

MASSIMO PERNA

## THE PYLOS Mb AND Mn TABLETS<sup>1</sup>

### A) The Tablets of Pylos Mb series.

E.L.Bennett Jr. and J.-P.Olivier in *PTT*<sup>2</sup> attribute to this series 25 tablets, and the attribution to this series is based on the presence of ideogram \*146, the form of the tablets and the quality of the clay.

More recently E.L. Bennett<sup>3</sup> has also attributed to this series 8 tablets of the **Xa** series which do not present ideogram \*146 because they are fragmentary, but they have in common with the **Mb** tablets all the other characteristics, and he has joined **Mb 1399** and **Mb 1403**.

**Mb 1406**<sup>4</sup>, which does not present any ideogram, has been excluded from the series and will be reclassified as **Ea 1406**.

After the new joins of J.L. Melena<sup>5</sup> still unpublished, the series now consists of 30 palm leaf tablets of which only 17 present ideogram \*146.

### Find-spots.

The series is rather homogeneous with respect to the find-spots. In fact 29 of

---

<sup>1</sup> This article is the complete version of that which will appear in an abridged form in the Proceedings of XI Mycenological Conference. Austin, May 7-13 2000, T.G. Palaima & CH.W. Shelmerdine eds., [forthcoming]. I would like to thank CH. Shelmerdine for some clarification about the find-spots and the scribes hands. For editorial reasons in all documents in linear B quoted, uncertain readings are indicated by underlining rather than a dot as is usually the case.

<sup>2</sup> Bennett and Olivier 1973, pp. 195-196.

<sup>3</sup> Bennett 1992, pp. 126-127. The relevant **Xa** tablets are: **Xa 1376, 1377, 1378, 1379, 1380, 1383, 1386, 1387**.

<sup>4</sup> This originates from trench 8 SW, Palaima 1988, pp.107, 166 and 209. *Prior publication* Lang 1961, p. 160, pl. 56. It is attributed to scribe S28 H 43?, the scribe of Ea series. Reclassified at the suggestion of J.T.Killen, in Bennett, Melena, Olivier, Palaima, *PofN* IV, [forthcoming].

<sup>5</sup> Melena 2000-2001, [forthcoming]. I would like to thank J.L. Melena for some clarification about these new joins. The joins are: **Mb 1365 + Mb (exXa)1386** and **Mb (exXa)1376 + Mb 1395**.



It is certainly a man's name in the nominative case in **PY An 192.14**, in **Cc 660** and in **Xa 1378** (a-ke-o[ ]). He is one of the collectors of Pylos, present in the genitive case in the **Cn** series.

2) ]a-ki-ri.

**PY Mb 1363** ]a-ki-ri \*146[

It is probably the same toponym, ]ka-a-ki-ri[ present in **PY Mb 1432** which, as M. Lejeune<sup>9</sup> suggests, could be read as *pa-ka-a-ka-ri* toponym which appears in **PY Na 926** or also as ]*a*<sub>2</sub>-*ke-wo-a-ki-ri* which appears in **Na 928**.<sup>10</sup>

3) ]a-ki-ri-jo[

**PY Mb 1387** ]a-ki-ri-jo [ \*146

It is probably an ethnic derived from the toponym ]a-ki-ri.

4) *a-pi-no-e-wi-jo*.

**PY Mb 1396** a-pi-no-e-wi-jo \*146 2

It is a well documented toponym. It appears in **PY An 37.3**, and **207.13**, in **PY Jn 605.1**, in **PY Nn 228.5**, in **PY Vn 130.3,4** and in **PY Xa 58**, which is in all probability a fragment of the **Na** series<sup>11</sup>.

It can be located without doubt within the territory of the *de-we-ro-a<sub>3</sub>-ko-ra-i-ja*.

5) *a<sub>3</sub>-ki-po-de*.

**Mb 1397** a<sub>3</sub>-ki-po-de \*146[

For M. Lejeune is «loc.sing. ou nom. pl.; lieu-dit tirant sa désignation du nom ἀίγιππος du “chèvrepied”»<sup>12</sup>.

Also M. Ventris and J. Chadwick<sup>13</sup> consider it a toponym.

It is worth underlining the existence of the man's name *a<sub>3</sub>-ki-po*, which appears in **KN U 4478.9**

<sup>9</sup> Lejeune 1971, p. 370. : «Les fragments Mb 1363:...]akiri et Mb 1432:...]kaakiri, si on les rapproche de *pakaakari*, font penser à un second élément disyllabique, que les scribes écrivaient soit —*ak(a)ri* soit —*ak(i)ri*. Le toponyme de Mb 1432 pourrait alors se restituer: ]*pa*]kaakiri et être identique au *pakaakari* de Na 926;».

<sup>10</sup> Shelmerdine [forthcoming], Melena 1997, pp. 284–285. I would like to thank C. W. Shelmerdine who has provided me with her texte before the publication.

<sup>11</sup> Bennett and Olivier 1973, p. 271

<sup>12</sup> Lejeune 1971a, pp. 344–345.

<sup>13</sup> Ventris and Chadwick 1973, p. 536.

6) *a3-me-wa* [ ]

**PY Mb 1376** *a3-me-wa* [ ] \*146 5

In **PY Vn 865.2** it is an individual in the nominative case in a list of *na-u-do-mo*.

7) ]*de*.

**PY Mb 1399** ]*de* \*146 11 [

It is difficult to say if this is indeed the ending of an allative.

8) *di-wi-jo*.

**PY Mb 1366** *di-wi-jo* \*146 2

Variant of *di-u-jo*, derived from the root of *di-we*, interpreted by everybody as the sanctuary of *Zeus* (*di-wi-jo-de* OLE+A v 1 in **PY Fr 1230**) or, less probably as a toponym.

9) ]*e-na-po-ro*[

**PY Mb 1435** ]*e-na-po-ro*[ \*146

It is a well attested toponym, whose location is probably in the *de-we-ro-a3-ko-ra-i-ja*. It is associated three times with another toponym of the **Mb** series *a-pi-no-e-wi-jo* in **PY An 37.4**, **Nn 228.7** and **Vn 130**.

It is also attested in **PY Mn 1408.4**, in **PY An 661.3**, **Cn 3.5**, **Na 1027**. It appears to be one of the places of the *de-we-ro-a3-ko-ra-i-ja* which supplies the palace with linen.

10 ]*jo*.

**PY Mb 1336** ]*jo* \*146 11 [

It could be the last syllable of a man's name in the genitive case, or of an ethnic, masculine or neutral.

11) ]*ka-a-ki-ri* [

**PY Mb 1432** ]*ka-a-ki-ri*[ \*146

This can be reconstructed as the toponyms *pa-ka-a-ka-ri* or ]*a2-ke-wo-a-ki-ri*, see n°2.

12) ]-*ka-te*

**PY Mb 1402** ]-*ka-te* \*146 5

The probable reading is *wa-na-ka-te* or *pi-ro-ka-te*, a man's name attested at *ro-u-so* in **PY Jn 832.10** with *pa-qo-si-jo* man's name which appears also in **Mn 1412.2**.

It is worth remembering that ideogram \*146 appears in a list of goods to be used in a ceremony in honour of the *wa-na-ka* in **PY Un 2**.

13) *ka-wa-ti-ro*[

**PY Mb 1401** pa-ro, *ka-wa-ti-ro*[ \*146

*ka-wa-ti-ro* is a man's name in the nominative case in **PY An 340.2** and perhaps in **Jn 431.24** ( ]*wa-ti-ro*). But here is in the dative.

As for the meaning of the preposition *pa-ro*, Ventris and Chadwick<sup>14</sup> translate it as: « from or at the hands of (a person) ».

C. Ruijgh<sup>15</sup> has underlined the possibility that the expression *pa-ro da-mo* translates as «auprès de la communauté» or «de la communauté».

J.L. Melena<sup>16</sup> in **KN Ld 584.2** translates *pa-ro* followed by *e-ta-wo-ne-we*, as 'apud'.

J.T. Killen<sup>17</sup>, considers *e-ta-wo-ne-u* as a finisher of textiles and translates the expression *pa-ro e-ta-wo-ne-we* « chez, at *e-ta-wo-ne-u* », in the sense that at the time of inscribing the tablet, the textiles are still with the finisher, and will later be sent to the palace.

Olivier Piteros ad Melena<sup>18</sup> consider: «les formules avec *pa-ro*...une localisation sans mouvement et extérieure au centre administratif: «auprès de X ». ».

From the analysis of these interpretations, above all of those originating from the textile industry, it seems to me that we can translate the expression *pa-ro ka-wa-ti-ro* as 'from *ka-wa-ti-ro*' or more likely as 'at *ka-wa-ti-ro*' (i.e. «in the place where *ka-wa-ti-ro* resides» see *infra*).

14) ]*ke-do-jo-no*[

**PY Mb 1365** ]*ke-do-jo-no*[ ]*i-jo* \*146 4 [  
= **PY Mb 1386** (ex **Xa 1386**) ]*ke-do-jo-no*[ + **PY Mb 1365** ]*i-jo* \*146 4 [

] *ke-do-jo-no*[ is clearly linked with the man's name *ke-do-jo*, which appears in **PY Ua 158**.

Probably a man's name in the genitive (Κέρδοιο) or in the nominative case (Κερδώιος). The presence of the word ]*i-jo*, presumably 'son' (gr. υἱός), after *ke-do-jo-no*, points to a genitive. It is only attested in this document.

15) *ke-sa-da-ra*.

**PY Mb 1380** ke-sa-da-ra, [ \*146

<sup>14</sup> Ventris and Chadwick 1973, p. 569

<sup>15</sup> Ruijgh 1967, p.95

<sup>16</sup> Melena 1975, p.85.

<sup>17</sup> Killen 1979, pp.160-161

<sup>18</sup> Olivier, Piteros and Melena 1990, p. 152.



18) ]-no-wi-jo [

**PY Mb 1383** ]-no-wi-jo [ \*146  
Not referable to any attested word.

19) ro-u-so.

**PY Mb 1398** ro-u-so \*146[

It is a well attested toponym which can be situated in the *de-we-ro-a3-ko-ra-i-ja*. It is one of the nine districts of the Hither Province cited in **Ma 365.1**.

It appears also in **PY Aa 717** and **798**, **Ab 382** and **1099**, **Cn 285.1** and **328.1**, **Fr 1238** (*ro-u-]so-de*), **Jn 829.10** and **832.1**, **Jo 438.9**, **Mn 456.7** and **1370.1**, **Un 47.1** and **Vn 130.12**. In this last tablet it is associated with *a-pi-no-e-wi-jo* and *e-na-po-ro*, toponyms of **Mb/Mn** series as well as *me-ta-pa*, *ka-ra-do-ro*, *pa-ki-ja-si*, which enables us, as we have seen above, to locate *a-pi-no-e-wi-jo* and *e-na-po-ro* in the *de-we-ro-a3-ko-ra-i-ja*, and to reasonably consider them as villages of less importance than the nine districts.

20) ]se-we

**PY Mb 1433** ]-se-we \*146 [           
Not referable to any attested word.

21) u-ma[

**PY Mb 1405** u-ma[ \*146  
Not referable to any attested word.

22) wa-a2-te-pi.

**PY Mb 1377** wa-a2-te-pi, ne[ \*146

*wa-a2-te-pi* is a toponym also attested in **Na 1009**. It probably appears also in **PY An 207.9** in the form *wa-a2-te-we*, where it is associated with *a-pi-no[-e-wi-jo*, and in **PY Mn 1371.1** where the first syllable is missing ( *]a2-te-we[*).

23) ]wi-jo.

**PY Mb 1436** ]wi-jo \*146[         

It can be reconstructed, perhaps, as *di-wi-jo* (**Mb 1366**) or as the toponyms *a-pi-no-e-wi-jo* (**Mb 1396**) and *na-i-se-wi-jo* (**Mn 1408.3**), but not classifiable with certainty.

24) ]wo

**PY Mb 1430** ]wo \*146 3

Not classifiable.

In sum, in the **Mb** series, it is possible to identify 6 different individuals (plus 3, who cannot be identified with certainty), 7 toponyms, 1 adjective and 1 preposition<sup>25</sup>. (see table 1).

The case of *ke-do-jo-no* is likely genitive and (*pa-ro*) *ka-wa-ti-ro* is dative. For *a<sub>3</sub>-me-wa*[, *a-ke-o*, *ke-so-da-ra* and ]*a-ki-ri-jo* it is impossible to define if they are in nominative case or dative.

(Table 1)

Men's names, ethnics and individuals identifiable: 6	Toponyms and places identifiable : 7	Non classifiable words: 10	Adjectives: 1
]ke-do-jo-no[  i-jo 1	di-wi-jo 1	]jo 1	ne-wa[ 1
a <sub>3</sub> -me-wa[ 1	a-pi-no-e-wi-jo 1	]no-wi-jo [ 1	
a-ke-o 2	]e-na-po-ro[ 1	]de 1	
ke-sa-da-ra 1	wa-a <sub>2</sub> -te-pi 1	]ka-te 1	
]a-ki-ri-jo 1	a <sub>3</sub> -ki-po-de 1	u-ma[ 1	
(pa-ro) ka-wa-ti-ro 1	ro-u-so 1	]wo 1	
	]ka-a-ki-ri[ 1	]wi-jo 1	
		ti[ 1	
		u[ 1	
<b>Probable men's names or individuals: 3</b>	<b>Prepositions: 1</b>	ne[ 1	
(pa-ro) na-me[ 1	pa-ro 2	<b>Common name denoting a person: 1</b>	
]ne-ja 1		i-jo 1	
]se-we 1			

### B) The tablets of the Pylos Mn series.

Let us analyse, now, the tablets of the **Mn** series and try to understand the significance of this series, which has many features in common with the **Mb** series and, like the **Mb** series, is very fragmentary and obscure.

First of all, as already underlined by E.L. Bennett and J.-P. Olivier<sup>26</sup>, tablet **Mn** 11 must be reclassified for two reasons. Firstly, it does not present ideogram \*146, which appears in all **Mn** tablets. Secondly, it features four ideograms *RI*, *ME*, \*152 and \*249, which do not appear in the other **Mn** tablets.

<sup>25</sup> In **Mb** 1364, 1400, 1429 and 1431 appears only the ideogram \*146 and numerals. In **Mb** 1404, only the numerals.

<sup>26</sup> Bennett and Olivier, p. 200.

Whereas the first three are found in the **Ma** series, the fourth ideogram, unidentified, only appears in this document.

In reality this tablet cannot be classified in any other existing series and only has in common with the **Mn** series the characteristic 'page' layout.

In the next edition of the texts of Pylos<sup>27</sup> this document will be included in a new series, especially created, and classified as **Mm** 11.

The **Mn** series now consists of 13 tablets, page shaped.

### Scribes.

Three different scribes are responsible for the inscription of these texts.

**Mn 1367, 1368, 1369, 1371, 1409, 1410, 1411** and **1412** are the work of scribe H 14.

**Mn 1370, 1407** and **1408** are the work of stylus S1398 Cii.

**Mn 162** and **456** belong to scribe S90 H2.

### Find-spots.

All the **Mn** tablets (except for **Mn 162, 456** and **1409**) originate from the South-Western Building. (Fig. 1)

**Mn 162** and **456** originate from the Archives Complex.

**Mn 1409** originates from the surface earth of trench 25, and was found east of the group of tablets from the South-Western Building, but can nonetheless be considered as part of this group<sup>28</sup>. (Fig. 1)

Let us analyse, therefore, all these documents to highlight the links between the series **Mb** and **Mn**.

Tablet **Mn 162** records quantities of \*146.

<b>Mn 162</b>	.1	] vacant	(S90 H2)
	.2	*146 ]4	
	.3	*146 ]4	
	.4	<i>deest</i>	
	.5	] *146 4	
	.6	]ka-sa-ta	*146 4
	.7	pa-ro, ke-ku-ro	*146 4
	.8	a-sa-ti-ja	*146 4
	.9	vacat	
	.10	vacat [	

<sup>27</sup> Bennett, Melena, Olivier and Palaima, *PofN*, [forthcoming]. I would like thank J. L. Melena and J.-P. Olivier who have provided me with a preview of the pages relating to the **Ma**, **Mb**, **Mm**, **Mn** series and **Ea 1406**.

<sup>28</sup> Palaima 1988, p. 77 and 164. Lang 1961, p. 159.

In line 6 there appears ]*ka-sa-ta* a hapax of difficult interpretation, probably a man's name (cf. [.]*-sa-ta* in **KN As 1517.3**)

In line 7, « at *ke-ku-ro* » 4 units of \*I46 are recorded.

*ke-ku-ro* is a man's name also attested perhaps in **KN Xd 7656** (*ke-ku-ro* [ ] )

In line 8 there appears the village of *a-sa-ti-ja*, well known in both the form *a-si-ja-ti-ja* (**On 300.11**) and *a-[.]ta<sub>2</sub>* (**Ma 397.1**). Also the name of this village is followed by 4 units of \*I46.

### Mn 456

(S90 H 2)

.1	<i>vestigia</i>	
.2	re[ ] <u>ro</u>	*I46 5
.3	ko-ro-jo-wo-wi-ja	*I46 2
.4	si-re-wa	*I46 2
.5	me-te-to	*I46 1
.6	e-wi-te-wi-jo	*I46 1
.7	ro-u-so	*I46 1
.8	e-ri-no-wo-te	*I46 1
.9	sa-ri-nu-wo-te	*I46 1
.10	e-pi-qo-ra <sub>2</sub>	*I46 1 [

The tablet **Mn 456** is a list of districts and sub-districts, most of them in the *de-we-ro-a<sub>3</sub>-ko-ra-ja*. In fact *me-te-to*, *e-wi-te-wi-jo*, *ro-u-so*, *e-ri-no-wo-te* and *sa-ri-nu-wo-te* are certainly situated in the Hither Province. For *ko-ro-jo-wo-wi-ja*, *si-re-wa* and *e-pi-qo-ra<sub>2</sub>* it is impossible to establish the location with certainty. The presumed presence in the first line of *re-[u-ko-to-]ro* has led Sainer<sup>29</sup> to locate the toponym *ko-ro-jo-wo-wi-ja* (which appears soon after *re-[u-ko-to-]ro*) in the Further Province.

This interpretation is unconvincing.

I believe various interpretations of this word are possible.

First possibility. We can consider **PY Mn 456** as a list of toponyms of the two provinces, where *re-u-ko-to-ro* appears in the first line either by chance or because it is the most prestigious location in the document, if it is true that it represents the main centre of the Further Province, as Pylos would be for the Hither Province.

Second possibility. If *re-u-ko-to-ro* is the main centre of the Further Province, why does it appear in **PY Ma 225** as a sub-district of *pi-\**82, one of the districts of the Hither Province?

This attestation of *re-u-ko-to-ro* seems to refer to a toponym of lesser importance than the *re-u-ko-to-ro* attested in the **Ad** series, and it would be situated in another province.

<sup>29</sup> Sainer 1976, pp. 43–44.

J. Chadwick's explanation that: «Perhaps the solution lies in the location of this town near the frontier between the two provinces» does not seem convincing<sup>30</sup>.

A more plausible explanation, in my opinion, could be that the *re-u-ko-to-ro*, which appears as a small village belonging to the district of *pi-\**82 in the Hither Province, is a toponym other than the one known as the main centre of the Further Province. This circumstance still occurs in both ancient and modern Greece, where in the same region one finds dozens of place names like *Platanos*, *Monastiraki*, *Haghia Triada* etc<sup>31</sup>.

I do not think that the argument that such a possibility would have created confusion at the time of the registration is valid, as this circumstance is well attested in the texts in Linear B also for men's names, and one name often refers to more than one individual.

No scribe would have confused the small *re-u-ko-to-ro* of *pi-\**82 with the main centre of the Further Province.

Third possibility. The reconstruction as *re[-u-ko-to-]ro* at line 1 could be wrong,<sup>32</sup> in which case, then, in all probability, this could be a list of toponyms all situated in the Hither Province.

In this case an acceptable reading could be *re-[pe-u-ri-]jo*, a toponym present in **PY Cn 40.11**.

The bottom part of the vertical line of sign JO, also common to sign RO, could have caused the confusion of reading between the two signs.

In lines 1 and 14 of **Cn 40** there appears in the genitive case *a-ke-o*, which, as we have seen, also appears in **Mb 1378** and **1434**.

*re-pe-u-ri-jo* belongs to the Hither Province and Sainer<sup>33</sup> locates it in the vicinity of *pi-\**82.

**Mn 1367**<sup>34</sup>

(H 14)

.1 ]\*146 26

Tablet **Mn 1368** presents in lines 2 and 3 the man's name *ke-sa-da-ra* (See series **Mb n°15**).

**Mn 1368**

(H 14)

.1 ki-[ ]-to , ka[ \*146

.2 ke-sa-da-ra, e-[ \*146

.3 ke-sa-da-ra i-no[ \*146

**Mn 1369**

.1 ] \*146[

30 Ventris and Chadwick 1973, p. 466.

31 For the repetition of same toponyms in the Peloponnese, see Chadwick 1975, p. 40.

32 Shelmerdine [forthcoming], note 80: «I exclude *re[-u-ko-to-]ro* (cf. Na 419) because this restoration now seems impossible.»

33 Sainer 1976, p.54.

34 Bennett and Olivier 1973, p.200:«possibly from the same tablet as Mn 1368 and 1411;»

.2	]	*146[
.3	]	*146[

Tablet **Mn 1370** shows the two well-known toponyms of the Hither Province *ro-u-so* and *ro-o-wa* (See **Mn 1408**)

<b>Mn 1370</b>			(S1398 Cii)
.1	ro-u-so [	*146	
.2	ro-o-wa [	*146	

In **Mn 1371** in a very fragmentary context there appears the word ]a<sub>2</sub>-te-we[, which could be reconstructed as the toponyms *wa-a<sub>2</sub>-te-we* of **An 207.9**, and *wa-a<sub>2</sub>-te-pi* of **Mb 1377**.

<b>Mn 1371</b>			(H 14)
.1	]a <sub>2</sub> -te-we[	*146	
.2	]te [	*146	

The text of **Mn 1407** is very fragmentary. Since large quantities of \*146 are associated with the words ]ma-ne and ]-jo, I think that these are likely to be two toponyms. In fact *-ma-ne*[ in **Mn 1410.3** follows a registration relating to an other toponym, *ma-ra-ne[-nu-we*.

<b>Mn 1407</b>			(S1398 Cii)
.1	]ma-ne	*146 19[	
.2	]jo	*146 27[	
.3	]	*146 4[	

In **Mn 1408** four toponyms of the Hither Province are recorded *ro-o-wa*, *po-ra-pi*, *na-i-se-wi-jo* and *e-na[-po-ro*

<b>Mn 1408</b>			(S1398 Cii)
.1	ro-o-wa	*146 [	
.2	po-ra-pi	*146 <u>5</u>	
.3	na-i-se-wi-jo	*146 2 [	
.4	e-na[-po-ro	*146	

The first one, *ro-o-wa*, is a well attested toponym.

It is, first of all, the site of a coastguard post as it appears from **An 519.1** (*to-ro-o*, *o-ka*, *ro-o-wa*) and we also find it in **PY An 1.2**, where it appears in the list of places which have to supply rowers to be sent to *Pleuron* (*e-re-ta*, *pe-re-u-ro-na-de*, *i-jo-te*), in **An 172.10** and in **An 724.1**, recording absent rowers (*ro-o-wa*, *e-re-ta*, *a-pe-o-te*).

*ro-o-wa* is also attested in **Mn 1370**, following *ro-u-so*, and in **Nn 228.2** which records the debt (*o-pe-ro*) of 35 units of linen related to *ro-o-wa*.

On **Na 568**: «is to be restored *ro-o*]-*wa*, a restoration which is suggested by mention of shipwrights on tablets»<sup>35</sup>.

It is interesting to note that in **An 1.2** *ro-o-wa* immediately precedes *ri-jo*, one of the nine districts of the Hither Province, supplying eight rowers against the five of *ri-jo*. This association reinforces the idea that *ro-o-wa* is located in this province.

M. Ventris and J.Chadwick<sup>36</sup> hypothesize that this could be the port of Pylos at the North of the Bay of Navarino.

The second toponym recorded in **Mn 1408**, *po-ra-pi*, shows the registration of 5 garments of the type \*146.

It refers, without a doubt, to a place of the Hither Province, as it is associated with toponyms of this province also in **Mn 1408**, in the above mentioned **An 1.4** (in which it supplies four rowers to be sent to *Pleuron*) and in **Nn 228.6** (which records the debt of 10 units of linen). Finally, it appears in the dative-locative case in **An 656.13** as a place where there are 20 *ke-ki-de*, and also in this case it is in relation to a toponym in the Hither Province, *a-ke-re-wa*.

A.P. Sainer<sup>37</sup> locates *po-ra-pi* in the north of *a-ke-re-wa* in the bay of Navarino not too far from today's Pylos.

2[ units of \*146 are associated with the third toponym *na-i-se-wi-jo*. It appears in **Jn 692.1** and **725.[18]**, where it is the place in which some *ka-ke-we* receive a certain bronze quantity as *ta-ra-si-ja*.

The fourth toponym *e-na[po-ro* is well documented, and it is likely to be situated in the *de-we-ro-a3-ko-ra-i-ja*.

*e-na-po-ro* is associated three times with *a-pi-no-e-wi-jo*, in **PY An 37.4**, **Nn 228.6** and **Vn 130.5**.

It also appears in **PY An 661.3**, **Cn 3.5**, **Mb 1435** and **Na 1027**.

In **Mn 1409** only the word *qe-re-me*[ appears, which can be reconstructed probably as the toponym *qe-re-me-e* also present in **Na 540**.

**Mn 1409** (H 14)

- |    |                       |
|----|-----------------------|
| .1 | ] <i>vestigia</i> [   |
| .2 | <i>qe-re-me</i> [*146 |

In **Mn 1410**, in line 1 there appears the word *wi-ja-we*[ which can be reconstructed as *wi-ja-we-ra*<sub>2</sub>, a toponym which can convincingly be located in the Hither Province, since in **Cn 643.2** and **Cn 719.11,12** it is associated with two toponyms of *de-we-ro-a3-ko-ra-i-ja*, *ma-ro-pi* and *pi*-\*82.

**Mn 1410** (H 14)

- |    |                     |      |
|----|---------------------|------|
| .1 | <i>wi-ja-we</i> [   | *146 |
| .2 | <i>ma-ra-ne</i> [   | *146 |
| .3 | [.] <i>-ma-ne</i> [ | *146 |

35 Sainer 1976, p.55.

36 Ventris and Chadwick 1973, p. 187.

37 Sainer 1976, p.51.

.4 ] *vestigia* [

In line 2 there appears the word *ma-ra-ne*[ which can be reconstructed as *ma-ra-ne[-nu-we*. This toponym which supplies 40 rowers in **An 610.11**, is located by A.P.Sainer<sup>38</sup> on the coast south of the Hither Province, whereas S.Hiller<sup>39</sup> locates it in the Further Province between *za-ma-e-wi-ja* and *ra-wa-ra-ta<sub>2</sub>*

The toponym *ma-ra-ne-nu-we* is to be related to the ethnic *ma-ra-ne-ni-jo*, but I do not find enough evidence to exclude, as Sainer<sup>40</sup> does, (without a reason) that this ethnic represents the inhabitants of *ma-ra-ne-nu-we*. For [.]ma-ne in line 3, see **Mn 1407**.

In **Mn 1411** *e-re-de* and *ma-se-de* are probably two toponyms with the ending of the allative. *ma-se-de* is followed by *ro-u-si*[ which is probably to be reconstructed as *ro-u-si-jo a-ko-ro*, adjectif of *ro-u-so* also present in **Mb 1398**.(Cf. *ro-u-si-jo a-ko-ro* in **PY Fr 1220.1, 1226.1, Ua 1413 Un 47.1** and **Vn 10.4**). Therefore, like *ro-u-so*, *ma-se-de* probably is to be located in the Hither Province.

**Mn 1411**

(H 14)

- |    |                                    |      |
|----|------------------------------------|------|
| .1 | <i>vestigia</i> [                  |      |
| .2 | <i>e-re-de</i> , <i>wa</i> [       | *146 |
| .3 | <i>ma-se-de</i> , <i>ro-u-si</i> [ | *146 |

The tablets **Mn 1411** and **Mb 1336** present anomalies compared to the other tablets in the **Mb/Mn** series.

In **Mn 1411** *ma-se-de* and *e-re-de* would seem to be allatives. This opinion is held by M . Lejeune<sup>41</sup>, who considers the two words to be accusative singulars in -ην of a toponym in -e j . The problem is that in the Linear B texts no example exists, and Lejeune proposes this hypothesis although aware of its limitations. If, following Lejeune, we consider *ma-se-de* and *e-re-de* two allatives, we should automatically maintain that the quantities of \*146 are registered as outgoing, not as incoming.

The other attestations of *ma-se-de* in **Cc 1285** (*ma-se-de* , OVISM<sup>m</sup> 6[ ) and *e-re-de* in **PY Fr1228** (*wa-na-so-i*, *e-re-de* OLE + PA v 1) does not give us any interesting indication.

I maintain that given the lack of attestation, it is not possible to pronounce on the significance of these two terms.

**Mb.1336** probably present an analogous situation if we admit that *di-wi-jo* represents the sanctuary of Zeus. Also in this case \*146 would be outgoing, be-

38 Sainer 1976, p. 44.

39 Hiller 1972, p. 24 and ss., 28, 231 and ss.

40 Sainer 1976, p.44.

41 Lejeune 1971b, p.261–262.

cause this product (like all the **Ma** products) is recorded in other texts (**Un 6.6**, **Un 853.3 Un 2.6**) as being distributed to sanctuaries rather than the other way round. If this were the case, the fact that **Mb 1336** is the only **Mb** tablet not to come from the Southwestern Building could be relevant. As well as the scribe is not among the scribes of the **Mb** series.

If, on the other hand, *di-wi-jo* is a toponym, then the problem does not arise.

Therefore, from the analysis of **Mn 1411** and **Mb 1336**, we can assume that currently it is not possible to understand these documents nor precisely define their function. But if we could prove that both documents recorded goods which were outgoing, then how could we justify these two exceptions to the rule?

I have no difficulty in accepting that some **Mb** or **Mn** tablets could record \*146 as exiting the palace. Indeed, the fact that they belong to these two series does not automatically imply that the documents recorded goods which were only incoming.

If we consider tablet **Ua 1413** we note that like the **Mb** tablets, it presents a palm leaf shape, the same type of clay, and ideogram \*146. Furthermore, the scribe of **Ua 1413** (Ci) is one of the scribes of the **Mb** series. Finally, also **Ua 1413** comes from the Southwestern Building<sup>42</sup>.

Line 2 of this document contains the toponym *ro-u-si-jo a-ko-ro*, which also appears in **Mn 1411**. The only difference which determines its classification in series **Ua** is the simultaneous presence of ideogram \*166+WE and of ideogram \*146 so that if the tablet which is already mutilated on the right lacked a further fragment and ideogram \*166, this would no doubt have been catalogued as **Mb**.

In this text, eight garments (7 units of \*146 and 1 of \*166+WE) were sent into a sanctuary in the territory of *ro-u-so*.

If **Mb 1411** and **Mb 1336** had really recorded \*146 at the exit, then the three documents would have the same meaning, as they would record consignments of garments to sanctuaries, two of which are in the territory of *ro-u-so*.

In the first line of **Mn 1412** there is the preposition *pa-ro* followed by *ka-ra*[(or perhaps *ka-ra-wa*)] which F.A. Jorro<sup>43</sup> considers as a man's name. If the reading of the third sign were correct, this could be the name *ka-ra-wa-ni-ta*, which appears in **PY Cn 45.12** (*pu-ro ra-wa-ra-ti-jo ka-ra-wa-ni-ta a-ke-o-jo* CAP<sup>m</sup> 100) and is associated with *a-ke-o*, a collector who appears in the **Mb** and **Mn** series<sup>44</sup>.

#### **Mn 1412**

(H 14)

- |    |                        |      |
|----|------------------------|------|
| .1 | <i>pa-ro, ka-ra</i> [- |      |
| .2 | <i>pa-qo-si-jo</i> [   | *146 |
| .3 | <i>o-no-ka-ra</i> [    | *146 |
| .4 | <i>ma-to-pu-ro</i> [   | *146 |

<sup>42</sup> Palaima 1988, p. 118: «Ua 1413 resembles Mb 1434 (Hand 14) in clay texture, tablet size and arrangement of text.».

<sup>43</sup> Jorro 1993, p. 323

<sup>44</sup> In *PofN* IV *ka-ra-do-wo* is not excluded.

.5 da-nu-wa-a-ri[ \*146

.6 po-ro[ \*146

For the meaning of the preposition *pa-ro*, please refer to the n°13 (**Mb 1401**) above.

*pa-qo-si-jo* (or *pa-qo-si-jo-jo* ) appears in line 2, this being a man's name in the nominative or genitive case; A *pa-qo-si-jo* is recorded in **Jn 601.8** (*qa-si-re-u, pa-qo-si-jo* ] 1) and in **Jn 310.8** under the heading ]a-ke-re-wa, ka-ke-we, ta-ra-si-ja, e-ko-te. In **Jn 832** the bronze-smith/decorators recorded (among whom is *pa-qo-si-jo*) are related to the place of *ro-u-so* (*ro-u-so ka-ke-we, a-ke-te-re*), also present in the **Mb** and **Mn** series. In line 10 *pa-qo-si-jo* precede the men's name *pi-ro-ka-te* probably the same which appear in **Mb 1402** ( ]ka-te \*146 5 ). Therefore is probably that the *pa-qo-si-jo* of **Jn 832** is the same individual attested in **Mn 1412**.

In line 3 there is the toponym *o-no-ka-ra*[ which is probably to be identified with *o]-no-ka-ra-o-re* of **Na 1038**.

In line 4 the toponym *ma-to-pu-ro*[ is probably a variant of the toponym *ma-to-ro-pu-ro*<sup>45</sup> (**Cn 595.5**) whose location remains uncertain.

A hapax appears in line 5, *da-nu-wa-a-ri*[ which M.Ventris and J.Chadwick<sup>46</sup> consider a toponym.

In line 6 *po-ro*[ cannot easily be interpreted.

From the table below one realises that, contrary to what happens in the **Mb** series, the majority of the words which are clearly identifiable are toponyms. We have 25 attestations of 23 different toponyms, and there are only 3 men's names which are identifiable with certainty.

The case of (*pa-ro*) *ke-ku-ro* is dative. For *ke-sa-da-ra* and *pa-qo-si-jo* it is impossible to define if they are in nominative case for dative.

(Table 2)

<b>Men's names</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Toponyms</b>	<b>23</b>	e-re-de	1 ?
ke-ku-ro	1	a-sa-ti-ja	1	ma-se-de	1 ?
ke-sa-da-ra	1	re[ ]-ro	1	o-no-ka-ra[-o-re	1
pa-qo-si-jo	1	ko-ro-jo-wo-wi-ja	1		
		si-re-wa	1	<b>Uncertain Toponyms</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Uncertain men's names</b>	<b>2</b>	e-wi-te-wi-jo	1	da-nu-wa-a-ri[	1
ka-ra[wa-ni-ta	1	ro-u-so	2	]ma-ne	1
]ka-sa-ta	1	me-te-to	1		
<b>Unidentifiable words</b>		e-ri-nu-wo-te	1		
e-[		sa-ri-nu-wo-te	1		
]te		e-pi-qo-ra <sub>2</sub>	1	<b>Prepositions</b>	<b>1</b>
i-no[		ro-o-wa	2		
e-[		]a <sub>2</sub> -te-we[	1	pa-ro	2

45 Bennett and Olivier 1973, p. 200.

46 Ventris and Chadwick 1973, p. 538.

-ma-ne[	po-ra-pi	1	
]jo	na-i-se-wi-jo	1	
wa[	ma-to-pu-ro[	1	
po-ro[	ro-u-si[-jo a-ko-ro	1	
ki- [ ]-to	e-na[po-ro	1	
ka[	qe-re-me[-e	1	
	wi-ja-we[-ra <sub>2</sub>	1	
	ma-ra-ne[-nu-we	1	

How can we interpret the registrations of the **Mb** and **Mn** series?

In the document which present only a toponym followed by a certain quantity of \*146, is the product registered as incoming or outgoing?

First of all it should be said that in the case of the **Mb** tablets the quantities vary from 1 to 5 units except for two cases in which there are 11 pieces.

I think that these registrations of \*146 cannot be interpreted as outgoing, as one could not explain how the palace should receive as a contribution, for instance, from the entire district of *ro-u-so*, 17 units of \*146 and then send up to 11 units to a smaller site.

If one imagines that the commodities are arriving at the palace, then everything becomes clear. Also in a tablet like **Ma 333** only the name of a place sending \*146 to the palace is registered, followed by the ideogram and the numerals.

The role of the men's names remains to be explained, whether they appear alone as *a-ke-o*, *a<sub>3</sub>-me-wa[*, *ke-sa-da-ra*, *pa-qo-si-jo* and *ke-do-jo-no*, or preceded by the preposition *pa-ro* like *ka-wa-ti-ro* and *ke-ku-ro*. In the case of the men's names which appear without the preposition, if we imagine that the commodity is recorded on exit, i.e. as consigned, for instance, to *a<sub>3</sub>-me-wa[* in five units (**Mb 1376**), we have to explain why in **Ma 193** the entire district of *ri-jo* collects a total of 17 units of \*146 for delivery to the palace, while *a<sub>3</sub>-me-wa[* alone would receive five units. Besides, this individual, who would receive about a third of the contribution from the whole district, appears to be a modest *na-u-do-mo* (provided he is the same individual) cited only once in **PY Vn 865.2**.

We should not forget that only very few units of \*146 are offered even to divinities (one unit to *e-ne-si-da-o-ne* in **KN M 719**).

A possible explanation is that these individuals do not receive but rather send a certain quantity of \*146 to the palace. The registrations of the **Mb** and **Mn** series, therefore, would record consignments to the palace from an individual or a place.

In the case of **Mb 1401**, *pa-ro ka-wa-ti-ro* would mean either 'from ka-wa-ti-ro', and in this case *pa-ro* would be a more precise specification than in the other cases, or — more convincingly — 'at ka-wa-ti-ro' in the sense that a certain quantity of \*146 is situated momentarily with this individual, to be subsequently delivered to the palace. We have already seen that J.T. Killen<sup>47</sup> had

<sup>47</sup> Killen 1979, pp. 160–161.

suggested that in **KN Ld 584.2** *pa-ro* followed by the man's name *e-ta-wo-ne-we* could be translated as 'at *e-ta-wo-ne-u*', in the sense that, at the time of the tablet's inscription, the textiles to be manufactured were still with this individual to be sent to the palace at a later stage.

Let us try to understand what the role of these individuals could have been.

The best known are *ke-sa-da-ra*, *a-ke-o*, *a3-me-wa* and *pa-qo-si-jo*.

In **PY Fg 368** *ke-sa-da-ra* receives five units of wheat and five of figs and in **PY Fg 828** five units of wheat.

*a-ke-o* has numerous attestations in the texts in linear B, particularly in the **Cn** and **Cc** series of Pylos, from which he appears to be a 'collector'.

*a3-me-wa*, as we have seen, appears in a list of *na-u-do-mo*.

*pa-qo-si-jo* is a bronze-smith active in *ro-u-so*.

It is hard to tell whether these deliveries of \*146 to the palace are contributions from individuals from a certain place, and therefore to be regarded as part of the contribution from that place, as in the case of the **Mc** series from Knossos, where individuals are recorded contributing four commodities directly to the palace.

I think that it is more likely that these four characters are not just contributors, but rather individuals involved in the collection and processing of \*146 originating from various places in the kingdom of Pylos. This would explain logically why a certain quantity of \*146 is temporarily kept with these individuals.

Besides, the role of link between the palace and other individuals has been ascertained for both *a-ke-o* and *ke-sa-da-ra*. The role of 'collector' has already been established for *a-ke-o*. In the case of *ke-sa-da-ra* it is impossible to imagine that 10 units of wheat and five of figs were for personal consumption. It is logical to assume that *ke-sa-da-ra* gets from the palace wheat and figs for consumption by the staff performing some activities under his supervision. These activities would be related to the collection or manufacture of \*146 in the various villages.

If we analyse the toponyms and men's names appearing in the **Mb** and **Mn** series, we realize that some occur in both series. For instance, among the men's names, *ke-sa-da-ra* appears in **Mb 1380** and **Mn 1368**, while among the toponyms ]*e-na-po-ro*[ appears in **Mb 1435** and **Mn 1408** (*e-na|po-ro*), and ]*a2-te-we*[ of **Mn 1371**, is probably the same place which appears in **Mb 1377** (*wa-a2-te-pi*). Both series record exclusively quantities of \*146, but whereas the **Mb** tablets are very simple registrations, nearly always on one line only, inscribed on tablets in the shape of 'palm leaf', the **Mn** tablets have more lines and are in the form of 'page'. All this could lead us to believe that the **Mn** tablets represent a recapitulation of the texts of the **Mb** series. Moreover, whereas in the **Mb** series (see table 1) we have 6 men's names and 7 identifiable toponyms, in the **Mn** series (see table 2) the toponyms are 25 as opposed to just 3 men's names, which seems logical, as a recapitulative document could recap under one toponym the preliminary data relating to more men's names and toponyms listed in the **Mb** tablets.

If we consider the toponyms in these two series (see table 3) we realize that a significant portion also appear in the **Na** and **Nn** series of Pylos.

Table 3)

Mb and Mn Tablets	Na and Nn Tablets
e-ri-no-wo-te (Mn 456)	e-ri-no-wo (Na 106)
me-te-to (Mn 456)	me-te-to (Na 337)
ref ]ro (Mn 456)	re-u-ko-to-ro (Na 419)
e-wi-te-wi-jo (Mn 456)	e-wi-te-wi-jo (Na 245)
sa-ri-nu-wo-te (Mn 456)	sa-ri-nu[.]te (Na 544+1094)
qe-re-me-[ (Mn 1409)	qe-re-me-e (Na 540)
]ka-a-ki-ri[ (Mb 1432)	pa-ka-a-ka-ri (Na 926) or
ed ]a-ki-ri (Mb 1363)	]a <sub>7</sub> -ke-wo-a-ki-ri (Na 928)
wa-a <sub>2</sub> -te-pi (Mb 1377)	wa-a <sub>2</sub> -te-pi (Na 1009)
]a <sub>7</sub> -te-we[ (Mn 1371)	
e-na-po-ro (Mb 1435 ed Mn 1408)	e-na-po-ro (Nn 228)
ro-o-wa (Mn 1408 e 1370)	ro-o-wa (Nn 228)
po-ra-pi (Mn 1408)	po-ra-pi (Nn 228)
o-no-ka-ra[-o-re (Mn 1412)	]no-ka-ra-o-re (Na 1038)
a-pi-no-e-wi-jo (Mb 1396)	a-pi-no-e-wi-jo (Nn 228)

How can we explain the fact that these toponyms appear in both the series which records linen and in the **Mb** and **Mn** tablets?

From the analysis of the attestations of \*146 (particularly **PY Un 1322.4** and **KN J 693.1**) it becomes evident that one of the materials employed in the manufacturing of this textile \*146 is without doubt linen.

When we read in the **Ma** tablets that, for instance, the district of *me-ta-pa* supplies the palace with 28 units of \*146, this does not mean that these have been produced at *me-ta-pa*, but simply that they originate from the territory of which *me-ta-pa* is the principal centre.

It is clear, also, that in the same territory where a certain commodity is produced, there can be 'ateliers' where that commodity is processed into the end product.

The toponyms which are common to the **Mb/Mn** and **Na/Nn** series only show that part of the \*146 sent to the palace and manufactured with linen, originates from villages where the linen was produced.

This circumstance raises a question. If the texts mention \*146 in wool and linen, why in the **Ma** tablets, which record the arrival of these commodities at the palace, is only the ideogram \*146 used, without indication of either linen or of wool?

In my opinion one material does not exclude the other. I believe that the quantities of \*146 recorded per single district do not refer to only one type of textile, but that only the total number of garments \*146 sent to the palace from each district was recorded. On the other hand, it would not make sense to think that all the garments requested by the palace would be the same size, considering that the recipients could be slightly or heavily built. On the other hand, in the texts there exists the variant *me-sa-to* 'medium quality' or 'medium size', but in none of the **Ma** tablets is there mention of a similar type of \*146. Likewise, the skins recorded by ideogram \*152 do not present any specification of quality, whether cow-, sheep- or goat skins.

On the other hand, even if the \*146 recorded in **Ma** were of linen only, we would still be missing a distinction between the \*146 made of ordinary linen and those made of special linen (*ri-no-re-pa-to*) or an indication of the different sizes.

The explanation is probably that the **Ma** series only registers the number of garments which every district had to contribute, otherwise we would have a long list of details pertaining to the different types of garments. It is logical to assume that the proportion between \*146 of wool and linen was well known to both the single villages and the palace, and it was not recorded in the **Ma** tablets.

Let us try to clarify the relationship between the **Mb** and **Mn** series on the one hand, and the **Ma** series on the other hand.

As discussed, everything seems to suggest that the **Mb** and **Mn** tablets are registrations of \*146 arriving at the palace, whether directly from a place, or through individuals who had the task of organizing the collection in the villages and eventually the transformation of the product.

But in what way do **Mb/Mn** registrations overlap those of the **Ma** series?

If we consider tablet **Ma 126**, we can observe that it presents a totally different scheme from those of the other tablets in the same series. A minor site, *si-re-wa* is cited in connection with a debt from the previous year for the products \*146, *RI* and *KE*.

**Ma 126** (S90 H 2)

- .a i-na-ma-ta  
 .1 pe-ru-si-nu-wa, si-re-wa, o-pe-ro, do-si-mi-ja  
 .2 \*146 3 RI M 1 KE M 1

Tablet **Ma 225** cites a debt relating only to *re-u-ko-to-ro*, which appears here to be one of the villages of the district *pi*-\*82, homonym of the main centre of the Further Province.

These are the only two cases in which the names of smaller villages appear, and these contributions are a trace of the preliminary registrations of the **Ma** tablets.

The village of *si-re-wa* also appears in tablet **Mn 456**, which records contributions of \*146 from various places including *ro-u-so*.

Also in tablet **Mn 162** there appears a toponym also attested in the **Ma** tablets, *a-sa-ti-ja* (**Ma 397**, *a-[.]ta<sub>2</sub>*) and the same ideogram \*146.

Like the **Mn** tablets, also the **Mb** tablets only record quantities of \*146 and also in this case a toponym, *ro-u-so*, is in common with the tablets **Ma**.

There are, therefore, three elements common to the **Ma** and **Mb/Mn** tablets: the presence of ideogram \*146 and two toponyms.

Moreover, the scribe of the **Ma** series, S90 H2, has also inscribed the two tablets **Mn 162** and **456**, which originate, it should be remembered, from room 8, like the **Ma** tablets.

This same scribe is also the author of the registration on sealings **Wr 1457** which shows ideogram \*152 (one of the six which appear in the **Ma** series) and **Wa 730** which shows the word *do-si-mi-ja-ge*, also present in **Ma 126.2** (*do-si-mi-ja*).

Sealing **Wr 1457** was attached to a knot or a string which closed a box or a basket, which probably contained the tablets recording the arrivals of \*152 to the palace, or was attached to the strings of a bale which contained the product itself.

Already on the occasion of the conference POLEMOS I underlined that there is enough evidence to suggest that tablets **Ma 126**, **Mn 11**, **Mm 162**, **Mn 456** and sealings **Wr 1457** and **Wa 730** are preliminary documents, waiting to be incorporated into the **Ma** breakdown.

Also J.T. Killen<sup>48</sup> has proposed, but only for **Mn 162** and **Mn 456**, that these two documents «were detailed breakdowns of the contributions of this commodity from various places and persons within the **Ma** districts a-si-ja-ti-ja and ro-u-so respectively.».

Moving from my previous viewpoint and the authoritative opinion of Killen, it seems to me that there is enough evidence to consider the **Mb/Mn** registrations as preliminary documents to the **Ma** tablets.

I believe that the **Mb** and **Mn** documents would have been inscribed in the vicinity of the collection place of \*146, where they would have been prepared as short notes concerning one individual or village, and later on, once a certain number of data had been collected, these would have been transcribed in the **Ma** Tablets.

But how can we explain the fact that except for **Mn 162** and **456** the vast majority of the registrations **Mb/Mn** belong to scribes different from that of the **Ma** series? And how is it possible to explain, on the other hand, that **Mn 162** and **456** have been inscribed by the same scribe as that of the **Ma** tablets?

The answer to these questions has been convincingly provided by C. W. Shelmerdine<sup>49</sup>.

The American scholar in a recent contribution presents a reconstruction which coincides perfectly with what we hypothesised above in respect of the purpose of the **Mb** and **Mn** tablets. She proposes, in fact, that the Southwestern Building represents a separate department of the palace specialising in the collection and monitoring of \*146 and maintains, furthermore, that the registrations **Mb** and **Mn** were provisional registrations made by different scribes. At a certain point in the year, the central administration of the Archive Complex would examine the balance of \*146 and scribe S90 H2 would transcribe on to tablets of type **Mn 162** and **456** the data from the **Mb/Mn** tablets which were then used to obtain the complete balance, the one recorded in the **Ma** tablets.

C.W. Shelmerdine thus explains convincingly how the scribes of the **Mb** and **Mn** tablets, except for **Mb 162** and **456**, are different from those of the **Ma** tablets and, vice-versa, why these two documents are of the same scribe as that of the **Ma** tablets.

At this point, we can add that at the time of the destruction of the Pylos palace, not all of \*146 had been delivered to the palace, as is shown by the **Ma** tablets, which record a debt; it is evident that a part of the registrations of the

48 Killen 1996, p. 147.

49 Shelmerdine [forthcoming]

deliveries made to the palace (**Mb/Mn** tablets), were still waiting to be transcribed on to the **Ma** tablets.

## REFERENCES

- BENNETT Jr, E.L. 1992. "A selection of Pylos Tablet Texts," in *MYKENAÏKA, Actes du IXe Colloque international sur les textes mycéniens et égéens*, (Athènes, 2-6 octobre 1990), J.-P. OLIVIER éd., Supplément 25 du *BCH*, Paris, pp. 103–127.
- BENNETT Jr, E.L. and J.-P. Olivier. 1973. *The Pylos Tablets Transcribed. Part I: Texts and Notes*, Roma.
- BENNETT Jr, E.L., Melena, J.L., Olivier, J.-P., Palaima, Th.G. [forthcoming]. *The Palace of Nestor at Pylos in Western Messenia*. (=PofN) vol. IV. The Inscribed Documents.
- CHADWICK, J. 1975. "ΕΣΤΙ ΠΥΛΟΣ ΠΡΟ ΠΥΛΟΙΟ," *MINOS* 14, 1973, pp. 39–59.
- HILLER, S. 1972. *Studien zur Geographie des Reiches um Pylos nach den mykenischen und homerischen Texten*. Osterreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für mykenische Forschung, herausgegeben von Fritz Schachermeyer, Wien.
- JORRO, F.A. 1993. *Diccionario micénico*, Madrid.
- KILLEN, J.T. 1979. "The Knossos Ld(1) Tablets," *Colloquium Mycenaeum, Actes du sixième Colloque international sur les textes mycéniens et égéens tenu à Chaumont sur Neuchâtel du 7 au 13 septembre 1975, Neuchâtel*, E. Risch and H. Mühlestein, eds., pp. 151–181.
- KILLEN, J.T. 1996. "Administering a Mycenaean Kingdom: Some Taxing Problems," *BICS* 41, pp. 147–148.
- LANG, M. 1961. "The Palace of Nestor Excavations at Pylos," Part II, *AJA* 65, pp. 158–163, pls. 56–59.
- LEJEUNE, M. 1971a. "Notes mycéniennes," in *Mémoires de Philologie Mycénienne* II, pp. 359–375, Roma.
- LEJEUNE, M. 1971b. "La postposition -δε en micénien," in *Mémoires de Philologie Mycénienne* II, pp. 253–265, Roma.
- LINDGREN, M. 1973. *The People of Pylos*, Uppsala.
- MELENA, J.L. 1975. *Studies on Some Mycenaean Inscriptions from Knossos Dealing with Textiles*, *Minos* Supplement 5, Salamanca.
- MELENA, J.L. 1997. "133 Joins and Quasi-joins of Fragments in the Linear B Tablets from Pylos," *Minos* 29–30, 1994–1995, pp. 271–288.
- MELENA, J.L. 2001. "63 Joins and Quasi-Joins of Fragments in the Linear B Tablets from Pylos," *Minos* 35–36, 2000–2001, [forthcoming].
- NOSCH, M.L. 2000. *The Organization of the Mycenaean Textile Industry*, Ph.D. thesis submitted to Universität Salzburg, May 2000.
- OLIVIER, J.-P., MELENA, J. L. and PITEROS, Ch. 1997. "Les inscriptions en linéaire B des Nodules de Thèbes (1982) : La Fouille, les documents, les possibilités d'interprétations," *BCH* 114, pp. 103–184.
- PALAIMA, T.G. 1988. *The Scribes of Pylos*, Roma.
- PERNA, M. 1999. "Fiscalità ed emergenza a Pilo," in *POLEMOS. Le contexte guerrier en égée à l'Âge du Bronze, Actes de la 7<sup>e</sup> Rencontre égéenne internationale. Université de Liège, 14-17 avril 1998*, R. Laffineur ed., pp. 381–386, Liège.
- RUIJGH, C.J. 1967. *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*, Amsterdam.
- SAINER, A. P. 1976. "An Index of the Place Names at Pylos," *SMEA* 17, pp. 17–63.
- SHELMERDINE, C. W. [forthcoming]. "The Southwestern Department at Pylos" in *A-NA-QO-TA. Studies Presented to J. T. Killen, Minos* 33–34, 1998–1999.
- VENTRIS, M and Chadwick, J. 1973. *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, Second Edition, Cambridge.




Fig. 1 Find-spots of Mb - Mn Tablets

