi-[•]-ta 100

But what, finally, of the fact that *ke-ra-e-we* begins with the sign *ke*, and that ideogram no. *189 has a KE surcharged on it? One possibility, of course, is that this is simply a coincidence. But there is another: that the KE on the ideogram does stand for a term derived from *ke-ra*, indicating that the object denoted by *189 has horn decoration or the like, and that this in the present context is proleptic, i.e., that it refers to the state the object will be in after the horn-worker has added his finishing touches.⁷ One might compare here the use of cloth ideograms like TELA + TE on the Lc(1) 'production target' records at Knossos to indicate the type of cloth which the workers involved in this production are expected to make with their allocations of raw material.

One final observation. If PY Un 1482 does list objects being sent to a hornworker or horn-workers to add his/their finishing touches to them, and if these

⁷ There is unfortunately no conclusive evidence as to what kind of object *189 denotes. As we have noted above, Melena points out, in support of his suggestion that the ideogram denotes a skin, that the *ka-tu-re-wi-ja* recorded on 1. 3 of the tablet are almost certainly of leather (see note 5 above); and it is also true, as Melena again points out, that the tablets from the NE Building, which may well also be the source of Un 1482, include several (classed as Ub) dealing with leather-working. But just as Un 1482 records objects other than leather ones, so the records from the NE Building include references to many more 'industrial' activities than leather-working; and given that the frame of *189 is merely a rectangle, and lacks any of the features which characterise ideograms for skins like *152 and *154, it would be best, I believe, to regard its identity as still remaining an open question. include beds from **a-ke-re-u* (very likely = *a-ke-re-wa*), there is a probable parallel for the situation being described here on the CLOTH records at Knossos. Though we cannot be certain where the horn-worker or -workers dealt with on this tablet is/are carrying out his/their duties, it is attractive to guess that it was at the centre, Pylos, itself. With the beds from **a-ke-re-u* here, therefore, it is tempting to compare the probable evidence on M(1) 683 for the finishing (at Knossos?) of the textile **146*. (Though we cannot be certain that the finishing workers named on line 1 of this record are expected to decorate the consignment of **146* listed on line 2 of the tablet, this seems not unlikely.) We know that, at Pylos at least, **146* was a simple form of cloth/garment which was supplied to the palace by way of its taxation system, not a fabric produced in the palace's own (specialised) textile workshops. Are therefore the situations on M(1) 683 and PY Un 1482 closely similar: viz. the adding of finishing touches in a central workshop to goods (probably of a rather simple nature) which have been supplied to the palace by workers elsewhere in the kingdom?

The text of M(1) 683 reads as follows.

M(1) 683					(103)
.1a] a-ze-ti-ri-j	a			
.1b]te-o	o-nu-ke	lana 9	м 2	
.2]ti-mu-nu-we	*146	30		

For the probability that *a-ze-ti-ri-ja* on l. 1 is *lasketriai*/, 'finishers, decorators', and that the *o-nu-ke* wool listed in connexion with these persons is wool intended for decorative purposes, see Killen 1979, pp. 157-167.

Cambridge CB5 8BL, UK Jesus College JOHN T. KILLEN

BIBLIOGRAPHY = La formation des noms en grec ancien. Paris 1933. CHANTRAINE, P. Formation = «The Knossos Ld(1) tablets» in E. Risch, H. KILLEN, J. T. 1979 Mühlestein (eds), Colloquium Mycenaeum. Actes du sixième colloque international sur les textes mycéniens et égéens. Neuchâtel, Geneve, pp. 151-181. KILLEN, J. T. 1983 = «On the Mycenae Ge tablets» in A. Heubeck, G. Neumann (eds), Res Mycenaeae. Akten des VII. Internationalen Mykenologischen Colloquiums. Göttingen, pp. 216-233. PALMER, L. R. Interpretation = $\hat{T}he$ Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts. Oxford 1963. VENTRIS, M. and CHADWICK, J. **Documents** = Documents in Mycenaean Greek. Cambridge 1956.