

Sanja Smodlaka Vitas
Zadar
Croatia

UDC:811.14'02

PY An 610 TABLET AND ITS PARENTHETICAL NOTE

Abstract: The purpose of this article is to reconsider the interpretation of the word ko-ni-jo and to offer an alternate view of its meaning and role in the document, hence the lines .13-.14 whose entries form a coherent group in relation to the entire text. The term parenthetical note is used to indicate that this word further explicates the related entries and that the number that is written beside it does not indicate the total number of rowers. This interpretation necessarily also includes consideration of da-mi-ni-jo as the name of the person who has a function of a “collector” and who controls a group of flax-workers mentioned on the tablet with a note that indirectly points to maritime context.

In Pylian archive there are three tablets directly dealing with rowers, each of them recording different information. **An 1** records rowers going to Pleuron (*e-re-ta, pe-re-u-ro-na-de, i-jo-te*) listing 30 men from five coastal towns of the Pylian kingdom, enough to man a single ship, triaconter. **An 724** mentions rowers absent from four towns, mentioned also either in **An 1** or **An 610**. Tablet **An 610** is particularly interesting because it indicates a system of recruitment based mainly on landholding. Content of all three tablets has already been studied in detail¹, but due to their fragmentariness and difficulties in interpreting individual words, except in case of **An 1**, they are still open for interpretation.

By joining several fragments and considering a few suggestions offered in studies of certain scholars, namely Chadwick and Bennett, the text of **An 610** is slightly different since *PTT I* edition². Figure 9 with second VIR in line 6 Chadwick supplies from

¹ M. Ventris – J. Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, 2nd ed., Cambridge, 1973; J.-L. Perpillou, “La tablette PY An 724 et la flotte pylienne”, *Minos* 9 (1968), 205–18; J. T. Killen, “PY An 1”, *Minos* 18, 1983, 71–80; J. Chadwick, “The Muster of the Pylian Fleet”, in P. Hr. Ilievski - Lj. Crepajac (eds.), *Tractata Mycenaea. Proceedings of the Eighth International Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies, Held in Ohrid (15-20 September 1985)*, Skopje, 1987, 75–84; T. G. Palaima, “Maritime Matters in the Linear B Tablets”, in R. Laffineur and L. Basch (eds.), *Thalassa. L'Egee préhistorique et la mer (Aegaeum 7)*, Liège, 1991, 273–310.

² Information on the tablet is taken from *PTT I*, 59; Chadwick, 1987, 75–6; T. G. Palaima, *The Scribes of Pylos*, Roma 1988, 36; E. L. Bennett, Jr., “A

the deleted text of line 7, he also implies *me-ta[-ki-ti-ta]* in line 10 and inserts space between second figure 40 and square bracket in line 13. First entry in line .12, previously *]-ku-si-jo* VIR 8, Bennett now reads as *za-ku-si-jo* VIR 7. Finally, Melena takes **Xn 1151** as most likely the upper left-hand corner of the tablet **An 610** completing the heading. Taking these suggestions into account the text should read as follows:

.1	me-za-[wə-]ne, e-re-ta []	<i>vacat</i> [
.2]e, ki-ti-ta	VIR 46 [
.3	me-]ta-ki-ti-ta	VIR 19 [
.4] wa, ki-ti-ta	VIR 36 [
.5	mę-ta-ki-ti-ta	VIR 3 [
.6	e-wi-ri-po	VIR 9 po-si-ke-te-re [VIR 9
.7	a-ke-re-wa	VIR 25 wo-qe-we [VIR
.8	ri-jo	VIR 24 wi-nu-ri-jo[VIR
.9	te-ta-ra-ne	VIR 31 me-ta-ki[-ti-ta VIR
.10	a-po-ne-we	VIR 37 me-ta[VIR
.11	ma-ra-ne-nu-we	VIR 40 po-ti-ja-ke-e VIR .6[
.12	za-ku-si-jo	VIR 7 za-e-to-ro VIR 3
.13	da-mi-ni-jo	VIR 40 e-ke-ra ₂ -wo-no VIR 40 [
.14	we-da-ne-wo	VIR 20 ko-ni-jo 126 me-ta-ki-ti-ta VIR 26
.15	po-ku-ta	VIR 10 we-re-ka-ra, te-qa-ta-qę VIR 20
.16-20	<i>vacant</i>	[

Many deletions are visible on this large page-shaped tablet. The deletions are a consequence of reorganizing the document in regards to its format. The main scribe of the Pylian archive H1, who also scribed **An 1** tablet with the same stylus, S1, and **An 724** with stylus S 657, ruled twenty lines. The first line contains the title, and the next four lines contain one entry each, all aligned in a column. It is very likely that toponyms were inscribed in lines 2 and 4, but due to the tablet damage they are not visible. From line 6 on the scribe changes the input form in regards to the quantity of entered information. Now the information is entered in two columns while leaving out the word *ki-ti-ta* from main entries. As Chadwick points out, in further text the word *ki-ti-ta* is assumed.³ In the same manner as in lines 6 and 7 one entry was written in one column, and was later deleted in order for line 6 to have the form of two columns, the scribe deleted a part of the entry in lines

selection of Pylos tablet texts”, in J.-P. Olivier (ed.), *Mykenaiika (BCH Supplément XXV)*, Paris 1992, 114; J. L. Melena, “167 Joins of Fragments in the Linear B Tablets from Pylos”, *Minos* 27/28 (1992/1993), 79; J. L. Melena, “244 Joins and Quasi-joins of Fragments in the Linear B Tablets from Pylos”, *Minos* 27/28 (1992/1993), 316; J. L. Melena, “133 Joins and Quasi-joins of Fragments in the Linear B Tablets from Pylos”, *Minos* 29/30 (1994/1995), 281.

³ Chadwick, 1987, 76.

14 and 15 in order to inscribe three entries in line 14. Over original $\llbracket \text{VIR } \kappa\omicron\text{-}\eta\text{-}\iota\text{-}\text{jo } \Psi\text{IR}[\] \rrbracket$ in line 14 it was written *ko-ni-jo* 126 *me-ta-ki-ti-ta* VIR 26, while $\llbracket \text{me-ta-ki-ti-ta} \rrbracket$ was moved from line 15⁴. Although it is considered that line 14 has three entries due to lack of space, the last five lines are left blank.

Considering that the majority of the tablet has been thoroughly interpreted in existing literature, in this paper we will only consider a number of elements, particularly focusing on the last written lines. The rowers are primarily identified as a certain social class indicating historically common practice of obligatory military service in accordance to the landholding system. Hence the majority of the entry make *ki-ti-ta*, κτίται ‘settlers, inhabitants’, who are on the *ki-ti-me-na* land, κτιμένα⁵. They are followed by *me-ta-ki-ti-ta*, *μετα-κτίται, who are, in the context of this document, also the only document containing this word, taken to be an accompanying person or a substitute to κτίται, therefore someone of a subordinate category. To this secondary entry Chadwick also has suggested other parallel groups, *po-si-ke-te-re* *ποσ-ηικτήρες (cf. προσίκτωρ), literally ‘coming towards’, *po-kuta*, *we-re-ka-ra* and *te-qa-ta*. In most cases the form in which groups of rowers were entered is such that they are listed by their place of origin, then an ethnic or an anthroponym where it is given that the main contingent is made up of *ki-ti-ta*, followed by the secondary entry.⁶ About a half of the locations listed on this tablet are also on **An 1** or **724**, while the rest of the locations can, with more or less certainty, be identified as such and be located. The first column in lines 6 to 11 is made up of toponyms, while the second column contains either the secondary entries or the new entries according to the toponym. In the second column of line 12 there is also a toponym (*za-e-to-ro*), but before it, in the first column there is an ethnic *za-ku-si-jo*, Ζακύνσιοι, whose occurrence is interpreted in various ways⁷. This is also one of the

⁴ In the same manner in line 7. it was written *a-ke-re-wa* over $\llbracket \text{po-si-ke-te-re} \rrbracket$, which was moved to the previous line and written over $\llbracket \text{VIR}[\]4 \rrbracket$, v. *PTT I*, 59.

⁵ Determining term *ki-ti-ta* making the majority of recruited rowers, Chadwick (1987, 82) concludes: “The term *ki-ti-ta* must therefore be reconstructed as */kītītās/*, cf. κίτης “inhabitant”... Its semantic value can be defined as ‘one who holds *ktimena* land’, and the connexion between land-holding and obligation to man the fleet becomes clear: *ktimena* land must be held subject to an obligation to provide military service. This obligation will be met either by appearing in person or by sending another on one’s behalf”.

⁶ *Ibid.* 77-78.

⁷ “The presence of men from a near-by kingdom is not surprising in a muster of forces; if the enemy was coming by sea round the south of the Peloponnese, Zakynthos too would be exposed to danger.” Chadwick, 1987, 78 cf. “The presence of Zakynthians may indicate a general direction for the fleet, as this is the only group outside the mainland Greece mentioned in the Rower Tab-

reasons for believing the purpose of this tablet is not to merely record the total number of men available for rowing service, as determined by Killen, but to record a particular event⁸.

The information about rowers is organized differently in the last lines. There is no mention of the rowers' place of origin, but considering the fact that some of the groups of rowers have been listed by anthroponyms in genitive, and those were the names of the prominent persons from Pylian kingdom, it is likely that these entries refer to Pylos itself.⁹ The fact that Pylos was not entered as a designation is not unusual for H1 as the location in the entire set of **Aa 240** is only mentioned if it was not Pylos (*e.g.* **Aa 772, 775, 786**), while the only exception is *pu-ro* that was listed in **Aa 1180**. Unlike him H21 and H23, the scribes of corresponding tablets of **Ab** and **Ad** series always list it. If for a moment we ignore the figures that could be related to Pylos, the largest groups of rowers separately number 40-odd people. 40 men originate from location *ma-ra-ne-nu-we* (.11). Also, in lines 2 and 4 groups of 46 and 36 rowers are entered. Due to the tablet damage it is not clear to what do entries refer, but most likely some toponyms were written there. Moreover, based on the comparison of coastal locations listed in Rower and *o-ka* tablets it was suggested to restore [*ro-o-wa*] in line 4 and [*ti-mi-to-a-ke*]-*ē* in line 2¹⁰. But it is significant that, besides these locations, the same number of rowers is entered with *E-ke-ra₂-wo* as well as with *da-mi-ni-jo*, both inscribed in the same line (.13). It is considered possible that this is a nom. pl. masc. ethnic adjective derived from toponym **Δάμνος*, therefore **Δάμνιοι*, with reference to *Ἐπίδαμνος*¹¹. Nothing prevents us from concluding that this is an anthroponym, and indeed, this assumption is increasingly accepted¹² and as such it corresponds to

lets...Their small number may indicate a specialized role within the colonization party – perhaps as pilots or informants leading the expedition to Zakynthos or beyond.” A. Yasur-Landau, *The Philistines and Aegean Migration at the End of the Late Bronze Age*, Cambridge, 2010, 47.

⁸ “...An 1 is in effect a taxation record: that the numbers of rowers shown as provided by the various villages listed on the tablet have been calculated on the basis of each village's standard 'rateable value': a 'rateable value' which is also reflected on An 610, which may ... show the total number of rowers who were available for service in each of the villages in question.” Killen, 1983, 78. *cf.* “PY An 610 and An 724 may record preparations for a shipborne emigration—at least of the upper levels of Pylos's stratified society—to escape an expected overwhelming attack.” S. Wachsmann, *Seagoing Ships and Seamanship in the Bronze Age Levant*, College Station, Texas, 1998, 160.

⁹ *v.* M. Lindgren, *The People of Pylos. Part II*, Uppsala, 1973, 84.

¹⁰ *v.* Chadwick, 1987, 77. He admits his suggestions are speculative, especially for line 2.

¹¹ *DMic.*, s.v.

¹² V. P. Petrakis, “*E-ke-ra₂-wo* ≠ *wa-na-ka*: The Implications of a Probable Non-Identification for Pylian Feasting and Politics”, in L. A. Hitchcock, R. Laf-

the assumption that entries in this line relate to Pylos. *Da-mi-ni-jo* (personal name in the genitive case or in the form of possessive adjective derived from his personal name) as a “collector” occurs in Knossos on numerous **D**-series tablets. “Collectors” are prominent members of the ruling élite who have been allocated a part of the productive capacity of the kingdom for their own benefit, as explained by Killen¹³. Considering that in Knossos some of the owners of workgroups are involved in the production of textile, the interesting coincidence is with the form *da-mi-ni-ja* used to describe a group of linen workers, *ri-ne-ja-o* on **PY Ad 697** tablet, a tablet that has an additional note *e-re[]qe-ro-me-no* which implicates joining of their sons to rowing service¹⁴. It is generally accepted that on this tablet, as well as on the corresponding **PY Aa 96**, also the only places this form was mentioned, is a toponym. But recently it has been taken as a possibility that “...*da-mi-ni-ja* is a scribal error for *da-mi-ni-je-ja* (a possessive adjective formed from a man's name, *da-mi-ni-jo*), in which case there would be work groups under the supervision or ownership of a man named *da-mi-ni-jo*...”¹⁵. Although avoiding interpretation as a scribal error is advisable, assumption that this is a name of a man under whose supervision were the linen workers whose sons are serving as rowers (based on an additional note, although there is no numeral after VIR), corresponds to the one on **An 610.13** where there is also a name of a man who gives 40 rowers. This makes it possible that in Pylos there is a *Da-mi-ni-jo* a “collector” who owns a workgroup from a textile production area and who provides rowers same as **We-da-ne-u* (although half as much), who is generally accepted as one of the four “collectors” of Pylos. The hypothesis that *Da-mi-ni-jo* is a “collector” was already stated by Olivier, moreover, he included him as one of the 12 “international collectors”¹⁶.

fineur and J. Crowley (eds.), *DAIS. Aegaeum* 29 (2008), 397, fn. 27; D. Nakassis, “Prestige and Interest: Feasting and the King at Mycenaean Pylos”, *Hesperia* 81, 2012, 15, fn. 75.

¹³ “...members of the royal family, high palace officials and the like...” J. T. Killen, “Some further thoughts on ‘collectors’” in R. Laffineur and W.-D. Niemeier (eds.), *Politeia: Society and State in the Aegean Bronze Age. Proceedings (Aegaeum 12)*, Liège, 1995, 213; 218.

¹⁴ For interpretation of the tablet v. J. Chadwick, “The Women of Pylos”, in *Texts, Tablets and Scribes: Studies in Mycenaean Epigraphy and Economy Offered to Emmett L. Bennett, Jr., Suplementos a MINOS, Núm. 10*, J.-P. Olivier, Th. G. Palaima (eds.), Salamanca, 1988, 87–88; F. J. Tritsch, “PY Ad 684”, *Minos* 5, 1957, 154–62; *Documents*², 161; Lindgren, 1973, 49.

¹⁵ Nakassis, 2012, 15, fn. 75.

¹⁶ J.-P. Olivier, “Les “collecteurs”: leur distribution spatiale et temporelle” in S. Voutsaki, J. Killen (eds.), *Economy and Politics in the Mycenaean Palace States. Proceedings*, Cambridge 2001, 148; 153. While Olivier elaborates on

Even if in previous interpretations of this tablet *Da-mi-ni-jo* and *We-da-ne-wo* were not mentioned as “collectors”, also providers of rowers, it was always clear that *E-ke-ra₂-wo*, who gave 40 rowers, is a name of an important person in Pylian kingdom, perhaps the most important, actually *wa-na-ka*, ῥᾶναξ ¹⁷. As the only persons mentioned by name consecutively, they jointly give 100 rowers, implying as in previous entries, that they are *ki-ti-ta*. Now we are getting to an interesting part where the word *ko-ni-jo* is written with a numeral but without an ideogram VIR, followed by *me-ta-ki-ti-ta* VIR 26. Considering that all the previous entries of *me-ta-ki-ti-ta* were interpreted as secondary to the previous one, it should be so in this case as well, thus 26 *me-ta-ki-ti-ta* follows 126 *ko-ni-jo* (*sc. ki-ti-ta*). In the early interpretations of the tablet the lack of an ideogram led scholars to believe it was some sort of an object, not people. This hypothesis was, however, quickly discarded and explained by the lack of space.¹⁸ This is also apparent because of the traces of deletions indicating that it is very likely that in the past there was an ideogram. Changing the entry form from two columns to three, consequently limiting the writing space, forced the scribe to omit the ideogram. Such a parallel was already seen.¹⁹ However, why did the scribe decide to delete and to abandon the form when he could see that the content of the document is nearing to the end and he still had six lines drawn out, out of which five lines were left unused?

ko-ni-jo as *hapax legomenon* raised different interpretations, but it is mainly accepted that this is nominative plural ethnic derived from toponym *ko-no* (**PY Eq 213.6**), which is supposed to have been located in province *de-we-ro-a₃-ko-ra-i-ja*²⁰. However, here is a number that greatly exceeds any other found on this tablet, concerning both *ki-ti-ta* and *me-ta-ki-ti-ta*. Is it possible to assume and what would be the basis for such assumption, that the group marked by an ethnic outnumbered the ones coming from other locations or from the one confirmed ethnic *za-ku-si-jo*? Even more so, even if the location of their origin is from within Pylian kingdom, it is not mentioned in any other tablet with maritime

Killen's idea identifying 66 of them, in those same *Proceedings*, F. Rougemont (“Some thoughts of the identification of the “collectors” in the Linear B tablets”, 130), by contrast, expresses caution (referring to J. Bennet) when identifying people as “collectors” “...in other economic areas, except when the “collector” concerned is already mentioned in sheep or cloth records.”

¹⁷ Most recently v. Nakassis (*op.cit.*) and his critics (p. 16, fn. 78) on Petrikis's (2008) suggestion that *E-ke-ra₂-wo* is a local aristocrat or chieftain of a region.

¹⁸ *Documents*², 187; 431.

¹⁹ Chadwick also pointed out such parallel (with **KN Fp 1**), 1987, 76.

²⁰ *DMic.*, *ss.vv. ko-ni-jo, ko-no*. Also v. suggestion that 126 *ko-ni-jo* comes from the north in discussion in Chadwick, 1987, 84.

context. More than a half of the certain toponyms on this tablet are confirmed on other tablets about rowers, or at least in *o-ka* set which records coastal towns²¹, and for a place where so many rowers come from we would expect to have been mentioned somewhere. There is a form *ko-ni-ja* which is taken as a place designation on tablet **An 615**, suggesting to be another list of rowers. And while *ko-ni-ja* as feminine adjective with noun *χώρα* implied could be a toponimic designation, other records on tablet do not particularly imply that this tablet is a rowers list. Only the phrase]*o-no, e-qa-te*[, written on *lat. inf.*, is taken as a connection with **An 724**, but by Melena's joining fragments and re-examining of the tablet²², the new reading is]*wo-no, e-qa-te*[thus there is a need for a new interpretation. Another problem arises if we question why the scribe decided to enter this information about *ko-ni-jo* specifically on this place. If we logically assume that the records from line 15 are related to the group from Pylos, and that *E-ke-ra-wo*, *ῥάναξ*, *Da-mi-ni-jo* (personal name in the genitive case or in the form of possessive adjective derived from his personal name) and **We-da-ne-u* are the members of the elite, perhaps even the royal family related to Pylos rather than to some other location, how would we explain the insertion of an ethnic between these two sets of entries?

Considering that linear B is not entirely suitable for writing in Mycenaean Greek, words consisting of two syllables and three syllables, are the most difficult to interpret, especially if they are also *hapax legomena*. Sometimes different words with different meanings have the same spelling as in *ko-no* which is in above mentioned examples related to a toponym, while on other tablets it is a phytonym (**KN Ga 953**, **MY Ge 602**, **603**, **604**), that also has an alternative spelling *ko-i-no* (**MY Ge 606**). In linear B documents there is another graphically similar form, *ko-na*. On **PY Ep 212.3** it is taken as “possibly erroneous repetition of preceding *ko-to-na*, or adj. *koinās*?”²³. It also occurs on **TH X 105.1**, with preceding *ῥo-sa*, and **MY Ue 652.1** where it is interpreted as an adjective comparable to *κοινός*.²⁴ Bartoněk offered a possibility of a different interpretation, aside from the form in gen. sg., still preferring the one in dat. sg. f., *κοινῆ*, meaning “gemeinsam, zusammen mit”²⁵. For both *ko-na* and *ko-ni-jo* we can assume the same

²¹ *a-ke-re-wa*: **An 724.9**, **An 656.11**, .18; *wo-qa-we*: **An 724.13**; *ri-jo*: **An 1.3**, **An 724.14**; *te-ta-ra-ne*: **An 1.5**; *a-po-ne-we*: **An 1.6** (*a-pu-ne-we*, **Ad 684**); *za-e-to-ro*: **An 661.6**; *?ro-o-wa?*: **An 1.2**, **An 724.1**, **An 519.1** (restoration [*ro-o*]wa proposed by Chadwick, 1987, 77).

²² <https://www2.hf.uio.no/damos/> (20. 3. 2013.).

²³ *Documents*², 555.

²⁴ *DMic.*, s.v. *ko-na*.

²⁵ A. Bartoněk, *Handbuch des mykenischen Griechisch*, Heidelberg, 2003, 211, 569.

stem which has already been done in some interpretations.²⁶ Traditional etymology of adjective κοινός is **konios* < **kōmios* (cf. lat. *cum*) and it is likely that the metathesis of group *-ni-* occurred later, after the time of the tablets, or, at least, it was not completed in the Mycenaean period.²⁷ There are too few examples to confirm this, however in the opposite case, where metathesis is already implemented, the examples are also vague. *ko-na* as *hapax* is not indicative for either of these two states, while *ko-no*, with alternation *ko-i-no*, is not the same word and in its stem it has a diphthong that did not necessarily have to occur through²⁸. As Ruijgh already stated, considering that group sonant + *i̯* still existed in Mycenaean, examples for *-wi-* (*di-wi-jo*, *di-u-jo*; *me-wi-jo*, *me-u-jo*) and *-ri-* (*a-ro₂-a*), can be found, while for sets *-ni-* *i̯* *-li-* there are no certain examples.²⁹

Considering everything that has been stated so far we can assume that *ko-ni-jo*, same as *ko-na*, perhaps also *ko-ni-ja*³⁰, belong to the stem from which later κοινός forms, where diphthong is a reflection of metathesis from *-ni-* following *-o-*, and it is precisely the case of *ko-ni-jo* where it is visible that it had no yet been implemented. This consonant group will be resolved in spelling with *-ni-j*, just as the *-nu-*, is resolved with *-nu-w*, in other words between sonant *n* and semivowel *i* vowel *i* is inserted, just as between sonant *n* and semivowel *u* vowel *u* is inserted (*pe-ru-si-nwa* / *pe-ru-si-nu-wa*, *e-nwa-ri-jo* / *e-nu-wa-ri-jo*). The sound *u̯*, *ɸ*, is simpler to interpret due to the fact that in Mycenaean Greek it was left in its original state in all of the positions of the word, unlike *i̯* which is susceptible to changes that themselves are

²⁶ e.g. L. R. Palmer, *The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts*, Oxford, 1963, repr. 1969, 429: “men of the κοινόν(?)”.

²⁷ Traditional etymology is being questioned (v. M. Lejeune, *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*, Klincksieck 1972, 156) primarily because on an *m* at the end of the stem that in Greek it becomes an *n*. Since Mycenaean still uses an **m* (e.g. **PY Ta 641.1** *e-me po-de*, *ἐμεῖ = ἐνί) it would be expected to also be present in *ko-ni-jo*. However, if we assume that the group **m̄i* has become **ni̯*, already in pre-Greek stage, or rather in Proto-Indo-European, it is reasonable to conclude that κοινός is formed from *kōmios* > **konios* and that it can be comparable to lat. *cum* < **kōm* that still keeps an **m* from the stem. Credits for this footnote go to my colleague Daniel Nečas Hraste.

²⁸ σχοῖνος which is used to explain *ko-no/ko-i-no* itself has unclear etymology, v. Chantraine, *DELG*, s.v.

²⁹ C. Ruijgh, *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*, Amsterdam, 1967, 66–67. But v. p. 66 fn. 91: “Si l’interprétation [A]περγών-ει que nous proposons pour]*pe-ro₂-[ne* (KN E 842,3...) est correcte, ce mot fournirait un exemple de *-ly-*”.

³⁰ We must have in mind that such a common word in these few occurrences could have different meanings, and even when it is in the same form. *ko-ni-ja* (An 615.4) will be hard to interpret since it has lack of context and its following word is not complete in the second part.

not finished and as such have an impact on spelling (e.g. initial and intervocalic $i > h$). But, ra_2 as homophone of ri - ja (ki - ra_2 - i - jo / ki - ri - ja - i - jo , a - ke - ti - ra_2 / a - ke - ti - ri - ja) shows the kind of vocalization we would expect too for $-ni$ -̄. Since in post-Mycenaean time $-ri$ -̄ and $-ni$ -̄ following vowel a or o have metathesis, there is a possible parallel even with a - ro_2 - jo (KN So 4437) if it is accepted as a scribal error based on contamination of a - ro_2 - e (KN L 735.1, 7409.A) with $*a$ - ri - jo - e ³¹.

Thus we would reconstruct ko - ni - jo as nom. pl. m. adjective $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\acute{o}\iota$ or adverbial acc. sg. $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\acute{o}\nu$ meaning “jointly, together” which describes three preceding entries and one following. This way, groups inscribed under Da - mi - ni - jo , E - ke - ra_2 - wo - no , We - da - ne - wo and me - ta - ki - ti - ta are numbered 126. This number is excluded from the total number of recorded men, which is by no means stated at the end, and therefore is forming some sort of parenthetical remark describing that these groups are joined together in some way. Perhaps this insert points to the projected quota that Pylian elite gives, and that in order to be complete, is filled with 26 me - ta - ki - ti - ta as some kind of a substitution while 100 rowers are already provided (similar to Chadwick’s suggestion for po - si - ke - te - re as men who have come in addition to the quota demanded of their home town³²). This should solve the doubt as to why ko - ni - jo when interpreted as an ethnic and inserted between persons who are related to Pylos by their positions, and those who are designated with appellative and whose entries also relate to Pylos which is implied. This parenthetical note is actually an unusual occurrence regarding the system of recording, but we could allow occasional departure from a set form of archiving if there is a peculiarity that needs to be mentioned in relation to other information. Besides that, we think that the reason why the scribe squeezes records forming three column entry is only because they are related to one coherent group of records. Indication of that nonuniformity and usage of other solutions in recording data belonging together are last two entries in line 15 coupled with enclitic $-qe$. This, however, does not need to be an unique case if we accept Killen’s hypothesis of me - za - na wo - ke as parenthetical note in **PY Sh 736**, although it is of a different character in relation to ko - ni - jo note³³. We are aware that these interpretations could face some problems mainly regarding direct attestation, but since previous interpretations are not very probable, and especial-

³¹ Interpretation generally admitted is $*\acute{\alpha}\rho\rho\eta\text{-}\epsilon(\zeta)$, cf. superl. $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$, later replaced by $\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\iota\omega\nu$, v. *DMic.*, s.v. a - ro_2 - a . Ruijgh (1967, 30) suggested scribal error and concluded: “Le scribe a donc écrit $-jo$ au lieu de $-e$ sous l’influence de l’autre possibilité orthographique.”

³² Chadwick, 1987, 78.

³³ J. T. Killen, “Mycenaean o - pa ” in *Floreat studia Mycenaea, Band II*, S. Deger-Jalkotzy, S. Hiller, O. Panagl (eds.), Wien, 1999, 330.

ly not certain, our aim was to stress another possibility that could fit linguistic, ortographical and contextual data.

After the above discussion about *ko-ni-jo* as a note, which was the purpose of this paper, we will finally look at the problem arising from adding the fragment **Xn 1151** to the tablet **An 610**, which “is most probably the upper left-hand corner of the tablet”³⁴ and thus complements the heading in first line *me-za-[wo-]ne, e-re-ta*. Before this joint we would perhaps assume the form as in **PY An 724** tablet, toponym + appellative + verb, therefore toponym ending with *-ne*, or, as Chadwick assumed³⁵, a verbal form with *o-* at its beginning. But now, with this joint, interpretation of the heading becomes a bit complicated because *me-za-[wo-]ne* should be dat. sg. of an anthroponym attested in other tablets in forms *me-za-wo*, nom. (**KN Sc 222**), *me-za-wo-ni*, dat. (**PY Un 138.5**) and *me-za-ne* (**PY Fn 50.4**) taken as a scribal error for *me-za<wo>-ne*³⁶. It might be surprising to find all of these men, almost 500, to be listed under one personal name. What role to give him? First thing that comes to mind is that this is an admiral of the Pylian kingdom's or Messenian fleet. In other Pylian documents, a person by the same name is mentioned as a recipient of 4 l. of barley entered under three βασιλεῖς and before *a₃-ki-a₂-ri-jo*³⁷ in **Fn 50** and he pays his dues with 578 l. of barley and 840 l. of olives, described as *ka-pa*, in **Un 138**. Nothing directly indicates this sort of office. In fact, there is no direct evidence for navy organization and officers' ranks in linear B documents and the information that could be related to officers are scattered on documents without maritime context. This is just a name of one officer (**PY An 723**, **Cn 1197**, **Jn 881**, **Na 284**, **Nn 831**) interpreted as *έπεθεύς ‘official in charge of rowers’, ‘head of τὰ σκάφεια’³⁸. Above all, it is tempting to find some explanation of this new heading but we ought to wait for confirmation of this joint as certain.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bartoněk, A., *Handbuch des mykenischen Griechisch*, Heidelberg 2003.

³⁴ Melena, 1992/1993, 316.

³⁵ Chadwick, 1987, 76.

³⁶ There is also erroneous writing *me-ri-du-te* for *me-ri-du<ma>-te* in line 5.

³⁷ *a₃-ki-a₂-ri-jo* is probably an anthroponym *Αἰγι-ἡάλιος, derived from an ethnic *Αἰγι-ἡαλός (cf. αἰγιαλός), it could be too an appellative (v. *Documents*², 91: “shore-man”), v. *DMic.*, s.v. *a₃-ki-a₂-ri-jo*.

³⁸ Th. G. Palaima, “Maritime Matters in the Linear B Tablets”, in R. Laffineur and L. Basch (eds.), *Thalassa. L'Egee préhistorique et la mer (Aegaeum 7)*, Liège 1991, 301; *DMic.*, s.v. *e-re-e-u*.

- Bennett, Jr., E. L., “A selection of Pylos tablet texts”, in J.-P. Olivier (ed.), *Mykenaiika* (BCH Supplément XXV), Paris 1992, 103–127.
- Bennett, Jr., E. L. and Olivier, J.-P., *The Pylos Tablets Transcribed. Part I: texts and notes*, Roma 1973.
- Chadwick, J., “The Muster of the Pylian Fleet”, in P. Hr. Ilievski - Lj. Crepajac (eds.), *Tractata Mycenaea. Proceedings of the Eighth International Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies*, Held in Ohrid (15-20 September 1985), Skopje 1987, 75–84.
- Chadwick, J., “The Women of Pylos”, in *Texts, Tablets and Scribes: Studies in Mycenaean Epigraphy and Economy Offered to Emmett L. Bennett, Jr.*, Suplementos a *MINOS*, Núm. 10, J.-P. Olivier, Th. G. Palaima (eds.), Salamanca 1988, 43–96.
- Chantraine, P., *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, Paris 1968.
- Jorro, F. A., *Diccionario micénico*, I-II, Madrid 1985–1993.
- Killen, J. T., “PY An 1”, *Minos* 18, 1983, 71-80.
- Killen, J. T., “Mycenaean o-pa” in *Floreat studia Mycenaea*, Band II, S. De-ger-Jalkotzy, S. Hiller, O. Panagl (eds.), Wien 1999, 325–342.
- Liddell, H. G. – Scott, R., *A Greek -English Lexicon*, Oxford 1996.
- Lejeune, M., *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*, Klincksieck 1972
- Lindgren, M., *The People of Pylos*. Part II, Uppsala 1973.
- Melena, J. L., “167 Joins of Fragments in the Linear B Tablets from Pylos”, *Minos* 27/28, 1992/1993, 71–82.
- Melena, J. L., “244 Joins and Quasi-joins of Fragments in the Linear B Tablets from Pylos”, *Minos* 27/28, 1992/1993, 307–324.
- Melena, J. L., “133 Joins and Quasi-joins of Fragments in the Linear B Tablets from Pylos”, *Minos* 29/30, 1994/1995, 271–288.
- Nakassis, D., “Prestige and Interest: Feasting and the King at Mycenaean Pylos”, *Hesperia* 81, 2012, 1–30.
- Olivier, J.-P., “Les “collecteurs”: leur distribution spatiale et temporelle”, in S. Voutsaki, J. Killen (eds.), *Economy and Politics in the Mycenaean Palace States*. Proceedings, Cambridge 2001, 129–159.
- Palaima, T. G., *The Scribes of Pylos*, Roma 1988.
- Palaima, T. G., “Maritime Matters in the Linear B Tablets”, in R. Laffineur and L. Basch (eds.), *Thalassa. L'Égée préhistorique et la mer* (Aegaeum 7), Liège 1991, 273–310.
- Palmer, L. R., *The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts*, Oxford 1963, repr. 1969.
- Perpillou, J.-L., “La tablette PY An 724 et la flotte pylienne”, *Minos* 9 (1968), 205–218.
- Petrakis, V. P., “E-ke-ra2-wo ≠ wa-na-ka: The Implications of a Probable Non-Identification for Pylian Feasting and Politics”, in L. A. Hitchcock, R. Laffineur and J. Crowley (eds.), *DAIS. The Aegean Feast*, Proceedings of the 12th International Aegean Conference University of Melbourne, Centre for Classics and Archaeology, 25-29 March 2008, Aegaeum 29 (2008), 391–399.
- Ruijgh, C., *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*, Amsterdam 1967.

- Rougemont, F., “Some thoughts of the identification of the “collectors” in the Linear B tablets”, in S. Voutsaki, J. Killen (eds.), *Economy and Politics in the Mycenaean Palace States*. Proceedings, Cambridge 2001, 195–213.
- Tritsch, F. J., “PY Ad 684”, *Minos* 5, 1957, 154–162.
- Ventris, M. and Chadwick, J., *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, 2nd ed., Cambridge 1973.
- Wachsmann, S., *Seagoing Ships and Seamanship in the Bronze Age Levant*, College Station, Texas 1998.
- Yasur-Landau, A., *The Philistines and Aegean Migration at the End of the Late Bronze Age*, Cambridge 2010.
- <https://www2.hf.uio.no/damos/>